Human rights obligations and Australian newspapers: a media monitoring project, using peace journalism to evaluate Australian newspaper coverage of the 2004 HREOC report regarding children in detention centres.

Author:
Andreasson, Tobias Martin

Human Rights Obligations and Australian Newspapers

A media monitoring project, using peace journalism to evaluate Australian newspaper coverage of the 2004 HREOC report regarding children in detention centres.

Tobias Andreasson
tobias@tobias.net.au

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts by Research

School of English, Media and Performing Arts
University of New South Wales

March 2008

Reverse-Psychotherapy

Why would you want to be sane in a mad world? It will only cause you misery.

It's better to go mad — it's easier, and who knows, you could become powerful and influential.

Reverse psychotherapy can help you overcome this terrible block — this burden, this liability, quaintly known as sanity.

Television, radio and newspapers can also be cheap, effective and readily available forms of reverse-psychotherapy.

You'll start to enjoy life again — the wars, the invasions, the justifications — they'll all seem normal, necessary and mature.

But be careful; bitter and twisted is the madness you need. Avoid dotty — it's for losers.

Leunig

Acknowledgement

I would like to first express my deep gratitude to Scott Shaner, who with a smile and positive energy helped me push this 'thing' forward, particularly the last few months, when the hill seemed steeper than ever. I am also humbly thankful for Professor Philip Bell's positive support and the freedom he gave me to explore what I thought was important and interesting. Without his insightful encouragement my aspiration to explore this topic would have diminished. I am further thankful to all other staff and students who smiled in the hallways of the Robert Webster Building, in particular Julie Miller who seemed to radiate a contagious positive vibe.

A massive big thanks to all good friends who have not picked on me too much for doing this, very personal and very unpaid, research project. I am particularly grateful to Sebastian Strakowicz, Maxine Sherrin and Cynthia Rankin for their discussion abilities late at night, constant support, but also the relief they provided when the brain cell needed a break.

Without the support of my family in Sweden, mom, dad, my sister and her family, this would not have been possible. Not enough words to express how amazing it is to have access to the unconditional support, the concern, the positive words, the inspiration, the financial 'gifts', and the love from you all… Love you all!

My last and most important appreciation goes to my amazing and beautiful Tara Welsh, who has put up listening to, and discussing with me, my little hobby for a long time. Your acceptance and positive smile has been a sparkle in the sky…

Abstract

This research thesis investigates news journalists' role in the promotion and protection of peace and human rights. I explore how news journalists do not just have the ability, through the discursive selections they make, to be a catalyst for peace and non-violent solutions, it is their obligation under international human rights. My study links arguments about universal ethics for media based on international human rights with the practical and analytical approach of 'peace journalism'. The main argument rests on the idea that objectivity or impartiality in news journalism does not equal ethical neutrality since there is always a discursive selection made by the news journalists. In order to monitor whether news journalists discursive selections comply with the international human rights obligations, I have explored how the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission (HREOC) report *A Last Resort?* were covered in three Australian newspapers when it was published in 2004. The HREOC report was a testament of human rights abuses by the Australian Federal Governments towards children in Australian detention centres. I establish that health professionals were a significant group for both HREOC's main findings and recommendations and a key group for the contextualisation of the human rights violations explored and exposed in the HREOC report. Informed by conflict analysis and peace studies theories I argue HREOC establish how the detention policy equals 'structural violence' that caused 'direct violence', which was justified and normalised because 'cultural violence'. I use discourse analysis to explore the discursive selections in the newspapers, and establish that the report received limited coverage and health professionals were omitted in the news while the political conflict was reported. This trivialised the report and health professionals' role, which led to the naturalisation and normalisation of the violence. I finally reinforce these finding by exploring alternatives to the coverage using a peace journalism framework, which further clarifies the subjective nature of the discursive selection.

Table of Contents

Chapter 3
Case Study

Part 1 The News Coverage

Introduction

Analysis of News Coverage

Part 2 The News Story

Part 3 Editorials

Chapter 4
Peace Journalism and 'Change Agents'

Tables

Introduction to Research Thesis

> Washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral (Paulo Freire in Chomsky and Barsamian 2001: 214-215)

Stuart Rees explains in his book *Passion for Peace* that "Acquiring a passion for peace partly depends on energy to generate ideas and to create enthusiasm" (Rees 2003: 24). In order to do this, Rees explains, people have to first be aware of human rights principles since there is a connection between awareness of human rights and abuses of human rights:

> …abuse of human rights if fed by ignorance about the principles which frame the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequent covenants on political, civil, social and economic rights. Illiteracy about human rights increases a tendency towards abuse of power. Literacy about human rights builds a culture in which humanitarian principles are known, respected and fostered (Rees 2003: 27-28)

This research investigates news journalists' role in the promotion and protection of peace and human rights. I explore how news journalists do not just have the ability, through the discursive selections they make, to be a catalyst for peace and non-violent solutions, it is their obligation under international human rights.[1] If this obligation is accepted and clarified, I argue news journalists' fundamental alliance lies first with international human rights and secondly with professional ethics (pragmatic or normative). These obligations are not limited to news journalists but their role as information providers in an egalitarian society makes news journalists particularly accountable for the establishment of a 'culture of peace', which is a reason their work should be critically monitored and evaluated.

My study will link arguments about universal ethics for media based on international human rights (Christians and Nordenstreng 2004; Christians and Traber 1997; Hamelink 1999, 1994; Perkins 2002), with the practical and analytical approach of 'peace journalism' (Galtung 2000; Galtung, Jacobsen et al, 2000; Lynch &

---

[1] All human beings (with normal mental capacity) are, according to international human rights, moral agents, with responsibilities and rights.

McGoldrick 2005; Lynch 2006, 2002, 1998). Peace journalism is a method initiated by peace scholar Johan Galtung, and it is generally defined as:

> when editors and reporters make choices-of what stories to report and about how to report them-that create opportunities for society at large to consider and value non-violent responses to conflict (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 5)

According to Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) peace journalism is not the norm in reporting violence and conflicts, but war journalism is, i.e., the violence is either trivialised or naturalised because of the discursive strategies employed in the coverage. From a liberal theory of the press this equals uneven or limited coverage and peace journalism is a way to redress this (McGoldrick 2006). However, I argue that to promote non-violence by naturalising non-violent "responses to conflict" as opposed to violent responses, is a fundamental moral *obligation* for journalists as set out in the International Bill of Human Rights.[2] This makes peace journalism a method that is not just more balanced, fair and responsible (Lynch 2002), but also 'anchored' in international human rights.[3]

Peace journalist proponent Majid Tehranian explain, "all cultures reflect the universal human propensity towards peace as well as violence" (1999: 180) and by "strengthening the cultural tendencies towards peace, we may build societies that reward peace and discourage violence" (1999: 183). In order to examine whether news journalists are currently 'strengthening the cultural tendencies towards peace', and as such, adhering to the universal ethics, I will analyse how three newspapers covered the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commissions' (HREOC) report *A Last Resort? National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention* (HREOC 2004) when it was published in 2004. The HREOC report was a testament of human rights abuses by the Australian Federal Government towards children in Australian detention centres.

---

[2] This bill contains the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols.
[3] This alludes to Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) notion that peace journalism is *anchored* in conflict analysis. My attempt is to add to this notion.

To do this I have used a conflict analysis and peace studies[4] framework to explore the HREOC report. I examine how the report contains evidence of different types of violence, which are necessary to make transparent for the peace journalism approach. I then set out to monitor and analyse three Australian newspaper's coverage of the publication of the HREOC report, the findings and the recommendations put forward within the report. I want to assess the discursive strategies that were employed by the newspapers to evaluate if violence or non-violence were naturalised.

This research project is inspired by a methodological framework Nordenstreng and Griffin (1999) call 'media monitoring'. This approach equates 'media monitoring' with a specific ethical aim as opposed to a general meaning of the term. The core idea is that all media have accountability, and this accountability is based on international human rights. The argument is that all journalists have both obligations and responsibilities to take international human rights seriously and adhere to the prescribed norms within the International Bill of Human Rights (Hamelink 1999, Nordernstreng 1989). These international norms are what Hamelink (1999) calls the only available 'universal ethics'. Media monitoring becomes one way to "guard the guardians" (Hamelink 1999: 14) and assess how they function according to these principles and it "is one of the most important means of materializing accountability" (Nordenstreng and Griffin 1999: 1).

I have organised this thesis into four chapters. Chapter 1 lays out the theoretical framework. I discuss the relationship between the discursive choice and objectivity. I use discourse analysis to argue that the discursive choices, including the selection of news actors used to frame the news, are subjective and that it is these choices that can be monitored and evaluated. I then set out to explore how it is possible to argue the ethics guiding the discursive selections should be fundamentally based on human rights. For a socially responsible media, based on those universal ethics, peace journalism becomes a practical method for news journalists reporting on conflict and violence.

---

[4] Lynch and McGoldrick explain that conflict analysis and peace studies are "overlapping fields" (2005: xvii) and it is not my intention to examine these as separate theories, instead I am drawing from the theories to understand how they define conflicts, violence and peace. These theories are focused on reducing violence, and achieving peace.

In chapter 2 I explore the HREOC report, using conflict analysis theories. Having established in chapter 2 that the HREOC report provided significant evidence of human rights violations in Australia and a number of recommendations that would stop the violence, both the direct and the structural, I set out in chapter 3 to examine the newspaper coverage the HREOC report, the findings and the recommendations received when the report was published in 2004. Chapter 4 is the concluding chapter. I discuss alternatives to the coverage analysed in chapter 3. I explore how peace journalists could have contextualised the HREOC report with their discursive selections and challenged any naturalisation and normalisation of the violence explained in the HREOC reports findings.

Chapter 1

Research Framework

Introduction

In this chapter I first explore the notion that news journalists have discursive choices. The discursive choices are used to frame the news, and can be critically monitored, evaluated and exposed. I then outline my methodological approach, which is based on 'media monitoring', as defined by Nordenstreng and Griffin (1999). I further explore discourse analysis as a method to monitor the media. Discourse analysis can be used to expose what discursive choices journalists make in reporting the news.[5]

After I have examined how news journalists have a choice, I explore what socio-cultural values should direct the choice. I discuss the human rights paradigm, which argues that news journalists have obligations enshrined within the International Bill of Human Rights. According to this approach, this Bill becomes the most fundamental ethics for news journalists as opposed to the more pragmatic professional ethics. To link human rights obligations and journalists is not a new idea and I refer to the New World Information and Communication Order debate (NWICO), which resulted in the Mass Media Declaration from 1979, and the MacBride Report in 1980. Both these documents demonstrate how this concept has been discussed and explored within UNESCO, based on similar ethical values. I think it is important to clarify how journalists' obligations have been explored internationally, what the aim was, and why it did not change news journalist's methods.

My theoretical contribution with this thesis is to link the ethical arguments about human rights and journalist's obligations enshrined in international treaties, with peace journalism, a method that I argue complies with the obligations mentioned. Hopefully this will validate further arguments for the benefits of peace journalism.

---

[5] I refer to discourse in the same way as those analysts who align themselves with the critical discourse analysis (CDA) model. Discourse is any forms of written, verbal or visual communication that are produced and interpreted within a socio-cultural and socio-political climate, i.e. discourse are accordingly intrinsically connected to context. Hence any critical discourse analyses include a socio-cultural or socio-political analysis (Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard 1996; Fairclough 1993, 1995; Van Dijk 1991, 1993).

The European Communities (EC) proclaim in their official journal; "information is not a product comparable to other products; having regard to the undisputed role that the press has played- and continues to play- in promoting democracy, freedom and human rights" (EC 1997: 415). To accept the EC's prescribed role to the press, there has to be a choice involved, which enables journalists and editors to promote 'democracy, freedom and human rights'. This research presupposes that journalists have a choice in their discursive selections, just as, for example, academics and historians have. Historian Howard Zinn has explained this well:

> Behind any presented fact…is a judgement- the judgement that this fact is important to put forward (and, by implication, other facts may be ignored). And any such judgement reflects the beliefs, the values of the historian, however he or she pretends to 'objectivity' (1997: 16).

Stuart Hall et al. explain the selection process in news production:

> The media do not simply and transparently report events which are 'naturally' newsworthy *in themselves*. 'News' is the end-product of a complex process which begins with a systematic sorting and selecting of events and topics accordingly to a socially constructed set of categories. (1978: 53)

Journalist Nick Davies (2008) confirms that whatever ends up on the front page is a conventional selection. However, it is not just a conventional selection, most media critics seem to agree the selected news does not "successfully mirror a real world" (Manoff and Schudson 1986: 6), which can alter the public's perceptions of events or issues not familiar to them (Philo and Berry 2004). Majid Tehranian points out how the discursive selection can influence, more or less, the reader's frame of what is going on in the world:

> Most studies demonstrate that media's moral achievement or failures lie in their power to frame social problems and conflicts, to set the agenda for public discourse, to dramatize, to glorify, or to demonize adversaries in national and international conflict (Tehranian 2002: 74).

One of the most referenced sources regarding media influence and the lack of balance in news media is the Glasgow University Media Group (GUMG 1985, 2002) and they have shown how selective news coverage influences the reader or viewer's perception of the covered event (GUMG 2002, Philo 1990). Hoijer et al. (2002) demonstrate in

their research how media audiences particularly remember compassion felt towards certain victims in a conflict because of certain images (or their interpretation of those images). Research clearly demonstrates that news media have the ability to influence; however the extent of influence has been debated (Curran 2002). Wolfsfeld (2004) and Philo (1990) demonstrate how some audiences think, for example, that the 'world' is more violent after reading or listening to news media. It has also been shown that, in general, audiences do not understand the complexities of international events, due to the lack of context provided by the news media to the processes behind the events. This can limit an understanding of the reasons behind certain people's or government's actions or situations (Philo and Berry 2004; Philo 1990; GUMG 1985, 2002; Kitzinger 2004).

I position my research within the radical tradition (Curran 2002), which assumes media does have a hegemonic[6] influence over the public (through frames and discourse) that fundamentally conforms to the ideological status quo, serving the interests of, primarily, corporate capital in the West. The news media are not an all encompassing powerful or monolithic system, but rather sets an agenda that does exist in a "guided market system" in the West, which structurally and ethically influences media content (Herman and Chomsky 1988: xii; Herman 2002, 1995). These structures place limitations on the discursive choices for news journalists. However, I argue there are still discursive selections that should be monitored and such monitoring can illuminate shortcomings of both structure and agency.

The importance of critically monitoring the discursive selections in the so-called impartial news media is well explained by Michel Foucault:

> It seems to me that the real political task in a society such as ours is to criticise the workings of institutions, which appear to be both neutral and independent; to criticise and attack them in such a manner that the political violence which has always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight against them. (Foucault 1971)

---

[6] I use hegemony in the 'gramscian' sense. Antonio Gramsci explained hegemony to comprise: "The "spontaneous" consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is "historically" caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production" (Gramsci 1971: 12 for further relevance to media see Curran 2002; Park 1998)

Media Monitoring

Media monitoring, as defined by Nordenstreng and Griffin (1999), also falls within the radical tradition. This methodological approach to media criticism is not viewed as an objective exercise; in fact the aim is to ground the criticism in ethics that are made explicit (Nordenstreng and Griffin 1999). Hamelink explains that the "implied task for media monitoring…[is] to evaluate whether media content contributes to the teaching of respect for human rights" (1999: 265). Galtung (1999) and John Eldridge (1999) explain that media monitoring projects should criticise and evaluate how well media fulfil the role of 'guardian' of the political powers.

> Monitoring is much more than trend watching: to monitor is to understand in order to act in an informed, well-reasoned way. Monitoring is beyond mirroring what happens in the fourth pillar of society… To monitor the media is to make them transparent, a basic condition for democracy to function. (Galtung 1999: 23)

The aim for a media-monitoring project is to contribute something of value to the media itself and the journalists (Galtung 1999; Van Dijk 1999). For Galtung it is obvious a government will push its objectives as being positive and good objectives, and it is the role of the media to examine, dissect and investigate how true any official versions of events are and what the alternatives are. Despite Galtung's claim, according to critical research conducted into media coverage of conflicts, journalists do not tend to seriously question official sources when there is a serious conflict (Aday, Livingston et al. 2005; Curtis 2004; Edwards and Cromwell 2006; Herman and Chomsky 1988). This is where the news media might falter in their role to provide relevant, correct and ethical information while exposing discourses that are manipulative or function as propaganda.

The discourses selected to frame the 'news' can be exposed using discourse analysis theories, which make the discursive choices transparent and open to evaluation. Van Dijk's method for monitoring racism within news discourses is critical discourse analysis (CDA). According to Garret and Bell "CDA has an explicit socio-political agenda" (1998: 6). It is an interdisciplinary method that focuses on power, and power abuse through discourse (Van Dijk 1993; Wodak and Matouschek 1993). Van Dijk

(2000) explains that CDA is a form of dissidence, since the aim is to critically examine dominant discourses communicated in the mass media, or the discourses used by those with the power in society to influence and change public or political agendas. The CDA method can clarify how objectivity is never a neutral concept and this becomes important for the explanation and promotion of peace journalism, since, according to Shinar (2007), the notion of objectivity is an obstacle in the acceptance of peace journalism.

According to Van Dijk (2006) the naturalisation of violence can be seen as a form of 'manipulation', since the naturalisation of violence leads to a passive acceptance of violence. Van Dijk argues this type of manipulation "violates the human or social rights of those who are manipulated" (Van Dijk 2006: 363). They become "*victims* of manipulations" (Van Dijk 2006: 361) and this mean the real consequence of their Governments action or intentions are not understood. The manipulation equals "abuse of power" (Van Dijk 2006: 360).

Since I am concerned with the naturalisation of violence (including human rights abuses) as a result of discursive selections, I will use discourse analysis methods to make the news discourses transparent. This makes it possible to evaluate the choices news journalists take, and argue for a discourse switch if manipulation is taking place, and violence is naturalised. This opens up possibilities for peace and non-violence. This discussion further sets up the argument then that journalistic aim for objectivity in the news is never completely free of value-laden choices.

Discourse Analysis

My media monitoring approach is informed by CDA in understanding there is a choice in news discourse, and this choice is a socially and culturally conditioned choice. The discursive choice can 'manufacture consent'[7] to certain actions or policies that are, at base, violent. One effective way to expose how a dominant discourse is promoting violence is to show that the dominant discourse is actually one of many

---

[7] From Chomsky and Herman 1988 (who took it from Walter Lippman), but frequently used by Van Dijk to explain hegemony in practice, (see Van Dijk 1993: 255)

possible discourses and to reveal how the discursive strategies promote violence through manipulation.

Van Dijk explain that CDA is grounded in an *"ethics of discourse"* and fundamentally this ethics is grounded in human rights (2006: 364). Van Dijk explains that a crucial task for CDA is "to account for the relationships between discourse and social power. More specifically, such an analysis should describe and explain how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimised by the text and talk of dominant groups or institutions" (Van Dijk 1996: 84).

CDA are partly informed by Halliday's theory of systemic-functional linguistics. For Halliday language can be seen as a system of meaning potential that reveals the choice taken in communicating. He explains this the following way:

> …a system is a set of options, a set of possibilities A, B, or C, together with a condition of entry. The entry condition states the environment: 'in the environment X, there is a choice among A, B, and C'. The choice is obligatory; if the conditions obtain, a choice must be made. The environment is, in fact, another choice […] It is equivalent to saying 'if you have selected X (out of X and Y), then you must go on to select either A, B, or C'. The 'then' expresses logical dependence-there is no real time here-it is purely abstract model of language as choice, as sets of interrelated choices. (Halliday 1978: 40-41)

Fairclough explains in more simple terms "texts are based upon choices, and that alternative choices might always have been made" (1995: 203). This is behind his idea that the 'order of discourse' (from Foucault) is related to 'choice relations' (generally socially conditioned) and 'chain relations'. Part of his analysis has been to expose these relations. This idea is also expressed by Roger Fowler, who writes "a discourse is a system of meanings within the culture, pre-existing language. Again, one speaks of text as being 'in' some register R1, whereas several discourses D1 to Dn may be 'in' a text'" (1996: 7).

Because texts are intertextual, that is, texts need to be understood in their broader social context, the socio-political or socio-cultural climate the text is read in has to be included in the analysis. Van Dijk explains "Discourse analysis is a multidisciplinary approach to the study of language use and communication in their socio-cultural

contexts" (1991:44). Stuart Allan highlights a similar point by referring to Barthes idea that: "Given that the 'polysemic' (Barthes, 1967) potential of the message is never fully realised in practice, it is the mobilization of certain meanings in the place of others which interests the analyst" (1998: 113).

Following on from this discussion I will focus on certain aspects of discourse analysis, which will help me analyse the coverage of the HREOC report in the newspapers. The aim is to show the "relationships between 'text and context'" (Van Dijk 1991: 45) and unearth potential ethical implications from the discursive conventions in the news.

Discourse Access

Van Leeuwen (1996, 1993) focuses, like Fairclough, on choices taken in the texts. Van Leeuwen has focused on 'social actors' and he states, the "exclusion [of actors] has rightly been an important aspect of Critical Discourse Analysis" (1996: 38). For Van Leeuwen it is important to examine what social actors are placed in the background and who is suppressed. Van Dijk further clarifies this "One major element in the discursive reproduction of power and dominance is the very *access* to discourse and communicative events" (1996: 85). This selection of news actors and certain actor's access to the news discourse prioritise certain voices and their ideologies.[8] Similarly Fairclough has pointed out that an important aspect is not just the inclusion of actors in the news, but also the location of the actors, statements and arguments in the story, and in the paper as a whole. In the Australian Press Council (APC) Report from 2006 (APC 2006), APC demonstrate that news stories in the press have only very limited types of sources.[9] Even though the amount of sources are important, critical discourse analysis focus more on who has discourse access and their relevance to the actual issue reported. The amount of sources does not provide information regarding whose values are given space or whose values are omitted. These aspects of CDA are included in Allan Bell's (1998) guide to interpret discourse structures in news, which I use in chapter 3.

---

[8] I use the word ideology to mean a set of beliefs about the world, which includes values and opinions.
[9] APC pointed out that "the most alarming finding was that more than 40per cent of all stories cited only one source" and Government officials were the main source for the news.

New Racism

For my research I have been most influenced by Van Dijk's (1991, 1993, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2006) approach to critical discourse analysis. Van Dijk research has particularly focused on racism in the news media discourse, both the common understanding of racism but also 'new racism'. New racism is not race specific, but more ethnic and culture specific, and as a result sometime more subtle and accepted. For Van Dijk racism (including new racism) encapsulates and reinforces non-humanitarian values and this becomes a particular problem when appropriated in the mainstream as commonsense or normal through cultural (or ethnic) hegemony (Van Dijk 2000). Because the media has the ability to influence or set 'the spectrum of debate' the more implicit new racism (which denies it is racist) within the dominant discourse should, according to Van Dijk, be examined and exposed. New racism is an 'invisible violence' that can appear natural or normal and is important to monitor if the aim is to promote non-violence and peace. New racism becomes one version of what can be viewed "cultural violence" according to conflict analysis theories (Galtung 2000).

However, the implicit nature of this new racism is contradicted by Peter Manning's (2004) research. Manning analysed two main Australian newspapers and his conclusion after looking at two years of representations of Arabic and/or Muslim people was that these two newspapers are part of the cultural hegemony at work, reinforcing the power of racist discourses (Manning 2004). Van Dijk (2000) argued that a main problem is that media do not promote anti-racism, while Manning (2004, 2006) explained how these newspapers actually feed racism, sometimes inexplicit but sometimes more explicitly. Both the implicit and explicit racism noted in Manning's research was accepted and viewed as natural by the news media. I will explore the naturalisation of new racism and other cultural violence's more in chapter 2 when I explore conflict analysis theories and the HREOC report.

I have attempted to show, using discourse analysis theories, how there is a discursive choice used to frame the news, and this choice is culturally and socially dependent, with ethical implications. It is not an objective choice. It is the discursive strategies that prioritises certain voices in the news and provides some actors with access to the

discourses at work in the news. News journalists' choices make them "active participants in reality making and not merely passive observers" (Carey 1986: 194-195). Within the subjective reality, news journalists can naturalise violence and new racism or non-violence and peace. In the next section I will explore the idea that news media should not be criticised for being true or false, instead it is the reality that news media contextualise, through the selections, that should be critically examined and evaluated.

Objectivity and Subjective Realities

To argue the reality created in the news discourse cannot be objective does not mean that news should be adversarial, partisan or a 'journalism of attachment' as advocated by Martin Bell (1998). Hammond explains the problem with Bell's position "despite claims to be pursuing a moral, human rights agenda, the journalism of attachment has led to the celebration of violence against those perceived as undeserving victims" (Hammond 2002: 180). Despite the conventional nature of news discourses, objective reporting is still possible; but the understanding of objectivity within this context must be clarified and defined. Sigal explains how objectivity should be understood in relation to news journalists:

.

> The operative convention is objective reporting. Objectivity in journalism denotes a set of rhetorical devices and procedures used in composing a news story. Objectivity, in this sense, has no bearing whatsoever on the truthfulness or validity of a story. Nor does it mean that the story is free of interpretation or bias. (Sigal 1986: 15)

Understanding 'objectivity' as a 'rhetorical device' used by the professional journalist, and not a correlation to truthfulness provides an opportunity to focus on the subjective reality, even when communicated in an objective way. The discussion can then shift to what values should direct those 'rhetorical devices' in order for news media to be socially responsible.

Philip Schlesinger's (1987) book about the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) was called *Putting 'Reality' Together: BBC News*. Considering that the reality conveyed in the news is a result of the discursive selections it is a subjective reality.

This applies even though such a reality is presented in an objective manner. Lynch and McGoldrick suggest, such "journalism is…better understood as playing a part in *constructing* the world around it- *creating* realities, and shaping discussions" (2005: 200). This is a fundamental understanding for the argument within this thesis, and the aim is to show how this construction works, and to question the values behind certain created subjective realities.

Kempf talks about the differences "between facts and meanings, between truth and beliefs and between objective and subjective realities"(2006: 6). Kempf argues any classical definition of truth (that truth corresponds with reality) or objectivity (as in neutrality) cannot be sustained, so the focus for media monitoring should be on what subjective realities are created in media. According to Kempf (2006: 6) these subjective realities can be criticised on three grounds:

- Lack of functionality (i.e. the functionality of the news is not fulfilled)
- Misrepresentation of the facts
- Inadequacy of the social and cultural rules on which it is based

In order to do this, both 'functionality' and 'the social and cultural rules' need to be justified and explained. I will argue in the next section that the fundamental functionality for news media is to promote and protect human rights; this is based on the 'rules' set out in international human rights treatise.

The Human Rights Paradigm

I have previously attempted to show how the reality presented in the news discourse is *always* subjective, and as a result, there is always an *ethical* choice involved, whether intentional or not. In this section I will present the argument that journalists reporting on conflicts and violence have obligations according to the International Bill of Human Rights. However the idea to focus on human rights has been misguided, since it has led to journalists siding with one side and exposing evil on the other. Hammond explains:

Contemporary 'human rights journalism' involves suppressing inconvenient information, distorting public understanding of conflicts, applauding the deaths of designated Western hate-figures (including the civilians associated with them) and ignoring evidence of the destructive effects of Western [violence]. (2002: 194)

Herman and Peterson (2002) call journalists who openly take sides in violent conflicts 'the new humanitarians' and argue they have "served as a political and propaganda arm of the new imperialism" (2002: 215). According to Herman and Peterson these new humanitarians propagated violence through the promotion of a good versus evil scenario, and ignored evidence that contradicted the journalists claim all faults lied with one side. To propagate violence is in opposition to the International Bill of Human Rights hence the result is that the 'human rights journalists' failed in their obligations under those rights. The aim of media monitoring is to expose this failure, explain why journalists might fail and how they can better fulfil their obligations when they are covering a violent conflict, power abuse, or other issues relating to human rights.

