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Abstract

My dissertation explores how journalists who self-identify as “transnational” shape their journalism to make human rights claims that trouble, open up and go beyond the nation-state. The project is a multi-sited, ethnographic, comparative case study of journalism education among two different transnational peoples: Romani/Gypsy and Saami (the Indigenous peoples in the current states of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia). Drawing upon 45 interviews with journalists and journalism educators, my research suggests there are two distinct strategies in how transnational peoples’ journalism is conceived, taught and assessed. These strategies influence and are influenced by larger socio-political contexts: the Saami media work within an Indigenous rights framework; their goal is to engage with journalism as a form of self-determination. This differs from Romani media programs, which are funded by non-state donors who aim to use Romani media as a form of claiming citizenship. These citizenship claims are both within a specific state as well as within Europe. In short, the political, economic and cultural contexts shape the journalism, and the journalism in turn shapes the politics.

Although the differences are significant, both transnational groups recognized the power of journalism in agenda setting within, between and across borders. Through the framing of information in particular ways, journalists, editors and the media outlets, as well as the funding sources for this journalism, were all engaged in a form of agenda setting (Carpenter, 2007; 2009) and productive power (Barnett & Duvall, 2005). My findings indicate that a unique feature of transnational peoples’ journalism is recognizing and operationalizing power beyond that of the state; another contribution is a more robust understanding of objectivity in journalism – one that demonstrates how journalists can be credible, without pretending to be neutral. These are all important contributions to reimagining human rights advocacy beyond current discussions of transnational advocacy which still often privilege the state and tends to pay scant attention to
journalists themselves. Learning from transnational peoples who are creating, teaching, and participating in journalism education in its many places, forms, and media allows us to make more sound connections between human rights and journalism.
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Glossary

**Roma** – plural term to refer to the Roma/Gypsy people. Rom is for a singular male, Romni for a singular female. The term “Gypsy” is considered pejorative by most Roma with the exception of some Roma in Hungary, England and Spain where the Romani language is used very infrequently.

**Romani** – is both the name of the language spoken by Roma (the base of the language is Indic with a lot of Greek and Turkish and it is then heavily influenced by the contact languages) and an adjective. Thus it is more appropriate to speak of ‘Romani media’ rather than “Roma media.”

**Saami/Sámi** – Indigenous peoples of the countries that are now known as Norway, Sweden, Finland and the Kola Peninsula of Roma. The term “Saami” can be used as both a noun and an adjective: “s/he is Saami,” “the Saami language,” as well as “the journalism should be done Saami ways.”

**Sápmi** – The traditional land of the Saami people located in the northern areas of the countries that are now known as Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia
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Chapter 1 — Introduction

In 2004, I was recruited to design and teach a course on human rights to future “producers of culture”—journalists, filmmakers, and artists—at Columbia College Chicago, a journalism, art, and media school in the heart of downtown Chicago. No human rights course had been offered there before, and the administration was not sure if there would be student interest. I had to ensure that 10 people registered for the class or it would be cancelled.

My colleagues were a bit nervous. I was a bit nervous. We did not know if we could get 10 people.

Within one year, however, all three sections of the class were filled with 20–25 students each, and I developed a “part II” of the course. To meet the demand, we needed more instructors who were comfortable with human rights language, laws, and mechanisms, and who wanted to work with interested students. Although many were sympathetic, I could not convince a single colleague at Columbia College to agree to teach this course. All feared that teaching human rights to future journalists was somehow “too political,” thus violating the professional norms of journalism, which they presumed to be apolitical. They were not making the distinction between human rights journalism and human rights campaigns. The only people I could recruit to teach these classes came from human rights organizations themselves, which appeared to further compromise the journalistic ideal. Interest only grew and we could not keep up with demand. We had to turn students away.

After four years of teaching human rights courses every semester to overflowing classes and overeager students, I vowed to figure out a way to convince my colleagues that it is indeed possible to provide basic literacy in human rights while instilling journalistic skills and ethics. Recognizing that there are “peculiarities connected to cultural authority that pertain exclusively
or primarily to journalism, particularly its reverence for facts, truth, and reality” (Zelizer, 2004, p. 110), I needed to show that human rights and journalism are not mutually exclusive. It is possible to be a robust and critical journalist while also approaching stories from a particular perspective—in this case, a human rights framework. The important thing is to show journalists how do it. I decided the best way to do this was to learn from people who were already making and teaching a different kind of journalism—a journalism that pushes the ideas of objectivity while remaining credible and that aims to create legitimate alternatives to how “reality” is presented, including the reality of power and the state.

Both conventional journalists and human rights advocates pride themselves on scrutinizing the actions of government, but there is a conflation of the government, the state, and “the people” and state is still often seen as the unmarked, given—and indeed ideal—source of power. This is not the lens that people with a transnational standpoint bring to media or politics. Transnational people engaged in journalism seemed to provide an alternative vision of journalism, politics and the state.

Transnational peoples—peoples who identify as one nation (“a people,” or what Andrew Smith, 1983, termed ethnie) across two or more states—bring a unique perspective because they understand the need to be fluent in the complexities of state, law, culture, and identity, and the responsibility and skills required when translating these complexities to multiple audiences. In short, many transnational peoples already presume and understand that the media is not neutral and rather is constantly engaged in a political process. Many who are politically and socially engaged choose to use journalism in this process. Therefore, my goal in this dissertation project is to learn from self-identified transnational journalists in order to present and construct an alternative approach to human rights advocacy that foregrounds the importance of identity and
self-representation *through* the power of journalism. By human rights I mean all of the rights enshrined in the United Nations (UN) conventions, as well as rights specific to Indigenous peoples and to other peoples who identify as one nation spanning two or more states. I focus on these transnational peoples to illustrate that for too long human rights has operated in a state-centric and state-dominant paradigm that assumes that people need to be protected from the state and/or that the state needs to provide for people (Osiatynski, 2009). In either case, power is perceived to come from the state, and thus too often visions of change become circumscribed within the borders of the state.

But this is too limiting. The state, as a political and institutional entity, is important, and can be both an adversary and a partner, but is not the sole center; rather, it is one actor that can be harnessed, worked with, and at times worked around. Journalism has an underexplored role to play here. Through the framing of information in particular ways, journalism—in the form of the journalists, the editors and the media outlets that they work for and with—participates in agenda setting. I am making a distinction here between agenda setting, which is the power needed to sift through a “myriad of bad things” (Carpenter, 2007, p. 102) and propaganda. Unlike propaganda, the information journalists provide in agenda setting is true, but it is positioned in a way that frames and foregrounds particular problems and solutions. This is one manifestation of what Barnett and Duvall (2005) refer to as “productive power”: how discourses shape and are shaped by resources and social structures and how this dynamism limits and opens up political possibilities.

What is unique in transnational peoples’ journalism is how it highlights the ways in which power beyond that of the state can be harnessed and operationalized. Recognizing that there is power within, between, and across states—and beyond the limits of the state—is an
important contribution when understanding and engaging in human rights advocacy. Learning from transnational peoples who are creating, teaching, and participating in journalism education in its many places, forms, and media allows us to strengthen the connections between human rights and journalism.

In this project I am bringing together what are presumed to be the disparate worlds and literatures of constructivist International Relations, critical journalism, and human rights within the specific context of transnational peoples’ journalism, so that we may better see the possibilities and importance of what solid journalism focused on human rights and with a transnational peoples standpoint, can do. My goal is simple: I begin my process of learning, and I hope to present these alternatives to my colleagues, both past and future, so that we may never have to turn students away again because of our own limited understandings of what is possible.

**Goals and Structure of the Project**

I aim to demonstrate that journalism can be, and is, used as a form of politics while maintaining its professional role rather than becoming public relations or propaganda. I believe this happens in all journalism but is often obfuscated through what Hackett and Zhao (1998) refer to as the “regime of objectivity” (*passim*). Traditionally, Anglo-American journalists were taught with a positivist notion of objectivity—believing that the world is out there to be covered and that the coverage should represent this external world without affecting it—they often cannot recognize the “taken-for-granted” assumptions that permeate their work. Assumptions about the permanence and prominence of the state, the conflation of national identity with that of the state, and the state-bounded realm of politics, often go unquestioned by academics, policy makers and journalists (Risse, Ropp, & Sikkink, 2013). Transnational journalists, on the other hand, tend to
have a complex understanding of the ways in which a country’s government maintains and perpetuates power within, between, and across states. Much can be learned from this perspective, or, to draw on Sandra Harding’s (1993) use of the term, this *standpoint* can show us a more robust way of thinking about the kind of power that allows things like state systems to remain unquestioned.

Journalists are often considered to have a responsibility to inform and educate a public on things deemed important. This responsibility is assumed to be a cornerstone of the democratic process; an informed citizenry can hold the state accountable (see, for example, Habermas, 1964/1974). It is crucial that all audiences see this information as credible and great pains are taken to guard journalists’ reputation for credibility. Journalists are thus distinguished from propagandists or public relations agents. This distinction is maintained through professional norms and practices and is fairly standard throughout the profession (Waisbord, 2013). The questions then are: Who are the audiences? What is journalism *doing* in the larger socio-political spheres? A journalist is not a journalist without credibility. But from whom do journalists seek validation and credibility?

Human rights work also markets itself on credibility, and that credibility is often assumed to be based on a detached approach to investigating, accumulating, and reporting “the facts,” which are then presented to the state as well as international organizations and advocacy groups to influence action (Barnett & Finnemore, 2004; Brysk, 2013a; Risse & Ropp, 2013). These “facts” are presumed to stand on their own and are then distributed to the publics and decision-making elites through journalism. It is for this reason that the questions I pose have implications beyond journalism, and I frame my research on journalism education as an exploration of a *political* project. Following in the footsteps of Michel Foucault (1980), political scientists
Michael Barnett and Robert Duvall (2005) view the crafting and distribution of information and thus the shaping of structured realities as an exercise of “productive power” (pp. 8–12, 20–22). Later scholars have picked up on the notion of productive power and further discuss the relationship between discourse and structural power and change (Risse & Ropp, 2013, pp. 14–15). The conversation, though, is still often limited to a less powerful agent trying to persuade a more powerful agent (either state or non-state actor) to make political changes within the limits of a state-bounded system.

Although such thinking on productive power is useful, few have spoken of how it plays out in journalism—the public forum of truths. Rather than trying to persuade a single actor, media always speak to multiple publics, and transnational peoples’ media are particularly aware of this and skilled at maneuvering within these audiences. When there is a media landscape of “multiple publics,” then media are “always charged with dynamics of power which can at times provide a forum for information sharing and at other times can enable decision making” (Splichal, 2011, p. 33). Media are presumed to have an important active role in providing citizens with tools for deliberative democracy (Strömbäck, 2005). Following that logic, when media highlight particular problems—for example, targeting particular perpetrators and offering particular suggestions for remedy—media (in both form and content) can be recognized as a form of politics (Brysk, 2013b). Keck and Sikkink offer some thoughts on the importance of information as a form of political currency in their 1998 work, but, like most of the scholars addressing International Relations from a constructivist perspective, they present “the media” in an un-nuanced, anthropomorphized, passive role. And the journalists themselves—assumed to be a monolithic group—are absent (see, for example, Price, 1998, pp. 18–23 or Joachim, 2003). In particular, accumulating, compiling, editing, and distributing information in order to frame a
story in a particular way, thus highlighting possibilities for change, can help shape the realities for those who read, watch, or listen to such media products. This echoes the effects media can have on “decision making” as noted by Splichal (2011, p. 33) above. Multiple scholars have also referred to this process as “agenda setting” (Carpenter, 2007; Gitlin, 1980; Hallin, 1994; Price, 1998; Wade, 2011).

In her most recent work, *Speaking Rights to Power*, Alison Brysk (2013b) has expanded on Keck & Sikkink’s 1998 work in what she termed “communication power” as she explores how information is used as currency in transnational advocacy. Yet even with this more nuanced approach, although “citizen journalists” are present, journalists working for conventional news outlets are largely absent from the analysis. In addition, the ultimate media targets are still states. The state is assumed to be the center point of governance, culture, and resources and thus the most important audience. And journalists are often assumed to be megaphones of what is already garnering the most attention.

Although it is recognized that media and communication are intricately linked to liberal democracy and are often an inherent part of governance, including struggles for self-determination, much of the academic research is limited to media’s role in state formation (Anderson, 1983/1991) or media reform in post-conflict areas such as Rwanda or the former Yugoslavia (Price & Thompson, 2002), or is specifically geared toward ethnic and linguistic minority policy (Graham, 2010; Karlsreiter, 2003; Wilson & Stewart, 2008). In addition, although quite a bit of academic work has been done on the socialization and professionalization process of Western journalists (Glasser & Craft, 1998; Johnson-Cartee, 2005; Skinner, Gasher, &

---

1 I have chosen to use the term “minority media” rather than “ethnic media” in my work because all people are of a particular ethnicity; it is actually the recognized minority status of a group of people that grants (or denies) certain peoples’ rights to state or donor support for their media. It should be noted that the terms are often used interchangeably in academic, legal, and policy circles.
Compton, 2001; Tuchman, 1978), and some on alternative media (Coyer, 2005; Downing 2001; Ostertag, 2006; Retzlaff, 2006), little has been written about journalism education done by and for specific populations, particularly those who identify as transnational. In fact, as I discuss throughout the dissertation, although there is increased discussion of the role of globalization and its effects on media production and content, the basis of mainstream journalism continues to be training journalists to work for media outlets in their own countries. Even with the proliferation of global media outlets like CNN, Al Jazeera, and Telemundo, traditional journalism education continues to assume that the vast majority of journalists will identify with, report for, and speak to people of a singular country, and should be trained accordingly. My research, however, evaluates the connections between transnational peoples’ journalism and their politics. I do so by examining how two different transnational peoples—the Saami and the Roma—train (and socialize) the next generation of journalists. I explore how these transnational journalists negotiate their relationships with, between, and across states and address the tensions of what Barbie Zelizer (2004) refers to as “journalistic professional ideology” within their varied socio-political contexts (p. 103).

Why Transnational Peoples?

Transnational peoples may identify as Indigenous\(^2\) (e.g., the Saami people, who have traditionally inhabited land currently located in the countries of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and

\(^2\) According to the United Nations Permanent Forum on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples’ official website, due to the diversity of Indigenous peoples and the potential misuse of classification/identification systems by states, Indigenous peoples have purposefully chosen not to define Indigenous but rather provide guidelines for identification strongly based on self identification. These include: “Self-identification as indigenous [sic] peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member; historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies; Strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources; distinct social, economic or political systems; distinct language, culture and beliefs; Form non-dominant groups of society; resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities”.}
Russia) or may not (e.g., the Roma/Gypsy people). In either case although there is much diversity within these groups of people; they are people who identify as one nation (a single people) who reside over two or more states. Other transnational peoples include the Kurds, Inuit and Mohawk, however I have chosen to work with the various people involved in creating journalism within the Romani and Saami peoples. There are many differences between the Saami and the Roma, which I discuss in great depth in subsequent chapters. In spite of these differences, or perhaps because of them, the Saami and the Roma provide illustrative examples of a larger phenomenon: the challenge of identifying as a professional journalist who chooses to bring a transnational perspective to journalistic work. Self-identified, politically conscious, transnational people often seek not only to make change across state borders but also to do so by exposing problems and solutions that necessitate framing said problems, solutions and actors across state lines. Transnational governance and advocacy do not stop at the borders of the state. Many of those I interviewed referred to this intentional transnational perspective as their “starting point.” Perhaps even more importantly, these transnational journalists also assume that the audience has a starting point. In other words, both the audience and the journalist are keenly aware of their contexts and of the unique positions and vantage points they inhabit (El Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002b). This strategic use of transnationalism—the identification with, and addressing of, multiple audiences—not only highlights and problematizes a state-bounded identity, but also broadens the possibilities for both traditional understandings of objectivity and socio-political change. Transnational peoples and identities cross over, are intertwined with, and yet are often at odds with the state; as a result, their understandings of the possibility of political change appear to be more creative in part because they are not limited to state-centered approaches.
Many transnational individuals, like other individuals marginalized by current state structures, distinguish “objectivity” (and thus credibility and professionalism) from “neutrality” (Harding, 1993; Said, 1978/1994; L. T. Smith, 1999). Based on more than a decade of academic and advocacy work with Romani media-makers, I embarked on my research with the assumption that transnational peoples often question both the reality and the ideal of traditional ideas of “objectivity” within journalism (Haetta, 2013; Wade, 2011; Zelizer, 2004). Rather, I have found there is another, more nuanced standard of credibility at play—one that values set (“professional”) journalistic techniques but has a clear and transparent perspective (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 96–110; Keller, 2013; Tait, 2011; Tuchman, 1978; Waisbord, 2013). In this chapter, I directly engage with the five research questions that guide my project, and show how these questions inform one another. The first three compare and contrast Romani and Saami journalism and journalism education with a focus on their socio-political contexts. The latter two focus more on what lessons can be learned from Romani and Saami journalism and journalism education. These are not lessons limited to journalism; rather, they presume a relationship between journalism and human rights that can speak to larger questions of socio-political change. How does this manifest when the state is not the center of power? Specifically:

1) What, if any, relationship exists between transnational identities, the framing of socio-political realities across borders, and transnational politics? How do socio-economic, cultural, and structural contexts shape these dynamics?

2) How do self-identified transnational journalists understand these processes, and how does that understanding shape their approaches to journalism and politics?

3) How are these approaches to journalism taught to the next generation of self-identified transnational journalists?
4) What can be learned from transnational peoples’ journalism when developing strategies for social and political change beyond a state-centered approach?

5) What can be learned from different forms of transnational peoples’ journalism when developing journalism which focuses on human rights issues?

I approach this work with the belief that when a person chooses to cultivate and foreground his or her identity as a transnational person, he or she can approach politics with a unique and clearer understanding of how power and political possibilities for change can and do operate within, across, and between states. My research shows that journalists who identify as transnational have a distinct approach to creating, framing, and transmitting information. I argue this is partially because of transnational journalists’ recognition that they are speaking to multiple audiences with a more robust understanding of objectivity. Put simply: the political implication of journalism is both acknowledged and cultivated by the journalists. That said, what journalism does varies greatly based on the socio-political context.

Some transnational peoples, like the Saami, whose politics are shaped by claims to self-determination, use their journalism primarily to speak within the nation as distinct from the state. Others, like the Roma, whose politics are shaped by an ongoing claim for citizenship and inclusion within the state and Europe, use their journalism primarily to intervene in the dominant discourse of the state and state-based organizations. The strategies are different and the resulting media products are different, but both hold a similarly strong belief in the ideal of journalism: being vigilant to abuses of power and informing the public of what is going on (and what is not

---

3 I specifically refer to transnational peoples as peoples who are “within, across, and between” states because they are influenced by, and influence, the states they reside in, the borders of the states, and a larger transnational reality. As evidenced in The Association for Borderland Studies here is much interesting critical academic and activist discussion regarding borderlands and border culture (Anzaldua, 1987; Fusco, 1995; Wilson & Donnan, 1989; Newman & Paasi, 1998); however, although “the border” influences my thinking, my work is not limited to this discussion. Transnational peoples do not reside only on the borders and the nexus between two states but also within, across, and beyond borders (Silverman, 2012).
going on) in their name. Neither group engages in its journalism from the “god’s-eye view” (Kelly, 2011). Rather, journalism is done within the context of their transnationality. Therefore, I argue that another similarity found within transnational peoples’ journalism, and their approach to teaching journalism, is the re-thinking of objectivity beyond that of positivist objectivity, “the god that won’t die!” (Hackett & Zhao, 1998). I will demonstrate throughout my work that objectivity within transnational peoples’ journalism is a mixture of contextual objectivity (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002a) and strong objectivity (Harding, 1993). Contextual objectivity speaks to questions of how journalistic objectivity is different depending on how different audiences will receive the story and the positionality of the journalist within the story. Strong objectivity posits the notion that in order to better understand power, one should examine a particular situation from the perspective of those who do not benefit from the status quo. In that way, the flows and blockages (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 11-12) of power will become more transparent. Recognizing that journalism requires specific skills and also plays an important role in informing and educating, I hope to demonstrate that we can learn much from transnational peoples’ journalism and journalism education as we try to build a more systemic, professional, responsive and codified approach to human rights journalism.

