The somewhat belated academic interest in communication and peace in recent years can only be welcomed. A growing body of work now variously advocates for a distinctive “Peace Journalism,” and sets about analyzing the news media’s different roles in unfolding peace processes, exploring the progressive potential of media and communication (including new communication technologies) in pre-conflict avoidance, post-conflict reconciliation and processes of civil society reconstruction – the latter in traumatized societies and failed states, or in contexts of development more widely (Price and Thompson 2002; Wolfsfeld 2004; Spencer 2005; Lynch and McGoldrick 2005; Cottle 2006; Goodman 2006; Thompson 2007; Keeble et al. 2010; Deane 2013; Hoffmann 2014). In their different ways such studies have all helped to move the critical academic focus beyond news agendas traditionally fixated on war, conflict, violence and deviancy. As Hoffmann (2014) rightly observes, we are witnessing the emergence of a field of “communication and peace.”

This chapter seeks to contribute to this wider effort by examining how the world’s press has variously recognized and represented the United Nations’ proposed new world norm of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). With its injunction to all nation states to concertedly work together to seek to bring to an end the four atrocity crimes of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, the R2P doctrine is fundamentally about securing the prerequisite conditions for the establishment of human security and peace. Of course there is more to “peace” than the absence of atrocious violence. With its emphasis on processes of atrocity prevention, human protection and civil society rebuilding, R2P is also, necessarily, about constructing the longer term possibilities for peaceful co-existence and, ultimately, the deep embedding of “peace” in and through the democratization of civil societies.

Since the 2005 UN World Summit, when the majority of the world’s nations signed up to its Outcome Document (UN 2005), the United Nations has officially endorsed, though not always managed to enact, its
commitment to the Responsibility to Protect. In the aftermath of the Holocaust, genocides in Cambodia and Rwanda and crimes against humanity in the former Yugoslavia, East Timor and Darfur, the doctrine of R2P was explicitly formulated to empower the international community’s expressed commitment to “never again.” Based on three fundamental pillars R2P stipulates that:

Pillar one is the enduring responsibility of the State to protect its populations, whether nationals or not, from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, and from their incitement.

Pillar two is the commitment of the international community to assist States in meeting these obligations. It seeks to draw on the cooperation of (UN) Member States, regional and sub-regional arrangements, civil society and the private sector.

Pillar three is the responsibility of Member States to respond collectively in a timely and decisive manner when a State is manifestly failing to provide such protection.

(UN 2009, 8–9)

R2P, unsurprisingly perhaps, has given rise to heated debates and controversies both in respect of its presumed philosophical idealism and its political implementation. Given the way that it has been rhetorically deployed and militarily implemented in some circumstances (for example, Libya 2011), but not in others (for example, Syria 2012–2014), detractors and critics are apt to challenge R2P in practice, if not its original design, for serving contemporary geopolitical interests and expressing inequalities of state power (Chomsky 2012). R2P also appears to strike at the heart of traditional (Westphalian) notions of state sovereignty (also enshrined in the UN Charter). This is because it deliberately seeks to rebalance traditional ideas of state sovereignty as state rights based on territorial inviolability alongside the state’s protective responsibilities toward its own sovereign populations, as well as toward those of other nations who are confronting impending atrocity (ICISS 2001). Such arguments have given rise to vociferous criticisms of R2P and these have also featured within the world’s press.

**Liberal imperialism by any other name**

“Responsibility to protect” strikes me as a slogan of liberal imperialism; the battle cry of post-modern civilization’s missionaries, the casus belli of self-appointed knights errant with an unquenchable thirst for running the world…. Not even the Grand Master of the Order of Kofi Annan has the authority to deputize the armed forces of sovereign nations to intervene into civil or religious wars.

(Jonas 2012)
For its adherents and advocates it is generally conceded that R2P in practice remains highly dependent on the UN’s own dependence on world states, with all their power plays, alliances and rivalries and political-economic vested interests. This can, and has, undoubtedly distorted the deployment of R2P (or the deliberate failure to do so) in some cases. For all that, it remains, they argue, the world’s best chance to halt the worst crimes that humanity has proved itself historically and currently capable of (Evans 2008). Moreover, in an increasingly interconnected and globalized world – a world which has witnessed the institutionalization of the United Nations post-1945, and judicial recognition of human rights and international prosecution of crimes against humanity (Robertson 2012), as well as the proliferation of civil society actors prepared to mobilize transnationally for social justice and humanitarian causes (Cottle and Lester 2011) – R2P can be seen as an emergent but nonetheless historically deepening trend (Evans 2008; Bellamy 2009). Images of atrocity, now more readily available than ever, often summon forth calls for something to be done, sometimes under the mantle of R2P, and these too also feature in the world’s press.

