international **IⱮS** media support

How to Improve
Conflict Reporting

A Report on the International Roundtable on
New Approaches to Conflict Reporting,
Copenhagen, 5-6 October 2003

and

**Invitation to a Virtual Roundtable
on New Approaches to Conflict Reporting**

Contents

1. Introduction

❑ How does conflict reporting impact on war?
❑ How can conflict reporting be improved?

On 5 and 6 October 2003 IMS convened the International Roundtable on Conflict Reporting in Copenhagen to advance the international debate on conflict reporting.

The participants at the Copenhagen Roundtable were all well-qualified and experienced media professionals, war reporters and media trainers. They came from Burundi, Canada, India, Indonesia, Middle East, Scandinavia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the UK and US.

This report seeks to outline the main issues discussed during the roundtable and illustrate some of the dominant trends that emerged during the discussions. Through the use of direct quotations, the report shows the differing stances of the various participants, thereby indicating both convergences and divergences of opinion. The report does not try to conclusively define any of the numerous debatable issues within the field of conflict reporting, but rather act as a catalyst for further dialogue and the ongoing development of related methodologies and implementing practices.

IMS wants more professionals to join this debate. We have therefore established a Virtual Roundtable on the Internet. You are invited to join this Roundtable. You can join now at: http://www.i-m-s.dk/roundtable

The Virtual Roundtable is focussed on four open questions. These are derived from the discussions at the roundtable in Copenhagen.

Virtual Roundtable Open Questions

1. What road to the future? Classical objective journalism or new methodologies for conflict reporting?

2. Are new methodologies for conflict reporting credible as a means of effecting change in conflict situations?

3. Should media engaged in propaganda and hate speech in war zones be considered non-journalists, or even combatants?

4. Do western media apply double standards when they criticise others for not being objective, whilst not being sufficiently critical of their own work?

In publishing this report and hosting the Virtual Roundtable, IMS hopes to include in the continued discussion more media training institutions, media organisations and individual media practitioners. As Ross Howard from Canada concluded at the end of the roundtable:

> "Many times during these days we have referred to what people were thinking and talking about concerning conflict reporting 15 years ago. Not that much has changed. Yes, one thing: there are far, far more professional journalists who are thinking and talking about this today than ever before."

2. Why a Roundtable on Conflict Reporting?

Over the last years it has been generally acknowledged that conflict coverage, whether by international news agencies or local reporters, produces its own significant impacts on conflict.

Like everyone else, warlords in Mogadishu listen to the radio, the Pentagon watches CNN and Arab policy makers watch Al Jazeera. Newspapers in Abidjan whip up emotions in the midst of the civil war; whilst in Sri Lanka the press is as much a part of the problem as a solution. The Serbian media did much to drive home this point, as did Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines in Kigali, which is often referred to as one of the most horrific misuses of 'media' in recent times.

Meanwhile, more and more local and international groups, media trainers, media institutions and others have developed methodologies for interventions aimed at countering the dangerous effects of poor or deliberately manipulated conflict coverage or for media interventions designed to reduce conflict through a change in the way the media work. These and other approaches have already been translated into numerous seminars, training sessions, booklets, handbooks and other products for journalists, editors and publishers across the globe. A Google search on 'peace journalism' presently gives 1,520 hits, whilst 'conflict sensitive reporting' will add a further 13.

However, in the field of conflict reporting, no sign of consensus on 'the right approach' has yet emerged amongst either the professionals who deal consistently with the issue, or the wider media community. Some actors who promote new concepts within the field of conflict coverage have faced fierce resistance from the very media communities they are trying to assist, often because journalists and editors feel - rightly or wrongly - that treasured values of their profession are now being questioned. The media fraternity watches the debate on conflict coverage with scepticism, fearing an attack on exactly those core values and standards upon which modern journalism bases its claim to legitimacy.

One of the core questions is as simple as it is good: How can a reporter ever remain independent, unbiased and faithful to the truth if she/he is also to promote peace, reconciliation or other such concepts? In answering, some will claim that a moral obligation rests on the modern conflict reporter to report in ways which take into account our accumulated knowledge on how reporting impacts on the war itself. If this causes the reporter to violate old-time standards, otherwise accepted as the cornerstones of professional journalism, so be it. Any other approach would be immoral, since it could cost lives.

Others argue that modern conflict reporting must at all times adhere to accepted standards of professional journalism – and only then add new qualities, like better understanding of the dynamics of conflict, more sophisticated selection of sources or other innocent 'tools'. If the core standards of professional journalism are not respected, any chance of producing positive impact on the conflict through journalism is soon undermined.

3. Peace Journalism and Conflict Sensitive Reporting

Introduction
The discussions about peace journalism and conflict sensitive journalism revolved around a number of themes. The issue of how different the two concepts were from that of classical objective journalism was raised. In this regard, some advocated that the two were not as

divergent as they might appear. While it was argued that new methodologies for conflict reporting set out to pursue a pre-set agendas, other stated that much journalism already follows such agendas, whether overt or not, based upon the current socio-political influences and trends of the day. In this regard, new methodologies for conflict reporting can seek to counter general trends by looking for alternative perspectives that bring wider understanding. In addition, it was argued that the pursuit of 'objectivity' above all else was fundamentally a western concept that was not always applicable in other countries.

Advocates of peace journalism also made the linkage between these concepts and adherence to the basic professional standards of objectivity, reliability and impartiality. In this regard, it was argued that classical objective journalism and new methodologies for conflict reporting are not inherently contradictory, but rather compatible with one another, with the latter possibly being seen as a 'humanist' extension of the former.

In contrast, the inherent danger of consciously choosing to achieve a purpose other than the practice of professional journalism as a goal unto itself was raised. It was felt by some that this could damage the role of the media as an impartial commentator. But it was also pointed out that professional journalism should by its very definition lead to the peaceful resolution of conflict, because it serves to diversify dialogue and broaden the range of opinions being heard.

General Discussions
As an introduction to the issue, Ross Howard noted, "Journalists mediate conflict, whether they intend to or not. The old theory works: professional journalism – which is to say accurate, impartial and responsible reporting – has automatic potential for contributing to conflict resolution. This is clear. How much more it can do and still be termed journalism, remains subject to debate."

