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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The civil war between the Sri Lankan government and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), which lasted 26 years, ended in May 2009. The final phase of the Sri Lankan civil war and the controversies that surround it have caught the attention of the international community. The media coverage of the last phase of the Sri Lankan civil war and its aftermath is of great interest because analyzing the coverage can provide insight into journalistic practices during these periods and reveal the role of media in covering the Sri Lankan conflict. More specifically, differences in coverage of the civil war between Sri Lankan and non-Sri Lankan (or Western) media will illuminate the impact of proximity and culture on how they emphasized different themes in the two periods.

The deliberate manipulation or unwitting slanting of news coverage of conflicts is not a new phenomenon. For example, media institutions, if any, transformed war into a spectacle, intended for mass consumption, as early as the mid-19th century. Modern warfare is so entrenched in news media that researchers must analyze conflicts while acknowledging the role the media play in portraying them to the public. The use of framing to simplify complex issues and give more importance to selected issues or arguments over others can have a long-lasting impact on how the public views certain issues (D’Angelo & Kuypers, 2010). Therefore, identifying how the Sri Lankan conflict was framed in the news media is not only important to understand how the war was painted during its life span but also how the consequences of the war were interpreted and discussed after the war ended (D’Angelo & Kuypers, 2010).
This study is aimed at examining words and frames used in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict. Among the many frames used to cover conflicts, the war journalism and peace journalism frames have brought much discussion among scholars in recent times. The main purpose of this study is to closely analyze how the news media covered the Sri Lankan conflict during and after it, as well as to compare the use of peace journalism and war journalism frames between Sri Lankan and U.S. newspapers. From a theoretical perspective, the research hopes to add to the existing framing literature by identifying subframes of war journalism and peace journalism specific to the Sri Lankan war reporting.

Framing analysis is ideal for examining newspaper coverage during times of conflict. Analyzing frames in news reporting entails uncovering consistent-patterns of selection, emphasis, and exclusion that create an interpretation and evaluation of events. News frames, therefore, structure and simplify stories, giving order to large amounts of information, highlighting certain actors and events over others. During times of conflict, an event that takes place can be interpreted, perceived, and presented in different ways. Understating these news frames in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict will allow one to go farther than merely evaluating whether a story or newspaper was just pro-war or anti-war, some events may be framed in ways that do not portray an obvious bias, yet do favor certain perspectives and arguments over others while silencing certain voices and giving prominence to other voices.

The newspaper articles are selected from mainstream Sri Lankan and U.S newspapers: Daily News of Sri Lanka (a state sponsored newspaper in Sri Lanka) and Daily Mirror of Sri Lanka and The New York Times and The Washington Post while adding to the growing scholarship of media framing in international conflicts, the study will benefit
newspaper editors and decision-makers by providing textual analysis of content produced from the coverage of war and conflict during a dangerous time period for both journalists and the victims of war.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Background of the Sri Lankan Conflict

Sri Lanka is referred to as the “pearl of the Indian Ocean” by some and the “tear drop of the Indian Ocean” by others. The tropical island is only slightly larger than West Virginia and diverse in both natural resources and its ethnic makeup. The contemporary distribution of ethnic groups is important when understanding the current situation in Sri Lanka, which contains an estimated population of 21,481,334 as of July 2012 (Central Intelligence Agency, 2012). The island nation’s diversity can be seen in the 2001 census: Sinhalese 73.8%, Sri Lankan Moors 7.2%, Indian Tamil 4.6%, Sri Lankan Tamil 3.9%, other 0.5%, and unspecified 10% (Central Intelligence Agency, 2012).

The Sinhalese are the majority of the Island, while the Tamils are the majority of what some Tamils call “traditional homelands” of Jaffna, Vavuniya, Batticaloa, and Trincomalee. Also, “Estate or Indian Tamils” live in the central and Badulla district of the country. The Tamils are the majority of the north and east, although intermixing of populations is evident in other parts of Sri Lanka. “Both Tamils and Sinhalese originated from northern and southern India and the Sinhalese Kandyan kings historically married women from southern India resulting in significant degrees of ethnic intermixing between the two communities” (Bloom, 2003, p. 57).

Diversity is observed in the island’s language and religious make-up. Since 1948, Sinhalese remain as the official language of the nation and Buddhism as the official religion of the nation. The Central Intelligence Agency (2012) reports Sri Lanka’s language distribution as “Sinhala (official and national language) 74%, Tamil (national language)
18%, other 8%”, and its religious distribution as “Buddhist (official) 69.1%, Muslim 7.6%, Hindu 7.1%, Christian 6.2%, unspecified 10%.”

British colonization had its toll on Sri Lanka and changed the nature of ethnic boundaries. The nature of ethnic boundaries before colonization was not as structured and differentiated as they became after the Sri Lankan independence in 1948 (Goonatilake, 2006; Nithiyananandam, 1997). Significant ethnic intermingling occurred in Sri Lankan history:

Ethnic boundaries in the pre-modern period were indistinct and permeable. There was considerable ethnic accommodation and intermingling. Ancient Sinhala cities reveal significant Tamil artistic and architectural influences, and the monarchy was not rigidly determined by ethnicity. Tamils are known to have ruled, often converting to Buddhism, even in Sinhala bastions like the city of Kandy... Ethnic, religious, and linguistic differences were not used as the bases for exclusion from the polity. At various times, groups would speak alternative languages, adhere to alternative religions, and claim alternative identities. (Bloom, 2003, p. 57)

Third-party influences on the Sri Lankan culture can be seen through the effects of colonization, which played a significant role in reshaping ethnic relationships. The Portuguese and Dutch religious intolerance influenced the forming of distinct identities based on socio-religious differences even before the arrival of the British. The British policies during this period play an important role in shaping the historical background of the conflict:

The British Raj was considered to have favored the Tamils, via the usual British strategy of preferring a minority group over the majority to secure a loyal and
dependent population (a policy of divide and rule). The British increased the Tamil populations by bringing in Indian Tamils to work the plantations, and the growth of the plantations transformed the economy of Sri Lanka and created opportunities for Tamil and Muslim entrepreneurs to make large fortunes. (Bloom, 2003, p. 58)

With time, British colonial rule and its economic development forced Tamils to pursue education. Through educational advancements the Tamils “moved in large numbers to state service employment, the private sector and entered into the medical, legal and banking professions” (Bloom, 2003, p. 58). Since the British focused their economic development in the central and western parts of the country, a large number of Tamils moved from the northern side to the southern side (Bloom, 2003; Nithiyanandam, 1997).

The ultimate result of such policies was a multi-ethnic, English speaking local bourgeoisie. Also, the use of “English created a ‘Petit bourgeoisie’ that transcended ethnic boundaries and created an elite class, especially in the capital of Colombo” (Bloom, 2003, p. 58). Consequently, during the Sri Lankan independence in 1948, a large number of Tamils were working for the government (Orjuela, 2008; Neumann & Fahmy, 2012; Nithiyanandam, 1997). Sri Lanka’s economy was rapidly changing, and according to some scholars, the Sinhalese aristocracy was still dependent on the agricultural economy for livelihood and social status (Orjuela, 2008; Nithiyanandam, 1997). Sri Lankan Tamils were mostly in the northeastern part of the island, where agriculture did not provide much hope as education, especially in terms of social mobility. So, when the English left the country, many educated Tamils held jobs in government and higher education services than Sinhalese (Bloom, 2003; Nithiyanandam, 1997; Orjuela, 2008; Sivanandan, 2010).
The Sinhalese bourgeoisie faced problems in its expansion amid the emergence of the new British, Tamil, and Muslim bourgeoises (Bloom, 2003; Nithiyanandam, 1997; Orjuela, 2008). The “Barriers to their advancement were perceived by the Sinhalese at all levels and as being caused by non-Sinhalese (i.e., Tamil) elements” (Bloom, 2003, p. 58). Some attribute economic antagonism toward minorities as a factor for forming separate ethnic identities (Nithiyanandam, 1997; Orjuela, 2008).

In order to counter the newly formed bourgeoisies, some leaders turned to politics. The leaders of the Sinhala revivalist movement used elements from the origin mythology and claimed that the Sinhalese were descendants of Aryan migrants from Bengal in the fifth century (Bloom, 2003). Ideas such as “The religion, the people, and the land were bound together in an indissoluble unity” (Boom, 2003 p. 60) came about through this new creation of a Sinhalese Buddhist identity (Orjuela, 2008; Nithiyanandam, 1997).

The exclusive nationalist ideology began discriminating against minorities soon after the Sri Lankan independence in 1948 from the British, asserting their power through politics and legislature. They refused to identify the multi-ethnic and multi-religious characteristic of the Sri Lankan society and the collective rights of minority groups. In 1956, Sinhalese became the only official language of the country (Wickramasinghe, 2001), “dethroning English as the language of administration and education for higher employment” (Bloom, 2003, p. 60).

The Tamils responded to the Sinhalese nationalism by creating their own nationalism. According to scholar Radhika Coomaraswamy, these included the myth that the Tamils were the pure Dravidian race, that they are the original inhabitants of Sri Lanka and heirs to the Mohenjadaro and Harappa civilizations of northern India, that the
Tamil language in its purest form is spoken only in Sri Lanka and that the “Saiva Siddhanta” form of Hinduism has “a special homeland” in Sri Lanka” (Bloom, 2003, p. 60)

Discrimination against minorities continued to escalate: “Tamils were disenfranchised from government and other positions of authority” (Bloom, 2003, p. 61). These discriminatory acts against the Tamils led to Tamil protests and political demands. The protests started off as a nonviolent protest movement but escalated into calls for separation through the formation of Tamil militant groups. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) was one of the many Tamil militant groups created through these movements.

