Reporting Conflicts, Humanitarian Crises and Peace Processes

Reporting Conflicts, Humanitarian Crises and Peace Processes:

Cases from Africa

By

Tedla Desta

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Reporting Conflicts, Humanitarian Crises and Peace Processes:
Cases from Africa

By Tedla Desta

This book first published 2024

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-7362-1
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-7362-8

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A few people have participated in this research acting as interviewees, assistants, data collectors, proofreaders and encouragers, thus I would like to express my sincere and profound gratitude to everyone, who assisted me in this research.

My first and foremost appreciation and gratefulness goes to my supervisor, Professor Iain Atack from whom I have learned many things in addition to academia. The cooperation and hospitality of local contacts and guides during my field trip in East Africa, Kenya and the perseverance of local enumerators in Sudan and South Sudan, who assisted in the data collection, is commendable.

Personally, during the course of the research, I had faced several challenges and difficulties, so I am thankful to the Holy Trinity and my wife and children.

Once again, I would like to thank all the interviewees, proofreading assistants: Finbar Murphy, Eamonn Sheehy and Deirdre Hanigan and individuals I may have not mentioned here but did participate in the research in one way or the other.

November 2023

INTRODUCTION

> When 20 people die, why do we write "20 people massacred?" or "20 Muslims murdered in Mombasa," an alarming headline that fuels people to rise against each other. There is tension in Kenya again in security, economy, and politics in general. Political reporters are fuelling the conflict now again.

Those are the words of a Kenyan freelance journalist describing the reporting of conflict in the region. The mass media reports on conflicts—from the ongoing conflicts in several locations in Africa to the current wars between Ukraine and Russia and in the Middle East—humanitarian crises and the ensuing peace processes or reconciliation efforts, from various frames of reporting and analysis. The increase in global crises and conflicts, as well as the ways and the effects of the mediatization of the phenomena, has generated intense interest, research, and debate. There are media houses for each political wing, and there are media groups that do not belong to any of the groups but attempt to balance and host the voices of each wing as part of their media policy. Within the continuous debate about the positionalities and effects of the media, an undeniable truism is that the media have become among the central mediators or instruments of the mediatization of these two wings of reality. This means, as key players, they have decisive roles, together with many other factors, institutions, and sectors, in the making of our world: whether it be peaceful, conflict-ridden, egalitarian, or a mixture of these attributes. Thus, the main motivation for this book is seeing a world of balance and equilibrium, reconciliation, minimized destruction and increased peace and happiness, and this long road may be traveled using the information, communication, and mediatization channel.

Can this goal be achieved by mediatizing more nonviolent and peace education information by the mass media? Can we have an egalitarian world by downplaying and removing the voices of extremists? By only transmitting liberal and nonviolent voices? By applying targeted media theories and strategies to legitimize certain political establishments believed to be stabilizing forces and thereby silencing the dissenting voices or the oppressed (and, of course, the oppressors)? Is it by mediatizing the voices of each in a manner that will result in a balance of voices and a balance of realities? What sort of media or journalist is good for this? A peace, war, or citizen journalist? A corporate, a non-profit, a public, or a parastatal media

model? In this research, I examine the relations between the mass media, conflict, humanitarian crises, and peace, and apply these theoretical interactions in selected crises and peace processes in three countries in the Horn of Africa: Kenya, Sudan and South Sudan. The media outlets studied follow different forms of reporting or ownership models. I begin the research by problematizing the statement.

This book is not about the impact debate, i.e., the effect of crises and conflict or peace on mediatization or vice versa, but rather about how it is mediatized in Africa and how it could better be applied in the region or elsewhere. My research argues that most of the current analytical frameworks of conflict and peace process reporting have flaws or shortcomings, and a more detailed and broader (four-part) framework is necessary for the purpose of reporting and the scientific analysis of media contents. It discusses several conflict and peace process cases, ranging from decades ago to the current Ukraine-Russia war, but it specially tests how conflicts and peace processes in the Horn of Africa (HoA), i.e., the post-2007 election violence and peace process in Kenya and the border conflicts between Sudan and South Sudan, especially around the Abyei region and the ensuing peace processes, were covered by two different media outlets – the Daily Nation (DN) and the Integrated Regional Information Network (IRIN), currently known as the New Humanitarian. As these two conflicts and humanitarian crises were among the most intense in the region in recent years and the amount of media interest and coverage they garnered, as well as their protractedness, was major, they are ideal cases to research.

Developing countries, Africa in particular, have been prone to conflicts and insecurities caused by multidimensional reasons emanating internally and externally. The absence of sustainable peace and stability and the humanitarian crises in Africa have affected the development of the continent, and this continues to be a global security concern. The HoA is one of the regions plagued by internal, regional, and transnational conflicts and humanitarian crises, and so has been the focus of African and international peace and security initiatives, programs, and organizations. According to the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the regional development and cooperation bloc includes countries such as Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda, while other records and scholars denote the region as only containing the countries of Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia and Somalia (Stock, 2012). Accordingly, in this research I employ IGAD's definition of the HoA countries.

Mass media-related interventions have been among the approaches employed in the battle of peacebuilding in the region. Many of the countries in the region are postcolonial states that won their independence in the 1960s but then continued with their colonial state, ethnic, institutional, political, and economic structures, which resulted in, in most cases, endless conflicts and internal instability. The postcolonial media education, reporting, and journalism culture retained as a colonial legacy has had a share in these conflicts. African journalism education reflects, in almost every conceivable way, "Western forms of journalism training and education" (Banda, 2008: 50). Banda suggests that African journalism needs to "engage in a deconstruction of Western libertarian journalism and construct a more responsive journalism that resembles the realities of the African context" (2008: 50). In this research, the framework I introduce, and the analysis, is inspired by decolonial thinking and approach.