**Responsibility to Protect; The Assad regime believes that it can murder with impunity. The time has now come to act and show that it is wrong.**

Much of the photographic evidence of what took place is too harrowing to publish. It shows the bodies of young children, some of who would never have known what it was to speak or walk, lying in rows on the floor of a makeshift morgue. The vast majority of these pictures – photographs of toddlers who have suffered gunshots to the head – this newspaper has chosen not to print, out of concern for its readers. But equally out of a duty to inform its readers it has taken the decision that some, at least, of these pictures must be seen.

*(The Times, London, 2012)*

Here we do not seek to directly take up a position or arbitrate between the detractors and advocates of R2P, but to begin to address exactly how the world’s media has recognized and represented the doctrine since its inception. It is surprising, we think, just how little attention has been devoted to R2P by researchers variously interested in communications for peace (Sidahmed et al. 2012). Our study sets out then to examine the patterns, practices and overall performance of the press in publicizing, promulgating or challenging R2P. Based on the first comprehensive study of the world’s English language newspapers and their reporting of R2P across the period 2002–2013, and following the publication of the *Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty* (2001) that first launched the R2P idea, the following provides an overview of some of the principal findings (and failings) associated with this general reporting.
do so by addressing five principal questions: (1) to what extent has R2P featured in the world’s press over time, regions and countries?; (2) to what extent have the important three pillars of R2P and their interrelated injunctions to prevent, react and rebuild, informed press reporting?; (3) to what extent and how has the world’s press variously supported or criticized the R2P doctrine and its implementation?; (4) how has the press variously framed R2P in its reporting? And finally, by way of a conclusion, we briefly pose a fifth question that asks: (5) how has the world’s press communicatively sought to “bring home” the human reality of atrocity situations and what journalistic precedents of value exist that could (and indeed should) be extended and deepened in the future? But first a few words on methodology.

Methodology

Using the search terms “Responsibility to Protect,” “R2P,” “RtoP,” and “United Nations” or “UN,” a search of all English language newspapers across the world’s press covering the period January 2002–December 2013 (inclusive) was conducted via LexisNexis. This produced a comprehensive sample of 3,599 separate news items that were principally about and/or made explicit reference to R2P and the UN. The search period beginning in January 2002 spanned 12 years and included institutional milestones such as the World Summit of 2005 as well as humanitarian crises and conflicts across the period. The overall volume and general contours of press reporting in the period 2002–2013 was mapped and a more detailed content analysis was conducted based on a ten-year rolling sub-sample (July 2002–July 2012) that comprised, in total, 1,047 items (110 items per year apart from 2002, which comprised only 41 items in total).

The rolling sub-sample was deployed to produce a representative sample. The first, then second, then third, and then fourth week of each subsequent month was selected, and following the selected week of the preceding month. A maximum of nine news items was selected from each month in each of the selected rolling weeks and these by rolling across the days of that week until the nine items had been found. An additional news item was then selected for each of the two largest months in that particular year in terms of total available “Responsibility to Protect” news items – to produce a total annual sample of 110 items per year. In this way the rolling sample sought to represent, but not be unduly skewed, by annual, seasonal and other possible monthly and weekly changes in world newspaper agendas across the ten-year period, whilst also capturing for analysis possible peaks and troughs in R2P reporting by including contiguous reporting of the same events in the selected sample weeks. This sub-sample represents 29.1 percent of the total available news coverage of 3,599 news items. The sub-sample was analyzed according to a wide range of variables. Here we present findings that address our key questions above, and that
include a frame analysis of the principal characteristics of R2P reporting, discussed later.

