

Chapter 3

‘Human rights journalism’: a critical conceptual framework of a complementary strand of peace journalism

Ibrahim Seaga Shaw

In recent years, the main conceptual focus of human rights journalism has essentially been twofold: the first has been on the role of the journalist in exposing human rights abuses, popularly called human rights reporting, and, second, on free speech which is in itself a human right. More rarely explored is the conceptualisation of human rights journalism (HRJ) that I am proposing in this chapter – that is, a rethinking of the form based on the insights of peace journalism (PJ). HRJ is a rights-based journalism – journalism based on the human rights principles enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) to be enjoyed and respected by all human beings, and subsequently elaborated upon in the twin International Conventions of Civil and Political Rights, and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, respectively, as well as subsequent legislative and normative frameworks espoused by the UN system and by UN member states.

The heads of government meeting for the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000 issued a declaration which, looking back over this record of human rights frameworks, consisted ‘largely of pieties’ according to Noam Chomsky (2000). ‘At the rhetorical level, rights and freedoms are supported by most governments, Chomsky noted, and by most journalists. However, Chomsky also drew attention to significant lacunae in the declaration’s text by comparing and contrasting the showpiece event in New York with an earlier conclave in Havana, the South Summit of the G77, which brought together leaders of the

developing countries that met in 1964 for the first UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The South Summit communiqué made extensive reference to the need, if human rights are to be meaningfully attained by the majority of humanity, for positive measures to extend security and opportunity in the economic and social spheres: 'Our highest priority is to overcome underdevelopment, which implies the eradication of hunger, illiteracy, disease and poverty.' The G77 leaders went on to 'urge the international community to adopt urgent and resolute actions, with a comprehensive and multidimensional approach, to assist in overcoming these scourges, and to establish international economic relations based on justice and equity'. It deplored the 'asymmetries and imbalances that have intensified international economic relations' to the detriment of the South, and called for reform of 'international economic governance' and 'international financial architecture' to make them 'more democratic, more transparent and better attuned to solving the problems of development'. The difference lay, in other words, in the acknowledgement, built into the G77 declaration but omitted or glossed over in the equivalent document from the UN meeting, that unjust political economic structures, put and kept in place for the benefit of powerful interests in the rich world, have the effect of keeping people in the majority world from attaining the rights prescribed for them in the wellknown international instruments.

Mainstream minority-world journalism generally sides with the official rhetoric and policy stances of the governments in the countries in which it is produced. Where human rights violations make the news, they are usually reported as the actions of individual perpetrators, not as the product of a system and of structures that construct and sustain long-term relations in conflict. This is one of the key critiques put forward by PJ advocates, and it relates to majority-world mainstream journalism as well. 'The predominant war journalism of conflict reporting in the wealthy northern hemisphere also dominates global news flows,' Lynch wrote (2008, p79).

By excluding or downplaying backgrounds and contexts, it privileges dispositional – often essentialist – explanations for people's behaviour

Expanding peace journalism

in conflict over situationist ones. It therefore obscures longstanding structural inequities, in favour of discussions about self-professedly well-meaning interventions' (2008, p79).

Mainstream journalism has failed to communicate not only peace, but also human rights in ways that have the potential of illuminating the important nexus between them. Perhaps more importantly, mainstream journalism has failed to focus on the potential for positive peacebuilding and on positive human rights to match the dominant negative peace and negative rights emphasised within the cosmopolitan context of global justice. Moreover, apart from the growing body of peace studies and peace journalism research in recent times (see, for example, Galtung & Vincent 1992; Galtung 1994, 1996; Lynch & McGoldrick 2005; Lynch 2008), which has at least attempted to illuminate the failure of the media to contribute to or highlight positive peacebuilding initiatives, there is little scholarly work focusing, first, on the journalism–peace–human rights nexus and, second, on critical discussion of the failure of mainstream journalism to foreground positive peace and positive rights issues. This chapter aims to address this gap in scholarship and support the development of human rights journalism as a new, complementary strand of peace journalism that can contribute meaningfully to the promotion and protection of peace and human rights.

This chapter also draws and elaborates on, because of its salience for considering issues in media domains, Lisa Schirch's 'justpeace' framework, which 'provides a setting for seeing how human rights concerns for justice support other peacebuilding activities' (2002, p209). It is in keeping with the PJ model, in favouring, with Galtung, the concept of positive peace over negative peace (1992, 1996). And it provides a conceptual underpinning for the call by other chapters in this volume for an expansion of peace journalism to incorporate ideas of human rights in tackling problems of visible, direct violence as well as invisible, structural and cultural violence.

The rest of this chapter will explore, first, the concept of justpeace within the context of the human rights, peace and communication nexus, and, second, the links between justpeace, PJ and HRJ. Finally, it will critically discuss how HRJ, through the justpeace approach,

complements the PJ model and makes it even more focused on 'justpeace-building' approaches.