**The Specific Cases: Romani and Saami Journalism, Journalists, and Journalism Education**

Using some of the theories and techniques described by Burawoy (2001) and Hannerz (2003) as multi-sited ethnography, I conducted a comparative case study with two distinct populations (the Saami and the Roma) operating within many different locations including across states and institutions. My findings are primarily based on interviews with 45 journalists and journalism educators, funders, and evaluators. The purpose of engaging in this multi-sited
ethnography was to identify and describe the similarities and differences in the structures and approaches to journalism, and the training of the next generation of Saami and Romani journalists—a goal and strategy both groups employed. In noting some of their underlying beliefs of both the role and the techniques of journalism—including differing understandings of how to be professional and have what I identify as a “transnational journalistic standpoint”—I hope this research will shed light on larger movements, tensions, and possibilities within mainstream Western journalism education, as well as larger issues of state and power.\(^4\) My qualitative, field-based interviews, observations, and document analysis addressed those involved in the following programs:

- The formal Saami journalism education program run by Sámi University College/Sámi allaskuvla, a tertiary institution in Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino, Norway (serving Saami-speaking students regardless of country of origin).\(^5\) Sámi allaskuvla currently offers a bachelor’s degree in journalism and plans to offer a master’s degree in Indigenous journalism starting in autumn of 2014. It hosted the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Conference in March 2012.

- The Open Society Foundations’ (OSF’s) Network Media Program (based in London, England) and Roma Initiatives Office (based in Budapest, Hungary), both of which oversee funding for journalism training programs that specifically target journalists of Romani origin.\(^6\) I interviewed the program officers, evaluators, and trainers. I also interviewed some of the long-term grantees of these programs throughout Central and

\(^4\) I describe the “transnational journalistic standpoint” in greater detail in Chapter 2.

\(^5\) The people I spoke with used the names Sámi University College and Sámi allaskuvla interchangeably, especially when speaking and writing in English. I follow their convention in my writing.

\(^6\) In 2014 OSF’s Network Media Program was renamed the Independent Journalism Program; however, at the time of the research it was known as the Network Media Program, and to reduce confusion, I will continue to refer to it as such throughout the dissertation.
Eastern Europe as well as people directly engaged in designing and implementing the trainings.

The primary research took place over two years, and I followed up with phone-based interviews, as well as return visits to the educational programs in both Sápmi (the traditional area of the Saami people) and training sites in Central and Eastern Europe.

Both the Saami and the Roma identify—and are identified—as distinct peoples who live within, between, and across multiple states, and both populations make political, social, and legal claims based on their transnational identities. Both also use media, and specifically journalism, as a strategic process in their claims making. Because of the importance placed on this journalistic strategy, both groups seek to advance the quality of their journalism and journalists from a particular standpoint true to their socio-political contexts. It is this commonality in the space of such difference that guides my research.

Although there are vast differences in both the context (demographics, geography, relationship to the state, funding) and the goals of these journalism programs, they share a strong common belief in the power of media to change not only perspectives but behaviors, both within the transnational community and in the larger society (Barnett & Duvall, 2005, pp. 1–32; Brysk, 2013b; de Jong, Shaw, & Stammers, 2005). There is a clear understanding that all of these journalists and journalism education programs identify and address a variety of audiences that often have unequal access to power and decision-making. The existence of the media itself, as well as its content, is assumed to affect, reflect, and possibly change something “in the real world.” Lorie Graham (2010) explains this relationship well:

Often we think about media as a tool for transmitting information. However, media also has the power to identify, name and shape issues. This is particularly true when mainstream media is reporting (or choosing not to report) on events that involve marginalized groups (p. 429).
This understanding of the connection between media, framing, power, and the socio-political realities “on the ground” is at the heart of my research (Barnett & Duvall, 2005; Fairclough, 1992; Hallin, 1994). Graham (2010) focused in particular on Indigenous peoples, who have specific media outlets because of language and cultural rights. However, given that many transnational peoples speak the state language as their first language, I choose to look at the strategies of transnational peoples in training journalists who operate with a specific worldview regardless of language. To be clear, I do not dispute the importance of language in shaping or reflecting worldviews; rather, I argue that the two are often not interchangeable. Many of the people who identify as Saami or Roma, and consume Saami or Romani media, speak or read a state language as their first language. Further, many people who consume Saami or Romani media may not identify as Saami or Roma. Therefore, I draw a distinction between media created to preserve and develop the language and media that may be in a state language but still operates with a distinctly transnational starting point.

My Places and Perspectives in this Research

My own name means “beautiful refugee.” I was born in Los Angeles, my parents in New York City. I grew up speaking English. My grandparents were from “the old country,” and none had English as a first language. I started my first newspaper at the age of nine and my first international ‘zine at the age of 14. I went to a high school where 43 languages were spoken in the hall. My classmates were often refugees or children of refugees. Having been born in another country was the norm. Some of my friends were documented and “legal” according to the state, some were not, and some did not know their legal status. Growing up, none of this seemed unusual. Needless to say, I have always had a particular interest in people who do not fit
comfortably into the structure and identity of the nation-state.

I believe information and research should make practical, tangible change. Both Indigenous scholars (Lightfoot, 2009; Sámi Instituhtta, 2008; L. T. Smith, 1999; Turner, 2006) and others coming from a tradition of critical scholarship (Doty, 1996; Dufour, Masson, & Caouette, 2010; Mamdani, 2004; Mohanty, 2003; Narayan & Harding, 2000) have written much about this. I am not a member of either of the communities with whom I worked on this project, and I recognize that this position as “outsider” both provides and limits particular access. I attempt to be transparent: my goal is not to become an “expert” on either the Roma or the Saami people, nor to speak “for” them. Rather, my aim is to learn from the current, diverse practices of journalism education by and for transnational people. I approach my work with three objectives:

- to better reflect on their practices, particularly how they negotiate the politics, economics and norms of speaking to and for audiences that are within, between, and across states;
- to illustrate the inherent biases in mainstream, traditional forms of journalism education; and
- to highlight alternative ways of understanding how one can be professional and credible without aspiring to be neutral or “objective” in the traditional sense.

The first and last points are worth further discussion, as they speak to the wider application of this project. The professionalization of human rights work and advocacy has the potential to lead to an entrenchment of uneven power relations that identify the state, and the current distribution of power between states, as the only source of legitimacy (Barnett & Finnemore, 2004; Bob, 2009; Borzel & Risse, 2013; Doty, 1996; Risse & Ropp, 2013). Good journalism and solid human rights work require a more critical approach. Journalists and human
rights advocates can work together without compromising their professional roles and identities.

I hope to highlight the important role that journalism can play in affecting economic, legal and political power, all of which are too often assumed to reside predominantly within the purview of the state. Much of the literature has focused on the importance of community media in creating solidarity, and thus pushing for local change (Howely, 2010), or alternative media as a form of dissent (Coyer, 2005; de Jong et al., 2005; Downing, 2001), but, as El-Nawawy and Iskandar (2002b) point out in reference to Al Jazeera, the media’s influence on policy occurs on a global scale (p. 44).

I do not believe this is unique to Al Jazeera; rather, it is a truth understood by many who choose to use media as tools of strategic self-representation and framing (Baer & Brysk, 2009; Carpenter, 2007; Carragee & Roefs, 2004; Fraser, 2007; Gaber & Willson, 2005, Husain, 2006; Retzlaff, 2006). How such change—be it called activism, advocacy, or cooperation—takes place differs based on the politics and particularities of the various transnational groups (Plaut, 2012a), but each group recognizes a role for media in this process. By learning how transnational people are being socialized as journalists, I strive to learn about tools and strategies applicable to a wide variety of journalists, activists, and policy-shapers.7

I bring a strong political and personal conviction to this work. I believe in the power of self-representation and media as a form of social change. I also know I will be confronted with the many challenges of how this manifests in practice—challenges from my colleagues, from the rarely intersecting fields of journalism studies and International Relations, and from the media

---

7 Although I have benefited from some of the literature on the creation of pan-Arab media and negotiations of content and distribution, I have not used these media as specific case studies (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002b; Sakr, 2007). This is a conscious decision. Many people have asked if I look at Jewish or Palestinian media in my work, given that both are transnational and have a strong media presence. I have chosen not to do so at this time. I am aware that my own identity as a Jewish person, and a person who is involved in a variety of left-wing political struggles, could potentially overshadow the broader focus of the dissertation project: the teaching of journalism by and for transnational peoples’ media and its relationship to human rights work.
world itself. As Carragee and Roefs (2004) clearly state, framing has “ideological implications” (p. 218). At the same time, there are real constraints that can threaten the political possibilities for; these must be acknowledged and negotiated.

I am driven to do this work because I was told it was not possible for a professor of journalism to teach human rights to future journalists. To do so was deemed impossible because a human rights perspective “crosses the line” into advocacy, thus rendering the journalist non-objective and, therefore, unprofessional. I pride myself on confronting the impossible. Therefore, I aim to show that indeed it is possible to be a credible, and simultaneously professional, journalist working within a human rights framework and that we can learn from the examples and challenges faced by transnational peoples who engage in journalism.

Structure of the Dissertation

The dissertation consists of six chapters. Following this introduction, I look at the literature regarding journalism and journalism education programs—both formal programs in educational institutions and “on-the-job” training and “professionalization” (Husband, 2012; Johnson-Cartee, 2005; Tuchman, 1978; Waisbord, 2013). I note that although there is a healthy body of work on Indigenous peoples’ media (Graham, 2010; Haetta, 2011; Raheja, 2007; Rasmussen, 1999; Retzlaff, 2006) “alternative media” (de Jong et al., 2005; Downing, 2001; Howely, 2010; Jensen 2001; Ostertag, 2006), and a growing body of literature on “Arab” media specifically (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002b; Sakr, 2007), there is a dearth of literature regarding transnational peoples’ journalism as a whole. Although scholars and practitioners of critical journalism problematize the ideas of objectivity and, at times, critique traditional journalism education, few alternatives focusing on the pedagogical process itself have been suggested
(Keller, 2013; Ward, 2003, 2010). This absence is even more glaring when addressing diverse audiences with different levels of power across and between state lines (Downing & Husband, 2005, pp. 194–217; Graham, 2010; Johnson-Cartee, 2005; Karlsreiter, 2003; Pietikäinen, 2008a, 2008b). With my research, I aim to contribute to the conversation in this area.

I also examine the literature available on transnational peoples and movements, and note the lack of discussion on the role of journalists as intentional political actors. By connecting conversations between the constructivist International Relations literature—particularly that of framing, agenda setting, and diffusion of ideas and institutions—with that of feminist and post-colonial scholars’ discussions of objectivity and credibility, I call into question the traditional understanding of credible, professional Western mainstream journalism as a factor, or non-factor, in political change. I argue that traditional understanding of journalistic objectivity is, in fact, a limited understanding of objectivity. Specifically, I focus on how the framing of stories, including the absence of questioning alternatives to state dominance, perpetuates uneven power structures and dynamics. As Chapter 2 continues, I address these issues directly through my theoretical framework. Most notably, I engage with Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink’s (1998) notions of “information politics” and “accountability politics,” Alison Brysk’s (2013b) discussion of communication politics, and Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall’s (2005) understanding of productive power. In recognizing the relationship between unveiling, contesting, and creating norms, we can recognize alternative forms of objectivity that challenge the “god’s-eye view,” such as strong objectivity (Harding, 1993) and contextual objectivity (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002a). How can we form a more robust idea of objectivity to better understand the importance of creating and disseminating credible information that can unearth and address systems and structures of power? And, more importantly, how can we use such
information and framing to present and create viable alternatives?

In Chapter 3, I explain my reasons for, and process of, engaging in a comparative case study. I then detail my process of data collection and analysis. In this chapter, I also address the question of whether the two case studies—Saami and Romani journalism education programs—are too different to compare. This was an issue I struggled with until more fully immersed in the data. This methodology chapter also discusses the multi-sited fieldwork (Hannerz, 2003) process including how and why I selected the locations of the programs/projects. I address in detail whom I interviewed and the documents (syllabi, grant applications, annual reports, evaluations, etc.) I reviewed. I strive to be transparent about the limitations of these choices (Lightfoot, 2009; Plaut, 2014; Yin, 2009). Specifically, I discuss the different relationships and access I have with both the Saami and Romani journalistic communities and how this affected the data-generating process and analysis. Then I explain how I analyzed the data, and thus identified various themes specific to the particular cases and the quintain, which Stake (2006) defines as a greater whole and process comprised of distinct case studies.

Chapter 4 is focused on my findings within the various training programs specifically geared towards and targeting Romani journalists and others wishing to create stories about and with Roma. Unlike Saami journalism education, which primarily takes place at formalized institutions, Romani journalists are primarily trained through a variety of NGO-initiated projects spanning more than 10 countries throughout Central and Eastern Europe. These projects were all dependent on international donors. The most consistent financial support comes from the Open Society Foundation (OSF), whose mission links journalism and media with the larger liberal democratic project and seeks to ensure that Roma are recognized as full citizens within their states as well as within the European Union. Through interviews, grant proposals and
evaluations, as well as my observations of trainings, I demonstrate how this framing of Roma, and journalism, affects the structure, delivery, and evaluation of Romani journalism education. In short: as the politics in the region change and racism increases, there are fewer funded media outlets specifically geared to Romani audiences.\(^8\) Instead, the donors who fund such projects and the coordinators who design and administer them seek to use journalism to *intervene* in and contest the way Roma are (mis)represented in the dominant discourse. Roma are with non-Roma to develop journalism that directly addresses the primarily non-Romani society.

In Chapter 5, I discuss Saami journalism education as taught at Sámi University College. The university college has offered tertiary education in journalism since 1999, and aims to start a Master of Arts in Indigenous Journalism in the Fall of 2014. This chapter focuses on the theories and practices guiding this educational endeavour with a special focus on notions of “self-determination” and the role Saami media play in this process. Unlike Romani media, Saami media frame their journalism as a way of addressing and serving Saami society. Through interviews and analysis of curricula and my participation at the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Conference held in Sápmi in 2012, I demonstrate how the relationships between nation building, self-determination, and critical journalism are negotiated —within both Sápmi and the larger Indigenous communities and with various state entities. Particular attention is given to the tensions within the community of Saami journalists, managers, and educators as to how Saami media can serve goals of self-determination, especially as it relates to choices of journalistic curriculum and media outlets.

In Chapter 6, I compare Romani and Saami journalism within their larger socio-economic

---

\(^8\) Since the mid-2000s has been an increase in online Romani media outlets (online radio and YouTube TV news), particularly from Roma who fled former Yugoslavia during the war and now reside in (and are often citizens of) Western and Northern Europe. However, these initiatives are almost always self-funded and often involve a laptop, microphone, and a webcam in someone’s house rather than a formal journalistic operation.
contexts and compare how their approaches to transnational politics reflect and manifest in their different approaches to journalism. I then examine some of the commonalities and differences in the emerging quintain of journalism education done by and for people who identify as transnational. In this chapter, I examine some of the larger ideas about social change, affinity, identities, and claims making across borders and the often-overlooked role that journalism and journalists can, and do, play. I pay special attention to how the cultural and political contexts shape both politics and journalism and the interplay between the two. By carefully examining the differences and similarities between Saami and Romani journalism education programs, one can see how understandings of power and the state shape these emerging self-identified transnational journalists’ understandings of their roles and responsibilities. I conclude by demonstrating that a transnational standpoint exists, and that it makes an important contribution to both journalism and human rights advocacy because it questions the assumed, reified existence and supremacy of the state and the state system.

For transnational peoples, it is clear that states are constructed and not a given. Journalism is a powerful tool used to educate and explain realities and possibilities to audiences within, between and across borders who exercise politics that are not bounded by a single state. The human rights framework and strategies, so often limited to trying to persuade a state in how it treats “its own” people, can be expanded. I aim to show how a transnational standpoint in journalism does exist and can provide a critically important lens for approaching the broader goals of human rights scholarship and advocacy.
Chapter 2 — Theorizing the Borders of Journalism and Journalism Beyond Borders

From George Orwell to Anna Politkovskaya to Albert Camus to Glenn Greenwald, journalists have provided plenty of testimonies about how the events of the world affect them, and how they, in turn, have struggled to affect the events of the world. Yet, even though these journalists, and many others like them, put pen to paper for a living, within academic literature there is surprisingly little written about journalists as intentional political actors. Considering the “real world” interplay between journalism and socio-political change, the lack of academic conversation regarding the journalist’s political power is surprising. John Downing (1996), a political communications scholar, describes this silence “as though politics consisted of mute pieces on a chessboard” (p. x). In this chapter, I employ an old mantra from journalism, and attempt to give voice to the “voiceless” chess pieces.

Borrowing from the constructivist school of International Relations (IR), critical communications theories, journalism education, and the vast literature on transnational movements, this chapter offers a more robust way of understanding the political role that journalists and journalism plays in both sustaining and critiquing power relations. I am particularly interested in how people are able to frame issues in such a way that problems, concerns, and possible solutions become worthy enough to address in newsrooms and media boardrooms (Hermann & Chomsky, 1988; Joachim, 2003).

I begin this chapter by very briefly reviewing the history of what we now recognize as mainstream journalism and journalistic objectivity. I argue that although many of the professional practices of journalism as a craft are valuable, the traditional, colloquial use of the term “objectivity” in journalism is too limiting (Miller, 2011; Waisbord, 2013; Ward 2003, 2010). In order to provide a more robust understanding of objectivity, I bring in the concepts of
contextual objectivity (El Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002a) and strong objectivity (Harding, 1993). Although this argument is not new in the fields of alternative journalism, Indigenous peoples’ journalism, and minority journalism, there is a lack of scholarly work available regarding transnational peoples’ journalism specifically. This is an important gap, as the very existence of transnational peoples—by definition—contests the normalization of the nation-state. I aim to offer a corrective, arguing that transnational peoples’ engagement and framing of the world and events around them—their “standpoint”—can offer a very clear and distinct understanding of the strength and limits of the state and its assumed power in international affairs. Journalism, which serves to inform an audience about the “facts” of the world, as well as to explain how the world operates, plays a very important role in this process. Journalism can serve a nation whose reality and politics are not prescribed by state borders and it can also intervene in unquestioned state structures such as a legislature, budget, and even telecommunications outlets.

This project involves looking at journalism and journalists within the larger context of international and transnational politics—not just the formal political process, but, as described by Iris Marion Young (1990), “all aspects of institutional organization, public action, social practices and habits, and cultural meanings insofar as they are potentially subject to collective evaluation and decision-making” (p. 9, my emphasis). I am particularly interested in the processes through which people recognize and collectively evaluate the subjugations that appear inevitable and create opportunities for alternative enactments of power. This process of deliberation and discord is a form of politics—and, as de Jong et al (2005) state, “politics is communication” (p. 1).

I continue the chapter by discussing how constructivist IR can help us better understand competing frames and the process that helps nurture the “conceptual link between the myriad bad
things out there and the persuasive machinery of advocacy politics in world affairs” (Carpenter, 2007, p. 102). Working with Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) understanding of the four kinds of politics that are the core ingredients of transnational advocacy—information politics, symbolic politics, leverage politics, and accountability politics—I argue that journalism can indeed be a form of productive power (Barnett & Duvall, 2005). This recognition also opens the door for understanding journalists as potential political agents and illustrates the tensions with traditional understandings of journalistic objectivity. I find much useful within the constructivist school of IR, although I question and critique its assumed inevitability and supremacy of the state and state power (Doty, 1996; DuFour et al., 2010; Mamdani, 2004). I am particularly critical of how this translates into human rights advocacy when engaging and harnessing “political will” beyond the state.

I use this chapter to show how the journalistic process is indeed a political process with very real effects on the ground (Fairclough, 1992; Husain, 2006). By exploring how journalism can be politics, as well as the potential politics of journalism, I examine two core questions: What, if any, relationships exist between a transnational identity, the framing of socio-political realities across borders, and transnational mobilization? And what roles do journalists, journalism, and journalistic outlets play in these dynamics?

What is Journalism?

“Where the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe”
“I do not take a single newspaper nor read one a month, and I feel myself infinitely the happier for it” — Thomas Jefferson, as quoted in Leveson Inquiry (Leveson, 2012, p. 4)

Journalists have traditionally embraced their role as informational gatekeepers for the public and enjoyed a monopoly on the news that enters public debate. Modern technology and
social media have changed the practice of journalism by making it more interactive, but the
gatekeeping role is still often considered the gold standard (Gitlin, 1980; Gladstone, 2011, pp.
144–155; Waisbord, 2013, pp. 5–6). A vast body of literature addresses alternative media, activist
media, and the evolving sphere of “citizen journalism,” but in this section, unless otherwise
noted, I use the term “journalists” and “journalism” to refer specifically to self-identified
journalists who are paid for their work by mainstream media outlets.