The Tamil movement escalated in violence over the years and reached its peak in 1983. The 1983 riots were caused by the LTTE’s ambush of 13 Sri Lankan government soldiers as retaliation for the murder of “Charles Anthony, Prabhakaran’s right-hand man, in July 1983 by Sri Lanka forces” (Bloom, 2003, p. 63). The result of the riots would shape the course of the Tamil protests forever:

A wave of anti-Tamil violence against civilians for 72 hours during which Tamil homes were burned, Tamil-owned factories and businesses were destroyed, and widespread looting, pillaging, and rape occurred. The degree of state involvement was unclear as it appeared to be disorganized mob violence, yet the government admitted 360 death, and the “mobs armed with voters’ lists, and detailed addresses of every Tamil-owned shop, house or factory, and their attacks were very precise.” There are additional allegations that the mob had detailed lists of individual personal belongings and knew what to look for. (Bloom, 2003, p. 63)
The 1983 riot played a major role in strengthening the LTTE: “Support for the LTTE increased sharply after the 1983 attacks. Coomprawamy puts the pre-1983 figures at 600 LTTE members, ‘by March 1983 after the pogrom LTTE support exceeded 10,000’” (Bloom, 2003, p. 64).

The LTTE, through systematic annihilation of other Tamil political and militant groups, emerged as the major representative of Tamil interest and freedom (Ranganathan, 2010). However, the LTTE’s questionable military tactics and human rights violations did not receive unwavering support of the entire Tamil community:

... LTTE supporter critical of the local Tiger leadership to a critique of the Tigers’ expulsion of Muslims from the North, child recruitment and suicide bombers; from having agreed to help the late political ideologue of the LTTE Anton Balasingham in steering the Tiger organization away from hardliners, he fell out with Balasingham and later sung paeans on his death. It must be noted here that Jeyaraj had borne the brunt of the intolerance of the LTTE. (Ranganathan, 2010, p. 75)

War crimes and human-rights violation accusations against the LTTE and the Sri Lankan government in the last phase of the war continue to be a hotly debated issue on local and international media. The Sri Lankan government categorically denies that it used heavy weapons and aerial bombardment during the final phase of the war. The British Channel 4 movie, Killing Fields of Sri Lanka, brought about much controversy by presenting what they described as raw footage of alleged war crimes committed by the Sri Lankan government forces in uniform. Accounts of the LTTE using civilians as human shields and government forces’ bombing no-fire zones have been reported by various
nongovernmental organizations and aid agencies as credible proof of possible war crimes committed by the LTTE and the Sri Lankan government (Whitehall, 2011).

In March 2012, the United Nations passed a resolution on Sri Lanka in order to encourage the government to be more active in addressing these human rights violations in order to prevent future outbreaks of civil disobedience.

Media Freedom in Sri Lanka

The need to communicate is fundamental to human nature. It derives partly from the instinct of self-preservation, as is so evident for example in the situation of the hungry infant crying for food or that of the desperate gestures of the dying person, conveying the intensity of the battle for life and the need for assistance to prolong it. In both instances, by a cry or gesture, the message is communicated and invariably evokes a response. (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 89)

According to some scholars, in Sri Lanka, suppression, censorship, and regulation of media freedom is not a new phenomenon. In order to better understand media freedom in Sri Lanka, one must delve into the historical background of media in Sri Lanka.

Politics have long been a major player in determining and altering media freedom in Sri Lanka. According to Gunewardena (1981), human rights and freedom are a recent development in Sri Lanka. Such rights first appeared in the 1972 constitution of Sri Lanka:

In Sri Lanka these rights were set out explicitly for the first time only in May 1972 in the Constitution of the Republic of Sri Lanka. In the chapter on the Principles of State Policy certain norms are set forth as being the guiding principles in the making of laws and the governance of Sri Lanka. Among the objectives to the realization of
which the Republic was pledged is the “full realization of all rights and freedoms of citizens including group rights.” (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 89)

In a nutshell, “constitutions would appear to limit the guarantee of this freedom to citizens only” (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 91). According to Gunewardena, (1981), the fact that most of the Tamil population in central Sri Lanka consists of Tamils that were brought over to the island to work as plantation workers during British colonial rule have made their citizenship ambiguous, with limited freedom. These limitations of freedom have affected not only the Tamils, but also the media influence of the entire population of the island.

Freedom of information can be hindered by authoritative practices. Hegemonic forces are known to abuse their power and influence over communities in order to protect and promote its self-interests. For example, when a state becomes selective of the information available to the community, “information services tend to be purveyors of propaganda rather than socially relevant information” (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 93). Restrictive administrative censorship and legislation that promotes and protects hegemonic interests over that of the people, will systematically choke the free flow of information. Some argue that the emergency regulations that have been in effect in Sri Lanka are an example of how the state has used state policies to exert power over the free flow of information, and control and shape the ideology of the nation.

The imposition of emergency rule, a phenomenon that is becoming increasingly common in certain parts of Asia, brings in its wake censorship of news and information and control of the media. In countries in which the media is under state ownership or control, a form of self-censorship is invariably practiced either as a matter of policy or because of managerial expediency. (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 93)
Implementation of policies, such as emergency regulations, has been long contested by journalists and activists. Such policies can hinder free flow of information and both directly and indirectly affect the role of media. Self-censorship is a great example of how hegemonic forces can affect the direct flow of information through indirect means of “suppression, distortion, or exaggeration” (Gunewardena, 1981 p. 94).

According to Gunewardena (1981), ordinary Sri Lankan citizens have a tendency to believe that freedom of speech, expression, and information are rights that belong to the media rather than individuals. As he points out, there is no such freedom in Sri Lankan law that grants media organizations more freedom than individuals. The “Sri Lanka broadcasting,” which is responsible for the management of media organizations in the country, have been a monopoly ever since the technology became available for broadcasting. Gunewardena (1981) points out the following:

The law prohibits private transmission by individuals except the restricted transmission and reception permitted to licensed amateur radio enthusiasts. Television, which is only a few years old, is also a state monopoly. The production and screening of films is controlled by the State Film Corporation. Two of the three major newspaper publishing institutions are state controlled. Thus, the state exercises effective control over the mass media in Sri Lanka. Consequently, the majority of the professional communicators are employees of the state and are subject to the policy directives of the government of the day. (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 94)

Furthermore, since 1973, laws have been passed in order to protect “cabinet publications, cabinet documents and cabinet decisions” (Gunewardena, 1981, p. 94).
According to Gunawardena, 1981, in Sri Lanka, the state is able to exercise direct authority over the free flow of information by having the newspaper, radio, and television and film production under its control:

A media system that functions so closely under state control does not promote public access to information through choice and feedback. The information process thus tends to become a monologue in a top-down model and cannot for that reason promote democratization. This is aggravated by the composition of Sri Lankan society which is pluralistic in its ethnic, linguistic, cultural and religious makeup (Gunewardena, 1981, p 95).

There is considerable division in reporting between Sinhalese and Tamil newspapers, which further adds to the polarization of the coverage along ethnic lines: “The vernacular Sri Lankan news media are deeply polarized along communal lines—through an “essentializ-ing of ethnicity” in terms of Singhalese, Tamils, and Muslims, especially in coverage of the peace process” (Nadaraja, 2005, p. 9).

Almost all leading Sinhalese papers have adopted strong nationalist positions. The Tamil press has seen a narrowing and shifting to the right of positions on the peace process and the Tamil question in general (Nadaraja, 2005; Lee, 2010).

According to Jazeel (2010), the state of Sri Lankan media freedom shows little signs of improvement:

Of late there has been little in the way of press freedom in Sri Lanka. During the war’s protracted endgame in particular, journalists who chose to speak out against the government’s military tactics in Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam-occupied territories, its wartime treatment of Tamil civilian populations and the subsequent
internment of approximately 270,000 internally displaced peoples were at risk of imprisonment, enforced exile and, in extreme but not unheard of cases, either assassination or ‘disappearances’ (p. 443).

Disagreeing or even reporting on the material that does not agree with hegemonic forces’ statements is considered to be unpatriotic, and such journalists and media institutions are under constant attack by “unidentified forces.” Mr. Lasantha Wickrematunga was one such brave soul who stood up to the government until his very last breath: “On Jan. 8, 2009, eight assassins on four black motorcycles surrounded the vehicle of my husband, Sri Lankan journalist Lasantha Wickrematunge. They bludgeoned him to death on a busy street in Colombo’s High Security Zone, just yards away from one of the nation’s largest Air Force bases” (Samarasinghe, 2010).

Mr. Wickrematunga’s wife, Sonali who was also a journalist before she fled the country after her husband’s death, writes that her husband was killed because of his work (Samarasinghe, 2010). Mr. Wickrematunga is not the only casualty in this struggle for media freedom. In a letter addressed to the president of Sri Lanka, the executive director of CPJ (Committee to Protect Journalists) wrote:

The Committee to Protect Journalists is alarmed by your government's policies toward journalists who write critically about the conflict between Sri Lanka's military forces and Tamil secessionists. We have seen an increase in harassment, intimidation, and detention of reporters, many of whom are columnists in senior positions with well-established careers. Police have failed to investigate threats to journalists who cover elections or expose alleged corruption or misdeeds. They have also never investigated the death of a television journalist (Simon, 2008). Thirty-
four journalists and media workers have been killed in Sri Lanka since 2004 (Balasundaram, 2011.)

As Jazeel (2010) sees it, the Internet has offered a ray of hope to journalists and media workers who wish to continue the fight for equality and freedom in Sri Lanka: “Key to such progressive reconfigurations is the spatial reordering that such platforms achieve. Their potential is precisely their ability to disassemble an established social and spatial order that has become the ‘naturally given’ basis for government” (Jazeel, 2010, p. 447).