In this regard, it was meant that regular professionally practised journalism in a conflict environment opens channels for communication, educates people, builds confidence, frames conflicts, humanises disputants, provides emotional outlets and notes solutions elsewhere. These are normal unintended outcomes of good reporting, where it is allowed to flourish. These are also the tools and objectives which professional conflict mediators intentionally use, often less publicly. In was the opinion of Ross Howard that the similarities are undeniable even if journalists or media managers seldom see it that way.

An awareness or sensitivity among journalists of the inherent or automatic impact of their work upon conflict inevitably makes for better journalism, argues Howard. It creates a more well-informed analysis of the conflict and it extends the range of story angles and ideas the journalist pursues. It vastly expands traditional disengaged and spectator-style reporting. It is not agenda-driven journalism, but it is conflict sensitive reporting It is a starting point for exploring the role of journalism further..

Moreover, Ross Howard described the Jake Lynch concept of peace journalism as 'putting the cat among the pigeons', or taking that exploration in a determined direction. It was further elaborated that Jake Lynch advocated a peace journalism-approach that consciously adopts an agenda for peace as an alternative agenda for war. To many traditional media professionals, this was committing the unforgivable transgression of crossing the line to outright advocacy at the expense of the traditional principle of objectivity.

It was further advocated by Ross Howard that there are five journalistic patterns of media work, and of potential media interventions, to be considered vis-à-vis conflict reporting:

1. The very basic journalism, lacking in professional training and resources and suffering manipulation by state or other powerful interests.

2. Journalism enjoying substantial freedom, employing sophisticated skills like economic, environmental and investigative reporting, protected by impartial laws.

3. Journalism sensitised to its role in and impact on conflict and exploring whether conflict resolution can be and should be one of its recognised roles or core values.

4. Pro-active use of media techniques to address specific urgent issues such as countering hate propaganda or providing practical information such as humanitarian relief, AIDS education or voting rights.

5. Intentional use of the media to influence attitudes towards an outcome of conflict resolution.

However, Ross Howard and others at the roundtable do not look at the fifth point as conventional journalism. Type 5 media intervention is overt advocacy of and activism for conflict reduction. However, Howard added, "It can't just be called peace propaganda. Most of the intended outcome programming I have seen scrupulously adheres to the basic journalistic principles of accuracy, impartiality and responsibility, which is definitely not what propaganda is based on."

Ross Howard did not think new approaches and ideals were necessarily required to redress the media's relevance to conflict. It might be just enough to use the old ones. He went on to say, "Look at the work of the FOX Television network in the USA. During the invasion of Iraq, newscasters waved and wore American flags, and abandoned all impartiality or fairness by providing a kind of play-by-play home-team coverage of the war between 'our boys versus the enemy'. It was not professional journalism. Increasingly, this uncritical (and overtly partisan) journalism is contributing to a dangerous American public isolation and insulation from reality on the global scene. Restoring and introducing critical thinking to Westerns journalism is a partial antidote to the FOX News style of journalism. We need to restore some old standards".

Jake Lynch started by saying that he no longer uses the phrase 'peace journalism' when working in the UK, as it has created much misunderstanding and opposition. Instead the concept of 'Reporting the World' has been introduced. Jake Lynch stated, "we need to take a philosophical step forward. We have been discussing interventions, as if media development is something 'we do to them'. I think we should start looking as ourselves as part in a global campaign, based on mutuality, solidarity and dialogue. People in other parts of the world who have seen the war in Iraq covered by CNN, BBC and – for the first time – Al Jazeera. They say, 'we have seen western media, thank you very much. Who are you to tell us?' If we can say we are trying to make a change in our own media, and we are here to offer solidarity, it will affect our credibility."

Furthermore, Jake Lynch talked about media's responsibility, saying, "If violence is presented as autistic, as dislodged from the process and the structure it is part of, it might seem to be a good idea to use more violence. But if we illuminate the process behind development assistance might seem to be a better idea. The choice of which way to go is partly dependent on how the violence is presented in media."

The need and interest for peace journalism is different in different countries, according to Jake Lynch. He states, "In many countries the rationale for peace journalism is clear. There is an urgent need to shift the society away from violence. This is something agreed on by all groups in society, including journalists. In countries like Georgia, Indonesia, or Burundi, journalists see themselves as proponents of conflict resolution. In the UK the rationale is remedial. A matter of balancing an unbalanced media industry. Many journalists see objectivity as a state of grace,

maybe even the Holy Grail. They have a monopoly on that view. Anybody else can see how objectivity is connected to economic and political structures. There are hidden biases. Official sources are seldom questioned. If the peace researcher Johan Galtung says that a particular war 'sucks', a lot of people will ask 'who is he to say so?' However, if President Bush says 'you are either with us or with the terrorists' it is not questioned because he is the President."

In addition, Andrew Puddephat offered an explanation as to why 'peace' could be a suspicious word in the minds of many journalists. This was because "the Soviet Union for 40 years branded a whole range of schemes with the word 'peace'. Peace congresses, peace initiatives – when the real objective was to secure Soviet domination. Therefore 'peace' as a brand has had a troubled history." Peter Tygesen thought that the opposition to peace journalism was about 'serving' a particular agenda. In this regard, he stated, "If a journalist is asked to serve peace they get uneasy. Journalists never like to serve anything."

Concerning the discussions about 'objectivity', Siddharth Varadarajan, offered the perspective that "the big problem for many Western journalists is a lack of objectivity. If I look at the Indian situation the big problem is that journalists are not objective. They take the official version, don't speak to the other side – violate all the principles of objectivity. That is what leads to war journalism. Why, therefore, are we knocking the idea of objectivity?"

In this context, Omary Walid provided the example that "in our region everybody, Arabs and Jews, believe they want peace. Some Israelis think they can reach peace by transferring all the Arabs, and there are Arabs who believe peace can be reached by dismantling the whole of Israel. The Palestinians think that the first condition for peace it to dismantle the Israeli settlements in the West Bank and Gaza strip whilst the Israelis believe that to dismantle these settlements is the first condition for war. The Palestinians are fighting for their freedom and they believe that is the way to reach peace, whilst the Israelis believe that is the way to continue the crisis. Where is the peace journalism here? Where is the war journalism?"

From the Sri Lankan context, Sunanda Deshapriya stated that "the question was raised: are media peace-makers or peace-breakers? I would like to put the question a little differently: Are media a part of the problem or a part of the solution? I don't think media can break a peace process if it is strong and backed by the people. But it can be part of the problem. Sri Lankan news media have been part of the problem."

