

A stylized, high-contrast graphic of an olive branch, rendered in shades of green and yellow against a black background. The branch features several elongated, pointed leaves and a small cluster of olives at the top. The graphic is positioned diagonally across the cover.

Peace Journalism, War *and* Conflict Resolution

EDITED BY
Richard Lance Keeble
John Tulloch
Florian Zollmann

Peace Journalism, War and Conflict Resolution draws together the work of over twenty leading international writers, journalists, theorists and campaigners in the field of peace journalism. Mainstream media tend to promote the interests of the military and governments in their coverage of warfare. This major new text aims to provide a definitive, up-to-date, critical, engaging and accessible overview exploring the role of the media in conflict resolution. Sections focus in detail on theory, international practice, and critiques of mainstream media performance from a peace perspective; countries discussed include the U.S., U.K., Germany, Cyprus, Sweden, Canada, India, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea and the Philippines. Chapters examine a wide variety of issues including mainstream newspapers, indigenous media, blogs and radical alternative websites. The book includes a foreword by award-winning investigative journalist John Pilger and a critical afterword by cultural commentator Jeffery Klaehn.

“This landmark work challenges war journalism’s right to occupy the mainstream, suggesting that those who propagate the profanities of war, no matter their euphemisms, ought to occupy the craft’s and humanity’s margins until they are finally made redundant.”

—from the foreword by John Pilger, award-winning investigative reporter

“The contributors [to this book] have created a benchmark collection which offers new understandings of what peace journalism fundamentally is while concurrently affording new opportunities for renewed critical engagement and debate.”

—from the afterword by Jeffery Klaehn, author and cultural commentator

RICHARD LANCE KEEBLE is Professor of Journalism at the University of Lincoln, United Kingdom. He has written or edited fifteen books including *The Newspapers Handbook* (2005, fourth edition); *Ethics for Journalists* (2008, second edition) and *Secret State, Silent Press: New Militarism, the Gulf and the Modern Image of Warfare* (1997). He is the joint editor of the academic quarterly *Ethical Space: The International Journal of Communication Ethics*.

JOHN TULLOCH is Professor of Journalism and Head of the School of Journalism at the University of Lincoln, United Kingdom. He is Co-Director of the Centre for Media Policy, Regulation and Ethics (CEMPRE). From 1997–2003 Tulloch was Chair of the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Westminster. He has taught, designed and validated journalism programmes in a number of international settings including India, Yemen, Oman, Tunisia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and nine European countries. In 1984 he set up the first positive action journalism diploma in a U.K. university, backed by the CRE and the BBC. In 1995–2003 and 2006–2007 he designed and managed the British Chevening programme for young Indian newspaper journalists for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Tulloch has edited two books and authored numerous journal articles and chapters on media subjects.

FLORIAN ZOLLMANN is studying for a Ph.D. at Lincoln University’s School of Journalism. His main research interests are press coverage of Western foreign policy in the Middle East and propaganda studies. He has recently written for *Ethical Space: The International Journal of Communication Ethics*, and is also a contributor to the German independent magazine *Publik-Forum* where he is a blogger as well as a regular writer and editor for its young adult supplement *Provo*.

Peace Journalism, War *and* Conflict Resolution



PETER LANG

New York • Washington, D.C./Baltimore • Bern
Frankfurt • Berlin • Brussels • Vienna • Oxford

Peace Journalism, War *and* Conflict Resolution

EDITED BY

Richard Lance Keeble, John Tulloch, Florian Zollmann



PETER LANG

New York • Washington, D.C./Baltimore • Bern
Frankfurt • Berlin • Brussels • Vienna • Oxford

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Peace journalism, war and conflict resolution /
edited by Richard Lance Keeble, John Tulloch, Florian Zollmann.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. War—Press coverage. 2. Social conflict—Press coverage.
3. Peace—Press coverage. 4. Journalism—Political aspects.
5. Journalistic ethics. 6. Mass media and peace.

I. Keeble, Richard. II. Tulloch, John. III. Zollman, Florian.

PN4784.W37P45 070.44'930366--dc22 2009045810

ISBN 978-1-4331-0725-2 (hardcover)

ISBN 978-1-4331-0726-9 (paperback)

ISBN 978-1-4539-0104-5 (ebook)

Bibliographic information published by **Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**.
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the "Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie"; detailed bibliographic data is available
on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de/>.

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability
of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity
of the Council of Library Resources.



© 2010 Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York
29 Broadway, 18th floor, New York, NY 10006
www.peterlang.com

All rights reserved.

Reprint or reproduction, even partially, in all forms such as microfilm,
xerography, microfiche, microcard, and offset strictly prohibited.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Foreword by John Pilger</i> | ix |
| Introduction: Why peace journalism matters Richard Lance Keeble, John Tulloch and Florian Zollmann | 1 |
| Section 1. Peace journalism: New theoretical positions | |
| 1. Non-violence in philosophical and media ethics Clifford G. Christians | 15 |
| 2. Recovering agency for the propaganda model: The implications for reporting war and peace Oliver Boyd-Barrett | 31 |
| 3. Peace journalism as political practice: A new, radical look at the theory Richard Lance Keeble | 49 |
| 4. Propaganda, war, peace and the media Jake Lynch | 69 |

Section 2. Peace (or conflict sensitive) journalism: Theory and practice in an international context

5. A global standard for reporting conflict and peace 87
Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick
6. When peace journalism and feminist theory join forces:
A Swedish case study 105
Agneta Söderberg Jacobson
7. Crossing borders: The global influence of Indigenous media 121
Valerie Alia
8. Iraq and Dahr Jamail: War reporting from a peace perspective 139
Florian Zollmann
9. Are you a vulture? Reflecting on the ethics and aesthetics of
atrocities coverage and its aftermath 157
Pratap Rughani
10. Social networks and the reporting of conflict 173
Donald Matheson and Stuart Allan
11. Building a peace journalists' network from the ground:
The Philippine experience 193
Jean Lee C. Patindol
12. Peace journalism in practice – *Peace News*:
For non-violent revolution 207
Milan Rai
13. Mediating peace? Military radio in the
Balkans and Afghanistan 223
Sarah Maltby

**Section 3. Peace journalism's critique:
transforming the mainstream**

14. Conflict gives us identity: Media and the 'Cyprus problem' 241
Susan Dente Ross and Sevda Alankus
15. The Peace Counts project: A promoter of real
change or mere idealism? 257
Marlis Prinzing
16. Conscience and the press: Newspaper treatment of
pacifists and conscientious objectors 1939–40 271
John Tulloch

| | |
|---|-----|
| 17. War as peace: The Canadian media in Afghanistan James Winter | 287 |
| 18. Normalising the unthinkable: The media's role in mass killing David Edwards | 301 |
| 19. US coverage of conflict and the media attention cycle Stephan Russ-Mohl | 319 |
| 20. Perspectives on conflict resolution and journalistic training Rukhsana Aslam | 335 |
| Afterword: by Jeffery Klaehn | 353 |
| List of Contributors | 357 |
| Index | 365 |

Foreword

JOHN PILGER

War and mayhem happen; peace is utopian. Many journalists believe such an assumption immutable. I did. But the more I investigated causes, the clearer it became that so-called mainstream journalism was committed almost exclusively to the interests of power, not people. There is no conspiracy; since the demise of the great crusading editors, such as John Delane, Edward Smith Hall and Hugh Cudlipp, and the rise of corporate “professional journalism”, the media has become the managerial arm of the established order, no matter its preferred disguise as a “fourth estate” and honourable exceptions. Turn the pages of any major newspaper, watch or listen to the evening broadcast news, and be assured that news and opinion come from the top, however circuitous, almost never from the bottom.