However, one must understand that those who have access to the Internet by far do not constitute the majority. The rural majority of Sri Lanka is still controlled and influenced by mainstream media. Also, journalists have not been able to escape the far-reaching arm of terror by taking their cause to cyberspace (Jazeel, 2010).

Cyberspace is not censorship-proof and more worryingly, online contributors and journalists are just as subject to the threat of expulsion, violence, and disappearance as are those who trade in the more traditional forms of print media. The disappearance of Prageeth Eknaligoda, political commentator and cartoonist for www.lankaenews.com, in January 2010 is proof of this. An increasing number of Sri Lankan news, information, and discussion websites have been blocked (Jazeel, 2010).

According to Ranganathan (2010), the LTTE and the Sri Lankan state have used the Internet as a weapon. The LTTE’s use of terror to counter dissent in the virtual world is attributed to how the LTTE dealt with dissenters in the real world. The LTTE used tactics such as defamation, smear campaigns, and vilification to exterminate Tamil journalists from the virtual world, when the journalists posed views that the LTTE deemed unacceptable (Ranganathan, 2010).
The private media operate under constant threats from the hegemonic and other ideological and political forces that exert power and influence in sociopolitical arenas. The overarching influence of the LTTE over Tamil journalists and activists during its reign is an example of how Sri Lankan media are exploited and abused by nongovernmental ideological hegemonic forces (Hoole, 2007; Jazeel, 2010; Simon, 2008; Samarasinghe, 2010).

According to Whitaker (2004), the state’s hegemonic and direct control over media comes in two forms: “Within a state’s borders via the various forms of direct control a majoritarian state can impose through legislation (i.e., censorship, state ownership of newspapers, etc.) or through sheer numerical control (as the ‘official voice’) a state has over how its activities are generally portrayed internationally” (p. 491). In the case of Sri Lanka, both of these forms are present. The LTTE and the state have practiced censorship by various methods, some of which were mentioned above, while both parties maintained separate fronts to disseminate information to the international community. The LTTE formed Tamilnet.com to create an alternative local media and official voice than that of the state (Whitaker, 2004). Tamilnet.com was repeatedly cited by Western news media outlets despite editorial criticism against the site (Whitaker, 2004). This further polarized news content in the international sphere along hegemonic lines.

Media personnel and activists start a process of self-censorship after prolonged suppression and hostility, thus accepting defeat in the midst of powerful, overarching hegemonic forces. Hegemonic forces control and suppress freedoms in order to make an ideal platform for propaganda, self-interests, preferred ideologies, and political control in Sri Lanka, making it extremely difficult to understand the conflict without being misled by
the hegemonic forces’ interpretations and portrayals of the conflict (Hoole, 2007; Jazeel, 2010; Simon, 2008; Samarasinghe, 2010).

Framing Analysis

The concept of framing can be useful when studying the practices of mass media and the manipulation of public opinion. Public opinion research has demonstrated that informed, consistent opinions to be rare and that even slight changes in presentation of a question are engender changes in responses (Chong & Druckman, 2007). When reporting news, journalists use frames to present certain viewpoints, stock phrases, and stereotypical images to convey a specific interpretation of an event. Repetition, placement, and reinforcement help portray a dominant interpretation of the subject matter, making the text more perceivable, acceptable, and memorable (Entman, 1991).

Sociologist Erving Goffman (1974), is partly responsible for the emergence of framing theory. According to Goffman, individuals label events with various “frameworks” or “schemata of interpretation”. He explained frames to render something meaningless from a scene or event and making it meaningful. He was the first to propose an approach to understanding how people interpret social events based on their expectations, or “frames of reference.”

When the individual in our Western society recognizes a particular event, he tends, whatever else he does, to imply in this response (and in effect employ) one or more frameworks or schemata of interpretation of a kind that can be called primary ... [A] primary framework is one that is seen as rendering what would otherwise be a
meaningless aspect of the scene into something that is meaningful. (Goffman, 1974, p. 21)

Framing theory has been popular among researchers in recent years. A recent review of the field of mass communication found that framing “was the most frequently utilized theory in top mass communication journals since the beginning of the 21st century” (D’Angelo & Kuypers, pp. 1–2). However, theorists of framing have not yet agreed on the status of the concept in the fields of communication and media studies, and the theory lacks precise criteria for identifying a frame, especially since no single agreed-upon definition of a frame exists.

Robert Entman (1993) provides the following definition: “To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (p. 52). Here, Entman (1993) focuses on selection and salience as the characteristics of framing in news stories. He also describes frames as “mentally stored clusters of ideas that guide individuals processing of information” (p. 53), implying that frames can be studied with an eye toward the journalists (i.e., creator or the source of the frame) and the audience (i.e., the interpreter of the frame). Gitlin (1980) seems to agree when he states that frames are “largely unspoken and unacknowledged, organize the world both for journalists who report it and, in some important degree, for us who rely on their reports” (p. 7).

Scheufele (1999) recognizes three actors when discussing frames: the advocacy organization (source), the journalist and the audiences. In other words, journalists
construct frames while working under pressure from press routines, interest groups, and how the audience accepts the message.

Other definitions of the concept focus on the ability of frames to manipulate the significance of matters in the public perception: “A frame is a central organizing idea for news content that supplies a context and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion and elaboration” (Reese, Gandy, & Grant, 2001, p. 10).

Gamson and Modigliani (1987) define frames as a “a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events ... The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue” (p. 143). Snow, Rochford, Worden & Benford (1986) propose a similar view and states that by rendering events to be more meaningful, frames organize experience and guide action. Frames organize experience for both journalists who report it and to some degree for those who rely on the reports.

In news media, the frame holders strategically influence and shape how the audiences perceive and comprehend situations, events, and products through persuasion and inclusion or exclusion of facts (Hallahan, 1999; Lim & Jones, 2010; Lundy, 2006; Schultz, Kleinnijenhuis, Oegema, Utz & van Atteveldt, 2012; Waller & Conaway, 2011).

Waller and Conaway (2011) sate as follows:

Frames are designed to deliberately reconstitute selected aspects of reality surrounding deliberation of a public issue. In essence, a frame binds together carefully chosen ideas, information, judgments, arguments, claims, and value statements into a tightly compressed noetic narrative that guides the frameholder’s interpretation of events as well as discourse related to a given topic.
Framing is also viewed as an extension of agenda-setting (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, 2006). The first level of agenda-setting transmits object salience to news audiences. The second level, focusing on indicator salience, illustrates how the media influence news audiences to think about something.

Since frames carry an adjustable interpretation, parties with different points of view and values can use framing to propagate, justify, and defend self-interests. This “adjustable” nature of framing makes it a very influential and sought out tool in communication strategies. Framing operates through cognitive, rhetorical, and ideological processes. In cognitive processing, framing includes ideas and facts that are beneficial to the frame’s core theme while excluding ideas and facts that are negative. The rhetorical process suggests and hints at how the idea should be interpreted using similes, metaphors, descriptions, and illustrations (Hallahan, 1999; Waller & Conaway, 2011). Finally, “On an ideological level, frames contain information on how a society works—or should work—as well as the proper relationship among its members; frames contain fundamental assumptions regarding social priorities and problems” (Waller & Conaway, 2011, p. 87).

According to Scheufle (1999), since frames are necessary for both portraying and comprehending news, two concepts of framing can be identified: media frames and individual frames. Media frames allow journalists to identify, classify, and package information for their audience and individual frames rely on people’s personal ideas to model how they interpret and process information (Entman, 1993).

State involvement has been known to influence how conflicts are covered in the news media (D’Angelo & Kuypers, 2010). The frames used by governing states have shown to be influential in affecting how journalists frame the same issue (D’Angelo and Kuypers,
The coverage of the U.S “war on terror” provides insight as to how the U.S. government’s stance and interpretations (frame) not only influenced how the U.S. news media framed the issue but also how international media adopted the frame used by the U.S. government (D’Angelo & Kuypers, 2010).

Several studies that examined the framing of war reporting, specifically the news coverage of the Arab–Israeli conflict, found four dominant frames: strategic interests, feuding neighbors, Arab intransigence, and Israeli expansionism (Gamson, 1992). Furthermore, Gamson found that negative identities were heightened in the text by repetitiveness. Wolfsfeld (1997) found the media’s preference of “drama” frames in the Middle East conflict aided the extremists. As a result of this preference, a dominant frame of injustice and defiance was found to prevail in favor of the Palestinian cause.

One similarity between the U.S. war on terror and the Sri Lankan conflict is that both conflicts involved states and terrorists. The meaning of terrorism must be explored in order to understand how this meaning was constructed to meet the ends desired by the hegemonic forces. Terrorism has provided rebels and states a platform for political theater (D’Angelo & Kuypers, 2010). Furthermore, D’Angelo, & Kuypers, (2010) suggest that journalists simply follow a “horserace” angle, especially when covering politics, in order to appear unbiased. Hegemonic forces have the ability to persuade and alter public opinion by using news media as their platform (Ottosen 2010). Scholars have argued that the Bush administration’s misleading of public opinion during its campaign for war has been underestimated by the media. Other scholars have also pointed out that the Bush administration used news media as a propaganda tool. In short, the Bush administration is seen to have led the nation to war on the basis of erroneous information. The officials with
the most opportunities to make speeches grant media interviews, and otherwise frame the public debate also tend to make the most false statements, according to a first-ever analysis of the entire body of pre-war rhetoric (Ottosen, 2010).

Applying Norwegian scholar Johan Gultung's war/peace journalism frames to the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict can provide further insight into Sri Lankan and U.S. newspapers used these frames. War journalism tends to portray winners and losers as distinct groups, thus have a tendency to be reactive (Neumann & Fahmy, 2012). Peace journalism is more concentrated on transparency, giving voice to the conflict parties. The ultimate goal of peace journalism is to promote a win-win situation (Neumann & Fahmy, 2012).