The concept of justpeace and the human rights, peace and communication nexus

This section explores the intersection of the theories of communication, human rights and peace. Communicating a message can be both a means and an end in the promotion and protection of human rights and peace. By taking part in an act of communication you can contribute to creating peace, which can also be indispensable for human rights promotion and protection. Cycles of violence (structural, cultural or physical), involving multiple potential human rights violations, are readily legible in the communication – or lack of – between conflicting parties. The enjoyment of human rights on the other hand may lead to peace while both combine to guarantee the freedom and security to communicate. There is therefore a clear nexus between peace and human rights, and between these two concepts and communication. However, the putative tensions that exist between the notions of human rights and peace on one level, and between these two notions and the conventions of 'professional' journalism on another, have threatened the mutually beneficial coexistence of these three arguably interrelated and interdependent notions. In this section I draw on insights from Lisa Schirch's justpeace framework (2002) and Galtung's positive peace framework (1996) to give a brief overview of these tensions and how the approach of justpeace-building addresses them.

Schirch (2002) traces the tensions between human rights and peace to a number of philosophical and practical differences. On the one hand, the work of human rights organisations is often interpreted as advocacy against human rights violations and calls for punishment of the violators. Human rights workers aim to carry out their work according to standards of behaviour enshrined in the UDHR, 'and use the legal system in the pursuit of a justice where offenders are punished for their crimes' (Schirch 2002, p210). In human rights discourse, clear victims and offenders are identified, and both cannot be equally held culpable for the acts of human rights violations.

Expanding peace journalism

On the other hand, conflict resolution approaches give equal attention to victims of all sides of a conflict, typically in a longer timeframe, and view all sides as mutually responsible for the task of addressing the problem. In other words, conflict resolution approaches to parties to a conflict emphasise impartiality between them (though not over issues of principle, such as human rights *per se*); while those of human rights advocates emphasise clear distinctions between perpetrators and victims.

The goal of being a mediating “bridge” between groups in conflict, helping each to empathise with the other, to share perspectives on “truth”, and work together to find ways of moving forward, is often seen as incompatible with the goal of raising awareness and naming injustice’ (Schirch 2002, p210).

The apparent incompatibility between these two positions might lead a human rights advocate to ask a peace worker: ‘How can you work for peace without including a sense of justice for victims?’ The peace worker might ask back: ‘How will we ever move forward if we insist on punishing offenders?’ (Schirch 2002, p210).

The emphasis, in the discourse of Western-based human rights organisations, on the accountability of individual perpetrators is in keeping with negative peace: if a particular person can be shown to have fired a gun in an illegitimate way (or caused others to do so), then she or he should be punished. This emphasis also informs the familiar human rights agenda in Western journalism, perhaps epitomised by the Crimes of War project, in which two journalists, Roy Gutman and David Rieff, teamed up with the International Committee of the Red Cross to produce a handbook and website furnishing readers with expert advice as to what constitutes a war crime in a range of different circumstances, with the aim of getting journalists to report it as such (Gutman & Rieff 2000).

Galtung defines peace as the absence of violence, but while negative peace – like a ceasefire – requires only the abstention from direct violence, positive peace implies programmatic actions to provide for social justice, limiting structural and cultural violence to enable people

to fulfil their potential. Putting these forms on the same ontological footing, by labelling them both 'violence', as Galtung has done, means that when an act or threat of force is made, individual culpability is automatically diluted. This insight, Galtung contends, is potentially important in peacebuilding, because the 'nature-structure-culture model' is inescapably 'exculpatory'. He explains:

A structure-oriented perspective converts the relation from interpersonal, or inter-state/nation, to a relation between two positions in a deficient structure. If the parties can agree that the structure was/is deficient and that their behaviour was an enactment of structural positions rather than anything more personal, then turning together against the common problem, the structural violence, should be possible. A culture-oriented perspective also converts the relation from interpersonal, or inter-state/nation, to a relation spurred by a deficient culture. (Galtung 1996, p65)

Justice for individual perpetrators must, this implies, be conceived in a context where deficient structures and cultures are also transformed, because the behaviours of the individuals concerned must be seen as having been, in an important sense, 'produced' by the structures within which their relationship with their victims was formed.

The concept of justpeace, which is a hybrid of human rights and peace, helps to provide answers to the questions posed by both fields. Justpeace goes beyond efforts to reduce direct violence. Justpeace-building efforts prioritise the proper transformation of principles and values over a long timeframe through an organised system of distributive justice, where resources and decision-making are shared. There is a substantial overlap, at least rhetorically, between the concept of justpeace and the statement issued by the South Summit. 'Moreover, the concept of justpeace builds on a restorative vision of justice, aimed at meeting basic human needs of both victims and offenders while holding the latter accountable for their crimes' (Schirch 2002, p212). Justpeace is only possible where there are sustainable structures and processes that allow humanity to meet basic needs. Hence there are no contradictions between human rights and peacebuilding goals within

a justpeace framework. 'The field of human rights fits into a long-term plan for building justpeace by contributing analytical tools, value frameworks, and by playing a variety of roles in peacebuilding practice' (Schirch 2002, p212).

While social oppression, which people experience as a result of structural violence, may have the effect of mobilising people who are normally nonviolent to commit acts of violence, 'it is [nevertheless] more difficult to notice than direct overt violence' (Larssen 2009, p21). Achieving peace without human rights generally renders such peace as sterile (Ife 2007). As Frank (2007) posits, any peace that is not grounded in human rights cannot be said to be justpeace. The concept of negative peace resonates with Walzer's just war theory (1992): injustice leads to structural violence such as poverty, famine and forced migration, which in turn may lead to direct physical violence and to further human rights violations. Thus the concept of justice for all is equally important in positive peace as in justpeace.