Our sample, then, focuses on the world’s English language press. Of course it can be argued that this is less than representative of all the world’s newspapers, much less the media in general. However, the prevalence of English language media, including newspapers across the nations of the world, is now pronounced. WorldNewspapers.com, for example, documents multiple English language newspapers in virtually all countries in the world today, including those where the English language is not the first or even second language (World Newspapers 2014). In a multi-lingual and increasingly globalized world, English language newspapers and online news sites proliferate, and these service indigenous as well as diasporic national identities and readerships. They cannot therefore be presumed to address Western expatriate communities only. Given their established national readerships, English national newspapers today are not so editorially distanced from national political debates and perspectives as they may once have been, and can register R2P events and issues. For our purposes, then, they offered the first practicable way of beginning to map press recognition and representation of R2P in and across different nations around the world.

1 To what extent has R2P featured in the world’s press over time, regions and countries?

The contours of press R2P reporting have evolved across the years, in part following the institutional career of R2P from earlier-mooted concept, to proclaimed principle, institutionalized UN doctrine and, as we shall see, still-emergent and embattled “norm.” Patterns of press reporting around the world also follow different political crises and humanitarian catastrophes and atrocities, albeit through an established news prism of geopolitical interests and a nationally inflected journalists’ “calculus of death” (Cottle 2009, 2012). The total volume of press coverage referencing R2P across our 12-year period since January 2002 demonstrates a general upward trend in absolute volume notwithstanding some troughs across the years (see Figure 5.1). In the early period debates prompted by the Canadian-sponsored Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001), the UN World Summit of 2005 (UN 2005) and pronouncements by UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon all figured within this coverage, as did reporting spurred by particular crisis events. The latter included (after an initial press silence) the worsening situation in Darfur, Sudan (2004), inter-communal violence following elections in Kenya (2008), government violence in Guinea (2009), the violent culmination of the civil war in Sri Lanka (2009), presidential election violence in Côte D’Ivoire (2010–2011), inter-communal violence in Jongoli State, South Sudan
(2011), and the eruption of the Arab Spring (2011) leading to the UN-sanctioned military measures in Libya (2011) as well as the protracted and worsening conflict and atrocities in Syria (2012–2013).

R2P is not only the preserve of Western newspapers and regions, as we can see from Figure 5.2. Drilling down by individual countries and their percentage of overall R2P press reports we find that Canada (29.3 percent) has been heavily involved in R2P reporting from its inception and has played a vigorous part in ongoing debates since (as we saw earlier in our first press extract). R2P press coverage has also been relatively extensive in the US (12.3 percent) and UK (11.8 percent) following, in part, their permanent UN Security Council membership and interventionist policies – policies often advocated under or challenged by R2P principles. Australia, and its former ambassador and R2P advocate, Gareth Evans, have also been vocal in debates about R2P and attracted a fair amount of Australian press coverage (6.8 percent). Many African countries are also well represented in the world’s press coverage of R2P and indeed the continent was instrumental in its original inception through the formation of the African Union (AU) in 2000 and its declared shift from “non-interference” to “non-indifference” enshrined in its Constitutive Act (African Union 2002). South Africa (4.1 percent), Nigeria (3.2 percent), Uganda (1.2 percent) and Ghana (1.1 percent) all feature alongside many other African countries. Asian countries too have variously supported the doctrine. A minority of countries, such as Zimbabwe (1.9 percent), Sudan (1.6 percent) and Sri Lanka (2.2 percent), when subject to world opprobrium for their actions in violation of R2P principles, have sought to counter such criticisms in their own national press, often vociferously challenging particular claims or condemning R2P entirely as an imposed Western doctrine underpinned by Western geopolitical interests – discussed further below.
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*Figure 5.1* R2P press coverage 2002–2013 (total number: 3,599 articles).
Our findings indicate, then, that although “Western” countries, predominantly Canada, the US, the UK and Australia, have given more prominence to R2P in their multiple English language newspapers, R2P also figures in and across the less numerous, though now generally available English language press found in most other countries in the world today.

To what extent have the important three pillars of R2P and their interrelated injunctions to prevent, react and rebuild, informed press reporting?