As a result of state and military censorship, the media have been found to use similar values and priorities in reporting conflict as in covering other events (Carruthers, 2000). Furthermore, by being subject to state and military censorship, mass media become accomplices in wartime propaganda, with a potential to play a role in instigating conflict (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, 2006). The coverage of the 2003 Iraq War was framed more favorably toward the U.S. military by embedded journalists than by non-embedded journalists (Pfau et al., 2004).

War Journalism

The news coverage of conflict goes hand in hand in the notion of conflict as a news value. As a result, war reporting is often sensationalized and used as a device to boost circulation and ratings (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, 2006). War journalism identifies with either side of the conflict; uses military triumphalist language; an action-oriented focus; and a
superficial narrative with little context, background, or historical perspective (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, C, 2006).

Simply put, peace journalism conceptualizes the four broad practice and linguistic orientations of peace/conflict, truth, people, and solutions, war journalism is oriented toward war/violence, propaganda, elites, and victory (Galtung, 2002). War journalism portrays conflict similar to a sport where participants are grouped into opposing sides (i.e., us-versus-them’) in a zero-sum game, highlighting the visible effects of war while ignoring the intangible consequences (Galtung, 2002).

Galtung’s peace journalism model includes four contrasting main points between war journalism and peace journalism: War journalism is violence-orientated, propaganda-orientated, elite-orientated, and victory-orientated, and is often linked to a dualistic method, a zero-sum game where the winner takes all as in sports journalism (Galtung, 2002). A potential consequence of war journalism is its contribution to escalating conflicts by reproducing propaganda and promoting war. Galtung (1998) was critical of the “low road” taken by news media in pursuing wars and the elites involved, and called on journalists to direct their reporting to a “high road” for peace, where news media did not focus on a win-lose outcome or a sports-arena style reporting.

Peace Journalism

Galtung first sowed the seeds of peace journalism in his seminal critique of war reporting, The Structure of Foreign News, coauthored by Mari Holmboe Ruge, to examine Norwegian newspapers’ presentation of the Congo, Cuba, and Cyprus crises (Galtung & Ruge, 1965). He continued to promote ideas of peace in his later works (Galtung, 1986,
2002) and take initiatives like TRANSCEND, a nonprofit organization that was founded to promote ideas of peace, and the U.K.-based Conflict and Peace Forums (Ottosen, 2010). Galtung (1986, 2002) lays out peace journalism and war journalism as two competing frames when covering a conflict. Although Galtung’s portrayal of peace journalism as both peace- and conflict-oriented may appear paradoxical, peace-oriented journalists first accept that a conflict exists and explores conflict formations by identifying the parties, goals, and issues involved (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, 2006).

Ottosen (2010) states that by carefully applying peace journalism, a journalist can understand the conflict’s historical and cultural roots, and give voice to all parties, creating empathy and understanding. In other words, by applying peace journalism carefully, consistently, and conscientiously, the peace journalist aims to create a setting in which the causes of and possible solutions to the conflict become clearer. Other peace journalism approaches include taking a preventive advocacy stance and emphasizing the invisible effects of violence (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, 2006).

Galtung and Ruge (1965) examined core principles like rejecting conflict as a news value in international news reporting, which forms a basis for peace journalism. Due to journalists’ reliance on conflict as a news value, war reporting is thought to display sensationalism, biased identification with one side or the other, overemphasis on losses such as human casualties and material damage, military triumphalist language, and narratives that lack in context, background and historical perspective. The peace journalism section of Galtung’s model acknowledges, from an ethical standpoint, that media play a role in debunking the propaganda war by presenting a truthful, people-oriented approach to the audience (Ottosen, 2010). Peace journalism is people-orientated
and focuses on the victims (often civilian casualties), giving a voice to the voiceless (Ottosen, 2010). It is also truth-orientated and reveals untruths on all sides.

According to Lee (2010), peace journalists must first acknowledge the existence of conflict before exploring the factors involved in forming the conflict. They must also understand the conflict’s historical and cultural roots while giving voice to all parties involved. By actively practicing peace journalism, peace journalists seek to create an understanding environment for possible solutions to the conflict. Other techniques of peace journalism are preventive advocacy approaches to urge reconciliation and focus on common ground, rather than on vengeance, retaliation, and differences, and present stories that emphasize the invisible effects of violence (Lee, 2010).

Objectivity is an honored journalistic principle that views the journalist as a neutral bystander. It is often offered as a defense for journalists’ disinterested moral autonomy in covering news. Objectivity is thought by some to silence reports of the brutality of war, and the suffering of victims, turning war into spectacle (Kim, Lee, & Maslog, 2006). There is much debate about peace journalism and objectivity (Ottosen, 2010). Ottosen (2010) also states that it may appear as if peace journalism is counter to the notion of detached objectivity. Some perceive objectivity as an obstacle for journalists when it comes to playing a responsible, constructive role in public (Ottosen, 2010). War journalism, focusing on patriotism, national interest, censorship, and propaganda, often prevents objective reporting (Carruthers, 2000; Iggers, 1998). For example, a study focused on hegemonic influences in covering conflict by reproducing verbatim two reports about the shooting down of a U.S. military helicopter by El Salvadoran rebels (Ottosen, 2010). Written by the same correspondent, the report written for a U.S. paper presented the anger
of U.S. officials toward the rebels while the report written for a European paper was sympathetic toward the rebels (Otttosen, 2010).

The body of literature documenting the failure of journalists’ adherence to objectivity in conflicts stands in support of peace journalism (Carruthers, 2000; Iiggers, 1998). Galtung’s war-and-peace model has its share of criticism. Otttosen (2010) points out how opponents have argued that models are overly dualistic:

In his article, Loyn prefers to use terms such as “truthfulness” and “objectivity” as journalistic guidelines, even though he acknowledges the limitations inherent in those terms: “On this analysis, if we accept that objectivity is at least a worthy aspiration, even though not a tool to achieve the “whole truth”, then peace journalism fails a key test by imposing other expectations onto journalists” (Loyn, 2007: 5). Loyn is disturbed by Galtung’s original war and peace model because its categories, “war journalism” and “peace journalism” are too dualistic. (p. 264)

Furthermore, some argue that peace journalism underestimates material conditions of modern news reporting, and overestimates the ability of journalists to contextualize their stories (Otttosen, 2010).

Others disagree that objectivity is the most important issue (Otttosen, 2010). According to this point of view, to report what you see is not essential. Otttosen (2010) also states that the main point of a story is often what you don’t see. Otttosen (2010) presents peace journalism as more than good journalism, different from traditional coverage of news stories, especially when journalists cover conflict. Instead of reporting what is seen, peace journalism focuses on exploring reality to discover what is not ostensibly reflective,
utilizes structural and organizational imperatives, and caters to the reader's interests (Ottosen, 2010).

As the power of the media empire continues to expand with each new technological innovation, hegemonic forces are constantly in a battle with external actors such as the news media and activists to frame a crisis. Framing theory is ideal to provide the theoretical basis for this study in order to understand and interpret how peace and war journalism frames were used in Sri Lankan and U.S. newspapers.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

According to Goffman (1974), framing renders something meaningless from an event and gives it meaning. In his view, individuals label events with different “frameworks.” Furthermore, he states that journalists situate, perceive, recognize and label events by applying frameworks. Wodak & Meyer (2001) state that individual discourse comes from these collective frameworks and frames of perception. Media like newspapers use these frames to select content, organize it, and produce stories to fit certain criteria and formats (Miller & Ross, 2004).

Using Gultung’s war journalism and peace journalism frame, the chosen articles for the two time periods—the final phase of the war and its aftermath, were categorized into war journalism and peace journalism. Gultung’s model for peace journalism includes four main indicators of war journalism and peace journalism: War journalism is violence-orientated, propaganda-orientated, elite-orientated and victory-orientated, whereas peace journalism is peace/conflict-oriented, people-oriented, truth-oriented, and solutions-oriented. Therefore, two research questions were posed based on Galtung’s (1986, 1998) classification of war/peace journalism:

RQ1: Are there significant differences in the use of war/peace journalism frames between local news coverage and foreign news coverage of the Sri Lankan civil war? If so, what were the dominant frames for each geographically different types of newspaper?

This research question seeks to uncover the dominant frame used in the coverage, as well as identify similarities and differences between local and foreign coverage.
It is important to understand how these two main frames were used in order to get more insight into the journalistic and reporting practices by identifying main indicators, or subframes, of the two frame types.

Furthermore, identifying subframes that are specific to the Sri Lankan conflict can shed even deeper insight into the overall coverage of the war. Once the subframes are identified, identifying the indicators of the subframes will give deeper understanding into how these subframes were used in covering the Sri Lankan conflict. Therefore, in order to better understand frames specific to the Sri Lankan question, RQ2 is posed:

RQ2: What are the subframes specific to the Sri Lankan conflict? What are the dominant indicators of each subframe?

Overall, answering the two research questions will provide a deeper understanding and insight into how peace journalism and war journalism frames were used in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict and identify the dominant indicators of each frame type.
CHAPTER 4

METHOD

In order to determine what frames were used in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict, the study used the textual analysis technique. Analyzing the words and rhetoric of the selected articles allowed a close examination of how journalists and news organizations chose to portray the conflict to the public. By analyzing the language used in the chosen news articles, textual analysis allowed a close study of the way journalists propagated their thoughts about the conflict to the public. This chapter will define textual analysis and explain why this method was appropriate for the study and provide details as to how this method was used in this study.