It is generally accepted that news journalists should work in the interest of the public within the 'public sphere' (Becker 2004; Hamelink 1999). This task is shaped and influenced by industry conventions and certain commercial constraints and it is not generally viewed as "anything but value free" (Becker 2004: 4). Industry conventions project news stories in the press as impartial and objective (value free), while editorials and opinion pieces are subjective (with values). The decisions taken in these parts can be defended "by the habit of *indexing*" (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005), which means the decisions are based (and blamed) on industry conventions. The editorials, the opinion pieces and the news stories create a media that is viewed as ethical on the whole, and socially responsible. However, I have pointed out that objectivity in the news can be seen as a rhetorical device and news are based on ethical selections. Carey (1986) argues that journalists and media should be evaluated as a whole because the parts have individually different functions. However, if the subjective reality put forward in the news story fails in its functionality, the newspaper will fail to be socially responsible, whether or not an editorial or opinion piece fulfil their ethical functions.

The ethics I am arguing for are the same ones that Hamelink (1999) calls the only available universal ethics. These universal ethics are based on the international human rights, and Hamelink (1999) explains they are fundamental normative ethics for journalists, under which other professional ethics should be framed.

Universal Ethics

In the International Center for Journalists (ICFJ) handbook *Journalism Ethics, the Global Debate,* there is no mention of international human rights, even though there is a discussion about universal values (Butler 2003). The foundation for this professional code of ethics is based on utilitarianism, Kant's categorical imperative and the golden rule (Butler 2003: 8-9).

Stratton and McCann (2002) use Emmanuel Levinas ethical thinking to discuss Australia's treatment of asylum seekers. Levinas viewed all humans as interdependent and with an ethical responsibility towards the Other due to this interdependence. Stratton and McCannn claim:

> An ethical response [to asylum seekers reaching Australia] would begin by shifting public discourse from a discourse which figures asylum seekers as 'outsiders' and 'others' to people in need to whom we owe legal and ethical obligations. (2002: 8)

However in both the ICFJ handbook and Stratton and McCann's argument there is lack of a normative codes for critique, instead the ethics becomes relativistic or pragmatic. There is no "frame of reference for critiquing news media practice and codes of ethics" (Christians and Nordenstreng 2004: 25). Pragmatic ethics for journalists have been promoted as the best ethics to use, but often such discussion focuses on particular ethical problems when the pragmatic approach can be best, for example in the selection of images, inclusion of names of people or the relevance of some topics in the news (Richards 2005). Richards (2005) focuses on the pragmatic and relativistic ethical debate but acknowledges others exist, such as an international ethical debate, which argues for universal ethics for governing news journalists. To ground journalists fundamental ethics on international human rights, the ethical norms will become important to defend stories about violent conflicts, that might be going

against the status quo, the establishment, the national interest or the official view. The fundamental human rights framework, based on obligations stated in the UDHR, remains unexplored by Richards (2005) and the ICFJ, but is also unexplored in the Australian Press Council's (APC 2003) Statement of Principles and in the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance's (MEAA 2008) Code of Ethics. If the human rights obligations are made explicit and clarified, it can limit arguments that news stories or news journalists are politically biased.

Christians and Nordenstreng argue in favour of a more universal ethics based on human rights, where the:

> standard of judgement is not economic or political success but whether our worldviews and community formations contribute in the long run to truth-telling, human dignity, and nonmaleficence. Ethical principles grounded in being do not obstruct cultures and inhibit their development. On the contrary, they liberate us for strategic action and provide a direction for social change. (2004: 24)

Christians and Nordenstreng call this 'citizen ethics' instead of professional ethics, since it is based on universal principles. They argue "when a media-centred paradigm is replaced by a citizen-centred paradigm, one is moving away from a functionalist approach to a critical (neo-Weberian) approach" (Christians and Nordenstreng 2004: 16). This discourse shift creates a different 'public discourse' not constrained by professional uniformity and codes. Weber claimed professional conformity and professional codes were elitist, concerned primarily with authority and power (Christians and Nordenstreng 2004; Tucker 2002). To connect journalists' ethical codes with international human rights, the codes become "instruments of self-reflection by helping practitioners understand the nature of their work and relating their practice to broader moral and ethical values" (Christians and Nordenstreng 2004: 19). Christians and Nordenstreng explain this further:

> The more one is acquainted with international norms and values, the less that person is committed to conventional professionalism. One begins to doubt the values basis of professionalism, and sees it more and more as an ideological smokescreen to protect the proprietors' interests instead of workers' rights. This is a paradigm shift away from an approach that understands media and journalists as the owners of communication rights and freedoms towards a paradigm whereby the citizens and

their civil society are seen as the ultimate owners of freedom of information. (2004: 16)

To position the universal ethics as the fundamental ethics for journalists and media is to challenge the traditional discursive strategies when it comes to certain serious social issues. This change in journalists' fundamental ethics will not change commercial imperatives, but it is a step towards slowly changing the ethical paradigm and journalists' professional role in a democracy that values both press freedom and human rights. In the next section I will explain how the fundamental ethics, those based on international human rights, are related to media and the notion media have a social responsibility based on those ethics.

The Universal Ethics and International Law

The argument that human rights are the fundamental normative ethics for journalists and editors, in the same way they should guide all institutions, and in particular those that deal in some way with humanitarian issues, is based on the International Bill of Human Rights. It is stated in the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms", and in Article 29 Paragraph 1, "Everyone has duties to the community". This is further reinforced in the preambles to both the ICCPR (1966) and ICESCR (1966), which state:

> that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance of the rights recognized in the present Covenant (ICCPR 1966; ICESCR 1966).

This was reinforced in the Proclamation of Teheran 1968: "It is imperative that the members of the international community fulfil their solemn obligations to promote and encourage respect for human rights" (OHCHR 1996).

Similar notions are also expressed in both The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man 1948, which states, "the fulfilment of duty by each individual is a prerequisite to the rights of all" (Hamelink 1999: 270) and in the Charter of Asian

Human Rights, which states in its introduction that "the community as a whole has a primary obligation to see that the State comply with these demands" (Hamelink 1999: 270). Australia does not have a national bill of human rights so "the international human rights framework is particular significant for Australia and Australians" (Hovell 2003: 297). The human rights treatise are not meant as suggestions, but are intended to be legally binding when the treaties are signed (Howell 2003), however the enforcement under Australian law is not possible unless "they are given that effect by [Australian] statute" (Chief Justice Gibbs quoted in William 2004: 52). Perkins explains:

> A nation is expected to respect and carry out the commitments it makes regarding human rights when it signs a treaty. This principle is captured in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969): "Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith" (Article 26). (Perkins 2002: 196)

Hamelink argues: "Human rights provide currently the only available set of standards for the dignity and integrity of all people. It is in the interest of all people that they be respected" (1999: 264). In this thesis I am considering whether or not the news coverage of the HREOC report indicates the newspapers and news journalists accept the "notion of the individual's duties under international law" (Hamelink 1999: 270).

In the *Charter of a Free Press* The Australian Press Council refer to Article 19 in the UDHR to defend "press freedom" (APC 2003: 9). Article 19 in the UDHR states, "everyone has the right of freedom of opinion and expression" (UDHR 1948). It is worth noting that there is no specific reference in UDHR to *press* freedom as such. When claiming the right under Article 19, APC commits journalists to protect and defend all rights expressed in the UDHR. Hamelink explains the reasoning: "Claims to the protection by human rights imply the commitment that violations of these rights are rejected and that the rights holders engage in the defence of such rights" (1999: 270). However this is not elaborated or explored in 'The Charter of a Free Press' or in other journalists' codes in Australia or in much literature on peace journalism.

Perkins explains how these obligations are expressed in the ICCPR:

> Article 19 of the United Nations' International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) is an excellent example of pairing broad guarantees for free expression with explicit limitations on that freedom-limitations born of the duties and responsibilities that accompany the right of free expression. (Perkins 2002: 196)

Article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights contains two paragraphs that further explain restrictions on media's privilege (ICCPR 1966):

> 1. Any propaganda for war shall be prohibited by law.
>
> 2. Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law.

To go back to Kempf's (2006) points about media criticism, I argue that media, with its implicit power to inform and influence, should base its fundamental functionality on the "social and cultural rules" put forward in the universal ethics. This is an essential aspect of what has been called a socially responsible media. A socially responsible media is not a new idea, and the idea that international human rights are fundamental ethics for such media is also not new. However, what needs to be done is constant monitoring of media to evaluate if the universal ethics are adhered to, but also explorations of *new* methods that are better suited for news journalists that comply with the universal ethics *and* the professional codes.

In order to clarify, the focus for media monitoring can be on either the structure or agency of journalists. News is produced within a structure, but journalists and editors have certain agency to make discursive choices within that structure. It is these discursive choices that I am mainly concerned with in this thesis. I argue peace journalism is one practical method that is based on human rights and would comply with the universal ethics without a significant change to the structure. However, I recognise that there are certain constraints that limit the peace journalism option (Hackett 2006), and a continual effort to minimise those structural constraints are necessary for a socially responsible media.

Before any case study or explorations of methods I think it is important to historically contextualise the argument for a socially responsible media since by doing so it

becomes apparent that the ideas have been widely debated but have often fallen short in practice because of the commercial structure of the media and the commercial imperatives journalists and editors work under. If the limitations of and the opposition to the argument for such a media are clarified, and the fundamental values within the debates are explored and explained, it might be possible to explore how journalists can freely adopt the notions discussed while retaining the freedoms expressed in the UDHR. I will elaborate on this argument in the next section.

A Socially Responsible Media

The idea that media should be socially responsible is according to Christians and Nordenstreng (2004) an evolving idea, that positions media, and in particular news media, as having a responsibility towards society at large and not merely a professional, institutional or political responsibility. I have explained that this responsibility is, according to some media critics and scholars (Christians and Nordenstreng 2004; Hamelink 1999; Nordenstreng and Griffin 1999; Perkins 2002) grounded in international human rights. The idea media do have a responsibility was elaborated by William Earnest Hocking, the main philosopher behind the Hutchins Commission, who argued; "freedom of expression was not an inalienable natural right but an earned moral right" (paraphrased in Christians and Nordenstreng 2004: 13).

Even though the report that came out of the Hutchins Commission was criticised in the United States for being a possible promoter of government control, the notion journalists have some social responsibility was accepted. The reasoning behind the acceptance have been debated, some have argued for example that it was accepted by journalists because it increased their social status (Nerone 2002: 184).

The criticisms towards the Hutchins Commission by media corporations were again put forward during the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) debate, or movement, as it has been called (Hackett 2006), during the late 1970s. For most media researchers the debate is well known and does not need further explanation, but I think that it is useful to re-state what I, as a researcher, think is important to get from this debate. One reason is that it foregrounds the argument that

news journalists have obligations based on human rights in a historical context. Padovani and Nordenstreng write the:

> …lack of historical depth in facing contemporary communication challenges reflects a dubious tendency to understand such challenges as novelties on the world scene, inviting public institutions to respond with a short-sighted political approach. (2005: 265)

Boyd-Barrett and Rantanen (1998: 1) called the NWICO debate "important, if unfashionable". They explained:

> The NWICO debate has largely collapsed, and so too, apparently, has social science interest. This is a pity because whatever its faults, and there were many, NWICO was at least a conscious, well-articulated and coordinated response to the reality of progressive globalization-even before the term was commonly used-at least as far as the media were concerned (1998: 3-4).

Boyd-Barret and Rantanen are critical towards the 'dependency framework' for the debate, but they do not focus on the broader social values and the basic ethics that guided the debate. Calabrese highlights a different view when he writes about the MacBride Commissions report *Many Voices, One World: Towards a New, More Just and More Efficient World Information and Communication Order* for UNESCO:

> …if we can overlook its flaws and the controversies that surrounded its public reception in 1980…we find a spirit of hopefulness about how a better world is possible, about the continued importance of public institutions as means to ensure global justice at local, national, and transnational levels, and about the value of global communication as a means to knowledge, understanding, and mutual respect (Calabrese 2005: 51).

Calabrese focuses on the fact that a clear ethical position was put forward, based on the notion media can be a catalyst for positive change and a protector of human rights. Sean MacBride writes in the forward to the report that the NWICO might be better seen as a *process*, rather than an *event*. He explains:

> The particulars of the process will continually alter, yet its goals will be constant-more justice, more equity, more reciprocity in information exchange, less dependence in communication flows, less downwards diffusion of messages, more self-reliance and cultural identity, more benefits for all mankind. (MacBride et al. 1980: xviii)

I do not aim to critically examine the NWICO debate, since that has been done (Carlsson 2003; Nordenstreng 1984; Nordenstreng and Schiller 1993; Nordenstreng and Vincent 1999) or how the 'process' has developed.[10] However I think the 'spirit of hopefulness' that Calabrese (2005) mentioned is important to be aware of if the argument is that media ought to have a social responsibility, based on human rights, to promote peace and non-violence. I further think the same 'spirit of hopefulness' is evident in writings about peace journalism. I view peace journalism to be part of the process MacBride mentioned and it is a practical method to make media more socially responsible. According to peace journalism definitions, to promote peace means to promote a creative and non-violent solution to a conflict (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005). Peace journalism provides the tools to do that. I wish to further demonstrate some ethical similarities between the aim of peace journalism and the ethical aim during the NWICO.

Tehranian asked in his article on peace journalism, "can we achieve a media system that promotes peace rather than war, understanding rather than obfuscation, tolerance rather than hatred, celebration of diversity rather than xenophobia?" (2002: 74)

This was the fundamental question that was discussed during the NWICO debate. The Mass Media Declaration of 1979, which was signed by all UNESCO members, had the full title:

> *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.* (Nordenstreng 1984: 271, italics in original).

The same fundamental principles are evident in the MacBride Report:

---

[10] In 2003 and 2005 the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), led by the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), took place (for further analysis see Calabrese 2004; Raboy 2004; Siochru 2004a 2004b). The Civil Society Declaration that was produced contains many similarities as those expressed during NWICO (WSIS 2004). WSIS is clearly part of the 'process' MacBride (1980) mentioned. However Siochru (2004a, 2004b) explain how civil society was undermined (even though officially invited), this was the reason for the separate Civil Society Declaration. Siochru argues that ITU is mainly a technically concerned agency and not the best-suited UN agency to deal with communication rights. The selection of host demonstrated the priorities (technical development) that were evident during the WSIS. For this reason, and space limitations, I will not explore the WSIS further but I recognise it is part of the communication rights movement.

> We live, alas, in an age stained by cruelty, torture, conflict and violence. These are not the natural human condition: they are scourges to be eradicated. We should never resign ourselves to endure passively what can be cured. Ordinary men and woman in every country-and this includes a country depicted as 'the enemy'-share a yearning to live out their lives in peace. That desire, if it is mobilised and expressed, can have an effect on the actions of governments. These statements may appear obvious, but if they appear more consistently in the media, peace would be safer. (MacBride 1980: 177)

These notions are present in Galtung's work on conflict analysis and conflict transformation. Galtung bases his understanding of conflicts and violence on the notion that violence is not in human nature (Galtung 2000; Galtung et al. 2002). Because of that, according to Galtung, conflicts can be transcended and violence can be eradicated (or at least constrained). These ideas triggered his development of peace journalism as a practical approach for journalists to use when reporting a conflict. The aim was to create a media dedicated to a peace discourse, as opposed to a war or violence discourse. Galtung clearly view journalists as an important group in the creation of a 'culture of peace' (Galtung 2000).

A similar social responsibility is further explained in the MacBride Report:

> *Defence of human rights is one of the media's most vital tasks...* The contribution of the media in this regard is not only to foster these principles, but also to expose all infringements, wherever they occur, and to support those whose rights have been neglected or violated… (1980: 265, italics in original)

Both the Mass Media Declaration and the MacBride Report were criticised by large media corporations and many other people who were concerned they undermined freedom of expression and the freedom of the press. Corporate sponsored advertising campaigns in 1982 warned that "press freedoms and economic freedoms are under attack" (Nordenstreng 1984: xii) and that the UN is against "fundamental principles of democracy"(Nordenstreng 1984: xiii). Nordenstreng shows through his work and research how the criticism towards NWICO, UNESCO and the UN was flawed and how the campaign can only be seen as an attempt to protect the status quo, which did not embrace the ideas of the Mass Media Declaration (Nordensteng 1984; Nordenstreng, Vincent, et al. 1999). USA and Britain's withdrawal from UNESCO in 1984 put a halt on the visions debated during the NWICO (Carlsson 2003; Nordenstreng, Vincent et al. 1999).

However, most criticisms were based on a fear of the NWICO that were rooted in ideological divisions and corporate interests, for example free trade, which was seen as a 'right' and put forward as equal to the freedom of speech and human rights (Baker 2002: 273). Nordenstreng and Vincent write that the NWICO was taken over and exploited by the Cold War powers, it "fell victim to imperial power" (1999: viii).

Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Secretary-General of the UN at the time, said in his first speech on communication:

> Critics of the Declaration, who expressed concern that national public authorities have been given an instrument to limit freedom of the press, are mistaken. Such a concept was not and could never be the intention of any United Nations deliberative body, in which free and open debate always prevails. (Nordenstreng 1984: xiii)

Perez de Cuellar explained how these ethical thoughts, must be adopted in creating the representations of subjective realities of world events that appear in the media. The "structures of world peace are often built in the minds of ordinary people, based on feelings of security and confidence in a just and rational world" (Nordenstreng 1984: xiv).

The ideals of the Hutchins Commission and the NWICO debate have not been realised, instead most media is produced by large profit seeking corporations. 'News values' are based on commercial imperatives, professional imperatives or political and cultural rules. It is the "political economy of the mass media" (Herman and Chomsky 1988). This is natural and not a conspiracy, which both Herman and Chomsky have explained many times when defending their 'propaganda model' (Herman and Chomsky 1988, Herman 2002) and the way it explains how economic imperatives constrain and shape media content.[11]

---

[11] Herman and Chomsky's (1988) 'propaganda model' has been criticised (see, for example, Curran 2002; Entman 1990; Jacobson et al. 2002) but sometimes the criticism misses the main point-that it is an analysis of a capitalistic market-driven media system and not an analysis of all aspects of news production, media influence or general news values. Herman explains that when it came to certain media behaviour (such as, for example, siding with the elites or viewing the official view as the objective view) they "looked to structural factors as the only possible root of the systematic patterns of media behaviour and performance" (Herman 2002: 61). Herman and Chomsky explain, "No simple model will suffice…to account for every detail of such a complex matter as the working of the national mass media. A propaganda model, we believe, captures essential features of the process, but it leaves many nuances and secondary effects unanalysed." (1988: 304)

The NWICO debate was taking place within a human rights framework, which placed human rights, human needs and human development before commercial imperatives. Similar human (and social) values are fundamentally behind peace journalism, which I argue is a practical method that demonstrates how the media and journalists can adhere to these values, while maintaining certain commercial imperatives and professional notions such as objectivity (as a rhetorical device).

Peace Journalism

I am basing my conceptual understanding of peace journalism on the works by Galtung (2000, 1998), who originated the idea, and the works by Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) and Lynch (2007, 2006, 2002, 1998). Lynch and McGoldrick have developed the idea into a practical method for journalists. Research on peace journalism is usually focused on military conflicts (including the attack on the World Trade Centre in 2001 and peace proposals), for example see, Hoijer et al. (2007), Lynch (2006), Mandelzis (2007), Ottosen (2007), Perez (2006), Peleg (2007), Ross (2006), Shinar (2007), Wijadi (2004). However it is not limited to such physically violent conflicts (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005).

The ethical aim of peace journalism, as I understand it, is to create an atmosphere in society in which non-violence and peace are seen as valid, justified and possible solutions to a conflict. The same ethical aim was evident during the NWICO, and it is evident within the human rights regime. The aim is to naturalise and normalise non-violence and peace, which will promote an acceptance of a 'culture of peace' as opposed to a 'culture of violence'. Galtung (2000) and Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) do not propose that this approach will end all war and violence, but if journalists make a conscious effort to focus on how to open up opportunities for peace when reporting violent conflicts they can normalise peace. However if journalists do not have an understanding of conflicts and violence, and the relationships between them, it is difficult to know how to report and contextualise a conflict such that all types of violence might be avoided, limited, or transcended. In order to be aware of the structure of a conflict and violence, peace journalism is 'anchored' in conflict analysis and peace studies (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005). Galtung, who is the founder of the

academic subject 'Peace Studies', applied his approach to conflict transformation[12] to journalism, based on the notion that the media (even when informed and with good intentions) can be a catalyst for more violence or the naturalisation (acceptance) of violence, including human rights violations.

The ethics guiding peace journalism are in particular a "Gandhian idea of justice" (Lynch & McGoldrick 2005: 222). Lynch and McGoldrick explain that "justice and emancipation, along with the principles of non-violence and creativity…give us a firm basis for identifying peace; establishing it as a vantage point from which to observe and report" (2005: 222). They continue to say "We have a firm basis for claiming that peace is a valid organising principle for journalism about conflicts" (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 224). Galtung has asked "What would a code of peace journalism look like?…To whom or what does the peace journalist owe his/her allegiance? To "peace"? Maybe too abstract. To present and future victims of violence/war?" (Galtung 2002: 1).

Shinar explains "the development of ethical codes for peace journalism should be considered necessary but not sufficient" (2007: 4). I argue a peace journalism ethics should be the same for all news journalists, and it is a communitarian ethics fundamentally grounded on international human rights. However this will not be sufficient but it is a step to frame news journalism within a humanitarian universal ethics and peace journalism is a practical method to adhere to those ethics. I argue similar values were discussed during the NWICO. I believe that if these fundamental values are made explicit, and clarified, it might help individual journalists to defend their reporting against outside pressures and other obstacles "inherent in the structure of their profession" (Blasi 2004: 3).

Phillips (2006) argues in a critique of Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) that

> In the end the issue here is not whether people are for or against peace but whether journalists are sufficiently well educated, widely read, well informed and suspicious

---

[12] I.e. the aim is not to end a conflict, but to *transform* it and this demands a focus on all aspects of the conflicts, and not just the visible direct violence.

enough to ask the right questions (Phillips 2006: 239).

Clearly an informed journalist is a key to Peace Journalism, but even an informed journalist will have to decide who to ask those informed questions and what to report in the first place. It is possible for an informed journalist to focus on, for example, events, people and historical contexts that do not open up opportunities for non-violence and peace. It is also possible for journalists to apply the methods behind peace journalism without claiming to use the method in the first place. This does not render the method less valid.

The basic logic behind peace journalism is simple, if we are surrounded by the idea that violence is natural and accepted, violence will become natural and accepted, however, if it is seen as unnatural and against our fundamental ethics as humans, it is more likely to be rejected.

Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) have explained how peace journalism have been used in Indonesia in order to be a positive part of the development of the nation. Media's function and ability to support the development of a nation was discussed during the NWICO, but often this was rejected in the West (MacBride 1980; Nordenstreng 1984). In 'developed' nations the notion that *we* are developed is entrenched with us and it is inked to the idea *we* are the apex of civilization and *we* do not need to develop further (Tehranian 2004). However, Cunningham and Flew argued there are "sophisticated and sustainable arguments in defense of development communication, the critique of overly adversarial and oppositional journalistic styles, or the excessive emphasis on masculine individualism and violence in Western media" (2000: 245). Peace journalism is an attempt to challenge the "overtly adversarial and oppositional journalistic styles" and some Western journalists might reject it and think it places constrictions on their choice, similar to the rejection of the ideas surrounding NWICO.

Because of the ethical shift that is needed in order to get away from opposition and adversarial style journalism, which normalise violence, I argue journalists have to be aware of their rights (freedoms) but also their obligations enshrined in the

International Bill of Human Rights, which states they should keep the treatise in mind and promote and protect human rights when those rights are threatened or violated.

In the next section I will take a close look at the HREOC report. I will first explain some basic conflict theories, which is followed by an exploration of the HREOC report and the findings and recommendations put forward by HREOC. This will enable me to understand the conflict, which is explored within the HREOC report, as a violent conflict that can be explained using conflict analysis. This is a necessity if peace journalism should be used to cover the HREOC report.

Chapter 2
The HREOC Report

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. (The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 1)

Introduction

This chapter discusses conflict analysis, which is the foundation for peace journalism. Conflict analysis provides tools for news journalists "to examine what conflicts are about and how they work" (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 33). For this to be practically achieved, the conflict has to be understood from a 'wide' perspective. One way of doing this, they say, is to 'map the conflict'. Lynch and McGoldrick explain this as a "useful tool used by conflict analysis to unravel what a situation is really about and who has a stake" (2005: 43). Method of doing this can vary and, since I am using the HREOC report as a case study in the research, I have explored the report in some more detail in this chapter. My aim is to 'map the conflict' and establish what the HREOC report was 'about'. I have used conflict analysis theories to investigate further how the conflict that is explored in the HREOC report both contains violence and is a product of violence.

Most research that explores peace journalism using conflict analysis theories investigates war or conflicts involving mass killings, such as the World Trade Centre attack in 2001, the attack on Afghanistan in 2001, the attack on Iraq in 2003, the Israel and Palestine conflict and the Rwanda genocide (Blasi 2004; Hanitzsch 2004; Lee and Maslog 2005; Lynch 2002; Lynch and McGoldrick 2005; Peleg 2006; Shinar 2004; Wijadi 2004). However, Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) explain that the peace journalism approach is not limited to such deadly conflicts, but can be equally applied to the representation of, for example, asylum seekers (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005) where the violence is more cultural or structural, than direct. I argue the representations of such 'smaller' violent conflicts, closer to 'home', both shape and are shaped by the social and cultural values within the society the violence occur, which is the same way larger militant conflicts shape and are shaped by social and

cultural values within nations, or particular cultures. The normalisation of cultural and structural violence in *any* conflict will lead to the promotion of a 'culture of violence' as opposed to a 'culture of peace'.

The HREOC report exposed human rights violations against asylum-seeker children in Australia. The aim should not be, according to conflict analysis and peace studies, to make one side evil and one side good, but to transcend the violent conflict (meaning to 'go beyond' and come up with creative non-violent solutions) (Galtung 2000; Lynch and McGoldrick 2005). I am using this report as a case study to establish how news journalists had the choice, in a broader sense, to report the conflict in one of two ways:

1. By contextualising the conflict and *all* violence so that non-violent options are justified, naturalised and given space.
2. By dichotomising the conflict in an adversarial way, which can politicise, trivialise, naturalise and justify direct violence while obscuring cultural and structural violence.

The first choice is the path of peace journalism and the second choice that of war journalism as previously defined. I also argue that the first choice complies with what Hamelink (1999) called 'universal ethics', which are based on international human rights, while the second choice contravenes those same ethics. I then discuss how the pragmatic and relative professional framework of journalists fails to live up to the 'social and cultural rules' encapsulated within international human rights regime.

Peace journalism is anchored in conflict analysis theory (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005). Conflict analysis theories explain conflict arenas, conflict formation, a typology of violence and the interconnectedness between conflicts and violence (Lynch 2002). Conflict arenas are where direct violence is taking place, while conflict formation contains cultural and structural violence. Lynch explains, "This understanding of the conflict affects judgements about what is worth reporting" (Lynch 2002: 15). A focus on conflict arenas alone will fail to contextualise the conflict and will only superficially explain the conflict. This leads to the argument

that in order to report on the HREOC report using peace journalism, and as such adhere to universal ethics, the conflict formation, the typology of violence and the interconnectedness, in relation to the conflict explored in the HREOC, have to be understood.

Informed by conflict analysis I explain how the HREOC report has two clear objectives: to clarify how structural violence (mandatory detention) is causing direct violence (mental health problems) among children and how such violence can be stopped. Exploring conflict formation I further explore how direct violence is a result of structural and cultural violence within our society (Galtung 1998, 2000; Lynch 2002). According to conflict analysis, if the aim is to achieve a 'positive peace' all three types of violence need to be transcended (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005).

The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission

HREOC was "established in 1986 by an Act of the Federal Parliament, the *Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Act*. The Federal Attorney General is the Minister responsible in Parliament for the Commission." (HREOC 2007). It is this act that gives the commission the power to conduct independent inquiries.