The role of the media in the conflicts, humanitarian crises and peace processes in these countries; the way the mass media (international and local) frame and represent local conflicts; and the impacts and legacy of the colonial media on postcolonial conflicts have seldom been extensively studied (Skjerdal, 2012; Zerai, 2010). Among the African postcolonial states that exhibit Banda's description of traditional African media education, practice, and culture in the eastern part of Africa are Kenya, Sudan and the recently formed nation of South Sudan. Have there been efforts to create indigenous models of journalism in Africa? How about reforming the journalism model that is often taught in schools or is practiced by the media? A reformist model, perhaps relevant to this research and the African context as well, might be Norwegian professor of peace studies Johan Galtung's model, which we will review in detail and draw on as a primary theoretical framework for the four-part framework created. It is called peace journalism (PJ).

Using a theoretical framework informed by and drawn from PJ, media and peace and conflict theories and reformulating a new four-part framework, I first explore how the media outlets covered the conflicts by gauging the presence of PJ aspects. The way in which peace processes were covered and the changes of discourse between the conflict and the peace process stages were studied. I also explore the perceived role of media ownership and ideology on conflict/crises and peace reporting. The use of language in conflict and peace reporting, gender and humanitarian reporting, the new media, and the challenges in conflict and peace reporting are the other subtopics that this book addresses. While it might not be possible to examine all these dimensions exhaustively, this book contributes to the

building of intersectional reporting and an analysis of media reporting. In addition to contributing significantly to conflict and humanitarian reporting in general, and the activities of the two media outlets in particular, the findings of this study form the foundation for the central argument that there is a need for a redeveloped framework of analysis for the conflict, peace, humanitarianism, and media nexus. The practices of conflict, peace process, and humanitarian reporting and the methods of analysis are simplistic, pro-war, and reproduce crises. Hence**,** I developed and tested a four-part framework out of PJ, conflict and peace studies, and mass media theories and literature.

The field of conflict analysis and conflict resolution theory is trans-disciplinary and thus shares theories from psychology, sociology, international relations, and other social sciences, such as realism, functionalism, human needs, aggression and deprivation, culture, ethnicity and identity, the Marxian class struggle, and postmodernism. Understanding conflict theories is useful for journalists analyzing the cause(s) and origin(s) of conflicts as well as the trajectory, and the solution – peacebuilding. Rubenstein et al. (1994) urge the conflict analyst or journalist conducting conflict analysis to be begin by describing the hidden historical and systematic dimensions of the conflict. Correspondingly, Rubenstein et al. (1994) listed conflict theories they thought journalists should be aware of, such as the bargainable interests, modernization, basic human needs and relative deprivation, class struggle, and clash of civilizations theories. I will further explore some of the conflict theories and how they relate to or could be used by journalists in their work, especially during conflict and peace reporting in the four-part framework. These conflict theories and the methods by which journalists can extrapolate from them now lead me to the next level of conflict and conflict resolution conversation.

As defined by Ramsbotham et al. (2011), conflict resolution implies that behavior is no longer violent, attitudes are no longer hostile, and the structure of the conflict has changed. For Burton (1990), conflict resolution means terminating conflict by analytical methods; therefore, by getting to the root of the problem. Babbitt & Hampson (2011: 46) argue that conflict resolution is about theories that can "improve our understanding of conflict and our collective practice of reduction in violence and enhancement of political processes for harmonizing interests." Diamond (1994: 3) defines conflict resolution as a process which seeks to "discover, identify and resolve the underlying root causes of the conflict," and conflict transformation as endeavors that "seek to change the conditions that give rise to the underlying root causes of the conflict." In summation, it seems that there is an overlap in the definitions of conflict resolution and conflict transformation

in that all the theorists seem to agree that ultimately the goal is to unearth the cause of the conflict. With that in mind, I traveled to the HoA and gathered data regarding the origins of the conflicts, the state of the humanitarian crises, and the experiences of peace processes.

I gathered examples of indigenous methods of peacebuilding as well as 'modern' methods of peacebuilding that use the mass media. Ramsbotham et al. (2011) state that investment in education for peace provides a strategically effective driver for what they call the transformative cosmopolitan model. The transformative cosmopolitan model resembles the PJ model and may be a supportive theoretical framework in the analysis of PJ from a conflict resolution and peacebuilding perspective.

Ramsbotham et al. (2011) indicate that the transformative cosmopolitan model explains the need for an approach that is not situated within any particular state, society, or established site of power, but rather promotes constructive means of handling conflict at local to global levels in the interests of humanity. The transformative cosmopolitan model contains the norm of non-violence and is sustained and informed by the transformative practices and modes of peace education, thus providing sites and spaces within which authentic peacebuilding (or multiple 'peaces' and 'peacebuildings') can be advanced. This model seeks to privilege local capacity building while recognizing the necessity of negotiating between local/communal and international/global perspectives. Like the transformative cosmopolitan model, a non-classical model of conflict resolution that is gaining momentum is the TRANSCEND method or transcendence.

Transcendence is the approach or concept of conflict resolution advanced by Johan Galtung, which I find is closely related to PJ. Galtung lists transcendence as one of the four main methods of conflict resolution. According to Galtung (2000: 30), by transcendence we mean creating a new type of reality by making it an empirical reality. The conflict between two countries over a disputed territory ends by one side winning a military or legal battle, by a compromise dividing the territory, by both sides withdrawing their claims, leaving the territory to somebody else (such as the inhabitants!), or by the two owning the territory together. Clearly, only the last outcome transcends empirical reality; the others conform to the formula that each km^2 is owned by one and only one state (Galtung, 2000). According to Galtung (2000), transcendence means redefining the situation so that what looked incompatible or blocked is unlocked and a new landscape emerges: The key to that lock is creativity. Creativity resembles what a social scientist encounters when introducing a third variable in multi-

variable analysis. What looks like no relationship at all between X and Y changes when Z is introduced: when Z is negative, X and Y are positive. The zero relation is still there, hidden in a more complex reality as some kind of average. The creative act consists of identifying that third (or fourth or fifth) variable that has not been introduced into the picture before, like cracking before balancing. Take, for example, an unemployed right-wing political leader who forms a political party, which, by default or design, targets minorities and immigrants. If the party cannot be stopped from its "militant" agendas, if it does not compromise with the standard level of political activism, and "defeating" its agendas does not work, the most creative alternative could be offering the leader of the political party a lucrative job, making him employed.

