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Foreword

Oliver Ramsbotham, University of Bradford

This book addresses a critical issue in the contemporary world. How does the communications revolution affect conflict and conflict resolution? And what is the role of the mass media in this? What needs to happen for “media and online political discourses” to contribute to peacemaking, peace-building and reconciliation rather than to the opposite? The chapters that follow apply discourse analytic approaches in order to explore these questions.

The extraordinary rapidity and scale of the spread of information and communications technology (ICT) in recent years, together with all the attendant forms of digital connectivity (Internet, social media, cell phones), have profoundly affected both the manifestation of conflict at all levels, and the way it is analysed/reported/framed and responded to worldwide. This has had a major impact on the way conflicts are instigated and conducted, on how conflict is understood (data, interpretation), and on efforts to prevent, mitigate, end and ensure a non-recurrence of its worst aspects. In all of this the media play a crucial role.

We know that the impact of communications technology on conflict in general is not as new as is sometimes made out. On the widest historical scale, we can think of the advent of writing itself at the time of the first states and empires; printing by moveable type at the time of the reformation and the wars of religion in Europe; the creation of the mass media and the rise of nationalism in the nineteenth century; the invention of the telephone, radio, film and TV in relation to the world wars and subsequent cold war and decolonisation wars of the twentieth century. In the worst genocide of the late twentieth century in Rwanda in April–July 1994, the most potent media role in instigating the massacre was played by a private radio station, Radio Television Mille Collines (RTMC), broadcasting to a largely illiterate audience between 8 July 1993 and 31 July 1994. And the main weapons used in the massacre were machetes. Nevertheless, it seems hard to overestimate the significance of the onset of the digital age – young though it still is – so far in the twenty-first century.

For one thing, the field of conflict analysis and conflict resolution has been radically affected by the impact of ICT in such a way that traditional
distinctions between international, national and local levels of human conflict are being eroded. And – in line with what I understand to be the theme and hopes of this book – perhaps the basis for a future global partnership for peace is being constructed.

But the analysis in these chapters emphasises the deep ambivalence of the role of the media and online political discourse in all this. On the one hand, in relation to the cyberworld, both Norbert Wiener (creator of cybernetics) and Tim Berners-Lee (creator of the World Wide Web) in their different ways hoped that the new capacity would be a powerful instrument for peace – in Berners-Lee’s words “to empower humanity by launching transformative programs that build local capacity to leverage the Web as a medium for positive change”. This accords with the aspiration of the World Summit on the Information Society in 2003 in its “Tunis Commitment” that the new technology would be used to promote “a people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society” premised on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the UN, international law, multilateralism, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

These hopes and aspirations remain vibrant and inspire many of the younger generation all over the world. But we hardly need to be reminded of the close relationship that has existed historically between technology and militarism, or the manifest danger of the opposite happening as underlying and mounting global problems impact on young, urbanised and increasingly informed populations outside the former monopolists of power, as well as on those “left behind” within them. A new digitalised worldwide field of contestation is opened up where mass media are co-opted and exploited by unscrupulous populist commercial and political forces, including the leaderships of the most powerful countries currently engaged in geopolitical struggles in what has recently become a multi-polar world.

Mass communications and the role of the media have always been a two-edged sword. They can inform, educate, empower, emancipate, and enable forms of cooperation. But they can also manipulate, polarise, escalate, exacerbate division, and enhance hegemonic control. The militarisation of new technology is an old story – in recent years connected to the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA). The Internet itself was born as the ARPANET funded through a US Department of Defense project in 1969. And we still hear more about cyber war, cyber warriors, cyber-attacks etc. than about the possibilities for cyber peace. Something comparable occurs in relation to commercialisation. The jury is out on whether the new digitalised mass media overall increases democratisation or its Orwellian opposite; whether it opens communication or results in the creation of isolated “information bubbles”; whether it promotes more mutual understanding through mutual exposure (the contact hypothesis) or leads to a break-up of the mass media itself into ghettoised “echo
chambers” where those inside only hear what they want to hear and divergent messages from outside are dismissed as “fake news”.

These are portentous issues in which the role of the media is central. Behind them lies the question: how can standards of “ethical or accountable journalism” or “responsible reporting” be redefined in the digital age? Attempts have been made in recent years to set out applicable criteria (Lynch and Galtung 2010; Hoffmann and Hawkins 2015; Lynch 2015) as also to warn against an overly “top down” imposition of interpretation (Sutherlin 2013). There has been advocacy for a concerted international effort at the “pacification of cyberspace” (Woodhouse 2014), and an attempt to grapple with the very idea of “neutral”, “impartial” or “disinterested” reporting in areas of intense linguistic intractability and “radical disagreement” (Ramsbotham 2010, 2017).

These are some of the larger themes explored in this book. The authors’ contributions offer analysis of this complex field across different sectors, in relation to different topics, at different levels, and with reference to case studies from many different parts of the world. Discourse analysis techniques are applied. The result is a study that contributes valuable information about the interplay between mass media/online political discourse and human conflict, and thereby casts light on what needs to happen if future development is to be in the direction that the authors hope to see.
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