In discussing these wider issues of the role of the media in conflict, Lena Slachmuijlder stated that an important journalistic mission was to search for solutions. "When we don't search for solutions we give more voice to one side, we demonise the other, we sensationalise the conflict, we make money out of selling newspapers… I think we should start discussing how we as journalists can promote solutions in all conflicts, whether the conflict is totally non-violent, or a open war."

Furthermore, Jake Lynch did not think journalists had to be that active to find or promote solutions. "There are always people in any conflict working for solutions. The problem is that they are not always seen or heard. Other people are seen and heard. One of the current conflicts in UK media is the discussion about asylum seekers. The competition between the two leading parties is about which of them can be tougher on asylum seekers. So the space between them is very narrow, and most of the media in working in that narrow space. I think the mission for journalists is to try to seek out other voices. We can't report about all reality, as reality is infinite in size. We have to choose which parts of the reality to report."

Jake Lynch also stressed the fact that media provides a gallery for political messages. In this regard, he recalled allegations about Iraq weapon's stocks from 1991, where 10,000 litres of anthrax should be hidden. These 'facts' turned up as graphics stacks on the BBC, where it was used and reused over and over again. Jake Lynch stated, "That was the intention. It was a fact created in order to be reported. The journalist's responsibility is to find out if these 'facts' are reliable before starting to repeat them. In the case of the anthrax, it is a fact that in its liquid form, which is measured in litres, the substance only has a shelf-life of two or three years. The story could therefore possibly not have been true and the journalists should have found out and stopped reporting."

However, Andrew Puddephat pointed out that there are "dangers in seeing media as having a function to promote a particular point of view". In this regard, Siddharth Varadarajan agreed, stating, "If a journalist practices truth it will promote peace. In the absence of truth-telling you have rumour-mongering and a lot of other problems. I am a little uncomfortable about peace being a direct aim of my work as journalist. If I allow that to be the driving force what will happen if someone else in our organisation has another aim that I do not agree with? Papers should support organisations working for peace and be truthful about their work. However, if the aim for the Times of India would be to promote peace between India and Pakistan, I am sure that if we cover what is happening honestly and open up our columns for different opinions, it will contribute to peace. However, the minute I put it into my agenda it affects the papers credibility. The professional code of conduct puts us in a win-win situation. Then it will be very hard for anyone to use media to promote the cause of war. If we are professional, that is enough."

In contrast Jake Lynch stated that "telling the truth is not enough. 'Truth' is an infinite category. It all depends on which part of the truth you focus on. Let me give one example: On Thursday morning it was true that a suicide bomber had killed 19 people in Haifa. It may be less important than the fact that that morning was day 114 of Israel's illegal 36-year occupation of Palestinian lands. By values and conventions in the industry, supported by political and economic imperatives, there is an in-built bias against certain portions of the truth. The problem with diversity today is that non-violence never gets a fair crack of the whip. Therefore some media action – positive strategies – is needed to give society an informed choice."

In this discussion, Ross Howard pointed out the difference between 'agents' and 'activists'. "As journalists we have to acknowledge that we are agents of change. That role we must defend, more vigorously. However, we are stuck on whether or not we are activists for change. That is the issue.

Kwame Kari Kari offered a different perspective from which to view the discussions. He stated, "are we not safer if we say there ought to be different media, doing different things? The traditional definition of journalism has not always been the same. And in some situations, even today, it might be too idealistic. It you live in Liberia and try to report the truth it will bring instant death. What can you do? If you live in Botswana, where people die of AIDS everyday, and run a radio station, should you not promote the use of condoms? Is that propaganda? The high level of journalism cannot be practised everywhere. We can't compare the Times of India with a small newspaper in Gambia."

Despite her participation in the programme 'Reporting for Peace', Fiona Lloyd raised the question about the word 'peace', saying, "peace is not a neutral or innocent term. I don't want peace without justice. I want to find a more nuanced approach. It is not so much a question of promoting peace, but open up a space for, and value, the non-violent options to solving conflicts.

It is not sunshine journalism, or soft journalism. It often demands more of investigative journalism, to seek out those other voices. It demands the highest journalistic standards. "

In this context, Andrew Puddephat gave a historical example that "there is another side to this. Some of the worst things that happened during the 20th century happened because France and Britain did not take earlier action against nazi-Germany. If they had not practiced peace, supported by media, we would not have had the Holocaust."

Jake Lynch also contributed further by adding, "if the news is presented as a series of unconnected events that may exclude process and without process it is hard to diagnose those events in the right way. If incidents of violence are reported as isolated events, without background, media do not support understanding. The news machine too often leaves the background out."

Ross Howard concluded, "the debate cannot be finished here. It is necessary to continue to explore the possibility that conventional journalism might not be enough to make a difference in a lot of countries, particularly as those countries define journalism. Those of us who argue that conventional journalism, if sharpened up again, can restore its roots and become conflict sensitive, may have to prove it."

4. Hate Speech

Introduction
The United Nations defines 'hate speech' under Article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), General Assembly resolution from 1976, as:

> "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."

Furthermore, according to a new provision adopted by the Council of Europe in November 2002, the Council bans 'any written material, any images or any other representation of ideas or theories, which advocates, promotes or incites hatred, discrimination or violence, against any individual or group of individuals, based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, as well as religion if used as pretext for any of these factors'.

The roundtable spent considerable time discussing hate speech. This included issues such as what constitutes hate speech and whether media being used for and/or engaged in propaganda in conflict situations can legitimately be viewed as non-journalist, or even combatants. In addition, there were discussions about possible duplicity in the western media in labelling others as propagandistic, whilst not turning a critical eye to their own actions. There was also debate about how much influence hate speech can actually have in sparking violent conflict and how it can realistically be countered by local, regional and international stakeholders.

General Discussions
The discussion started with the story of Radio Mille Collines in Rwanda, accused of being partially responsible of genocide in 1994. The radio station was founded by Hutu extremists and directly called for massacre of Tutsis. There was much agreement around the table that Radio Mille Collines was not media – or journalism – in the professional sense of the word. It is also a rare and extreme example, with nothing quite as extreme having emerged in other conflicts since.

However, there was debate about the accountability and proportionality of holding Radio Mille Collines responsible for the Rwandan genocide. Loretta Hieber questioned the role of the radio, stating, "What bothers me is the belief that someone would listen to the radio station, take a machete and kill someone. There is no direct proof it worked that way. I'm wondering if we are not making a mistake referring to Radio Mille Collines as 'media'. It reminds me of when I was at the Gaza strip. There was a soldier, listening to the radio, and when he got the order he shot. The radio was used as a mean of communication, a walkie-talkie, not media. We don't know what the effect was of Radio Mille Collines. There was a military, political system working and the radio was a mean of communicating their message. The radio probably created a society of violence – yes – but so did the schools, the churches. The radio was just one player."