The qualities Galtung lists above are the identifying characters of not only a transcending conflict worker but also a peace journalist. Galtung (2010: 5) suggests "more peace education, more peace journalism" is a necessity in any peace and transcendence effort. After going through the various levels of escalation and de-escalation, conflict finally reaches the post-conflict stage, when it has to be resolved. Conflict workers need a grounding in general conflict theory and general conflict practice, and more particularly in what difference empathy, non-violence and creativity can make. But they also have to know about the types of violence – not only the direct violence that shows up in the meta-conflict but also the structural and cultural violence, the bad structures and cultures underlying the conflict, and the bad 'bed' the conflict has to be lifted out of. The rest is the transformation of the conflict to peace by ever-deeper dialogues. The result: a transformed conflict that can be handled non-violently and creatively.

Mediation is another approach. Bercovitch et al. (1991: 8) define mediation as

> a process of conflict management where the disputants seek the assistance of, or accept an offer of help from, an individual, group, state or organization to settle their conflict or resolve their differences without resorting to physical violence or invoking the authority of the law.

The relationships and similarities between conflict mediators and the media or journalists will be explained further in the next section.

In the introductory section of his 2004 book, Gadi Wolfsfeld states that the news media can "emphasize the benefits that peace can bring, raise the legitimacy of groups or leaders working for peace, and they can help transform images of the enemy" (2004: 1). Regarding the role of media in

peace processes, Wolfsfeld (2004) states first that the media can play a major role in defining the political atmosphere in which the process takes place. Second, the media can have an important influence on the nature of the debate about a peace process; news media determine who gets to speak and what is considered an appropriate form of argument. Third, they can have an impact on the antagonists' (refers to all individuals, groups, or institutions that are attempting to have an influence on a particular peace process) strategy and behavior. The media can also influence the strategies and behavior of those in power, such as when violence or a crisis breaks out. Fourth, they can raise and lower the public standing and legitimacy of the antagonists involved in the process and their positions; although all actors in a peace process want influence, few are warranted media attention. Wolfsfeld lists four major news values that journalists use in the editorial process when constructing news on peace: immediacy, drama, simplicity and ethnocentrism.

However, in media work, the political economy of the media is highly decisive. Who owns the media? What are the ideological and financial interests of the media outlet and the owners? Not only peace processes but also conflicts might receive over-coverage or could be totally ignored depending on the choices of the media institution. These choices are not just based on the value of the conflict or the peace process but also on the political economy of the media and the owner's or the media institution's politically and economically tuned decisions. These complex relationships are best expounded by two seminal theories: the propaganda model and the hierarchy of influences model. Overall, from Davison's (1974) caution to the media about interference during peace processes to Wolfsfeld's (2004), Spencer's (2005) and Botes' (1996) conclusions that the mass media often play a destructive role in peacemaking processes, it is evident that the development of a media practice constructive of peace processes and negotiations is required. As discussed in the following sections, the PJ model could be among the most ideal methods and models for reporting peace processes.

The peace/war journalism (WJ) model

The current discourse and research of PJ and WJ began to take shape after Galtung introduced his PJ/WJ model in 1998. Galtung's (1998) dyadic tabular frames were later adopted and developed by peace and media scholars like Lynch and McGoldrick (2005).

The dyadic model of PJ/WJ begins its description of the differences between the two categories with the PJ model following a peace/conflict orientation and the WJ being war/violence orientated. The PJ model's peace orientation is explained in its very nature and ability to explore conflict formation by specifically researching x parties, y goals, and z issues. Similarly, it looks for a win-win solution in the conflict and generally applies it in its reporting. It also makes conflicts more transparent by analyzing conflicts through an open space and time. PJ, according to Galtung's table, gives voice to all parties; in other words, to use the cliché, it is the voice for the voiceless and uses empathy and understanding, as is discussed in the transcendence section in the next chapter. One main peculiarity of such reporting is that it does not see people as the problem but the conflict/war, and by transcending the conflict conventions, it focuses on creativity.

For instance, WJ elements, such as the focus on the conflict arena, zero-sum orientation, blame, lack of transparency or making wars secret, "us-them" propaganda, and the dehumanization of "them", focus on the visible effects of conflict, and its reactive nature requires it to be reformed or demystified. This calls for a more structured and well-thought-out model, which, at the moment, although still needing further theoretical and analytical solidification, is PJ. Spencer (2005) argues that if the media is to humanize opponents to each other, it must discourage the zero-sum game that it promotes. When the media shift to such a form of reporting – reducing the potential for violent conflict – we can say that the social and moral responsibility of news has been properly realized (Spencer, 2005).

The second major element of PJ that makes it different from WJ is its truth orientation rather than using propaganda. Galtung often argued that PJ is not an advocacy of peace but an orientation to truth and good reporting. A truth-orientated PJ is balanced and exposes the untruths of both sides, unlike WJ, which only exposes 'their' untruths and conceals 'ours.' Thirdly, Galtung and the developers of this tabular model, Lynch and McGoldrick, maintain that PJ is people-orientated, while WJ focuses on elites, taking them either as the sole news source or even simplistically covering the conflict as a war of elites.

Accordingly, the authors argue the "people orientation" or "alternative sources" use of peace journalism, which does not, in fact, mean "vox pops", takes their (the alternative sources) nonviolent suggestions to the public sphere. Jürgen Habermas' public sphere theory emerged after the relative freedom of society in the 18th century when the bourgeois, mainly, met in "salons, coffee houses and other public places" and debated issues of

concern until they gained publicity. Jürgen Habermas argues that communication actions in the public sphere should not be orientated towards success but to understanding. This conditionality is associated with the PJ model. Galtung and, later, Lynch contended that journalism, PJ in particular, should be orientated to understanding. The coffeehouses as public spheres have transcended the Enlightenment Era paradigm to now include the mass media, particularly the digital media. The media, according to Castells (2007:1), "have become the social space where power is decided." The convergence of horizontal communication networks and the mass media has resulted in "a historical shift of the public sphere from the institutional realm to the new communication space," and this shift could be a suitable arena for the new reformist movement of PJ.