Textual analysis first emerged in the mid-1960s and soon became accepted as an alternative to content analysis (Van Dijk, 1991). Also known as discourse analysis, textual analysis can critically examine texts to establish meaning (van Dijk, 1991). Given the interpretive nature of textual analysis, it allowed me to consider all aspects of content (Hall, 1975). Corbin and Strauss (2008) defines qualitative analysis as “a process of examining and interpreting data in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge” (p. 1). Qualitative research includes theoretical or interpretive studies that classify, use concepts to amplify, and focus on aesthetics in texts, leading to an evaluation (Berger, 2011). The interpretive method used in textual analysis, which allows me to examine all aspects of the text, such as stylistic language, omissions, and visuals, differentiates it from content analysis (Lester-Roushanzamir & Raman, 1999). Textual analysis is also known as discourse analysis, which critically examines cultural artifacts or
texts to establish meaning (Flener, 2008). Textual analysis can examine such questions as follows: What is the writer's claim? Is it justified? Who is the audience?

Scholars have identified three steps in a textual analysis: defining the potential frames, close reading of the text, and interpreting the findings (Flener, 2008). For this study, war and peace journalism frames were identified as prevalent frames in conflict reporting. Next, I closely read the texts (i.e., newspaper articles) and analyzed the text and categorized the articles into war or peace journalism. Also, in this step, I identified subframes that are specific to the Sri Lankan conflict. In the final step, I interpreted the findings and compared how differently local and foreign newspapers used the peace and journalism frames and analyzed the subframes used by the newspapers, adding to the accumulating knowledge on conflict framing.

Although Neumann and Fahmy (2012) have conducted a content analysis on the visual framing of the Sri Lankan war in newspapers, the present textual analysis allow a deeper analysis on the rhetoric, metaphors, and paragons present in the coverage.

The specific details of how the textual analysis was applied is as follows: First, a list of newspaper articles from Sri Lankan and U.S. newspapers from the Lexis-Nexis academic database for specific time periods using the search phrase “Sri Lanka war”, was obtained. The search results were limited to only two Sri Lankan newspapers, due to the lack of availability of Sri Lankan newspapers in the Lexis-Nexis Academic database. Next, two prominent U.S. newspapers (The New York Times and Washington Post) that covered the Sri Lankan conflict were chosen for the study, in order to identify differences and similarities in the use of war and peace journalism frames used by local and foreign newspapers. The articles were separated by two different time periods: May 1, 2008—May 31, 2009 and
June 1, 2009—December 31, 2011. The articles were narrowed down and selected for the study, according to the relevance of the content in the articles. After reading through each article, it was determined if the content of the article referred to the Sri Lankan conflict. The compiled articles addressed the Sri Lankan conflict or issues that are directly related to it. Articles that mentioned the Sri Lankan conflict but did not describe it directly were excluded due to lack of relevance to the study. For instance, if the article was about a different conflict, and there was a reference to the Sri Lankan conflict as yet another ethnic conflict, the article was excluded due to the lack of analyzable content and lack of relevancy. Furthermore, I read through each article and excluded Associated Press stories from the compilation to avoid redundancy. A total of 1774 articles were available for both local and foreign newspapers when the search term “Sri Lanka War” was entered in the Lexis Nexis Academic database. From the 1774 total articles, 445 articles were excluded (for both time frames and all four newspapers) because of lack of relevance. Overall, a total of 185 articles were selected and analyzed for this study. (See Table 1)

For the time period May 1, 2008—May 31, 2009, 77 articles were available for Daily News, from which 16 were excluded for lacking relevance to the Sri Lankan conflict. For the time period: June 1, 2009—December 31, 2011, there were 629 articles available for Daily News, from which 206 were excluded. For the time period: May 1, 2008—May 31, 2009, 139 articles were available for Daily Mirror from which 11 were excluded for lacking relevance to the Sri Lankan conflict. For the time period: June 1, 2009—December 31, 2011, there were 674 articles available for Daily Mirror, from which 82 were excluded. For the time period: May 1, 2008—May 31, 2009, 61 articles were available for The New York Times, from which 9 were excluded for lacking relevancy to the Sri Lankan conflict. For the time
period: June 1, 2009—December 31, 2011, there were 41 articles available for The New York Times, from which 16 were excluded. For the time period: May 1, 2008- May 31, 2009, 92 articles were available for Washington Post, from which 54 were excluded for lacking relevancy to the Sri Lankan conflict. For the time period: June 1, 2009- December 31, 2011, there were 61 articles available for Washington Post, from which 51 were excluded.

Next, for each time period, 25 articles (except for the Washington Post) were selected, using disproportionate stratified random sampling: I randomly selected 25 articles from each of the two local newspapers (Daily Mirror and Daily News), 25 articles from The New York Times, and 10 articles (due to availability) from The Washington Post.

By analyzing the articles, I hoped to reveal how the peace journalism and war journalism frames were used by the newspapers and journalists, as well as to identify differences and similarities between local and foreign newspapers’ use of these two frames when covering the Sri Lankan conflict. Media can be considered a third party in times of conflict. The journalists can be seen as going between environments of the conflict and facilitating communication and defining situations (Peleg, 2006, 2007). According to scholar, Howard (2005), the news media “can be a weapon of war, or can uphold prospects for peace” (p. 1). This interpretation explains how journalists and the news media can decide to focus on violence or peace. Knightley (2002) states that “the media have more influence than journalists seem to realize” (p. 168). Although a neutral point of view is deemed to be vital and necessary for journalism, sociological and journalism research has revealed that news is socially constructed by journalists (McIntosh, 2008). The peace journalism and war journalism frames are two main frames that are known to be present in conflict reporting.
According to Boyd-Barrett (2004), war journalism is a taken-for-granted feature in armed conflicts. Lee and Maslog (2005) characterizes war journalism as “an identification with one side or with the home side of the war, military triumphant language, an action orientation, and a superficial narrative with little context, background, or historical perspective” (p. 311). War journalism is seen to have limitations due to its features. Boyd-Barrett (2004), states that “the media focus on some wars rather than others, often fail to capture both the deep-level and the proximate causes of wars or explain their actual durations and aftermaths” (p. 25) therefore not being suitable to cover wars.

Peace journalism can be defined as a self-conscious type of reporting, focused on specific causes and solutions to conflict, preventative steps and aiming to enhance prospects for peace (Frohlich, 2006). Psychologist Kempf (2007) explains peace journalism as a two-step process. He recommends a de-escalation of coverage, distanced, respectful, and fair to all sides, and the coverage to be oriented towards finding solutions in the second phase. Lee and Maslog, (2005) state that peace journalism is grounded in communitarian philosophy and is committed to ideas of civic participation and understanding of social justice as a moral imperative. Lee and Maslog, (2005) also state that stories that reflect peace journalism should “highlight peace initiatives, tone down ethnic differences, prevent further conflicts, focus on the structure of society, and promote conflict resolution, reconstruction, and reconciliation.” (p. 311)

Next, all chosen articles were reviewed and categorized using Galtung’s (1986, 1998) classification of war journalism and peace journalism frames (see Table 2). Articles that conceptualized the four broad practice and linguistic orientations of peace journalism: (i.e., peace/conflict, truth, people, and solutions) were categorized under the peace-
journalism category, while articles that conceptualized the four broad practice and linguistic orientations of war journalism: (i.e., war/violence, propaganda, elites, and victory) were categorized under war journalism.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

Using textual analysis, I examined the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict in two time periods: May 1, 2008—May 31, 2009 (the final phase of the war) and June 1, 2009—December 31, 2011 (two and a half years after the war). A textual analysis of the coverage explored how peace journalism and war journalism frames were used in local and foreign newspaper coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict. The analysis further examined the relationship between local and international news publications' use of the peace/war journalism frames when covering the conflict and uncovered two sub frames that are specific to the Sri Lankan conflict.

As outlined in the framing analysis chapter of this thesis, Galtung's model for peace journalism includes four main points between war journalism and peace journalism: war journalism is violence-oriented, propaganda-oriented, elite-oriented and victory-oriented, and is often linked to a dualistic method, a zero-sum game where the winner takes all (as in sports journalism)(Galtung, 2002). In contrast, peace journalism is peace/conflict-oriented, people-oriented, truth-oriented and solutions-oriented.

As discussed extensively in previous chapters, due to journalists' reliance on conflict as a news value, war reporting is thought to display: sensationalism; identifying with one side or the other; overemphasis on losses such as human casualties and material damage; military triumphalist language; and narratives that lack in context, background and historical perspective, while peace journalism (according to Galtung's model) acknowledges, in an ethical standpoint, that media play a role in the propaganda war by presenting a truthful, people-oriented approach to the audience (Ottosen, 2010). Peace
journalism, therefore, is people-orientated and focuses on the victims (often civilian casualties), giving a voice to the voiceless (Ottosen, 2010). It is also truth-orientated and reveals untruths on all sides.

RQ1: Are there significant differences in the use of war/peace journalism frames between local news coverage and international news coverage of the Sri Lankan civil war? If so, what was the dominant frame?

In order to answer this question in-depth, an overview of the coverage from the two selected time periods, comparing the coverage between local and international news publications are presented. Then, the peace journalism frame and war journalism frame categorizations for each specific news publication is explored for the two time periods.

Final Phase (May 1, 2008- May 31, 2009)

Peace journalism dominated the overall coverage in the final phase, with 67 articles categorized under the Peace Journalism frame, and 33 under the war journalism frame (see Table 2). People-oriented, peace/conflict-oriented reporting dominated articles categorized under the Peace Journalism frame while the final phase for this section was dominated by people-oriented emphasis on civilian suffering and issues surrounding the subject matter. Civilian suffering was highlighted in all four news publications in this time period.

Local news publications’ coverage during the final phase of the civil war was dominated by violence-oriented, propaganda-oriented, elite-oriented, victory-oriented reporting and people-oriented reporting that focused on reports on human suffering, international pressure over civilian casualties, patriotic coverage, military triumphalist
language pro-war justifications. The coverage of the final phase of the civil war was dominated by civilian issues, military initiatives and battle reports.