In his chapter in the following collection, “Normalising the unthinkable: The media’s role in mass killing”, David Edwards relates one of his now famous exchanges on medialens.org with Helen Boaden, the BBC’s director of news. “To deal first with your suggestion that it is factually incorrect to say that an aim of the British and American coalition [in Iraq] was to bring democracy and human rights,” she wrote, “this was, indeed, one of the stated aims before and at the start of the Iraq war and I attach a number of quotes at the bottom of this reply.”

Whereupon Boaden supplied, as Edwards describes, “no less than 2,700 words filling six pages of A4 paper of quotations from George Bush and Tony Blair”.

I can think of no other admission as demonstrable of a war propaganda role. To Boaden, the proven lies of Bush and Blair, to borrow from Harold Pinter, did not happen even when they were happening; they did not matter; they were of no concern. That her rationale was apparently unconscious merely confirmed rapacious power’s grip on media orthodoxy. The war journalism she defended is, in principle, pretty much that of the *Sun*; only the presentation is different.

This happens at a time when British parliamentary democracy has been appropriated by reinvigorated militarism: witness the refusal of MPs to vote on the invasion of Iraq and the standing ovation they gave the warlord Blair when he departed the House of Commons. This is an historic shift, with the main parties now pursuing almost identical foreign as well as domestic policies. The media’s role is to present the fiction of difference and democracy and the bloody invasion of countries as “humanitarian” enterprises, acts of altruism whose victims are “us”. Mark the manipulative TV images of the flag-wrapped coffins of 18-year-old soldiers being borne through a Wiltshire high street, accompanied by commentary about “Britain’s resolve to see this through”. In fact, the majority of Britons oppose the current wars, just as a majority regarded Blair as a liar. The journalism of people speaks for this disenfranchised majority.

Looking back, this “peace journalism” has a remarkable if unacknowledged record. During the twentieth century’s longest war, in Vietnam, the mainstream media promoted, at best, the myth of America’s aggression as an honourable “blunder” that became a “quagmire”. This allowed Ronald Reagan to renew the same “noble cause”, as he called it, in Central America. The target, once again, was an impoverished nation without resources, Nicaragua, whose threat, like Vietnam, was in trying to establish a model of development different from that of the corrupt colonial dictatorships backed by Washington.

I reported Reagan’s wars from Nicaragua, El Salvador and the United States. War journalism so framed the mainstream coverage in the US that liberal newspapers, such as *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, actually debated whether or not the Sandinistas by their proximity somewhere south of the border represented a “threat”. Truthful or peace journalism countered this by exposing the “secret” and bloody campaign by the CIA to subvert the government in Managua and to make war on the populations of El Salvador and Guatemala via armed and bribed proxies.

Are the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq different? Yes, but there are haunting similarities. Read again Helen Boaden’s response to David Edwards and you have

an echo of Reagan's "noble cause" of "bringing democracy to others less fortunate". And yet Reagan was responsible not only for the killing of countless thousands throughout Latin America but also for the creation of a force of mujihadeen, who drove the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan and whose drug lords were as far from democracy's embrace as it was possible to be. War journalism made them into heroes. Truthful or peace journalism traced Reagan's war to an inevitable "blow-back", which happened on 11 September 2001.

Today, liberal war journalism promotes the myth of Barack Obama, whose siren call of "change" ensures the status quo and muffles the opponents of war. "From Europe to the Pacific," said Obama in May 2009, "we've been the nation that has shut down torture chambers and replaced tyranny with the rule of law." As William Blum has documented, since 1945, the United States has overthrown fifty governments, including democracies, and crushed some 30 liberation movements, and set up torture chambers from Egypt to Guatemala. War journalism reports what power says it does; peace journalism reports what it does.

This anthology of essays from those who study peace journalism in the international academy is a landmark work. Led by the pioneers of Lincoln University, it challenges war journalism's right to occupy the mainstream, suggesting that those who propagate the profanities of war, no matter their euphemisms, ought to occupy the craft's and humanity's margins until they are finally made redundant.

Introduction: Why peace journalism matters

RICHARD LANCE KEEBLE, JOHN TULLOCH AND
FLORIAN ZOLLMANN

According to the most recent authoritative source, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's annual report for 2008, world military spending by 2007 had reached \$1.2 trillion.¹ This represented a 6 per cent increase in real terms over the previous year and a 45 per cent increase over the ten-year period since 1998. The United States, responsible for around 80 per cent of the increase in 2005, accounts for some 45 per cent of the world total, distantly followed by the United Kingdom, China, France and Japan each with 4 to 5 per cent of the world share.

American military spending for 2009 was expected to account for 44.4 per cent of federal budget funds (\$1,066 billion), with the annual intelligence budget amounting to around \$30 billion (Woodward 2004). At the same time, just \$284 billion (11.8 per cent) was being directed at projects to eliminate poverty and \$52 billion (just 2.2 per cent) to education and jobs.

In the UK, almost 13 million people live in poverty: that's one in five of the population, according to the charity Oxfam.² Yet the latest Ministry of Defence figures show around £32 billion is spent annually on the military. Planned expenditure on military equipment alone over the next 30 years stands at £235 billion – with £2.5 billion wasted every year on outdated projects (Norton-Taylor 2009).³ As the environmental activist and journalist George Monbiot commented, the Department for International Development could be funded twice over just from the MoD's budget for capital charges and depreciation (£9.6 billion) (Monbiot 2009). Globally almost 1 billion people are estimated to be living in poverty (Rizvi 2008).

The United Nations defines “major wars” as military conflicts involving at least 1,000 battlefield casualties each year. In mid-2009, there were at least eight major wars under way, with as many as two dozen “lesser” conflicts ongoing.⁴ At the same time, millions of people around the world are confronting abuses of human rights, environmental degradation, violence and repression with courage, imagination and non-violent resistance (see Carter, Clark and Randle 2006).

These are bald, impersonal statistics – but they highlight the wider, political and social context in which this book appears. Indeed, in a world where the priorities of governments appear so misguided in the face of such glaring disparities of wealth (both material and cultural) and privilege and potential environmental catastrophe, are there any more pressing issues than those that surround war and peace – and the media coverage of them?

The emergence of the notion of peace journalism

And yet, while the study of wars and the media coverage of conflict – which we might term war journalism – has been well advanced within the academy for many years, the study of peace journalism has emerged only recently. During the 1970s, peace researchers, activists and academics began to develop the premises underlying the notion of peace journalism (Shinar and Kempf 2007: 9). But the seminal theoretical study was conducted by Johan Galtung (see Lynch 1998: 44), one of the founders of the academic subject of Peace Studies, who essentially contrasted the elements of what he described as “peace/conflict journalism” with those of “war/violence journalism” (in other words, the dominant mode of covering conflict in the mainstream media).