The next example – Serbian radio and TV during the Balkan wars – did not create the same consensus. There was some discussion about the NATO bombing of the Serbian broadcaster and whether such actions could be justified by labelling the enemy's media as propaganda? Could the status of journalists be removed from those killed by the NATO bombing because they were working for the state broadcaster? Can messages from the media in a country at war be called hate speech and if so, what about the current popularised US phrase, 'War Against Terror'?

As Andrew Puddephat put it, "is there a media in the world that does not have the sense of patriotism, convey a sense of fear in a conflict and project the sense of 'the other'. If any media were free from that, it could be interesting."

Furthermore, Siddharth Varadarajan highlighted the fact that the Committee for Protection of Journalists did not count the Serbian journalists killed by NATO bombing, as they were not considered journalists, because the broadcaster was deemed a vehicle for propaganda. He stated, "they may be right or they may be wrong, but in any conflict situation it is very dangerous to allow one of the parties to dub reporters from the other side as propagandists, and not give them the protection that journalists normally get. If tomorrow Russians start calling Chechnya journalists bandits or if Saddam Hussein had declared that all CNN reporters CIA-spies… It is a slippery road to go down. When the United States bombed the Iraqi government TV-stations nobody was really protesting, as they were propagandists. What they manage to do is to say that if you don't agree with the output of a particular media station it becomes a legitimate military target."

Siddharth Varadarajan also spoke about the local Gujarat media during the outbreak of violence in the Indian province in 2002. Many of them played a dubious role, circulating false information and rumours, inciting violence. "This was a violation against Indian law. If a journalist is crossing the line of law, the law has to be applied on that person. It is a little different in a war between two countries when one part is deciding which medium is propaganda."

Omary Walid talked about local and regional radio stations in the Middle East enhancing hatred. When a small radio station says "the Arabs are snakes, we must crush their heads" it is quoted by many bigger newspapers and broadcasters. "This makes media a tool for killing", Omary Walid stated. In seeking to clarify what the media should and should not report, Andrew Puddephat asked, "if the head of a state calls people from another state snakes, and think their heads should be crushed – should we not report this in the media?" "Of course we should" replied Omary Walid, "there is no other choice. It is news".

The question of hate speech in the western media was also raised. Siddharth Varadarajan stated that "this whole debate over weapons of mass destruction and the uncritical selection of experts. We never talk about those people as providers of hate speech. Why not? The media helped to

justify a war that took 10,000 to 15,000 people's lives. We need to broaden the question of responsibility, even in the West."

Martin Breum gave one example from Sudan, stating, "it is very hard to take groups of journalists out of the discussion because they don't fit all the professional standards. The media might have a huge impact. Let us say that someone decides that the state broadcaster of Sudan does not provide journalism but propaganda, which is true. It is a war mongering national broadcaster. If we excluded working with Radio Omdoman in Sudan the only national broadcaster would be excluded from our work. It is impossible from my point of view."

Siddharth Varadarajan wanted to stress the importance of using the tools of the journalistic craft. When journalists question facts and opinions from leaders and others they will work against the escalation of conflict. "In October, Tony Blair stated that it would take 45 minutes for Iraq to launch its weapons. That statement should have been challenged then, not nine months later if the journalists had used their professional tools. It is the same in India. When the Indian government states a crisis with Pakistan including efforts to stop cross border terrorism. 95% of the media say 'Yes, yes, that is fine'. Then the government says, 'the danger is over, we can bring our troops back' and the same media say, 'brilliant timing'. This sickness that we willingly accept what our government states, will sometimes bring us directly into hate speech."

Loretta Hieber questioned the term 'hate', when she said, "If you want to create an atmosphere supporting military action it is more often about 'fear'. The feeling you are trying to provoke is fear. During World War Two the nazi propaganda machine used fear most effectively when the Russians were coming into Berlin. The propaganda convinced people to get up and take military action against the Russian tanks – small boys, old women. They did not 'hate' the Russians. They were afraid. September 11 in the Unites States is the same. There is an atmosphere of fear of the other in the US. The question is 'what will they do if we don't strike first'. I think the media, wittingly or unwittingly, have played into that. I don't think people hated the Iraqis; they were afraid what the Iraqis might do. An the American media lead them to this atmosphere of fear."

To conclude on this subject, Andrew Puddephat stated, "it seems to me that the idea of a clear definition on hate speech disappeared. The media can be an instrument of official policy and the difference between CNN, headlining 'War Against Terror', and Radio Mille Collines directing listeners to kill people is one of degree, not kind."

In a group session the problem of hate speech was explored again and the group's conclusions was not to go for more formal regulations or legislation, but to support self-regulation within the media community and – most of all – try to increase the number of voices being heard. Pluralism, diversity and openness were seen as the best tools to drown out voices of hatred.

5. Peace message – but is it journalism? And is journalism enough?

Introduction
Participants at the roundtable included those not solely engaged in professional journalism, but also in intended outcome programming or communication for peace. This therefore brought an additional perspective to the discussions about working with the media for peace, although not through the use of classical independent journalism.

The discussions included whether the media had a role to play in disseminating specific pre-set messages to the public. In addition, the question of whether using the media as a

communications tool was conducive for the creation of long-term sustainable institutions was raised. This point was based upon an observation that external funding can artificially distort media landscapes and when funding ceases, media institutions are often no longer financially viable as independent entities.

General Discussions

Loretta Hieber, who works for WHO in Geneva, has been engaged in different UN health projects in co-operation with media. In this regard, she wanted to bring in another perspective to the discussions about intend outcome programming and stated, "giving information to people is not an end in itself. We know perfectly well that we can tell a woman in a refugee camp that there in a clinic across the street where she can be tested for TB. This does not mean she will do so. Even in a humanitarian crisis people will not act on the information. There are many other elements needed to change people's behaviour. When we talk about media and peace building we must realise that giving information is just one part. There are many other factors, such as reinforcement of the masses, designating opinion leaders, modelling behaviour… Is this the role of media and journalists? If we want to change the way people think and act, to create peace, we have to teach critical thinking in schools and many other things – not just broadcast programs. A journalist might say, 'our only role is to provide accurate information'. Then I am saying, from the public health sector's point of view, that's a very small step in the change of behaviour. Journalism can learn from other sectors."