PJ concentrates on the suffering of all groups without any discrimination, does not shame and name only "them-evil doers" but all sides, and concentrates on all peacemakers rather than simply on elite peacemakers. The Gacaca courts, popular and mostly employed in East Africa, particularly in Rwanda, is a traditional system of conflict resolution often applied in post-conflict situations to sustainably resolve conflicts by removing revengeful retribution. It is one type of people–peacemaker system and community that has gained attention and coverage in the media.

The fourth and last major distinction between the two models is PJ's solution orientation and WJ's victory orientation. PJ transcends the conventional wisdom about reaching peace through victory and ceasefire and sees peace as an outcome of non-violence and creativity. It highlights peace initiatives and focuses on structure, culture, the peaceful society and the aftermath of conflict – resolution, reconstruction, and reconciliation. The tabular model covers most of the nuances and elements located in the research and theory of both conflict reporting and peace journalism. This dyadic division, although still criticized for its dichotomous division of journalism and modeling a specific frame while at the same time advising transcendence, demands further development if it is to be used as a theoretical framework.

PJ has not been free from criticism, however. Skjerdal (2012) argues that PJ may primarily be viewed as a sub-discipline of communication for development within development studies. Skjerdal (2012) advises media practitioners who want to engage in constructive PJ to emphasize objective and unbiased reporting, utilize investigative journalism, serve the entire population rather than isolated group interests, be quick to make decisions in the newsroom, use informal sources, and avoid confrontational and

biased language. Media analysts are often more skeptical, and peace researchers generally see a great potential for improvement in the area of mass media as an instrument for change and reconciliation (Skjerdal, 2012). In practice, when the PJ philosophy is transferred to actual media work, small media and active audience formats are deemed the most useful. Some of the important issues are how reporters frame a conflict and who they include and exclude in the presentation (Skjerdal, 2012).

In his research of African media, Nyamnjoh (2005: 231) finds features that are similar to the WJ frame.

> The African media have assumed a partisan, highly politicised, militant role in Africa... by dividing citizens into the righteous and the wicked, depending on their party-political leanings, ideologies, and regional, cultural or ethnic belonging.

My preliminary assessment conducted for this research showed that the media in Africa, since they are part of the global media landscape and system, have been found to broadly practice WJ.

Just as it has its proponents, PJ is also not short of opponents. PJ is criticized for lacking theoretical grounding and being merely prescriptive and normative. It is critiqued for diverting from the two fundamental journalistic ethics and principles – objectivity and neutrality – which is caused by its promotion of peace and bias towards peace.

If some of the issues that PJ aspires to reform can be improved by making structural changes within the media, then why do we need genres such as PJ? Is it all about improving and respecting journalistic ethics? One major point that most critics of PJ fail to recognize is that PJ is a speciality, just like business, sports journalism, criminal law, and cardiology. Therefore, it is destined to live long as a genre and speciality of journalism whose fixation is the manner and effect of peace and conflict reporting by the media and peace. Secondly, as a core reform movement or framework, PJ has introduced fresh ideas into media studies and peace and conflict reporting. The theoretical framework chapter aspires to appraise some of the criticisms raised by media scholars regarding PJ and build an accommodative analytical framework that is sensitive to the criticisms. Appreciating the criticisms on objectivity and detachment, the framework, however, does not vow for the total annihilation of the two but a managed level of attachment and disruption of objectivity. Lastly, similar themes were discussed in "Media, Conflict and Peacebuilding in Africa: Conceptual and Empirical Considerations" in the *Routledge Handbook of Media, Conflict and Security*

published in 2016 and in 2021; however, the framework I am introducing in this book is different.

Theoretical framework

Although I primarily use the PJ model as a theoretical framework, I formulated a stronger four-part theoretical framework (prevention, salience and analysis, transcendence and mediation peacemaking) to analyze peace and conflict-related media reporting in the HoA. The PJ framework is supported by mass media and conflict resolution theories drawn from framing, agenda-setting, social responsibility media theories, and transcendence and mediation theories of conflict resolution, among the many. Framing is the first act of a journalist in the news writing process. It is the stage where journalists identify problems, analyze reasons, and make moral judgments (Akhavan-Majid and Ramaprasad, 1998). Entman (1993: 52) argues that media frame building occurs as journalists "select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text" with the aim of promoting a particular interpretation or understanding.

If we consider the realities on the ground of the HoA and the advance of PJ journalism internationally, research on how the mass media in the region report on peace and conflict and the ways in which reporting can be conflict-sensitive becomes crucial. Therefore, I will primarily use Galtung's (1986, 1998) PJ framework/model expanded by Lynch & McGoldrick (2000). I also draw from mass media and conflict resolution theories to come up with a theoretical framework that will be used to analyze the coverage of two conflicts and peace processes in the Horn by two media outlets: one international and one regional. In terms of recent regional research, Admire Mare and Jacinta Maweu's book, *Media, Conflict and Peacebuilding in Africa: Conceptual and Empirical Considerations*, published in 2021, is an important collection that broaches this very topic, although nothing like the four-part framework is considered or employed.

Methodologically, this research uses multi-method or multiple triangulation (Woods & Catanzaro, 1988) since more than two methods, theories and data sources are used, resulting in methodological, theoretical and data triangulations, respectively. Qualitative and quantitative methods are used in this research. I set out to use Content Analysis (CA) as the main method in this research; however, CA only answers some questions, and does not research the human, production and reception aspects of mass media studies. As such, more methods of research were included, such as semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, critical discourse analysis (CDA),

corpora (plural for corpus, which means a text or body), linguistics (CA) and archival research. Supplementary methods, such as Corpus Linguistics (CL) and framing, were also used. Founded on the idea that meaning is made with sequenced words, CL studies language through a corpus (a principled and naturally occurring language). Actually, to conduct CDA, one must also conduct a framing analysis by asking how the reports were framed and what was emphasized.