Within this world of mainstream media, there is an ongoing debate about whether
journalism is a profession or a craft (Waisbord, 2013). Journalists pride themselves on being a
necessary service: providing information about what is important in the world to a (presumably
singular) public that can use the information to make informed decisions. Thus this audience has
the information needed to hold those in power accountable (Strömbäck, 2005). In the English-
speaking world, journalism may be practiced as a market model, a public service model, or one
of numerous hybrid models, as seen in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada,
respectively (Waisbord, 2013). Although media institutions and models vary, journalism is
universally understood to have “quality standards” and practices that separate it from “pure”
entertainment (Johnson-Cartee, 2005; Waisbord, 2013, p. 26; Ward, 2003, 2010). In addition,
although there are diverse understandings of journalism and journalism education, the definition
of “good journalism” is also fairly consistent: it requires credibility, transparency, fact checking,
and seeking out a diversity of sources (Plaut, 2014; Ward, 2003, 2010). However, the recognition
of these core elements is relatively recent. In fact, a central question that has followed the field of
journalism education since its inception in the beginning of the 20th century is what exactly a
good journalism education looks like. Should journalists be trained in journalism as a field, or do
they benefit more from a broad liberal arts education coupled with the time, space, and
opportunity to hone their craft under tutelage of other, more experienced journalists (Folkerts, Hamilton, & Lemann, 2013; Husband, 2012; Waisbord, 2013)?

In 1920, Walter Lippmann published *Liberty and the News*, in which he argued passionately for the need for a dispassionate press. In the shadow of the robber barons and media moguls who helped fuel manifest-destiny (the most famous being William Hearst⁹), Lippmann advocated for a detached, scientific approach to journalism. This approach was labeled “objective.” This was a “positivist” notion of objectivity: the idea that there is knowledge (or news) “out there” waiting to be discovered. Although even Lippmann himself was unsure of the viability of this approach, it became the presumed standard, or ideal, of American professional journalism (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 96–102; Handley & Rutigliano, 2012, p. 10; Miller, 2011).

In Lippmann’s day, it was not the professional norm for a journalist to be removed, dispassionate, and detached (Alzner, 2012; Bell, 1997; Tait, 2011). In 1920, partisan press was rampant. In fact, many people ignored Lippmann, arguing that journalists were obligated not only to chronicle what was happening, but to *explain* it to the audience in a way that fit within their worldview (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 102–106). However, things changed in the 1950s, when television became the dominant news medium in North America. Instead of addressing a particular, targeted audience, there was social and financial gain in cultivating and catering to the *largest, broadest audience* possible. All of a sudden, millions of people were watching the same thing at the same time, which meant media, had the potential to both shape the national conversation and access a captive consumer market. In other words, there was an incentive not to

---

⁹ Journalist-artist Federic Remington was in Cuba to learn about the Cuban uprising against Spanish colonialism for the *New York Journal*. He found little to write about and sent a telegram to that effect to the publisher, William Hearst, who responded with the now infamous quote, “Please Remain. You furnish the pictures. I’ll furnish the war.” Although oft told as an urban legend within journalistic circles, there is now speculation as to whether Hearst actually wrote that telegram at all (see, for example, Campbell, 2001).
alienate the audience (potential market/voters) by focusing on a specific segment of viewers, but to produce a single, indisputable version of the events of the day (Bell, 1997; Gladstone, 2011 p. 103). Thus, the professional, removed, mainstream journalist with a professional responsibility to tell the audience the (singular) daily narrative became the norm (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 102–103; Hackett & Zhao, 1998; Hallin, 1994; Waisbord, 2013; Zelizer, 2004).

After World War II, North American journalists were taught to see themselves as removed from the world, and this distance is still often seen as the basis, and proof, of their credibility.10 According to El-Nawawy and Iskandar (2002a), “objectivity has come to imply both a media practice of information collection, processing and dissemination and an overarching attitude… suggestive of the absence of subjective and personalized involvement and judgment” (par 4.). Objectivity has become so engrained in the traditional journalistic practices of mainstream Anglo-American journalism that it is often not even recognized until its principles or practices are challenged (Bell, 1997; Carr, 2013; Tuchman, 1978). According to communications scholars Robert Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao (1998), journalism operates within and creates a “regime of objectivity” (passim). Objectivity requires dissent, but there are limits (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 104–107; Hallin, 1994; Handley & Rutigliano, 2012). Hermann and Chomsky (1988, passim) refer to the notion of “acceptable dissent,” the parameters of what is considered news and what is considered too “far out” to be reasonable. Although, it is important to note that these limits change depending on the cultural and political norms of the time. Borrowing from Hallin’s (1994) idea of the “sphere of consensus” (passim)—what is assumed to be agreed upon by all (in a society) and what is open for contestation—Gladstone (2011)

---

10 According to Barnett and Finnemore (2004), this idea of detachment as a means of claiming and maintaining authority is also institutionalized in other fields, such as refugee policy (e.g., the UNHCR) and economic development (e.g., the World Bank).
explains this journalistic boundary policing process through the analogy of a donut:

The donut hole is the sphere of consensus, ‘the region of motherhood and apple pie.’ Unquestionable values and unchallengeable truths. The donut is journalism’s sweet spot: the sphere of legitimate controversy. Here issues are undecided, debated, probed. The sphere of deviance is the air around the donut… the place for people and opinions that the ‘mainstream of society reject as unworthy of being heard.’ Objective reporters don’t go there. (p. 105)

Gladstone continues by explaining how, through story selection and presentation, journalists serve as guardians and gatekeepers of legitimate political discussion. This border managing takes place through what Tuchman (1978) explained throughout her work as “strategic rituals” of journalism—the daily routines of how one goes about performing the job of being a journalist. Separating “the” news from “the” journalist thus becomes one of the strongest means of performing one’s objectivity.

However, this self-image rarely matches the reality. Although some journalists have publically advocated for a more engaged form of journalism, Martin Bell’s (1997) argument for a journalism of attachment (and the public fallout that arose) being the best known, I am more interested in those journalists who claim detachment and yet are engaged in the process of maintaining and challenging power.11 Lisa Wade’s (2011) work offers an illustrative example. Through both content analysis of print material and semi-structured interviews, she traced how American journalists working for venerable publications like the New York Times and the Washington Post in the 1990s built, campaigned for, and sustained a public consensus against female genital cutting (which was most often referred to as female genital mutilation—FGM). This was done through book reviews, editorials, and news pieces. In fact, some journalists

---

11 Martin Bell was a seasoned BBC journalist who covered the wars in Yugoslavia and provided eye witness accounts of the ethnic cleansing. He insisted that by covering the news from a stance of and not highlighting the experiences victims of the ethnic cleansing, journalists were in fact enabling human rights violations to continue. Instead he promoted a “journalism of attachment” that advocated empathy as a key journalistic trait and skill.
worked with refugee lawyers to publicize cases that shed light on particular laws and advocated for specific asylum outcomes. In short, Wade shows how journalists who would not refer to themselves as “activist journalists” can and do work to expose human rights violations and offer support to various human rights solutions. I argue this is an example of journalists’ use of productive power.

Borrowing from Michel Foucault’s (1980) understanding of discourse as a form of power, both in terms of constraint and of possibility, Barnett and Duvall (2005) identify productive power as:

foster[ing] resistance as attempts by actors to destabilize, even to remake, their subjectivities and thereby, to transform, or at least to disrupt the broader social processes and practices through which those subjectivities are produced, normalized and naturalized…Resistance also can include how knowledgeable actors become aware of discursive tensions and fissures and use that knowledge in strategic ways to increase their sovereignty, control their own fate, and remake their very identities. (p. 23, my emphasis)

In other words, the process of framing issues, actors, problems, and the viability of various solutions—is a far cry from the positivist idea of objectivity. Brysk (2013a) refers to this process as “winning the hearts and minds” of those in positions of power, but I go one step further and present it as a way of disrupting assumptions about who holds power—especially as the journalist must also be recognized as a character in the story. Although scholars acknowledge that media play a role in this process, journalism itself is still often cast as passive. In most work, “the media” is anthropomorphized, but the journalists are absent (Barnett & Finnemore, 2004; Bob, 2005; Jochim, 2003; Tarrow, 2006). If journalists are discussed, they are seen as simply presenting and reacting to the stories they are given.

---

12 Some journalists, including Nicholas Kristoff (Tait, 2011) and Glenn Greenwald (Carr, 2013; Keller, 2013), identify as both journalists and advocates, but this is much rarer in Anglo-American news than it is in Latin America or continental Europe (Waisbord, 2013).
Three Different Approaches to Objectivity

“The notion of journalist as political and ideological eunuch seems silly, even to some who call themselves journalists.” – David Carr, journalist for the New York Times, June 30, 2013

Many piercing critiques of objectivity have been undertaken in a variety of fields, but the ideal of “the god’s eye view” of objectivity is still the cornerstone of mainstream journalism (Kelly, 2011; Waisbord, 2013, p. 76; Zelizer, 2004). In 1998, Hackett and Zhao proclaimed that within the professional field of journalism, “objectivity is the god that won’t die!” (passim). This intentionally humorous (and, I have found, quite true) statement presumes a specific, narrow, definition of objectivity.

I suggest that journalistic objectivity can be recognized in three distinct forms: positivist objectivity, contextual objectivity, and strong objectivity. As discussed above, positivist objectivity is the one most associated with traditional journalism. It is premised on the idea that the world and facts exist out there waiting to be reported, and that “truth” and validity in reporting can be achieved using methods of detachment, observation, and triangulated verification (although in journalism this most often involves two corroborating sources rather than the three of traditional social science research). As discussed earlier in this chapter, this view is most often historically ascribed to Walter Lippmann, as he attempted to carve out a “scientific” approach to journalism in 1920s America in reaction to the often flagrant propaganda of “American yellow” journalism (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 96–103; Lippmann, 1920). Often this understanding of objectivity is assumed to be the only definition. However, I argue it is only one of the possible meanings of the word.

13 “Yellow journalism” was the norm de rigour of journalism in the late 1800s to the early 1900s. It was very partisan and sensationalist, and often served the political and economic interests of the publisher, unabashedly.
As Zelizer (2004) notes, the journalistic profession equates objectivity with a positivistic notion of facts and holds such factuality to a near-holy level. In fact, Hackett and Zhao’s (1998) “regime of objectivity” is entrenched in basic everyday practices of the newsroom. This is evident, for example, in the separate labeling of feature writing and analysis to mark them off from “hard news,” which goes unlabeled (Gladstone, 2011, pp. 112–113; Tait, 2011; Tuchman, 1978; Zelizer, 2004). It is important to note that other understandings of objectivity still hold fast to the skills, techniques, and values of journalism but allow for a more expansive idea of what objectivity is and can be.

In their ground-breaking 2002 work on Arabic-language network Al Jazeera, El-Nawawy and Iskandar (2002a) coined the idea of “contextual objectivity,” describing their purposeful construction of such a seemingly oxymoronic term as “an attempt to articulate and capture the eclectic discursive and epistemological tensions between the relativism of message receivers and empirical positivism of message builders” (par. 4). Their work focuses not just on the media outlets, but the journalists themselves—as journalists and as members of the Arab world, and thus as Arab journalists.\(^{14}\) The kinds of “distance” assumed to be the ideal and the norm within other forms of journalism are not just impossible, but also undesirable. Just as journalists in Canada make their news in a way that makes sense to Canadian audiences, journalists from the Arab world speaking to the Arab world do their journalism in a way that makes sense to their audiences. This is manifested in story selection, source access, language choice, and other techniques (Sakr, 2007). For example, how does one reference people living on both sides of the Green Line—“settlers,” or “colonizers,” “Jews” or “Israelis,” “refugees,” or “displaced peoples,” “Palestinians” or “Arabs?” How does one refer to people who use violence to advocate

\(^{14}\) A similar argument is made regarding the Israeli media, particularly at times of crisis (see Zandberg & Neiger, 2005).
particular causes in the name of Palestinian liberation: “martyrs,” “terrorists,” “suicide bombers” or “heroes?” All of these journalistic techniques have very political implications that are read differently by different audiences. Journalists employing a form of contextual objectivity strive to be objective within the context of both the story and the audience.

An additional definition of objectivity put forth by some feminist and post-colonial scholars suggests that one can more clearly see systems and dynamics of power if one begins one’s observation from the perspective—“the standpoint”—of those who are marginalized by said systems. This perspective, which Sandra Harding (1993) terms “strong objectivity,” suggests that the standpoint of those marginalized offers a better (“stronger”) objectivity than traditional, positivist objectivity, because it starts from the point of questioning that which is often not questioned: the taken-for-granted ideas of “the way things are” or “ought to be.” This starting point is important because it not only opens up more questions (stories), it also opens up ideas about whom and what may be legitimate and credible sources of information (sources). In fact, Harding terms positivist objectivity “weak objectivity” because the starting point is too narrow to allow for full exploration of different problems and solutions. To be clear, Harding does not argue that one needs to embody the identity of those who are marginalized in order to research or write about them (one does not need to be a woman to write about women or Latino to write about Latino issues), nor does she suggest that a person of that marginalized identity will inherently write from that perspective (a gay writer does not automatically take up that standpoint in his or her writing or research). Rather, Harding is quite clear in stating that one’s standpoint is a conscious and purposeful choice; it is a position that one strives for, “an achievement.” Again, according to Harding, starting from the standpoint of those who are marginalized makes the entire system (or, in journalistic terms, “the story”) clearer, and thus it is
a more robust form of objectivity.

Harding’s notion of strong objectivity helps us understand that regardless of our own relationship to power, listening to people who do not benefit from the status quo—those who are marginalized from power—allows us to more clearly recognize the systems and structures that shape the world around us, and in turn, shape and influence our own perceptions of the world. As Harding (1993) states,

The activities of those at the bottom of such social hierarchies can provide points for thought for everyone’s research and scholarship—from which humans’ relations with each other and the natural world can become more visible….These experiences and lives have been devalued or ignored as a source of objectivating questions—the answers to which are not necessarily to be found in those experiences or lives but elsewhere in the beliefs and activities of people at the center who make policies and engage in social practices that shape marginal lives. (p. 54, emphasis in original)

In other words, by not only listening to those who are excluded from the structural status quo but starting from their perspective, we can see the structures that include and exclude working more clearly. This is because “one’s social situation enables and sets limits on what one can know; some social situations—critically unexamined dominant ones—are more limiting than others” (Harding, 1993, pp. 54–55). According to Young (2000), “such a contextualizing of perspective is especially important for groups that have power, authority or privilege” (p. 116, my emphasis). Thus, concerned people, including journalists, can more effectively gain an understanding of what the story are—both the problems and possible solutions—by learning from people who are typically “devalued” or “ignored,” and thus excluded from framing the story.

Journalists have a significant role in this process. Take, for example, a journalist assigned a story for a U.S. paper on the twentieth anniversary of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). How the journalist writes, researches, and presents this story will be based on the assumed audience and their presumed values and cultural narratives; this shapes the
“standpoint” of the journalist. Is it that of corporate shareholders? Unionized truckers? The U.S. Department of Labor? Agricultural migrants from Central Mexico? Autoworkers in Windsor, Ontario? Border patrol officers? Female workers in the maquiladoras? Veterans of the first Zapatista uprising? To repeat, it is not the ethnic or social identity of the journalist that determines the lens, but rather the perspective—the “starting point”—the journalist uses in crafting a story. As can be seen in the subsequent chapters, this framing affects the journalistic process itself: Where do journalists go to look for the story? Who is a legitimate source? Which languages are used in the interviews? Who is/are the audience(s) for the story? The story of the twentieth anniversary of NAFTA is more complicated than its effect on the American Gross Domestic Product, and the decisions and conditions that go into making an objective story are layered. To be clear, there are real, tangible, consequences to how the story is framed in terms of audience reaction and the socio-economic and political implications (Fairclough, 1992).

With these more robust understandings of objectivity, one can better recognize how media and the journalists are always and necessarily engaged in political work regardless of a claim to “objectivity.” Journalists have agency in how they frame certain issues, problems, and solutions, and the role they play in articulating, defining, and diffusing new norms (Keller, 2013; Wade, 2011). Journalists do not have to be passive to be objective. In fact, journalists are constantly engaged in a process of framing, which means they are constantly engaged in navigating and negotiating power (Carragee & Roefs, 2004). In being passive and accepting positivist objectivity as the only form of legitimate objectivity, journalists actually perpetuate the dominant systems of power (Hallin, 1994; Hermann & Chomsky, 1988).
Framing, Counter-Framing, and Framing Contests

When discussing frames and framing, much of the attention within communications literature has focused on the definition of frames and audience response to frames, but little attention has been given to the role of power in bringing particular frames to the forefront at particular times (Carragee & Roefs, 2004). Gitlin (1980), paraphrasing Erving Goffman defines framing as a way of negotiating all the various events taking place, managing them, comprehending them, and choosing “appropriate repertoires of cognition and action” (p. 6). As “the public,” we rely heavily on the media in navigating this process; although they are largely unspoken and unacknowledged, media frames “organize the world both for journalists who report [on] it and, in some important degree, for us who rely on their reports” (Gitlin, 1980, pp. 6–7). De Jong et al. (2005) offer a clear view from the perspective of actors involved in social and political change. According to them, framing is “deploying advanced media strategies in order to get their [social and political activists’] issues into the mainstream media…as a way of getting issues onto the political agenda but it is also about influencing public opinion and gaining support” (p. 7).

The process of framing, then, “confronts significant questions focusing on journalism’s relationship to political authority and to demands for change” (Carragee & Roefs, 2004, p. 228). According to Carragee and Roefs, the academic and practical discussions of the power—including the corrupting power—of framing have lessened over the past few decades. This lack of discussion raises concerns about the pervasiveness of this framing practice. As Carragee and Roefs (2004) remind us, frames do not just happen but are sponsored by various actors with various degrees of power (pp. 216–217).

Within the field of IR, and specifically within the constructivist school, the purpose of
framing an issue in a particular way is usually to bring about action—including the decision not to take action—which is usually built into the frame. A “back and forth” process often occurs, what Baer and Brysk (2009) refer to as “framing and framing back” (p. 102). This is an example of journalism affecting politics and politics affecting journalism. Strömbäck, Shehata, and Dimitrova (2008) provide an excellent example of the process of competing frames surrounding the human rights violations that took place at Abu Ghraib Prison in Iraq: The “torture” frame (placing accountability on the United States government as a whole) and the “abuse” frame (a few soldiers were abusing their authority and acting out of line) were in competition on the front pages of nearly every domestic and international media outlet. Various governmental officials and human rights organizations struggled to push the frames they felt would be most persuasive for their various audiences and most conducive to meeting their political objectives (Strömbäck et al., 2008, p. 119). 

Competition often occurs between different frames. It is important to understand that this competition determines how media outlets “pitch” an issue to the audience and react to the audience’s response. What helps certain ideas or norms “stick” (Price, 1998, p. 193)? Which issues get picked up and which ones garner little interest? What issues have what Carpenter (2007) defines as “issue emergence”?

According to Keck and Sikkink (1998), issue emergence is easiest to mobilize within transnational activist networks (TANs) when the concerns relate to either bodily harm (especially to vulnerable individuals) or equal access to the law (pp. 27–28). TANs include state, inter-state and non-state actors engaged in trying to change behaviors in another state. The results of some

---

15 According to Bennett et al. (2006), the abuse frame won in U.S. media.
historically successful TANs include the end to the trans-Atlantic slave trade, the end of foot-binding practices in China, and ensuring the right to vote for women in North America. In addition, TANs emphasize a short causal chain between the violation and the perpetrator. It is important to have “a causal story that establishes who bears responsibility or guilt” (p. 27). The longer the causal chain, the harder it is to hold the perpetrator accountable. For this reason many violations that take place in the private sphere—such as female genital cutting or domestic violence—prove difficult because the target (the perpetrator) is so distant from the state. It is important to note that the perpetrator is assumed to be connected to the state as is the remedy. Of course, many theorists and activists have complicated this understanding, noting that it is rare for a person to be pure victim or pure perpetrator; rather, power differentiation often renders some victims more “worthy” than others (Carpenter, 2007, 2009, 2012; Gilchrist, 2010; Hermann & Chomsky, 1988; Jiwani & Young, 2006; Mamdani, 2008).

**The Contribution of International Relations Theory**

As de Jong et al. (2005) point out, there is a particular gap in analyzing “the nature of media and the mediation of activism” (p. 3). According to Moravscik (2000) the “republican liberal” view of IR which is quite pervasive in western governmental policy, argues that citizens who have a problem with the state will express their concerns (often through lobbying, including lobbying through the media), and the state should, in turn, respond. Of course, the state tends to respond only if it is in its interest to do so. Human rights violations offer a particularly sticky point here, as the perpetrator is often the state itself. How does one hold the government accountable for the treatment of its own citizens? Too often this becomes a non-issue, swept under the rug, one of the “proverbial dogs that don’t bark” (Barnett & Duvall, 2005, p. 16).
According to Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) understanding of transnational politics, non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), diasporic communities, and religious institutions are able to affect the behavior of states by deploying four different types of politics: information politics, symbolic politics, leverage politics, and accountability politics (pp. 18–24). Information is the primary currency in information politics. NGOs in State A provide information about what is occurring on the ground to NGOs and other activists in State B. This information can be presented in an “event” to garner social attention beyond those already involved, thus engaging symbolic politics. Quite often, this attention can be used to shame a state into action (or inaction) through leverage politics, and the traditional role of the journalist as “watchdog” is an example of accountability politics. The in-depth discussion below of Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) different forms of politics better illustrates the connections between journalism, activism, institutions, and social/political change.