Thus peace journalism “gave a voice to all parties”, focused on the invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to social structures), aimed to “expose untruths on all sides”, was “people-oriented”, gave “a voice to the voiceless” and was solution-oriented. On the other hand, war journalism dehumanised the enemy, focused on only the visible effects of the violence, was propaganda-oriented, elite-focused and victory-oriented, and tended to concentrate on institutions (the “controlled society”).

From these beginnings, a considerable body of work examining the actual or potential role of the media in promoting conflict resolution rather than war and violence has emerged (see Ross 2007). Amongst these, one of the most important was Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick’s *Peace journalism* (2005). Significantly

many of the contributors to this text refer to it. Lynch and McGoldrick suggest peace journalism is 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. Moreover it:

- uses the insights of conflict analysis and transformation to update the concepts of balance, fairness and accuracy in reporting;
- provides a new route map tracing the connections between journalists, their sources, the stories they cover and the consequences of their journalism – the ethics of journalistic intervention;
- builds an awareness of non-violence and creativity into the practical job of every-day editing and reporting (ibid: 5).

In addition, they offer a 17-point plan for practising peace journalism (ibid: 28–31) which includes:

- Avoid concentrating always on what divides parties, on the differences between what each say they want. Instead, try asking questions which may reveal areas of common ground.
- Avoid focusing exclusively on the suffering, fears and grievances of only one party... Instead, treat as equally newsworthy the suffering, fears and grievances of all parties.
- Avoid “victimising” language like “devastated”, “defenceless”, “pathetic”, “tragedy” which only tells us what has been done to and could be done for a group of people by others. This is disempowering and limits the options for change. Instead, report on what has been done and could be done by the people.
- Avoid focusing exclusively on the human rights abuses, misdemeanours and wrongdoings of only one side. Instead, try to name all wrong-doers and treat allegations made by all parties in a conflict equally seriously.

Dov Shinar and Wilhelm Kempf’s *Peace journalism: The state of the art* (2007) is important for drawing together some of the major writings on the field. In a concluding chapter, Dov Shinar (ibid: 199–210) suggests that peace journalism does not necessarily mean “good news”; rather it is conceived as “a fairer way to cover conflict, relative to the usual coverage and suggests possibilities to improve professional attitudes and performance; strengthen human, moral and ethical values in the media; widen scholarly and professional media horizons and provide better public service by the media” (ibid: 200).

Shifting the focus

Peace journalism, war and conflict resolution now builds on the theoretical and methodological foundations within these seminal texts but expands the focus to new and significant fields. The first section of the book features an eclectic and contrasting range of approaches, often marginalised in both the mainstream and alternative media debates.

Clifford G. Christians is considered the world's leading authority on communication ethics and in his opening chapter draws on the insights of philosophical anthropology with its stress on the "relational self" (as opposed the liberal "individualistic self") and of social philosophy with its stress on dialogic communication (rather than monologic transmission between discrete individuals) to promote a notion of peace communication. Christians' emphasis on spirituality also highlights an essential role of communication as uncovering the significance in life. "It recognises that our important threat is not physical survival but the uncanny. The ultimate menace occurs when lingual systems start disintegrating."

Debating Herman and Chomsky's propaganda model

One of the major inspirations for peace movement media activists worldwide has been the writings of the American maverick intellectual Noam Chomsky – and in particular those he drew up with his colleague Edward Herman on the propaganda model (PM) (see Herman and Chomsky 1988). Accordingly, the mainstream media are seen as operating primarily as propaganda instruments of dominant economic, political, social, cultural and military interests. Chris Atton (2003: 27), in exploring the ethics of the alternative media, suggests that the works of Chomsky (and Edward Said) are constantly cited in alternative media as the seminal demystifiers of corporate media notions of "objectivity".

Here Oliver Boyd Barrett acknowledges that the PM is useful for showing how the corporate media produce a supply of news and views that fits comfortably within the limits acceptable to power elites. At the same Boyd Barrett joins with Robert A Hackett (2007: 75–96) in criticising the PM for saying little about the mechanisms of propaganda in the text itself. But he is more concerned here to critique the PM for prioritising a *systemic* explanation of media performance, thus downgrading the question of *agency*. In particular, Boyd-Barrett, argues that it is impossible to ignore the links between corporate journalists and the intelligence services and other arms of the "secret state" when analysing the coverage of war

and peace. Focusing on three case studies – of William Laurence, Judith Miller and Michael Gordon – he concludes:

Unless the significance of these operations are factored centrally into peace journalism theory and media theory more generally, Western scholars may be doomed to a pluralist “deficit” model of the press, one that assumes that if only there was some tinkering here and there then the press could at last fully serve its purported roles of watchdog, fourth estate and public sphere.

Richard Lance Keeble similarly critiques peace journalism theory that emphasises professional responses arguing that journalism is best seen as *political* practice. According to Keeble “a dominant strand in PJ theory focuses too closely on the notion of journalism as a privileged, professional activity and fails to take into account the critical intellectual tradition which locates professions historically and politically, seeing them as essentially occupational groupings with a legal monopoly of social and economic opportunities in the marketplace, underwritten by the state”.

He joins John Hartley (2008) in calling for a radical transformation of journalism theory. We need to move away from the concept of the audience as a passive consumer of a professional product to seeing the audience as producers of their own (written or visual) media. This leads Keeble to highlight the peace journalism of the alternative media both historically and globally and to extend the definition of “journalist” beyond the ranks of the professionals to radical media activists, intellectuals and human rights campaigners.

In his chapter, Jake Lynch synthesises critically a range of propaganda theories (e.g. Ellul 1965; Luostarinen 1994; Nohrstedt and Ottosen 2000), focusing in particular on the reporting of the Nato attacks on Kosovo of 1999 and the US/UK invasion of Iraq in 2003. He draws, in particular, on Marianne Perez’s exploration (2006) of George Lakoff’s theory (2004) that two competing frames govern the conduct of US politics: the “nurturant parent” and the “strict father”. Lynch concludes that the logic of peace journalism is “to adumbrate a strategy covering both structure and agency to increase the plenitude of cues and clues for readers and audiences to form their own negotiated or oppositional readings of appeals to support collective violence of one kind or another”.

Peace journalism theory and practice in an international context

The second section examines peace journalism theory and practice in an international context. Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick propose a strikingly original

transnational research exercise to identify psychological responses, firstly to examples of war journalism – and then to these same reports adjusted to peace journalism framings. The aim, they say, would be to identify thresholds at which war journalism can be confidently pronounced harmful to its consumers, and peace journalism, psychologically beneficial, thereby directly informing the global standard.

Agneta Söderberg Jacobson draws on her experience in the Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation in lobbying rank and file journalists and editors in Sweden to adopt the principles of peace journalism. In addition, the foundation works with women's groups in many conflict-ridden countries – such as in the Balkans, South Caucasus and the Middle East. The promotion of women – both as journalists and subjects of journalism – has to be at the heart of peace journalism, she argues. Even the dominant peace journalism model fails to incorporate adequately a gender perspective. Jacobson thus proposes the addition of the opposing factors of gender blindness and gender awareness to Lynch and McGoldrick's model of the contrasting aspects of war journalism and peace journalism (2005: 6). Making the gender analysis more explicit “would surely make the model more attractive to women journalists and to feminists in general (including men)”.