The R2P doctrine explicitly posits a dynamic understanding of R2P situations, as we have noted, and deliberately incorporates a plethora of non-military as well as military responses that can be applied separately, in combination, or cumulatively, as each R2P scenario unfolds over time and as events on the ground demand (UN 2009, 2010, 2011). To what extent have the R2P pillars concerned with the “enduring responsibility of the State to protect its populations” (pillar one), “the commitment of the international community to assist States in meeting these obligations” (pillar two), and “the responsibility of Member States to respond collectively in a timely and decisive manner when a State is manifestly failing to provide such protection” (pillar three) (UN 2009: 8–9) informed world press reporting? Pillar one reporting predominates across our sample (see Figure 5.3) with the majority of articles (65.8 percent) principally – that is unambiguously and in a concentrated way throughout the news item – focusing on a particular state that is failing to protect a significant segment of its own population or is engaging in or threatening acts of aggression and atrocity in contravention of R2P principles. Where the different aspects of the three pillars featured in a minor or subsidiary way within the principal news items, these have also been coded and signalled in Figure 5.3 as

Figure 5.2 R2P press coverage around the world.
references only. A minority of items only (12.9 percent), as we can see, are principally about pillar two “international assistance and capacity-building,” while a fifth of all R2P-related press reports (20.8 percent) are principally about some forms of “timely and decisive response” (pillar three).

As the International Coalition for R2P notes:

Under the third pillar the international community can respond with a range of both coercive and peaceful measures. These include preventative diplomacy, fact-finding missions, economic sanctions and embargoes, and military operations, such as no-fly zones, monitoring and civilian defense missions.

(ICRtoP, n.d.: 11)

It is significant, we think, that of the 217 news items in our sample that are principally about some aspect of pillar three, 181 (83.4 percent) were focused on military forms of humanitarian intervention. Clearly this suggests that news reporting appears to be narrowing considerably the range of forms of response that have been identified by the UN and others in responding to R2P situations (UN 2009, Evans 2008). This effectively distances the full range of available options and thereby short-circuits understanding of R2P responses to militarized intervention only – a course of action, that may not always be practicable or necessarily effective. Indeed, since the initial formulations of R2P by ICISS (2001), advocates of R2P have argued that any coercive action should only be contemplated when positive responses can be gauged in respect of four R2P precautionary principles based on (1) the right intention, (2) the last resort, (3) proportionate means, and (4) reasonable prospects of success (Evans 2008: 141).
And yet these precautionary principles rarely figure within the generality of the world’s press reporting of R2P situations, despite the panoply of more nuanced and multiple forms of response available to the international community as well as neighbouring states and the immediate region. This represents a major silence, we suggest, and one that can only produce wider misconceptions about R2P and undermine its emergence as a shared world norm.

3 Has the world’s press variously supported or criticized the R2P doctrine?

Support or criticism of R2P can generally assume five analytically distinct forms. It can be directed at (1) the overall R2P doctrine in principle; (2) the political implementation of specific R2P responses, short of militarized intervention; (3) the lack of political implementation in particular cases; (4) military intervention in particular cases; and (5) lack of military intervention in other particular cases.

Nearly two-thirds of all evaluative R2P press reporting (65.5 percent) and the vast majority of news reports principally and explicitly supporting R2P as a general doctrine (92 percent) characterize press reporting. A small minority only (8 percent) criticizes the general R2P doctrine. In part this correlates with the majority of world news reports focusing on pillar one situations where human lives have already been lost or are in dire jeopardy, and where calls for something to be done are likely to invoke R2P (as illustrated in our second opening press report). It is also noteworthy that our next largest evaluative category of R2P press reporting explicitly concerns lack of military intervention in particular cases (13.8 percent), with the overwhelming majority of these (98.4 percent) criticizing the failure to intervene militarily. Press reports commenting on
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particular military R2P interventions (8.4 percent) are also, in the main, supportive in the majority of all cases (77.4 percent). A minority of all R2P press reports are only concerned with the wider panoply of forms of R2P response outside of military intervention, whether in respect of the implementation of such measures (3.8 percent) or their lack of implementation (2.8 percent).

The main findings that come to the fore, therefore, are that R2P can be supported and criticized in a number of different ways across the world’s press but the majority of all evaluative cases are in fact seemingly supportive of R2P in principal, and critical of the lack of intervention in particular cases. While critics of R2P may want to question the motivations and possible geopolitical interests at play behind the scenes, our findings suggest that nonetheless there is considerable press support for recognizing the human plight of others in jeopardy and that this is something that those interested in peace communications could and perhaps should recognize and seek to build on. However, the press’s tendency to focus on pillar one situations, when populations are already in mortal danger, with the relative neglect of pillar two situations involving external states and associated regions as well as civil society actors, and pillar three situations confined to principally militarized conceptions of intervention, all contribute to a noticeably partial and truncated view of dynamic R2P situations.