In the following chapters, I offer a new analytical framework and take a glimpse at the conflicts, peace processes and media outlets in the region. The Reinvigorating Crisis Mediatization chapter examines the experiences of mediatization of conflict and crisis reporting in the region. Before concluding with final reflections, I discuss peace process and humanitarian reporting and the role of ownership and gender.

THE FOUR-PART FRAMEWORK

In this section, I look at the intersection of three different themes that are mostly studied under different theories and disciplines. Hence, to capture those themes, I conduct the interrogation from three theoretical perspectives and paradigms; namely, mass media theories, peace and conflict theories, and PJ, by formulating what I call an intersectional four-part framework. The framework builds on Galtung's dyadic table of PJ and aims to provide a comprehensive and integrative framework that can be used to research peace and conflict reporting in the media. I present systematic theoretical discussions using Kimberle Crenshaw's intersectionality conceptions on how marginalized voices could be covered better during intersectional representations (Crenshaw, 2017).

The Four-Part Framework

So far, the major and contemporary mass media theories and conflict resolution and peacebuilding and their nexus with the media have been discursively reviewed. PJ is the main model that brings the theories of conflict, conflict resolution, peacebuilding and media together. The definition of PJ by Jake Lynch is the operational definition that will be useful in the proceeding analysis.

> PJ is when editors and reporters make choices – of what stories to report, and how to report them – that create opportunities for society at large to consider and value nonviolent responses to conflict (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005: 5).

More recent definitions of PJ described it as

> a normative/critical approach to evaluation and training in journalism and communication. It seeks to view communication choices through the lens of de-escalating conflict vs. escalating conflict (Perry, 2022: 623).

WJ is a genre or model of reporting that does not align with this definition, and it has often been ascribed to the traditional reporting formats of the traditional media. It is not merely the reporting of war. Ottosen (2010) notes that the WJ/PJ model is an example of a theoretical contribution that defines an agenda and inspires scholars, teachers, and journalists to look for new

paths they can follow in their work. WJ is not a simplistic analysis of war reporting or conflict reporting. In many of Johan Galtung's and Jake Lynch's texts, WJ is also defined as the corporatist, elitist and profiteering journalism that is dominantly practiced today, with only few or none of the PJ frames visibly present.

Based on my readings and analysis of empirical evidence, I find that there are four main identifying characteristics that link PJ with other related theories (i.e., media theories and conflict resolution): *prevention, salience and analysis, transcendence and mediation peacemaking*. The elements were taken from Galtung's PJ/WJ model, conflict resolution, and media theories. These elements will be discussed in detail below in what I call the four-part framework.

To apply the four-part framework to the current research, it is necessary to first analyze the elements of PJ and the nuances that link it with and make it similar to conflict resolution and related mass media theories. Prevention, salience and analysis, transcendence and mediative peacemaking will later be used, along with Galtung's original model, to detect and evaluate media content in the empirical analysis section. These four main elements form the basis of the research findings and give an additional perspective to Galtung's original model. They also contribute to the research of PJ and, in effect, are my own responses or formulations after analyzing the theoretical contexts in this field.

Prevention	**Salience and Analysis**	**Transcending Conflict**	**Mediation Peacemaking**
Early warning	In-depth/Historical tracing	Creativity, non-violence, and understanding	Dialogue
Preventive diplomacy	Conflict theory/Framework	Diagnosis–prognosis–therapy	Win-win
Proactive	Salient frame		Confidence-building
	Contextualization		People as peacemakers
			Resolution, reconciliation and reconstruction

Table 2.1 The four-part framework

Prevention

One important feature of the PJ model is prevention. Prevention also surfaces in conflict resolution and media theories. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Secretary-General of the United Nations (UN) in 1992, suggested preventive diplomacy as a conflict management method. The 1992 "Agenda for Peace" report defined preventive diplomacy as "action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur." Number 84 of the 1992 report points out that peace cannot be achieved by the singular efforts of the UN or governments and urges "non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, parliamentarians, business and professional communities, the media and the public at large" to get involved. This suggestion has not been pursued as sufficiently as it should have been—notwithstanding the continuation of academic research and the promotion of the application of the media and journalism toward peacebuilding. Prevention tools were then divided into four sectors: early-warning, mediation, confidence-building measures and fact-finding. These tools later came to include policy measures such as humanitarian measures, arms control, social welfare, military deployment and the media. Marthoz (2003: 18) contended that to develop conflict-prevention journalism or early-warning journalism, the mass media needed to show a "renewed flexibility" by transcending the conventional form of journalism and finding "imaginative ways to reconnect with audiences at all levels." The author lists some of the suggestions made during the debate on the topic, such as training members of the mass media on "conflict prevention culture," or making conflict prevention rather than conflict more newsworthy in all media formats (ibid.). Conflict theories, such as bargainable interests, human needs, clash of civilisations, class struggle and relative deprivation theories, are very useful in preventive journalism. Journalists that have mastered conflict theories may be able to predict the eruption of conflict or deconstruct active conflicts and find solutions. For instance, if a journalist was aware of the relative deprivation theory, they could write pre-emptive and predictive reports by "acquiring data about the group's economic and social performance" and asking contextual, historical, and politico-economic questions (Rubenstein et al., 1994: 33), which can essentially be described as conflict preventive journalism.