Valerie Alia, in her chapter, explores the ways in which Indigenous peoples around the globe are engaged in a collaborative project that is forging new ways of communicating, and new ways of preventing, mediating and resolving conflicts. In particular, she examines developments in Australia, Greenland, Canada, the United States and Japan. Alia writes of the “guerrilla” or “outlaw” roots of much of Indigenous journalism and she notes, optimistically, that the media guerrillas and outlaws are increasingly coming aboveground and publicising their views and work to an ever-growing global audience.

In contrast to Alia's focus on Indigenous peoples, Florian Zollmann next spotlights the journalism of the American independent journalist Dahr Jamail. Initially reporting from Iraq as a blogger and travel writer, Jamail's distinctive journalism was rapidly recognised and published by various independent and mainstream news organisations. Concentrating on the US attacks on Fallujah, Iraq, in November 2004, Zollmann compares Jamail's reporting with the corporate media's coverage. And through a close textual analysis, he argues that Jamail encapsulates the principles of peace journalism as outlined by Lynch and McGoldrick in their seminal text (op cit). For instance, Jamail focuses on causes, outcomes and the aftermath of the conflict and reveals the effects of violence as well as the suffering of ordinary people. The experiences and views of ordinary Iraqis caught up in the appalling violence of the occupation lie at the heart of Jamail's reporting. Statements by government officials and the military are weighed against these

personal testimonies and, contrary to mainstream media practices, do not make up the major frameworks for journalistic understanding. Moreover, unlike embedded reporters, Jamail does not concentrate on the strategic progress of what is labeled as “warfare”. Instead, he documents the progressive destructiveness of what could rather be described as “high-tech barbarism”.

On the potential of web-based activism

Shifting the focus to India, television producer and academic Pratap Rughani reflects on his own photographic representation of atrocity, drawing on Susan Sontag’s critique of Holocaust photography as in general “re-victimising the victim”. Rughani also highlights the potential of web-based activism in the digital age and how this historical moment can throw up new opportunities for marginalised peoples.

Continuing the theme of web-based witnessing, Donald Matheson and Stuart Allan next assess a range of ways in which war journalism is being rearticulated by social networks such as YouTube and Flickr, personal media such as blogs and Twitter, social sites such as Facebook and virtual worlds such as Second Life, as well as networks enabled over cell phones. Their case studies look at the Mumbai attacks of 26 November 2008, the Greek street protests in December 2008, the Israeli assault on Gaza in the same month and the Sri Lanka government’s final push against the Tamil Tiger rebels in late 2008 and early 2009. In the process Matheson and Allan show how individualised media often intersect with professional and mass media in significant ways as the recording of conflict moves to the level of the interpersonal. As a result, the familiar “culture of distance” engendered by Western journalism’s mediation of witnessing is thrown into sharp relief, with the stress on the suffering – as well as the aspirations for peace – of many of those caught-up in the atrocity resonating in social media sites.

Two journalists next outline their very different ways of promoting peace journalism. First Jean Lee C. Patindol draws on her experience of building up a peace journalists’ network in the Philippines. Because the very notion of “peace” is controversial in her country (often being associated, for instance, with leftist/communist groups) journalists there often find the notion of “peace journalism” confusing – and thus it is abandoned in favour of “conflict-sensitive reporting” (as promoted by Ross Howard, 2003).

In contrast, the author, journalist and political activist Milan Rai directs his spotlight on the London-based *Peace News*, which he jointly edits. After outlining its history and placing it firmly within the tradition of the alternative, radical, dissenting

press of the early part of the 19th century, Rai argues that his journal captures many of the principles of peace journalism (see Lynch and McGoldrick op cit). For instance, it illuminates “issues of structural and cultural violence, as they bear upon the lives of people in a conflict arena, as part of the explanation for violence”; it frames “conflicts as consisting of many parties, pursuing many goals”; makes “peace initiatives and images of solutions more visible, whoever suggests them”; and aims to equip citizens “to distinguish between stated positions, and real goals, when judging whether particular forms of intervention are necessary or desirable” (op cit 28–31). Making the peace initiatives of the Afghan Taliban and of the Iranian government “more visible” were particular priorities in *Peace News* in late 2009.

But Rai also writes that “*Peace News* has functioned in many ways outside the framework of Lynch-McGoldrick-style peace journalism”. For instance, *PN* has not always obeyed the injunction to look at “how shared problems and issues are leading to consequences that all the parties say they never intended”, rather than assigning blame. In many conflict situations, *Peace News* has found it appropriate, and indeed necessary, to “assign blame”, and to identify (and criticise) the hidden objectives that lie behind the rhetoric of “unintended consequences”.

Sociologist Sarah Maltby adds a completely new dimension to the debate over peace and conflict journalism, examining the ways in which the military have used local radio in the Balkans and Afghanistan during peace building and conflict resolution operations. She argues that these activities (while they cannot be considered as “peace journalism”) are positioned in terms resonant with some of the key principles of peace journalism, namely: a commitment to providing a voice to the voiceless; a promotion of peace through open dialogue and an orientation to solution. Moreover, Maltby argues that the military’s self proclaimed orientation to “peace” in radio stations such as Oksigen and Rana FM raises some interesting questions about the use of discourses of peace and empowerment to legitimate military practices which, at times, appear to be culturally naïve.

Critiquing (and transforming) the mainstream

The final section carries a series of case studies which build on the major strand of peace journalism theory and practice – critiquing mainstream news values and myths of “balance” and “objectivity”. Susan Dente Ross and Sevda Alankus, in examining the press coverage of the 2008 election of a new president in the (Greek) Republic of Cyprus and the subsequent bilateral initiatives towards settlement of

“the Cyprus problem”, examine the way in which the corporate media’s obsession with national histories perpetuates the primacy of national identity and the status quo in opposition to those “outside” its borders.

Marlis Prinzing, in contrast, outlines, critically, an ambitious project in which journalists and communication researchers in Germany are not simply critiquing the mainstream but supplying radio, magazines, newspapers, authors and the designers of school curricular materials with features and photographic essays inspired by peace journalism theories.

In a detailed historical, textual analysis, John Tulloch examines the corporate media’s reporting of conscientious objectors at the start of the Second World War. Conscientious objectors (COs) – not all of whom, of course, were pacifists – were then four times more numerous than during World War One and thus, while they were marginalised in the media, they could not be entirely ignored. Often they were represented as pantomime eccentrics or shirkers. Focusing, in particular, on the mass-selling *Daily Mirror*, Tulloch concludes that loud trumpeting of human rights in leader columns, intertwined with jeering sarcasm in the letters page, was probably the best deal COs were likely to get.

Academic and activist James Winter, David Edwards, of the media monitoring group Media Lens (www.medialens.org), and Stephan Russ-Mohl, of the European Journalism Observatory (www.ejo.ch) all analyse aspects of the “war journalism” of the corporate media in Canada, the UK and US. James Winter focuses on the cultural and medial representation of Canada’s role as part of Western imperialism: “Since the Vietnam War, Canadians have taken great delight in ridiculing US foreign policy, with an air of smugness and self-satisfaction,” he writes. “Imagine the surprise, then, as Canadians found themselves up to their necks in the service of imperialism.” Winter reveals that contrary to the “altruistic imagery” of benevolence, Canada’s foreign policy has been fuelled by military-industrial interests complicit with US imperialism.