Thomas Frank (2007) conceptualises the ethic of justpeace as comprising the following seven forms of reasoning:

- All people have an ontological claim to 'Being' and 'Being Responsible' for their own social agency, although societal conditions such as war can affect this.
- The idea of 'Being' and 'Being Responsible' is a global phenomenon which emphasises the 'equality of all social agents'.
- The equality and co-existence of all social agents is valued.
- The value of 'Being' implies that the global social agents' needs are global values – that is, that values (rights) are universal and not relative.
- Wrongs committed by a social agent can be condemned and corrected but their life cannot be taken from them as punishment. The being of social agents is radically dependent on others.
- The issue of compulsory trust and the need for external assistance in matters outside of one's control implies the global norm to value the trust of others.

- The social agent is the subject of the concept of justpeace, not the sovereign state or the international community.

The ethics of justpeace as summarised by Frank (2007) above are already present and emerging in the framework of international human rights law. Frank (2007) explains that the needs of the social agent and the principles or norms designated to meet those needs are very much 'represented in the human rights discourse and regime and the asymmetric identities constructed therein' (p84). The logic of justpeace is framed in the notion that 'we must be just if we want justice to come' (Frank 2007, p86). As Gandhi famously said: 'Be the change you want to see in the world'.

The Western philosophical foundations of the peace and human rights nexus can be traced to the work of Immanuel Kant and his notion of the 'cosmopolitan community'. Kant believed in both peace and human rights and saw a clear connection between the two concepts. He linked the moral development of any particular political community to 'the development of international law and a pacific federation of states' (Kant 1963 [1784], p18), and argued that war or even preparation for it brings into play attitudes and behaviours hostile to the realisation of human rights. Kant advocated a lawful form of international association based on the cosmopolitan condition of interdependence. In an ideal cosmopolitan world, human rights are held equally by all persons; if that is the case, cosmopolitans argue that there will be common interest in their promotion and protection. 'A cosmopolitan community comes into being when a violation of human rights is felt to be of concern to the whole international community regardless of where it occurs' (Kant 1963 [1784], p21). This rhetoric is fine, but unfortunately the reality often does not follow suit. Why the international community acted to avert mass killings in Kosovo, for example, but not in the cases of Somalia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone, to name but a few African crises (to which one might now add the intervention in Libya, but not Palestine, Yemen or Bahrain), exemplifies what I call a form of 'rhetorical cosmopolitanism' (Shaw 2011, forthcoming): honoured by rhetoric, but not with follow-through actions.

Expanding peace journalism

Frank’s ethic and logic of justpeace (2007) and Kant’s philosophical framework of the peace and human rights nexus resonate more closely with Schirch’s (2002) human rights paradigm of justpeace than with a realist paradigm, especially as each values the important cosmopolitan justice-based values of equality and interdependence. I include below two tables reflecting a realist paradigm, and Schirch’s justpeace human rights paradigm.

Table 1

Realist paradigm: focused on meeting human needs and rights of self at expense of other

- Human relationships are structured hierarchically where some people dominate others in an effort to meet their own needs and obtain their own rights.
- Humans are independent of each other so that one person’s gain can be another’s loss.
- Violence is often seen as the only way of pursuing one’s human needs and rights.

Table 2

Justpeace human rights paradigm: focused on meeting human needs and rights of both self and other

- Many human relationships are structured in an egalitarian, partnership model where people cooperate to meet each other’s needs.
- Humans are interdependent with each other so that unmet human needs or rights of any individual or group ripple outward toward the whole of humanity.
- Nonviolent methods of ensuring human needs and rights are essential so that the very struggle to obtain rights does not violate the rights of an opposing group, thus reinforcing the cycle of violence.

Justpeace, human rights journalism and peace journalism

In this section I explore the links between justpeace and PJ on the one hand and between justpeace and HRJ on the other. Justpeace is seen as a holistic and practical framework informed by the idea that war is not simply an isolated event but very much rooted within the fabric of our societies, and by ‘the hope that wars can be prevented from within by creating modes of negotiation and reconciliation practices to reduce and eventually end the necessity for violence’ (Malone 2004, p8). Ury (2001, p38) conceptualises justpeace as having a ‘third side’ that is ‘a kind of a social immune system that prevents the spread of the virus of violence.’ Ury is critical of the Hobbesian notion that human nature’s inclination to war can only be restrained by a strong government. He ponders how our ancestors were able to resolve conflict so successfully for so long (Ury 2001).

While carrying out research among the Kalahari Bushmen, in which he observed the ways in which family, friends and the extended community intervened to resolve issues between conflicting parties, Ury discovered that conflicts never take place just between two adversaries, but that there is always a ‘third side’. This third side:

is made up of people from the community using a certain kind of power, the power of peers, from a certain perspective, which is a perspective of common ground; supporting a certain process, which is the process of dialogue and nonviolence; and aiming for a certain product, which is a triple win – a solution that’s good for the community and good for both of the parties. (Ury 2001, p73)

Ury perceives conflict as a natural phenomenon and calls for a positive interactive dialogue rather than mere opposition from external forces. He comes up with ten roles that ‘third siders’ can play in achieving justpeace:

Expanding peace journalism

Table 3

1. Provider	Helping people meet their frustrated needs
2. Teacher	Instilling skills or attitudes to defuse tensions
3. Bridge builder	Fostering good relationships across potential lines of conflict
4. Mediator	Helping people reconcile their opposite interests
5. Arbiter	Delineating the disputed rights
6. Equaliser	Balancing the power between clashing parties
7. Healer	Repairing injured relationships and defusing wounded emotions
8. Witness	Taking heed and note of early warning signs of dispute
9. Referee	Establishing objective rules for conflict
10. Peace keeper	Stepping in to separate the fighting parties, even physically

Defining peace journalism

Lynch and McGoldrick (2005, p5) define PJ as ‘a set of tools, both conceptual and practical, intended to equip journalists to offer a better public service’. It is a journalism that helps reporters and editors alike to make informed choices about what stories deserve reporting and how the reporting itself is done, and that provides society at large with opportunities to consider and value nonviolent responses to conflict. Lynch and McGoldrick (2005, p5) present PJ as playing the following three key roles:

- It uses the insights of conflict analysis and transformation to update the concepts of balance, fairness and accuracy in reporting.
- It provides a new route map tracing the connections between journalists, their sources, the stories they cover and the consequences of their journalism – the ethics of journalistic intervention.
- It builds an awareness of nonviolence and creativity into the practical job of everyday editing and reporting.

Like all alternative journalism models, PJ has both supporters and critics. By recognising the debates in favour of and against peace journalism, Lynch (2008) challenges practitioners of war journalism to try an alternative paradigm – that of providing a more comprehensive diagnosis of conflict dynamics to aid news consumers’ understanding of the issues, and encouraging a ‘win–win’ logic of finding solutions instead of just reporting the facts of violence in a ‘win–lose’ framing that often leads to more violence. PJ creates an enabling environment that helps people consider nonviolent approaches to ending violence and in this sense it resonates with the justpeace approach that favours dialogue and nonviolence. Both have elements of critical conflict analysis and creativity that help provide solutions to conflict. However, where justpeace goes further in the solution-orientated approach is where its own targeted end product is a triple win, a solution that meets the needs of the two parties in the conflict and the community as the ‘third side’. Moreover, where justpeace goes further in the people-orientated and justice-orientated approach is where it is attached, rather than detached, to all vulnerable victims of human rights violations. Justpeace implies the provision for social justice, necessary for allowing the fulfilment of human potential that has been curtailed by structural and cultural violence. Lederach captures something of this sense by defining justice as ‘the pursuit of restoration, of rectifying wrongs, of creating right relationships based on equity and fairness’ (1995, p20).

Defining human rights journalism

Human rights journalism can be defined as a diagnostic style of reporting which offers a critical reflection of the experiences and needs of the victims and perpetrators of (physical, cultural and structural) human rights violations. It attempts to understand the reasons for these violations in order to prevent further violations and to solve current ones in ways that would not produce more violence. Moreover, it is a journalism that challenges, rather than reinforces, the status quo of the dominant voices of global and national societies. It is, in other words, journalism without borders, based on human rights and global justice, challenging political, economic, social and cultural imbalances of society at both local and global levels.

The HRJ strand of PJ is premised on the argument that if journalism is to play any agency role in society, it should focus on deconstructing the underlying structural causes of political violence such as poverty, famine, exclusion of minorities, youth marginalisation, human trafficking, forced labour and forced migration (to name but a few), rather than focusing merely on the attitudes and behaviours of the elite that benefit from direct and uncensored violence. In short, it calls for a robust, proactive (preventive), rather than dramatic, reactive (prescriptive) role for media in conflict. In an analogous dyadic diagnosis to that of ‘war journalism/peace journalism’, it identifies, as mainstream practice, a dominant strand of ‘human wrongs journalism’ (HWJ) – a journalism that reinforces, instead of challenges, the problematic representational imbalances in society and the concentration of power in the hands of the few people and political communities within global society (Shaw 2011, forthcoming).

Like PJ, HRJ resonates with the justpeace approach by valuing the critical conflict analysis and creativity that is needed to help people actively participate in the resolution of violent situations. HRJ, similarly to justpeace, adopts a global, long-term, proactive and sustainable approach to news coverage as it provides a critical reflection of the experiences and needs of not only the victims, but also of perpetrators or offenders. In this way, it ensures the prevention or resolution of all forms of future or present violence. Hence, HRJ has the potential to complement PJ’s contribution to global, long-term, proactive and sustainable justpeace-building.

The orientation variables of peace journalism, as outlined by Galtung (1992) and reproduced in the first chapter of this book, are similar to those I have identified with human rights journalism, as can be seen in Table 4.

On the other hand, the orientation variables or principles of war journalism, as outlined by Galtung (1992), also share similarities with what I have identified as human wrongs journalism, as can be seen in the Table 5.