Omary Walid, however, was critical about this connection between journalism and humanitarian information, stating that "humanitarian media is not journalism, they are very close to propaganda telling the audience what they should do and think. It is a contradiction to journalism." In response, Loretta Hieber recalled a cholera epidemic in Africa in the mid 1990's. "The BBC was asked to broadcast some information in one of their local languages, ensuring that the local population would boil their water before using it. The BBC refused, saying, 'we are journalists. We are not here to intervene in this crisis'. The change in attitude is enormous since then. Mainstream media has become a lot more open to give solutions and support change in behaviour."

Lena Slachmuijlder, working for Search For Common Ground with radio station Studio Ijambo in Bujumbura, Burundi, informed, "we work with people from all sides of the conflict. We are creating teams of journalists, coming from both the Tutu extremist and the Hutu extremist side. We brought those professionals – because they still were professionals – together to work as a team. It gave us listeners, as these journalists already were well-known. Secondly it gave us access to information, as people did not respond to questions from the other side. To put people from both sides together in teams gave us credibility. We talk to all sides. The best protection we have is our professionalism."

However, Lena Slachmuijlder also stated that, "sometimes we go beyond what ordinary news reports when we go to search out for positive reports. We produce a weekly program about someone who has saved the life of another from another ethnicity. We began to develop other ways of communication, to bring information about peace, tolerance, diversity and warn of rumours and stereotypes. We have two soap operas running. One is on episode 600. It remains the most popular program in the country. It is about two families of different ethnicity. We never tell who is who. The father of one has been killed buy a member of the other family. This is a reality. 92 percent of the Burundians have lost someone in the conflict. Studio Ijambo give these people hope and another way of looking at things. This can be done through drama."

6. Media Environments and Frameworks

Introduction
There was general agreement round the table that the ability of the individual journalist to conduct good – or bad – reporting is not an isolated matter. Even if journalists received extensive training, this was often not enough. Independent and professional journalism needs a structural framework within which to function. Most important for this is the protection of freedom of expression. However, for obvious reasons, this is lacking in many conflict areas.

General Discussions
Sunanda Deshapriya informed the group about the Sri Lankan reality, "one needs a holistic approach. If you don't have journalist solidarity and strong trade unions nothing happens. Just before I came here a journalist called me and said she had been contesting for a journalist organisation and her editor said 'by four o'clock I need a resignation from you, otherwise you are going to lose your job'. If you don't fight for freedom of expression you can't work for sensitive conflict reporting."

Examples from Burundi were given by Lena Slachmuijlder about what diversity and media pluralism can mean. In 1997 the first independent radio station was opened. Now there are about ten radio stations. "The number is amazing for such a small country, undergoing a civil war. And it means a lot for the development of the country. Media pluralism gives people a choice. Even if there still are government controlled radio stations there are alternatives. Between noon and 2 o'clock, the ordinary Burundian will change channels on their radio sets to listen to 3 or 4 different versions of the news to figure out what they believe. To decipher what actually is going on. What is true? What is propaganda? This cannot be underestimated."

Lena Slachmuijlder also told about a joint effort by all independent Burundi radio stations to stop the ban against two radio stations. The ban had been put on the stations because they had talked to a rebel leader not involved in the peace process. The radio stations thought it was wrong to exclude him and deliberately opposed a law to prevent this. The other radio stations agreed. As a result, after two weeks the banned radio stations were back on air, due to the international pressure and solidarity from all other independent radio stations.

Kwame Kari Kari expressed concern about the future of press freedom in systems such as Burundi, where there was dependency on donor funding. "If the pluralism is forced on people by international forces and money from the outside – how will it remain? I am sure there is progress by encouraging people to be professional, but then there is no sustainability."

Martin Breum talked about the Central Asian example, stating, "Donors have been present there since the breakdown of the Soviet Union, putting in substantial lot of money. It seems as if the introduction of new journalism concepts is only sellable if it is followed by external money. It is a donor driven media development. Very little is coming from the media community in these countries."

As an example of the need for broad approaches that take into account the wider structure media environment, Kwame Kari Kari pointed out the various different aspects needed in order to improve conflict reporting in Ivory Coast. "Training in ethics for journalists is very critical. A more independent ownership of the press, away from politics. People with money must use them to set up non-partisan newspapers. Transformation of the state owned radio and television into public service broadcasting. Strengthen the self-regulatory bodies. Encourage media legislation reform."

Christina Dahlman concluded, "We must realise that we can't wait. We can't say that democratisation or freedom of the press must wait; it will be put in place when we have peace. It needs to be put into the humanitarian assistance too. There has to be a long-term perspective, even in the middle of the conflict. Otherwise we will undermine what is coming afterwards."

The group session on framework policies ended up with a long list of recommendations. "A variety of conflict types and situations would require a variety of appropriate approaches to addressing the factors required for creating necessary conditions for media coverage, media survival and media development. Any strategies for creating the necessary conditions would involve initiatives of local civil society activists, as well as interventions by the international community. Some of the requirements for enabling media coverage would include:

1. Consideration of the specific priority needs and specific situations of media in conflict;

2. Need for an assessment to identify specific needs for the media as a basis for determining a program of assistance according to immediate short-term and long-term needs;

3. Support the development of a policy framework which includes information strategies on humanitarian needs as part of de-mobilization, disarmament and reintegration;

4. Support, as part of the legal reforms required, a policy framework that promotes transforming the state media into public media accessible to all viewpoints, as well as supporting a market condition for sustaining private media enterprises;

5. Need to develop a policy framework and mechanisms for the safety and protection of journalists;

6. Need to provide an enabling environment for the media to cover conflict without hindrance or interference, including free access to all areas under conflict, and access to peace processes and negotiations;

7. Create opportunities for networking among journalists in a region of conflicts, or from different sides of a conflict, to exchange experiences in professional practice;

8. Consider the need to facilitate the establishment of media associations where such structures have completely collapsed;

9. Support the development of mechanisms for financial support to journalist's families; rescuing journalists in danger into exile; "safe houses" for the persecuted and access to legal aid and legal support.