International publications were dominated by peace/conflict-oriented and people-oriented reporting and gave more in-depth insight into the realities of civilian suffering, gave voice to ordinary citizens and non-elite sources and reported alleged atrocities committed by both sides that were involved. The international publications also contained articles with violence-oriented and elite-oriented reporting that sensationalized battle reports and presented events in a zero-sum scenario.

The war journalism frame dominated the final phase of the coverage of Daily News articles, with 14 articles categorized under war journalism and 11 under peace journalism. Peace Journalism dominated the post war coverage for Daily News, with 13 articles categorized under peace journalism and 12 under war journalism. Overall, Daily News showed the strongest war journalism frame, with 26 out of the total 50 articles (both periods) being categorized as War Journalism.

The main difference between local and international news publication coverage during this time period was present in the articles that were categorized under the War Journalism frame. Local news publications provided justifications for the war, whereas the international news publications were dominated by battle reports and the use of military triumphalist language, giving voice to elite sources.

Postwar Phase (June 1, 2009- December 31, 2011)

Local newspaper coverage of the post war period was dominated by peace/conflict oriented, people oriented, violence-peace oriented, victory-oriented and elite oriented
reporting that focused on development initiatives, human rights investigation reports, military triumphantalist language and justifying war efforts and military strategies.

International publication coverage during the post-war period was dominated by people-oriented, truth-oriented, elite oriented and victory oriented reporting that provided in-depth insight into the realities after the war; ongoing human rights investigations and elite focused military triumphantalist language.

The post-war coverage too, was dominated by the Peace Journalism frame. A total of 64 articles were categorized under Peace Journalism and 21 were categorized under War Journalism during the post war period. Here, in the articles categorized under Peace Journalism, a lot of attention was brought to the civilian deaths that occurred during the final phase of the war. The articles categorized under the War Journalism frame were dominated by justifications for the war and military triumphantalist language.

A more in–depth analysis of the findings for each time period is discussed below, where main indicators of the two frames are identified and presented with examples.

War Journalism Frames and Subframes Used by Local (Sri Lankan) Newspapers

*Final Phase of War*

In the local newspapers selected for the study, the war journalism frame was dominated by victory-oriented, elite-oriented reporting, and propaganda-oriented reporting—delivering opinions shared by elite-sources providing justifications for the war.

The strongest war journalism frame was evident in *Daily News* articles, where victory-oriented, violence-oriented and elite-oriented reporting dominated the coverage. Here, justifications for the war were presented while demonizing the opponent. A similar
pattern was present in *Daily Mirror* articles as well, where violence-oriented, victory-oriented, and elite-oriented reporting provided justifications for the state-backed military initiatives.

Articles that took a strong war-reporting stance, with violence-oriented, elite-oriented and victory-oriented reporting, focused on battles between the LTTE and the government, portraying the battles in a win or lose scenario. Furthermore, these articles were focused on giving reasons to justify the war effort. The articles also gave prominence to elite-sources that often demonized the opposition.

Example: President won't bow to foreign pressure (2009, April 20). *Daily Mirror*.

“The security forces have now reached the tail end of their noble mission. They achieved this victory not because they cannot do any other job but out of the dedication and their love for their motherland,” President Rajapaksa said.

Here, the president of Sri Lanka, an elite-source, is highlighting the government’s interpretation of the war with a celebratory attitude. Furthermore, this example also highlights propaganda-oriented reporting that tend to favor one side over the other, enabling one hegemonic force’s propaganda mouthpiece to define the conflict and the issues surrounding it. Moreover, local newspapers also put a lot of emphasis on military initiatives, and relied heavily on elite-sources that more often than not, acted as propaganda mouthpieces for the state, especially in justifying the war effort.

Example: Terrorism will be eradicated soon- PM (2009, March 9). *Daily News*.

Wickramanayaka said that the Government would never support a ceasefire. The LTTE entered into such ceasefires in the past only to strengthen itself adding that the Government has learnt his lesson from past experiences. “We will be able to
finish off terrorism in a few days time. After that, we will be able to engage these war heroes in the massive development program so that the country can achieve the much needed economic development,” the Prime Minister said.

In this instance, an elite-source presents reasons for the continuation of war: The rebel's previous track record, eliminating terrorism, and paving the way for future economic development. Furthermore, the elite-source acts as a propaganda mouthpiece promoting the continuation of the war. As pointed out in the literature review, state involvement is known to affect how media portray conflicts, which in turn can explain the propaganda-oriented reporting approach the state-owned newspaper is took—especially during a period where a lot of international pressure surrounded the conflict. Demonization of the rebels persists in local newspaper coverage throughout the final war phase. The accusations against the rebels are not without premise, especially since the LTTE's questionable military tactics were no secret to the world. However, the fact that these articles are dominated by elite-sources, lacking representation from rebel-sources, is what makes the coverage one-sided and propaganda-oriented, especially in the articles from the state-owned newspaper, Daily News.

Example: No end till we get Prabhakaran – President (2008, October 3). Daily News

We are also advancing from the East to take Mullative. Progress is low because we want zero civilian casualties. “Now, one of LTTE’s child soldiers is the chief minister and another Prabhakaran’s commanders is a member of Parliament. But Prabhakaran must be punished for his crimes. Let’s not forget he killed Rajiv Gandhi apart from so many Sri Lankan leaders. He has to undergo trial and if India is interested in having him extradited we will do that,” he remarked.
Here, victory-oriented reporting, dominated by elite-sources, provides justifications for the war. Furthermore, it also presents the conflict in a zero-sum game scenario where one party is winning. In this article and subsequent others with similar traits, victory-oriented coverage fails to acknowledge or represent the opinions and points of view of rebels.

Overall, the war journalism frame in local newspapers during the final phase focused on: victory-oriented, propaganda-oriented and elite-oriented reporting that presented justifications for the war.

*Postwar Phase*

As it was with the final phase, the war journalism frame in this time period was dominated by victory-oriented, elite-oriented, and propaganda-oriented reporting that focused on justifying the war. The difference between how the war justification frame was represented in the two time frames is that during the final phase, war justifications were in support of the *continuation* of the war, whereas in the postwar phase, justifications were in support of why the war was necessary.

Example: Inspiration: If Sri Lanka can do it, so can we (2011, September 8). *Daily Mirror.*

In 2005, when Rajapaksa was elected to power, he came with a single agenda - to defeat the LTTE - the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam. Till then, the Tigers seemed invincible. The island was wracked with attacks - bomb blasts, suicide attacks and guerrilla tactics that left the Lankan army and the government only reacting - much like what Pakistan is going through. The LTTE was backed by Indian and in one instance when the Sri Lankan army actually cornered its leader, Prabhakaran, senior
Lankan officials say India actually threatened to bomb the island. But all this was about to change.

As evident in the above example, victory-oriented reporting, characterized by military triumphalist language and justifications for the war, continued to dominate the coverage of articles categorized under war journalism frame. Also, in the example above, the opposition is demonized and their atrocities are highlighted in order to justify the war. The above narrative also fails to present views from the opposition, making the reporting one-sided.

The main indicators of the war journalism frame in local newspaper coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict are: victory-oriented reporting (characterized by the use of military triumphalist language) and propaganda-oriented reporting (characterized by war justifications). Furthermore, the analyses also revealed the war justification subframe, which is unique to the local newspaper coverage of the conflict.

*War Justification Subframe*

This sub frame was present in local news publication articles that were categorized under the war journalism frame. The main indicators, victory-oriented reporting and propaganda-oriented reporting, provided justifications for the continuation of war, during the final phase and justified military action and war, during the post war phase.

Here, the war is justified as a means to an end: needed to end terrorism and build a better society, which presents the war as *necessary*, to end terrorism and pave way for a better future for all. Demonization of the opposition and propaganda-oriented reporting are also present in the war justification subframe.

Example: Terrorism will be eradicated soon – PM (2009, March 9) *Daily News.*
Asked whether the war would be over if Kilinochchi falls, he said: "I don’t call it a war. It is a military operation we have launched to wipe out terrorists. Kilinochchi is the LTTE headquarters. We are also advancing from the East to take Mullaitivu. Progress is slow because we want zero civilian casualties."

The above example shows how elite-sources presented the war: as a military operation to wipe out terrorists. Here, the emphasis is on the need for war, not solutions or the consequences of war. Even though civilians are mentioned, they are mentioned as a factor that’s slowing down the imminent victory. Overall, the war justification sub frame was dominated by victory-oriented, propaganda-oriented, elite-oriented and violence-oriented reporting that presented reasons justifying the war and demonizing the opposition.

War Journalism Frames Used by Foreign (U.S.) Newspapers

*Final Phase of War*

Foreign newspaper articles, categorized under the war journalism frame, were dominated by victory-oriented and elite-oriented reporting that used military triumphalist language to present war in zero-sum game scenario.

In foreign newspapers, victory-oriented and violence-oriented reporting sensationalized the fighting and presented the battles in zero-sum, win-lose scenario.


The ethnic Tamil separatist rebels of Sri Lanka, one of the world’s most feared and enduring guerrilla movements, acknowledged Sunday that their war of more than a quarter-century for a homeland had “reached its bitter end.”
The announcement by their group, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, coming as the Sri Lankan military said it was conducting final mop-up operations on a tiny silver coast that had been rebel’s last refuge, paves way for the conclusion of Asia’s longest-running civil war.

The above example presents how victory-oriented reporting dominated the coverage with zero-sum reporting that describe war as a zero-sum game where one side triumphs over another. Here, the focus is on the conflict; a battle between two opposing forces, without no mention or acknowledgement of the consequences of war or its effect on ordinary citizens.