The transformative cosmopolitan model focuses on globally constructive peacebuilding at all levels in the interests of humanity; the model contains the norms of non-violence and is mainly informed by peace education. As peace is a process rather than the work of one day, there must be constant

peacebuilding, and one of the methods to help this happen is formal academic peace education or informal peace education via the mass media. Botes (1996) argues that for the news media to aid peace, it must play an educative role. Education, be it general or peace, may prevent the outbreak of conflicts. The media could increase and propagate critical thinking and peace education, thereby preventing conflict. The author argues that this change requires a "reframing" of issues and debates, which is aimed at helping to identify the causes of conflict (prevention). This is also at the core of the PJ model, the framing theory and peace education. The media can frame or reframe a conflict preventive and peace education program to fit their intended agenda. As explained in the preceding chapter, the transformative cosmopolitan model puts peace education at the center of its concept via the media (Ramsbotham et al., 2011). The transformative cosmopolitan model collects the ideas of PJ and education via the media for the purposes of peacebuilding. This is one of the nuances where the nexus between peacebuilding, PJ, social responsibility, and agenda-setting theories of the media also interacts and intersects. Any form of education (and specifically peace education) mainly via the media is prevention; thus, if the transformative cosmopolitan model could use education in conflict resolution, the PJ model could also educate the public to prevent or resolve conflicts. The transformative cosmopolitan model of peacebuilding is relevant to the PJ model in that they both avow to find constructively creative nonviolent solutions based on education, where (peace) journalism is one type of education, or the genre of the PJ core program is peace education.

An example of this is the research by Yanagizawa-Drott (2013: 20) on propaganda vs. education in the Rwandan genocide, which found that "the Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLM) broadcasts did not have any effect in high literacy villages. The radio propaganda thus seemed to be ineffective among the literate population." The researcher concludes, "A necessary condition for radio propaganda to induce civilian participation in violence is that the targeted population lacks basic education." Yanagizawa-Drott (2013: 20) also argued that the presence of an alternative print media "enabled citizens to access alternative news sources," showing that basic education may limit the persuasive power of a given propaganda. This conclusion simply explains the values and roles that the two sectors play in conflict prevention, i.e., education and the media and the use of literacy education (peace) via mass media, and, in the post-conflict scenarios, in reducing the chances of relapses.

The first common indicator of the transformative cosmopolitan model, media theories and PJ is found in Galtung's PJ model that was later developed by Lynch & McGoldrick (2005). The "prevention" cohesion of these models is "proactiveness: prevention before any violence/war occurs." As conflict prevention is the main aim of PJ, it complements the models and goals of conflict resolution when applied in conflict scenarios.

In this discussion of the role of the media in conflict prevention, new media (social media such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and blogs) are also part of the discourse. Even though the research is still fresh, some studies suggest a positive correlation while others show a negative outcome from the relationship between the new media and conflict prevention. The former British prime minister, Gordon Brown, suggested that new media can actually prevent genocide: "You cannot have Rwanda again because information would come out far more quickly about what is actually going on and the public opinion would grow to the point where action would need to be taken" (Aday et al., 2010: 103). This statement holds water if the power of the new media to disseminate information instantaneously and its interactiveness, reach, cost and people/grassroots orientation are taken into consideration. However, the new media could also be used negatively or serve the promotion of ethnocentrism, hate, genocide and violence if misused or in the hands of the irresponsible and untrained. While the coverage of certain neglected issues, such as humanitarian crises, may help improve the enlightenment of the public, if unregulated, unedited, and unethically reported, the outputs of the new media might also lead to conflict escalation and violence. The destructive role is also at hand during peace processes if the new media carelessly applies the four major news values in the editorial process of constructing news of peace: "drama, immediacy, simplicity and ethnocentrism" (Wolfsfeld, 2004). This may be reversed, and the new media could be used in the prevention of conflicts by applying PJ within each medium guideline or by educating users.

At this point, it seems natural to ask how journalists/media can produce conflict preventive reports. The easiest and most intuitive answer would be "when they know how conflicts start and escalate to violence." Not all journalists would have this skill; therefore, advanced training in conflict analysis, early warning, conflict mapping, and conflict resolution or peacebuilding becomes indispensable.

It has been discussed that the media has a social responsibility. According to Siebert et al. (1963), in the social responsibility of the media theory, news producers design news output that discourages anti-social behavior and

reflects, fosters, and publicizes social concerns. Commenting on the potential of the model for overpowering media and depriving citizens the right to full information, Oates (2008) labels the social responsibility theory as "responsible." This contrasts with the libertarian model, which gives the sense that while the former nears the ideals of prevention vis-à-vis PJ, the latter seems, at least not directly or intentionally, to share or promote the nuances of war journalism. According to Oates (2008: 8),

> The benefits of the social responsibility model of the media, when compared with the more freewheeling libertarian model, are clear. The social responsibility model provides a level of protection to society, from everything ranging from bad taste to information that could lead to panic or violence. It protects the public from damaging, distorted, or dangerous information. Overall, it works towards building a societal consensus, while the libertarian coverage of the same news might destroy that harmony.

The mass media have the ethical and professional duty to produce socially responsible journalism, which in this context could mean non-conflict-escalating (and at times an early warning) journalism. Therefore, drawing from the early-warning notions of conflict prevention, journalists could produce editorials, news features, analyses and opinion outputs to guide the public and conflict actors on what the future might hold and its therapies.

Early warning

Early warning assessments by journalists could follow the models used by conflict experts, such as taking the political, legal, economic, and social factors that determine a country's susceptibility to conflict into consideration as well as the potential triggers of mass violence and instrumental coping mechanisms in the country in which they are reporting. Afaghani (2011: 10) explains that an early-warning system in the model of peacebuilding journalism, which he himself formulated, is "a conflict prevention tool and is intended to help the journalists to be proactive in analyzing and detecting conditions that can lead to violence." Howard (2001), listing the function of the media as an early-warning system before a conflict escalates, states such reporting is based on researching all indicators of pre-conflict settings. Robert Manoff (1997) argues for an approach that calls on journalists to prevent and stop conflicts (Spencer, 2005). Manoff's suggestion calls for directly intervening "advocacy" types of journalism. Even though the PJ model and preventive reporting do advise an early-warning and preventive type of reporting, they do not, even indirectly, suggest advocacy. Journalists can produce predictive early-warning and, thus, preventive reports by

identifying the parties, goals, and issues by cross-analyzing and referring to the basics of conflict analysis. This approach is contrary to the conflict-orientated anti-resolution approach of "them vs. us," of zero-sum, as it focuses on the direct and visible effects of war, such as casualties, injuries, and damage to property. It mainly attempts to prevent destructive conflicts from emerging or even turning violent.