Table 4

Peace journalism	Human rights journalism
1. Peace/conflict orientated: prevention/win-win	1. Nonviolence/structural/cultural violence orientated: proactive/preventing direct violence/triple win
2. Truth orientated: exposes all untruths	2. Human wrongs orientated: exposes all human wrongs
3. People orientated: names all victims	3. People/human-face orientated: cares for and empowers all but is biased in favour of vulnerable people
4. Solution orientated	4. Holistic problem-solving: for present problems now/tomorrow; and surface/hidden problems

Table 5

War journalism	Human wrongs journalism
1. War/violence orientated: reactive/first zero-sum/win-lose orientation	1. Competition orientated: violence/drama/provocative: solution after damage/business profit or loss
2. Propaganda/deceit orientated: exposes 'their' untruths/lies and covers up 'ours'	2. Their propaganda/deceit/conspiracy orientated: talks about 'their' conspiracies to commit human rights violations, and ignores 'ours'
3. Elite orientated: focuses on 'those' evil doers and 'our' victims/friend (good), enemy (bad)	3. Demonisation orientated: focuses on the human rights violations by 'them', 'others' or 'our enemies' against 'us' or 'our friends', the victims
4. Victory orientated: peace=victory +ceasefire	4. Partially solution orientated: focuses only on immediate physical needs at the expense of long-term structural solutions

How human rights journalism complements peace journalism

Galtung's PJ model was conceived as a peace–conflict paradigm to counterbalance the war–violence model with a view towards moving from the current dominant culture of violence to a culture of peace. This called for a paradigm shift, coming as it did on the heels of the end of the Cold War which climaxed with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and which was characterised by the outbreak of wars in the Balkans, the Middle East Gulf, Africa, and Southeast Asia. Galtung's model was informed by the popular saying 'violence breeds violence' (Galtung & Vincent 1992).

According to Galtung (1992), PJ denounces mainstream journalism as war journalism mainly because of its focus on problems rather than solutions, on propaganda rather than truth, on its elite rather than people, and its win–lose rather than win–win orientated paradigms (Lovasen 2008). Lovasen, who agrees with Galtung, uses PJ's orientations to claim that it holds dear the values of humanitarianism, truth, holism and empowerment. But there is a problem with this claim. I argue that, despite ticking almost all the boxes of the abovementioned orientations and values, PJ, as it stands, is lacking in the four other orientations typically reflective of HRJ listed in Table 4 (working for a global, triple-win, rather than a selective win–win or win–lose solution, biased in favour of vulnerable voices, proactive rather than reactive, and justice orientated, siding with the victims of violence). To show how HRJ complements PJ's orientations outlined in Table 4 above, I argue that HRJ also problematises mainstream journalism, labelling it 'human wrongs journalism', because of its orientation to selective justice rather than global justice; its bias against, rather than for, vulnerable voices; its tendency to report reactively rather than proactively; and its detachment from victims of human rights violations. All of these orientations are the polar opposites of the four HRJ orientations in Table 4. The four values – humanitarianism, truth, holism, and empowerment – advanced by Lovasen (2008) resonate in certain ways with the five principles of the HRJ approach to journalism: linkages to human rights standards, participation, accountability, non-discrimination and empowerment. These principles are informed by both negative and

positive rights, and by both negative and positive peace (Berman & Calderbank 2008; Galtung 1992, 1996; Nowak 2005). The four values and five principles of the HRJ also largely inform the justpeace-building approach advocated by Schirch (2002).

Global, long-term, proactive and sustainable approaches of justpeace

In the remainder of this section I critically explore how HRJ can, through the global, long-term, proactive and sustainable approaches of justpeace, complement and strengthen PJ as a counter-hegemonic journalism practice. Drawing on these justpeace approaches, HRJ proposes a critical reflection of the experiences and needs of both victims and perpetrators of human rights violations. I look now at these justpeace approaches in the context of PJ's use of both realist and human rights paradigms, the debate about the place of objectivity and of advocacy in journalism.

In the context of realist and human rights paradigms, HRJ makes transparent, and problematises, power relations (at both national and supranational levels) that increase the powerlessness, helplessness, impotence, and apathy of those whose mobilisation would best serve the peace efforts (Carrol 1972; Dente Ross 2006). In 1972, Carrol argued the case that research failed to 'consider seriously the possibility that war is inherent not in human nature but in the power system of dominance in human relations', articulated through the nation-state. Political realists such as Hans Morgenthau believe that states are rational egoists seeking to promote their material interests in foreign policy (1967). Wheeler sees realism as predicated on a particular conception of the relationship between citizens and strangers that privileges what Robert H Jackson calls an ethic of 'national responsibility' (Wheeler 1999, p175; Jackson 1995). Realists believe that where there are competing interests, a country's vital strategic interests must be prioritised over actions to save human lives; this runs contrary to what cosmopolitans stand for. Mainstream journalism is overly manipulated by political, economic and cultural structures of hegemony and, hence, often leans towards political realism in its promotion of 'selective justice' than

cosmopolitan 'distributive' justice. Realists argue that since journalists do not operate outside their immediate political, social, economic, and cultural communities, it would be naïve to think that their reporting could remain uninfluenced by these.

In his synthesis of the arguments and counter-arguments in the PJ debate, Kempf (2007) defends Galtung's (2002) criticism of the mainstream media for reducing conflict to a zero-sum game and Lynch's (2007) call to journalism to analyse and address its own role in creating realities. PJ is critical of the media for systematically concealing certain facts, especially those that favour the peace discourse, in favour of others such as those that favour the war discourse. Kempf (2007) sees conflict as an interactive process involving three kinds of reality: first, the subjective reality of one party; second, the subjective reality of an opponent (and both this and the first kind of reality can interact internally); and third, the kind of reality that can only be assessed from an external perspective. Kempf (2007) sees PJ playing the role of an external perspective that shows how the two internal subjective realities interact with each other.