HREOC's aim is to "eliminate unlawful discrimination based on race, sex, disability or age" and, to quote from the HREOC website, "the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission has more general responsibilities, under the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Act, to promote human rights for all people in Australia" (HREOC 2007). HREOC should give advice and recommendations on actions and changes Australia should take, according to the commissions understanding, in order to comply with relevant human rights instruments, whether they are legislative or not (HREOC 2004: 28). This means the HREOC role is both to recommend and investigate human rights issues within Australia, based on the international framework developed from international instruments (since Australia does not have a bill of human rights). It is the only government body in Australia directly dealing with these issues within the international legal framework. I am arguing it is important such a body is accepted as an authority on human rights, since

these issues should not be viewed as relativistic by the sitting Federal Government. Mary Robinson has pointed out the importance of nations having a human rights body:

> Without national institutions to promote and protect human rights, critical commentary by international human rights bodies simply hangs in the air… Our goal should be domestic self sufficiency in human rights implementation without the necessity for international assistance. (Rees 2003: 186)

Conflict Analysis and Peace Studies Theories

Lynch argues that "journalists seeking to apply ethical values to their work could benefit from studying the dynamics of conflict itself" (2002: 29). In order to do this, Lynch argues, journalists need to have an understanding of conflict analysis theories. These theories are the foundation for peace journalism. In this section I explain the definitions of 'conflict', 'peace' and 'violence' according to conflict analysis theories.

For Galtung peace does not just mean 'the absence of war', but the "capacity to handle conflicts with empathy, nonviolence and creativity" (Galtung 1996: 9). Indra Adnan explains: "A society capable of living peacefully is one which is good at handling…conflicts non-violently" (afterword in Lynch 1998). To live in and work for peace means to handle a conflict in a creative way, and to *actively* aim to transform any conflict peacefully, non-violently. Galtung, Fisher and Brand-Jabobsen explain:

> To work for peace is to work against violence. We analyse its forms and causes, we predict in order to prevent, and we act preventively and curatively, all medical terms, since peace relates to violence much as health does to illness. (Galtung et al. 2002: xiii)

The aim for peace journalists is to look at a conflict more like a conflict or peace worker, and focus on open up and contextualise a conflict so violence can be transcended. According to a basic peace research definition: "Conflict is a relationship between two or more parties (individuals or groups) who have, or think they have, incompatible goals, needs and interests" (Chris Mitchell 1981 in Lynch &

McGoldrick 2005: 34). In order to transcend violence in a conflict these 'incompatible goals' have to be transcended.

Galtung (1998, 2000) explains that when there are incompatible goals there is a 'contradiction' and this can then lead to hateful 'attitudes' (but also apathy among some) and this can lead to violent 'behaviour' towards the other or even towards oneself. This happens in a cycle and each step in the conflict brings new dimensions to the conflict and soon every party in the conflict have different perception of when and how the conflict started. Galtung present this as the Conflict ABC triangle which is "Conflict = Attitudes + Behaviour + Contradiction" (Galtung 2000: 17). This triangle visually demonstrates how these three parts are related and all three parts need to be dealt with when attempting to resolve a violent conflict. Lynch & McGoldrick (2005: 38) explain this by pointing out that if a ceasefire (which means the violent behaviour stops) does not also include creative work to deal with the attitudes and the contradictions in the conflict, the violence is likely to erupt again.

A basic point in Galtung's work is that conflicts are natural, but violence is not in human nature, and he rejects the realist notion that the possibility of war is a necessity for international stability. The aim should be, according to Galtung, to transcend violence at all levels of government and within all institutions. The focus must be on human's peace abilities, not war abilities. Wijadi explains: "the violence concept forwarded by Galtung is extensive and based on human rights. Every individual and person has the right of self-realisation" (2004: 158).

Violence according to Galtung extends beyond the physical violence dominating the media, and this is a significant factor considering the news value that physical violence has in the media, while more subtle, less visual violence, is viewed as less interesting or less newsworthy (Wolfsfeld 2001, 2004). Violence for Galtung is dependent on social, political, cultural, and ideological aspects of a society and is never the isolated act that is commonly in constructed media discourse. Frequently in the news media violence and conflict is reported as an event, but the event is not put into a context. In conflict analysis, the notion of an 'evil' side is rejected because of the dualistic and simplistic logic behind such a statement, which will not open up

opportunities for peace. However, that does not mean one side is sometimes more violent or the main perpetrator of the direct violence, but that all conflicts are more complex than the opposite of 'good' and 'evil'.

According to conflict analysis theories violence can be 'direct', 'structural' and/or 'cultural' (Galtung 2000). Direct violence includes physical violence (including self-harm), but also invisible violence such as psychological violence. Structural violence can be the oppressive structure of society; it is violence embedded within a structure, for example, colonialism, imperialism or the unequal treatment of certain nationals (western, white, rich) and unequal transnational trade agreements. Structural violence is the system that prevents certain people from doing what others are doing, it is the policies, laws or mental concepts that enable such power abuse or discriminations to take place. It is political, economical, patriarchal, racial or ethnic oppression within the system where, "Harm is permitted or ignored" (Perez 2006: 17). Cultural violence "legitimising the other two as good, right" (Galtung 2000: 102). This mean cultural violence is the acceptance and belief that the structural and direct violence are correct, fair or justified. Cultural violence is embedded in the culture, it is the myths surrounding one culture or race, placing it above another. It can be cultural dominance or arrogance, evident in *our* descriptions of the *others* or our belief in our government's benevolence. Cultural violence is linked to structural violence and can be for example orientalism. Edward Said (1978) describes in his book *Orientalism* how the Occident has *constructed* mental pictures of the Orient that is culturally and socially inferior to the West. Such cultural and social myths are a version of cultural violence still very much present in today's world, for example, it can be found in new-racism (van Dijk 2000) or neo-populism (Mazzoleni et al. 2003). Some aspects of Orientalism can also be viewed as structural violence, see for example Lynch and McGoldrick (2005: 52). Cultural violence includes anti-immigration attitudes and mental justifications for certain neo-populist policies (structural violence). These attitudes do not only justify and naturalise cultural and direct violence in our community, they also justify and naturalise structural and direct violence imposed by our governments (the West) on other countries.

The three types of violence relate to Galtung's Conflict Triangle. Each violence corresponds to a corner of the triangle: attitudes (cultural violence), contradictions (structural violence) and behaviour (direct violence). To transcend a violent conflict there needs to be a focus on the triangle as a whole and all three types of violence. If direct violence is occurring, it should stop, but instead of just aiming for a ceasefire, the structural and cultural violence that preceded the direct violence should also be transcended. Otherwise there will not be a 'positive peace'. Wijadi explains:

> Violence is not only robbery, torture and murder, or any other physical maltreatment, but also lying, indoctrination, threat, oppression, and the like, blocking the actualisation of someone's mental and thinking potential… The mass media…have an opportunity to become actors of psychological and symbolic violence. (2004: 158)

What is also clear is that the media has an ability to become an actor in the promotion of peace and non-violence. This has been explored in research and literature focusing on peace journalism (Galtung 1998, 2000; Galtung et al. 2002; Lee and Maslog 2005; Lynch 2006; Lynch and McGoldrick 2005; Perez 2006; Tehranian 2002; Wijadi 2004). Conflict analysis can provide tools for journalists so they become aware of how their reporting might promote violence, or non-violence. Lynch explains: "The point is to expand the space to consider creative solutions to the structural and cultural violence, the underlaying causes" (2002: 33). However, the conflict, or the story, has to be thoroughly understood if the tools provided by conflict analysis are to be put into practice. In the next section I will explore the HREOC report in more detail in order to contextualise the report and the issue. This is followed by an exploration of the HREOC report using the conflict analysis framework.

The HREOC Report *A Last Resort?*

In April 2004, Australia's Attorney-General, Philip Ruddock, received the (over 900 pages long) Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission's (HREOC) report *A Last Resort? National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention* and on the 13 May 2004 he tabled the report. The report was launched during a press conference held by the HREOC on 14 May 2004.

The name, 'A Last Resort?' referred to the UN *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC), which points out that any detention of a child can only be acceptable as a 'last resort' (article 37(b)). It also refers to the 'last resort' someone has taken by fleeing their homeland in search of a safe place for themselves and their family.

The report was compiled by HREOC because of their concerns that Australia's mandatory detention practice, which had been in place since 1992, was violating international law, in particular the CRC, to which Australia is a signatory.[13] This mandatory detention practice placed all asylum seekers, including children, who came to Australia uninvited and without a visa, in detention centres until they were given refugee status and provided with a protection visa or could leave and go back to their home country, voluntarily or when their application failed (HREOC 2004).

It is stated in the preface to the report that:

> …under our immigration laws, children who have not been accused of any crime are detained automatically and for indefinite periods and there is also no real opportunity to argue their case before an independent tribunal or court. (HREOC 2004: 2-3)

This was further confirmed a few months after the report was published in the so-called 'Al-Kateb' case.[14] David Marr points out: "On 6 August 2004, when the court handed down its verdict, Australia discovered it was a rare country in the free world where a government minister has the power, all on her own, to imprison innocent people, perhaps forever" (Marr 2005: 223).

It is explained in the report that the main purpose of the HREOC inquiry "was to examine whether Australia's laws and executive acts and practices ensure that children can enjoy their rights under the CRC" (HREOC 2004: 8). HREOC explain that the rights implied in the CRC apply to all children under Australia's care whether or not the children are unauthorised asylum seekers, authorised asylum seekers, Australian residents or Australian citizens.

---

[13] The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) is the most comprehensive treaty directly focused on the rights of the child. It is also the most widely ratified of all UN conventions, the only UN members who have not ratified it are the USA and Somalia.

[14] Ahmed Ali Al-Kateb arrived in Australia in 2000, he had his refugee application declined but no country would accept him, he was stateless, but kept in detention.

The other reason for the HREOC inquiry was that the number of children in detention had gone up since 1999 and there was a "widespread community concern about their treatment" (HREOC 2004b).

The inquiry focused on children in detention between 1999 and 2002 (though this information was updated by the HREOC where possible, with the last updates from December 2003), and apart from the aim to evaluate how well Australia complied with international law, HREOC also have the responsibility to investigate alternatives to the mandatory detention practice if it was found it contravened international law and inflicted human rights violations.

One of the main findings of the report was that the Australian detention policy towards asylum seekers and children in particular, who arrive without a visa and as such are seen as unauthorised arrivals (I use unauthorised since it is a more neutral term than 'illegal', illegal connotes criminal offence, which, according to international law, it is not),[15] is "fundamentally inconsistent with the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)" (HREOC 2004: 5). Following this the inquiry found that "children in Australian immigration detention centres have suffered numerous and repeated breaches of their human rights" (HREOC 2004b).

In one of the many testimonials in 'A Last Resort' from children who have been accepted as refugees, one boy explains the difficulty of arriving and watching other detainees who had been detained for longer periods, and the stress this could bring:

> And sometimes they would put the new arrivals with the people who have been there for a quite a long time who have completely lost their minds and their ability to think and when you spend some time with people like that who have been out of their minds so of course you lose your mentality, and you lose your thoughts as well and this is what was happening to us. Sometimes I was looking at those people I was thinking that we'll all end up in the same place so in short, I can say life was very horrible. (HREOC 2004: 81)

---

[15] It is pointed out in the report that; "The Refugee Convention recognises that where persons are in fear for their life or freedom they may be forced to enter a country of refuge unlawfully. It therefore prohibits nations from penalising refugees 'on account of their illegal entry' where they are 'coming directly from a territory where their life or freedom was threatened'. Penalties may include prosecution and fines as well as punitive measures such as detention" (HREOC 2004: 99).

One Afghan father in detention asked the commissioner about the exposure to trauma and distressed people in a confined place such as the detention centres:

> I have a request. What will happen with the future of these children, that they see in front of them people cutting themselves and hanging themselves? What is the effect on their minds? What can they get? They are the future… (HREOC 2004: 82)

It is clearly stated in CRC that one of the most important aspect of the treaty is that no matter who is responsible for the children, such as The Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (the Department)[16] or the Australasian Correctional Management Pty Ltd (ACM), "the best interest of the child shall be a primary consideration" (CRC 1989, article 3(1)).

Considering that most of the children in detention during this time came from Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan, countries not unaccustomed to suffering on a grand scale, they were likely to have witnessed and/or experienced violence in many forms. It is stated in the CRC that such trauma needs to be treated in a decent and appropriate environment.[17]

The Detained Children

In 2001, when the inquiry was announced, there were over 700 children under Australia's care in detention centres.[18] By the end of 2003 there were 111 children still detained. The total number of children in detention between July 1999 and June 2003 were 2184 (HREOC 2004: 61), excluding the detention centres outside Australia's territory, such as on Nauru (these centres were not included in the inquiry). These 2184 children arrived in Australia without a valid visa, hence were unauthorised arrivals. During this time the unauthorised arrivals mainly came from Iraq, Afghanistan and Iran. Of these children, all of whom were detained, 92.8 per

---

[16] Now called the Department of Immigration and Citizenship

[17] "State Parties shall take all appropriate measures to promote physical and psychological recovery and social reintegration of a child victim of: any form of neglect, exploitation, or abuse; torture or any other form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; or armed conflicts. Such recovery and reintegration shall take place in an environment which fosters the health, self-respect and dignity of the child." (CRC 1989, article 39)

[18] The Department had the ultimate responsibility for asylum seekers in detention although ACM was at the time responsible for the day to day running of the centres.

cent were eventually given refugee status. For the Iraqi asylum seeker children, the percentage was 97.7 and for the Afghan children it was 95 per cent. This can be compared to the children arriving with a valid visa, and therefore not detained when applying for asylum; only 25.4 per cent were given refugee status during the same period. These children, who were authorised arrivals, mainly came from Fiji, Indonesia and Sri Lanka (HREOC 2004: 67).

> Since 1999, children have been detained for increasingly longer periods. By the beginning of 2003, the average detention period for a child in an Australian immigration detention centre was one year, three months and 17 days. As at 26 December 2003, the average length of detention had increased to one year, eight months and 11 days. (HREOC 2004: 68)

The inquiry's focus was on the human rights of all children detained for any period of time, but clearly an extra concern was held for the children detained over extended periods and suffering as a result of this. A child is someone under the age of eighteen, according to classification by the UN, so the report concerned all these individuals, including a number of infants.[19]

Reasons for the HREOC Inquiry

HREOC can, as an independent statutory government body, conduct an inquiry when it thinks one is warranted. For such a comprehensive report as 'A Last Resort?' the Commission was obliged to report to the Attorney-General in relation to the inquiry, but the power to initiate an inquiry falls within the power of HREOC. With this power come certain obligations to allow the Department and ACM to respond to the findings before publication.[20]

HREOC had raised their concerns previously regarding the mandatory detention

---

[19] As at 26 December 2003, there were 29 infants in immigration detention: 13 had been in detention for more than a year, five had been in detention for more than two years and two had been there for more than three years. (HREOC 2004: 75)
[20] The "Department and ACM have the right to make submissions in relation to each act or practice about which the Commission has formed a preliminary view. They also have the right to indicate what action they have taken in response to the Commission's findings. This process seeks to provide both parties with procedural fairness regarding all allegations adverse to them. The process adds to the integrity of the report. It also lengthens the reporting period." (HREOC 2004 : 28)

practice, which solidified the justification for undertaking a comprehensive inquiry into the situation. In May 1998 HREOC published a report called *Those Who've Come Across the Seas: Detention of Unauthorised Arrivals* (HREOC 1998) by the then Human Rights Commissioner Chris Sidoti. Dr Sev Ozdowski was the new commissioner in 2000, and visited all detention centres during 2001. This led to the *Report on Visits to Immigration Detention Facilities* (HREOC 2001). Both these reports confirmed the HREOC position that mandatory detention went against international law and was potentially harmful.

Apart from these reports by the HREOC, there were a number of other reports coming to the same conclusion about the practice of mandatory detention (HREOC 2004). *A Last Resort?* is the only report by HREOC which focused solely on children in detention. The Commission was arguing that despite the recommendations by the HREOC in 1998 the government was still placing children in detention, and this validated a special assessment focusing on children (HREOC 2004: 27).

Another reason HREOC argued that the report 'A Last Resort?' was different from other reports dealing with asylum seekers in detention is that HREOC has:

> unique powers to require the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (the Department) and the detention services provider, Australasian Correctional Management Pty Limited (ACM) to produce documents relating to the management of detention centres. The Inquiry used those powers throughout its evidence gathering process and cites those documents extensively. (HREOC 2004: 27)

This power is significantly different from the power of other groups within society who also voiced their concerns about the detention policy. This in itself validates the news media to particularly focus on HREOC reports.

The Inquiry's Methodology

Considering that a report of this kind is likely to be criticised, it is important to understand the methodology used in order to get a picture of the scope of the report. If the methodology is not understood, it is easier to dismiss the report or the findings.

Australia's Human Rights Commissioner (at the time of the inquiry) Dr Sev Ozdowski had two assistant commissioners for this inquiry, who provided Ozdowski with expert advice in their respective fields. Dr Robin Sullivan who was the Commissioner for Children and Young People, Queensland, and Professor of Psychology Trang Thomas from the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. The commissioners commenced the inquiry on behalf of HREOC, in early 2002.

Dr Ozdowski writes in the preface to the HREOC report:

> Australians don't need a team of experts or dramatic media stories to convince them that detention centres are no place for children to grow up. However, this Inquiry analysed evidence from an enormous number of sources in order to objectively assess whether this gut reaction was right. The answer is conclusive -even the best-run detention centre is no summer school or holiday resort. In fact, they are traumatising places which subject children to enormous mental distress. This confirms the need to ensure that children should only be locked up in this environment as a measure of *last resort* and for the *shortest appropriate period of time.* (HREOC 2004: 2)

HREOC announced the inquiry would accept public submissions in November 2001. This included submissions from detained, or formerly detained adults but also children,[21] professional groups, individuals, State Government agencies, community groups and Non-Governmental Organisation's (NGO). It is explained in the report that: "The submissions were useful in highlighting to the Inquiry certain areas which warranted further investigation" (HREOC 2004: 40).

Due to its power discussed earlier, HREOC also had the ability to visit all the centres, which was done by the commissioners, though they were refused the right to visit the detention centres on Nauru and Papua New Guinea. The Government argued the HREOC Act did not give them such powers since those centres were outside the Australian migration zone, this lead to HREOC dropping the attempt to reach centres outside that zone.[22]

---

[21] To include children's own views and perspective was important considering that article 12 in CRC states that children should be allowed to have their say and express their view on their situation (their age and maturity should then be taken into account when their evidence is assessed, but this right is still valid and was respected by the inquiry).

[22] It should be noted, though further investigation will not be done within this document, that it has been pointed out elsewhere that: "Conditions in these centres [outside the Australian migration zone] are generally regarded as being worse than in Australian detention centres" (Singer & Gregg 2004: 64).

To get further information regarding the children in detention HREOC held public hearings and the Department, ACM, health professionals, academics, legal practitioners, NGO's and education professionals provided information and evidence at those hearings. HREOC also held 29 focus groups with former detainees (with Temporary Protection Visas, TPV).[23]

Both the Department and ACM were given opportunities to provide both oral and written submissions during this time.[24] HREOC received around 360 pages in July 2003 from the Department. The Department wanted to respond to any changes HREOC made after the submissions and was given the revised report in November 2003 and responded in December 2003. ACM provided oral submission in September 2003. This is important since these facts need to be taken into account when reporting certain criticisms of HREOC by the Federal Government or the Department after the publication of the report.

The Department argued in their defense that the report should not be historically focused, but look at recent changes to the detention policy. This was included and taken into account, but HREOC explains that it is important to understand and know why and when children's human rights have been breached, in order to be able to better understand how to protect these individuals better in the future (HREOC 2004). It was clear that despite the changes, human rights violations were still occurring and the reasons for these violations were the same as before despite the changes made by the Department (HREOC 2004).

Major Findings

HREOC assessed all the findings from the inquiry and established three major findings containing the many concerns arising from the inquiry (for details see appendix 1). The first and the third major findings pointed out that Australia's

---

[23] This was conducted so the TPV holders' identities were protected.
[24] "In accordance with the principle of natural justice, a copy of the report was provided to the Department and ACM in May 2003 allowing them to respond to the Inquiry's findings and to provide further evidence and submissions." (HREOC 2004b: 7)

detention policy was 'fundamentally inconsistent' with Australia's obligations under CRC. The second major finding pointed out that the Federal Government's failure to implement recommendations by health professionals "amounted to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment of those children in detention (CRC, article 37(a))" (HREOC 2004: 850).

Recommendations

Ozdowski acknowledges that though changes had been made in the detention policy since the inquiry began, "these measures ultimately represent a 'blu-tack' approach to repairing a detention system that is fundamentally flawed" (HREOC 2004: 3). Therefore the recommendations were valid when the report was tabled and which the 'blu-tack' measures did not address. This clarified the report was not a historical document, but in fact an inquiry into a system that was still in place, and still caused harm to children (and children who might be arriving at the centres in the future) according to the HREOC.

HREOC makes 5 recommendations in the report 'A Last Resort?' (for details see Appendix 2). All the recommendations are within the legislative capacity of the Minister and the Department. HREOC gives suggestions as to how the recommendations can be realised, but there is a conscious attempt to avoid giving overly specific suggestions in relation to specific concerns because at the heart of "the problem is the system of mandatory detention itself" (HREOC 2004: 857). [25]

The main recommendation was that children in detention centres should be released "as soon as possible, but no later than four weeks after tabling" (HREOC 2004: 856). The next major recommendation was that "Australia's immigration detention laws should be amended, as a matter of urgency, to comply with the Convention on the Rights of the Child" (HREOC 2004: 856).

---

[25] Some countries can detain children but the system is not mandatory, such as the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Germany and Norway (HREOC 2004: 860), some countries have strict regulations to prevent long detention of children, such as Canada, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Denmark and Belgium (HREOC 2004: 860). Of these countries, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Norway and Canada all took more refugees per capita than Australia in 2000 (Singer and Gregg 2004: 75-76).

The Department responded but was unwilling to cooperate with HREOC, and instead HREOC claimed the Departments priority was not the welfare of the children but to stop unauthorised arrivals (HREOC 2004). However, HREOC points out that even if the Department's main goal to stop unauthorized arrivals is accepted, it does not justify human rights abuses. The Department claimed it acted within international law, however this was rejected by the HREOC who explained that the HREOC findings are based on "the most persuasive interpretation" of Australia's international obligations (HREOC 2004: 101). [26]

According to conflict analysis and peace studies theories, the conflict between the asylum seeker children and the Australian Federal Government can be understood as a result of contradictions, attitudes and behavior, and the violence discussed and exposed in the report can be understood as direct violence (both invisible and visible), which is a result of structural and cultural violence. For a creative non-violent solution to the conflict all these types of violence need to be understood in relation to the HREOC report. I will explore how the three types of violence can be understood in relation to the HREOC report in the next section.

The HREOC Report and Three Types of Violence
Direct Violence (Behaviour)

The most pressing concern in the HREOC report is the direct violence. The aim of the first recommendation is to stop this violence, and to do so all children need to be released from detention. The direct violence that HREOC is most concerned about is children's mental health problems, for which detention is the root cause. Mental health problems can be more or less visible, particularly for someone without

---

[26] "While the instruments of the UN treaty and charter bodies do not represent the only interpretation of international obligations, they do represent the most persuasive interpretation of what should be done to ensure compliance with the CRC, the ICCPR and the Refugee Convention. They do not impose new obligations, but the guidelines and standards which are adopted by UN charter bodies, like the General Assembly, represent international consensus on what principles should govern the detention and treatment of children generally. The findings and general comments issued by treaty bodies are written by a Committee composed of experts from a wide range of countries charged with the specific purpose of interpreting and applying the provisions of the treaty and are thus highly significant" (HREOC 2004: 101).

knowledge of the mental health problems, but it can still be viewed as direct violence. CRC places a responsibility on the Department to make sure previous trauma and other mental health problems in all children in Australia's care are taken care of, and not exacerbated by detention.

> The Alliance of Health Professionals, which includes a majority of the medical colleges in Australia, suggested that:
> Current practices of detention of infants and children are likely to have both immediate and longer-term effects on children's development, psychological and emotional health. (HREOC 2004: 367)

It is made clear in the report that the mental health of children can be affected in a number of different ways.[27] When investigating this, one or more of the following seven factors for mental health deterioration were considered:

- torture and trauma prior to arrival in Australia
- the length of detention
- uncertainty as to the visa process and negative visa decisions
- the breakdown of many families within detention
- living in a closed environment
- children's perception that they are not safe within detention
- treatment of children by detention staff
(HREOC 2004: 368)

The fact that children's mental and physical health had been, and was, violated, or in danger of violation, by the policy in place meant their human rights were clearly being violated. The "Inquiry uses the term mental health to describe the psychological well-being of children as well as diagnosed psychiatric illness" (HREOC 2004: 359). The right to mental and physical well-being for a child is paramount to all other rights, since without those rights, all others crumble, and the best interest of the child cannot be obtained. The moral aspect was not missed by some commentators; Singer

---

[27] A psychiatrist who worked with families in detention pointed out how mental health problems can start or be exacerbated in detention: "People are resilient and given appropriate circumstances, people can recover from the most horrible traumas, but on average you would expect a significant proportion of these children to continue to suffer, throughout their life, the effects of the detention experience. Now, that is obviously not the only traumatic experience that many of these children have had, but it is certainly - a number of the families that I've been involved with discussions about, the trauma - the traumatic nature of the detention experience has out-stripped any previous trauma that the children have had. So it has got to the point where being in detention is the worst thing that has ever happened to these children." (HREOC 2004: 370)

and Gregg pointed out that "a wealthy nation like Australia should…ease the current tough treatment of asylum seekers that produce substantial mental illness" (2004: 78).

The direct violence is both visible and invisible and it is clarified in the report how treatment of mental health problems are not possible while children are in detention, since the detention is "one of the major causes of the problems" (HREOC 2004: 423) according to mental health experts. [28] It is even stated in the report that "No torture or trauma services were provided to children" (HREOC 2004: 429). The Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, South Australia (CAMHS) pointed out the frustration: "Recommendations and expert clinical advice has been provided but to date substantially ignored" (HREOC 2004: 427).

From the above evidence it is possible to conclude that children's human rights had been violated while in detention and under the care of the Department. HREOC explain in the report:

> … human rights are designed to protect each and every individual. To the extent that the detention of any child prevents that child from enjoying the highest attainable standard of health or an environment that fosters their rehabilitation from past torture and trauma, there may be a breach of international law. (HREOC 2004: 396)

Structural Violence (Contradictions)

According to conflict analysis theories, direct violence is the result of structural violence and/or cultural violence. According to the HREOC report, the direct violence mentioned in previous section was directly linked to the Federal Government's mandatory detention policy. The policy places harmful "barriers" on the already mentally fragile children (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 59) and it is a form of structural violence since those barriers (for example the hindrance to adequate care

---

[28] A senior psychiatrist who examined a 14-year-old boy who spent over one year in detention explained how the detention is dangerously destructive. The psychiatrist argues the boy "…meets criteria for major depressive disorder. More importantly, he is an acute and serious suicide risk. [His] suicidal intent is closely related to whether or not he is in detention. This should not be dismissed as some form of emotional blackmail, but recognised as a realistic reaction to his appraisal of his predicament after many months in detention witnessing the progressive disintegration of his family, and the destruction of hopes for the future…" (HREOC 2004: 404).

and wellbeing) can cause physical and mental problems. Without this policy, the direct violence that stems from the detention itself would diminish, and trauma or other problems could be, according to health professionals, adequately treated.