Information politics is employed when information becomes the currency through which a framework for advocacy can be created and mobilized. In order for this currency to be valued, it must be deemed credible. Thus, a desire to professionalize the information gathering process; and distribution often takes place. Those creating and consuming such information recognize that it is selected, framed, and portrayed to substantiate a particular view of a given situation that must resonate with many different audiences (Bob, 2005; Keck & Sikkink, 1998). Legitimacy and credibility are not seen as synonymous with being neutral or unbiased. The understanding of credibility here privileges facts but recognizes that they are subject to interpretation (Bogert, 2011).

The information that advocates and institutions present must be distributed in a way that is not only clearly understandable to the target audience but also constructs and cultivates an
assumed affinity, thus both creating and motivating an audience (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 18–22; Mihelj, 2011). This is often done using particular dates, pictures, people, maps, languages, or songs of cultural or historic significance that can help create emotion, affinity and thus, hopefully, action. This process is termed *symbolic politics* and is a tactic heavily employed in alternative media as well as transnational people’s journalism (Berg-Nordlie, 2011; Downing, 2001; Ostertag, 2006; Plaut, 2010, 2012b; Retzlaff, 2006; Skogerbo, 2003). One of the most easily recognizable being the white handkerchiefed Madres de Plaza de Año

*Why* is information expected to evoke a response from the target? Addressing this question is critical to affect change. Why does the state or non-state actor care about how they are perceived? What *leverage* do these actors have over the state? It is typically assumed there may be some rewards (trade agreements, membership in the European Union, etc.) for complying with particular expected behaviors, or perhaps consequences if standards are not upheld (sanctions, removal from the League of Commonwealth States, etc.). Many constructivists argue that actors can *internalize* certain norms as part of their own identity. Thus, when their behavior deviates from these norms, it is flagged as incongruent with their self-perception, leading to embarrassment (Risse & Sikkink, 1999, pp. 16–17; Thomas, 2002).16 For this to be effective, the target has to care about how it is perceived by others. This is what Keck and Sikkink (1998) refer to as *leverage politics*.17

Ignoring for a moment the overly state-centered approach to politics, according to Keck

16 A clear example of this is the self-image of the Nordic countries, particularly Norway. Since the end of the Second World War, the Norwegian state has recognized and promoted itself as a protector of human rights throughout the world. In the 1970s and 1980s, the Saami pointed out the inconsistency between Norway’s reputation and its actions which subsequently embarrassed the Norwegian state in international forums. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.
17 Of course, one can ask whether a target state or dominant population will understand, let alone be persuaded by, the concerns of those people who straddle states and identities.
and Sikkink (1998), once State A (or an international organization such as the European Union or World Bank) has leverage over State B, the latter will be held accountable for its human rights behavior. This is called *accountability politics* and is often considered the most under-theorized aspect of Keck and Sikkink’s analysis (Risse et al., 2013). Quite often it is assumed that “shaming” a target is all activists can do to evoke change. But as noted in the above discussion on leverage politics, shaming a target (and framing that person/institution/law/state as a violator of human rights—a perpetrator) only works if the perpetrator recognizes, respects, and thus feels compelled to respond to said shame and thus changes its behavior to comply with human rights norms. In other words, even when State B does make “tactical concessions” to such shaming—thus at least rhetorically recognizing the legitimacy of human rights—what moves State B from “prescriptive status” (the “window dressing” of human rights discourse) to internalizing human rights into its identity and institutions through “rule consistent behavior” (Risse & Ropp, 2013, pp. 6–8)? In other words, what causes a commitment to human rights to evolve into consistent compliance with human rights norms (pp. 9–10), as they can, and do, differ?

When reflecting on their work nearly 15 years later, Risse & Ropp (2013) characterized their thinking at the time as believing that all states have the power to comply, and thus, if they do not comply it is because they lack the willingness to do so. Their previous work was very much focused on persuading and state’s buy-in (“commitment”) with the understanding that compliance will follow. In revisiting their work, Risse and Ropp believe their primary weakness lies in not acknowledging that some states lack real sovereignty and complete control over their territory. My concern lies more in the fact that they do not question the supremacy and rightness of a state-focused approach. What are other understandings of sovereignty and power? But whatever the shortcomings, Keck and Sikkink’s (1998), Risse & Sikkink’s (1999), and Risse,
Ropp & Sikkinks (2013) models lay the groundwork for urging advocacy organizations to look beyond shaming human rights violators and towards building mechanisms for human rights compliance (Risse & Ropp, 2013, pp. 9–12, 13–14). Accountability and leverage politics go beyond the negative and instead focus on social and political internalization and institutionalization of human rights norms (Bob, 2005; Risse & Sikkink, 1999). Keck and Sikkink’s model provides rich ground for exploring how journalists can and do play a part in this process through their enactment of productive power.

The (Neglected) Role of Journalism in Constructivist International Relations Theory

I argue that journalists can be understood as agents of productive power. They are engaged in shaping perceptions of how the world is and, to some extent, how the world should be, including contesting and “destabilizing” what is perceived as unquestioned in the world (Barnett & Duvall, 2005). Not only does this selection process leave many—indeed the majority—of potential stories unwritten, it privileges a certain idea of what is important (Gitlin, 1980). As de Jong et al. (2005) correctly point out, “media and their sources frame the news agenda, structure the debate and create what we perceive as the reality in which we live” (p. 6).

The examples are plentiful—from R. Charli Carpenter’s (2007) examination of why few international organizations are focusing on the needs of children born from rapes during the Rwandan genocide to Richard Price’s (1998) work on the successful campaign to have land mines recognized as an international human rights concern. According to many IR scholars,

---

18 Gaber and Wilson (2005) provide a comprehensive analysis of their successful use of information and symbolic politics to ensure that “blood diamonds” reached issue emergence. Through strategic use of information politics, as well as symbolic politics (i.e., the catchy term “blood diamonds” holds mnemonic and visual resonance), condemning “blood diamonds” became part of the sphere of consensus. Mainstream media thus took up the issue, enabling various state and non-state actors to pressure governments and business to look for viable alternatives.
this is not a new process. Keck and Sikkink (1998) offer a historical examination of the successful campaign to end foot binding in China and the unsuccessful campaign by the British to eradicate female genital cutting in Kenya (pp. 165–198). Price (1998, p. 617) articulated this constructivist “pedagogical process” as a four-step but often circular practice:

1. Generating issues by disseminating information and framing the information as a problem;
2. Establishing networks for “proselytizing” within, across, and outside government channels;
3. Linking new norms with existing norms—grafting (which many communication scholars refer to as “priming”);
4. Reversing the burden of proof involved in contesting norms where states have to respond to why they are not cooperating with the new norm.

Of the myriad events that occur every day, certain occurrences can be transformed and highlighted by both journalists and advocates as an “issue,” thus warranting attention, while other potential issues that may be just as dire are ignored (Carpenter, 2007; Hackett & Zhao, 1998; Johnson-Cartee, 2005; Tuchman, 1978). Those issues deemed worthy of attention by journalists and editors are then shaped into “stories” and distributed through media outlets to an audience. The question that arises, however, is how and why certain issues are important enough to certain journalists and editors to rise to the level of assigned, publicized stories whereas others are not.

**Where is the Power in the Story?**

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, although “journalism” and “the media” are recognized as important parts of human rights advocacy, the role of the journalist in the shaping
and crafting of particular stories is often surprisingly absent from the IR literature. One notable exception is in the discussion of “minority” (and Indigenous) journalists, which is illustrative because it presupposes that people who are not of the dominant ethnicity/language have a different perception of the world and prioritize different kinds of stories as important (Anderson 1983; Brubaker, 1996).\(^\text{19}\) Another exception is the debate about embedded reporters in the second Iraq War and how their personal experiences influenced their coverage (de Torrente, 2004; O’Brien, 2004).

There is, however, quite a bit of discussion on this point within communications and journalism studies—most notably the debate regarding the journalism of attachment and whether journalists should be “detached” when gross injustice is taking place. As previously noted, Martin Bell put this argument forward most vocally in his coverage of the wars in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. According to Bell (1997), not to take a side was to be complicit in genocide (p. 15). Using his stature as a BBC journalist, Bell attempted to pressure states into action. It could be argued that Bell was engaged in classic leverage and accountability politics (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 22–24; Tait, 2011).

The debate around the “journalism of attachment” is a recent example of the ongoing conversation pitting professional journalistic ethics and journalists’ more general ethical obligations as humans against each other (Alzner, 2012; Ward, 2003)—a conversation that often surfaces and resurfaces in times of war or intense conflict (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002a; Gladstone, 2011, pp. 71–95; Zandberg & Neiger, 2005) or during the management of crisis.

\(^{19}\) For more on Indigenous and community journalism, please see Browne, 1996; Downing, 2001; Haetta, 2013; Henrikson, 2011; and Howely, 2010. Europe has a long history of recognizing and funding media outlets of recognized minority communities (Gross, 2006; Mihelj, 2011; Splichal, 2011), which I discuss in detail in Chapter 4. There is also a growing discussion about the “right” to media, particularly as it relates to Indigenous peoples and is enshrined in the Universal Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Graham, 2010).
Many times it is the legitimacy of the state’s power and “rightness” itself that is in crisis. This leads to overt grafting of both the audience and the journalist to the state and its governmental position (Handley & Rutigliano, 2012; Zandberg & Neiger, 2005).

As previously noted, the American and European media coverage of the abuse/torture taking place under U.S. watch at Abu Ghraib is an example of a “framing contest” (Bennett et al., 2006; Strömbäck et al., 2008). A more recent example can be seen in the coverage of WikiLeaks and Julian Assange (Handley & Rutigliano, 2012). Whereas mainstream media (such as CNN and 60 Minutes) questioned how it was possible for this “dangerous” and (unquestionably) classified information to be leaked and were enthralled by the drama surrounding the “manhunt” for the “fugitive,” non-corporate and non-state media outlets framed Assange as a “whistleblower.” Their coverage of the leaks involved combing through important information that they believed should be in the public domain. Within alternative media, such as Democracy Now, the information gleaned through the leaks was used to shape future interviews with powerful officials, many of whom refused to answer the questions because the source itself (Wikileaks) was framed as illegitimate. Within mainstream media, the question was how Assange would be held accountable for actions that, while not illegal, were deemed threatening to state, and mainstream journalistic, power. This is yet another example where Price’s four point constructivist pedagogical process can be seen at play. The unfolding reaction by American and European governments to Edward Snowden is yet another example of “reversing the burden of proof.” Whereas in the beginning the US government and mainstream media portrayed Snowden as a fugitive and a traitor who was spreading nonsense, within a few months the

---

20 Handley and Rutigliano (2012) also make the point that Julian Assange’s status as a non-state actor without a permanent home increased the presumed “dangerousness” of both Assange and WikiLeaks, noting, “Non-state actors pose a direct threat to the state and journalistic fields, so the state and journalistic fields overlap to contest emergent forms of journalism as irresponsible and threatening agents” (p. 748).
Obama administration was apologizing to European heads of state for bugging their mobile phones and publically revising governmental policy.

**A Transnational Journalistic Standpoint**

In sum, one of the more powerful things that takes place during war or crisis management is mainstream journalists’ outward identification with the state and the presumed threats against “us.” As Zandberg and Neiger (2005) explain when detailing the Israeli media’s coverage of the second Intifada, slippage occurs between journalists’ professional identity and their “national” identity. They found that regardless of the political or social leanings of the media outlet, in a time of crisis the “national identity” took precedence over the journalistic identity for at least the first few days. This process was so routinized and normalized that neither the journalists nor the Israeli (Jewish) audience recognized it. It was, however, recognized by the Israeli Arab (non-Jewish) audience. The presumed “us” of the Jewish nation did not fit, but neither were they quite “them” — the Palestinians living in the occupied territories. Here I once again turn to El-Nawawy and Iskandar’s (2002a) contextual objectivity to understand how the unique position of a self-identified “transnational journalist” can provide a clearer picture of the constructed nature of the power, and limits, of the state.

People who identify as transnational almost always have a complicated relationship with states; they are most likely citizens of a state, but their *nationhood* transcends those borders (Gellner, 1983; A. D. Smith, 1998). That said, transnational journalists also identify as journalists. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, journalists often envision themselves as informing, educating, and explaining to an audience what is going on in their world with the hope that the audience can then make the best, most informed decisions about what affects them,
including holding those in power accountable for their actions (Strömbäck, 2005). Transnational journalists are truly what Hill Collins (1986/2008) describes as “outsiders within,” with a particular standpoint (Harding, 1993) that potentially provides a clearer picture of the larger machinations of power. This clearer perspective enables journalists to question both the presumed supremacy of the state system and the ideals and practices of journalism. Self-identifying as a transnational journalist creates a heightened awareness of the different political, economic, and cultural factors that influence identities for all people including all journalists. Transnational peoples’ journalism does not assume the permanence or omniscient power of the state; this gives it the potential to reframe both politics and journalism, as well as the relationship between the two.
Chapter 3 — The ABCs—From the Arctic to the Balkans to Central Europe: How I Researched Transnational Peoples’ Journalism Education

My research identifies, describes, and analyzes the interplay of transnational peoples’ politics and journalism by focusing on how it manifests in two transnational peoples: the Roma and the Saami. I begin by contextualizing larger historic, political and economic realities of the peoples and journalism, how it affects notions of identity and how this manifests into the education of the next generation of Roma and Saami journalists. The process of using multiple unique case studies to investigate and understand a greater whole is what Stake (2006) refers to as “the quintain.” In this case, the quintain is transnational peoples’ journalism and its relationship to socio-political change. Using some of the theories and techniques described by Burawoy (2001) and elaborated on by Hannerz (2003) as “multi-sited ethnography,” I conducted a comparison of two qualitative case studies focusing on two distinct populations spread out over a number of locations. I used multiple methods: interviewing 45 people (sometimes numerous times) between May 2011 and May 2013 as well as analyzing primary and secondary documents (including curricula, grant proposals, internal and external reviews, and expenditure sheets). In addition, I observed some select trainings and workshops in Hungary and the Czech Republic in May 2013 and the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Conference in Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino in March 2012.

Why Comparative Case Studies?

Marketing of Rebellion addresses similar questions. In the book, Bob focuses on the process used by small, unknown groups to gain support from larger non-governmental and other advocacy organizations to build and leverage international support. I too wanted to focus on better understanding a process—in this case, how the next generation of Romani and Saami journalists were trained. Therefore, my own research design was greatly informed by Bob’s model. Although I assumed this would be a situation where transnational people are training “their own” to be professional journalists (as I reflect later in Chapters 4, 5 and 6), this is true for Saami journalists but it is not the case for Romani journalists.

Bob (2005) focuses on two disparate cases: the Ogoni in Nigeria and the Zapatistas in Mexico, both of which he chose because they were the “most visible of unlikely cases” that were successful in achieving their goal of gaining international support (p. 12). As Bob demonstrates, the Ogoni and Zapatista cases have different geo-politics, actors, and resources, and yet in spite of such differences, the groups chose to use “parallel strategies.” Bob’s selection of research tools was inspired by his desire to understand these similar strategies and the factors and dynamics that made them successful or produced tensions. These research tools consisted of multi-sited fieldwork with the organizations that had fundamental roles in the process and interviews with key players, some of whom were allied with those organizations. This meant Bob relied heavily on “expert” interviewing, snowball sampling, and primary source documentation to answer questions about how certain groups were able to capture international attention while other groups were unsuccessful (pp. 10–11).\(^\text{21}\) It also meant that his fieldwork took him from Brussels to Ogoniland and from the jungles of Chiapas to Madrid.

Like Bob, I explore how two very different groups of people operate in very different

\(^{21}\) I use the same definition of “expert interviews” as the Behavioural Research Ethics Board: people, in their professional capacity, being interviewed about their work.
contexts. Also like Bob, my interest is in the processes of negotiating and transforming socio-political change on a transnational level.\textsuperscript{22} This project aims to identify both if there is a process, —in this case using a “transnational starting point” —and, if so, how this manifests in journalism. Specifically, I want to map the connections between a transnational starting point and possibilities of socio-political change that go beyond the state, focusing on the role of journalists that choose to foreground their transnational identity. There is also a very practical application. I want to understand what larger lessons could be learned from transnational journalism education: what professional journalism education can look like when addressing human rights issues. When examining human rights issues and when engaging in journalism, context is extremely important. Based on my interests and skills, in-depth qualitative work including immersion in and analysis of case studies is the best method.

**Brief Overview of Case Selection**

Case study research has some unique characteristics: Various types of cases are identified and, in fact, often sought out to better explore the research questions. This process is referred to as “progressive sampling” (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006) or “information-oriented selection” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 230). Case study research is often used to look for different types of cases to test or confirm a prediction or to examine the reasons that a particular anticipated outcome did not come to pass. Cases have typically been classified by type into three or four categories. I use the following three case typologies in my project:

- **Least likely case**: An unusual or atypical case in which things do not seem to be working the way they are expected to; this provides the opportunity to identify the various actors

\textsuperscript{22} Various International Relations (IR) scholars (George & Bennett, 2005; Gerring, 2004) have termed this “process tracing”; however, I find that the focus has been too much on the chronology of the process rather than the organic—and at times messy—reality.
and dynamics in great detail. It may also help in the mapping out of various combinations of variables and causal patterns (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 229; George & Bennett, 2005; Gerring, 2004).

- **Significantly different cases**: A *small-N* study of cases with some very significant differences allows identification of what is common between them; this is very similar to the notion of choosing cases on the basis of the quintain (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 230; Stake, 2006).

- **Most likely case**: A case in which all the conditions *should* be in order for the hypothesis or theory to generate the expected outcome. The underlying assumptions are that “if it is valid for this case, it is valid for all (or many) cases” and “if it is not valid for this case, then it is not valid for any (or only a few) cases” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, pp. 230–232).

Similarities between cases are interesting, but the contradictions of responses within and between cases are also seen as a rich source of data. For this reason, when engaged in multiple or comparative case studies, it is recommended to study and write up case reports on the individual cases *first* and then to perform cross-case analysis (Flyvbjerg, 2006; George & Bennett, 2005; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009). This enables a more cohesive understanding of the particularities of an individual case to better appreciate the dynamics of the quintain as a system. Flyvbjerg (2006) identifies this as “context-dependent knowledge” and argues that it is “at the very heart of expert [knowledge] activity” (p. 222).

---

23 I use the term “comparative” case studies to refer to any study that involves two or more cases. Some authors, including Stake (2006), draw a distinction between research comparing two cases and small-N studies because “comparative case studies…seek similarities and differences among cases on a relatively few specified attributes…to make some grand comparison rather than to increase understanding of individual cases” (p. 83). However, it appears Stake (2006) overstates his case, referencing not comparative case studies as a whole but rather the goal of generalizability. Other scholars, such as Yin (2009) and Hancock and Algozzine (2006), also disagree with this comparative case study description and provide detailed steps for how to conduct in-depth, case-specific comparative case studies that are more in line with what Stake defines as the multi-case method.
Significantly Different Cases

Although they are both transnational peoples, the Saami and the Roma differ significantly from one another. I selected these cases because, like Bob (2005), I wanted to focus on the similar tactics in spite of such obvious differences (p. 12). Working from Flyvbjerg’s (2006) classifications of how to work with different case studies, I selected cases that vary greatly and foregrounded such differences in order to better identify the commonalities between them (p. 230)—and better understand the quintain of transnational peoples’ journalism (Stake, 2006).

Although both the Saami and the Roma predominantly live in Europe, their experiences vary in terms of their socio-economic status, recognition by the states in which they reside, and their relationships with the majority population. Moreover, based on their geographic distance and different spheres of influence and claim-making (the Saami are leaders in transnational Indigenous politics, whereas the Roma are struggling to be heard by European Court of Human Rights), they have little to no contact with one another in the larger arena of transnational politics and advocacy. I illustrate these differences, and the effects they have on journalistic and political strategies, in Chapter 6.

Case Selection

Bob (2005) spends much of The Marketing of Rebellion investigating the cases of the Zapatistas and the Ogoni separately. He gives special attention to the negotiated process of framing issues in order to market the “cause” to different audiences (Indigenous rights and autonomy for the Mayan people of Southern Mexico and environmental protection for the Ogoni people in the Nigerian Delta, respectively). The purpose of detailing each case is to acknowledge
the particularities of the case, set the context, and then focus on the *similar strategies* employed because of the need to frame issues in the most effective way in the context of international advocacy. I followed a similar strategy in selecting and researching my cases.