In the context of the objectivity–advocacy journalism binary, PJ continues to face the daunting challenge of relying on its critical conflict analysis approach based on values (truth/honesty/humanitarianism) that are at odds with those of mainstream 'professional' journalism, notably 'objective journalism'. Peace journalists must strike a balance between reporting and informing (objectivity) on one hand, and caring for humanity (advocacy) on the other hand. Are they getting the balance right? Or are they leaning more towards objectivity than advocacy? Or vice versa? Both PJ and HRJ are putatively extra-linear; that is, not based on neutral/objective journalism but on honest/subjective journalism. However, this is not always the case with PJ, which oscillates between the two divides and tends to lean more towards the objectivity standpoint. Perhaps the most illustrative case of this tendency of PJ is that offered by Lee and Maslog (2005) and Lee et al. (2006) in their studies of the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* (PDI)'s coverage of political violence in the Philippines:

The peace journalism framing is highly dependent on criteria of a less interventionist nature, for example, an avoidance of good/bad labels, a non partisan approach, a multi party orientation and avoidance of emotive language. These four indicators, although important in the overall scheme of peace journalism ... are mere extensions of the objectivity credo: reporting the facts as they are. These indicators do not truly exemplify a strong contributory, proactive role by journalists to seek and offer creative solutions and to pave a way for peace and conflict resolution. (Lee et al. 2006, p512)

In portraying PJ in the Philippines as taking a somewhat neutral, or passive stance, Lee and Maslog (2005) argue that the PJ practised by the *PDI* is more closely related to the 'classic' tenets of 'good journalism', rather than the more radical interventionist approach called for by 'advocacy journalism' (Hanitzsch 2007, p3; Becker 2002, p14). Lynch (2008, p149) argues that while the Lee and Maslog (2005) and Lee et al. (2006) studies concentrate on 'passive' peace journalism indicators – coded as the *absence* of, for instance, demonising or partisan language – they ignore the more ideational, 'active' indicators of PJ, which, according to Shinar (2007, p200), work to 'explore context', 'challenge propaganda' and 'make peace visible'. In Lynch's study, the *PDI* exhibited the highest 'quotient' of active PJ, of any of the media examined, in their coverage of the communist insurgency in the Philippines, at 41.2 percent: significantly higher than international media covering the same story in the same period.

The percentages of the three 'passive' indicators – avoiding emotive or demonising language (40 percent), non-partisanship (49.4 percent), and avoiding labels such as 'good' or 'bad' (64 percent), present in the *PDI* coverage of the same story – were even higher than those of the active peace journalism indicators. The crucial distinction is whether indicators or issues are framed in ways that will not only illuminate the problems but also identify, recommend, advocate and mobilise actionable solutions to address them. The passive (neutral) peace journalism illustrated in the Lee and Maslog (2005) and Lee et al. (2006) case studies resonates with the 'impartial' conflict resolution approach, and the 'negative', retributive-justice-based human rights approach, as

opposed to the 'positive' human rights, or justpeace approach outlined by Schirch and discussed above.

Not all writers in the broadly defined PJ 'camp' are inclined to this more radical approach. Kempf (2002) rejects advocacy explanations of PJ in favour of what he calls 'good' journalism, which he says has one aim: to represent reality accurately. Kempf (2002) presents objectivity, neutrality and detachment as means of reaching accuracy. While recognising the need to problematise the conventional journalistic appreciation of objectivity by way of liberating it from its shortcomings, Kempf cautions against turning away from it, as Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) or Hackett and Carroll (2006) have advocated, warning that this may undermine the 'trust bonus' that PJ currently enjoys (Kempf 2007, p7).

Kempf, like David Loyn (2007), prefers to reserve the name 'good journalism' for describing the opposite of what the former BBC correspondent Martin Bell called a 'journalism of attachment' (1996). Journalism, in Kempf and Loyn's view, must attempt to remain 'detached' – albeit with some caveats. Objectivity may, Loyn allows, be 'chimerical' – but it is still an essential goal of news. Nevertheless, Nordenstreng points out that the privileged place of journalism within the international human rights framework – explicitly provided for twice over in the twin 'Articles 19' of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights – is not intended to enshrine the free flow of information as a goal in itself, but as a means to an external goal – that of peace (2001).

This is in keeping with the advocacy journalism which German political scientist Jorg Becker (2002, p14) sees as the political obligation of the media. That is, it should 'participate and stand for peace of its accord', and, I add, human rights. Becker looks to journalism not only to report reality 'as it is' but, rather, to create reality, set examples and call for change (Hanitzsch 2007, p3). This is what Siebert et al. (1963, 1956) call the 'social responsibility of journalism model': with their enjoyment of communications rights, journalists have a social responsibility to criticise those in power on behalf of peoples and societies, more or less serving as their watchdogs (Siebert et al. 1963, 1956; Hohenberg 1974;

Cater 1957; Cohen-Almagor 2001). Article 3 of the 1978 UNESCO Declaration, for instance, states that, 'the mass media have an important contribution to make to the strengthening of peace and international understanding and in countering racialism, apartheid and incitement to war' (UNESCO 1978, p1). The social responsibility role of journalism, grounded in communication rights, underpins Nordenstreng's call for initiatives 'to systematically monitor what the media tell about the world with a view to improving media performance and contributing to media ethics' (2001, p1).