The parties in a conflict always want different things (for example independence, control, rights or respect) otherwise there would be no conflict. It is not always possible to cater for all parties' demands, instead a conflict worker can focus on creative alternative solutions (transcend the contradictions). Contradictions are "the centerpiece of a conflict" (Galtung 2000: 130). In relation to the HREOC report, one main contradiction is the fact that the Australian Federal Government wants to stop uninvited asylum seekers reaching Australian land by boats, while asylum seekers wants to reach Australian land in order to apply for asylum. The Government has certain rights to control the nations borders, while asylum seekers have a right to apply for asylum when they reach Australian main land. The two parties' to the conflict wants different solutions, there is a contradiction and this contradiction can lead to violence, for example, violence at sea, before asylum seekers reach Australia, or violence towards asylum seekers when they reach Australia. The Australian Labor Government introduced mandatory detention laws in 1992 to control what they referred to as 'boat people' (HREOC 2004: 141). As a policy it did not focus on the wellbeing of the asylum seekers, but to gain control over those who came by the sea (HREOC 2004), the initial contradictions were not resolved and the asylum seekers rights and wants were dismissed.

It is worth pointing out that out of the detained unauthorised asylum seekers, 92.8 per cent were later viewed to be refugees, which is much higher than the percentage of refugees found among the authorised asylum seekers who arrived in higher numbers. This can be compared to the fact that certain nationals can easily enter Australia, this amounts to what Lynch and McGoldrick call "economic injustice" (2005: 60). There is a 'barrier' for some people, which is accepted and justified.

On a personal note, I have had experience with the Australian immigration system. I am from Sweden and now have a permanent residents visa, and there have been few real problems for me in obtaining this status. It is difficult not to view the policy to

mandatorily detain the relatively small amount of unauthorised asylum seekers in harsh conditions as a contradiction when compared to the treatment Westerners, who can afford a plane ticket, get a working visa, student visa, or a tourist visas, receive.

If the aim is creative transformations of contradictions there has to be a focus on the conflict formation, as opposed to the conflict event (the unannounced arrival of asylum seekers in a boat). This is explained in the HREOC report:

> The international community must take into account the 'cause and effect' nature of migratory movements when developing policies; if one part of the globe is under pressure there is likely to be a corresponding increase in asylum seekers elsewhere. The Australian experience with boat people is testimony to this reality. People smugglers who risk children's lives by taking them on a perilous voyage in an unseaworthy boat, should be appropriately dealt with through international policing co-operation. However the answer to these issues lies more in international co-operation and planning than in the creation of 'fortress Australia'.
> (HRECO 2004: 3)

One response to criticism of mandatory detention-that it deters others from coming-is not accepted by the inquiry: "the detention of one group of children to deter another group from coming to Australia raises the issue of the proportionality of our policy response" (HREOC 2004: 2). To have a system that by its very nature is harmful to children's mental health is viewed by the inquiry not to be defendable, since it can be seen as inhumane and punitive.

Cultural Violence (Attitudes)

The structural and direct violence explained is accepted and justified because of the cultural violence. Cultural violence is the social and cultural attitudes and beliefs that naturalises and normalises the other types of violence. Cultural violence can also lead to apathy or lack of interest in other people's suffering. I will in the following section discuss some possible reasons for the attitudes that contributed to the acceptance and justifications for the violence explored in the HREOC report. These attitudes are not exclusive to the HREOC report, or asylum seekers, but they shape the social and cultural values that accept structural and direct violence.

If the aim is to achieve a culture of peace, people have to be convinced peace is the right thing to do. Their attitudes have to be open to non-violence and peace. Bailey explained that "Australia's treatment of unauthorised arrivals can be seen as violating these people's rights in the apparent attempt to protect Australia from 'floods' of asylum seekers. Such fears are largely unfounded" (2002: 8). But they are fears entrenched in people's minds because of what they read and hear about asylums seekers. Peter Manning explains that in a number of articles and letters to the media about the people on the Tampa,[29] "three themes ran through the outpouring: illegality, terrorism and disgust" (2004: 37). Manning continues: "Asylum seekers have been represented in both Sydney newspapers [*Sydney Morning Herald* and *The Daily Telegraph*] as threats to Australia… The ordinary reader is drawn to the natural conclusion that they don't deserve our compassion or sympathy and should be sent away" (Manning 2004: 39). Whether it is fear or political populism, it is an attitude that justifies and normalises the systematic treatment (structural violence) of others in such a way that "their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential" (definition of violence by Galtung in Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 59).

Former Prime Minister John Howard said after 11 September 2001: "I feel distressed. I am unashamedly distressed as a human being about what is happening" (Osuri and Banerjee 2004: 166). Osuri and Banerjee point out that "This comment universalises the event as an attack on humanity" (Osuri and Banerjee 2004: 166). The point is that September 11 can be viewed as horrible (which it was) while other equally horrible events are sidelined or omitted because of cultural violence. Cultural violence justifies that people who have similarities (culturally and socially) to Australians are cared for more. Others who are less similar are viewed as "unpeople" (Curtis 2003; Pilger 1998).

Cultural violence is cultural, political, historical and socially situated. We learn to have these attitudes. According to critical discourse analysis all media discourses are

---

[29] Refers to when the Norwegian ship MV Tampa rescued 433 people, who were on their way to Australia when their boat sank. The Howard Government refused MV Tampa entry to Australian water knowing the passengers wanted to apply for asylum in Australia, the refusal was ignored by MV Tampa's' Captain who had concerns for the rescued passengers, and a stand off, close to Christmas island, triggered national and international interest.

interpreted by the reader within such a framework, so any *critical* discourse analysis needs to include an analysis of the socio political climate in which the text is read. However, the cultural violence is invisible, and it is not possible to claim one type of cultural violence justified the structural or direct violence, since cultural violence is multi-faceted and based on previous experience.

The attitudes that lead to cultural violence can be deeply held ("deep attitudes" Galtung 2002: xiv-xv) and a continuous effort in the news media (and in other suitable institutions such as educational institutions) to challenge attitudes that justify violence is needed. I view this as a main challenge of peace journalism. Edwards explains: "Many of the miseries of the world are rooted in this fundamental willingness to subordinate the interests of others to our own" (Edwards and Bain 2008: 1). This becomes a rationale for the acceptance of violence. 'Deep attitudes' will not change because of one small article or one opinion piece, the change will only occur only when there is a substantial effort to challenge such attitudes. When Phillips (2006) in his attempt to dispute Lynch and McGoldrick's (2005) argument pointed to one article that disputed Lynch and McGoldrick, Phillips does not understand (or want to understand) that the point is that more than one article is needed to challenge 'deep attitudes'. George Lakoff and Sam Ferguson has used the term "deep frames", and he explains how the solution to challenge deep frames is to re-frame how we communicate or explain a conflict and similarly he argues a substantial effort is needed in order to challenge those 'deep frames' (Lakoff and Ferguson 2006).

Part of cultural violence is the continued attempt to not recognise the asylum seekers as potential refugees (which most of the unauthorised arrivals were during this period), positioning them instead as 'illegals' with criminal connotations and attempting to de-humanise them by, for example not allowing pictures of them or their stories to be told) (Macken-Horarik 2003; Marr and Wilkinson 2003; Ward 2002). By denying journalists and photographers access to detained asylum seekers the human aspect was lost in the news. The government placed asylum seekers in isolated camps, where all the protests among detainees appeared ungrateful and irrational (not like 'us' rational decent people). If they are seen as a threat to national

security because connotations to their 'violent' culture or 'queue jumpers' (cheaters) they are clearly not appropriate to include in our society. People's definitions of normality is what they think is normal and correct social behaviour. This has been explored by postcolonial and 'whiteness' theorists, such as Osuri and Banerjee (2004), Perera (2002), Gabriel (1998), and it is a type of cultural violence, which I would argue is behind much structural violence in the developed world.

I would argue that it was the cultural and social attitudes that made it socially acceptable that the Australian military forcefully pushed un-seaworthy boats with children on board back out to sea, towards Indonesia[30] or that the military transport asylum seekers to off-shore processing camps, for the sake of national border security (MacCallum 2002; Mares 2002; Marr 2005; Marr and Wilkinson 2003).

It could be argued it was a particularly difficult time, with abnormal amounts of boats attempting to reach Australia, but this idea has been rejected by Neumann (2004),[31] instead cultural violence was used to justify policies and actions that were at the time rejected as dangerous and causes of direct violence (I explore this in chapter 4, when I examine health professionals' positions towards detention). The extent of the federal government's attempts to keep these people away from the mainland is described in detail in *Dark Victory* by Marr and Wilkinson (2003) and it appears that people got caught up in the bureaucracy and viewed the people, who mostly were genuine refugees, as 'unpeople'. Since the Howard government won the federal election in 2001 and in 2004, his government's hard attitude towards asylum seekers arriving on boats, or in detention, was not an issue a large portion of Australian society viewed as morally indefensible or of enough importance to seriously oppose. Ward (2002) argues that journalists are victims of manipulation by PR specialists and spin doctors, and if they had understood the Howard government used 'wedge politics'[32] during the

---

[30] It should be noted here that Indonesia was not a signatory to the Refugee Convention.
[31] Klaus Neumann explored how Australia's historical commitment to asylum seekers, and one of his points is that the "Howard Government's hardline approach" was not "unprecedented" (2004: 113) and I think that insight is important since it debunks the idea that Australia has an unblemished record towards asylum seekers, when in fact cultural violence has previously caused hard line approaches towards asylum seekers and the aim should be to debunk the cultural violence, of both past and present, that has made such structural violence possible.
[32] Wedge politics is when politician create divisions and resentment among one group towards another, smaller group, for political gains (Ward 2002)

Tampa incident in 2001, they might have been able to challenge the cultural violence. The Tampa incident provides clear examples of wedge politics and journalists' failure to challenge such tactics. However, I think that to challenge cultural violence in regards to asylum seekers, it is not enough for journalists to be aware of wedge politics, journalists have to make discursive selections that prioritise a humanitarian discourse. Wedge politics are possible because certain attitudes are evident among the public, and I argue it is these attitudes that have to be understood and challenged by journalists.

I believe that portraying asylum seekers as a threat and not worthy of our (decent Australian's) generosity is linked to neo-populist ideas. Neo-populism is defined as right-wing populism (Mazzoleni et al. 2003). Researchers such as Mazzoleni et al. (2003) talk about neo-populism as a threat to the status quo, but in relation to the government's actions, described in detail by Marr and Wilkinson (2003), neo-populism influenced the mainstream, but adopted a more neo-liberal (and socially accepted) discourse, rather than the blunt rhetoric coming from minor political parties such as Pauline Hanson's One Nation. I do not view neo-populism as a threat to the status quo, it has instead become part of the status quo. It is the human rights discourse and the claim that Australia has obligations under international law, that is viewed by neo-populists and neo-liberals as a threat to the status quo. Neo-liberals proponents have labelled this 'threat' as 'elitist' (Sawer and Hindess 2004). For the anti-elites, neo-populists and neo-liberals the human rights position is a threat to the capitalist status quo, since the ideology of those who place human rights first, is based on humanitarian ethics (that is, people before profit, respect across cultures and international cooperation as opposed to nationalism, individualism and 'free-market' capitalism).

Failure to acknowledge the entrance of neo-populist values into mainstream politics also fails to tie the neo-populistic uprising in some countries to the neo-liberal uprising and acceptance of many Western countries. Some researchers have explained that "populism [that] has skilfully adopted neo-liberal policies" (Waisbord 2003: 201) is neo-populism. Fairclough calls the neo-liberal discourse 'new capitalism' (Fairclough 2002), which lacks humanitarian values.

Neo-populism is anti-immigration and nationalistic and I would argue it contains 'new racism'. Every & Augoustinos discuss how much of the research into what is called 'new racism' "has detailed several pervasive features of contemporary discourse that denies, rationalizes and excuses the dehumanisation and marginalisation of, and discrimination against, minority out-groups, including asylum seekers" (2007: 411). The understanding is that this type of racism can look very different. Osuri and Banerjee have explained that the racism behind attitudes towards asylum seekers:

> …may be of the more blatant "regressive" kind (i.e. Pauline Hanson and notions of a white race in terms of biological and cultural superiority) or the "progressive" kind (i.e. liberal notions of "Western culture" and "democracy", terms that sometimes function as a code for the spread of civilising white enlightenment ideals) (2004: 160).

Manning (2004), Macken-Horarik (2003), Osuri and Banerjee (2004) and MacCallum (2002) have demonstrated how both regressive and progressive types of racism is still present in Australia in the news and because of this it is something that ought to be monitored, if our aim is to transcend cultural violence. However the so-called 'anti-elites' criticise the internationally framed humanitarian discourses as 'political correct' and 'left wing' and labelled the supporters of such discourse 'bleeding hearts' who are morally lecturing the average decent Australian (Sawer 2004: 35). This can be understood as a general trend to dismiss international treatise and those who promote them (Falk 2000). In Australia, the Howard government's anti-international position has been explored by Hovell (2003) and Zifcak (2003). Clearly the theories mentioned cannot answer for everything, but if there is not an effort to oppose cultural violence and contextualise the international human rights discourse, a 'culture of peace' is less likely to be accepted and achieved.

Alan Morris (2004) exemplifies the position that journalists are not responsible to reject or oppose cultural violence. Morris has defended the notion that journalists have an obligation to report everything, even when it might feed 'new racism'. Morris has establish that new racism can be seen in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, but he says when it comes to reporting problems in South Africa, it is unavoidable (Morris 2004). He claims it is possible to view it as the duty of the journalist to report newsworthy

events and not ignore important issues because they can re-enforce racial stereotypes. I reject this based on my understanding of conflict analysis and peace studies. All events can be explained using available facts, without the discursive selection exacerbating 'new racism'. However, in order for this to be possible, this mean journalists will have to be aware of what cultural violence is and how it is connected to other types of violence and the conflict at large (which is explained in the ABC-conflict triangle).

I argue the social values that enable wedge politics, neo-populism, anti-elitism, new-racism are very similar, and part of cultural violence, even though the discourses might look different, however any discourse that puts forward such attitudes contributes to cultural violence. I think this is in part what Lynch And McGoldrick (2005: 60) call "civilisational arrogance", because such arrogance can provide a pretext for our exclusions or suppression of them.

Without such cultural violence (attitudes) it is less likely the government would have been able to implement policies that can be viewed as structural violence, and oppose the health professional consensus in regard to the asylum seekers. Instead the government opted for a more populist approach, accepted legislative amendments William Maley claimed "are nothing short of sinister, and a…danger to all free citizens" (Maley 2002: 2), and refused to publicly accept that they had violated children's human rights, or international human rights law.

Summary

> How do we judge the health of a free society? How do we distinguish the appearance of democracy from the reality?
> There are no hard and fast rules, no scientific methodologies. But as a rule of thumb it is safe to suggest that we can learn much from a society's willingness to address the humanitarian crimes for which it is responsible.
> (Edwards and Cromwell 2006: 1)

I have demonstrated that the HREOC report provided evidence that the policy of mandatory detention of children equals structural violence, and this has led to and is likely to lead to more, direct violence if the policy is not amended. I have also

attempted to explore how structural violence is accepted and normalised because of cultural violence, which can contain many different forms and shapes, and how an effort to explore the manifestations of cultural violence is necessary in order to prevent a general acceptance (which can be passive) of structural violence.

After the examination of the HREOC report, I argue that in order to frame the HREOC report so that the attitudes (cultural violence), the contradictions (the structural violence) and the behaviour (direct violence) can be transcended, and a 'positive peace' is possible, two positions are necessary to contextualise. These are the health professional's position and the international human rights position.

First, health professionals are clearly a key group to both the findings and recommendations within the report. Their discourse is based on a humanitarian ideal that strives to alleviate any harm done to the children due to the policy. It is not based on political or commercial ideals.[33] If this discourse is explored, the cultural violence or the attitudes among the public, and then the government, might become more empathetic and humanitarian. The health professionals have the understanding of how the children are suffering, but they are also key actors in how the policy should look, in order to make sure these already fragile individuals do not suffer more or later in life (whether accepted or not as a refugee). Not only are they key actors who when given a voice, can challenge certain elements of cultural violence but, when this is done, it can lead to changes in structural violence. As a professional group they are key actors all three forms of violence identified within this report, and they need to be consulted in order for both the direct and the structural violence to stop.

The second aspect is that HREOC base their evaluation on international law and this should be understood considering the role HREOC has in Australia. An international human rights framework can challenge certain contradictions and attitudes that normalise or justify violence. This international law discourse should also be promoted to avoid some relativistic or pragmatic argument for the continuation of the

---

[33] However there are individual health professionals who most likely could be viewed as driven by commercial or political ideals, but it is clear when reading the report that the collaborative opinion of health professionals was driven by humanitarian ideals.

policy or certain parts of it (such as the Australian-funded detention centres outside Australia's national borders).

The next chapter will look at how the report featured in the three Australian newspapers. There will be a focus on how many articles mentioned the report, and how many of those mentioned the key actors and the CRC. I conduct a more detailed analysis of one article that was published the day the report was released and there is an analysis of the two editorials that mentioned the report.

Chapter 3
The Case Study: The HREOC Report in The News
Introduction

In this chapter I set out to explore how three Australian newspapers covered the HREOC report, the findings and the recommendations within the report. I discuss how the coverage trivialised the report, which led to the marginalisation, but also the naturalisation and normalisation, of human rights violations. Normalisation of violence justifies violence and creates an acceptance, a lack of feeling of responsibility or an apathy towards the violence (Herman 1995). I argued in chapter 1 that news journalists have obligations, according to international covenants, to promote and protect peace and human rights and that these obligations should be monitored. The normalisation of any type of violence is then in opposition to journalists' obligations and this, according to the aim for a media monitoring project, should be monitored and exposed. I ask how can normalisation of violence occur in the discursive selection taken by journalists. In chapter 4 I explore what alternative news journalists could have taken to counter any normalisation of violence in regards to the HREOC report and the findings.

I explained in chapter 2 that two positions are vital to explore in order to contextualise the HREOC report's findings and recommendations. First the health professionals' position. Health professionals provided the evidence that human rights violations had, and were taking place. The health professionals' opinion was also behind the most urgent recommendation, that children should be released from detention. The second position was the international human rights position. HREOC found that Australia was violating the *UN Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC), which Australia is a signatory of. This changes the conflict from being a conflict about pragmatic rights and wrongs (based on common-sense and cultural decency) to an international legislative matter.

The Howard government's policies regarding asylum seekers and border protection have been previously passionately opposed by prominent commentators in newspapers, particular after the Tampa incident in 2001 (see, for example, Costello

2001; Kingston 2001; Manne 2002; Murdoch 2001; Sheridan 2002). However, despite these calls for the development of humane policies towards asylum seekers, Marr (2005) and Manne (2004) pointed out that the HREOC report received very limited news media coverage. Brian Walters wrote in 2005, well after the publication of the HREOC report, that the "treatment of asylum seekers in Australia, and our continued promotion of the 'Pacific solution' overseas, retains the support of both Labor and the Coalition" (2005: 47). Walters also points out that Australia has "taken a stubborn stand against human rights in the UN" (2005: 46) however, he points out that this has gone "unremarked in our media" (2005: 46).[34] The Howard Government won the election in both 2001, after the Tampa incident, and again in 2004, after the publication of the HREOC report. The government's publicised actions towards the Tampa have been described as 'wedge politics' that was fed, or at least not challenged, by the news media so the government's hard stand towards the asylum seekers subsequently 'helped' (more or less) the Howard government to win in 2001 (Ward 2002). In 2004 there was no serious publicised controversy exposed in the news media regarding the HREOC report and the findings, the story simply came and went.

Case Study Objective

In order to conduct a systematic analysis of the press coverage of the HREOC report I am informed and inspired by critical discourse analysis, since it is a method (or approach to media analysis) that focuses on media discourse but also more specifically on power abuse or manipulations through discourse (Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard 1996; Fairclough 1993, 1995; Van Dijk 1993, 1999, 2000, 2006; Titscher et al. 2000). Discourse analysis is in this sense "the analysis of what people do with talk and text" within a specific context (Richardson 2004). According to (critical) discourse analysis (CDA) the choices made in the selection of news-discourses in the press are bound by cultural and ideological rules, but also by structural rules, as explained in chapter 1. CDA clarifies how any discourse includes subjective choices. When it comes to large institutions such as mass media

---

[34] For a further examination of the Howard Government's position towards the UN see Hovell 2003 and Zifcak 2003.

corporations, the discursive strategies are sometimes assumed to be determined by the dominant (elite) power and commercial imperatives (Curran 2002). However, before limitations are explored in relation to a particular issue, the actual selections have to be analysed.

In this chapter I am focusing on news stories and editorials that mention the report 'A Last Resort?' specifically. Van Dijk explains a significant difference between news stories and editorials, "news reports usually have the pragmatic function of an 'assertion': they state what is supposed to be unknown to the reader. Editorials on the other hand may also have the function of an accusation or a recommendation" (1991: 46). Newspapers' ethical comments or opinions are then confined to editorials ('opinion' articles contain opinions but these opinions are not necessarily shared by the editors or written by journalists), while the news stories' 'assertions' report the events (impartial and objective); on the whole the newspaper is a combination of subjective and objective articles. The news journalist is then free from responsibility if neutrality is achieved, since the journalist only reports what others are saying or doing. Lynch and McGoldrick explain this as a linear approach to reporting, lacking "cause and effect" (2005: 216).

If it is possible to demonstrate how news stories are in fact naturalising violence because of the discursive selections and the linear way of reporting, then it is clear news journalists do not remain ethically neutral, and can be evaluated according to the standards and ethics we expect them to uphold. The discursive selection can also be further compared to the ethical position taken in the editorials to examine if there are similarities. This is the reason why it is valuable to include a discussion about what the editorials prioritise, marginalise, trivialise and naturalise (Gitlin 1980). If an issue is not seen as significant in the editorials, it is likely to be marginalised in the news.

News Actors and Discourse Access

'News actors' can be, according to Bell, "people, organizations, nations, etc." (1998: 77). For example, if a particular individual or organisation appears in the news, they become 'news actors'. News actors are one important conventional selection news

journalists make, and journalists writing in an adversarial style rely on actors to create an impartial news story, hence it is vital for critical media analysis to examine and evaluate who the chosen news actors are. Manhoff and Schudson point out: "The news reinforces a certain understanding of what authorities to defer to, what events to treat respectfully, what groups and topics to regard as trivial, what kinds of explanations to seek out" (1986: 8). Similarly, according to Sigal (1986), news is what someone says the news is. News journalists provide certain actors with discourse access. Van Dijk explains:

> …we need to explore the implications of the complex question *Who may speak or write to whom, about what, when, and in what context*, or *Who may participate in such communicative events in various recipient roles*, for instance as addressees, audience, bystanders and overhearers. Access may even be analysed in terms of the topics or referents of discourse, that is, who is written or spoken *about*. We may assume, as for other social resources, that *more* access according to these several participant roles, corresponds with more social power. In other words, measures of discourse access may be rather faithful indicators of the power of social groups and their members. [italics in original] (Van Dijk 1996: 86)

This means an analysis of discourse access must focus on who is active and who is passive in the news discourse. However, it is equally important to explore what possible news actors are omitted. In order to explore omitted actors, the analyst has to know who to look for. I explored the HREOC report in chapter 2 and come to the conclusion that health professionals and international law instruments are vital for the implementation of the reports findings and the recommendations.

Lynch and McGoldrick point out that the peace journalism approach "sets out to restore parts of the picture commonly omitted or marginalised" (2005: 220). In this chapter I argue that the marginalisation and omission of news actors will distort the picture. In chapter 4 I go on to explore alternatives, using a peace journalism and conflict analysis framework, to the discursive selections that were used to frame the news about the HREOC report in the newspapers.

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part examines, how many stories mentioned the HREOC report when it was published in 2004 and the news actors (active, passive and omitted) in the newspapers. The second part analyse one news

article, using a discourse analysis structure. The third part analyse two editorials, one in *The Australian* and one in the *Sydney Morning Herald.*

Limitations of Study

Like any research project the methods used have a number of limitations. First this research does not explore readers' perceptions of the HREOC report or the newspapers coverage, it is purely focused on the news discourse and the socio-cultural and socio-political context it was produced in. This clearly limits any conclusions about how the reportage affected the readers. Any structural constraints that might influence the coverage, which can both explain and justify certain coverage, have not been explored partly because thesis limitations, but also because the focus is on what was reported. The search in part 1 is limited to the key words used, so it is possible some articles, that mentioned the report, were not found because they did not use the key words. However, considering my aim was to focus on articles that specifically mentioned the report and the key actors, this is an acceptable limitation. Furthermore I only analyse one news story in depth, due to thesis limitations, but I argue it does work as a general indication of the way HREOC report was covered, which was very limited.

Part 1 The News Coverage

Introduction

General News Coverage

In the first part I will first examine the amount of coverage the HREOC report received in three Australian newspapers. This survey was done using Factiva search engine, and it was possible to search articles from the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Sydney Morning Herald* (SMH) and *The Australian*. The period selected was from 01.04.2004 to 20.06.2004. This includes the period leading up to when the report was completed in April 2004, the day it was tabled (13.05.2004) and beyond the deadline HREOC had put for the release of all children in detention, which was 10.06.2004. Four key words were used to search for articles:

- Ozdowski [Australia's Human Rights Commissioner at the time and main author of the report]
- Equal Opportunity Commission
- A Last Resort
- HREOC

The aim was to retrieve news articles that mentioned the report specifically, rather than general news items about asylum seekers, their children or other reports or detention centre issues. One of these key words had to be present for the item to qualify and there had to be specific references to the HREOC report, though the name did not have to be explicit. Often it was referred to as 'the report by HREOC into children in detention'. The result contains news articles and opinion pieces, however, letters to the editor were excluded. Once the articles were retrieved the second objective was to expose the main active actors in the located news stories.

News Actors

Based on findings from chapter 2, the third objective was to establish whether the health professionals were active, passive or omitted actors in the news stories mentioning the report and also whether the main covenants relating to asylum seekers were active, passive or omitted in the news. This was done by searching the obtained articles using a number of key words to find out how many times particular news actors (including covenants) are mentioned in the articles. The following are the nine key words used in the search:

- Mental health
- Doctor
- Psychiatrist
- Psychologist
- Health professional
- Medical professional
- Rights of the Child [This search identified both the 'Convention *of* the Rights of the Child' and the 'Convention *on* the Rights of the Child', the latter being

the correct term, but both are used.]

- Convention [This search identified all 'Convention' but only those referring to the UN Refugee Convention were counted.]

- A Last Resort [This identified the name of the report, but also a key phrase in the CRC]

These key words were selected because of their prominence in the HREOC report and their significance for any outside understanding of the findings and recommendations in the report.

Headlines and Topical Priorities

The objective in this section is to establish the topical priorities of the selected newspapers. I explore front-page stories and demonstrate what macro-topics were given front-page priority in the *Australian* and the *SMH* from 07.05.2004 to 22.05.2004. I consider whether it is possible to argue that other news was of such humanitarian importance that it justified the limited coverage the report received? I only look at the headlines and what macro-topics they cover, that is I do not conduct a textual analysis of the headline.

This part of the study was done using Microfilm and manually looking up the front pages from the period selected, noting the headlines, and whether the headline was the main one (boldest) on the page and if the main picture (largest) related to that headline.

Analysis of News Coverage
General News Coverage

The following list shows all the headlines of the stories that mentioned the report during this time frame:

Sydney Morning Herald
07.05.2004 "Faced with unprecedented influx, Government did what it had to,

says Ruddock"; "Child detainees' rights violated, Inquiry finds"

14.05.2004 "Detention policy damned as cruel to children"

15.05.2004 "About face: Afghans on Nauru to be let in"

17.05.2004 "Barely a blink, despite the evidence of children's suffering" (opinion piece)

18.05.2004 "Dehumanisation-humans respond" (editorial)

11.06.2004 "Chimes to change lives of captive children"

Daily Telegraph

11.06.2004 "Free detained children call"

Australian

14.05.2004 "Vanstone locked in detention fight" (front page); "Free kids, demands watchdog"

17.05.2004 "Release kids from detention centres" (editorial)

20.05.2004 "Resorting to rights"; "Detention children finally find human touch"

27.05.2004 "Refugee status for slashed boy"

10.06.2004 "Deadline up but children still not free"

News Actors

In all of the above articles collected, there are a very limited amount of active actors, and they are all fairly similar across the board. Asylum seekers, including children, are only active in one article in the *Australian* on the 20.05.2004. Other than that the active actors in these articles are as follows:

- Political spokespersons (from the Federal Government and the Opposition)
- The HREOC (including a small extract from the actual report)
- Sev Ozdowski (Australia's Human Rights Commissioner at the time)
- Refugee advocate spokesperson

The 14 located news articles and editorials were then searched using the nine key

words derived from the report and the main findings in the report. I excluded the only opinion piece, which was written by Professor Robert Manne in the *SMH* on 17.05.2004. His article was a passionate piece that explained how the report described human rights violations and how health experts had been ignored. However, considering it was an independent (from the newspaper) opinion piece, not written by journalists working for the newspaper, it will be excluded from further analysis within this thesis. I focus on news stories and the discursive selections used to frame the news.