Two suspected Tamil Tiger rebel planes launched a surprise attack in Sri Lanka’s capital late Friday in defiant show of power that government officials said killed three people and injured at least 48. One plane, riddled with bullets, crashed into a government office building in the heart of Colombo and exploded, killing the pilot and a bystander.

In the above example, violence-oriented reporting highlights fighting and presents the conflict in a zero-sum scenario, where the emphasis is on military initiatives that are taking place, ignoring the civilian population’s troubles.

*Postwar Phase*

Elite-oriented and victory-oriented reporting dominated the coverage during the post-war phase, where elite-sources and military triumphalist language dominated the covering. Only *The New York Times* articles were categorized under the war journalism
frame during this time frame, because all of the 10 articles selected from The Washington Post were categorized under the peace journalism frame.


Having staked his presidency on the bloody but successful end to the war, Mr. Rajapaksa called for a presidential election two years early and had expected to win easily. As evident in the above example, articles categorized under the war journalism frame in this period were dominated by victory-oriented and elite-oriented reporting. In the article above, the focus is on an elite-source, the Sri Lankan Army General that led the final war, being arrested. Furthermore, it presents war as a zero-sum game, drawing attention to the fact that that the war ended, successfully.

Peace Journalism Frames Used by Local (Sri Lankan) Newspapers

Final Phase of War

The articles categorized under peace Journalism were dominated by peace/conflict-oriented, people-oriented and truth-oriented reporting, drawing attention to the plight of civilians, caught in the fighting. International organizations were consistently quoted in the articles categorized under the peace journalism frame, which indicates giving voice to non-elite sources and neutral parties.


“The subject of reintegrating ex-combatants into society, the resettlement and rehabilitation programmes and the steps taken to mitigate the factors that may lead to resurgence of violence and the political reforms to accommodate all ethnic
communities and the development activities in the North and East will also be discussed at the seminar.”

In the above example, solutions-oriented emphasizes on development and rebuilding the nation. There was a lot of pressure on the Sri Lankan government after the war, especially from the international community. Consequently, efforts taken by the government to rehabilitate war torn areas and develop the nation were highlighted in local newspaper coverage. Articles such as these highlight various efforts taken by the government to rehabilitate and develop the nation, in the midst of mounting international pressure. Overall, the Peace Journalism frame indicators for this time period were dominated by people-oriented reporting, with a heavy focus on the suffering and well being of civilians, and mounting international pressure to halt the fighting.

Postwar Phase

Articles categorized under the peace journalism frame were people-oriented, truth-oriented, and solutions-oriented. The articles emphasized on postwar development efforts, civilian casualties, war crimes investigations and human rights concerns. Example: Army preparing report on war (2011, May 29). Daily Mirror.

“The subject of reintegrating ex-combatants into society, the resettlement and rehabilitation programmes and the steps taken to mitigate the factors that may lead to resurgence of violence and the political reforms to accommodate all ethnic communities and the development activities in the North and East will also be discussed at the seminar”
The above example captures how articles in this time period were solutions-oriented and emphasized on development and rebuilding the nation. As it was during the final phase of the war, there was a lot of pressure on the Sri Lankan government after the war, from the international community. Consequently, local newspaper articles continued to highlight government efforts taken toward rebuilding and developing the war torn nation.

Example: Ex UN spokesman drops a bomb (2010, February 12). Daily Mirror

He tells reporter ABC news that between 10,000 and 40,000 civilians died during the final, desperate battles - last year - of one of the world’s longest running and bloodiest civil wars.

“About 300,000 civilians, plus the Tamil Tiger forces, were trapped in an area of territory about the size of Central park in New York,” says Weiss. “They were within range of all the armaments that were being used, small and large, being used to smash the Tamil Tiger lines, the end result was that many thousands lost their lives.”

The above example captures how local newspaper also focused on fate of civilians during the final phase of the civil war. Here, people-oriented reporting highlight and acknowledges the suffering that civilians had to endure during the final phase of the war and after.

Peace Journalism Frames Used by Foreign (U.S.) Newspapers

Final Phase of War

The peace journalism frame during the final phase of the war was dominated by people-oriented, truth-oriented, and peace/conflict-oriented reporting, giving voice to non-elite sources that emphasized on trapped civilians. People-oriented reporting was heavily
focused on civilian matters of the ordinary citizens that were caught in the crossfire during the final phase of the war.


In the final weeks of the war, government troops cornered the Tamil Tigers in a tiny strip of coastline in the island nation's northeast. Tens of thousands of civilians caught in that area, and used as a human shields by the Tamil Tigers, have been moved south to the Vavuniya district.

Some of those seriously wounded are being taken to the main hospital of Vavuniya, where 1,900 people were being treated earlier this week in a center with a capacity for 450, according to Doctors Without Borders, the aid group that is helping Sri Lankan doctors there. Most of the refugees were taken to four camps, collectively called Manik Farm and lining a main road in Vavuniya district.

In the above example, the article describes military initiatives, but also focuses on civilian matters. It captures the reality of the civilians trapped in the war zone and presents a picture of what ordinary people have to face as a consequence of the fighting. The people-oriented reporting approach, in this example, encapsulates the helplessness of the civilians that were being used as a means to further the cause of war.


Ethnic Tamils who fled an earlier round of fighting three years ago, the refugees still live in uncertainty, surrounded by barbed wire, and their resentment against the majority-Sinhalese government has grown.
"If they won’t let us back to our land, then cancel our citizenship and send us to another country," said Chitaraval Somasundara, 55, who was once a farmer.

“For us Tamils, this is the way it is,” he said. “For Sinhalese this would not happen."

Here, the reader is presented with the suffering of civilians using a direct quote of an ordinary citizen that do not side with the LTTE or the Sri Lankan government. Giving voice to ordinary citizens is a prominent indicator of peace journalism in *The New York Times* articles, during this period. Furthermore, foreign newspapers also gave voice to non-elite sources such as NGO spokespersons and doctors who do not have loyalties to either of the two fighting sides.


Both sides in Sri Lanka’s 26-year long conflict have been accused of war crimes, especially during the past few months, when government troops cornered the Tamil Tigers on a narrow ribbon of land on the northeastern coast. Aid agencies say that Tigers used terrified civilians, including children, as human shields, and that government indiscriminately shelled hospitals and areas where civilians huddled in trench.

Here we see an example of truth-oriented reporting, where questionable acts by both sides are presented by giving voice to neutral, non-elite sources. Furthermore, this example sheds light into the plight of civilians that were caught in the middle of fighting. Here, the focus is not on military advancements, but the suffering of ordinary citizens caught in the crossfire.
Postwar Phase

People-oriented reporting dominated this period, where humanitarian concerns and issues took center-stage.


This leaves many Tamils wondering where this shattered community will go from here. The Jaffna Peninsula, the cultural heart of Tamil life, lost hundreds of thousands of residents over the course of the war. About 100,000 are dead, but many more have fled. Far from Colombo’s shimmering seaside skyscrapers, the hollowed-out city of Jaffna seems stuck a generation behind the rest of the country. For every inhabited house stands an abandoned, weed-choked one. Many buildings still bear bullet scars even though the last fighting here was in 1996. Its famous university, once among South Asia’s best, is crumbling.

The above extract is an example of people-oriented reporting that goes beyond sensationalized military reporting. The article provides the reader realistic information about the situation of the country, from a perspective of how war affects the day-to-day lives of citizens, as opposed to focusing on military advancement and implications. It also focuses on the destructive nature of war as opposed to justifying the war and using celebratory language during post war reporting, as evident in some local newspapers in during this time period.

United Nations workers counted about 7,000 dead in the last weeks of April, just before the last phase of fighting, but diplomats, aid workers and human rights activists have long argued that those figures far underestimated the dead and did not include the final weeks of battle. Government officials, meanwhile, have repeatedly denied singling out civilians, and have said that the total number of people killed is much lower.

Here, the article presents voice and opinions of multiple parties involved during the post-war period. The reporting in this example aims to be impartial and tries to present both sides of the issue by presenting the reader with the official government statements, as well as giving voice to the opinions of other interest groups.


The panel’s findings constitutes a devastating indictment of the country’s military conduct during the final stage of the 28-year war, accusing government forces of shelling hospitals, no-fire zones and U.N. facilities, and blocking the delivery of humanitarian aid to victims of war.

The above example presents the controversies that surrounded the final phase of the war and highlights the fate of thousands of civilians and the United Nations’ attempts at investigating the allegations made against the battling parties.

Furthermore, I identified one subframe under the peace journalism frame. The humanitarian crisis subframe was present in both local and foreign newspaper articles categorized under the peace journalism frame.
Humanitarian Crisis Subframe

This subframe was evident in all four publications, in articles categorized under the peace journalism frame, in both time periods. International newspapers used this subframe in people-oriented reporting, highlighting civilian suffering and painted an insightful picture of the sufferings of the civilian populations. Furthermore, one important characteristic in the international newspapers’ use of this frame was the use of non-elite sources in reporting.

Example: Hundreds are killed in Sri Lanka attack; Civilian death toll near 400, doctor says (May 11) Washington Post.

About 50,000 civilians are crowded into the 2.4-mile-long strip of coast along with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam rebels, who have been fighting for 25 years for a homeland for minority Tamils.

Artillery pounded the area throughout the night, forcing thousands to huddle in makeshift bunkers, said V. Shanmugarjah, a health official in the region.

Hours after the attack, the dead and wounded continued to pour into the hospital, he said. As of Sunday afternoon, the bodies of 378 civilians had been brought in and were being buried by volunteers, but the death toll was probably fair higher, because many families buried their slain relatives where they fell, he said.