The major part of Winter’s text discusses coverage of the recent war in Afghanistan by the *Toronto Star*, the largest and most “progressive” newspaper in Canada. According to Winter, this detailed case study “reveals the way in which Canada’s mainstream media justify and promote the war, selling it to Canadians on behalf of the government, war-profiteers and the military”. Winter concludes that “like their American counterparts, the mainstream Canadian media have adopted the role of stenographers to power, and cheerleaders for the war team”.

Relying on Herman and Chomsky’s propaganda model, David Edwards and David Cromwell, of Media Lens, have produced hundreds of pages of evidence on the media’s crucial role in promoting wars. And through their engagement with

journalists, they have been able to pressure mainstream media organisations to alter their standards. In this text, David Edwards explores the limited “spectrum” of media debate (including the BBC) in a range of case studies focusing on Western human rights abuses: “The unthinkable is normalised as a result of the media presenting Western actions within a highly supportive ideological framework,” he writes. While US/UK foreign policy and interventions are presented as benign and with peaceful purposes, the media neglects to discuss credible evidence suggesting “British and American mass killing”.

Edwards, for instance, focuses on the media coverage of a *Lancet* report in 2006 which suggested the US/UK Iraq invasion of 2003 had led to 655,000 excess deaths. In particular, the media discredited the study by suggesting that it was based on a “dodgy methodology”. This was in contrast to research on “the death toll in Congo” which used the same methodological design: “Even though the estimates of death in Congo surprised experienced observers of the conflict, the media reported the figures without concerns about the validity of either the numbers or the methodology,” Edwards says.

Stephan Russ-Mohl discusses recent research about US coverage of terrorism, the 2003 Iraq war and subsequent US/Coalition-occupation from the perspective of an “economic theory of journalism”. He shows how “mediatised” wars tend to become the subject of one or even several issue-attention cycles – with “an upturn, a turnaround, and a downturn phase” of coverage. Russ-Mohl’s economic perspective suggests that shrinking resources of media organisations and an increase in PR and government spin led to a decline in the quality and truthfulness of the mass media.

Peace and pedagogy

Finally, Pakistani journalist and leading media educationist Rukhsana Aslam highlights the way in which a peace journalism curriculum in higher education can both serve to critique dominant values and routines – and provide graduates who will hopefully help in the transformation of the mainstream and the development of alternative, progressive media.

The future

Peace journalism speaks with many voices in this collection. In assembling it, our belief has been that, if the movement for peace/conflict sensitive journalism is

to develop, it must draw from an eclectic range of critical perspectives – and be global in ambition. Give the strength of the opposing forces in journalism, such an enterprise is bound to have a flavour of the quixotic, a conversation within the belly of the monstrous war machine. To withstand these forces, we believe that the movement must be intellectually rigorous, courageous, imaginative, life-affirmative – and open to diversity. We welcome further discussion and thought on the themes explored within this book, and will be happy to convey your feedback to any of the contributors. Over to you!.

- Our contact details: Richard Lance Keeble – rkeeble@lincoln.ac.uk; John Tulloch – jtulloch@lincoln.ac.uk; Florian Zollmann – fzollmann@lincoln.ac.uk.

Notes

- 1 See <http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending> for these details, accessed on 1 May 2009.
- 2 See http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/ukpoverty/downloads/ukpp_key_facts.pdf, accessed on 11 September 2009.
- 3 Even so, mainstream newspapers carry regular reports of defence companies and the military calling for extra funding. For instance, see Webb, Tim (2009) Defence firms call for more spending, *Guardian*, 2 September.
- 4 See <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/index.html>, accessed on 14 September 2009.

References

- Atton, Chris (2003) Ethical issues in alternative media, *Ethical Space: The International Journal of Communication Ethics*, Vol. 1, No. 1 pp 26–31
- Carter, April, Clark, Howard and Randle, Michael (2006) *People power and protest: A bibliography on nonviolent action*, London: Housmans
- Ellul, Jacques (1965) *Propaganda – the formation of men's attitudes*, New York: Knopf
- Hartley, John (2008) Journalism as a human right: The cultural approach to journalism, Löffelholz, Martin and Weaver, David (eds) *Global journalism research: Theories, methods, findings, future*, Oxford: Blackwell pp 39–51
- Herman, Edward and Chomsky, Noam (1988) *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*, New York: Pantheon Books [reissued 1994, London: Vintage Books]
- Howard, Ross (2004) *Conflict-sensitive journalism: A handbook*, Denmark: International Media Support (IMS) and Institute for Media, Policy and Civil Society (IMPACS)

- Lakoff, George (2004) *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*, White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing
- Luostarinen, Heikki (1994) *Sergeants of the mind: news management and journalistic counter-strategies in military conflicts*, Helsinki: Hanki ja Jaa Oy
- Lynch, Jake (1998) *The peace journalism option*, Taplow: Conflict and Peace Forums
- Lynch, Jake and McGoldrick (2005) *Peace journalism*, Stroud: Hawthorn Press
- Monbiot, George (2009) Any real climate effort will hurt. So start with the easy bits. Like war toys, *Guardian*, 23 June
- Nohrstedt, Stig A and Ottosen, Rune (2000) Studying the media Gulf war, Nohrstedt, Stig A and Ottosen, Rune (eds), *Journalism and the new world order*, Nordicom, Gothenburg
- Norton-Taylor, Richard (2009) Brown accused of suppressing report on spiralling arms costs, *Guardian*, 13 August
- Ottosen, Rune (2007) Emphasizing images in peace journalism: A case study from Norway's biggest newspaper, Shinar, Dov and Kempf, Wilhelm (eds) *Peace journalism: The state of the art*, Berlin, Regener pp 111–35
- Perez, Marianne (2006) Moving mainstream media towards a culture of peace. Unpublished thesis at European University Center for Peace Studies at Stadtschlaining/Burg, Austria
- Rizvi, Haider (2008) Global poverty figures revised upward, OneWorld US, 28 August. Available online at <http://us.oneworld.net/article/357172-global-poverty-figures-revised-upward>, accessed on 11 September 2009
- Ross, Susan Dente (2007) (De)Constructing conflict: A focused review of war and peace journalism, Shinar, Dov and Kempf, Wilhelm (eds) *Peace journalism: The state of the art*, Berlin, Regener pp 53–74
- Shinar, Dov and Kempf, Wilhelm (eds) *Peace journalism: The state of the art*, Berlin, Regener
- Woodward, Bob (2004) *Plan of attack*, London: Simon and Schuster/Pocket Books

**SECTION 1. PEACE JOURNALISM:
NEW THEORETICAL POSITIONS**

Non-violence in philosophical and media ethics¹

CLIFFORD G. CHRISTIANS

Non-violence is an ethical principle grounded in the sacredness of human life. Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King developed it beyond a political strategy into a philosophy of life. For the pre-eminent theorist of dialogic communication, Emmanuel Levinas, the Self-Other relation makes peace normative. When the Other's face appears, the infinite is revealed and I am commanded not to kill (Levinas 1981). Along with *dharma* (higher truth), *ahimsa* (non-violence) forms the basis of the Hindu worldview. In communalistic and indigenous cultures, care for the weak and vulnerable (children, the sick and elderly), and sharing material resources are a matter of course. Death and violence at the World Trade Center, suicide bombings in the Middle East, and killing of the innocent in Afghanistan and Iraq cut to our deepest being. Along with the public's revulsion against physical abuse at home, our consternation over brutal crimes and savage wars are a glimmer of hope reflecting the validity of this principle.