The question was how often the nine key words were mentioned in the editorials or the news stories. The following table shows the number of times these selected words or concepts were mentioned in the 14 articles sampled from the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Australian* and the *Daily Telegraph* during the period from 01.04.2004 to 20.06.2004.

Table 3.1 News Actors

Key Words	*SMH*	*Australian*	*Daily Telegraph*
Mental health	1	2	
Doctor		1	
Psychiatrist			
Psychologist		1	
Health Professional		2	
Medical Professional			
Rights of the Child [Will pick up 'Convention *of* the Rights of the Child' or 'Convention *on* the Rights of the Child', the latter being the correct term, but both are used]	4		
Convention [This search looked for all mentions of 'Convention' and counted only those referring to the UN Refugee Convention]	1		
A Last Resort [The actual name of the report, full title is *A Last Resort? National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention*]		2	

The sole references to 'doctor' and 'psychologist' in the *Australian* were found in a

quote attributed to a detained asylum seeker. This means the words 'doctor', 'psychiatrist' and 'psychologist' were not mentioned in any of the stories collected apart from in this quote.

The *Australian* is the only newspaper of the three that placed any text concerning the HREOC report on the front page with a small news piece containing 87 words, under the headline 'Vanstone locked in detention fight' on 14.05.2004. The *Daily Telegraph*'s only piece mentioning the report devoted 88 words to it, on 11.06.2004 on page 29. This story pointed out how some school children held demonstrations and demanded the release of all children from detention centres. Due to the otherwise complete lack of stories in the *Daily Telegraph*, I will focus in the remaining sections on the other two newspapers for further analysis.

This part of the study suggests that the report was not mentioned in many articles at all. The active actors in those articles were limited to mainly political actors. The health professionals were omitted. Considering the importance of health professionals within the report, it is questionable whether the news media could give a thorough explanation of the report, its findings and recommendations, without these actors.

Headlines and Topical News Values

In this section I examine the headlines on front pages during a two-week period from 07.05.2004 to 22.07.2004, that is, one week prior to the publication of the report, and eight days after its publication (including the weekend of the 22nd). I have restricted this study to headlines in the news section of the front page. This section of the study should not be seen as a complete content analysis, instead my aim was to get an overview of the stories covered during this time. This first part of this chapter supports previous research that has pointed out that structural human rights stories are not prioritised in the news (Caliendo et al. 1999; Ovsiovitch 1999), and what I am showing in this section are examples of what stories the editors did prioritise and place on the front pages instead of stories about the human rights conflict the HREOC report was exploring. This indicates, not just the limited "importance with which the editors regarded this story" but what stories the editors regarded as important for

front-page space (Manoff 1986: 207). I argue lack of coverage on front-page space will downplay any news story.

The SMH Front Pages

During this period the *SMH* had 58 news headlines on the front pages (see appendix 3). Out of these none mentioned the report at all, and none mentioned anything relating to the issues raised in the reports, such as asylum seekers or mandatory detention.

In the *SMH* the most frequented macro-topic during this period concerned the US torture scandal in Iraq. Seven front-page stories were about this scandal. Two of these had both the main headline and the main picture of that day. One of these was "Angry Bush carpets Rumsfeld" on 07.05.2004, and another was "First solid evidence of torture" on 11.05.2004. Both stories featured pictures from Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq. Three further stories were about Iraq. One of these, on 20.05.2004, has the main headline "Iraq front line of terror war, says Howard". Two stories were about tortured Australian citizens while they were in US custody "Beaten, shackled and kept awake: how the US treated David Hicks" and on 21.05.2004 it is revealed in the main headline "US tortured, second Australian", the accompanying picture was of the tortured man's wife.

Other recurring macro-topics were national and state politics and finance (including the budget), such as:

> 08.05.2004 "Housing bubble has lost its puff, says Reserve"
> 10.05.2004 "Budget done, Costello stirs leadership pot"
> 13.05.2004 "Labor rush to trump tax cuts"
> 14.05.2004 "Latham pitch to voters who feel left adrift"
> 17.05.2004 "Cashed-up taxman launches blitz"
> 18.05.2004 "Brogden's pledge: I'll cut waste to give back property taxes"
> 19.05.2004 "Secret Lib poll reveals why PM is worried"

A number of random topics were twice given front-page priority, the Danish royal wedding, Renee Rivkin's fall, Joanne Lee and the trial of Murdoch. Other main headlines during the period were:

> 08.05.2004 "Richer areas losing HSC stayers"
> 12.05.2004 "Qantas slaps fuel charge on all tickets"
> 15.05.2004 "Sydney braces for big squeeze"

The Australian *Front Pages*

The *Australian* had during this time 57 news headlines on the front pages (see appendix 4). One of these mentioned the report on 14.05.2004 with a small headline. The main macro-topic on the front pages for the *Australian* during this time was the national budget (including both the Coalition's budget, and the Opposition's proposals, but excluding general finance stories), with 13 stories. Some of the main headlines (on the front page) relating to the budget were:

> 07.05.2004 "PM spends up to woo mothers"
> 11.05.2004 "$700m to protect our icons"
> 13.05.2004 "Latham's tax cuts to be 'bigger'"
> 14.05.2004 "Latham's study for dole plan"
> 15.05.2004 ""Labor in confusion on tax cuts"
> 19.05.2004 "Treasury says cut more tax"

On 12.05.2004 the *Australian* also had an entire separate section about the Budget.

The second macro-topic was the US torture scandal in Iraq. Seven headlines were focused on this topic. On 11.05.2004 "Naked terror: dogs set on inmates" was accompanied by the main picture on the front page and "Canberra has duty to Iraqi prisoners" appeared as a smaller headline. On 12.05.2004 "Iraq abuses widespread: Red Cross" was the main headline and on 22.05.2004 "The bodies of evidence" were accompanied by the main picture on the front page.

Four front-page stories were about the Costello's possible leadership challenge to Prime Minister Howard (for example on 08.05.2004 "Costello backers expect handover" and on 10.05.2004 "Costello's supporters under fire"). Some stories occurred twice on the front pages, such as the story about an Australian pedophile caught in Bali and his suicide, the royal wedding in Denmark (which was accompanied by the main picture on both 14.05.2004 and 15.05.2004) and the Joanna Lee and trial of Murdoch stories. Other main headlines or headlines with main picture were:

> 08.05.2004 "Housing bubble bursts: Reserve"
> 10.05.2004 "Chechen President dies in stadium blast"
> 13.05.2004 "US captive beheaded on the internet"
> 17.05.2004 "Aussie asylum for Test cricketer"
> 18.05.2004 "Top Iraqi assassinated"
> 19.05.2004 "Aussie son cries for Iraqi leader"
> 20.05.2004 "Hicks 'tied up and beaten'"

I have not included all headlines from the front pages (see appendix 3 and 4 for all headline during this time), and in particular not all smaller headlines. However, I have extracted a few macro-topics that demonstrate recurring stories and topics. My interest in doing this is to gain an understanding of the topics that competed for space during this time. It is possible to make quick judgements regarding what news values guide this selection without entering a discussion about certain news-values taxonomy. The US torture scandal was prominent in both newspapers and can be viewed as an event that contained scandalous visuals, and as such had a high news value. Another aspect of the scandal is that the story is relatively unambiguous, with a 'clear' moral right and wrong (the evidence being the available pictures), and with the perpetrators of the wrongs (individual US military personnel) identifiable and culturally close to Australians and Australia's involvement in Iraq. Even people supporting the war (and by extension the far more serious human rights violations the 'coalitions' has brought upon civilian population in Iraq) could oppose the actions of the prison guards in Abu Ghraib.

The Budget, the other main topic, in the *Australian* in particular since it is the national newspaper, is a recurring national event that can be analysed and debated. It is presented as very relevant and important to Australians, and the focus is mostly on what individuals will benefit, who will be promised more money and tax breaks. The other stories are about celebrities, famous people, or an event, such as a killing, a suicide, a trial, David Hicks or sport stories.

Part 2 The News Story

Introduction

In this part I analyse one news story from the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 14.05.2004 in more detail. This was the day after the report had been tabled. Despite the fact that it was only one day after the report had been released the report would have been well known considering that a media pack had been released and the inquiry was announced in 2001. One week earlier, on 07.05.2004 it was stated in the *SMH* that the HREOC report had been leaked and it was reported that the Opposition opposed the Federal Government's policy, and agreed with the recommendation from HREOC that the children should be released. It was further reported on this day that the Government, who argued mandatory detention was a necessary and justified policy, rejected the findings in the HREOC report. The *SMH* was selected for the more detailed analysis because of its prominence as Australia's more liberal broadsheet. However the news story in the *SMH* was very similar to the one in the *Australian* and works as a general case study.

This part follows a structure for discourse analysis developed by Bell (1998). This structure establishes 'what', 'who', 'where' and 'when' regarding the news story. The main question Bell asks is "what does the story actually say?" (1998: 75). The purpose here is not to examine what the story was, but what is communicated in the news discourse. Bell bases his method on "The journalistic five Ws and the H" (1998: 75), but excludes the 'why' and the 'how'. Bell argues these can be asked later, and would include socio-political, structural, and economic influences. Bell's method is a clear and structured way of analysing and interpreting a news story. My main focus is to establish *what* the story actually says, *who* the story is about (who is active and

who is passive in the story), *where* the story is taking place and what temporal aspects (*when*) are important. Bell's structure enables me to "step-by-step" go through the article systematically, and to explore the *"event structure"* (1998: 75, italics in original).

I have argued that objectivity can be seen as "rhetorical devices and procedures used in composing a news story" (Sigal 1986: 15), however, I aim to demonstrate how the discursive strategies of 'professional' objectivity, i.e., to present 'both sides of the story', was used when reporting the HREOC report and this restricted the contextualisation of the news story with ethical implications.

Analysis of News Story

The story is reproduced in full in table 4.2, with each separate sentence given a number that I refer to when examining that particular part.

Table 3.2 *Sydney Morning Herald*s' News Story
By Cynthia Banham (SMH 14.05.2004: 5)

HL	Detention Policy Damned As Cruel To Children
S1	A damning report by the nation's human rights watchdog has found Australia's mandatory immigration detention policies had subjected thousands of children to "cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment".
S2	However, the report was rejected by the Federal Government as unbalanced and backward-looking.
S3	The Immigration Minister, Amanda Vanstone, said it covered a period between 1999 and 2002 when "thousands of people were coming unannounced and unlawfully into Australia".
S4	Asked whether, with hindsight, the Government would do things differently today, Senator Vanstone said, "No, we wouldn't. The border control policies have been very successful."
S5	The final report of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission into children in immigration detention, tabled in Parliament yesterday, recommended the release of all children from detention centres and residential housing projects.
S6	But Senator Vanstone said that to implement its recommendations would be to "send a very dangerous message" to people smugglers that "if you bring children you'll be able to be out in the community

	very quickly".
S7	The report found Australia's current system of detention was "fundamentally inconsistent" with the UN's Convention on the Rights of the Child, and that children who were detained for long periods were at "high risk of serious mental harm".
S8	Senator Vanstone denied there had been any human rights breaches, saying the convention "does allow children to be detained lawfully, and these children are detained lawfully".
S9	However, she said she was looking at the possibility of allowing whole family groups, including fathers, to live in alternative detention arrangements.
S10	The report was welcomed by Labor and the minor parties, as well as refugee groups.
S11	Labor's immigration spokesman, Stephen Smith, said that the report was a "damning indictment" of the Government, its policy and administration, and called for the immediate release of all children from detention.
S12	"This frankly has been a bad period and we need to set the system up to ensure it can't happen again," he said.
S13	The Australian Democrats leader, Andrew Bartlett, said that the report "must lead to major policy change".
S14	The Greens leader, Bob Brown, said it was "disgusting that there are still more than 100 kids locked up behind razor wire in Australia and Nauru and on Christmas Island"."It's got to stop," he said.
S15	The Refugee Council of Australia's president, David Bitel, warned "the fundamental conditions that underpinned the worst abuses are still in place and there is nothing to stop them from being repeated".
S16	The report branded immigration detention centres "traumatising places which subject children to enormous mental distress".
S17	It criticised the centres for posing health threats to children, due to their locations in extreme climates, the provision of insufficient cooling, heating and footwear, and inappropriate food for young children.
S18	It also said they had inadequate numbers of health care staff, had been subject to overcrowding and had unsanitary toilets.

Headline, Lead and Story

According to Bell's structure for discourse analysis, the aim is to find out what the stories say happened. The headline (H1) states that "Detention Policy Damned As Cruel To Children". Van Dijk (1991) points out headlines express the central 'topic' of an article. The political topic concerning asylum seekers and detention in Australia is well entrenched among the public, so even though there is no specific information in the headline, it is likely the headline connotes this is a story about detained asylum seekers; the news event is that the detention has been "Damned As Cruel To Children".

Further information can be found in the lead (or intro). The lead positions the first actor, "the nation's human rights watchdog" as the author of a "report" that is "damning" towards the "immigration detention policies". It states what policy the headline refers to and that "thousands of children" have experienced "cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment". This appears to be a quotation from the report but this is not specified, nor is it clear *who* is responsible for the cruel treatment.

In S2, the Federal Government rejects the report on the grounds that it is "unbalanced and backward-looking". This is not placed in quotation marks but the statement is backed up in S3 where Vanstone explains the report covered the period "between 1999 and 2002" when "thousands of people were coming unannounced and unlawfully into Australia". The story now becomes adversarial; H1 and S1 appear to be claims that are disputed in S2.

There is a conflict: the Federal Government's position is against "the nation's human rights watchdog". The journalist reports what each side has to say and the news story becomes what Wolfsfeld calls a "political contest" (1997: 53).

S4, S6 and S8 are defenses of the Government's policies by Vanstone. S5 and S7 contain claims made in the report. In S9 Vanstone admits, even though she in S8 claimed the policy was not breaching human rights and the detention was lawful, that she "was looking [for] alternative detention arrangements". S10 explains which actors

"welcomed" the report. S11-S15 contains news actors supporting the report and opposes the policy. These are the adversarial positions, and create the 'objective' feel of the story, the journalist appears impartial to the conflict. S16-S18 explains some of the claims made in the report. This last section furthers the claim in the lead and headline that the report is "damning" towards the policies.

Accordingly there are three elements in the story:

- The critical report into policy and treatment of children
- Defence of the policy
- Support of report and its claims and opposition of the policy

All three elements are given space in the story and all three are presented in equal terms, they are 'just reported'. These three are 'what' the news story was about, and these three elements give the story its 'news value'. There is the published report, event 1, then there is the conflict, events 2 and 3.

The News Actors

The story is attributed to an *SMH* journalist rather than a news agency, which is important in the sense that the editors and the journalists have the ability to frame the event according to what they think is important, since they do not have to rely on information provided by an agency. The story becomes more specific to the newspaper and it is the journalist who decides who should be active and passive in and omitted from the story. For Bell (1998: 77) these news actors become the story, they tell the story and frame the debate. As previously explained, news actors are a crucial aspect of critical discourse analysis.

The articles use of a number of quotes from a number of sources, which in turn become part of the news story itself. Van Dijk explains that the use of quotes can have a number of functions, he writes:

> …most important, quotations allow the insertion of subjective interpretations, explanations, or opinions about current news events, without breaking the ideological rule that requires the separation of facts from opinions (Dijk 1991: 152).

The quoted actors are subjectively chosen by the journalists to express their opinions, and it is their claims that drive the story. All presented facts are provided by the active actors in the article and not explored by the journalists. Van Dijk (1991: 161) explains how his research has demonstrated that "a large part of the news report appears to be about what people say, even for typical 'action news'". This is in line with Sigal (1986) who has argued that news is what people say happened. Actors who have a voice in the news become active. In the article, the following are active actors:

- The Federal Government (S2)
- Minister Amanda Vanstone (S3, S4, S6, S8. S9)
- The HREOC Report (S1, S5, S7, S16, S17, S18)
- Labor's Stephen Smith (S11, S12)
- The Democrats' Andrew Bartlett (S13)
- The Greens' Bob Brown (S14)
- Refugee advocate David Bitel (S15)

All active voices are political actors or 'official sources' in the sense they are all political spokespersons (or a government body, i.e., the HREOC who speaks through the reports findings). It has been argued that the news media are often subjective towards official or elite news actors, since "their voice is heard, and their opinions are presented as credible and legitimate, even when the Press may disagree about details of their policies and actions" (Van Dijk 1991: 40, paraphrased Golding, Murdock and Schlesinger 1986). Entman (1993) claimed the notion of objectivity in the press is subjective to the dominant power because official actors are provided with both space and an active role in the news. The journalist is relying on what these 'official sources' have to say. There is no resolution since each side has its views and its understanding of what is the correct interpretation of the report, which is not challenged or questioned in the news story by the journalist, i.e., all these active actors are "credible and legitimate" (Van Dijk 1991: 40).

In the article the following actors are passive:

- Children (HL, S1, S5, S6, S7, S8, S11, S14, S17)

- People Smugglers (S6)

- The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child or CRC (S7)

- 'Family groups, including fathers (S9)

- Nauru and Christmas Island (S14)

- Health care staff (S18)

These actors are not given a voice, just reported as objects of the news. None can be considered 'elite' actors in Australia and none are 'official actors'. The CRC is mentioned but not contextualised. I have explained how the story is written as a political disagreement, and these actors are not part of that disagreement. They are 'subjects' that are discussed and disagreed upon. It is not clear if the 'children' mentioned in S1 and S5 (children in detention) have been detained for a long time and if that is why it is a 'cruel' policy that contravened the CRS as explained in S7. The CRS is not given an active role, instead it is only referred to as the convention the report seemingly has used as a guide, and as a result HREOC found the detention policy contravened this convention. This is not explained further.

The length of detention is vital to Vanstone's argument in S8, since she argues that the 'Convention' (presumably meaning the CRS) does allow detention. However the fact that detention according to the CRS should only be used as a 'last resort', is not explained in the article (the name of the HREOC report was 'A Last Resort?' which directly referenced this, but again this is not mentioned). There is only a mention of Nauru and Christmas Island, and their relation is not further explored, but it appears these two places still contain children, however, it is not clear if these children are the focus of the report. 'Health care staff' is only referenced in S18 and only in relation to the number of staff. People smugglers are mentioned as the villains in S6, and according to Vanstone's comment it appears it is these actors that the policy is aimed towards, and the smugglers are subsequently responsible for the children coming to Australia and the pain they might suffer as a consequence.

The passive actors are important since these are who or what the active actors are talking about, and the active actors contextualise the passive actors. When journalists report the active actors as the adversarial parts of a conflict, while remaining impartial, the journalists absolve responsibility. When the active actors are only political actors, whom the reader might have (deep) preconceived ideas about, the story is less likely to challenge readers' 'models' (Van Dijk 1991).

Where is the story?

This is another of Bell's (1998) questions, which should be asked in order to clarify 'where' the story is taking place and the 'place structure'. There are few references to places in this story. The conflict is in regard to Australia's (S1) detention policy, and immigration detention (S5), however, it is not until S14 that the geographical positions of the detainees are actually placed within Australia's borders. In S14 it is the Greens' Bob Brown who positions the detention centres "in Australia" and he also mentions the detention centres on Nauru and on Christmas Island. Otherwise, in relation to the detention centres' location, there is only reference in S17 to their "locations in extreme climates", which is attributed to the report's claim this is posing a "health threat" for the children. It is not explained where the location is or if there are several locations. The children's location is not known. The children could be on Australia's mainland, but they could equally be outside the mainland, in Australian-controlled detention camps. This is significant information in terms of accessibility to these children and their condition, which will affect the ability to gain proper information about the detention camps. It is also significant since the HREOC report only focused on detention centres on the mainland, while offshore detention camps are not included because the Government claimed HREOC did not have powers to investigate those. This is not explored in the news story.

Temporal Aspects in the Story

The most important temporal aspect in this story is whether or not it is 'old news'. In S3 Amanda Vanstone claims that the report focuses on "a period between 1999 and 2002" and she positions the report in a historical context. Vanstone claims in S3 the

period was special due to the large amount of people arriving "unannounced and unlawfully", however, in S5 it is stated the HREOC recommend "the release of all children from detention". This implies there were children in detention when the report was released. In S7 it is stated the "report found Australia's current system of detention" is contravening the CRC and the welfare of children is at stake. In S12 Stephen Smith positions the conflict as relating to a "bad period" and change is needed, i.e., no change has been made. In S14 the current numbers of detained children are clarified in the comment from Bob Brown, and in S15 it is reinforced by David Bitel that the policy is still in place and "there is nothing to stop them from being repeated". In S16-S18 it is not clear if this relates to the current policy or the period the report covered, which is also not clarified in the story accept in Vanstone's comment in S3, where she "said it covered…". This is not disputed and the claim it is "backward-looking" appears to be valid. The fact that Vanstone's comment is factually wrong (the report covered a period up until end of 2003) has not been noted.

The story does not explain the time frames within the HREOC report, the only references to time occur in the comments attributed to others, so the actual time frames are uncertain, for both the period the report covered and the length of detention. There is also no indication of time in relation to the making of the report. All these missing temporal aspects are important in relation to the findings and the significance and urgency of the recommendations in the report.

Journalistic Commentary or Evaluation

Bell (1998: 88) explain that "[c]ommentary concerns context, evaluation or expectations for events that are happening". This news story contains no commentary by the journalist. The headline comments that the report is 'damning' but there is no further comment from or evaluation by the journalist of what is said or argued by any of the active actors. The only ideology evident behind the story is the professional ideology that a political news story ought to just report what is said, presenting both sides of the argument and not commenting or evaluating either side. The adversarial conflict is the news. This is an important ideological position, however, and the underlying 'commentary' or 'evaluation' by the journalist within the discursive

structure is the implicit understanding that the active actors are justified and legitimised as the only active actors.

Follow-up Stories

The story is about the adversarial dispute following the critical report released by the HREOC. The HREOC included a number of recommendations. In S5 the story states the HREOC recommends "the release of all children", however, this is rejected by Vanstone in S6. This can be seen as a follow-up to the recently published report. Though for Vanstone the follow-up to the story and the "possibilities" she is looking into in S9, regarding "whole family groups" and alternative placements. She disagrees with the recommendations and as such she is following the story differently from what the report asks for. Labor's spokes person Smith is in S11 "calling for the immediate release of all children" and this is another follow-up, which is backed up by Brown and Bitel's comments in S14 and S15. S16-S18 quote from the report, but there is no follow-up since these is explanations of what the report indicated was wrong. There are no more mentions of the recommendations in the report and subsequently the story ends with no clear follow-ups indicated by the journalist. The 'conflict' remains unresolved.

Conclusion to Discourse Analysis

After the structural analysis, in which I have established 'what', 'who', 'where' and 'when', it is possible to look back and ask if it is clear what happened or if there are any ambiguities or confusions (Bell 1998). What becomes evident is that the ambiguities in this story mean that the claims in the story are not backed up or verified, so it becomes a political story that dichotomises the event. The story is the disagreement over a policy, which is damned as cruel. The federal ministers are not questioned even though they are in charge of the policy and consequently could be viewed as ultimately responsible for the human rights violations exposed in the HREOC report. This adversarial structure leads to what Gitlin (1980) called 'polarisation' and to the "emphasis is on internal discussions" (among the political actors), and by doing this the issue (the children and their human rights) becomes

'trivialised'. The news story becomes more about 'officialdom's' positions and claims, not the actual human implications of the policy (towards the children).

There is no explanation of the foundation of the claims made in the report more than in S7, which explains the report found the policies "fundamentally inconsistent" with the CRC, though details are missing regarding this claim. S16- S18 are not backed up with evidence and can be seen as one view of a situation, and that view was disputed early on in S2- S4. In S16 the journalist states "the report branded immigration detention centres…" but there is no reason or background for this claim and instead the report is positioned as one actor, with one set of subjective values that can be opposed if one disagrees, as is evident in Minister Vanstone's rejection of the report. There is confusion over who has legitimacy to claim something about the policy and the children; the political actors have opinions, but other actors are omitted. These omitted actors could have explained the situation outside the political framework, but they are not given any space.

According to the above analysis it is possible to briefly explore what news values (Bell 1991; Galtung and Ruge 1965; Golding and Elliott 1996) contributed to the publication of this 'event'. It is a conflict, i.e., a 'negative' story (or 'drama'), about a report just released ('recency'). The story is about a report into Australia's detention policy ('proximity') and it is a conflict between 'elite' actors and all 'attributions' in the story are political actors. The story appears 'unambiguous' since it is a story for or against the policy. Whatever news values are prioritised, they are selected because the journalists and the editors think this is what makes the story, and this is what they wish to tell the reader has happened. However, it becomes clear when analysing the story that this approach contributes to a trivialisation of the story.

The next section will discuss two editorials, one in the *SMH* and one in the *Australian*. The editorials are the ethical positioning of the newspapers, while the news story is the 'impartial news' (if the traditional aim to 'just report the facts' are accepted as legitimate and possible). Because the editorials are not intended to be impartial, but to contain the ethical positioning of the newspaper, I will not use Bell's (1998) structure for discourse analysis. I will focus on more topical structures in the

editorials. Both these editorials mentioned the report, and the aim of this study is to examine the official position of the newspapers, to find out what they view as the important aspects. I am interested in how that relates to the discursive strategies in the news articles.

Part 3 Editorials
Introduction

In this part I conduct a limited topical analysis of the only editorials that mentioned the report during the time frame used in part 1. There were two editorials during this time, one in the *Australian* on 17.05.2004 and one in the *SMH* on 18.05.2004. These editorials are interesting because they expose what the newspapers view as the most important aspect of the report and they also voice the newspapers' positions on the issue.

The ideologies and opinions in editorials are usually, according to Van Dijk: "not personal, but social, institutional or political" (Van Dijk 1998: 22). Readers usually accept opinions in editorials, whether explicit or implicit (Van Dijk 1996), and editorials can be said to frame the agenda for the public (McCombs 1997).

Van Dijk(1991) argues that the selection of certain topics and not others by a journalist or editor will shape the readers' perception of the story. The selection becomes the subjective reality. If asylum seekers are reported as a problem, they are likely to be perceived by the public as a problem. Van Dijk (1991:73) defines 'topics' as "semantic macro-structure", which is a text sentence that contains several propositions within the text, i.e., it is the summary of a number of propositions that are encapsulated in a 'macro-proposition'. Van Dijk explains that these macro-propositions "reduce the complex information of the text to its essential gist" (1991: 73) and he likens the news to a pyramid, with all detailed information at the bottom of the pyramid and, at the "higher levels of the pyramid" (1991: 72), what Van Dijk calls 'topics'.

Van Dijk writes, "[t]opics not only suggest what information is most important in the text, but also what is most important 'in the world'" (1991:74); this means that the "topics influence the representation readers construct in their mind of specific" situations and events (1991: 74). This leads to the point that if the reader does not have access to alternative topics in order to understand an issue, they will rely on those present in news stories, and it is these topics that are likely to come to mind later. When it comes to human rights issues, such as issues concerning asylum seekers, the public will have little knowledge about the issue, the people involved and the circumstances surrounding the issue, just as they know little about international conflicts. Tehranian writes, "on issues that are distant from the audience's existential and social realities, media constructions of reality play a critical and sometimes decisive role" (2002: 75).