7. Evaluating Impact

Introduction
One question raised several times during the roundtable was about how to evaluate the impact of interventions aimed at addressing the issue of conflict reporting. Due to the complexities of both the immediate and wider objectives of many interventions in this field, it was seen by the participants as a particularly problematic area in which to gather the necessary empirical data. In addition, a number of the participants felt that they, as trainers, would like to have more structured feedback about their approaches to communicating conflict reporting issues to local journalists.

General Discussions
Ross Howard asked Sunanda Deshapriya, "Many of us have been involved in conflict sensitive reporting interventions in Sri Lanka. Still you say very little has happened. Have any of our efforts made any difference or have we wasted our time and money?" Sunanda Deshapriya's

response was that some changes have been made, but not much in mainstream media. He stressed structural problems, such as lack editorial and journalistic independence and other factors as the main hindrances to change.

The issue of evaluating impact was further discussed again later in a group session. How do we know if we make a change? How can donors evaluate different interventions? Are we wasting our time and money? As a result, the group identified some potential ways to improve evaluation of interventions:

1. Base line media studies should be built into any media intervention;
2. Identify and share quantifiable indicators of conflict sensitivity;
3. A new language to be able to communicate with each other, and donors;
4. Donors must understand the importance of pre-project assessments;
5. Develop methods of career path tracking to find out what has happened to people. Go back to trainees afterwards and ask them what they have accomplished;
6. Ask the trainees how their progress could be measured;
7. Tell the trainees that they, and their work, will be monitored;
8. Ask trainees about the training, while it as going on, to find out what is working
9. Readers' surveys can be used;
10. Use knowledge from other areas in society;
11. To evaluate changes in society, and media's impact on those changes, is very hard and perhaps even impossible. The same goes for media's impact in conflicts.

8. Practical Actions for Improving Conflict Reporting

The question was posed: What can we – as journalists, as trainers, as agents of change – do to improve conflict reporting in our media environment? In response there were a number of ideas put forward on this issue during the Roundtable. Here are some:

Using Existing Policies and Guidelines
Jake Lynch quoted the BBC 'Producer's Guidelines', which among other things says 'all views should be reflected to mirror the depth and spread of opinion in the UK'. "This does not happen. According to research 44% of the British population thought the war in Iraq really was about oil. Were 44% of the programs from BBC exploring the oil agenda? Were they trying to find out? Far from it." He encouraged everybody to find those policies and guidelines in their own environment – and use them.

Opening Up the Media for Other Messages
Lena Slachmuijlder's stated, "One question often raised is 'What do we do with extremist language and views, whether it comes from the government or from rebel leaders?' The way we deal with it is to report it, with a bit of self-censorship if the language is very provocative. But we make sure to put in a context when this message is married to other voices. We try to find someone with another, more peace-building standpoint. We are not trying to black the strong message out, as it probably will come out some other way, but show other voices too."

Inclusive Approaches to Journalist Participation
Fiona Lloyd spoke about how groups of participants are chosen in conflict reporting training. "If you stop seeing yourself as a journalist, when you loose that self-respect, all sorts of horrific things might be possible. If we polarise attendance at our training and do not bring in the state media, because it is thought to be of no use, this can have negative repercussions. Let me give you one example – last year I was working with a group of Zimbabwean journalists, both state owned media and private owned. In fact the group got on quite well. Everybody understood you don't leave a state employment easily in the Zimbabwean situation. That is the starting point for a dialogue. What can be done from the inside? When can you say "Enough is enough, I can't do this" and when do you have to accept things and still think it is important to be there, because it might be possible to make some change from the inside. This discussion is challenging for us as trainers."

Identifying Groups in Conflict
According to Indian journalistic convention, newspapers and broadcasters don't report about groups – nationalities, religious beliefs, cast – involved in conflicts. Siddharth Varadarajan explains, "if ten Muslims have been killed you don't identify them as Muslims, the idea being that you should not incite further violence. Perhaps that was proper before when there was more spontaneous violence involving Hindus and Muslims, but what happened last year in Gujarat was neither spontaneous nor was it local. It was orchestrated. It was not a clash between Hindus and Muslims, but a targeted killing of Muslims. That was why it was do important to identify the victims. Some of the television stations identified the attackers as a 'Hindu mob'. We did not. They were not there because they were Hindus, not motivated by religious beliefs, but a bunch of thugs. If we knew which political fraction was behind it we would name them. But the Gujarati press did not identify the groups. For example there was a terrible massacre on 1 March when up to 100 Muslims were killed, but the newspapers just said they came from "a particular community". This made many Hindus believe the killed were Hindus, and the fact that they not reported correctly made the circle of violence continue."

Working with Western Journalists
Jake Lynch has applied special rules for meetings with British journalists, discussing conflict reporting. "We never have open meetings, just meetings by invitation only. We have invited conflict analysers to join those discussions and prominent journalists. If you hold an open meeting in London their is a big risk it will turn into an argument, because there will be people joining such meetings putting demands on journalists that is quite impossible for any journalist – and it will put the journalists in a defensive position."

Coordinating Actions between Stakeholders
Sunanda Deshapriya gave the picture of a Sri Lanka overwhelmed by donors, money and projects. "We have decided on a transformation roadmap. What are the main problems in Sri Lanka? Safety, security, social conditions, civil society strategies, freedom of expression, it all has to be there if we want to change the media landscape. At least every three months we have a roundtable discussion among Sri Lankan groups doing media interventions, and put all the donors together every month to discuss co-operation. Otherwise all of them will do the same. More workshops."

9. Roundtable Participants

Karin Alfredsson
Ms Karin Alfredsson is a journalist trainer, media and gender consultant and freelance journalist in Stockholm, Sweden. In 1998 she lived in Hanoi, Vietnam responsible for a journalist training project run by SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency). Since then she has been active as a journalist trainer in Europe, Africa and Asia. Focus in the training has been on basic journalistic skills, management, gender awareness and conflict sensitive reporting. Together with Peter Tygesen she has developed a two-week training course in Conflict/Peace Reporting for news editors based on participants' own experiences and utilising their own regional conflict experiences. Ms Alfredsson has a background as reporter at different Swedish newspapers and magazines, editor in chief for a journalist magazine and as news editor for Swedish Television.

Melissa Baumann
Ms Melissa Baumann is currently the president of the Media Peace Center in the US and associate at the Center for War Peace and the News Media (NYU), USA, working on US-Arab media dialogues and initiatives. She edited the publication, "Media and Conflict" (Track Two), and several editions of Rhodes Journalism Review dealing with "Global Narratives of Race", the South African Truth Commission, and Media in Africa. She has been training journalists at universities and newspapers in Egypt, Palestine, South Africa, Sri Lanka and the United States. As co-founder of the Media Peace Center in South Africa almost 13 years ago, she was instrumental in writing about the role of media in conflict since the early stages of the development of this new paradigm and field of journalism.