Out of non-violence, we articulate ethical theories about not harming the innocent as an obligation that is cosmic and irrespective of our roles or ethnic origin. When peace is an ethical imperative, it is not reduced to the politics of war but is a fundamental way to understand the sacredness of life intrinsic to our humanness. The principle of non-violence promotes a discourse of peaceful coexistence in community life rather than a focus on peace-making between inter-governmental bodies. Flickers of peace are emerging on our media ethics agenda, but only glimmers compared to major struggles with truth, human dignity and social justice. Johan Galtung has developed and applied the principle systematically through peace journalism concerned not simply with the standards of war reporting, but positive peace – the creative, nonviolent resolution of all cultural,

social and political conflicts (e.g. 2000, 2004). As with Galtung, Jake Lynch recognises that military coverage as a media event feeds the very violence it reports and, therefore, has developed the theory and practice of peace initiatives and conflict resolution on the ground (e.g. Lynch and McGoldrick 2005; Lynch 2008). Within this work by media academics and professionals, the broad task remains of bringing the concept of non-violence to intellectual maturity. This chapter seeks to advance that project by giving the non-violence principle theoretical justification.

My perspective on peace and communication is philosophical anthropology.² For my framework, I identify the characteristics common and unique to human beings. The status of philosophical anthropology is controversial within the classical philosophical disciplines at present, that is, epistemology, metaphysics, and ethics. Its agenda has been taken over by the philosophy of mind or eclipsed by analytical philosophy in North America. Therefore, while working out the necessary and sufficient conditions of the human species, my overall argument is more broadly ontological.

Social contract theory

For properly justifying non-violence philosophically, the elephant in the room is social contract theory. In coming to grips with the nature of the human in our establishing non-violence as an ethical principle, we must identify the alternatives to social contract as the dominant paradigm.

In social contract theory, a person's moral and political obligations are dependent on a contract or agreement among a society's members. In its modern terms, social contractualism is given its first full exposition and defence in the moral and political theory of Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679). After Hobbes, John Locke (1632–1704) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) are the best known proponents of this enormously influential theory, in fact, one of the most dominant theories within moral and political philosophy throughout the history of the modern West. In the twentieth century, the social contract tradition gained further momentum as a result of John Rawls' Kantian version.³ In fact, Virginia Held has argued that “contemporary Western society is in the grip of contractual thinking” (1993). Contractual models have, certainly, come to inform a vast variety of relations and interactions among persons.

However, despite its longevity, prominence and sophisticated defenders, a number of philosophers have questioned the very nature of the person at the heart of contract theory (Pateman 1988). The one who engages in contracts is

a Robinson Crusoe, represented by the Hobbesian man, Locke's autonomous self, Rousseau's noble savage, and Rawls' abstract person in the original position. The liberal individual is purported to be universal – raceless, classless and gender neutral – and is taken to represent a generalised model of humanity above cultural differences. But many political thinkers have argued that when we investigate carefully the characteristics of the liberal self, we find not a universal human being, but a historically located, specific type of individual (cf. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/soc-cont.htm>). Macpherson (1973), for example, has concluded that the Hobbesian person is actually a bourgeois man typical of early modern Europe. Feminists have also made it obvious that persons at the heart of the liberal social contract are gendered masculine (e.g. DiStefano 1991). Hobbes' conception of the liberal self, which established the dominant modern conception of the person in Western contract theory, is explicitly masculine. It is radically atomistic and solitary, not owing any of its qualities to anyone else. This model of masculinity, therefore, cannot legitimately claim to be a general representation of all persons. Moreover, such liberal individuals enter into the social contract as a means by which to maximise their own individually considered interests.

For media education and practice committed to the principle of non-violence, the first and radical step is to move beyond contract definitions of the self. When the public is understood in contract terms, aggression and defensiveness are typically considered the natural state of affairs.

Dialogic theory

In terms of a credible ethics of non-violence, philosophical anthropology with its focus on the human, insists that the liberal self be exorcised and replaced by the relational self instead. A shorthand version for peace and communication argues that a dialogic model ought to be substituted for monologic transmission between discrete individuals. In fact, the argument here is stronger – for non-violence to be legitimate intellectually and possible practically, dialogic social philosophy is the only defensible normative communal theory at present. Daryl Koehn (1998), as one example, supports the emphasis in feminist ethics on a relational rather than individualistic self and insists on an empathic instead of a legalistic approach to community life. In the process she argues for a dialogic ethics that makes feminist ethics more credible. A normative dialogic paradigm is a decisive alternative to social contract and a fruitful framework for an ethics of non-violence in an age of globalisation and multiculturalism.

According to the dialogic perspective, *homo sapiens* is the one living species constituted by language; therefore, humans are fundamentally cultural beings. As creators, distributors and users of culture, humans live in a world of their own making. Rather than one-dimensional definitions of the human species as *homo faber*, *homo economicus* or *animale rationale*, the cultural character of our humanness illustrates both our dialogic composition as a species and the relationship of human beings and the media. In traditional epistemology, all acts are monologic, though actions may be coordinated with others. However, when the lingual interpretation of ourselves and our experience constitutes who we are, human action is dialogic. Our experience is then understood largely in terms of rhythm with other non-individuated actors. Humans are dialogic agents within a language community.

Therefore, all moral matters must be seen in communal terms. A self exists only within “webs of interlocation” and all self-interpretation implicitly or explicitly “acknowledges the necessarily social origin of any and all of their conceptions of the good and so of themselves” (Mulhall and Swift 1996: 112). Like feminist ethics, dialogic ethics does not think of morality as an impersonal action-guiding code for an individual, but rather as a shared process of discovery and interpretation in which members of a community continually refine their positions in light of what others have said and done. The most defensible ethical stance is one of continuing thoughtfulness (Koehn op cit: 156–161).

Rather than patch up liberal individualism, the dialogic paradigm enables us to start over intellectually and thereby establish a more credible humanness for understanding non-violence and acting peacefully. As a substitute for individual autonomy, Taylor (1994: 32, 34, 36) summarises the social bondedness of dialogic theory as follows:

We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves and hence of defining our identity, through...rich modes of expression we learn through exchange with others. My discovering my own identity doesn't mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others. My own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others...In the culture of authenticity, relationships are seen as the key loci of self discovery and self affirmation.

The dialogic lineage of Martin Buber (1965), Paulo Freire (1970, 1973) and Emmanuel Levinas insists on emancipatory struggles and transformative action. Together they make a normative commitment to the dialogic unequivocal. In Freire's (1970) perspective, only through dialogue do we fulfil our ontological

and historical vocation of becoming fully human. Under conditions of oppression, through dialogic communication we can gain a critical consciousness as an instrument of liberation (Freire 1973). For Buber, restoring the dialogic ought to be our primary aim as humankind (op cit: 209–24). Buber's philosophy of communication is not content with empirical claims regarding socially produced selves or lingual assertions about symbolic constructions. He speaks prophetically that only as I-Thouness prospers will the I-It modality recede (Buber 1958). Levinas's interaction between the self and the Other makes peace normative; non-violence in his theory is not only a political strategy, but a public philosophy (1981). Together they enable us to endorse dialogue as the apex of normative communication theories and the most appropriate framework for the ethics of non-violence.