The readers create a picture of the event or issue based on previous knowledge and ideologies, and Van Dijk (1991: 74) says they create a "model of" the event, or "mental representation". Certain 'models' can be evoked through the usage of certain phrases or topics. Van Dijk explains "models are the central 'interface' between the knowledge and attitudes of the readers, or journalists, on the one hand, and the texts they read, or write, on the hand" (1991: 74). If, however, the readers have preconceived ideas about the news, their 'model' of the event might be different than that of the journalists. This is similar to readers' "deep attitudes" (Galtung 2002), and will affect their "mental representation".

The Australian

The editorial "Release kids from detention centres" in the *Australian* mentioned the HREOC report and was published on 17.05.2004. The editorial starts with Immigration Minister Amanda Vanstone's defence of the policy and her opinion that without the Government's 'tough love' there would be a lot more children in detention. The editorial claims she has a point and explains the drop in unauthorised arrivals after July 2002. The editorial continues and frames what it views as the main concern:

> Unfortunately, it is not the raw numbers but the human examples in the HREOC report that will break the hearts of civilised Australians. While responsibility for the involvement of children in hunger strikes and lip-sewing must be shared by their parents, there is no such escape clause in the case of the child with severe cerebral palsy who was held for three years at remote detention centres, and had to be wheeled around in a stroller because there was no wheelchair provided.
> (*Australian* 17.05.2004)

The editorial acknowledges that the report points out that all children potentially suffer in detention, both physically and mentally and that the *Australian* has "argued long and hard" (*Australian* 17.05.2004) that detention for woman and children is not preferable. The individual cases of suffering are the concern, the editorial states: "It is these basic humane considerations, rather than the international convention speak that HREOC report indulges in, that will convince many Australians to take another look at the mandatory detention system" (*Australian* 17.05.2004). This is followed by the claim that:

> The "pacific solution" is a fraud and a disaster, but so long as Christmas Island is retained for offshore processing it is unlikely the humane treatment of children would send unauthorised arrivals sky-rocketing. (*Australian* 17.05.2004)

The editorial ends with; "We need a mandatory detention policy that does not surrender to either populism or bleeding-heart liberalism- but that above all does not traumatize children." (*Australian* 17.05.2004)

The Sydney Morning Herald

The day after The *Australian* editorial, on 18.05.2004, the *SMH* had an editorial titled "Dehumanisation- Humans Respond". It was a critical account of the Government's detention policy. It contains reference to the book *Another Country*, published the same week. This was a book that included a number of stories by refugees, and these painted a bleak picture of their time in detention and reaching Australia. The other evidence (to support the argument in the editorial) is the HREOC report 'A Last Resort?'. The editorial explains how the stories in the book *Another Country* "show the consequences of the Federal Government's actions" (*SMH* 18.05.2004) and it is explained how the report by HREOC examined the policy these individuals had suffered under:

> The commission measured the Government's detention policy regarding children. The commission measured the government's policies and practices against the United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which Australia is a signatory. That convention requires detention of children to be a measure of last resort. Australia uses it as the measure of first resort for all children, irrespective of their individual situation. That detention, the commission says, is "automatic, indeterminate, arbitrary and effectively unreviewable" (*SMH* 18.05.04).

The editorial continues explaining how most of the detainees are in fact in the end classified as refugees which makes long-term detention even more questionable, and it contradicts the Federal Government's defence that they have the right to make the decisions about who comes to Australia since refugees have a legal right to seek asylum and the decision is not the Government's. The editorial explains how the Government desired to keep Australia:

> …ill-informed about who these refugees are. Detention centres are placed in deserts and on remote islands; it denies access to most visitors and to the media; and uses terms such as 'illegals' and 'queue-jumpers' (*SMH* 18.05.04).

The editorial ends by claiming HREOC "provide an alternative view" of asylum seekers and their plight and the recommendation to change the detention policy "is the starting point for a reassessment of Australia's treatment of asylum seekers." (*SMH* 18.05.04)

Analysis of Editorials

Van Dijk (1991) writes that the topical structure can be ideologically manipulated to suit the journalist's position (professional or political). In the case of an editorial this is the aim (to appear objective is not the goal). Van Dijk writes:

> …in order to evaluate and explain them, editorials often summarize or recapitulate the events, select relevant dimensions, or focus on specific actions or actors. That is, they briefly define and redefine the situation. (1991: 135)

Editorials are different from news pieces, since they contain open opinions, but this does not make them unambiguous; they contain hidden ideologies and opinions implicit in the text or structure, in the same way as news pieces. I will mainly focus on the editorial in the *Australian*, because it functions as a clear example of the

topical selections editors make, which are not based on any particular ethics or norms, but upon common sense and pragmatism.

The *Australian* argues the most pressing topic was the fact that children had been harmed and not that Australia was, according to HREOC, breaking international law. UNHCR pointed out, in their 2002 submission to the HREOC report, that it is their view that mandatory detention of minors does not comply with international law (UNHCR 2002). To give this topic less prominence is what Van Dijk (1991) calls 'downplaying' a topic. Considering HREOC's aim as a government body is to highlight when international laws are broken, the *Australian* displaces a main function of the HREOC and the responsibility HREOC has as a government body. The fact that Australia as a nation is breaking international law according to international covenants is not accepted as a ground for serious criticism, it is implicitly seen as part of "either populism or bleeding-heart liberalism" (*Australian* 17.05.2004). Australia apparently cannot violate international law. This is in line with the Howard Government's reaction to criticism from the UN, such as Downer's comment that the UN will end up with a bloody nose if it interferes in Australian domestic policies (Zifcak 2003). The attitude is the same as the anti-elite's opposition to international norms that I discuss in chapter 2.

The *Australian* is concerned with certain stories, certain topics in the report; the editor explains, it "is these basic humane considerations…that will convince many Australians to take another look at the mandatory detention system". Van Dijk writes:

> …the selection and textual prominence of topics result from routines of news-making and embody criteria of journalistic decisions about the newsworthiness of events. Therefore, topics also manifest complex networks of professional, social and cultural ideologies (1991: 71).

The *Australian* expresses what it views as the important issue, without consulting the report further. It does not position HREOC in its role as a promoter and protector of international norms. As a newspaper it expresses an opinion on the matter, and points out most Australians will agree. The 'common sense' opinion is in stark contrast to the evidence, which is presented in the report by health professionals and numerous

human rights groups, something the *Australian* is neglecting to examine.

The *Australian* further states that some responsibility for the children's involvement in certain activities while in detention "must be shared by their parents". The idea that these parents are suffering themselves and cannot control what their children are witnessing, and doing, is not examined. Van Dijk has called such statement a "apparent empathy"; this is the position that 'of course there is a problem with detention, we don't agree, BUT parents are to blame, BUT smugglers are to blame, BUT…' (Van Dijk 1998: 39). The fact that the report made it clear detention prevented parents from properly caring for and protecting their children is omitted.

However, the *Australian* argues it has continuously taken the position that the detention of children and woman ought to stop. The editors do recognise the risk of potential harm (the direct violence). This demonstrates how the *Australian* sees itself as an active part in the debate and conflict, but only insofar as expressing its opinion in the editorials, like one of the actors, equal to HREOC and the Government. The *Australian* takes from the report what justifies the newspaper's own understanding of the situation; the commonsensical idea that of course children should not be harmed. the *Australian* does not reject mandatory detention as a policy (the structural violence), which is explained in the HREOC report as the cause of much of the direct violence. Nor does the *Australian* specifically reject punitive measures, which this mandatory policy is, according to HREOC, and which, as a result violates international law. It appears that even though *The Australian* argues in favour of a humane policy, the editor still agree unauthorised asylum seekers could 'sky rocket' if off-shore processing was not available or there was not a mandatory detention policy. That is an argument rejected by the HREOC.

It is not clear in the editorial if the HREOC or the health professionals who provided the most vital information "surrender to either populism or bleeding-heart liberalism". If that is the case it is not clear who the *Australian* views as the correct evaluators of the children's wellbeing.

The *SMH* editorial makes the case that the detention policy is faulty and ought to be

changed. The asylum seekers are given an active role in the editorial through the book *Another Country*. The editorial steps away from the party-political conflict and humanises the asylum seekers. There is a clear reference to how HREOC points out how international covenants have been broken and children are suffering as a result of the policy (the structural violence). There is reference to aspects of the cultural violence that enables the policy to be accepted and promoted, the labelling of asylum seekers as 'illegals' or 'queue-jumpers' and as such deserving of what they get.

The *SMH* acknowledges that access to detained asylum seekers has been difficult to get and their stories are as a result not known, however this is not explored further. The *SMH* editorial appears ethical and inline with the functionality prescribed in international human rights, that the protection and promotion of human rights are an obligation for all individuals and institutions. This was not clarified in the *Australian* editorial, which did point out that children should not be traumatised but the protection of their human rights (which goes beyond direct violence) was not made explicit or elaborate in the editorials, even though the protection of the children's human rights were significant for the HREOC.

Both editorials focused on certain themes and topics. The idea that journalists as a professional group have a certain responsibility is not considered in either the *Australian* or the *SMH*. The *Australian* does not explore cultural violence, and the fact that the HREOC report clarifies the point that mandatory detention policy equals structural violence is not accepted, instead there is a concern for the direct, visible, violence. The *SMH* editorial does explore some parts of the structural and cultural violence that exacerbates the direct violence. However the *SMH* claim that the HREOC report "provides an alternative view" and this signifies the report as one actor in the conflict, when in fact the report was a collection of evidence, including evidence from many health professionals, and provides an authoritative view on the health implications of mandatory detention of children.

Summary

This study has reinforced Marr (2005) and Manne's (2004) claim that media provided limited coverage of the HREOC report. The over-900-pages report from the nation's only human rights commission was mentioned in 15 stories, including 2 editorials, over a two and a half month period. Whether this is enough coverage is clearly a question of values, however, looking at the headlines on the front pages, none deal with humanitarian issues within Australia, so if a newspaper's social responsibility should be based on human rights, the amount of coverage is questionable.

Apart from the overall coverage, I was interested in *how* the HREOC report was covered, *what* was covered and if the HREOC report was contextualised. I looked at both editorials and news stories. After the analysis in chapter 2 I demonstrated that two positions of the HREOC report should have been covered in the media: it was the health professionals' position and the international human rights position. Without an explanation of these positions I argue it is difficult to understand the violence, who and what is behind the violence, and possible non-violent solutions. These are questions Lynch (2007) points out that a reader or a student of a news discourse should have in mind when reading or watching a news segment about a violent conflict, and they are also questions a peace journalist should ask. This chapter explored how these questions cannot be adequately answered because health professionals and their views were omitted from the news while official spokespersons were given an active role. The publication of the report was reported as a political conflict, with two sides ('dualism in reporting'). The violence in the conflict the HREOC report explored became trivialised. The news journalists appear to be impartial about the adversarial conflict and only reported what each side claimed. I further discussed in this chapter that in the newspapers international law is only explained via the actors in the conflict, so it becomes a part of the dualistic conflict, and can therefore be disputed. The HREOC report was reported as a (conflict) *event*, and not a (conflict) *process*, which limits any contextaulisation of the report and any understanding of the violence.

Part 2 in this chapter further reinforced the idea that "the press reduces politics to a

clash of personalities, wills, and ambitions" (Carey 1986: 188). The news stories were "morally indifferent" (Marr 2005) to the issue. In part 3 it became apparent the editorials were concerned with specific topics, they were concerned about the children but none positioned the newspapers as an active part in the story, but merely an observing actor with no particular responsibility. The concern expressed in the editorials did not reflect the news coverage the newspapers gave the report.

I am claiming it is the chosen discursive strategy "that denies, rationalises and excuses the dehumanisation and marginalisation of, and discrimination against, minority out-groups, including asylum seekers" (Every and Augoustinos 2007: 412). The editors and the news journalists' position the newspapers and the (elite) actors as decent, rational and moral characters (Condor et al. 2006), disagreeing on an issue 'good men can disagree on'. The trivialisation of the HREOC report and health professionals by the news media can therefore be viewed as both "inappropriate and morally wrong" (Every and Augoustinos 2007: 414). If we view international human rights as fundamental rights with fundamental obligations, the way the media have reported the HREOC report also contravenes the obligations enshrined in those rights.

Caliendo et al. (1999) explains that when violence becomes trivialised and naturalised it limits public interest in the story, which will likely have political ramifications:

> Because a representative democracy necessarily relies on some degree of public interest to determine the policy agenda, a lack of interest among the mass public almost always translates into a lack of interest by political elites.
> (Caliendo et al. 1999: 49)

What this means is that if newspapers naturalise any type of violence, including new racism, neo-populism and anti-humanitarian neo-liberal policies, it is unlikely to be seen as a serious issue, with serious humanitarian ramifications. According to the social responsibility model mentioned in chapter 1, newspapers have the ability to create and foster a cultural and social atmosphere where human rights are the most fundamental ethics, which are prioritised, as opposed to political, economical or professional ethics. Clearly these other ethics can be important and applied when journalists write about certain political or economical events that are not related to

human rights.

Previous research has demonstrated how compassion for 'worthy victims' can be generated by the news, however, if certain issues are covered too much or for too long, with no apparent solution in sight, it is a possibility "compassion fatigue" desensitises the readers (Hoijer et al. 2002). I would argue that because of the possibility of 'compassion fatigue' it is even more vital articles about humanitarian issues that do end up in news media fulfil the functionality demanded of news about human rights and violence. To find ways to challenge compassion fatigue is a challenging job for journalists, but if violent conflicts are contextualised and the individuals who understand the violence and who advocate creative non-violent solutions are given a voice, compassion fatigue might be limited.

In the last chapter I will analyse the results of the case study within a peace journalism framework, to explore how the coverage of the report can be seen as 'war journalism'. I will present an alternative to the reporting analysed in this chapter to highlight how the peace journalism method will not just present a more fair, more accurate, more honest and less biased news (and these are key professional norms) but also news that fulfills their obligations under international human rights.

Chapter 4

Peace Journalism and 'Change Agents'

> The media constitute a major human resource whose potential to help prevent and moderate social violence begs to be discussed, evaluated, and, where appropriate, mobilised (Manoff 1997: 24-27).

Introduction

I explored, in chapter 3, the discursive *selections,* used to frame the publication of the HREOC report in 2004, and in this chapter I discuss and explore *alternatives* using analytical structures based on peace journalism and conflict analysis. I explore how peace journalists could have challenged the naturalisation and normalisation of violence outlined in the HREOC report. By doing this I also suggest how news journalists could have complied with their obligations under international human rights without threatening professional independence, standards or ethics.

Peleg (2006) explains how journalists can be 'a third party' in a conflict (2006: 5). This third party, according to conflict theories does not take sides, but has the aim of transcending violent conflicts. Peleg suggest peace journalists can "assume the role of third party" to a conflict and "focus on creativity and human ingenuity to resolve conflicts and to emphasize truth-oriented, people-oriented and solution-oriented journalism to expedite peace" (2006: 2). Wijadi argues more specifically the aim for peace journalism must be to question those in power when they fail to adopt non-violent policies and ask "why they do not do more" to protect peace (2004: 160). This is similar to the aim a media-monitoring project has (as defined in Nordernstreng and Griffin 1999), however the question 'why they do not do more?' is directed to journalists and editors. To hold media accountable, a media-monitoring project has to critically examine discursive selections and alternatives in order to evaluate the coverage.

I demonstrated in chapter 2 that the HREOC report provided evidence direct violence (human rights violations) was occurring, and it was connected to structural violence (the mandatory detention). I discussed attitudes (cultural violence) that justify and

naturalise human rights violations, for example the de-humanisation of asylum seekers, nationalistic arguments, 'civilisation arrogance' (such as the idea international law does not apply to *us*) and the focus on the asylum seekers as a threat. I further pointed out that these attitudes enabled political spokespersons to conduct wedge politics during the Tampa incident in 2001, however, I argue similar attitudes naturalised the violence outlined in the HREOC report in 2004. Because of the nature of this type of violence, it is not enough for news journalists to understand the nature of wedge politics. Ward (2002) suggested their lack of understanding was the main problem for news journalists during and after the Tampa incident, instead I argue peace journalism provides tools that would challenge not just wedge politics but cultural, structural, and direct violence with the aim of achieving a culture of peace. Before I explore peace journalism and alternatives, I will establish how the newspapers' coverage of the HREOC report can be viewed as war journalism.

War Journalism and the Newspapers

Lynch and McGoldrick (2005: 209) argue that there are three "conventions of Objective reporting" that are prone to create war journalism; these are journalists' biases towards:

- Official sources
- Event over process
- 'Dualism' in reporting conflicts

The case study in chapter 3 demonstrates that the coverage was indeed biased towards 'official sources' while other actors relevant to the report were omitted. The focus was on the publication of the HREOC report and the political conflict that erupted. The focus was on the 'event over process'. The event was the conflict between those supporting the HREOC claim, and the Government who rejected the claim. What the HREOC report *actually* contained was marginalised, which led to any explanation of the violence or solutions to the violence being equally marginalised. The severity of the human rights abuses became trivialised.

I further explored in chapter 3 that because of the discursive strategies that led to a focus on official actors, the story became dichotomised. The conflict between the supporters of the HREOC claims and the Federal Government became dualistic, i.e., the news contained *two* sides in an adversarial conflict. According to the above criteria for war journalism, the findings from the case study clarify how the news coverage of the release of the report can be viewed as war journalism even as it complies with professional objective conventions (McGoldrick 2006). However in the political conflict the two sides did not differ significantly when it came to the issue of border protection versus asylum seekers. Kim Beazley, who had been in opposition in 2001, said "[O]ur views on [the asylum seeker policy] were not light years away from the government at all, never had been" (Marr and Wilkinson 2003: 120).

McGoldrick argues that because of the objectivity conventions, non-official and non-elite actors who are "working to intervene in the Cycle of Violence" (2006: 3) will have limited discourse access and the public will as a result have limited knowledge about them. These individuals, who McGoldrick (2006: 3) calls 'change agents', are essential news actors to include in the discursive selection, in order to open up opportunities for peace and non-violence. Wijadi explains that if peace journalism, and a focus on change agents, is not actively applied, "[M]edia realities easily become subjective realities of those parties in a position of making war" (2004: 155).

Peace Journalism and Discourse Access to Change Agents

Chapter 3 demonstrated that the violence the HREOC report provided evidence for was trivialised and naturalised, while the conflict was politicised. I argue this was because the health professionals' positions regarding children's welfare and the international human rights positions the HREOC report were based on were omitted or marginalised. Lynch and McGoldrick ask: "Would Peace Journalism…represent a remedy, for systematic shortcomings or distortions in coverage, arising out of this pattern of omission and marginalisation?" (2005: 7) In this section I will explore how, if news journalists can provide discourse access to change agents, it can be a major remedy for the 'omissions and marginalisation' that contribute to the naturalisation or trivialisation of violence.

Galtung developed and explained the original peace journalism model using a table that indicates differences between war journalism and peace journalism. This model can be used for assessing news (Lee and Maslog 2005; Lynch and McGoldrick 2005; Perez 2006; Wijadi 2004), but also as a guide for journalists and editors covering a conflict or exploring alternatives (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005).

The table has four main orientations; these can be seen in table 4.1. (For complete table see appendix 5)

Table 4.1 Peace and War Journalism Table

Peace/ Conflict Journalism	War/ Violence Journalism
Peace/Conflict Orientated	War/Violence Orientated
Truth Orientated	Propaganda Orientated
People Orientated	Elite Orientated
Solution Orientated	Victory Orientated

(Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 6)

Change agents are people who are able to open up opportunities for non-violence and peace. According to peace journalism, change agents, or 'people peace-makers' (which Galtung calls in his 'table') are non-elite and non-official news actors that must be given discourse access if news media are to be 'peace/conflict orientated' (news becomes 'people orientated'). These actors are able to challenge propaganda from official sources ('truth orientated'), and if a non-violent solution to the conflict is to prevail (which would mean to transcend not just visible violence, but invisible violence, structural violence and cultural violence) it is important to focus on those people who do not view the conflict in a dichotomised, adversarial way and who do not have political agendas ('solution orientated').

These change agents are what Galtung call 'conflict workers' or 'peace workers'. Conflict or peace workers "apply for membership in the conflict formation as outside parties. Credentials: as fellow human beings, bringing in general conflict knowledge and skills, with compassion and perseverance, and no hidden agendas" (2000: 2).

In the Society of Professional Journalists' Codes of Ethics it is stated journalists should: "Give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid" (SPJ 1996). However it does not elaborate why or what this might mean, nor does it explain that official sources are nowadays proficient in public relations (PR) and do use propaganda to get *their* views across, while they contain others. PR training is something unofficial sources are less likely to acquire. Peace journalism, on the other hand makes it clear why the voiceless should be given a voice, and in particular those voices advocating non-violence and peace (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005). Tehranian (1999: 79) points out "[f]or peace journalism to take on a sustained life, the voiceless in global communication must be empowered." The notion that only the official, powerful or elite (including all kinds of so called think-tanks) are worthy to comment on issues is rejected, since often there are many others, more qualified, better positioned or less inclined to use propaganda, than those individuals. This demands that journalists are knowledgeable about the conflict and the *process* that led to the reported violent conflict (the event). Tehranian argues peace journalism is:

> …a kind of journalism and media ethics that attempts, as well as possible, to transform conflicts from their violent channels into constructive forms by conceptualizing news, empowering the voiceless, and seeking common grounds that unify rather than divide human societies. (1999: 79-80)

This is similar to what Wijadi argues: "To humanize people is the main idea of peace journalism, supported by activities to document all the invisible suffering and the peaceful initiatives of all the parties to the conflict" (2004: 157). In order to do this peace journalism is 'people-oriented'.

According to Lynch and McGoldrick "Peace Journalism entails picking up on suggestions for non-violent responses from whatever quarter, and remitting them into the public sphere" (2005: 18). However, they point out this is often not done in media, instead the people who have a non-violent vision are often "overlooked and disempowered" (John Paul Lederach cited in Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 18). Lynch and McGoldrick explain that to omit these actors, and their positions (or visions) are "perhaps the most noticeable characteristic of War Journalism" (Lynch

and McGoldrick 2005: 18). In the next section I will examine what I argue was the most significant change agent during the conflict between the Federal Government and the detained asylum seeker children, based on the findings of and recommendations within the HREOC report.

Health Professionals as Change Agents

In order to be able to "focus on people peace-makers" (see appendix 5) journalists have to make an effort to understand the context and background of the conflict. The reasoning is the same for any conflict, for example, news journalists omitted certain individuals and groups from the news during the lead up to the Iraq invasion in 2003. Some of those agents argued and provided evidence that challenged the coalition's claim regarding Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), but instead official sources were unquestionably prioritised when the 'war drum' started (this is particularly well explored by Edwards and Cromwell 2006). I have pointed out that these same war journalism traits were evident when the HREOC Report was reported in the news. Those groups who contributed through their professional knowledge to the findings and the recommendations in the HREOC report were omitted from the news reportage of the HREOC report (including the findings and recommendations).

I argue that health professionals can be viewed as change agents or people peace-makers, since they are not part of the political elite or the power elite. Their professional agenda is fundamentally humanitarian (the medical professions' motto is 'prium non noceru', 'first do no harm') [35] as opposed to political or commercial with hidden agendas. However, one problem is that "despite their potentially powerful advocacy role, most paediatricians have had little if any training in the art and science of advocacy" (Goldfeld 2004: 508). This demonstrates why it is important for peace journalists to provide opportunities for the discourse of the health profession (and other change agents who are advocating a humanitarian solution but who do not have PR or advocacy training) to access the media discourse.

---

[35] "The medical profession has a legitimate role in communicating on the general and mental health risks of imposing restrictive and discriminatory measures on asylum seekers, especially when some of these administrative procedures threaten one of the fundamental principles underpinning the practice of medicine: primum non nocere." (Silove et al. 2000: 610).

I explore next some positions health professionals put forward, some well before the HREOC report was initiated and some while the report was being conducted. All demonstrate clear humanitarian concerns that were missed in the news reports when the HREOC report was published. I argue this provide an example of how to contextualise the findings and recommendations and provide a balance to official comments if their positions had been reported. This could have further challenged all types of violence.

In the editorial in the *Australian,* the opinion of health professionals and their recommendations were omitted even though the editorial claimed the newspaper supported the release of all children in detention, based on decent common sense. However, the complexity of the situation cannot be understood without an explanation of why and how detention contributes to health problems for detainees. In The *SMH* editorial, health professionals are mentioned as a group, but not positioned as vital for all readers to be aware of, which results in their position and opinion, about children's welfare, being 'downplayed'.

HREOC pointed out in the report that it is against international law to implement asylum seeker policies that are punitive, and according to health professionals the detention policies caused harm and this was viewed by HREOC as punitive and against the CRC. The Federal Government dismissed this. The editorial in the *Australian* also dismissed the "international legal" references, but in the HREOC report these are not separate aspects but fundamental to an understanding of the situation since we have signed up to the CRC and the entire evaluation in the report focused on how Australia complied with the CRC. Both the purpose of HREOC and the international human rights framework become undermined if international law discourse is left out. If this is not explained, HREOC criticism towards the Government can be seen as an encroachment on sovereign rights (when in fact Australia is obliged to adhere to all treaties signed, see Hovell 2003) or as a criticism of *our* decency (civilisational arrogance). If human rights are structurally violated, the violation becomes more serious than an 'accident', 'mistake', 'blunder' or unfortunate side effect of a well-meaning rational (nationalistic or populist) action. Because of this the international human rights framework that HREOC works within cannot be

separated from the health professionals' position.

The dispute over whether or not the policy was punitive (and against the international treaties) was not new and should have been known. It became particularly evident in Philip Ruddock's response to and rejection of Sultan and O'Sullivan's study of detained asylum seekers in Australia. This study was, at the time, one of the most important studies of the mental health of Australian asylum seekers in the detention centres (Halasz et al. 2002; Manne and Corlette 2004). Ruddock (2002) fails to mention any previous reports backing up Sultan and O'Sullivan's study. One of them, Steel and Silove (2001), was even featured in the same issue of The *Medical Journals of Australia* and supported the medical concerns raised by Sultan and Sullivan (2001).

Ruddock's (2002) response is very short and focuses on some minor issues, which Sultan and O'Sullivan (2002) point out are either wrong or misguided. Ruddock (2002) writes he was not going to address the medical issues, which is the main point of the article, that is, the detrimental effects the government's detention system has on detainees, according to many prominent psychiatrists and psychologists. Instead he defended the policy and claimed "Detention is not arbitrary. It is humane and is not designed to be punitive" (Ruddock 2002: 85). This statement shows a complete lack of understanding or a refusal to admit and engage in an important debate regarding what health professionals and human rights experts have claimed for many years, that the system is in fact punitive (whether or not it is designed to be) and the effect on the detained individuals is serious health consequences. Silove and Steel (2002: 86) argued that the: "claim that detention is humane is extraordinary" and they point towards the medical evidence that detention is far from a humane policy. The limitation of Sultan and O'Sullivan's (2001) report is not disputed, since it was based on participant-observer research conducted by a detained doctor, Aamer Sultan, but the fact that it should be an important contribution to the debates seems to be beyond question within the medical community. Halasz et al. (2002), and 20 co-signatories who all are psychiatrists, position themselves behind the study and its significance. The editors of the *Medical Journals of Australia* write in response to this:

> To our knowledge, the information conveyed by Sultan and Sullivan's article is the best available data on the mental health of detained asylum seekers in Australia. We look forward to a more rigorous and independent assessment, hopefully initiated by the Minister. The opportunity is his. (Weyden et al. 2002: 87)

This was a debate that underpinned some of the main findings in the HREOC report, but was completely omitted in the news reports. The Federal Government's unsupported comments that they had not violated any human rights were given a higher news value.

It is important to make clear that the HREOC report never argued for open borders, or that asylum seekers would not lie in the hope of being able to stay in Australia, or that people smugglers are not criminals. Similarly Fazel and Silove (2006) argued it is not the health professionals' purpose to oppose the controlling of immigration, something that has been agreed is necessary, but that the mechanisms for such control need to be implemented according to international conventions and balanced against the human cost of any action.