Manoff (1997, 2000) identified 12 roles for the media in constructively reporting conflict and violence, of which "corroborating and suggesting the preventive roles of the media in conflict reporting and situations are considered" is related to the preventive concept. Preventive reporting mainly affirms and highlights the solution orientation of the media and the journalist. A conflict-sensitive and preventive journalism as defined by the most noted scholars of the field—Galtung, Shinar, Lee and Maslog, Lynch and McGoldrick—is PJ. PJ is mainly composed of the following four components: peace, people, truth and solution orientations. Preventive reporting can also save PJ from the criticism that the model is too repressive of those undertaking legitimate struggles for freedom against oppression. Preventive reporting helps groups fighting against oppression to be heard and equalizes them, so that solutions can be found before the conflict transforms into complete war. Unlike the popularly understood PJ reporting that comes during the conflict or post-conflict phases and aims to de-escalate and sometimes "repress" parties, activities, and goals that revive conflicts, in preventive reporting, the journalist gives equal hearing to all parties, goals, and voices. This may have the negative impact of legitimizing unknown rebel groups; however, reporting that applies the conflict-sensitive model of PJ would not be vulnerable to this possibility.

Operational prevention (immediate/short-term efforts), structural prevention (root causes/long term) and systematic prevention as tools of conflict prevention interact with the types of conflict analysis and violence that PJ studies. Similarly, the media can take an active responsibility in preventive diplomacy: "actions to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the layer when they occur" (UN Agenda for Peace, 1992: Para. 20), with either the conflict experts and other conflict-prevention systems or integrating it into their prototypes. The mass media can use the four root causes of conflict: injustice, inequality, insecurity and inequity (disparity among identity groups), according to the 1992 Agenda for Peace report, as frameworks to probe imminent conflicts and produce preventive reports. Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) advise the usage of conflict mapping in conflict reporting.

Explaining the importance of preventive reporting in PJ, Shinar's (2007: 200) schema of PJ asserts that the role of journalists is "exploring the background and contexts of conflict formation and presenting causes and options on every side so as to portray conflict in realistic terms, transparent to audiences." Preventive reporting also diminishes the persuasiveness of the "CNN effect," as politicians would react before a conflict or disaster rather than react in fire-fighting mode after media reports of the crisis. It also helps the public make choices about their role in conflicts, as Rubenstein et al. (1994) pointed out. One way of enhancing such a form of reporting is to form cross-border cooperation between journalists, especially in conflicting societies (Afaghani, 2011). Peleg (2006) notes PJ coverage introduces the multiplicity of the actors on each side and familiarizes readers or listeners with the nuances and sensitivities of everyone involved. This section of the framework argued for a preventive type of reporting by drawing on theories from conflict analysis, resolution, and PJ, and showed it is theoretically grounded and can serve in the analysis of the research findings. Lynch and McGoldrick stressed the importance of conflict intervention and the specific-stage external parties, or that the media should intervene in the conflict cycle. If the preventive nuances of the media and, particularly, PJ were properly applied, any form of intervention to either protect or secure would be less necessary.

Salience and analysis

The theoretical discussion of this research defined the framing theory, a ubiquitous concept within media, conflict resolution and conflict studies. One of the principal scholars of framing, especially media framing, Entman (1993) suggests framing is the "making salient" of certain aspects of a communicating text in ways that influence the cognitive responses of the reader and audience. Gitlin (1980: 7) defines framing as "persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation and presentation, of selection." In short, framing is salience, or the process of selecting and making certain aspects of an issue or news more prominent. This process is not solely up to the journalist; it starts from the source and then the journalist's and the audience's own frame. McQuail (2010: 515), in his tabular hypothesis of agenda setting, states "public debate is represented by a set of salient issues (an agenda for action) which originates from public opinion and the proposals of political elites and thus competing interests seek to promote the salience of 'their' issues." This is followed by the selection by the media of an issue that it wants to give attention to. Finally, the prominence (salience) given to issues by the media gives public recognition to the current "agenda."

This is the process of agenda setting in the media; the framing process follows the same steps. Both theories share normative and theoretical similarities and overlap, with the major overlapping feature being "salience." Denis McQuail shows that the agenda-setting stages play crucial twofold roles and cover the functions of framing, making the roles of each theory reciprocal. Framing and PJ are also related; for example, Galtung's PJ model is supported by the elements of the framing theory, as Lee and Maslog (2005: 313) affirm: "Theoretically, peace journalism is supported by the framing theory." Furthermore, the process of producing PJ reports follows and uses the framing theory, which means it also applies the agenda-setting theory. PJ is itself one frame of reporting, and WJ is another and may be described as anti-research. The question that follows then is how is salience used in PJ and what is its use? PJ reports make nonviolent, peace-orientated, humanistic, truth and solution-orientated issues more salient than those that are not while inherently applying the framing and agenda-setting processes.

The agenda-setting theory is related to the framing theory, but framing focuses on the what and which factors while agenda setting is about the where and how factors. They differ between information and news processing because the framing effect is more concerned with audience attention to news messages while agenda setting is more concerned with repeated exposure to messages. Finally, they also differ between media and locus effects as agenda setting affects the ease with which people memorize issues covered recently while framing is the extent to which media messages fit the ideas or knowledge people already have. Though the agenda-setting theory might set both war and PJ agenda like framing, PJ can benefit from the agenda-setting theory. The mass media thus sets the agenda for the public, which supports the role and agenda of PJ, which is creating "opportunities for society at large to consider and to value nonviolent responses to conflict" (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005: 5).