There are many transnational peoples, but there are *not* many consistent, well-established journalism education programs for transnational peoples. The late 1990s saw a small uptick in programs aimed at Mayan journalists but these differ from the programs on which I focus. For even the Mayan journalism education programs still tend to be state specific—Mayan TV is specific to Guatemala while the filmmaking trainings run through the Chiapas Media Project/Promedios, although reliant on international funding, are still focused on Southern Mexico.\(^{24}\) In the early and mid-2000s there was an increased interest by the US and other governments in training “Arab” journalists—often with a focus on women—but these were often very closely tied to diplomatically driven geo-political goals. Of course, even with this limited number, decisions about which programs to examine were required. As Hannerz (2003) explains, multi-sited ethnography almost always entails, “a selection of sites from among those many which could potentially be included” and these decisions are “to an extent made gradually and cumulatively, as new insights develop, as opportunities come into sight, and to some extent by chance (p. 363).

This was certainly my experience.

In designing my research, I wanted to ensure that I had a basic “cultural competence” for the cases. It made no sense to parachute into a community in which I had no linguistic or cultural

---

\(^{24}\) UNESCO has engaged in media trainings throughout the Muslim world—often bringing together journalists, particularly Muslim female journalists. In the early 2000s the Open Society Foundation also tried its hand in focusing on North African female journalists and filmmakers as a whole. Very few of these programs extend beyond one or two projects. In 2009, Inuit journalism students from Nunavut Arctic College have engaged in an exchange program with Sami University College for short workshops. For information on Indigenous filmmaking please see *Global Indigenous Media* (2008).
knowledge (Neumann, 2008), but that still left me with a handful of options. However, as Gusterson (2008) notes, “ethnographers inevitably have to decide which aspects of a field environment are more or less accessible or closed off by virtue of their own identity” (p. 96). Based on my own identity as someone who is both Jewish and an American citizen, I decided the risks and questions associated with conducting research on some transnational groups (Palestinians, Jews, Kurds) would outweigh the potential benefits.

Prior to beginning this project I knew that both the Saami and the Roma identified themselves—and are identified—as distinct peoples who live within, between, and across multiple states, and both populations use multiple methods to make political, social, and legal claims based on their transnational identities. One of these tools is media, and specifically journalism. Because of the importance they place on this journalistic strategy, both the Saami and the Roma seek to advance the quality of their journalism and their journalists and yet do not strive to be neutral. This commonality of transnationality, and what I have come to recognize through my research as a “transnational starting point” in journalism, became clear in my analysis.

The process of identifying and working with diverse cases in order to identify what, if any, common threads exist has been recognized as particularly useful when engaging in case study research that aims to explore and refine a “novel hypothesis or theories, such that an existing body of evidence cannot be referenced in speculating about the plausibility of a suspected relationship” (Kaarbo & Beasley, 1999, p. 375). This is where I position my research. For although quite a lot of academic work has been done on the socialization and professionalization processes of Western journalists (Glasser & Craft, 1998; Johnson-Cartee, 2005; Skinner et al., 2001; Tuchman, 1978), and some for alternative media (Coyer, 2005;
Downing, 2001; Retzlaff, 2006), as noted in Chapter 2, little has been written about journalism education done by and for specific populations, particularly those who identify as transnational. I aim to show how transnational standpoints do exist and can provide a critically important lens for approaching human rights scholarship and advocacy.

In other words, the Saami and the Roma are both transnational peoples, and they both have media, and in that way they are very similar. However, they have very different socio-political and economic statuses and resources; in this sense, they are significantly different (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 230). So, are there in fact similarities in the ways they train and evaluate “their own” to be journalists? Can I examine a quintain of transnational peoples’ journalists, and journalism? And, if so, what are the differences in understanding and negotiating the tensions in terms of audience, languages, relationship to the state, and the media outlets themselves?

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 below show the distinctions that will be highlighted throughout subsequent chapters. I knew some of this information prior to engaging in fieldwork, but other points became clearer afterwards.
### Table 3.1: Romani and Saami Media Outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Romani media</th>
<th>Saami media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location(s)</strong></td>
<td>Throughout Europe (including Turkey and the UK). In Central/Eastern (C/E) Europe and the Balkans media is primarily TV/radio and online. In Western and Northern Europe it is primarily Internet-based radio and TV programs. There are also pan-European documentaries. Print is minimal.</td>
<td>TV and radio are found in the Norwegian, Swedish, and Finnish sides of Sápmi; daily newspapers in the Norwegian side, weekly inserts in the Finnish side, and magazines in the Swedish and Norwegian sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language(s)</strong></td>
<td>Mixture of state languages and Romani</td>
<td>Radio is in Saami, TV in Saami subtitled in the state language; some print media is in Saami and some in the state language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of media</strong></td>
<td>TV, documentaries, radio, multimedia</td>
<td>TV, radio, multimedia, newspapers, children’s programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>Almost all donor-based; limited state funding in Kosovo/a, Macedonia and Slovakia; very limited advertising revenue</td>
<td>State support/subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience(s) (in order of priority)</strong></td>
<td>Non-Roma and Roma</td>
<td>Saami, majority population, other Indigenous communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to state</strong></td>
<td>Minimal; very few states have designated Romani programming on state-owned TV or radio</td>
<td>Significant; all Saami programs are on state-owned TV or radio; state subsidizes both daily Saami papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 There are nine different Saami languages that are not mutually understandable; North Saami is the most common. In my work, unless otherwise noted, “Saami language” refers to North Saami. There are also many different Romani dialects, which can vary widely; however, the base of Romani is consistent and it is considered by most to be one language (Victor Friedman, personal communication, June, 3, 2013).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Romani journalism education</th>
<th>Saami journalism education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Programs throughout EU countries in C/E Europe as well as some programming in the southern Balkans</td>
<td>Sámi allaskuva in the Norwegian side of Sápmi; Saami filmmaking and documentary making in Finnish vocation schools; professional training in the newsrooms throughout Sápmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Mostly concentrated, focused short-term training (3 days; 5–10 days) as part of media production; larger projects have training integrated throughout (4–6 weeks); currently, there is no long-term education focused exclusively on Romani journalism</td>
<td>3-year BA at Sámi allaskuva; 2-year MA in Indigenous journalism to start Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student demographics</td>
<td>Roma and non-Roma journalists working together to make a product and learning from one another under the guidance of experienced journalist/trainer(s)</td>
<td>All BA students are Saami speaking; the MA student body will be primarily Saami, with some other Indigenous students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Inconsistent grants from foundations and, more recently, the European Union</td>
<td>Norwegian state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Very few, if any, trainers are Roma; all are very experienced journalists</td>
<td>Nearly all instructors are Saami; some non-Saami (including other Indigenous journalists) are brought in for guest lectures, etc. Three non-Saami professors (University of Helsinki and University of Bedford) are also involved in development of the curricula/program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to state</td>
<td>Minimal; Hungary designed and funded a Roma-specific journalism training program in 2012</td>
<td>Sámi allaskuva is fully funded and accredited by the Norwegian Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At risk of belabouring the point, I chose these cases because, in spite of the significant differences, there is a greater whole (a quintain) of “transnational peoples’ journalism” that such differences help elucidate. To be clear, this can cause conceptual tension—what Stake (2006) refers to as the “case-quintain dilemma” (pp. 7–8). I discuss my own process of engaging with such tensions later in the chapter when reflecting on the research design.

Why Romani Journalists?

Given their extreme poverty and many pressing concerns about their rights, recognition, and protection, the Roma could be assumed to be “least likely” to have journalism education. For the most part, the Roma live in poverty without food and housing security; there is often a high threat of physical violence as well as legal/judicial acquiescence to such violence. Laws regarding their recognition and protection by the state and local authorities as well as degrees of legal mobility and transnational mobilization vary based on the countries in which they reside. As can be seen in Table 3.1 above, there is very little state support. Some countries have Romani news programs/channels as a vestige of the socialist system that supported ethnic group/national minority (the USSR, as well as Yugoslavia’s definitions of – nation, national minority and ethnic group) and linguistic rights, but these are often poorly funded, resulting in poor quality (Gross, 2006; Plaut, 2010). Most of the media outlets and all of the specialized media training and education programs are the result of external interventions and are not guaranteed consistent funding; thus, they (the institutions and, I would argue, the journalists themselves) are not an institutionalized part of the larger media landscape. The most consistent funder of these programs is the network of Open Society Foundations—primarily the Network Media Program.
(the Roma Initiatives Office also has a growing, albeit inconsistent, presence).\(^\text{26}\) Therefore, I not only interviewed the trainers but also the people who are responsible for designing and evaluating the quality of these programs, as well as those who allocate funds.

**My Background with Romani Media**

My work and research in the Romani community, and the Romani journalism/media community more specifically, goes back many years. In 2001, I began interviewing Romani activists in Hungary to answer questions about their strategies of self-representation, particularly in their international publications/media. I go into further detail regarding the actual research design of my MA, and how it influenced my doctoral research process, later in this chapter, but here I offer a brief background on my involvement in the relatively small and intimate community of Romani media makers and advocates.

In December 2001, I traveled to Budapest, where I met with key actors and gatekeepers to discuss the state of Romani media. All of them said that if I was indeed interested in Romani media, I would need to expand my research to Serbia and Macedonia. Thus, in the summer of 2002, I returned to the region and conducted in-depth fieldwork in all three countries. My master’s thesis, *Nation, Ethnic Minority, Other: Shifting Self-Representation in Romani Media*, was based on the interviews and primary source data accumulated during this fieldwork as well as online Romani activism/media available at the time.

Although I had completed the research necessary for my MA, the work still felt incomplete. With the encouragement of my mentor and MA advisor, I applied for funding to

\(^\text{26}\) As noted in Chapter 1, in 2014 OSF’s Network Media Program was renamed the Independent Journalism Program however, at the time of the research it was known as the Network Media Program and to reduce confusion, I will continue to refer to it as such throughout the dissertation.
return to Macedonia and continue my research in Romani media—this time focusing on the connections, and disconnections, between Romani media and Romani civil society. In the summer of 2003, I moved to Macedonia for 13 months. During that time, I learned how to communicate in the Arli dialect of Romani and cultivated strong personal and professional connections with many Romani activists, policy makers, and media makers in Macedonia and the surrounding areas. These relationships continued after I returned to the United States. Since then, I have traveled to the region numerous times in both personal and professional capacities, including working for five years as Amnesty International USA’s country specialist for Macedonia. In short, I have been involved, in one way or another, with Romani media and Romani activism (including those who fund these programs) since 2001.

Why Saami Journalists?

Given their relative financial security and integration within society, Saami in some ways could be seen as the “most likely case” for transnational people’s journalism. They have very little fear of any physical threat. They live in affluent countries (with the exception of in Russia), and for the most part they enjoy the financial and legal support of the countries in which they reside; numerous Saami officials noted in interviews that it is difficult to make people care about your concerns when there is no immediate threat of starvation or violence. The Saami are recognized as Indigenous peoples within the international community, and all the states in which they reside offer some sort of political and legal recognition of their special status. The Saami have free mobility between the Nordic countries (and even, to some extent, Russia) and have a formal media structure and a formal media education structure, both of which are heavily (if not exclusively) state-funded. I chose to go to Guovdageaidnu to study the journalism program at
Saami University College, which has provided accredited tertiary education for Saami journalists since 1990—including the option to receive a BA starting in 2000. All courses are taught in the Saami language (with some English-language classes) and most of the faculty are Saami. I spoke with many of the formal media outlets/institutions that identify as Saami media and some of the “veterans” of the Saami movement who were involved in establishing many of the Saami media outlets. I also spoke with some of the Saami involved in communications strategies for Saami institutions such as the Saami Parliament and Riddu Riddu (a pan-Indigenous music and culture festival organized by Sea Saami).

My Background with Saami Journalism

In the first semester of my doctoral program, I wrote a research paper focusing on Saami and Inuit cooperation as a form of political strategy. In the process of researching that paper, I conducted numerous telephone interviews, so I was somewhat familiar with some of the institutions and key actors and had already been in contact with people at Saami University College (Sámi allaskuvla), the Saami Parliament, and some Saami media (Plaut, 2012a). But I did not visit Sápmi and all my communication was on the phone or via email. Although I was not nearly as familiar with the politics, language, culture, or other dynamics of the Saami as I was with the Roma (a point I will discuss in greater detail later in this chapter), I did at least have an “in.” More importantly, the Saami with whom I spoke were very interested in having more systematic research conducted (particularly by someone from the “outside”) about their journalism education programs and media outlets, and thus my proposed research was deemed both relevant and useful to the community itself (L. T. Smith, 1999; 2005).
A Potential Third Case? Migrant Voice: The Road Not Taken

When I designed this project, I was concerned about the validity of arguing for alternative theories and methods of journalism education based on two very distinct and arguably exceptional cases. Put simply, given the differences between the Saami’s and Roma’s material and political circumstances, I was not sure if a comparative study would hold up. I was also concerned that I would get too stuck in the particular context of the Roma and the Saami and lose the larger focus of journalism education. Once again, I was struggling with the “case-quintain dilemma” (Stake, 2006, p. 7). I was adamant that I needed a third case study. Specifically, I wanted a case study of a transnational group whose identity was based not on a shared culture or ethnicity but rather an identity based on forced or chosen migration.

I planned to include Migrant Voice, an organization based in three cities in the United Kingdom and founded to provide migrants with the skills and opportunities to work with mainstream media while simultaneously creating their own newspaper and website.27 The organization’s mission is both to reclaim the term “migrant” and to intervene and change the increasingly negative discourse about immigration in Europe. I chose Migrant Voice because those involved in the organization, all of whom identify as migrants, chose to use a unifying term not based on a shared ethnic/cultural identity. I assumed that the migrants shared an identity of transnationality and of resistance (Husain, 2006, pp. 2, 4).

However, after immersing myself in the myriad daily activities organized out of Migrant Voice’s closet of an office, it became clear that while I was interested in Migrant Voice’s work, it
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27 The term “migrant” is a purposefully broad term encompassing everyone from the visiting artist from Japan to the plumber from Poland to the undocumented migrant from Morocco to the student from Pakistan and the refugee claimant from Syria. By using this, Migrant Voice and its allies aim to challenge the distinctions made in terms of basic health care, food, shelter, security, and so on justified in the name of legal definitions. François Crépeau, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants has put forth a similar argument (public talk at UBC, November 14, 2012). Although I am sympathetic to this logic, my research shows it is not a term used by the majority of migrants themselves, let alone states.
did not make sense to include the organization in this research project.

First, although it is true that many people involved with Migrant Voice did identify as migrants, within a few days it became apparent that this was actually an emerging and, in some ways, radical identity—one that was in the process of being formed. Based on my preliminary research, it appeared more people identified with their country/region of origin and the United Kingdom rather than with a transnational migrant identity. Secondly, the politics and laws surrounding “migrants” as a group are changing rapidly in the United Kingdom. Although the term is used in international rights (i.e., the Convention of the Rights of Migrants), “migrants” is not a legally recognized term in the United Kingdom. Rather, there are very clear distinctions between migrants from the EU, those from other parts of Europe, and those from “the third world,” and it became evident these legal distinctions had much more to do with the British government’s negotiation of how to control (police and legislate) its Britishness. Lastly, it became evident that the media in the United Kingdom itself (and particularly the English media) have particularities that are very country specific. Further, because of the ongoing investigation into journalistic practices (the Leveson inquiry), regulations regarding British media were also undergoing rapid change.28

Stated simply, I decided that trying to fit Migrant Voice into the category of “self-identified transnational people” who were “training their own to be journalists” was not honest; it was not what I saw. I did not have the “assurance” of an emerging pattern (Stake, 2006, p. 36). If I was to practice the needed skills of reflexivity, then I had to recognize that I was trying to make the case fit the theory (Armbruster & Laerke, 2010; Leander, 2008, pp. 23–27). In order to do

---

justice to Migrant Voice’s work, I decided it would be best to do a single, in-depth case study about Migrant Voice as a network and its role in the emerging migrant rights movement in the United Kingdom and possibly Europe, rather than approaching including it as a third case.

I therefore dropped Migrant Voice as a case study for this project. At the same time, in conducting my fieldwork and reviewing my preliminary findings, I became more convinced that in spite of the differences between the Saami and the Roma as groups, they shared a unique perspective: both articulate larger socio-political goals as the reason for wanting to train journalists. I went back to the work of Bob (2005) and Lightfoot (2009) to see how they constructed in-depth qualitative research studies using cases that are both alike and different in order to better study a larger, international process that involves framing to multiple audiences. Although Migrant Voice was not part of the quintain of journalism education done by and for self-identified transnational people, I was becoming more confident that Romani and Saami media are part of this quintain.

**What I Bring to this Research**

Bob’s (2005) example influenced my methodological choices, but I was also influenced by my previous experience. I have worked as a freelance journalist in one way or another since I was 14 years old; thus, I am accustomed to gathering information by interacting with people. Like Bob (2005) and Lightfoot (2009), I moved from a practitioner/activist position into the world of academia. Since 2000 I have been engaged in human rights–based investigations that involve locating and corroborating primary sources (both people and documentation) through intensive investigation.

In addition, my choice in research design was framed by my MA research project. In that project, I argued that Romani media makers strategically represented themselves as transnational
peoples, national minorities, or unique “peoples” depending on the audience. As I noted earlier in this chapter, after exhausting all the primary and secondary material I could gather online (through NGO reports, news sources, Internet forums, and academic literature), I conducted field research in Hungary, Serbia, and Macedonia. Although all are located in Central or Southeastern Europe, these countries have vastly different histories, including in the relationships to their Romani populations (E. Friedman, 2002). My research focused on the emergence of, and self-representation in, Romani media, a factor present in all three countries. I focused on this by conducting multi-sited research, often asking people to refer me to their friends and colleagues in other countries. I interviewed those people and others who were recommended as primary source data. I gathered data and analyzed the Romani media in each country separately before engaging in comparisons across countries (Stake, 2006).

Stake’s work heavily influenced the design of my doctoral work. Stake emphasizes the need to respect each case as a separate entity and argues that only after thoroughly considering each case individually is it appropriate to engage in analysis across cases. In this project, not only did I conduct my research on Saami and Romani journalism educators at different times, but I found I needed to actually store and analyze the data in different physical places. Only after the Saami and Roma case studies were analyzed and written as individual cases could I engage in a process of cross-case analysis and better sift through and construct the emerging whole.

**The Who, What, Where, Why, and How of Interviewing and Multi-Sited Fieldwork**

The bulk of my data came from thematic interviews focusing on people’s understandings of their work as well as the primary source documentation they provided (Hannerz, 2003, p. 364). I conducted two rounds of fieldwork with Romani journalists/journalism educators/funders and two rounds with Saami journalists and journalism educators totalling interviews with 45
people—journalists, program administrators, and educators/trainers—and sometimes conducting multiple interviews with the same people. Each time a person is referenced, I have indicated it with their last name in parenthesis; if a person was interviewed more than once, this is shown by numbers—corresponding to the month, day and year, following their last name so that my interview with Dean Cox on December 17, 2012 will be referenced as Cox (121712), whereas my subsequent interview on May 13, 2013 will be referenced as Cox (051313). A full list of those interviewed and the dates can be found in Appendix A and B.

Although the majority of people were comfortable having quotes attributed to them, a few wished to remain anonymous. This is noted in the text when initials (which usually do not correspond to their name) or nom-de-plume are used. I shared all transcripts with those interviewed and solicited their feedback, including providing them with an opportunity to modify their words and/or ask to not be identified in certain sections. One person, after reading his transcript, asked to be omitted from the research project. Two people asked to be consulted before any direct quotes were attributed to them.

**Negotiating Gatekeepers and Respectful Yet Critical Research**

Prior to travelling to Sápmi and Central and Eastern Europe, I identified gatekeepers in both communities through their formal positions or through personal and professional referrals. There was often a level of serendipity—on more than one occasion the person who happened to answer the phone when I called after hours, or who happened to be answering emails while someone was on medical leave, became some of my best resources. I spoke with them on the
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29 There are a variety of reasons that some people were interviewed more than once. Some people were interviewed multiple times because, upon review of the transcript, it became evident that there were points that could benefit from clarification and further discussion. Torkel Rasmussen and Aslak Palto preferred me to interview them in their homes over a series of days. In addition, due to their schedules and the time differences, some people were interviewed over a series of Skype conversations (Loza, Druker, Jankovic).
phone and via email, and, once I arrived, I met with them extensively to help get a general “feel” for the people/organizations/dynamics on the ground. I came with a list of people/positions with whom I wanted to speak but also asked these gatekeepers to fill in the gaps—whom was I missing? It is important to note that this way of finding people is not unproblematic. I relied on other people to provide information and guide the data-gathering process. I could, therefore, have both missed people and been colored in the eyes the community by the assumption that I was aligned in one way or another with the gatekeepers. I tried to mitigate this as much as possible by living and working in the community while I was there and creating social connections that, at times, also opened up work connections. Like Hannerz (2003), in his reflections on research with foreign correspondents noted, I often “sensed it was appreciated when it turn[ed] out that I had also talked to friends and colleagues of theirs in some other part of the world; perhaps more recently than they had…it was a matter of establishing personal credentials” (p. 364).