Spiritual dimension of the human

In focusing relentlessly on the nature of the human, philosophical anthropology rejects the mainstream's contractual self and validates dialogic communication as the only appropriate framework for the ethics of non-violence. And in concentrating on the relational human in dialogicism, its spiritual dimension becomes *sine qua non*. Buber and Levinas are typically connected to Judaism and Freire's Catholicism is well known. But philosophical anthropology works even more deeply and persistently so that spirituality becomes intrinsic and inescapable. In enhancing rather than suppressing the spiritual dimension, a thicker understanding of humans-as-relational emerges, and a normative strategy is made transparent for acting on the ethics of non-violence. Not only is the liberal self reductionistic, but its secular context prevents it from seeing humans in holistic terms. Therefore, a spacious framework is unveiled by including spirituality within philosophical anthropology rather than adhering to the conceptual boundaries of an epistemology and metaphysics that excludes it.

Spirituality refers to an inherent aspect of everyday life, that perennial propensity of human beings for ultimate meaning. This term defines those sacred times and spaces so engrained in human community that history becomes an empty shell if viewed without it, and our categories blurred if we fail to appreciate spirituality's irrepressible character.

This is not an appeal to a theology of communication or to theological ethics. From St. Augustine in the 5th century to Stanley Hauerwas (see <http://stanleyhauerwas.blogspot.com/>) today, work in theological ethics is imperative reading. But the argument here is not for a series of formal, scholastic theologies. Even where theologians appear

in the argument or elaboration, they serve as springboards to more wide-ranging explanations. Philosophical anthropology with a spiritual inflection does not mean we just write about God or use official theological categories.

Nor is spirituality and non-violence identical to communication and religion. Obviously spirituality comes into its own through institutional religion, and several of the world's major religious traditions enter the analysis here – Jewish, Buddhist, Catholic, Protestant, Animistic, Muslim, Russian Orthodox and so forth. Yet the appeal in spirituality is not basically to organised religions. Religions are filled with distortions; they typically lust after certitude and present dogmatism in the name of truth. Such accusations the world's religions can meet themselves. Spirituality emphasises another dimension – the religious. The concern of philosophical anthropology, in coming to grips with the relational human, is not formalised dogma, but the quality of experience called “spiritual”. In that sense, participation in this analysis of spirituality is welcomed out of concern for peace studies, regardless of whether an explicit theological tradition is held or not. For non-violence to be at home in media ethics, the spiritual dimension of human life will need to be taken seriously.

Spirituality rejects the naïvete that the religious realm can be isolated and established independently. One of the human species' most intriguing problems is why something exists and not nothing, why we find ourselves living on a tiny particle of the vast universe in a minute fragment of time. Our intrinsic spirituality motivates religious life and thought to answer that. Thus the contention here that the religious dimension is still the best form for exploring the human predicament. What are typically dismissed as archaic spiritual values are not limited to a primitive state, but are preoccupations which emerge in those unending struggles across history for freedom and purpose.

In the same way that spirituality brings history into presence, a thematic idea within it might be labelled openness or creativity. While organised religions are normally castigated for being narrow, stifling, and bigoted, the spiritual domain actually means releasing creativity, opening our perception of reality. Spirituality cries out for a polyphonic, multi-dimensional world that prevents both sterility and cacophony.

The most dramatic kind of openness in spirituality, of course, is openness toward the transcendent. Spirituality by definition entails the higher and deeper and more ultimate realities beyond the immanent. In Buber's language it is God, in Paul Tillich (for instance, 1959) a non-symbolic ground of being, in the Russian Orthodox tradition the Primordial principle, and in the New Testament grace. While social contract democracy tends to support a bland, demythologised form

of scientifically acceptable religion, the spirituality of everyday life finds the non-empirical not only meaningful but necessary.

In important ways, therefore, spirituality can be defined as humans thrusting out beyond their embodiments and the limited social order under which they live. Spirituality is, then, the human attempt to reach unconstrained reality and the ultimate sphere, or in Rudolf Otto's (1950) terms, "the numinous". Again, this press towards transcendence is neither new nor passé. The assumption is that human beings have a transcendent dimension which if not encouraged to develop properly will steal through the back door in bizarre and destructive ways. Secular culture thus lives dangerously by shutting out transcendent meaning. In so arguing, spirituality not only enhances philosophical anthropology, but adds an important dimension to contemporary discussions of communication and culture. It insists on the need for a centre, an ultimate focus to curb arbitrariness in human relations. At the least, it encourages journalists to take religious language and rituals seriously as arenas where ultimate matters are given existential significance.

Thus spirituality makes the world of meaning absolutely essential for our well-being as humans – and encourages our working that out in highly practical ways as Freire does. Spirituality opens an imaginative journey into the secrets and mysteries of human meaning. Culture is thus considered an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, and meaning is the fundamental ingredient in human cultures. For spirituality, communication describes the process of creating meanings. Communication is seen as the human attempt to uncover significance in life. It recognises that our important threat is not physical survival but the uncanny. The ultimate menace occurs when lingual systems start disintegrating. We are connected to the history of the human race and to human communities through the realisation that ritual and symbolism are not extraneous to social processes, but intrinsic to humankind as a species.

Social contract has reduced human experience and handles openness awkwardly. The contemporary mind as a whole finds it difficult to grasp the subtlety of our multi-roled, multi-formed existence. Secularisation continues to shape us decisively, yet a revolutionary transformation of consciousness is always held out as a hope by the tradition of spirituality represented here. Its various iterations anticipate the release of the creative, an upsurge of liberating energy, a freeing of people from suffering and dulling restraints. Making spirituality prominent brings all symbolic creations – including song, poetry, drama, metaphor, and worship – into our study of media phenomena.

Above all, the spiritual/religious/numinous is committed to the sacred character of human speech. Spirituality has a sacramental concern for the communication

process rooted in its oral-aural form. Already in the ancient world humans understood the powerful force of words in shaping reality. In the tradition Paulo Freire represents, for example, people are assigned the responsibility of naming as a sign of their partnership with God in forming the creation. Those for whom the spiritual is phosphorescent, stand in awe of oral language. Language is spirit, being, reality – a powerful force of creative energy. Words are understood to produce events, not just describe private thoughts. The spirit of Hebrew poetry in Buber's mysticism sees life as essentially personal throughout – the human and divine, and natural reality too. Spokenness across history warrants our hearing still today. While the relationship between abusive speech and violent behaviour is a complicated one, from a spirituality perspective only the language of non-violence is morally acceptable in human relationships.

Spirituality adds to dialogic theory by challenging us to maintain the mystical quality of language. Where do we find the Bubers now among communication theorists and media practitioners, those who revere dialogue as the primary vehicle for relational living and a personalist world? Where are we committed to protecting the sacramental quality of natural language which the Creator bestowed upon it? Spirituality forces us to consider whether we have any longer a profound appreciation for frail human speech as sacred for all human beings everywhere in that it can divide or reconcile, destroy or build up, enslave or set free. Out of the violence and turmoil in the Middle East, for example, are the inspiring stories of Jews and Muslims working together on water projects in Palestine, and teaching their children each other's religion – proving once again that language can empower the moral imagination toward peace.