Silove (2002: 292) writes: "For psychiatrists working with asylum seekers, the interdependence of the principles of human rights, mental health and social development is self-evident." Sally Hargreaves writes in the *Lancet*:

> The fundamental link between health and human rights offers health-care professionals the opportunity to play a vital advocacy role for refugees… Using health as a platform to promote positive media and political attention towards the displaced is essential: the greatest challenges are not death and disease, but indifference. (2001:1384)

However, news journalists who are not devoted to the same ideals, or to an understanding of their own obligations and abilities, will limit the ideals Hargreaves is arguing for. If journalists do not view health professionals as change agents they will fail to open up an opportunity for a non-violent solution for this conflict since health professionals hold the key to understanding the link between human rights and the invisible violence inflicted on the children. Louise Newman, who was the Chair, Faculty of Child Psychiatry, the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of

Psychiatrists' (RANZCP) Chair, NSW Branch, RANZCP and the Director of the NSW Institute of Psychiatry when the report was being prepared, explained:

> As evidence accumulates as to the harmful effects of detention on vulnerable individuals and children, the medical profession as a whole has more actively entered into the discussion. (2002: 15)

Mares et al. (2003) confirmed this and highlighted this is an issue that a number of health professional groups have been involved in and mentions specifically the Committee of Presidents of Medical Colleges (CPMC) and the Australian Medical Association and the Australian Psychological Society. Mares et al. argue the clinical evidence is such that they morally cannot and should not be quiet, but should actively work to make sure the children and the adults who are in need of treatment and urgently changed circumstances receive that as soon as possible. Specialists in child psychiatry supported this and many expressed their frustration at the Federal Government's dismissal of their concerns (Zwi et al. 2003).

Professor of Nursing Linda Shields explains the difficulty:

> As health professionals we have a moral obligation to object to government policy which compromises the health of future generation Australians, and at the same time confirms opinions of Australia as a racist state. (2004-2005: 84)

It is interesting to note that none of the health professionals referred to in this chapter mentioned that news journalists or the news media could have provided their profession with access to the media discourse. Their only arguments were that health professionals had an active role to play because of their professional expertise and understanding of the situation. It is clearly up to news journalists and editors to make sure they include those professions or individuals who can work as change agents and challenge propaganda and cultural violence.

'Propaganda' is similar to Kempf's (2006) 'misrepresentation of facts'; there are facts out there, but the question is how they are represented and what are the "local meanings" (Van Dijk 2000: 39). In relation to the HREOC report, the news stories did not attempt to verify or counter the comments made by the active actors, instead all

active actors were reported as 'legitimate' actors. Political propaganda (the selection of information, not necessarily lies, that suit a particular political interest) was given space, instead of space being given to what the actual HREOC report claimed or to the evidence (for example, the health professionals' position) within the report. Such propaganda 'manipulates cognitions' (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 115) and influences the subjective realities in the discourse. Since political actors and official actors have clear political agendas, propaganda is likely to surface, so a conscious effort to bring forth other actors, to counter any political 'cover-ups' from all sides, is necessary to enact a peace journalism approach. This was not achieved in the news stories; there was no effort by the journalists to examine in more detail what was covered in the report, or to examine what other people involved in the issue and who would know first hand about the children in detention, had to say. This led, through the discursive strategies to distortion and displacement of what really was important for a peaceful (non-violent) outcome to the conflict. The propaganda orientation of the news reports also meant that factually incorrect comments were reported unchallenged in the news such as the Federal Government's comments that the report was "backward looking."[36]

Apart from a focus on change agents, or people peacemakers, Peleg (2006) has demonstrated how peace journalism indicators can be divided into the ABC conflict triangle to create an analytical tool. I will use this model to explore how journalists should approach conflict 'behaviour', 'contradictions' and 'attitudes' if a positive peace is the aim.

The Conflict Triangle and Peace Journalism

I explained in chapter 2 the conflict triangle as a conceptual tool for understanding any type of conflict (Galtung 2000). This triangle can also be used to explore what peace journalism should focus on in order to open up opportunities for peace. I will

---

[36] It was not until July 2005 that all children relating to the report were released from detention. The Australian Human Rights Commissioner at the time, Dr Sev Ozdowski said when he became aware of this decision that: "There have been several thousand children held in immigration detention over the past few years. As I said at the launch of the report-let no child who arrives in Australia ever suffer under this system again." (HREOC 2005)

first briefly repeat some of the theories. The conflict triangle contains three parts: behaviour, contradictions and attitude. Each part corresponds to a type of violence: 'direct', 'structural', or 'cultural' violence. According to conflict analysis, the focus has to be on all three parts of the triangle in order to transcend a violent conflict (Galtung 2000). If direct violence (violent behaviour) has not erupted, the focus for conflict workers or journalists should be on contradictions and attitudes in order to limit the possibility of direct violence. This is a foundational theory for peace journalism, since the aim for peace journalists covering a violent conflict is not just to report the physical manifestations of violence, but to report also the invisible violence and the structural violence that contributes to the direct violence (visible and invisible), and to challenge attitudes that justify direct and structural violence.

Peleg (2006) has created an analytical tool that connects the indicators under the 'peace/conflict' heading in Galtung's peace journalism table (see appendix 5) with the conflict triangle. This provides the conflict triangle dimensions with a number of indicators that can be used to examine conflicts covered in the news. In the table 4.2 I have used Peleg's (2006: 6) model for positioning peace journalism "[a]ttributes within Conflict Dimensions". [37]

Table 4.2 Peace Journalism within the Conflict Triangle

Contradictions (structural violence)	Attitudes (cultural violence)	Behavior (direct violence)
- Explore conflict formation, x parties, y goals, z issues - General "win, win" orientation - Open space, open time; causes and outcomes anywhere, also in history/culture - Making conflicts transparent	- Giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding - See conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity - Humanization of all sides; more so the worse the weapon	- Proactive: prevention before any violence/war occurs - Focus on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/ culture)

 (Source: content taken direct from Galtung's peace journalism table, see appendix 5, using Peleg 2006 model to divide indicators into the sections)

---

[37] The only difference is that I am using 'contradictions', which is the 'c' in Galtung's 'ABC conflict triangle', as opposed to Peleg's (2006) 'situation'.

The aim for peace journalists, as the third party to this conflict, is to focus on all parts of the triangle. In relation to the conflict explored in the HREOC report, the findings and the recommendations clarified that direct violence was taking place and the most pressing recommendation was that all children should be released from detention to prevent further direct violence. This means the first aim for peace journalists should be to focus on the behaviour that causes direct violence.

Behaviour (Direct Violence)

The direct violence evident in the HREOC report was the mental and physical violence the children suffered and encountered while in detention. According to peace journalism indicators, the focus should be on not just visible violence, but "on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/ culture)" (see figure 4.2). The most significant 'invisible' violence that was discussed in the HREOC report was post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (HREOC 2004). This was not mentioned in the news reports. PTSD causes serious suffering among many asylum seekers, and this can erupt while in detention and lead to serious mental health implications. If this is not explained to readers, it is a difficult 'violence' to understand. The main point is that PTSD can cause serious suffering even when the asylum seekers are in relative 'safety', as opposed to when they are in flight, when body is in survivor mode (Doctare 2002). This can explain why some parents fail to care for their children once they are in detention, or why some become lethargic, depressed, self-destructive or violent.

In relation to the HREOC report and the violence it provided evidence for, health professionals are a key group that can explain the nature of the violence and the implications of the violence. The *Journal of American Medical Association* stated back in 2000 that the "medical profession has a role in educating governments and the public about the potential risks of imposing excessively harsh policies of deterrence on the mental health of asylum seekers" (Silove et al. 2000: 604). To educate the public (and the government) by publicising information from the health professionals can be seen as vital for peace journalism since such information can explain the invisible violence and open up the possibility of creatively changing the situation by

first ending the direct invisible violence and then focusing on the contradictions that lead to the direct violence.

Contradiction (Structural Violence)

The Australian Federal Government at the time of the HREOC report argued they were acting in the national interest, protecting Australia from an unprecedented influx of asylum seekers arriving on boats. However, that pragmatic argument has a number of contradictions that peace journalists should challenge. Silove et al. mentions that the way the Australian Federal Government was acting towards asylum seekers and the detention of some in a harsh way, while talking about human rights and protection for some, must be understood in its "full historical, geopolitical, economic, and psychological complexity" (2000: 608). To achieve news stories that contextualise a conflict so it is possible for readers to gather the complexities of a conflict, peace journalists should according to figure 4.2:

- Explore conflict formation
- General 'win, win' orientation
- Open space, open time; also in history/culture
- Making conflicts transparent

Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) and Lynch (2006) demonstrate in their research that a conflict has no clear beginning, middle and end. It becomes the news journalists' job to decide which points to include or exclude. Sometimes there might be one story to cover part of the conflict and another to cover a different part, but when a story has limited coverage, which I demonstrated with regards to the HREOC report and the findings within it, this selection is even more important. Peace journalists should aim to 'explore conflict formations', meaning focus on who is involved in the conflict (there are usually more than two parties), and who is doing what. This exploration can also expose who the change agents are, since they are usually not the main conflict parties, and not the most vocal (or visual).

For peace journalism the aim is to find a 'win, win' situation in any conflict and to avoid a 'zero-sum' orientation, which is the result of an adversarial party political report. The HREOC recommendations, which I have mentioned, were not intended to open Australia's borders for all, but to advocate for a humane policy that is based on human rights and human dignity for all. In order to promote this human rights position, peace journalists have to contextualise the conflict in a historical, cultural and temporal perspective. This aim for peace journalists should be to 'open up the conflict' and expose how the justification for the structural violence (the detention policy) is weak, while strengthening the motivation for creative non-violent solutions. Silove et al. point out an important difference in the goals of the parties:

> The frames of reference adopted by protagonists of the policy of deterrence (in most instances, those who hold power) differ substantially from those of human rights advocates and health professionals who are committed to ameliorating the plight of asylum seekers. (2000: 608)

Silove, Steel and Mollica, three medical professionals and scholars, point out how politicians "offer glib rationalisations" for the detention policies they are promoting and "the more-developed world [must] accept that convenience and administrative simplicity cannot justify the mistreatment of asylum seekers" (Silove et al. 2001: 1437). Health professionals role is explored by Silove (2002: 295): "As a humanistic profession, we have a role to highlight at least one key contradiction-pursuit of public policies that directly undermine the mental health of an already vulnerable group."

This 'key contradiction' is not explored in war journalism, since the conflict is not contextualised. Wolfsfeld (2001) has explained that Western media tend to favour direct violence, i.e., a bomb or a killing is often reported, but not the structural and cultural violence that according to conflict analysis pre-exists such direct violence (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005). This can lead to a subjective reality portraying some areas, some cultures, and some people, as more violent, irrational and/or dangerous.

If the subjective reality constructed on by news media trivialises and naturalises violence the complexities of violent conflict will not be understood and the media audience will be receptive to arguments defending punitive policies in place, to keep

them away, to keep *us* safe in the West. When there are contradictions in a conflict, the conflict has to be made transparent, then the contradictions that prevent a non-violent and peaceful solution to the conflict can be challenged.

Attitude (Cultural Violence)

Cultural violence justifies and naturalises direct and structural violence. I explored in chapter 2 parts of the cultural violence that shaped the socio-political climate in which the HREOC report was published. This climate influences both the discursive selections and the interpretation of the selections. Peace journalism should challenge this socio-political climate whenever it justifies or naturalises violence. According to figure 4.2, the peace journalism indicators that can challenge the attitudes (cultural violence) are:

- Giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding
- See conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity
- Humanization of all sides; more so the worse the weapon

I have already explored how health professionals were vital change agents who could have challenged the cultural violence around the publication of the HREOC report because of their apolitical and humanitarian position. However, there were other parties who also had empathy and understanding for the asylum seekers and who worked towards a humanitarian response. The HREOC report contains 346 submissions, 64 were confidential submissions (HREOC 2004: 39) from individuals, professional groups and NGOs, and they all provided significant evidence that could have been explored in the news and used to challenge contradictions and the structural violence of the mandatory detention policy. It is stated in the HREOC report that some submissions:

> …contained first hand accounts of the detention experience while others contained the views of qualified professionals, such as doctors, who were able to give opinions based on their experience with current or former detainees. (HREOC 2004: 40)

None of these submissions were explored in the news. It is these voices that can provide support for creative solutions to the violence in the conflict. If news journalists reject the rhetoric of dehumanising and neo-populist claims that re-enforces new racism, it is possible to challenge cultural violence. The lack of access to the asylum seekers (structural violence) limited access to humanising images, so the selection of news actors became more significant for the humanisation of the asylum seekers. The lack of access was highlighted in the editorials but, in the news stories, the adversarial structure did not provide a third apolitical and humanitarian alternative to the party political conflict that erupted briefly when the report was published. If international human rights obligations are explained what Falk (2000) called the 'human rights paradox', that is, when Western nations talk about and promote human rights for others, while picking and choosing which ones to accept or ignore, might be prevented.

Conclusion and Discussion

Peleg explains that the "perspective of peace journalism demands a major philosophical and ethical shift" (2006: 12) in how journalists view themselves, their obligations and their work. However Ross (2006) has expanded and explained the shift news journalists have to undertake:

> This shift demands abandonment of the moral certainty in one's own beliefs to adopt a broader and more fundamental set of values grounded in clarity that peace is always better than violence, health is better than epidemic disease and starvation, and economic sufficiency is better than ravaging poverty (Ross 2006: 10)

In this research project I have discussed and argued that peace journalism is already anchored in international human rights, which provides the most 'fundamental set of values' for news journalists and editors. To serve peace is not limited to peace journalism, instead news journalists in general have accountability towards human rights. This clearly does not apply for all journalists covering any topic in the news, nor should it, but when there are potential human rights violations occurring, journalists should frame the news, through their discursive selections, so peace and non-violence is naturalised and normalised as opposed to violence of any kind. To

serve peace in this sense becomes a universal obligation for all and peace journalism is a clear and practical method for news journalists to adhere to their obligation.

Peace journalism clarifies and demonstrates how and why journalists have to shift the focus away from official and elite sources, be aware of propaganda from all sides, and make an effort not to agitate conflicts but comprehend conflicts and open up opportunities for non-violence by providing space for creative solutions and change agents.

Next Step for the Establishment of a Humanitarian Focused News Media

Lynch (2007) provides a clear framework for the teaching of peace journalism and even though the main focus for peace journalism remains on war conflicts, it has applicability to other types of conflict. I think it is important to expand the debate to include other types of conflicts and violence, particularly within our own society that shape our socio-cultural values. The implications of my research is that it became apparent that the discursive selections news journalist's took when covering the HREOC report, were not based on a humanitarian ideals or ethics, but a professional practice that aimed for political impartiality. The result was that change agents were prevented from accessing the news discourse. My conclusion is that the discursive selection was not ethically neutral, instead, it created a subjective reality that trivialised and naturalised human rights violations.

Journalists are important information providers in our society and their discursive choices frame the news and the information available to the public. I argue it is important to monitor their discursive selections when they are covering any type of social or cultural conflicts, and expose when they fail to include actors or information that challenges any types of violence. If enough research demonstrates how certain types of violence, in all types of conflicts, are trivialised or naturalised in the news media because the discursive selections, it will become easier to argue that the ethics guiding the discursive selections, when covering violence and conflicts, fail to comply with their obligations. Impartial party political reporting clearly has its place, but when human rights are in question, adversarial style journalism should be limited.

Peace journalism is one method I have argued for, which consciously is structured to challenge any naturalisation and trivialisation of violence without challenging other professional standards.

The obligations I argue are fundamental for news journalists are enshrined in the same human rights treaties as those used by journalists to protect their professional freedom. The idea that anyone can pick and choose which obligations and rights to adhere to is rejected. To convince journalists there has to be training provided, they have to become literate about human rights but also willing to comply. To create this acceptance and enthusiasm for human rights and peace, media monitoring projects have an important part to play.

A good example of a practical and current media-monitoring project is *Media Lens* (www.medialens.org). Media Lens co-founders, Edwards and Cromwell, use the Internet to challenge news media in the UK. They write to journalists and question why certain topics, groups, individuals or ideas are omitted. They have demonstrated how discursive selections are not based on humanitarian values but commercial, corporate or official values among the political elite (Edwards and Cromwell 2006). Their aim is to make journalists accountable by exposing their biases. *Media Lens* demonstrates the Internet's potential as a media watchdog. But more is clearly needed to alter the ingrained structures in media and news production.

A culture of peace is only attainable if peace and non-violence are naturalised and normalised in everyday news discourse about conflicts and violence. There are many violent conflicts in the world, beyond the military conflicts such as poverty and starvation, lack of medicines, lack of access to fresh water or contraception, economical injustices and environmental degradation. If these are contextualised and creative solutions (and the people who have them) are put forward and given access to the news discourse, international and national cooperative effort is more likely to be accepted and demanded by the general public. It will not change everything, but if there is no 'passion for peace', which Rees argues for, the belief that it is possible to change will be limited.

References

Aday, S., S. Livingston, et al. (2005). "Embedding the truth." Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics **10**(1): 3-21.

Allan, S. (1998). News from NowHere: Televisual News Discourse and the Construction of Hegemony. Approaches to Media Discourse. A. Bell and P. Garret. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

APC (2003). Objects, Principles and Complaints Procedure. Sydney, Australian Press Council**:** www.presscouncil.org.au/pcsite/fop/charter.html: Retrieved 12 July 2007.

APC (2006). State of the News Print Media in Australia. Sydney, Australian Press Council: www.presscouncil.org.au/snpma/snpma_index.html: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

APC (2007). "State of the News Print Media in Australia: a supplement to the 2006 report." Australian Press Council: www.presscouncil.org.au/snpma/index_snpma2007.html: Retrieved 20 November 2007.

Bailey, J. (2002). "Australia and asylum-seekers: is a policy of protection in the "national interest"/." Australian Journal of Human Rights **8**(1): 1-10.

Baker, C. E. (2002). Media, Markets, and Democracy. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Becker, J. (2004). "Contributions by the Media to Crisis Prevention and Conflict Settlement." Conflict & Communication Online **3**(1-2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 24 November 2007.

Bell, A. (1991). The Language of News Media. Oxford, Blackwell.

Bell, A. (1998). The Discourse Structure of News Stories. Approaches to Media Discourse. A. Bell and P. Garret. Oxford, Oxford Press.

Bell, M. (1998). The Journalism of Attachment. Media Ethics. M. Kieran. London, Routledge.

Blasi, B. (2004). "Peace journalism and the news production process." Conflict & Communication Online **3**(1/2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 October 2008.

Boyd-Barrett, O. and T. Rantanen, Eds. (1998). The Globalization of News. London, SAGE Publications.

Butler, P. (2003). Journalism Ethics, the Global Debate. Washington, International Center for Journalists.

Calabrese, A. (2004). "The Promise of Civil Society: a Global Movement for Communication Rights." Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies 18(3): 317-329.

Calabrese, A. (2005). "Moving Forward, Looking Back: The MacBride Report Revisited." Information Technologies and International Development 1(3-4): 51-52.

Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. and M. Coulthard, Eds. (1996). Texts and Practices: Reading in Critical Discourse Analysis. London, Routledge.

Caliendo, S. M., M. P. Gibney, et al. (1999). "All the News That's Fit to Print? New York Times Coverage of Human-Rights Violations." Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics 4(4): 48-69.

Carey, J. W. (1986). The Dark Continent of American Journalism. Reading The News. R. K. Manoff and M. Schudson. New York, Pantheon Books.

Carlsson, U. (2003). The Rise and Fall of NWICO- and Then? From a Vision of International Regulation to a reality of Multilevel Governance. Information Society: Visions and Governance, Venice, NORDICOM.

Chomsky, N. and D. Barsamian (2001). Propaganda and The Public Mind. Cambridge, South End Press.

Christians, C. and K. Nordenstreng (2004). "Socially Responsibility Worldwide." Journal of Mass Media Ethics 19(1): 3-28.

Christians, C. and M. Traber, Eds. (1997). Communication Ethics and Universal Values. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Condor, S., J. Abell, et al. (2006). ""They're Not Racist...": Prejudice Denial, Mitigation and Suppression in Dialogue." British Journal of Social Psychology 45: 441-462.

Costello, T. (2001). Humanity Adrift as leaders' morals sink to new low. Sydney Morning Herald. 31 August.

Cunningham, S. and T. Flew (2000). De-Westernizing Australia? Media systems and cultural coordinates. <u>De-Wesernizing Media Studies</u>. J. Curran and M.-J. Park. London, Routledge**:** 237-248.

Curran, J. (2002). <u>Media and Power</u>. London, Routledge.

Curtis, M. (2003). <u>Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World</u>. London, Vintage.

Doctare, C. (2002). <u>Hjarnstress: kan det drabba mig?</u> Vallingby Runa Forlag AB.

EC (1997). "Resolution on impact of new technologies on the press in Europe." <u>European Communities Official Journal</u> **C339**: 415.

Edwards, D. and M. Bain (2008). "Non-Violence and the Self-Cherishing Mind." www.medialens.org/cogitations/080216_non_violence_and.php: Retrieved 18 February 2008.

Edwards, D. and D. Cromwell (2006). <u>Guardians of Power: The Myth of The Liberal Media</u>. London, Pluto Press.

Eldridge, J. (1999). Foreword. <u>International Media Monitoring</u>. K. Nordenstreng and M. Griffin. Cresskill, NJ, Hampton Press**:** ix-xii.

Entman, R. M. (1990). "News as Propaganda." <u>Journal of Communication</u> **40**: 124-127.

Entman, R. M. (1993). "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm." <u>Journal of Communication</u> **43**(4): 51-58.

Every, D. and M. Augoustinos (2007). "Construction of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers." <u>Discourse & Society</u> **18**(4): 411-436.

Fairclough, N. (1993). "Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities." <u>Discourse & Society</u> **4**(2): 133-168.

Fairclough, N. (1995). <u>Media Discourse</u>. London, Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2002). "Language in New Capitalism." <u>Discourse & Society</u> **13**(2): 163-166.

Falk, R. (2000). <u>Human rights horizons: the pursuit of justice in a globalized world</u>. New York, Routledge.

Fazel, M. and D. Silove (2006). "Detention of refugees." <u>BMJ</u> **332**: 251-252.

Foucault, M. (1971). <u>Justice Vs. Power - Chomsky Vs. Foucault, Part 1</u>, www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbUYsQR3Mes: Retrieved 13 June 2007.

Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. <u>Texts and Practices: Reading in Critical Discourse Analysis</u>. C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard. London, Routledge**:** 3-14.

Gabriel, J. (1998). <u>Whitewash: Racialized politics and the media</u>. London, Routledge.

Galtung, J. (1998). <u>After Violence: 3Rs, Reconstruction, Reconciliation, Resolution</u>. Geneva, <u>www.transcend.org</u>.

Galtung, J. (1999). Prospects for Media monitoring: Much Overdue, But Never Too Late. <u>International Media Monitoring</u>. K. Nordenstrang and M. Griffin. Cresskill, NJ, Hampton**:** 15-24.

Galtung, J. (2000). Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (The Transcend Method). New York, United Nations.

Galtung, J., C. G. Jacobsen, et al. (2002). <u>Searching for Peace: The Road to Transcend</u>. London, Pluto Press.

Galtung, J. and M. Ruge (1965). "The structure of foreign news: the presentation of the Congo, Cube and Cyprus crisis in four Norwegian newspapers." <u>Journal of International Peace Research</u> **1**: 64-91.

Garrett, P. and A. Bell (1998). Media and Discourse: A Critical Overview. <u>Approaches to Media Discourse</u>. P. Garret and A. Bell. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Gitlin, T. (1980). <u>The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left</u>. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Glasgow, U. M. G. (1985). <u>War and Peace News</u>. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Glasgow, U. M. G. (2002). Media Coverage of the developing world: audience understanding and interest, Glasgow University**:** 1-19.

Goldfeld, S. (2004). "Editorial Comment : Health of refugee children: Broader lessons to be learned." <u>J. Paediatr. Child Health</u>: 508-509.

Golding, P. and P. Elliot (1996). News Values and News Production. <u>Media Studies: A Reader</u>. P. Morris and S. Thornham. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press**:** 405- 415.

Gramsci, A. (1971). <u>Selections from Prison Notebooks</u>. London, Lawrence and Wishart.

GUMG (1985). <u>War and Peace News</u>. Glasgow University Media Group: Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

GUMG (2002). Media Coverage of the developing world: audience understanding and interest, Glasgow University Media Group**:** 1-19.

Hackett, R. A. (2006). "Is Peace Journalism Possible? Three Frameworks for Assessing Structure and Agency in News Media." <u>Conflict & Communication Online</u> **5**(2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 October 2007.

Halasz, G., M. Block, et al. (2002). "To The Editor." <u>The Medical Journal of Australia</u> **176**: 86.

Hall, S., C. Chritcher, et al. (1978). <u>Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order</u>. Basingstoke, Macmillan Education Ltd.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). <u>Language as Social Semiotics</u>. London, Edward Arnold.

Hallin, D. (1994). <u>We Keep America on Top of the World</u>. London, Routledge.

Hamelink, C. J. (1994). <u>The Politics of World Communication: A Human Rights Perspective</u>. London, Sage Publications.

Hamelink, C. J. (1999). Media monitoring and individual duties under international law. <u>International media monitoring</u>. K. Nordenstreng and M. Griffin. Cresskill, Hampton**:** 263-274.

Hammond, P. (2002). Moral Combat: Advocacy Journalism and the New Humanitarianism. <u>Rethinking Human Rights</u>. D. Chandler. New York, Palgrave MacMillan**:** 176-195.

Hanitzsch, T. (2004). "Journalists as Peacekeeping Force? Peace journalism and mass communication theory." <u>Journalism Studies</u> **5**(4): 483-495.

Hargreaves, S. (2001). "Refugees: 50 years on." <u>The Lancet</u> **357**(9266): 1384.

Herman, E. S. (1995). <u>Triumph of the Market</u>. Cambridge, South End Press.

Herman, E. S. (2002). The propaganda model: a retrospective. <u>McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication Theory</u>. D. McQuail. London, SAGE Publications**:** 60-68.

Herman, E. S. and N. Chomsky (1988). <u>Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media</u>. New York, Pantheon.

Herman, E. S. and D. Peterson (2002). Morality's Avenging Angles. <u>Rethinking Human Rights</u>. D. Chandler. New York, Palgrave MacMillan**:** 196-216.

Hoijer, B., S. A. Nohrstedt, et al. (2002). "The Kosovo War in the media - Analysis of a Global Discursive Order." Conflict & Communication Online **1**(2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 October 2007.

Hovell, D. (2003). "The sovereignty stratagem, Australia's response to UN human rights treaty bodies." Alternative Law Journal **28**(6): 297-301.

HREOC (1998). Those Who've Come Accross the Sea: The Report of the Commission's Inquiry Into the Detention of Unauthorised Arrivals. Canberra, Commonwealth of Australia**:** www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/asylum_seekers/index.html#seas: Retrieved 17 September 2007.

HREOC (2001). Report on Visits to Immigration Detention Facilities**:** Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commisson. www.hreoc.gov.au/Human_Rights/idc/idc2001.html: Retrieved 12 October 2007.

HREOC (2004). A Last Resort? National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention. Sydney, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission**:** www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/children_detention_report/index.html: Retrieved 17 September 2007.

HREOC (2004b). A Last Resort? National Inquiry into Children in Immigration Detention-Media Pack. Sydney, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission**:** www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/children_detention_report/index.html: Retrieved 17 September 2007.

HREOC (2005). "Statement by Human Rights Commissioner and Acting Disability Discrimination Commissioner, Dr Sev Ozdowski OAM." www.hreoc.gov.au/about/media/media_releases/2005/64_05.html: retrieved 10 February 2008.

HREOC (2007). The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, www.hreoc.gov.au: Retrieved 11 April 2007.