It is this social responsibility role that Lynch and McGoldrick (2005, cited in McGoldrick 2006, p4 and cited in Kempf 2007, p3) allude to when they assert that journalists are responsible for the way they report, and even for the creation of 'opportunities for society at large to consider and to value nonviolent responses to conflict'. But Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) see this 'responsibility' not so much as an external goal imposed on journalism from outside, but, as they argue, an 'obligation to create these opportunities [that] results directly from the role assigned to journalism in democratic societies' (cited in Kempf 2007, p3). Lynch and Galtung (2010, p91) note that 'the external goal of peace is added instrumentally, to deliver more successfully on internal goals of accuracy and fairness'. HRJ, which, as an external goal, consistently draws on the principles of the human rights-based approach to journalism mentioned above, can therefore potentially strengthen PJ's call to journalists to be more socially responsible in creating opportunities for the nonviolent prevention or resolution of conflicts within a justpeace-building framework, without necessarily undermining the professional tenets of professional 'good' journalism such as accuracy and fairness. In fact, I have argued that the external goals of the HRJ principles assigned to journalism in democratic societies instrumentally reinforce professional journalism's internal goals of fairness and accuracy.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the problems of war or mainstream journalism identified here are largely to blame for the under-reporting and/or misrepresenting of political and structural forms of violence – and, by extension,

Expanding peace journalism

human rights violations – that permeate today’s news media. Given these problems in mainstream journalism, it makes sense to incorporate HRJ as a complementary strand of PJ, to tackle these problems.

HRJ complements the four orientations of the PJ model advanced by Galtung (1992, 1996) and supported by Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) – namely: solution rather than victory oriented, truth rather than propaganda oriented, people rather than elite oriented, and win–win rather than win–lose orientated by introducing four others. These are: global rather than selective reporting, a bias in favour of vulnerable voices, a proactive (preventive) rather than reactive (prescriptive) approach to reporting, and an attachment to, rather than a detachment from, victims of violence. It is also human rights orientated. With these complementary attributes of HRJ, PJ, this chapter argues, will be able to lay justifiable claim to the observation of the values of ‘humanitarianism, truth, holism and empowerment’, as identified by Lovasen (2008) in support of the Galtung model. These four values resonate with the principles of the rights-based approach to journalism: participation, accountability, non-discrimination, empowerment, and linkages to human rights standards informed by both negative and positive rights on one hand, and negative and positive peace on the other (Berman & Calderbank 2008; Galtung 1992, 1996; Nowak 2005). (See also Shaw, 2011 for a detailed discussion of this connection.)

Below is a table showing my human wrongs and human rights journalism model.

Table 6 HWJ vs HRJ

HWJ	HRJ
• Empathy/distance frame	• Empathy/critical frame
• Evocative reporting	• Diagnostic reporting
• Reactive	• Proactive
• Non-interventionist	• Interventionist
• War journalism	• Peace journalism

The above model underscores the importance of the role of the media in the promotion of peace and human rights. The existence of any solution presupposes the existence of a problem that that solution is aiming to solve – hence my reasoning behind juxtaposing HWJ with HRJ in the table. Communication manipulated in favour of the dominant classes of society is bound to be produced when journalists employ HWJ (evocative empathy distance frames) that discourage advocacy or intervention. This is in contrast to HRJ (diagnostic empathy critical frames) that encourages advocacy and intervention to promote and protect peace and human rights (Preston 1996). I conclude with the argument that HRJ upholds the internal principles of human rights-based journalism which encompass the tenets of professional journalism to address the structural imbalances of global society at large, and in this way prevent or resolve direct physical violence within a justpeace framework. In this way, human rights journalists can complement peace journalists as ‘third siders’, taking on the roles of providers, teachers, bridge builders, or mediators to help parties in conflict reach their needs and achieve justpeace.

References

- Becker, Jorg (2002). *Medien im Krieg*. In Ulrich Albrecht & Jorg Becker (Eds). *Medien zwischen Krieg und Frieden* (pp13–26). Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Bell, Martin (1996). *In harm's way: reflections of a war-zone thug*. London: Penguin Books.
- Berman, Gabrielle & Daniel Calderbank (2008). *The human rights-based approach to journalism: training manual Vietnam*. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Carroll, Berenice (1972). Peace research: the cult of power. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 16(4): 585–616.
- Carruthers, Susan (2000). *The media at war: communication and conflict in the twentieth century*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cater, Douglass (1957). *The fourth branch of government*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Expanding peace journalism

Chomsky, Noam (2000). World summits yield remarkable contrast. *Z Magazine*. [Online]. Available: www.progress.org/chomsky05.htm [Accessed 22 July 2011].

Cohen-Almagor, Raphael (2001). *Speech, media and ethics: the limits of free expression*. New York: Palgrave.

Dente-Ross, Susan (2006). (De)constructing conflict: a focused review of war and peace journalism. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 5(2). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de/ [Accessed 22 July 2011].

Frank, T (2007). Idealist and realist aspirations for just peace: an analysis of ethics of military force and the discursive construction of an ethic of international policing within the framework of just peace and the contemporary hegemony of international law. Unpublished PhD Dissertation Submitted to the Theological Faculty, University of Aarhus.

Galtung, Johan (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: peace and conflict, development and civilisation*. PRIO–International Peace Research Institute, Oslo. London: SAGE Publications.