At times my interactions were informal, but I always arranged formal interviews beforehand and conducted them following ethical protocols, including distributing the approved consent form, ensuring I had permission to record the conversations, and subsequently distributing, reviewing, and, if needed, modifying transcripts. These protocols, however, are not enough to ensure that a fair and honest relationship is established and maintained. Many scholars involved in working with Indigenous communities have discussed navigating personal and professional engagement in communities that have a history of academic exploitation. Much can be learned from Indigenous protocols of research even when, as in my case, not all the communities identify themselves as Indigenous. I attempted to engage in respectful research by being physically present while trying not to be too obtrusive. Sometimes this meant just being around—in the media offices, training/educational facilities, and foundations. I offered any
support I could provide (I edited a lot of written English texts and designed a variety of flyers) and engaged with people as people—I drank coffee, learned how to fish and pick cloudberries, and shared many a meal—thus attempting to establish my own relationships outside of those suggested or facilitated by gatekeepers. I tried to remember how families were related and made sure I was available for social and cultural engagements.

Put simply, in many communities you need to know people, and more importantly be known by people in order to be recognized as an ethical researcher. Indigenous scholars Kirkness and Barnhardt (1991) created a “4R” model for conducting research with Indigenous communities: respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility. Parent (2009) added a fifth R—highlighting the importance of relationships in research. Respect is earned and maintained based on personal and social integrity and consistency. Note that relationships do not end once one leaves “the field.” There is a constant negotiation of professional and personal connections that can be both rewarding and challenging—sometimes within the same relationship. I am still in contact with many of the people I interviewed, sometimes keeping informal friendly contact and holiday wishes, sometimes asking for help in locating or interpreting documents (and offering the same help in return) and, in one case, helping locate missing gakti (traditional Saami clothing, almost always handmade specifically for the person) when people were stranded in the Eastern United States during Hurricane Sandy.

In traditional anthropological ethnography, the researcher is assumed to be immersed in “the entire culture,” which presupposes a “durability of the fields and the involvement of the ‘natives’ in them” (Hannerz, 2003, pp. 359–367). This is not my experience; rather, I engaged in what Hannerz (2003) termed multi-sited ethnography. Hannerz describes how his work with foreign correspondents differs from traditional ethnography—in which the researcher goes into
the field and then leaves—as boundaries between “in the field” and “out of the field” are somewhat blurred. This is partly because foreign correspondents by definition are “trans-local people” who move around. Modern technology is another important factor; one can follow a journalist’s work, and often his or her stated opinion of that work, before ever meeting in person. In addition we can keep abreast of the journalist’s public life for years after the interview. When questions arise (whether in reviewing the transcript or based on a new article or press release), clarification can be sought via email, phone, or Skype. In other words, multi-sited ethnography requires a methodological approach that differs from the traditional anthropological understandings of ethnography.

Going “Into the Field” with Saami Journalism

I was in Sápmi for 10 weeks in the spring/summer of 2011 and returned for three weeks in March of 2012. I researched Saami journalism and journalism education as a visiting researcher at Sámi allaskuvla. I had access to an office, phone, printer, and full library privileges. Prior to arriving, I was in primary contact with Torkel Rasmussen and Arne Johansen Ijäs (who both took turns running the journalism program), Ante Siri (who helped run communications outreach at the university), and Rune Fjellheim (Executive Officer of the Norwegian Saami Parliament). During my first visit to Sápmi (Summer 2011), I met Kent Valio, who assisted me in reaching staff within NRK-Sápmi and locate particular documents; Valio has continued to be a key contact. Sápmi differed from other research locations, where I have engaged in “snowball interviewing.” People in Sápmi would recommend potential interviewees but were generally
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30 I timed my return to Sápmi to arrive two weeks prior to the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Conference (WITBC) so that I could catch up with people before the town of 2,900 people was overrun with more than 300 visitors. I also wanted to make myself available to provide practical support. I was asked to facilitate a workshop on international human rights law and journalism and edit English materials for the website (http://www.nrk.no/witbc2012/).
hesitant to actually facilitate introductions; in small communities one must be careful not to
oblige another person to do something he or she may not want to do. People mentioned names,
but it was my responsibility to track that person down and (perhaps) secure an interview. This
was, at times, quite challenging.

Sápmi covers a huge land mass (approximately 388,350 km or all the islands of Japan
combined) over four countries, and my mobility was limited without access to a car; however, I
managed to conduct interviews in Tromso, Kárášjohka, Kåfjord (where Riddu Riddu, the Sea
Saami–organized international music festival takes place), Leammi (Lemmenjoki) near Ánar
(Inari), and Ohcejohka (Utsjoki) on the Finnish side of Sápmi. That said, 10 weeks is not a lot of
time, and, as I discuss in other work, some specific limitations in my research are important to
note (Plaut, 2014).

Most importantly, I interviewed a disproportionate number of people from the Norwegian
side of Sápmi, which has unique economic, historical, and linguistic characteristics (Lehtola,
2004; Pietikäinen, 2008a, 2008b; Solbakk, 2006a; Somby, 2009). In fact, as I discuss in detail in
Chapter 5, many would say that because of Norway’s particular history regarding treatment of
the Saami (Norwegianization policy, Alta Dam conflict, etc.), as well as its oil wealth, the
Norwegian government is now the most financially and legally supportive of the Nordic states
with regards to formal Saami rights and institutions. At the same time, some scholars and
practitioners have also noted that such support by the Norwegian state has led to an
overshadowing of the experiences and initiatives of Saami in the Swedish and Finnish (let alone
Russian) sides of Sápmi (Lehtola, 2004; Markelin, 2003; Markelin & Husband, 2007; Solbakk,
2006a). At times, the experiences of Saami in the Norwegian side of Sápmi, particularly of those
who speak Saami language from the interior of the country (often called “the Saami heartland”),
have been conflated with the experiences of all Saami. This is problematic. It is, then, a limitation of this research project that I did not have a chance to interview anyone in or from the Swedish or Russian sides of Sápmi. Speaking with these journalists, as well as more journalists who identify as Saami but do not work in the Saami language, would have offered important diversity to better understand the different ways to identify, participate in, and shape Saami media beyond the Norwegian experience. In addition, it may have impacted the emphasis placed on language as the primary (if not sole) lens through which to understand and articulate Saami perspectives.

**Narrowing My Approach to Romani Journalism: Focus on Open Society Foundations**

My research process for Romani media involved quite different circumstances than did my Saami research. I was not based in one place. Instead, I traveled to various locations to interview people who were spearheading projects. Unlike Saami journalists, Romani journalists are not trained in one location. My fieldwork for this project spanned five countries and could easily have included more. As noted earlier, I have worked with Romani media makers and their funders in one way or another since 2001 and am much more familiar with the region and therefore more mobile within it. 31 That said, in 2005 I took a step back from the world of Romani media and was only peripherally informed about what was taking place on a day-to-day level. Thus, in 2012 when I returned to the field for this research project, I was concerned that I was no longer up to date — much had happened in Europe in ten years. I wanted to ensure that I was not looking at the realities of 2012–2013 with lenses that were a decade old. One of the most significant changes is the expansion of the European Union and the Schengen visa-free zone which has brought an increase of Roma from Romania to Western Europe. This demographic

31 In addition, the majority of trainings take place in urban centers, which makes commuting much easier.
shift has created interesting socio-political dynamics between the Romanian government, the Western European destination countries (Finland, France, Spain and the UK) and the already existing Romani communities in those countries. In the future, I would be very interested to speak with Romani journalists in Romania and in the destination countries to see how the “problems” and “solutions” regarding this new wave of Romani migration are being framed.

Because journalism programs and NGOs come and go, I decided to focus not on the Romani media outlets themselves but on the institutions designing, funding, evaluating, and conducting training for Romani journalists. This also offered some means of comparison with Saami media and Sámi allaskulva which is highly institutionalized. By far the most consistent and influential of these institutions for Romani media was the Open Society Foundations (OSF). I therefore chose to focus on OSF itself as well as the OSF supported Romani journalism education programs throughout Europe. In the 1990s and early 2000s nearly all Romani media were financially supported in one way another by OSF; thus George Soros, the founder of OSF, earned the nickname “Baba Soros” (Grandfather Soros) throughout much of Central/Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Of course, by focusing on OSF I did limit my scope. Although there is little consistent state funding of Romani media, there are publically funded Romani media programs as part of official multicultural projects such as those found in Macedonia and Kosovo/a as well as Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands. In addition, international organizations such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and, increasingly (although sporadically) the European Union, provide significant funds into the establishment of various media outlets and programs. These two multilateral organizations are political entities and for the purpose of this research, it would be interesting to discuss how they discuss their understanding of the role of journalism.
Because I chose to focus on those administering Romani journalism education programs rather than on the media outlets themselves, I reached out to Marie Struthers of the Network Media Program (located in London) at OSF to ask for her help in identifying grantees conducting journalism education for Roma with OSF financial support. In the interest of ethics, we made sure the grantees had received OSF support for more than five years and were not currently up for renewal. Unlike Saami media, the world of Romani media is facilitated by direct connections and introductions; thus, I asked Struthers to help connect me with the people at the Roma Initiatives Program, an OSF program based in Budapest. After making a list of grantees, Struthers and her assistant provided me with the names of the relevant people and contact information. I wrote an email to those contacts, copying Struthers. I conducted in-person interviews with some people (including staff at the Network Media Program and the Romani Participation Program as well as the director and senior journalist at the Center for Independent Journalism in Budapest), and other interviews were done by phone.

After conducting interviews with ten people involved with Romani media education, I began my first round of coding and realized I had a problem. Although I had interviewed people who administered and evaluated Romani journalism programs, I had only interviewed two trainers, which was not enough given the number and diversity of Romani media projects. I therefore arranged to return to Central and Eastern Europe in May 2013 to conduct in-person interviews in Macedonia and the Czech Republic and observe workplace trainings in Hungary and the Czech Republic. I arrived at the start of the training/storyboarding process for a five-country project *Europe: A Homeland for the Roma*. Thanks to the generosity of Tihomir Loza and Jeremy Druker of the organization Transitions, I was invited to observe a few days of the training in Hungary and the Czech Republic.
In addition, I reached out to three international trainers who have been involved in training Romani journalists for the NGO Transitions for many years, conducting interviews with them over the phone and via Skype. I eventually interviewed 19 people involved in Romani journalism training in a variety of capacities. In the future, I hope to conduct interviews and observe trainings in Romania, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia—places where I am told some of the most innovative Romani journalism, including in mainstream TV, is taking place.

**Reflections on My Different Dynamics within Interviews**

My different relationships with the Romani and Saami journalism communities affected both the design of my research and the content and dynamics of the interviews themselves. Unlike my work within the Saami community, I did not enter the world of Romani journalism as a complete outsider. I knew many of the players already, or, if I did not know them personally, I knew of them and they knew of me. This had its advantages: I did not have a hard time locating gatekeepers and key players, and was able to interview people like the director of OSF’s Network Media Program. But I had to remind people that I had been out of the field for many years and ask that they help get me back up to speed—particularly since the EU expansion and the impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion (which I discuss in detail in Chapter 4) all went into effect after I had essentially stepped out of the world of Romani media. As I noted above, I also had to ensure that I was not operating on previous assumptions of the trends and dynamics of Romani media and remain humble in my understanding of the current situation. This involved asking a lot of questions about present dynamics and *why* things were the way they were. This was especially true for the radical changes that had taken place with the EU expansion, the increased *open* prejudice against Roma, deteriorating economic conditions throughout all of
Europe, and the changing priorities of donors, all of which I discuss in great detail in Chapter 4. Also, people within Romani media projects were very busy, often juggling three-four if not more projects at a time. As for Saami journalism, although I had conducted some phone interviews in 2009, I was an outsider and had no experience with the languages, cultures or rural life of the northern Nordic region. In addition, the Saami journalists were working journalists and were often on story and traveling although the educators based in Saami allaskulva were often based in one place.

**Locating and Analyzing Transcripts and Primary Source Documents**

I asked interviewees and gatekeepers for documents such as expenditure sheets, syllabi, training programs, grant applications, final reports (to funders and for internal use), and external evaluations. I was sometimes also provided with informal documents including training schedules and reflections on trainings as well as emailed evaluations and edits of pieces by trainers to journalists. I used this material both to help provide context—to “triangulate” the information provided via interviews, secondary sources, and observation—and to guide future conversations.\(^{32}\) I sometimes went back to people for clarification or background on these documents. On a few occasions I had documents translated (from Norwegian or Hungarian into English), but most of the original documents were in English or Romani (which I would translate myself).

I read the documents and transcripts and noted emerging themes, which I put into shorthand as “codes.” Some of these themes—such as “objectivity” or “journalist as agent for social change”—were clear to me going into the research and helped guide the questions I asked.

---

\(^{32}\) Like Stake (2006), I view “triangulating” not as a way to provide “proof,” but rather as a means of “gaining assurance” for a pattern that appears to emerging (p. 36).
As discussed earlier in this chapter, per Stake’s (2006) suggestion, I coded all the transcripts and documents for each case separately. Since I conducted my fieldwork in Sápmi first, I began by coding the Saami transcripts and primary source documents. I then coded Romani data in which new themes emerged. I coded those themes and then returned to the Saami transcripts with those codes. It was an iterative process that involved creating new codes, merging codes, and at times getting rid of codes altogether. I was looking for themes and patterns, including patterns of difference. Some themes—such as “media outlet” or “economic sustainability”—emerged from the transcripts. Some were particular to each case (i.e., “Alta” for Saami or “EU” for Roma) and did not “cross code.”

After coding all the interviews individually as “Saami” and “Roma,” I then compared the patterns between the two conglomerated cases. I noted when there was cross-over in the codes, for example “the journalistic ideal” in reference to both what good journalism should look like as well as its relationship to deliberative democracy. There were also many similarities in how “goal and quality” were discussed. Although these similarities were informative, I paid special attention to when a similar term had radically different meanings such as “audience” or “credibility.” Ideas behind journalistic skills and strategies were nearly identical, as was the means of teaching journalism through practical engagement. I focused in on the tensions that arose during the interviews to note similarities and differences. One example is how the economic sustainability of media outlets for Saami meant a reliance on the state; this was a tension noted by many interviewees. On the other hand, the lack of economic sustainability for Romani media meant that consistency of projects and journalistic quality was often a concern. One interesting thing to note is that although “racism” was a big part of Romani interviews, it was nearly absent when interviewing Saami journalists. What was present, however, was the
belief that Saami journalists were not given the same journalistic respect as their non-Saami counterparts because of an assumption that they were unable to be journalistically objective when reporting on their own community.

To be clear, an overtly political lens colors my approach, which is why I refer to my work as critical. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) explain this well: “The aim of critical discourse analysis is to explore the links between language and social practice. The focus is the role of discursive practices in the maintenance of the social order and in social change” (pp. 69–70, my emphasis). Although I did not specifically engage in critical discourse analysis as a methodology, the theoretical underpinnings of both reflecting and changing power dynamics through story selection and presentation is crucial in both the research design and process of this project. The crux of my research question rests on assuming actor agency—in this case, that of journalists—as it “both reflects and actively contributes to social and cultural change” (p. 78).
Chapter 4 — “A (Romani) Journalist is (Just) a Journalist!”: Roma, the State, and Europe—Crafting Inclusion and Citizenship

In 2003, I was invited to Ohrid, Macedonia to observe a meeting of Romani media makers and outlets from throughout Central and Eastern Europe. For three days, more than 30 people, some veteran and some newly minted journalists—nearly all Roma, enjoyed food, cigarettes, and each other’s company. Discussion on file sharing, video editing, and trans-border Romani news agencies was lively. Hopes and plans were high. The meeting was jointly organized by Medienhilfe, an NGO based in Switzerland under the direction of Nena Skopljanac (originally from Bosnia although now based in Switzerland), and the Open Society Foundations (OSF) Network Media Program. The goal was to bring all the Romani media makers together in one space so that, by the end of the weekend, a formal “Romani Media Network” would exist.

Over a decade later, although there is plenty of information regarding Roma available in various online and traditional media outlets, there is still no formal Romani media network. It is unclear whether Medienhilfe as an organization is still operational. And, perhaps more importantly, it would be hard today to fill the room with 30 people working specifically on Romani media. Put simply, in those 10 years the entire notion of what constitutes “Romani media” has radically changed. This chapter examines this shift in Romani media from media focused on serving Romani populations with news, entertainment and analysis to media targeting non-Romani populations and institutions in an attempt to alter their perceptions of Roma and include them in the concept of citizenry. I demonstrate how this approach to media affects, and is affected by, the changing approaches to transnational Romani advocacy. Specifically, I examine how the “Europeanization” of Romani issues by donors/foundations, state governments, and the
European Union has shifted the conversation from speaking to and with Roma to convincing the state and the non-Roma population that Roma are citizens too. Put simply, “transnational advocacy” has shifted from Roma who live over many states in Europe to targeting “Europeans” (presumably non-Roma) themselves as audiences. This in turn privileges a more traditional idea of journalistic objectivity and the role of the journalist, and serves to strengthen the ideal of an ethnically neutral media which can often overlook real power imbalances, and systemic human rights violations, in larger society. This change in approach is reflected in the international-donor supported training of journalists and affects the understanding and support of “good journalism” as well as its larger place in socio-political change.

**Structure of the Chapter**

The chapter begins by providing background on Roma, the largest transnational group in Europe. I then discuss how the politics and policy surrounding Roma are intimately connected to the politics and policy surrounding an attempt, by a number of actors, to build a more unified Europe (the European project), noting significant limitations in this approach. Most importantly, as Roma are citizens of various states; they influence and are influenced by their particular localities. Speaking of “the Roma” as one group can provide an excuse for states to abdicate their responsibility (OSI, 2011; Plaut, 2013; Sobotka & Vermeersch, 2012). In addition, the specific roles donors have played in Central and Eastern Europe have allowed both innovative and “thin” approaches to political advocacy to develop. I specifically examine the OSF’s approach to democracy and the role of media in creating and maintaining this version of democracy. I move on to map the “geography” of journalism in the region, specifically the well-defined but limiting concept of minority media in the region. After illustrating the legal and political frames of
minority media, I demonstrate why that concept, although relevant, is inadequate when addressing Roma and Romani media. I highlight that Roma are not only Europe’s largest minority, but also Europe’s largest *transnational* population; there is no one “homeland” state that claims to guard their interest. The lack of “an external homeland” (Brubaker, 1996) to monitor and safeguard their rights has a particular effect on how media about and/or for Roma should, and should not, be understood and supported.

The next section discusses the connections between the liberal-democracy-building goals of the OSF and how they affect the production and content of Romani media. I note that the approach donors, program developers, and trainers have adopted is not necessarily attentive to the local particularities of Roma nor are these donors, program developers and trainers reflecting on how *their* agenda affects the position, and positionality, of Romani journalists. This in turn affects approaches to story content and framing as well as the training programs themselves.

The last third of the chapter addresses these changes and tensions by detailing three OSF-supported Romani journalism-training models. The programs, which were in operation from 1998 to 2013, were all run by non-Roma and primarily catered to a non-Romani audience, though some had Romani trainers and lecturers. I argue that the change in the focus of these programs demonstrate a turn away from Romani-specific media to a strategy of intervening within the dominant discourse and demanding equal citizenship and recognition within the state. These three programs reveal different ways of thinking about the role of journalism and journalists, particularly as they relate to larger issues of social-political change. These different ways of thinking shape how “news judgment,” “professional standards,” and “journalistic skills” are taught and honed within a variety of programs that specifically address Romani issues while
spanning many countries. They can also be seen in the demographic makeup of the trainees and trainers as well as the targeted audience. Put simply, my research with Romani (and, as described in the next chapter, Saami) journalists demonstrates that, although the goals of journalism and the journalistic product change as the political and economic contexts change, the core professional skills of journalism as a profession remain the same and in fact are closely guarded (see also Waisbord, 2013).