ICCPR (1966). International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, United Nations: www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm: Retrieved 3 February 2008.

ICESCR (1966). <u>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</u>, United Nations: www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cescr.htm: Retrieved 3 February 2008.

Jacobson, T. L., N.-H. Fang, et al. (2002). "The propaganda model, A test of human rights reporting in the New York Times." <u>The Journal of International Communication</u> **8**(1): 19-38.

Kempf, W. (2006). "Social constructivism and its implications for critical media studies." <u>Conflict & Communication Online</u> **5**(1): www.cco.regener-online.de: retrieved 30 November 2007.

Kieran, M., Ed. (1998). <u>Media Ethics</u>. London, Routledge.

Kingston, M. (2001). Compassion and the fair go principle lost at sea. <u>Sydney Morning Herald</u>. 30 August

Kitzinger, J. (2004). <u>Framing Abuse: Media Influence and Public Understanding of Secual Violence Against Children</u>. London, Pluto Press.

Lakoff, G. and S. Ferguson (2006). "Crucial Issues Not Addressed in the Immigration Debate: Why Deep Framing Matters." www.rockridgeinstitute.org/research/lakoff/imm-response: Retrieved 26 July 2007.

Lee, S. T. and C. C. Maslog (2005). "War or Peace Journalism? Asian Newspaper Coverage of Conflicts." <u>Journal of Communication</u> **55**(2): 311-329.

Lee, S. T., C. C. Maslog, et al. (2006). "Asian Conflicts and the Iraq War: A Comparative Framing Study." <u>The International Communication Gazette</u> **68**(5-6): 499-518.

Lynch, J. (1998). <u>The Peace Journalism Option</u>. Taplow, Conflict and Peace Forums, accessed from <u>www.transcend.org</u> 12 February 2007.

Lynch, J. (2002). <u>Reporting the World</u>. Bershire, Conflict and Peace Forums.

Lynch, J. (2006). "What's so great about Peace Journalism?" <u>GMJ: Mediterranean Edition</u> **1**(1): 74-87.

Lynch, J. (2007). "A course in Peace Journalism." <u>Conflict & Communication Online</u> **6**(1): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 10 January 2008.

Lynch, J. and A. McGoldrick (2005). <u>Peace Journalism</u>. Stroud, Hawthorn Press.

MacBride, S., E. Abel, et al. (1980). <u>Many Voices, One World: Towards a New, More Just and More Efficient World Information and Communication Order</u>. London, UNESCO.

MacCallum, M. (2002). "Girt By Sea: Australia, The Refugees and The Politics of Fear." <u>Quarterly Essay</u>(5): 1-73.

Macken-Horarik, M. (2003). "Working the Borders in Racist Discourse: The Challenge of the 'Children Overboard Affair' in News Media Texts." <u>Social Semiotics</u> **13**(3): 283-303.

Maley, W. (2002). "Refugee Policy: Towards a Liberal Framework." <u>Policy</u> **Spring**: www.cis.org.au/policy/Spring02/polspring02-7.htm: Retrieved 20 February 2008.

Mandelzis, L. (2007). "Representations of Peace in News Discourse: Viewpoint and Opportunity for Peace Journalism." <u>Conflict & Communication Online</u> **6**(1): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

Manne, R. (2002). Oh for a show of mercy, sincerity. <u>Sydney Morning Herald</u>. 10 June.

Manne, R. (2004). "The Politics of Suffering Children." <u>New Doctor</u> **81**: 24-25.

Manne, R. and D. Corlett (2004). <u>Sending Them Home: Refugees and the New Politics of Indifference</u>. Melbourne, Black Inc.

Manning, P. (2004). <u>'Dog Whistle Politics' and Journalism: Reporting Arabic and Muslim People in Sydney Newspapers</u>. Sydney, The Australian Centre for Independent Journalism.

Manning, P. (2006). <u>Us and Them: A Journalist's Investigation of Media, Muslims and the Middle East</u>. Milsons Point, Random House Australia.

Manoff, R. K. (1986). Writing the News (By Telling the "Story"). <u>Reading The News</u>. R. K. Manoff and M. Schudson. New York, Pantheon Books**:** 197-230.

Manoff, R. K. (1997). The media's role in moderating conflict, Crosslines Global Report**:** 24-27.

Manoff, R. K. and M. Schudson, Eds. (1986). <u>Reading the News</u>. New York, Pantheon.

Mares, P. (2002). <u>Borderline: Australia's Response to Refugees and Asylum Seekers in the Wake of the Tampa</u>. Sydney, University of New South Wales Press.

Mares, S., M. Dudley, et al. (2003). "Politics of children or childish politics?" Australasian Psychiatry **11**(4): 477.

Marr, D. (2005). Is the Media Asleep? Do Not Disturb: Is the Media Failing Australia? R. Manne. Melbourne, Black Inc. Agenda**:** 216-230.

Marr, D. and M. Wilkinson (2003). Dark Victory. Crows Nest, Allen & Unwin.

Mazzoleni, G., J. Stewart, et al., Eds. (2003). The Media and Neo-Populism; A Contemporary Comparative Analysis. Praeger Series in Political Communication. Westport, Praeger.

McGoldrick, A. (2006). "War Journalism and 'Objectivity'." Conflict & Communication Online **5**(2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

MEAA (2008). Code of Ethics, Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance: www.alliance.org.au/resources/media/: Retrieved 20 February 2008.

Morris, A. (2004). "Is This Racism? Representations Of South Africa In The Sydney Morning Herald Since The Inaguration Of Thabo Mbeki As President." Australian Humanities Review(33).

Murdoch, L. (2001). Alone in a sea of cruelty. Sydney Morning Herald. 5 June.

Nerone, J. C. (2002). Social Responsibility Theory. McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication Theory. D. McQuail. London, SAGE Publications**:** 183-193.

Neumann, K. (2004). Refuge Australia. Sydney, UNSW Press.

Newman, L. (2002). "Medical Professionals and the Politics of Detention." New Doctor **78**: 15-16.

Nordenstreng, K. (1984). The Mass Media Declaration of UNESCO. Norwood, Ablex Publishing.

Nordenstreng, K. (1989). Professionals in transition: Journalistic ethics. Communication ethics and global change. T. W. Cooper, C. G. Christians, F. F. Plude and R. A. White. White Plains, NY, Longman**:** 277-283.

Nordenstreng, K. and M. Griffin, Eds. (1999). International Media Monitoring. Cresskill, NJ, Hampton.

Nordenstreng, K. and H. I. Schiller, Eds. (1993). Beyond National Sovereignty: International Communication in the 1990s. Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Nordenstreng, K., R. C. Vincent, et al., Eds. (1999). Towards Equity in Global Communication: MacBride Report. Cresskill, NJ, Hampton Press.

OHCHR (1996). Fact Sheet No.2 (Rev.1), The International Bill of Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. www.ohchr.org/EN/PublicationsResources/Pages/FactSheets.aspx: Retrieved 25 February 2008.

Osuri, G. and S. B. Banerjee (2004). "White Diasporas: Media Representations of September 11 and the Unbearable Whiteness of Being in Australia." Social Semiotics **14**(2): 151-171.

Ottosen, R. (2007). "Emphasising Images in Peace Journalism: Theory and Practice in the Case of Norway's Biggest Newspaper." Conflict & Communication Online **6**(1): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

Ovsiovitch, J. S. (1999). News Coverage of Human Rights. International Media Monitoring. K. Nordenstrang and M. Griffin. Cresskill, NJ**:** 243-262.

Padovani, C. and K. Nordenstreng (2005). "From NWICO to WSIS: another world information and communication order?" Global Media and Communication **1**(3): 264-272.

Park, H.-W. (1998). "A gramscian approach to interpreting international communication." Journal of Communication **48**(4): 79-100.

Peleg, S. (2006). "Peace Journalism through the Lense of Conflict Theory: Analysis and Practice." Conflict & Communication Online **5**(2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

Perera, S. (2002). "A Line In the Sea." Australian Humanities Review(27): INTERNET.

Perez, M. H. (2006). Moving Mainstream Media Towards a Culture of Peace. Stadtschlaining/Burg, European University Center for Peace Studies**:** 92.

Perkins, M. (2002). "International Law and the Search for Universal Principles in Journalism Ethics." Journal of Mass Media Ethics **3**(17): 193-208.

Phillips, A. (2006). "Peace Journalism: Reviewed " Global Media and Communication **2**(2): 236- 239.

Philo, G. (1990). Seeing and Believing: The Influence of Television. London, Routledge.

Philo, G. and M. Berry (2004). Bad News From Israel. London, Pluto Press.

Pilger, J. (1998). Hidden Agendas. London, Vintage.

Raboy, M. (2004). "The WSIS as a Political Space in Global Media Governance." Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies **18**(3): 345-359.

Richards, I. (2005). Quagmires and Quandaries: Exploring Journalism Ethics. Sydney, UNSW Press.

Richardson, J. E. (2004). (Mis)Representing Islam: The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ross, S. D. (2006). "(De)Constructing Conflict: A Focused Review of War and Peace Journalism." Conflict & Communication Online **5**(2): www.cco-regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

Ruddock, P. (2002). "To The Editor." The Medical Journal of Australia **176**: 85.

Said, E. W. (1979). Orientalism. New York, Vintage Books.

Sawer, M. (2004). Populism and Public Choice in Australia and Canada: Turning Equality-Seekers into 'Special Interests'. Us and Them: Anti-Elitism in Australia. M. Sawer and B. Hindess. Perth, API Network**: 33-56.

Sawer, M. and B. Hindess, Eds. (2004). Us and Them: Anti-Elitism in Australia. Perth, API Network.

Sheridan, G. (2002). Policy of insane cruelty. The Australian. 16 May.

Shields, L. (2004-2005). "'A Last Resort?' Impact of Australian government refugee policy breaching the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)." Contemporary Nurse **18**(1-2): 81-84.

Shinar, D. (2004). "Media Peace Discourse: Constraints, Concepts and Building Blocks." Conflict & Communication Online **3**(1/2): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

Shinar, D. (2007). "Epilogue: Peace Journalism- The State of the Art." Conflict & Communication Online **6**(1): www.cco.regener-online.de: Retrieved 30 November 2007.

Sigal, L. V. (1986). Sources Make the News. Reading The News. R. K. Manoff and M. Schudson. New York, Pantheon Books.

Silove, D. (2002). "The asylum debacle in Australia: a challenge for psychiatry." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry **36**: 290-296.

Silove, D. and Z. Steel (2002). "In Reply." The Medical Journal of Australia **176**: 86.

Silove, D., Z. Steel, et al. (2001). "Detention of asylum seekers: assault on health, human rights. and social development." The Lancet **357**: 1436-1437.

Silove, D., Z. Steel, et al. (2000). "Policies of Deterrence and the Mental Health of Asylum Seekers." Journal of American Medical Association **284**(5): 604-611.

Singer, P. and T. Gregg (2004). How Ethical Is Australia? An Examination of Australia's Record as a Global Citizen. Melbourne, Australian Collaboration and Black Inc.

Siochru, S. O. (2004a). "Will The Real WSIS Please Stand Up? The Historical Encounter of the 'Information Society' and the 'Communication Society'." Gazette **66**(3-4): 203-224.

Siochru, S. O. (2004b). "Civil Society Participation in the WSIS Process: Promises and Reality." Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies **18**(3): 330-344.

SPJ (1996). Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics, www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp: Retrieved 12 January 2008.

Steel, Z. and D. Silove (2001). "The mental health implications of detaining asylum seekers." The Medical Journal of Australia **175**: 596-599.

Stratton, J. and S. McCann (2002). "Staring into the abyss - confronting the absence of decency in Australian refugee law and policy development." Australian Journal of Human Rights **8**(1): 1-12.

Sultan, A. and K. O'Sullivan (2001). "Psychological disturbances in asylum seekers held in long term detention: a participant-observer account." The Medical Journal of Australia **175**: 593-596.

Sultan, A. and K. O'Sullivan (2002). "In Reply." The Medical Journal of Australia **176**: 85-86.

Tehranian, M. (1999). Global Communication and World Politics: Domination, Development and Discourse. Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Tehranian, M. (2002). "Peace Journalism: Negotiating Global Media Ethics." Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics **7**(2): 58-83.

Tehranian, M. (2004). Civilization: A Pathway to Peace? [draft], www2.hawaii.edu/~majid/draft_papers/civilization/civilization.html: Retrieved 12 July 2007.

Titscher, S., M. Meyer, et al. (2000). <u>Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis</u>. London, SAGE Publications.

Tucker, K. H. (2002). <u>Classical Social Theory</u>. Malden, Blackwell Publishers.

UDHR (1948). "The Unversal Declaration of Human Rights." www.unhchr.ch/udhr/index.htm: Retrieved 15 February 2008.

Van Dijk, T. (1991). <u>Racism and the Press: Critical Studies in Racism and Migration</u>. London, Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). "Principles of critical discourse analysis." <u>Discourse & Society</u> **4**(2): 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. (1996). Discourse, power and access. <u>Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis</u>. C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard. London, Routledge**:** 84-104.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Opinions and Ideologies in the Press. <u>Approaches to Media Discourses</u>. A. Bell and P. Garret. Oxford, Oxford Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1999). Media, Racism and Monitoring. <u>International Media Monitoring</u>. K. Nordenstreng and M. Griffin. Cresskill, NJ, Hampton**:** 307-315.

Van Dijk, T. (2000). New(s) Racism: A discourse analytical approach. S. Cottle. Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.

Van Dijk, T. (2006). "Discourse and Manipulation." <u>Discourse & Society</u> **17**(3): 359-383.

Waisbord, S. (2003). Media Populism: Neo-Populism in Latin America. <u>The Media and Neo-Populism; A Contemporary Comparative Analysis</u>. G. Mazzoleni, J. Stewart and B. Horsfield. Westport**:** 197-216.

Walters, B. (2005). "The state of human rights in Australia." <u>Dissent</u>(18): 46-49.

Ward, I. (2002). "The Tampa, wedge politics, and a lesson for political journalism." <u>Australian Journalism Review</u> **24**   (1): 21-39.

Weyden, M. B. V. D., R. M. Armstrong, et al. (2002). "In Reply." <u>The Medical Journal of Australia</u> **176**: 87.

White, R. A. (1995). "From codes of ethics to public cultural truth." <u>European Journal of Communication</u> **10**: 441-459.

Wijadi, T. P. (2004). The WTC tragedy and the US attack on Afghanistan: The press joins in beating the war drums. <u>Media, War, and Terrorism: Responses from</u>

the Middle East and Asia. P. v. d. Veer and S. Munshi. London, RoutledgeCurzon**:** 155-185.

Williams, G. (2004). <u>The case for an Australian Bill of Rights: Freedom in the War on Terror</u>. Sydney, UNSW Press.

Wodak, R. and B. Matouschek (1993). "'We are dealing with people whose origins one can clearly tell by looking': critical discourse analysis and the study of neo-racism in contemporary Austria." <u>Discourse & Society</u> **4**(2): 225-248.

Wolfsfeld, G. (1997). <u>Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East</u>. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Wolfsfeld, G. (2001). "The News Media and the Second Intifada, Some Initial Lessons"." <u>Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics</u> **6**(4): 113-118.

Wolfsfeld, G. (2004). <u>Media and the Path to Peace</u>. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

WSIS (2004). "Shaping Information Societies For Human Needs: Civil Society Declaration to the World Summit on the Information Society." <u>Gazette</u> **66**(3-4): 323-346.

Zifcak, S. (2003). <u>Mr Ruddock goes to Geneva</u>. Sydney, UNSW Press.

Zinn, H. (1997). <u>The Zinn Reader</u>. London, Seven Stories Press.

Zwi, K. J., B. Herzberg, et al. (2003). "A Child in Detention: dilemmas faced by health professionals." <u>The Medical Journal of Australia</u> **179**(6): 319-322.

Appendices

Appendix 1

The HREOC Inquiry's Major Findings (HREOC 2004: 849- 850)

Major finding 1

Australia's immigration detention laws, as administered by the Commonwealth, and applied to unauthorised arrival children, create a detention system that is fundamentally inconsistent with the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC).

In particular, Australia's mandatory detention system fails to ensure that:

(a) detention is a measure of last resort, for the shortest appropriate period of time and subject to effective independent review (CRC, article 37(b), (d))

(b) the best interests of the child are a primary consideration in all actions concerning children (CRC, article 3(1))

(c) children are treated with humanity and respect for their inherent dignity (CRC, article 37(c))

(d) children seeking asylum receive appropriate assistance (CRC, article 22(1)) to enjoy, 'to the maximum extent possible' their right to development (CRC, article 6(2)) and their right to live in 'an environment which fosters the health, self-respect and dignity' of children in order to ensure recovery from past torture and trauma (CRC, article 39).

Major finding 2

Children in immigration detention for long periods of time are at high risk of serious mental harm. The Commonwealth's failure to implement the repeated recommendations by mental health professionals that certain children be removed from the detention environment with their parents amounted to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment of those children in detention (CRC, article 37(a) – see chapter 9).

Major finding 3

At various times between 1999 and 2002, children in immigration detention were not in a position to fully enjoy the following rights:

(a) the right to be protected from all forms of physical or mental violence (CRC, article 19(1) – see Chapter 8)

(b) the right to enjoy the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (CRC, article 24(1) – see Chapters 9, 10)

(c) the right of children with disabilities to 'enjoy a full and decent life, in conditions which ensure dignity, promote self-reliance and facilitate the child's active participation in the community' (CRC, article 23(1) – see Chapter 11)

(d) the right to an appropriate education on the basis of equal opportunity (CRC, article 28(1) – see Chapter 12)

(e) the right of unaccompanied children to receive special protection and assistance to ensure the enjoyment of all rights under the CRC (CRC, article 20(1) – see Chapters 6, 7, 14).

Appendix 2

The HREOC Inquiry's Recommendations (HRECO 2004: 856-857)

Recommendation 1

Children in immigration detention centres and residential housing projects as at the date of the tabling of this report should be released with their parents, as soon as possible, but no later than four weeks after tabling.
The Minister and the Department can effect this recommendation within the current legislative framework by one of the following methods:

(a) transfer into the community (home-based detention)
(b) the exercise of Ministerial discretion to grant humanitarian visas pursuant to section 417 of the Migration Act
(c) the grant of bridging visas (appropriate reporting conditions may be imposed).

If one or more parents are assessed to be a high security risk, the Department should seek the urgent advice of the relevant child protection authorities regarding the best interests of the child and implement that advice.

Recommendation 2

Australia's immigration detention laws should be amended, as a matter of urgency, to comply with the *Convention on the Rights of the Child.*
In particular, the new laws should incorporate the following minimum features:

(a) There should be a presumption against the detention of children for immigration purposes.
(b) A court or independent tribunal should assess whether there is a need to detain children for immigration purposes within 72 hours of any initial detention (for example for the purposes of health, identity or security checks).
(c) There should be prompt and periodic review by a court of the legality of continuing detention of children for immigration purposes.
(d) All courts and independent tribunals should be guided by the following principles:

(i) detention of children must be a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time
(ii) the best interests of the child must be a primary consideration
(iii) the preservation of family unity
(iv) special protection and assistance for unaccompanied children.

(e) Bridging visa regulations for unauthorised arrivals should be amended so as to provide a readily available mechanism for the release of children and their parents.

Recommendation 3

An independent guardian should be appointed for unaccompanied children and they should receive appropriate support.

Recommendation 4

Minimum standards of treatment for children in immigration detention should be codified in legislation.

Recommendation 5

There should be a review of the impact on children of legislation that creates 'excised offshore places' and the 'Pacific Solution'.

Appendix 3

SMH 07.05.2004- 22.07.2004 The Headlines on the Front Pages

07.05.2004	"Angry Bush carpets Rumsfeld" Main Headline (MH), Main Picture (MP) "Howard to splash out on keeping the streets safe" Smaller Story (S) "Libs master the art of the branch stack" S "NAB showdown in doubt as rebel hands in her notice" S "Relief for CSIRO" S "Murali equals record"
08.05.2004 Weekend Edition	"Richer areas losing HSC stayers" MH, MP "Cars, boats, houses: it's the Rivkin garage sale" S "Housing bubble has lost its puff, says Reserve" S "Bush sickened, but suspect still at work" S "Hardies quite move" S
10.05.2004	"Budget done, Costello stirs leadership pot" MH "Mary's royal decree: he'd better be faithful" MP "A canny place, where boys don't cut and run" S "Harvard students to taste the university of real life" S
11.05.2004	"First solid evidence of torture" (In Iraq) large MH and large MP "Lots of gain, little pain, with defence on front line" S "And God said unto Fred: go to the senate" S "Them's the brakes" S
12.05.2004	"Qantas slaps fuel charge on all tickets" MH "Don't shoot me, I'm just the conductor" MP "Abuse alert months ago, Hill admits" (Regarding Iraq) S "Laws is radio's lonely bull after thrashing in ratings" S
13.05.2004	"Labor rush to trump tax cuts" MH, MP "Brutality damages war on terror: Hill" (regarding Iraq) S "Chilling payback as scandal over abuses reaches the top" (regarding Iraq) S "It'll be goodbye Mr Chips at the canteen with this smart card" S
14.05.2004	"Latham pitch to voters who feel left adrift" MH, MP "Rumsfeld rushes to Iraq after admitting US mission may fail" S "Immigration casts its net at Doyles" S "Gandhi dynasty on way back as India dumps PM" S
15.05.2004 (Weekend edition)	"Sydney braces for big squeeze" MH "Home grown royal is the new jewel in the crown" MP

	"A pretentious little Cab Sav, with a bouquet of rat" S
	"Tales of torture" (regarding Iraq) S
17.05.2004	"Cashed-up taxman launches blitz" MH
	"Breakfast and baton: Opera House B&B" MP
18.05.2004	"Bomber kills US-backed Iraqi leader" MH
	"Stop winding up Athens IOC tells Australia" MP
	"Joanne's terror: 'Have you shot Pete?'" S
	"Brogden's pledge: I'll cut waste to give back property taxes" S
19.05.2004	"Secret Lib poll reveals why PM is worried" MH
	"Tely's done a bad, bad thing" MP
	"Sydney's future eaten, the Flannery prophecy" S
	"Lees and Murdoch face to face" S
	"How demolitions put Israel in hot seat" S
20.05.2004	"Iraq front line of terror war, says Howard" MH
	"The MP, her ex-lover and the dead model" MP
	"Beaten, shackled and kept awake: how the US treated David Hicks" S
21.05.2004	"US tortured, second Australian" MH, MP
	"Corruption stench as company loses huge Iraq contract" S
	"League star sacked for obscene call to woman" S
	"Guilty: the monster child set" S
	"Video verdict on the PM: not out for a few years yet" S
22.05.2004 (Weekend edition)	"Police drugs task force targets Rivkin" MH
	"He lies: Minichiello sacked from Origin" MP
	"Brawl in a Prawn Cocktail ready to explode" S
	"School's out as teachers call a two day strike" S

Appendix 4

The Australian 07.05.2004-22.05.2004 The Headlines on the Front Pages

07.05.2004	"PM spends up to woo mothers" MH
	"School care takes the worry out of work" MP
	"Choppy waters ahead Costello" S
	"US shame at prisoner on a leash" S
	"News corp beats expectations" S
	"Fairfax chief hands in his notice" S
08.05.2004 Weekend edition	"Housing bubble bursts: Reserve" MH
	"Iraq 'torturer' calls Australia home" MP
	"Costello backers expect handover" S
	"PM admits family tax plan flaw" S
10.05.2004	"Costello's supporters under fire" MH
	"Chechen President dies in stadium blast" MP
	"$300m helps libs go green" S
	"Camp X-ray 'torture' approved" S
	"Can torture be justified? Writes Areil Dorfman, answers a dirty question worldwide" S (Under masthead)
11.05.2004	"$700m to protect our icons" MH
	"Naked terror: dogs set on inmates" MP
	"Canberra has duty to Iraqi prisoners" S
	"An Aussie's fight for Fallujah" S
12.05.2004 (This issue	"Iraq abuses widespread: Red Cross" MH
	"Bali pedophile jailed for 13 years" MP

contained an entire section on the budget; these headlines are from the front page of the main section.)	"Fuel slug for Qantas passengers" S "Terror manual names Australians" S
13.05.2004	"Latham's tax cuts to be 'bigger'" MH "US captive beheaded on the internet" MP "Australian pedophile hangs himself in Bali cell" S
14.05.2004	"Latham's study for dole plan" MH "Princess-to-be, at the drop of a hat" MP "Costello's work to welfare" S "India's poor revive the Gandhi dynasty" S **"Vanstone locked in detention fight" S** "Rumsfeld visits Baghdad troops" S
15.05.2004 Weekend edition	""Labor in confusion on tax cuts" MH "Princess Mary's fairytale moment" MP "The budget and you" Under Masthead "Costello's Ladder of prosperity" S "How I beat Game security" S
17.05.2004	"Rumsfeld gave abuse green light" MH "Aussie asylum for Test cricketer" MP "Deputy's pledge puts heat on PM" S "Property slump leaves owners in a losing wait" S "Oil prices to fan inflation" S
18.05.2004	"Top Iraqi assassinated" MP, MH "Latham steals budget bounce" S "Falconio accused on DNA match" S "Court told of Osama's Canberra bomb plan" S
19.05.2004	"Treasury says cut more tax" MH "Aussie son cries for Iraqi leader" MP "I tried not to breath: Lees" S "Gandhi's no to PM's jori [CHECK]" S "Out with kitch, in with a fair dinkum pitch… over to you Richie" s
20.05.2004 21.05.2004	"Hicks 'tied up and beaten'" MH, MP "Soldiers pleads guilty to abuse" (regarding Iraq) S "Crean fights Treasury on ageing fund" S "PM ponders more cash for Mitsubishi" S "Two bullets in the mail for police corruption investigator" "Terrorist suspect 'tortured'" MH "Costello not forgotten at the John-a-thon" MP "Star fired in new league scandal"
22.05.2004 Weekend edition	"Mitsubishi hits the wall, 700 jobs go" MH "The bodies of evidence" MP (regarding Iraq) "League stars fined over visits to brothel" S "Long harm of the Law" S

Appendix 5

Galtung's original Peace and War Journalism table (from Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 6)

PEACE/CONFLICT JOURNALISM	WAR/VIOLENCE JOURNALISM
1. PEACE/CONFLICT ORIENTATED - Explore conflict formation, x parties, y goals, z issues - General 'win, win' orientation - Open space, open time; causes and outcomes anywhere, also in history/culture - Making conflicts transparent - Giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding - See conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity - Humanisation of all sides; more so the worse the weapon - Proactive: prevention before any violence/war occurs - Focus on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/ culture)	I. WAR/VIOLENCE ORIENTATED - Focus on conflict arena, 2 parties, 1 goal (win) war - General zero-sum orientation - Closed space, closed time; causes and exits in arena, who threw the first stone - Making wars opaque/secret - "Us-them" journalism, propaganda, voice for "us" - See "them" as the problem, focus on who prevails in war - Dehumanisation of "them"; more so the worse the weapon - Reactive: waiting for violence before reporting - Focus only on visible effect of violence (killed, wounded and material damage)
II. TRUTH ORIENTATED - Expose untruths on all sides / uncover all cover-ups	II. PROPAGANDA ORIENTATED - Expose "their" untruths / help "our" cover-ups/lies
III. PEOPLE ORIENTATED - Focus on suffering all over; on women, aged, children, giving voice to voiceless - Give name to all evil-doers - Focus on people peace-makers	III. ELITE ORIENTATED - Focus on "our" suffering; on able-bodied elite males, being their mouth-piece - Give name to their evil-doers - Focus on elite peace-makers
IV. SOLUTION ORIENTATED - Peace = non-violence + creativity - Highlight peace initiatives, also to prevent more war - Focus on structure, culture, the peaceful society - Aftermath: resolution, reconstruction, reconciliation	IV. VICTORY ORIENTATED - Peace = victory + ceasefire - Conceal peace initiative, before victory is at hand - Focus on treaty, institution, the controlled society - Leaving for another war, return if the old flares up again