4 How has the press variously framed R2P in its reporting?

The term frame in the conventional academic usage refers to a cognitive structure that helps to apprehend and make sense of some aspect of perceived reality; a means of sense-making and interpretation that grants salience to some features and not others (Entman 1993, Reese et al. 2003). Based on inductive immersion with our extensive sample of 1,047 news reports, four principal and recurring frames soon became apparent. These comprised: (1) an institutional frame that addressed R2P events or processes through the principal news focus in that item on a key institution and associated development, such as a debate or new policy initiative at the UN or a particular government statement, (2) a conflict frame that addressed R2P through a prism of conflict, typically focusing on an event or developmental process associated with a specific and unfolding conflict and defined by some as an R2P situation, (3) a humanitarian frame that addressed the human consequences of R2P events and unfolding processes, and which invariably did so by giving voice to witnesses and survivors and what this meant for the individuals and communities involved, and (4) a critical frame that sought to provide background and analysis of R2P either as a doctrine or as a particular circumstance and that critically engaged with the perceived failure of the international community or others to address the humanitarian needs involved. Each of these frames constitute the principal way in which a particular news item was framed in
nearly two-thirds (61.4 percent) of all sample news items, while in the remainder two or more frames were included with no single frame clearly predominating.

Our analysis documents how the majority of R2P press reports that have a principal frame are framed in terms of institutional developments (76.7 percent) with newspapers reporting major institutional initiatives and events – whether this be a visit by a UN special envoy, a debate in the UN Security Council, or a specially convened conference of regional governments to consider responses to a R2P situation in a neighbouring state. News reports focusing principally on conflict situations (15.5 percent) also drive many reports, with the latest developments in an ongoing conflict being reported and updated over time. In a minority of cases only, some news reports principally framed their reporting in terms of a humanitarian focus – to the exclusion of other possible frames (4.5 percent), and with a predominant focus on the human consequences and suffering involved. Fewer still news reports, we found, are principally framed in terms of an in-depth critical analysis of a specific R2P situation or the R2P doctrine in general (3.3 percent). Our findings, therefore, conform to established findings about the largely institutionally dependent, conflict-oriented and event-driven nature of news reporting (Cottle 2006). However, this is not the whole story with humanitarian frames and critical frames, as we can see in Figure 5.5, also included in a more subsidiary role in nearly half of all R2P press reporting. This suggests that elements of humanly empathetic and critically engaged reporting of R2P situations characterizes much of press reporting, though these, at present, remain secondary to the principal focus on institutional and conflict reporting frames.

Figure 5.5 Press frames and R2P reporting.
5 How have the world’s press communicatively sought to “bring home” the human reality of atrocity situations to their readerships and what journalistic precedents of value exist that could be extended and deepened in the future?

We have documented how R2P, at most, has only found a tenuous foothold in the discourses and delivery of the world’s press since its inception, and how it remains to this day far from being a clearly understood and established world norm. Much of this reporting has provided a less-than-comprehensive appreciation of its historically unparalleled attempt to protect, respond and rebuild through differing tiers of civil society and structures of regional and international governance. However this is not to say that the press, as well as other media, cannot or have not sometimes performed a necessary and sometimes powerful role in communicating R2P situations, whether prior to or during periods of atrocity. And here it is useful to delve a little into its “communicative architecture” (Cottle 2004) and how this can variously – analytically, affectively and performatively – communicate R2P situations. As in the world of broadcast television news (Cottle and Rai 2006), an established repertoire of newspaper communicative forms routinely shape, constrain and enable different views and voices to deliver and deliberate the issues involved, sometimes in affective and emotionally charged as well as critically informed ways (see Table 5.1).