I end the chapter by discussing how Romani journalism and Romani journalists are shaped by donors, program coordinators, and journalists themselves, and the implications this has for imagining and enacting socio-political change within, between and across state borders.

The Who, What, Where, When, and How of Roma in Europe

The Romani population of Europe, conservatively estimated at 10 to 12 million (Council of Europe, 2010), overwhelmingly lives in “third world” conditions (UNDP, 2003, 2011). Many Roma face systemic and ongoing human rights violations in terms of employment, health, education and housing, as well as a real fear of physical violence. In addition, pogroms, so often relegated to the history books, are very real for some contemporary Roma. In fact, many have argued that economic difficulties such as high unemployment and a greater income gap brought about by Central/Eastern European states’ accession to the European Union have increased racism against Roma in both Central and Eastern Europe and Western Europe (Council of Europe, 2010; Engelhart, 2013; Silverman, 2012; Thelen, 2005; UNDP, 2011, UNDP, 2003).

Definitions of who is Roma and what constitutes “legitimate Romani identity” are both

33 Nearly all the trainers and program coordinators/directors used the terms “professional standards” and “journalistic skills.” Nedim Dervişbegović, a veteran reporter and journalism trainer, specifically used “news judgment” to encompass much of the experience and skill that become inculcated in journalists as they develop within the profession (05242013). I find this term useful and use it throughout my work.
The definition of “a real Rom” appears to fall loosely into three categories: someone who speaks Romani, someone who identifies as Romani, or someone who is identified as Romani (Plaut, 2010, 2013). Due to the misuse of census data by the Nazi regime to commit genocide, many countries in Central and Eastern Europe choose not to collect demographic data, and many Roma strategically choose to hide their identity (V. Friedman, 1999a, 2001). The percentage of Romani speakers varies widely by country. Some countries have few to no Romani speakers (Hungary, Spain), and in others more than 80% of Roma speak Romani (Macedonia, Slovakia). According to those interviewed and my own observations, Romani media are produced in both Romani and the state language and are most often a mixture of both (Lange, 2006; Plaut, 2010).

Figure 4.1 Estimated Romani population in Europe (Council of Europe).

---

34 For important contributions to this debate, see Petrova (2004). Petrova is the former Executive Director of the European Roma Rights Center. For an in-depth look at the heated debated surrounding Roma and statistics, see Project on Ethnic Relations (2000).
Roma are spread throughout every country in Europe, with about eight million residing in former socialist countries, including the former Yugoslavia. The lack of an “external homeland” as a watchdog state is key because it runs counter to the way minority rights have traditionally been understood and protected, in law, practice, and politics in Europe. Unlike ethnic Hungarians or Albanians or Serbs or Germans who reside in other countries, Roma do not have a country safeguarding their interests. Some scholars and activists have worried that when “Roma” are framed as a people that exist everywhere, in turn they belong nowhere. Vermeersch (2012) writes, “They (Roma) are thus portrayed as a separate nation without a state. By promoting this particular identity frame, however, the Council of Europe unintentionally supports the nationalisms that have pushed the Roma out of the other national communities in Europe” (p. 10).

This desire to “push them out” and ensure “they” know they do not belong often results in daily practices of segregation in schooling, housing, and recreation. The relegation of Roma to the margins—physically and in policy—in turn strengthens the majority population’s identity (Fidyk, 2013). Roma are literally marginalized; they are simply not considered important enough to be a part of the conversation or the society’s imaginary (Plaut, 2012b).

This segregation is also evident in the mainstream media’s coverage of Romani issues; although both Roma and Romani issues are at times derided, they are often simply absent. This may also explain the tension surrounding Romani-specific media and media programs. Although traditional understandings of minority rights recognize the need to have ethnic and linguistically specific media to serve the population’s specific needs, some have expressed concerns that doing so exacerbates Romani cultural segregation. This concern has been actively refuted, however, by those involved in evaluating such media programs, who point to the fact that having a strong
Romani cultural identity can only help in the larger socio-cultural dynamics within countries, and in Europe as a whole (Walter, 2010).

**The State, Roma, and the Emerging Project of Democracy: A Brief Overview**

As can be seen in the 2014 European Union elections, the concept of “Europe” is struggling to become more present in policy and politics, and it has become more difficult to see where the Roma might fit into the new discourse and operationalization of Europe and Europeanness. Here was a group of people who lived throughout Europe (and had done so since at least the fourteenth century) suffering from systemic discrimination and at times grave human rights abuses, and yet the traditional model of securing minority rights through third-country diplomacy was not going to work. A new model was needed. If the European Roma population “suffers from similar problems of exclusion and marginalization wherever they are” (Vermeersch, 2012, pp. 9–10), then who is to advocate for the Roma? If the very states in which they have citizenship either violate their rights directly or, at minimum, fail to protect them, from whom can they seek protection? How will a state advocate for citizens whose full citizenship it does not acknowledge (Plaut, 2012b)? What kind of leverage politics, let alone accountability politics, could be exercised here (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 16–25)? How can advocates make the people and institutions with power care about a people whom they did not always recognize as people, let alone as citizens?

Perhaps unique to the Romani context, non-state actors—specifically donor organizations, international organizations, and NGOs—have stepped into the role of external homeland with varied levels of consistency and success. It is not an overstatedmment to say that donor organizations, most notably the OSF, have been most active in promoting Romani rights in a variety of programs. International organizations such as the World Bank and USAID, some
Western European aid agencies and embassies, and some UN agencies have also played an advocacy role. As it stands, however, the “lobbyists” are external actors with evolving, shifting, and at times competing priorities: The OSF and third-party countries may indeed have a genuine commitment to advocate for Romani rights, but they have little political stake in the outcome (Curcic & Plaut, 2013; Sobotka & Vermeersch, 2012). Funders can shift their interests and money elsewhere, and world affairs or a change of leadership can have a drastic change on priorities (Lawrence & Dobson, 2013).

Many advocates and policy makers assumed the EU would, and should, take the lead on Romani issues. The Copenhagen Criteria (the standards originally drafted in 1993 for all new accession countries seeking entry into the EU) were explicit about a candidate country’s commitment to minimal standards for the treatment of Roma and other ethnic minorities. However, once countries join the EU there is no incentive to ensure compliance (OSI, 2011, p.5; Sobotka & Vermeersch, 2012). Although the EU has become increasingly generous with its funds for Romani issues, it too is inconsistent. Given that economics, employment, and the rule of law are primary agenda items for the EU, discourse on Roma has become polarized between two frames:

1) ensuring that the Central and Eastern European countries “deal” with “their” Roma domestically (partially so “Eastern” Roma don’t “migrate” to Western Europe and “become a problem”) and

2) promoting the idea of Roma as a pan-European phenomenon (Barany, 2002; Thelen,

35 It is important to remember that many of the original members do not offer ideal treatment of their own Romani populations (for example, Italy’s ongoing fingerprinting campaign, France’s ongoing liquidation of Romani camps and deportation of students, the UK’s ongoing demolition of camping sites, and the shockingly poor health and living standards of Roma in Greece). Further, the EU is a political body balancing its own internal struggles with the desire to carve out its own identity and agendas as an evolving transnational unit.
Again, even when intentions are good and noble, Europeanizing the problems of Roma risks Europeanizing the solution. Thus, not only are Roma themselves reified as a homogenous group (often devoid of agency), but realities of local and national context are stripped away, including their differing relations with the state and the non-Romani populations in which they reside. This de-contextualization in the name of Europeanization may “leave us with the impression that the situation of the Roma is very similar across Europe and that formula-like solutions can be implemented” (Vermeersch, 2012, p. 15). As Vermeersch cautions, “even if problems seem similar, causes may vary a lot from place to place and each community might possess different resources and dynamics to deal with these problems” (p. 15). So, although no government in Europe is particularly good to its Romani citizens, the mistreatment is by no means the same in every country. “Roma” as a reified ethnic group play different political and social roles within the domestic and international politics of different states (Englehart, 2013; E. Friedman, 2002). This can be highly problematic when framing problems and possible solutions within the public sphere—particularly when the “public sphere” itself has become increasingly Europeanized. These particularities can be seen in how Roma are portrayed in media and how they, in turn, seek to portray themselves.

**Combating Romani “Culture Talk”**

Operating under the assumption that Roma “are a category of people who suffer from a particular problem, similar across the European cultural space,” the discourse can quickly slip into “a frame that argues that there is something in the category of ‘Roma’ itself which mandates special treatment” because there is something inherently different about Roma as a group of people (Vermeersch, 2012, pp. 10, 14). This becomes especially true in the unfolding project of...
an expanding Europe, when ideas of what Europe is, and who is European, increase the importance of identity and borders—of who is included and excluded. Salovaara-Moring (2011) found this when interviewing journalists from four new accession countries, noting, “when historical and ideological fault lines start to fade, new values have to be evoked in order to articulate difference” (p. 53). Some of these values may revolve around education or culture. Others can involve bonding over a similar “problem,” such as what to do with these “others” who do not fit into the bounded European identity—be they immigrants or Roma. Quite quickly, well-intended conversations about poverty or education change from what can be done to ensure that all members of our society enjoy equal rights and protection to “what is it about Roma that causes ‘them’ to be so different?” This is what Mahmood Mamdani (2004) calls “Culture Talk.”

Culture Talk is the idea that there is something inherent in an “other’s” culture that explains away socio-economic and political inequalities (Mamdani, 2004, Chapter 1). Therefore, things like a lack of running water, the absence of paved roads, or school segregation—which are the responsibility of the state and greater society—are explained away by “their” culture: “They” are not clean, “They” prefer to live with horses, and “They” do not value school or education. As Vermeersch (2012) continues,

from there it is a small step to see such marginality and exclusion simply as a symptom of Romani culture and identity and not as a problem of inequality and socio-economic polarization. From deprived co-citizens the Roma are turned into cultural deviants. (p.14)

The danger of Culture Talk is not only that it is inaccurate, but also that it strips away any agency that “those people” (in this case Roma) may have in deciding how they want to live; as Mamdani (2004) puts it, “whereas we have culture, culture has them” (p. 24, my emphasis). Such Culture Talk also serves to strengthen the boundaries between “us” and “them” and perpetuates “a narrative that highlights the distance between Roma and other groups of citizens and portrays
both Roma and non-Roma as homogenous bounded camps” (Vermeersch, 2012, p. 11).

Many have assumed that one reason prejudice against Roma is so high is that interaction between the majority and the Romani population is so low (Moricz, 05212013; Saracini, 05082013; Skopljanac; Struthers, 02202012). Journalism is seen as a means of bridging the gap between Roma and non-Roma people—be they journalists working together on a project or audience members watching a TV piece or documentary. It is partially for this reason that many of the directors of journalism programs as well as Romani journalists choose to focus their attention on making programs that can counter these negative perceptions held by members of the majority society. The question then arises: can Romani media or “Romani content” in mainstream media help to offer another interpretation of political accountability on both state and transnational levels? Can it reclaim or reassert agency? The donors who are developing, administering, funding, and evaluating these programs seem to locate much of the potential agency in the ideals of democracy, and media’s role in democracy. However, this is not always in line with the realities of Romani experiences within, between, and across different states.

The Context: History and Geography of Journalism in Central and Eastern Europe

Although Roma live throughout Europe (as well as in North Africa and the Americas) the majority now reside in Central and Eastern Europe. Central and Eastern Europe is an ethnically and linguistically “messy” region. Such messiness was previously acknowledged and somewhat managed through the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires, with legal recognition for the cultural rights of different peoples. When the empires began to disintegrate in the late 19th century, there was an attempt to craft the nation-state: a single home (state) for a single people (nation)

36 This section heading is inspired by Salovaara-Moring’s (2011) “What is Europe? Geographies of Journalism” in Media, Nationalism and European Identities. I use the term “Central and Eastern Europe” to include all former socialist countries in Europe, including those of the former Yugoslavia (sometimes referred to as Southeast Europe).
(Brubaker, 1996; Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1991). However, that is not how people live—either historically or in the present, and ethnic and religious minorities or nations have always been found across state borders.

Because the state borders of Europe do not correspond to the linguistic borders of the peoples of Europe, many provisions have been implemented to protect the rights of ethnic and linguistic minorities and to manage potential political strife mobilized in the name of identity (Brubaker, 1996; Friedman, 1999; Gellner, 1983). Whereas in the past, religious institutions were assumed to take care of their followers regardless of where they lived, the codified recognition and protection of national and religious minorities is now presumed to be the state’s responsibility (Brubaker, 1996; Gellner, 1983; Kymlicka, 1995). This protection is often called “group rights” or “minority rights.” One of these rights is to provide nations with news and entertainment in their own language and focused on issues that are relevant to their people. According to customary law, domestic laws and the European Charter on the Rights of Minority and Regional Languages, this is a right that should be actively provided by all states. This right is upheld both by not restricting such media in addition to providing financial and bureaucratic assistance, such as printing subsidies, radio/TV frequencies and/or bandwidth. As noted, the “external homeland” of an ethnic group or nation often actively seeks and encourages such protection (Brubaker, 1996).

---

37 In Europe, the understanding of a right to minority culture, cultural preservation, and cultural development has been enshrined in European charters such as the Charter on the Rights of Ethnic Minorities and the Charter on the Rights to Minority Languages, and has also served to influence international law in other parts of the world that aspire to a “multicultural” model of citizenry within the nation-state (Donders, 2002; Kymlicka, 1995; Odello, 2012).
**Minority Media as a Right**

In the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires, minority media “played a significant role in stimulating nationalist feelings and ultimately in the formation of nation states, thus helping ethnic minorities *reinforce* their ethno-cultural distinctiveness, socio-political presence and viability in the newly established nations” (Gross, 2006, p. 478, my emphasis). Given the fact that the media is recognized as a public good throughout most of the continent, in Central and Eastern Europe, the political role of the media is seen as a given. Minority media are assumed to be in a different language, one that the majority will most likely not understand, with a mandate to *serve* the minority community by protecting and preserving “group rights.” This service is often understood as protecting the minority from cultural encroachment by the majority and providing particular information relevant to the community (Downing & Husband, 2005; Graham, 2010; Howely, 2010; Lange, 2006; Saracini, 05072013). The fear of cultural encroachment, and thus the need to protect and develop national and minority cultures, has only increased with the expansion of the European Union (Salovaara-Moring, 2011; Splichal, 2011).

Again, in Europe, minority media is often framed as a right. States often set aside separate TV and radio channels for programming in minority languages and provide subsidies for minority press (Donders, 2002; Howely, 2010; Kymlicka, 1995; Waisbord, 2013, Chapter 1). Minority media also often enjoys financial support from the “external homeland” (Brubaker, 1996), for example Hungarian language media in Romania and Slovakia is legally guaranteed by the Romanian and Slovakian state, and financially supported, at least in part, by the Hungarian state. If one recognizes that media are a means of both creating and promoting “productive power”—creating political realities through the framing of problems, actors, perpetrators, and possible solutions and thus engaging in agenda setting—then minority media play an interesting
role; they both serve a population with information to help with their agenda setting and protect this population from encroachment by the majority. Thus, the state supports the “public sphere” of the minority within its borders by providing funds and infrastructure for minority media (Downing & Husband, 2005). As Splichal (2011), explains, although the content may address local, national, regional, and global issues,

mechanisms are lacking that would enable citizens to act effectively beyond the national frame. The normative requirement of the public sphere to be both a forum for citizens’ deliberation and generation of public opinion, as well as a medium for mobilizing public opinion as a political force makes its necessary that a public sphere and a sovereign power correlate with each other (pp. 34–35).

Again, because of the use of the minority population’s language, such media are assumed to target only the minority populations.

**Why the “National Minority Rights” Model Does Not Work Well for Roma**

Romani media do not follow the traditional minority media model. With the exception of sporadic funding in Slovenia and Kosovo/a, and minimal but more consistent funding in Macedonia and Slovakia, state governments are not supporting Romani media. Rather, funding is coming from international donors. My research shows that the traditional minority media framework does not work well for Romani media or Romani journalists because Roma do not fit into the traditional “ethnic minority model” of Central and Eastern Europe. A parallel can be seen in the academic and policy discourse of Roma, which has increasingly framed Roma as a transnational European minority, that is, a group that lives throughout Europe and constitutes a minority in every state but—in contrast to other minorities—has no clear national lobby or external homeland to defend its interests. (Vermeersch, 2012, p. 9)

So, rather than using media as a form of internal politics, nearly all the Romani journalist trainers and many of the Romani journalists I spoke with saw it as their mission to “educate and inform”
the non-Romani audience through their stories with a secondary goal of trying to combat internalized racism within the Romani community. As Ilona Moricz, director of the Center for Independent Journalism in Hungary explained, many Roma entering the journalistic profession see being a journalist as a way of serving their community or changing how the media depicts their community, whereas for those who identify as members of the majority society, the goal is often more personally career driven (03022012). The community focus, rather than individual focus on Romani journalists is also promoted and supported by the journalistic program directors who are financially supported by international donors (OSI 2011, pp. 61–64).

**The Role of International Funders in Framing Transnational Mobilization**

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, money, energy, and hope flooded into Central and Eastern Europe. But many governments, including the USA, feared that the overlapping ethnic tapestry of the region could once again be used as a means of dividing people and cause political instability, and that those who found themselves struggling would want to return to the economic and social familiarity of communism (Plaut, 2013). Unfortunately, as the wars of the 1990s showed, these fears were not completely unfounded.

The OSCE, the Council of Europe, and the European Union engaged many of these countries on a political level. One method was for Western governments, aid organizations, and donor organizations to provide funding to help grow a “civil society” in these new democracies. Civil society was understood to comprise those aspects of society not directly connected to the government: NGOs, the arts, cultural and religious organizations, youth groups, public intellectuals, and the media. The idea was that a robust civil society could serve as a counterbalance to the top-down party politics and entrenched political system and bring Central
and Eastern Europe into the Western European model of democracy and politics.\textsuperscript{38}

Many international funders and policy makers assumed that, given the similarity of repression across the region, different civil society actors from different countries could learn from each other. Sharing successes and challenges would allow these actors to develop a kind of “best practices” and perhaps lead to cross-border mobilization (Khagram, Riker, & Sikkink, 2002; Tarrow, 2006). Based on classic liberal democratic theory, the expectation was that after a while, this way of doing politics—the domestic constituency setting the agenda and political leaders servicing the sometimes noisy and messy constituency—would become the political norm (Moravscik, 2000). Further, accountability to both the international community and the more empowered domestic constituency would become entrenched in governmental policy. Therefore, governments would learn to be accountable to their citizenry and the citizenry would learn how to hold their governments accountable.

For those involved in democracy-building, journalism and journalists are deemed a key component of an open society (Jankovic, 05022012). The presence or absence of Roma in political and media representation is thus telling about the societies of which they are a part. Sobotka and Vermeersch (2012) note a shift in the European-level rhetoric regarding Roma from that of “human rights” to that of “inclusion.” Much of this can be traced to the framing, implementation, and ongoing evaluation of the Decade of Roma Inclusion.

\textsuperscript{38} Salovaara-Moring’s (2011) piece offers very interesting insight into how journalists from four accession countries understood the role the European Union, as an institution, played in “forcing accession countries at the European level to conform to their model of democracy.” Such “forcing” took place not only through inclusion in or exclusion from the EU itself but also—and perhaps even more importantly—through access to funds and markets. “Europe as an institution set a benchmark for those who wanted to be inside,” and there was no questioning the fact that the Western European model of democracy and politics was the goal for new accession countries (p. 47).
The Role of the Decade of Roma Inclusion and Its Impact on Romani Media

By the turn of the twenty-first century, it was evident there were too many short-term “Roma projects” and not enough coordination in terms of how they were actually helping Roma on the ground (Pusca, 2012; Thelen, 2005). Many people, including Roma hired as the translators or coordinators of the projects, joked that a “Roma-industry” was emerging (Plaut, 2013). As the Central and Eastern European countries with large Romani populations were getting ready to join the European Union, it became evident that, unless systemic problems of economic and social exclusion were addressed, Roma were going to migrate to the more affluent Western Europe. Many of the governments of Western and Northern Europe saw this as problematic. Thus began a more concerted donor effort at the European level to bring governments of countries with large Romani populations together to discuss the role of the state in ensuring Roma “inclusion” in the socio-economic fabric of their countries.

In the Summer of 2003, the Council of Europe Development Bank, the European Commission, the Open Society Institute (OSI), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the World Bank, as well as the governments of Finland, Hungary, and Sweden sponsored the conference “Roma in an Expanding Europe: Challenges for the Future.” In attendance were government representatives from Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, (the then-State Union of) Serbia and Montenegro, and Slovakia (E. Friedman, 2014). It is worth noting the unique situation of having NGOs, IGOs, and state governments working together in order to achieve change at both national and transnational levels (OSI, 2011, pp. 8–9).