Martin Breum
Mr Martin Breum, journalist, media development consultant, until August 2003 Deputy Director at International Media Support, Denmark. Martin Breum has worked as a journalist since 1985 in print and electronic media. 1990 - 1993 Martin Breum lived in Namibia as a correspondent for Scandinavian media on southern African affairs. 1993 - 1995 he was Course Director at the Nordic SADC Journalism Centre in Mozambique, running mid-career training courses for African journalists. He is currently hosting a current affairs programme on Danish Television.

Christina Dahlman
Christina Dahlman is currently on secondment from SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) to UNESCO, specifically working with media in conflict areas within the Communication Sector. Her assignment at UNESCO has mainly been focused on policy and strategy work and she coordinated a joint UNESCO-SIDA seminar on Assistance to Media in Tension Areas and Violent Conflict, which was held in Stockholm in May 2003. The outcome of the seminar will be integrated into of the planning process of World press Freedom Day 2004. She also participated on behalf of UNESCO in the UNDG/WB Needs Assessment mission in Iraq in August 2003 as part of the governance sector's media team. As media program officer at SIDA's Division of Culture and Media she was responsible for SIDA's assistance to media. She was also the Division's focal point for Democracy/ HR and Conflict Management.

Sunanda Deshapriya
Mr Sunanda Deshapriya was a founder member of the Movement for Inter Racial Justice and Equality (MIRJE) in 1979 and the Movement for the Defence of Democratic Rights (MDDR) in 1981. However, his life as a social activist started when at a much earlier stage, and he was involved the youth insurrection of 1971 in Sri Lanka. This was also the time he first developed an interest in human rights activism and journalism. This interest continues to date, and Mr.

Deshapriya is not only a founder member of the Free Media Movement (FMM) in 1991, but has functioned as the convenor since 2000. He is also a member of the Editors Guild of Sri Lanka. He both launched and functioned as the Editor of the weekly newspaper Yukthiya until its closure in 2000. Yukthiya newspaper was instrumental in initiating a discourse on inter racial justice issues in the mainstream media in Sri Lanka. Mr. Deshapriya is the Editor of the monthly magazine Balaya, a magazine on socio-political and economic issues. He edits bi-monthly Saama Vimarshi, a magazine on the peace process and related issues. He is a regular columnist for a leading mainstream Sinhala weekly newspaper, the Lankadeepa, and the weekly alternative newspaper, Ravaya mainly on governance and peace issues. Mr. Deshapriya has researched on media role in conflict in Sri Lankan context and has presented papers at national as well as international media workshops. He has written and lectured on code of ethics for journalists in Sri Lanka.

Loretta Hieber-Girardet
Ms Loretta Hieber-Girardet is a co-founder of Media Action International and has been involved in humanitarian and peace-building projects since 1994. Her particular interest lies in working with the media in conflict situations to help initiate the effects – psychosocial, trauma, humanitarian crisis – of war. In 2001 she worked in Kabul. Afghanistan, to establish a women's health radio project. Today she works for the World Health Organization (WHO) and its Country Focus Department.

Ross Howard
Mr Ross Howard is Vancouver-based journalist, educator and consultant specializing in the role of media in conflict environments and media in elections. He is an Associate of IMPACS - The Institute for Media, Policy and Civil Society (Canada), a faculty member at Langara College Journalism Department (Vancouver), and a freelance writer. Formerly a Senior Correspondent for The Globe and Mail newspaper and a senior editor for Vancouver Television News, he recently produced An Operational Framework for Media and Peacebuilding for IMPACS/CIDA, has conducted journalism assessment and training missions in Cambodia, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Rwanda, and is author of a Conflict Sensitive Journalism handbook for journalists (IMPACS-International Media Support 2003.) He is co-editor of The Power of Media, a handbook for peacebuilders (European Centre for Conflict Prevention 2003); and has published and presented analyses of media and conflict/democratization in Europe, Asia and North America, some of which are available at http://www.impacs.org/index.cfm?group_ID=2708.

Jesper Højberg
Mr. Jesper Højberg has worked for more than ten years within the field of journalism, social research, media (FREE PRESS projects) development, communication planning and development of conflict resolution programmes in South Eastern Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa. As employee and consultant for UNESCO and for NGOs, he has developed policy strategy documents, carried out needs assessments for training institutions, developed training programmes as well as implemented and reviewed specific media and NGO projects. Furthermore, Mr. Højberg has experience within curriculum development, institutional and organizational development as well as training in Logical Framework Analysis and Strategic Planning.

He has a diploma in journalism and has gained experience in project management through a post as director of a UNESCO Film School in Zimbabwe. In recent years he has worked for the Peace and Stability Secretariat (FRESTA) of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a co-ordinator for a regional Civil Society Development programme for South Eastern Europe (involving human rights, media, refugee and youth organisations in Denmark and South Eastern Europe).

He is currently Executive Director for International Media Support an international media NGO assisting media in conflict areas around the world.

Kwame Kari Kari

Mr Kwame Kari Kari is a Professor in Journalism and Mass Communication at the School of Communication Studies, University of Ghana; Educated at the Columbia University School of Journalism, New York, USA; Director General of the Ghana Broadcasting Corporation 1982-84. Founder and Executive Director of the Media Foundation of West Africa, a press freedom and freedom of expression advocacy- and defence organisation, based in Accra. Kwame Kari Kari has been actively involved in promoting press freedom, media law and policy reform, media training and in human rights promotion in several parts of Africa for the past two decades.

Fiona Lloyd

Ms Fiona Lloyd is a Zimbabwean radio journalist and media trainer, based in South Africa. She has worked in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Kosovo, East Timor and Indonesia – particularly with community-based radio projects. In 1999 she co-devised the 'Reporting for Peace' curriculum for Internews (Jakarta), and wrote the Reporting for Peace (RPF) course handbook: 'Reporting from the Frontline'. She continues to run the RFP programme in Indonesia, and in 2003 also conducted RFP training for Greek and Turkish journalism students (on behalf of European Centre for Common Ground). Fiona runs Training of Trainer courses and is particularly interested in developing participatory-learning methodology for media trainers involved in conflict-sensitive training.