Galtung, Johan & Richard C Vincent (1992). *Global glasnost: toward a new world information and communication order?* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Gutman, Roy & David Rieff (2000). *Crimes of war*. Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross.

Hackett, Robert & William Carroll (2006). *Remaking media: the struggle to democratize public communication*. New York: Routledge.

Hanitzsch, Thomas (2007). Situating peace journalism in journalism studies: a critical appraisal. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 6(2). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de [Accessed 27 July 2011].

Hohenberg, John (1978). *The professional journalist*. New York: Holt Rinehart Wilson.

Ife, Jim (2007). Human rights and peace. In Charles Webel & Johan Galtung (Eds). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies* (pp160–72). New York: Routledge.

Kant, Immanuel (1963 [1784]). *Idea for a universal history from a cosmopolitan point of view*. Translated by Lewis White Beck. [Online]. Available: www.marxists.org/reference/subject/ethics/kant/universal-history.htm [Accessed 18 August 2011].

Kempf, Wilhelm (2007). Peace journalism: a tightrope walk between advocacy journalism and constructive conflict coverage. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 6(2). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de [Accessed 27 July 2011].

Kempf, Wilhelm (2002). Conflict coverage and conflict escalation. In Wilhelm Kempf & Heikki Luostarinen (Eds). *Journalism and the new world order: studying war and the media*, 2nd volume pp59–72. Goteborg: Nordicom.

Larssen, Ingvild (2009). Peace and human rights: a comparative analysis on the role of human rights in Norwegian peace processes in Sudan. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Faculty of Social Sciences University of Tromsø, Norway.

Lederach, John Paul (1995). *Preparing for peace: conflict transformation across cultures*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Lee, Seow Ting, Crispin Maslog & Hun Shik Kim (2006). Asian conflicts and the Iraq war: a compassionate framing analysis. *International Communication Gazette*, 68(5–6): 499–518.

Lee, Seow Ting & Crispin Maslog (2005). War or peace journalism in Asian newspapers. *Journal of Communication*, 55(2): 311–329.

Loyn, David (2007). Good journalism or peace journalism? *Conflict and Communication Online*, 6(2). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/loyn.pdf [Accessed 27 July 2011].

Lovasen, Line (2008). Journalism and power: the role of media in building human rights and culture of peace. *Human Rights Defence.org*. [Online]. Available: www.humanrightsdefence.org/journalism-and-power-the-role-of-media-in-building-human-rights-and-a-culture-of-peace.html [Accessed 27 July 2011].

Lynch, Jake (2008). *Debates in peace journalism*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Expanding peace journalism

Lynch, Jake (2007). Peace journalism and its discontents. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 6(2). [Online]. Available: cco.regener-online.de. [Accessed 27 July 2011].

Lynch, Jake & Galtung, Johan (2010). *Reporting conflict: new directions in peace journalism*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Lynch, Jake & Annabel McGoldrick (2005). *Peace journalism*. Stroud: Hawthorn Press.

Malone, Naomi (2004). From just war to just peace: re-visioning just war theory from a feminist perspective. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Political Science College of Arts and Sciences, University of South Florida, US.

Marshall, Rachele (1991). Nothing without US pressure on Israel. *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, X(4): 14.

McGoldrick, Annabel (2006). War journalism and 'objectivity'. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 5(2). [Online]. Available: cco.regener-online.de. [Accessed 10 February 2010].

Morgenthau, Hans (1967). To intervene or not to intervene. *Foreign Affairs*, 45: 425–36.

Nordenstreng, Kaarle (2001). Something to be done: transnational media monitoring. *Transnational Broadcasting Studies Journal*, Spring edition. [Online]. Available: www.tbsjournal.com/Archives/Spring01/nordenstreng.html. [Accessed 8 February 2011].

Nowak, Manfred (2005). The International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. In Rhona Smith & Christien van den Anker (Eds). *The essentials of human rights* (pp193–200). London: Hodder Arnold.

Preston, Alison (1996). Television news and the Bosnian conflict: distance, proximity, impact. In James Gow, Richard Paterson & Alison Preston (Eds). *Bosnia by Television* (112–16). London, British Film Institute.

Schirch, Lisa (2002). Human rights and peacebuilding: towards justpeace. Paper presented to 43rd Annual International Studies Association Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, March, 2002.

- Shaw, Ibrahim Seaga (2011). *Human rights journalism: advances in the reporting of distant humanitarian interventions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shinar, Dov (2003). Peace process in cultural conflict: the role of the media. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 2(1). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de. [Accessed 25 July 2011].
- Siebert, Fredrick S, Theodor Petersen & Walter Schramm (1963 [1956]). *Four theories of the press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- UNESCO (1978). Declaration on fundamental principles concerning the contribution of the mass media to strengthening peace and international understanding, to the promotion of human rights and to countering racialism, apartheid and incitement to war. [Online]. Available: portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13176&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 19 September 2011].
- Ury, William (2001). *Must we fight? From the battlefield to the schoolyard-a new perspective on violent conflict and its prevention*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Walzer, Michael (1992). *Just and unjust wars: a moral argument with historical illustrations*. 2nd edn. New York: Basic Books.
- Wheeler, Nicholas (1999). Enforcing human rights. In Timothy Dunne & Nicholas Wheeler (Eds). *Human rights and global politics* (pp169–99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.