Here, while fighting is mentioned, the main focus is on the civilians. The rhetoric attempts to provide the reader with more insight into the grim reality these trapped civilians had to face during the battles.

Daily Mirror used this sub frame and used international organizations’ statements and opinions as a mouthpiece to blame both the state and the rebels for civilian suffering.
Example: Lanka should be on UN SC agenda – Miliband (2009, May 1) *Daily Mirror.*

British Foreign Secretary David Miliband, in an interview with the BBC following his visit to Sri Lanka, said that Sri Lanka should be on the UN Security Council agenda for which UK, France an the US are pushing for as the war has regional and wider ramifications. Miliband said the so called safe zone is not safe at all because that’s where the conflict has been ongoing. While the Sri Lankan Defence Secretary confirmed there will be absolutely no more heavy shelling in the zone Miliband said it’s a stop to the fighting that the European Union and the G8 have been calling for.

As evident in the above example, the *Daily Mirror* article gives voice to elite-sources from the state but also gives room to the opinions of neutral parties that were involved in the post-war stage of the conflict.

*Daily News,* a state owned newspaper framed the crisis as a humanitarian rescue operation conducted by the Sri Lankan government to save the civilians from the grasp of terrorism.


The humanitarian mission carried out by Sri Lanka is a new concept during a war situation in the world,” he said.

In the above example, elite-sources frame the crisis as a humanitarian mission, rather than a war. Statements such as these are also indicators of propaganda-oriented reporting, especially during the post-war stage where the state was countering mounting international pressure regarding civilian casualties of the war.

During the post war phase, this sub frame took on more indicators. For example, the humanitarian issues shifted toward war crime investigations proposed by the international
community, blaming opposing parties for the civilian deaths that occurred and reports of rehabilitation and development in areas that were affected by the war.


Evidence gathered by Crisis Group provides reasonable grounds to believe that during these months the security forces intentionally and repeatedly shelled civilians, hospitals and humanitarian operations," the report said. "It also provides reason to believe that senior government and military officials were aware of the massive civilian casualties due to the security forces' attacks, but failed to protect the civilian population as they were obliged to under the laws of war.

Here, international news publications blame both the government and the LTTE for the loss of civilian lives while *Daily News* blame to the LTTE. *Daily Mirror,* the other local news publication was unbiased in the postwar coverage of the ongoing humanitarian crisis issue. As it was with during the final phase of the war, *Daily Mirror* used external sources to voice opinions that put both the LTTE and the government at fault for the human casualties.

Overall, the humanitarian crisis sub frame appears in both time periods in all 4 news publications. During the final phase, the sub frame is dominated by the coverage of civilian suffering. During the post-war phase, the sub frame is dominated by investigations into the events and military strategies that took place during the final phase of the war and finding out which side was responsible for the loss of civilian lives. People-oriented and truth-oriented reporting dominated this sub frame while traces of propaganda-oriented and elite-oriented reporting can be found in the post-war phase.
Comparison on Frames and Subframes between Local (Sri Lankan) and Foreign (U.S.) Newspapers

The study revealed that the overall coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict (during the final war phase and the postwar phase), to be dominated by the peace journalism frame. During the final war phase, both local and foreign newspaper articles focused on the unfolding humanitarian crisis, highlighting the suffering of civilians that were trapped in the war zone. Local newspapers, specifically *Daily News*, used the humanitarian crisis subframe to present the war as a humanitarian rescue operation carried out by the government during this time. Here, *Daily News* revealed the strongest case of propaganda-oriented reporting, with the main characteristic being, elite-oriented reporting, that gave voice to elite-sources, which in turn, framed the conflict as a humanitarian rescue operation. Foreign newspaper coverage also focused on the humanitarian crisis during the final war phase, except for the fact that foreign newspapers pointed out that both the government and the LTTE were responsible for the suffering of ordinary citizens, whereas local newspapers were blamed the LTTE.

A strong war justification frame was present in local articles categorized under the war journalism frame during the final war phase, whereas foreign newspapers were focused on battle reports, where military triumphalist language dominated the coverage, painting a zero-sum game scenario of events. The war justification frame was particularly dominant in the *Daily News* articles, where justifications for the continuation of war were provided in the final phase of the war, and the need for the war were provided in the postwar phase, by giving reasons as to why the war was necessary.
Furthermore, in the postwar phase, the peace journalism frame was dominated by local newspapers focusing on postwar development initiatives and blaming the rebels for civilian deaths, whereas foreign newspapers continued to focus on the humanitarian crisis and blamed both the government and the LTTE for the loss of civilian lives. Local newspapers continued with a similar war journalism frame from the final phase, where justifications for the war effort and military triumphalist language continued to take center-stage during the postwar coverage of the conflict. Only *The New York Times* articles were categorized under the war journalism frame from the two foreign newspapers during the postwar phase, and the war journalism frame continued to be dominated by military triumphalist language during this time period.

All in all, the analysis reveals that local and foreign newspaper coverage focused on humanitarian issues during the final war phase. The main difference between local and foreign coverage for this time period is in the use of the humanitarian crisis frame. Here, local newspapers used the humanitarian crisis subframe to portray military initiatives as a humanitarian rescue operation, whereas foreign newspapers portrayed the situation as a humanitarian disaster, by highlighting in-depth, the suffering of ordinary citizens caught in the conflict zone. Furthermore, the main difference in the use of the war journalism frame in this time period is local newspapers’ focus on justifying the war effort and foreign newspapers’ focus on battle reports and military advancements.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

This thesis has identified how two local and foreign newspapers used peace journalism and war journalism frames in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict. The models for identifying and categorizing news stories emerged from the work of Johan Galtung. The pioneering work for peace journalism, *The Structure of Foreign News*, was published in 1965. Galtung (1998) states that peace journalism attempts to depolarize issues by looking for truths on all sides, and attempts to reduce conflict reporting by highlighting need for peace and realities of conflict, equally. In order to understand how peace journalism frame and war journalism frames were used in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict, I examined the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict in two Sri Lankan newspapers: *Daily News* (state owned) and *Daily Mirror* (privately owned), and two U.S. newspapers: *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*.

The span of the Sri Lankan conflict is more than two decades. The final phase of the conflict (May 1, 2008 — May 31, 2009) that brought an end to the war received much attention around the globe due to the longevity of the conflict and the large number of civilians trapped in the final battle zones. This research focused on how the peace journalism frame and war journalism frames were used in the selected newspapers during the final phase of the war.

The textual analysis showed that, the overall coverage was dominated by peace journalism frame that emphasized on the plight of civilians that were caught in the cross-fire. *Daily News* articles showed the strongest war journalism frame period with 14 out of
the 25 articles during the time period: May 1, 2008- May 31, 2009 categorized under war journalism frame.

The dominant use of the war the war justification subframe by local newspapers, can be attributed to a variety of factors. As outlined in the literature review, scholars have found media suppression, state censorship and state control over media to be present in Sri Lanka. These factors can directly and indirectly affect how stories are framed, especially in terms of propaganda-oriented reporting present in Daily News, a state-owned newspaper. Foreign newspapers’ heavy reliance on military triumphalist language and focus on battle reports can be attributed to the foreign readerships’ lack of knowledge about the conflict, and the need to capture the attention of an audience with little or no-concern regarding events taking place so far from their homes. Therefore, military sensationalization and the heavy focus on zero-sum reporting present in foreign newspapers can be understood as foreign newspapers’ trying to get the attention of readerships unfamiliar with the Sri Lankan conflict.

Peace journalism activists believe that peace journalism practices in news media has the potential to lead to peaceful outcomes for the parties involved. I am convinced that the questions: “Do news media have enough influence to mobilize hegemonic forces to consider more peaceful solutions? Or do news media change their positions depending on the influence and positions of the hegemonic forces?” to be important questions for future research, especially for peace journalism activists.

Finally, this research project was limited to the last year of the Sri Lankan civil war and the two-and-a-half years after the end of the civil war, and to the availability of newspapers, both local and foreign, that extensively covered the Sri Lankan conflict. First,
the Sri Lankan conflict spanned 26 years. Second, the availability of newspapers that heavily covered the Sri Lankan conflict was limited in the Lexus Nexus Academic database. For example, articles from the pro-LTTE online news publication TamilNet were unavailable in the database.

It is also important to note that the two local newspapers cannot be completely representative of all local news publications, and the same can be said of the two foreign newspapers. Other prominent foreign newspapers that extensively covered the Sri Lankan conflict were also unavailable in the Lexus Nexus Academic database. Therefore, future research is required to examine how peace journalism frame and war journalism frame were used in local and foreign news publications, especially in news publications such as TamilNet and Groundviews, which are considered to be alternative news sources in the coverage of the Sri Lankan conflict.
### Table 1 Number of Articles by Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>News publication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DN</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2008-May 31, 2009</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total chosen</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2009-December 31, 2011</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total chosen</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total from initial search query: 1774

Total excluded: 445

Total analyzed: 185
Table 2 Article Categorization by Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>May 1, 2008- May 31, 2009</th>
<th>June 1, 2009- December 31, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace Journalism</td>
<td>War Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily News</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York Times</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Frame Comparisons Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final war Phase</th>
<th>Peace journalism frame</th>
<th>War journalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Humanitarian crisis</td>
<td>Justifying war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Humanitarian crisis</td>
<td>Justifying war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT</td>
<td>Humanitarian crisis</td>
<td>Military triumphalist language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Humanitarian crisis</td>
<td>Battle reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postwar phase</th>
<th>Peace journalism frame</th>
<th>War journalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Postwar development</td>
<td>Military triumphalist language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Civilian deaths: blames LTTE</td>
<td>Justifying war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian deaths: blames both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT</td>
<td>LTTE and GOVT</td>
<td>Military triumphalist language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Humanitarian crisis</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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