Holistic humans

Insisting on the spiritual dimension of our humanness enables us to define relational beings holistic. Humans are spiritual embryos, endowed with mystical power that needs to be cultivated by non-violence. In a holistic view of the human species, there is an unseen power that leads the world's creatures in a harmonious way. In Taoism its name is Tian. With humans as whole beings created by nature, the focus is on nurturing and awakening our basic humanity, that is our whole inner being.

Humans are understood to be an indivisible whole, a vital organic unity with multi-sided moral, mental and physical capacities. The body, mind and heart are indivisibly linked and developed in concert with one another. Even deeper than

political strategies toward peace is the profound educational need to touch our inner being in order to awaken the higher elements. This is a way of knowing that is non-conceptual or pre-conceptual, one in which the inner powers that reside within us are released. Educators committed to holistic humans cultivate a harmonious spirituality that exists and need not be imposed. Human beings in these terms are elevated to their highest and noblest by the very spirit being nurtured (Huang 2007: 1–5).

Life is understood as a journey of releasing the sacred power residing within life itself. Human beings are not simply biological or psychological entities but spiritual beings seeking expression within the physical and cultural world. In these terms, an ethics of non-violence is primarily activated through a special kind of education. Pedagogy provides an atmosphere in which our inner energy is liberated through a natural internal unfolding. It means, further, that human beings must become inwardly certain that they belong to a supersensible world of soul and spirit that always surrounds them while animating them. Thus education is not an instructional system but an art of awakening what is actually there within the human being. Rather than ignore the spiritual dimension, an ideal education enriches the soul and awakens the unity of our whole being – body, mind, and spirit. In other words, education has to activate a sense of the sacred and the interconnectedness of life, and ultimately expose us to the larger vision of what it means to be a human being inhabiting the cosmos (cf. Huang 2007).

Rather than a Taliban-style indoctrination imposed from without, authentic awakening centres on our inner life and only through such quickening can non-violence flourish. Critical thinking is essential to education in general and to journalism education under consideration here, but being mindful is to bring soul into our lives. Compassion is to see our connectedness to others. Educational goals cannot be centred too narrowly on intellectual development or behaviour control that ignores human growth in holistic terms. When we are harmonious within our selves, we are able to see the whole picture of one's being in relation with others and our connection to the universe. Harmony within spreads to compassion for others and oneness with the eternal.

Taoism

The spiritual dimension of the holistic human is stated in different ways and from different cultural perspectives, but with the same meaning. The Protestant theologian H. Richard Niebuhr turned Christian love ethics into a definition of the

person as *The responsible self* (1963). The Dalai Lama's best-selling book, *Ethics for a new millennium* (1999), is written for all though it is intensely spiritual in character. Karol Wojtyla (better known as Pope John Paul II) explicates horizontal love (human-to-human) and vertical love (divine-to-human and human-to-divine) as a trained philosopher speaking to the human race, not as official teaching for the Roman Catholic Church (1981).

As an extended illustration, one way to describe the spiritual dimension of the human is through Taoism.⁴ The spirit of Taoism is to recognise a mysterious power in nature, and to pursue the harmonious state of being united with nature (cf. Gunaratne 2005, esp. Chs 1 and 5). It is particularly applicable to the ethics of non-violence because of its origins in the 4th century BC. It was created as a philosophical system when China was occupied by countries that constantly fought against each other to become the dominant authority. Taoists in that era explored what was driving the conflicts and violence, and how human beings were to live in such a society. Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu are two major figures in developing and advocating it. Lao Tzu's *Tao Te Ching* (2005) is the origin of Taoism and Chuang Tzu's biography, *Chuang Tzu* (1964), presents it poetically.

In terms of Lao Tzu, "Tao cannot be heard, cannot be seen, cannot be told, and should not be named". For him, Tao is a formless mysticism that gives life to all creation and is itself inexhaustible. The Chinese character pronounced as Tao contains two parts – a head (actually an "eye in a head") and a walking foot meaning "to go". Together they mean "the way" (both physically and philosophically/metaphorically) or "the path or road" (Lao Tzu op cit: xiv). Lin Yutang interprets it as truth (Lao Tzu et al 1948: 5). Tao is an energy that guides human action. Tao is within a Self and gradually evolves in the Self when humans embody it. When humans are merged with the Tao, they are at one with nature, both one's "innermost nature and the force of nature we experience everywhere" (Lao Tzu op cit: xv). In this sense "all human actions become as spontaneous and mindless as those of the natural world" (Chuang Tzu op cit: 6).

Chang Tzu's philosophy is about freedom – in his words freeing ourselves from the world (ibid). Thus from Taoism's perspective, the essential point in holistic education is nurturing our inner nature while respecting the mystical power of natural reality. The basic question is how can we live harmoniously in the midst of social orders and values that tend to make human beings soulless objects? Chuang Tzu contends that humans suffer because they have no freedom. We lack freedom because we are attached to material goods, to feelings, knowledge and religions. Our fears and suffering come from our attachments which themselves result from our own web of values. However, anything we believe we own, such as reputation,

wealth, and power can be changed when our value system is altered. What we believe we own is merely attachment which has no eternity, and brings no peace, that is, harmony of heart.

Chuang Tzu emphasises that we tune in to the harmony and balance within our own Self and the larger world, rather than live according to a value system that at its best recognises merely part of a human being's significance to the whole universe. When freed from attachment to the external, we are at peace with others, society, the world, and the universe. We neither struggle for good things nor are bothered by what others consider bad things. We refuse to recognise death as any less desirable than life. Living in an era of constant war over power, wealth and territory, Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu advocate forsaking the value system that twists people's behaviour and intentions and disturbs the harmony within our humanness.

Taoism pursues a society that operates without hurting the harmony within its people and the harmony within nature. Holistic educators promote a form of teaching and learning that retains our inner nature and recognises everyone's uniqueness. Taoism advocates our pursuit of the spiritual life in the midst of the dominant voices touting efficiency, structure and management. It turns people's eyes to the state of life, being at one with the world, in a hope of making the world a better place physically and spiritually. Given the emphasis on the general morality in this chapter, if both media practitioners and the public as a whole were educated in these holistic terms, the ethics of non-violence would flourish (cf. Huang op cit).

Golden rule

Philosophical anthropology that takes spirituality seriously provides us a vocabulary for and definition of the holistic human. The seeds of such holism are already in dialogical humans-in-relation. But spirituality makes holistic humans explicit and transparent. In addition to articulating a human being who thinks and acts non-violently, the spiritual domain gives us a normative strategy for living peacefully – the golden rule (cf. Kang 2006).

From a religious perspective, almost all discussion of the ethics of non-violence refers to the golden rule as a guide for morally appropriate action. Hans Küng is one prominent scholar who emphasises the golden rule as the core of religious ethics. He has concluded, as have many others, that all the great religions require observance of something like: "Do to others as you would have them do to you." This is a norm that is not just hypothetical and conditional, but is categorical,