In the context of R2P reporting, relatively short news reports update breaking news events and developments (34.9 percent); comment/opinion pieces (32.7 percent) and editorials (8.6 percent) deliver arguments and provocations about R2P situations, principles and responsibilities, as does rare use of staged debates (0.2 percent); while profiles and extended interviews can provide the means for personalized accounts and perspectives (2.2 percent). All of these established press forms, then, perform their part in providing information and ideas and circulating discourses and debate about R2P. Importantly, a further fifth of all R2P press coverage is also conducted in and through the more discursively open and sometimes affective communicative form of “features and analysis”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News report</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment/opinion</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature/analysis</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile/interview</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,047</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The machetes flash again; The international community claimed to have learned the lessons of Rwanda yet 10 years on, the terrible cycle of ethnic violence has started again in neighboring Burundi.

Large tents made of UNCHR (United Nations Commission on Human Rights) green plastic sheeting flapped in the wind. In some places the plastic was blackened by smoke, in others it was all but destroyed.

Scattered on the ground were the white masks and gloves dropped by the charity staff who had gathered up the dead into body bags. The men worked in silence, and the smell of charred wood and dead bodies still lingered in the air.

Just over two weeks have passed since 160 Burundi Banyamulenge refugees were killed in this desolate transit camp, which lies under the shadow of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) Kivu mountains. They had come here to the Burundian border seeking respite from the war that continues to ravage the Congo, hoping if not for peace then at least for a temporary rest from the horrors that they have grown up with for most of their lives. They found instead that war cannot be outrun…

“We were overwhelmed by victims when they arrived,” says the hospital director, Dr Nzotungwamayo. “Some had only small wounds, but others had been shot or injured by grenades, others cut with knives and machetes. Two pregnant women had been kicked in the stomach. Both miscarried."

In the crowded wards, women lie groaning, unable to suppress their pain. Others simply turn their backs, expressing their grief internally. Judith Nabeza, 23, is trying not to worry about her son, Prince. He is seven years old and he lost his leg to a grenade during the attack on the camp.

That night, Judith says, she and Prince prepared to sleep as normal. They lay down in the small bed in the plastic shelter where...
they had made their makeshift life with their families. Then the shooting began. “Prince was lying next to me and suddenly we heard all the noise and shooting,” she says. “I took Prince to try and leave but a grenade went off and got his leg … and I was injured in the stomach.”

The story behind the massacre in Gatumba is one of responsibility and ethnic conflict. It is the story of a country attempting to make the transition from war to peace, and of the internal and external tensions that threaten that transition. But it is also the story of the international community, of how much – or how little – protection they owe to refugees and of how well equipped they are to deal with violence when it begins…

(Holt and Hughes 2004)

This crafted piece of journalism, informed at its heart by an empathetic concern for the people and their experiences, deliberately moves to contextualize the massacre in Burundi within the country’s earlier political history as well as the shifting regional and wider interests that intervene from afar. It seeks to raise questions about those charged with the responsibility to protect at national, regional and international levels. The personal testimonies of victims, NGO workers, and government and UN officials, all populate the report – while the human consequences of failure to protect are graphically described and bodily invoked. This is an example, we think, of journalism taking its responsibility to report seriously.

There is, of course, more to today’s media ecology than English speaking newspapers and this chapter and the study of R2P reporting on which it is based is only a preliminary investigation into how the world’s media could yet play a more significant and necessary role in the world’s monitoring and concerted responses to atrocity. New communication technologies – from satellites to social media, alongside 24/7 news formations, online news and global communication flows – can all play their part in ensuring that populations confronting atrocity from Darfur to Damascus, from Sri Lanka to Syria and South Sudan, are not invisible to the outside world (Cottle 2009). In a rapidly globalizing world many journalists increasingly recognize their professional and moral obligation to alert the world to human carnage – wherever it may occur – and some may even be supportive of those longer term processes of civil society regeneration and development aimed at securing responsible sovereignty and peaceful existence. Some journalists, as we have heard, already do so. Increasing numbers of them put themselves in harm’s ways and risk everything to report terrible events as they unfold (Cottle et al., forthcoming). Whether R2P manages to move forward and establish itself in the decades ahead as a new world norm, or whether its laudable humanitarian impetus succumbs entirely to the entrenched national and geopolitical interests that
constrain its current implementation, will become apparent in the years ahead. What is clear, however, is that in today’s rapidly globalizing world, journalism’s responsibility to report, as a precursor in the possibilities of peace, must be granted increased recognition and serious study.
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