Jake Lynch

Mr Jake Lynch is a leading figure in the growing global dialogue about Peace Journalism and the ethics of reporting conflicts. He has facilitated training dialogues for journalists and activists in many countries including Indonesia, Nepal, Jordan, Cyprus, Turkey, Norway, Macedonia, Australia, the US, Armenia and Georgia. Publications include The Peace Journalism Option; What Are Journalists For?; Reporting the World - a practical checklist for the ethical reporting of conflicts in the 21st century and the TRANSCEND manual, Peace Journalism – What is it? How to do it? (co-authored with Annabel McGoldrick). Lynch and McGoldrick are co-Directors of Reporting the World, a series of critical discussions, publications and a website for journalists in London. The Observer newspaper called it "the nearest thing to a journalism think-tank." He teaches MA courses at the universities of Sydney, Australia (Peacebuilding Media – Theory and Practice) and Cardiff, Wales (at the leading Journalism school). He leads the on-line Peace Journalism course offered by the TRANSCEND Peace University. Jake is an experienced international reporter in newspapers and television, currently for BBC News, based in London. He was the Independent Sydney correspondent in 1998-9 and covered the NATO briefings for Sky News throughout the Kosovo crisis. He is an adviser to the Toda Institute for Peace and rapporteur for its media research team.

Andrew Puddephat

Mr Andrew Puddephatt has been the Executive Director of ARTICLE 19 since 1999. He has been an expert member of both the Council of Europe of the Commonwealth Expert working groups on freedom of information and freedom of expression. He is the Vice-Chair of International Media Support; a Danish based NGO that provides emergency support to journalists in conflict areas. He is also a member of International Steering Committee for the Bibliotheca Alexandrina database, a Norwegian based project that documents the history of censorship in the world and an international Board member of the Open Democracy Centre in South Africa. Andrew works closely with a number of international bodies, including the Special Rapporteurs for free expression of the UN, OSCE and OAS, with UNESCO, with the Africa Commission for Human and People's Rights and the Council of Europe. Andrew has been a

senior manager in the not for profit sector for more than twelve years. Between October 1995 and January 1999 he was the Director of Charter 88 which was the UK's leading constitutional reform organisation. Between 1989 and 1995 he was General Secretary of Liberty (aka the National Council for Civil Liberties). In both capacities he played a leading role in securing a Bill of Rights for the UK. This was agreed in 1998 after eight years campaigning and took effect in October 2000. In January 2003 he was awarded an OBE for services to human rights.

Lena Slachmuijlder
Ms Lena Slachmuijlder is currently the director of Studio Ijambo, a project of Search for Common Ground, which produces radio programs to promote dialogue, peace, and reconciliation in the Great Lakes region of Africa. She manages a team of 30 journalists and technicians in the development and production of weekly radio programs for broadcast on Burundian and regional radio stations. She also assists in the coordination of Search for Common Ground's existing project in the Democratic Republic of Congo and for the development of a new project in Rwanda. Based in Africa for the last 14 years, Ms. Slachmuijlder has worked as a consultant, editor, producer, journalist, and trainer in diverse countries such as Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Africa, Ghana, and the United States. Before working with Search for Common Ground, she was a Producer and Project Coordinator for Vuleka Productions in Durban, South Africa. In Accra, Ghana, she was editor of African Agenda magazine and a founder member of the independent Public Agenda newspaper. In pre-1994 South Africa, she headed the Natal bureau for the anti-apartheid New Nation newspaper in Durban, KwaZulu Natal. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from Stanford University in international relations with a focus on media and African studies.

Peter Tygesen
Mr Peter Tygesen is a Copenhagen-based journalist, trainer and consultant having been involved in a wide range of training activities for journalists and media personnel in Africa, Europe and South Asia. Training activities has involved general journalistic training, media ethics, foreign news reporting and conflict sensitive reporting. Together with Karin Alfredsson he has developed a two-week training course in Conflict/Peace Reporting for news editors based on participants' own experiences and utilising their own regional conflict experiences. 20 years of experience as a foreign news reporter, mainly reporting from Africa, author of a number of books on African affairs – and Danish health issues. Former foreign news editor of the national Danish daily "Information", presently free-lancing writer and consultant.

Siddharth Varadarajan
Mr Siddharth Varadarajan is deputy chief of the national bureau of the Times of India. He has reported on several important political events, from Kashmir and the royal palace massacre in Nepal, to Pakistan, the weapons-inspection crisis in Iraq, the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Before his current assignment, he was an editorial writer for the same newspaper. Among his academic writings are the articles 'The Ink Link: Media, Communalism and the Evasion of Politics,' in K.N. Panikkar, The Concerned Indian's Guide to Communalism (Viking 1999), and 'The International Dynamics of a Nuclear India,' in D.R. Sardesai and Raju G.C. Thomas, Nuclear India in the Twenty-First Century (Palgrave, 2002). He studied at the London School of Economics and Columbia University and taught economics at New York University before turning to journalism in 1995. In 2002, he edited a book, Gujarat: The Making of a Tragedy (Penguin), on the anti-Muslim violence that rocked the Indian province that year.

Omary Walid
Mr Omary Walid has since 1996 been Senior Correspondent for Al Jazeera Satellite Channel , covering news from West Bank, Gaza Strip and Israel , coordinating the work of Al Jazeera

Office in Ramallah, Palestine. Since 1996 teaching at Media Institute, Birzeit University, Palestine. Correspondent for Multi Kolti Radio station in Berlin, Radio Orient in Paris, Al Mustaqbal Daily Newspaper, Lebanon. Education: High Diploma in Journalism and Communication, BA in International Relations. Awards: "Palestine International Prize for Journalism, 2000", bestowed by the Palestinian National Authority. and "Recognition Award" from the United Holy Land Fund 33rd Convention , State of New Jersey, USA on November 26, 2000, for outstanding and courageous reporting of Al-Aqsa Uprising and bringing the struggle of the Palestinian People to the world.

Bambang Wisudo
Mr Bambang Wisudo has been a journalist at Kompas Morning in Jakarta, Indonesia, since 1990. He has been involved in press freedom movement since the banning of Tempo, Detik, and became an activist of Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI) in 1994. Ha has also been a supervisor of Journalist Reconciliation and Peace Journalism in Maluku since 2001. Assisted in the establishment of Maluku Media Centre (MMC), a forum for interaction, training, trust building between Muslim and Christian journalist in Maluku.