Use of language

This leads us to another related concept—language. Entman (1993: 52) states that framing could be achieved by the "presence or absence of certain key words, stock phrases and stereotyped phrases and images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments." Clearly, a PJ model would be sensitive when it comes to the usage of words, phrases, images, sources, and sentences that lead the audience to be misinformed and reach conflicting judgments because using

language that does not promote conflict is the pillar of the PJ genre. As Lynch and McGoldrick (2005: 1) explain, PJ is a "broader, fairer and more accurate way of framing stories, drawing on the insights of conflict analysis and transformation," which also highlights that reporters need to be mindful of their choice of words, and report without producing sensational, dramatic or ethnocentric content (Wolfsfeld, 2004). All this is centered on the use of language and the framing of the issues. Language can support and promote war, just as it can be used to support and promote peace (Schäffner & Wenden, 1999). Salience in PJ is not solely about highlighting certain issues; it is also about the style and manner of writing and word use. It is worth recalling that Galtung's classification of PJ assessed language for words that are "demonizing, victimizing, and emotive" (Galtung, 1998: 4). If the media outlets frame their reports in a conflict-insensitive frame and use conflict-escalating words and language, they may possibly promote violence (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005). This is because the content produced is capable of being interpreted in a likewise manner by the audience "through repetition, placement and reinforcement, the texts and images that constitute the image provide a dominant interpretation more readily perceivable, acceptable, and memorable than other interpretations" (Entman, 1991: 43). WJ language and images are capable of being embedded in the minds of the audience, elucidating the "media effects" theory; this genre may promote violence and lead to destruction, as observed in Rwanda, Yugoslavia and Bosnia and during World War II in Nazi Germany. Therefore, the issues, language and images selected by the journalist could have a significant impact on the conflict. Lynch and McGoldrick make a similar recommendation on the issue of language in their 17-point checklist of practicing PJ and good reporting. Point number 10 of the checklist advises avoiding the use of "victimizing" language, like "devastated, defenceless, pathetic, tragedy," which only tells us what has been done "to" and could be done "for" a group of people (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005). Additionally, it highlights caution about the imprecise use of emotive words to describe what happened to people, such as "genocide, assassination, massacre and systematic," and advises writers to avoid adjectives like "vicious, cruel, brutal, barbaric" and demonizing labels like "terrorist, extremist, fanatic or fundamentalist." This ethical salience of conflict-sensitive language must be applied from the pre- to the post-conflict phases of reporting the conflict. Hall (1997: 15) defines representation as "using language to say something meaningful about, or represent the world meaningfully, to other people." Language and meaning are central in representation. If meaning and language are also results of the sequential framing processes, the language that journalists use to represent the world

must be analytical, emphatic, creative and nonviolent, especially when covering conflicts as they are agents of salience, create meaning and are at the forefront of representation. This statement stresses the way that journalists, as representational and meaning-making agents, should write analytically about the world and events around us. Frames and representations come not only from the journalists but also from their sources. Rubenstein et al. (1994) suggest that the language used to describe a conflict with the general and specific frameworks of the speaker's own conflict interpretation can be challenged by the reporter's independent questioning (which provides it a context in which to interpret the conflict).

If salience and analysis are important in PJ, then contextualization is also essential in any analytical writing. Priming enhances the effects of the media by offering the audience a prior context that can be used to interpret subsequent communication. The qualities of a PJ report depend on how much it has contextualized and given balance and detail to the subject. Considering the consequences of the framing, agenda and editorial decisions that journalists make, Rubenstein et al. (1994: 56) emphasize the importance of putting a struggle "in a historical perspective and analysis." From the PJ perspective, this is stated in the element of "untruths on all sides/uncover all cover ups," where hidden facts can only be uncovered through deeper analysis.

Analysis that explores the historical dimension of a conflict can "demystify" it by identifying any critical changes. Afaghani (2011: 146) states that analysis "allows the journalists to develop an understanding of contextual information about the conflict dynamics, thus leading to more balanced and conflict-sensitive news content." Furthermore, Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) prohibit "portraying a conflict as consisting of only two parties contesting the same goals" and advise "disaggregation", i.e., disaggregating the two parties into many smaller groups of many needs, interests and goals by mainly "tracing the links and consequences of conflict for peace in other places now and in the future."

As shown in the PJ model review, Galtung (2012) produced six main types of analytical questions for peace correspondents that are formulated from the 5Ws of journalistic formula and conflict analysis. These help journalists to discover deeper and more multidimensional questions for the production of analytical peace reports. Rubenstein et al. (1994, 66–68) emphasize that when being analytical, creating meaning and providing interpretation during conflict reporting, journalists need to have "a range of potentially applicable frameworks, a checklist of useful conflict theories that will help them to

bring particular conflicts into focus and avoid distorting or missing the real story." Analytical reports covering conflict issues can then critically examine the historical, socio-political origins and theories of the conflict; thus, are able to properly frame, interpret and present the conflict to the audience (Rubenstein et al., 1994).

Salience and analysis in peace and conflict reporting can draw from the transcendence approach, which will be explained in detail when applied to the diagnosis–prognosis–therapy approach. It is argued that in addition to its use for transcendence, the medical approach of diagnosis–prognosis–therapy can be an instrumental methodology for analytical PJ. Considered an element of the PJ model, being analytical also means "focusing on suffering all over; on women, aged, children, and giving voices to the voiceless" rather than the elite and more visible aspects of the conflict, which are easily picked by media outlets and journalists that follow the WJ model.

Some international media organizations have begun to employ conflict specialists to provide technical analyses and explanations to journalists and audiences or are training their journalists with postgraduate research on peace and conflict. Media organizations could practice better salience and analyses of sensitive and technical topics, such as peace and conflict, by employing either of the above two options. Consequently, they will practice a "balanced and ethical journalism" without having to compromise the most debated nuances and principles of media and PJ—objectivity and neutrality. This leads us to the related theory of transcendence widely advanced by Johan Galtung, which can serve as an interconnecting concept of mass media and peace theories. In this research, the major aim is to investigate how the mass media, specifically IRIN and DN, cover conflicts and peace processes in the HoA region. The prevention, salience and analysis elements, together with the next two elements, transcendence and mediation peacemaking, will serve to research the cases and analyze the findings.

Transcending conflict

The discussion on transcendence has already explained what the approach entails and considered the feature from a conflict resolution point of view. TRANSCEND is the name of Galtung's own peace organization, which, according to its own official website, is a non-governmental organization with the mission of "bringing about a more peaceful world by using action, education/training, dissemination and research to handle conflicts non-violently, with empathy and creativity, for acceptable and sustainable