It was at this meeting that the 2005–2015 Decade of Roma Inclusion (“The Decade”) was announced. The Decade is an initiative that aims to coordinate state Roma initiatives and
attention that had previously been handled by a variety of overlapping NGO projects.\textsuperscript{39} Four priorities of inclusion were established: education, employment, housing, and health care, all of which, according to international and domestic law, are traditionally understood as responsibilities of the state. There were also two cross-cutting themes: gender mainstreaming and discrimination. While the focus and structure of the Decade was still being negotiated, there was an effort to include media and discrimination as formal foci. After much discussion, neither was included. As Gordana Jankovic explained, “The Decade was a lost opportunity for strengthening further the Romani media—but there were other very important issues on the agenda and the Decade could not address everything” (05022012).

Many have identified this “lost opportunity” as the beginning of a shift in the goals and priorities of Romani media. Rather than serving the interests and needs of Romani populations, Romani media have become a method to reach state and European audiences (Jovanović; Moricz 03022012, 05202013; Skopljanac). This has occurred in tandem with the larger policy shift from “addressing” Romani issues within a human rights frame (a context-specific denouncement of the violation, strategy, and mobilization) to “including” Roma within the state and the larger European project (Sobotka & Vermeersch, 2012; Petrovski). Indeed, the expenditure sheets of the OSF’s Network Media Program confirm that, with three exceptions, the OSF ceased supporting Romani-specific media outlets after 2006.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{39} The Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005–2015) is a joint initiative established by the World Bank and the Open Society Foundations. “Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, (the then-State Union of) Serbia and Montenegro and Slovakia were all original members. Albania joined the Decade in 2008, with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Spain joining in 2009. Slovenia, the US, and Norway joined the Decade as observers in 2009, 2012, and 2013, respectively” (E. Friedman, 2014). Member countries are obligated to draft national action plans intended to become part of their national legislation and initiatives. Although the Decade does not have an external budget (member states pool funds), the World Bank and the OSF provide a corresponding Roma Education Fund that allocates funds specifically for Romani education initiatives.

\textsuperscript{40} In 2008, a Romani radio station in Kosovo/a received “institutional support,” and in 2011, the Network Media Program and the Roma Initiatives Program gave some small emergency grants to resuscitate Radio C and the Roma Press Center in Hungary.
My findings indicate that this shift in the goals for Romani media is reflective of changing, and strategic, approaches to Romani people and issues at state, regional, and European levels. This can be seen in the EU mandating multi-state cooperation for nearly all of their Romani journalism projects. Nearly all Romani journalism is dependent on funding from donors whose goal is to bring about socio-political change. In fact, a 2006 report commissioned by the OSF Network Media Program and conducted by former journalist and external media evaluator Yasha Lange was both instrumental and symptomatic. It was symptomatic in the sense that the OSF felt a need to re-evaluate what constituted “successful” Romani media programs and content in the context of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. It was instrumental in that its findings justified the shift in the OSF’s understanding and financial support of Romani media initiatives. Thus, the change in journalism is reflected in the changes in politics and vice versa—once again, as de Jong et al. (2005) noted, “politics is communication.”

“The Stigma of Donor Dependence”

According to Marie Struthers, a senior program manager for the Network Media Program and the person in charge of OSF funding for Romani media, one needs to be “humble” in both expectations and assessment of Romani media (02292012). As she wrote in 2008,

Romani media were born into a post–Berlin Wall development environment marked by large-scale donor intervention and a corresponding over-blossoming of new outlets in the region. Competition for resources and audiences amongst all media outlets was at a premium, and the Roma media outlets had and continue to have, arguably, the least resources of all (Struthers, 2008, p. 59).

Donors, grantees, and external assessors all agree that the funding provided to Romani media and media programs have been “insufficient or inefficient” (Lange, 2006; Struthers, 2008, p. 59;

---

41 I thank Tihomir Loza for putting such a complicated idea into such eloquent language.
Gross & Spaskovska, 2011). Both Struthers and Jankovic were uncomfortable with some of the changes they oversaw in the Network Media Program for Romani media, noting that long-term financial commitment to journalism education and institutional support to outlets is necessary but has not been implemented (Jankovic, 06202012; Struthers, 02292012; Struthers, 2008, p. 63). For example, Struthers (2008) wrote, “Monies from a handful of donors have been almost exclusively directed to programming, with significantly less for operation costs and infrastructure. Funds for capacity building have been sporadic” (p. 59). Whereas many other minority media are supported at least in part through public funds, Romani media are surviving on project-based funding, which severely affects the range and quality of the content they can deliver and expectations for the future.

The OSF wants to increase the availability of “good-quality Romani content,” but this requires audiences to want to consume such content (Lange, 2006; Plaut, 2010; Struthers, 02292012). Audiences turn to news outlets they trust. According to Struthers, “trustworthiness” is carefully cultivated and becomes part of the media outlet’s “brand”—a brand of credible, reputable information that allows the audience to trust it as a reliable news source (02292012). In order to be consistent, the outlet must have sufficient and reliable reporters, editors, equipment, transmission, and so on, which requires consistent income—something Romani media outlets (with two possible exceptions) have never had.42

One effect of this project-based donor dependence is that Romani journalists must wear many hats. Those working at Romani media outlets have to be journalists, marketing managers,

42 As noted by Lange (2006), Struthers (02202012), Rethy, and Jovanović, both Radio C and the Roma Press Center began with very generous (“some would say lavish”) support from the OSF, providing them with a good foundation and large and reasonably compensated staffs (Lange, 2006, p. 23). When the OSF switched from institutional to programmatic support, thus cutting the core operational funding for all Romani media, neither outlet could compete, and eventually both of them folded.
and technicians, and moreover must become experts at looking for grants and applying for funds (Rethy; Jovanović). Many people to whom I spoke referred to the process as “begging,” specifically from the OSF. Željko Jovanović, the current director of the OSF’s Romani Initiatives Program, jokingly reflected on his experience as a former director of a Romani radio station in Serbia that depended on OSF funds: “We became OSF junkies.” In other words, when the donors go, the money goes, and the media outlet itself goes into withdrawal and folds.

“Why Do You Eat Today if You are Going to be Hungry Tomorrow?”— The Elusive Goal of “Sustainability”

Everyone I interviewed recognized that the current donor model is not sustainable and certainly not desirable, lamenting: “It is the way it is” (Dekic; Druker, 04172013; Loza, 04162012). Professional journalists expressed the particular concern that media were run in an “NGO culture” (Dekic; Dervišbegović, 05232013), noting the quality and depth of the journalism were often directly connected to the amount of funds available at the time (Cox, 12172012). When I asked people if they felt frustrated, they almost sighed with resignation. As Slobodanka (“Boba”) Dekic, Project Coordinator for Media Centar Sarajevo, explained:

It’s not frustration; it’s reality. It is something that happened to most of these kinds of media in the region. Because everything was really project driven, nothing came from inside. So in the beginning you have to deal with what will happen once the funds stop.

This lack of sustainability is obviously disheartening for all NGO projects, but for media,

---

43 Loza explained there is an undeserved “stigma” to donor-supported media. This journalism, often referred to as “public service journalism” or “non-profit journalism” is non-partisan and non-commercial and addresses issues pertinent to civil society, ethnic minorities, and social-political trends, often using feature writing and in-depth investigative reporting. What Loza and others note is that such stigma does not extend to the publically supported BBC or other, well-respected, public media (personal communication, December 28, 2013). People involved in Romani media repeatedly wondered how funders and audiences expected them to produce good-quality journalism without consistent funds allotted through public means (all interviews with Cox and Moricz; Jankovic; Skopljanac).
which are built and survive on reputation, it is particularly damaging. How does one build credibility based on “trust” and the “brand” (Struthers, 02292012) as a media outlet that will most likely disappear in a year or two? The response from many of the directors of journalism programs and media centers was that it was impossible, but, for the sake of the larger society, they needed to try. This is captured in the following excerpt from my interview with Boba Dekic:

BD: …the funders and international organizations somehow expect to achieve sustainability, which is really ridiculous because this kind of content will never achieve sustainability.

SP: So then why do you keep doing it?

BD: Still working with journalism?

SP: Still working with journalism…still working with journalists…

BD: Why not? I mean, it’s like asking why you eat today if you are going to be hungry tomorrow?

Everyone I interviewed, including the funders, believed that media focusing on human rights, minority issues, and Romani issues were never going to be profitable in the marketplace, but at the same time were an essential part of a healthy, democratic, society. Most believed that Romani media should be supported by public funds, but, if they were not, that donors and funders needed to step in without stigma and strangling regulations (Jovanović; Loza, personal communication, December 28, 2013; Moricz). According to Ilona Moricz, the director of the Center for Independent Journalism and a former international journalist, mainstream journalists often avoid covering certain issues, “especially in difficult political times,” which must be “corrected” by what she and others refer to as “non-profit journalism.” Moricz added that she believes non-profit journalism “will never be sustainable. Community media or minority media will never be sustainable. It is a myth…but it serves the interest of the public and therefore must exist”
(05212013). Everyone I interviewed agreed that this kind of media needs to be in the public sphere as a kind of “public service” to all of society. As Gordana Jankovic explained, on the donor side it is incredibly difficult. While everyone expresses commitments to the rights, there is not much money on the table. A decade in 10 countries is not a sufficient effort….Sustainability means to support the process that lasts for a sufficiently long period of time. During the longer period of engagement, of course, you would adjust strategy, but you need to have the ability to keep supporting (06202012).

Both donors and journalists believe that in order to have a healthy, democratic society, a vibrant media must address, reflect, and formulate issues important to the growth of the society. This media needs to include, or perhaps must especially include, those who are often marginalized. Following Harding’s (1993) understanding of “strong objectivity,” by beginning to investigate a story from the perspective of the marginalized, one can provide more accurate coverage of the power dynamics within the larger society.

The (Assumed) Role of “Healthy Media” in Ensuring and Maintaining Democracy

“All persons have the right to equality and civic participation…and media plays a very critical role in representation of communities that can either have a negative or positive aspect on their perception of themselves and therefore on their capacity to actively conduct civic participation and act in the public interest.” – Marie Struthers, February 20, 2012

As noted above, upon the fall of the Berlin Wall, a handful of well-meaning Western governments and foundations poured millions of dollars into building up media institutions in Central and Eastern Europe. The goal was to “introduce Western journalism standards to emerging democracies in the region” (Walter, 2010, p. 29). They did so because of the strong normative belief that democracies need to have a non-state-controlled (often referred to as “healthy and vibrant”) media in order to develop, survive, and thrive. Journalism’s role is not simply to inform the community about what those in power are doing, but also to inform those
who have institutional power about what should be done and to hold them accountable. As Richard Beckman, a visual media maker and scholar and the lead trainer and partner for two Romani-specific projects, explained:

> Journalism can be a very strong tool for social change, but you need to empower people to tell the stories and not just assume change is going to happen. If there are traditions to celebrate, things to unearth...then these stories get to the people in power, the people who can make change, and that is a good thing. They are informed now. And then change can potentially happen. (01072013)

It is evident that the underlying logic for many of the Romani journalism programs is that, when informed, citizens can maintain watch over their governments. The role of the citizen is to be informed; the journalist’s role is to do the informing. But as I discussed in Chapter 2, North American journalists—who make up a good portion of the lead trainers—are wary of being seen as directly engaging in socio-political mobilization. This is seen as crossing a line outside of the professional boundaries of journalism. Journalists I interviewed were very careful to distinguish between informing about issues, concerns, and problems so that citizens could advocate for change and advocating for specific change. This distinction is extremely important, as it enables journalists to maintain their credibility as journalists. Boba Dekic illustrated this clearly, stating, “Journalists are not activists,” but also noted that they could, and should, “play a role in informing the public as well as those in power about what is, or is not, going on.” The hope is that, armed with such information, the public will initiate steps to create change—the information itself becomes the currency for political change (Brysk, 2013b; Keck & Sikkink, 1998). When pressed, journalists seem to do a delicate dance of providing accurate and critical information without wanting to be to be seen as the framers of the issues themselves—as this could cross into advocacy. Being seen as an advocate would thus decrease a journalist’s credibility and efficacy as a journalist. In other words, journalists can help bring issues to the
forefront or even move things up the ladder of media importance, but don’t want to be seen as actually writing the agenda.

However, drawing a clear distinction between informing a citizenry and advocacy was not always as a priority for the donors. The OSF’s Network Media Program began giving financial support to media outlets in the 1980s, even before the fall of the Berlin Wall. Gordana Jankovic founded the program and ran it until she stepped down in December 2013. When I asked her specifically how Romani journalism helped serve the larger goals of the OSF, she was a bit puzzled by the question. I had to ask it a few times:

Well, OSF sees itself as building a vibrant and tolerant society to empower and promote democracy for all communities in all spaces. The Romani community is one of the largest communities in Europe. You can’t marginalize a large community in these societies and then claim that you have an open society. (05022012)

Jankovic’s assessment of the connection between a “vibrant and tolerant society” that “empower[s] and promotes democracy” and journalism is based on assumptions about the role of the media. This is not a state-bounded concept. In her view, the media’s role goes beyond strictly reporting; rather, media should be informing and educating the public about certain issues, not just reflecting society but formulating the issues that are, or should be, of concern within society (Barnett & Duvall, 2005; Fairclough, 1992, 1995; Hallin, 1994). As Carragee and Roefs (2004) remind us, media help frame issues of concern, and this framing is possible because of access and use of power. My interview with Jankovic continued:

GJ: Media helps formulate the issues; it helps to contextualize the issues for both minority and majority communities and helps build a debate. It helps in building democracies.

SP: That is a very specific role for media—how does this work with the larger ideas and guiding principles of objectivity, unbiased, credibility…?

GJ: Independent journalism has all those characteristics. Those don’t go away.
There is a need for the additional function—a need to have a mission for the society you serve. Media are reflecting political discussion of the country and of particular groups, for example, ethnic groups, but in doing so journalism can still maintain independence and non-partisan approaches (05022012).

It is interesting to note that this process of reflecting and formulating issues for majority and minority societies is still done within the framework of good, independent (meaning in this case non-partisan) journalism. This is clear in Jankovic’s words: “Independent journalism has all those characteristics. Those don’t go away.” As will be seen throughout this chapter, “good journalism” is understood as journalism that meets “Western professional standards”—specifically, diversity of sources, credibility, fact checking, and transparency—within the Anglo-American tradition (Struthers, 02292012). It is this standard that shapes the goals and content of training programs focused on reproducing “good-quality Romani content.”

**Roma as the Canary in the Coalmine**

As former Czech president and playwright Vaclav Havel famously said in 1993, the treatment of Roma becomes the “litmus test” for the health of a free society (as cited in Kamm, 1993). In a similar spirit, I repeatedly heard from journalists that the treatment of Roma can be understood as the “canary in the coalmine” in terms of how other citizens in Europe can, or will, be (mis)treated in the future (Moricz, 05212013; Saracini, 05082013; field notes, May 22, 2013). As can be seen in my interview with Petrit Saracini, deputy director of the Macedonian Institute for the Media, journalism that works for the common good of a society must start by addressing the concerns of the most marginalized:

SP: Why do we need good [Romani] journalists?

PS: Because nobody is writing about Romani issues. Nobody is writing about *real*
Roma issues. About the *real* pain of those people.

SP: And why should it be written about?

PS: Because it is really bad.

SP: So what? There are many things that are really bad, why should it be written about?

PS: (laughter) Why should it be written about…

SP: Why? What good is writing about it?

PS: Because when a society which doesn’t take care of those in need, those that are the weakest, those that cannot survive, then the society is condemned to failure. Because [today] you are not writing about Roma, [and] tomorrow you are not writing about Albanians. And the day after tomorrow you won’t be writing about those whose left ear is pierced or whatever....And as the bishop from Germany said, first they came for the communists and I didn’t say anything because I wasn’t a communist, next they came for the Jews and I didn’t say anything because I wasn’t a Jew. When they came for me there was no one to stand for me. That is why. Because if you do not stand for the Roma today, when the poverty knocks on your door, who is going to write for you?

Saracini’s perspective is illustrative in many ways: Not only does he see the treatment of Roma as somewhat symptomatic, if not prescient, for the treatment of all people in society (harking back to the Holocaust), but he is also clear that solidarity is needed within society. From Saracini’s perspective, such solidarity can be achieved by eliciting empathy through what Cox referred to as “fact-based story telling” (12172012). According to Saracini, this empathy can be *taught*—and, as Kelly (2011) has previously argued, conditions for its facilitation can be constructed by recognizing journalism as a form of public pedagogy. In other words, according to Saracini’s analysis, writing about the “real pain of those people” makes such knowledge “real” for the larger society, which can potentially propel people to make change. When asked about journalism’s role in this process (“What does the writing do?”), Saracini continued, “It makes the people aware. It incites compassion in the society….And the common interest in any society is
that it prospers and survives and all people in it are offered the same opportunity to progress.”

It is clear that, like Fairclough (1992) and Barnett and Duvall (2005), Saracini is highlighting the relationship between the way people are represented in media and their treatment within the society. At the same time, Saracini still locates the change within a state-bounded society. He is not speaking about a transnational approach to change—or relocating power dynamics. Rather, his identification of the problem and the solution is located within the heterogeneous society of one country, in this case, Macedonia.

Many of the other journalists and coordinators of journalism trainings who were originally from Europe spoke of the treatment of Roma as “an embarrassment” to Europe and to the idea of Europe as a union of democracies. Tihomir Loza, a journalist and journalism trainer who has lived and worked in both the Balkans and the UK, was clear when he referred to the treatment of Roma as one of—if not the—greatest current human rights abuses in Europe (06052013). All those involved in covering Romani issues—journalists, trainers, coordinators, and funders—assumed that notions of liberal democracy could be put in motion by using journalism to inform and educate; that calling attention to Romani issues through media has the potential to galvanize the citizenry to pressure their societies and governments into action (Dekic; Jordan, 12192012; Moricz, 03022013, 05212013).

In short, donors, trainers, and journalists alike see stories about how Roma are treated and

---

44 Although it carries beyond the scope of this dissertation, the ethical and political distinctions between compassion, empathy, and solidarity merit further analysis.

45 Saracini mentioned an example involving Romani journalism students who were denied service at a coffee bar in Skopje (the capital of Macedonia) in 2007. With the support of the Macedonian Institute of the Media (MIM), they wrote to Trajko Slaveski, the Minister of Finance at the time. The Minister went to the coffee bar the next day, with the same students, and all were served without incident. According to Saracini and Petrovski, the Minister then spoke with the press, stating, “such behavior is intolerable [and] discriminating. People, citizens of Macedonia [as well as] anyone who visits this country should be able to sit down and enjoy a cup of coffee!” Saracini continued, “The next day, three major newspapers ran the story, ‘Minister Slaveski was drinking coffee in the same coffee bar where they were refused the day before!’” (05082013).
mistreated, as well as empowering stories about Roma—what Struthers refers to as “good-quality Romani content”, as strengthening the democratic project. This approach to “bridging” Romani and non-Romani society is assumed to help fold Roma into the citizenry of dominant society. The goal for donors and journalism trainers appears to be erasing difference: All are to be equal citizens within the state. In this way the state and the dominant culture within the state are still held as the norm, and media covering Roma become a kind of intervention. This strategy of intervention, rather than supporting distinct Romani media outlets, has become the priority.

“Roma Should be Seen as Full Citizens; And Media is The Medium [To Do This]”

The goal of the Roma Mainstream Media Internship Program (RMMIP), which ran from 1998 to 2010, was to create a “strong cadre of journalists of Romani origin” to work within mainstream media (Struthers, 02292012; Moricz, 03022012, 05212013). This was based on the belief that having more Roma present in the newsroom and newsroom meetings would improve coverage of Romani issues in the media—providing both more and different stories about Roma. In addition, many of the program coordinators and funders assumed that the Romani community’s sense of worth and agency (often referred to as “self-esteem”) would increase when Roma literally saw themselves in print and onscreen (Dragomir; Saracini, 03072013). It is important to have well-trained Romani journalists who can work as peers with other journalists to produce what Struthers called “good-quality Romani content.” All those interviewed made this point repeatedly, although they cautioned that the mere presence of Roma in the newsroom is not enough to counteract long-standing structural and social discrimination (Struthers, 02292012). Struthers notes that “Romani content” is content about and for Roma issues, noting that media, plays a very critical role in representation of communities that can either have a
negative or positive aspect on their perception of themselves and therefore on their capacity to actively conduct civic participation and act in the public interest (02202012).

Although never clearly articulated, it appears that the OSF defines Romani journalists as journalists of Romani origin who create good-quality media content that may or may not be specifically about Romani people or issues particular to Romani culture or society. However, this definition differs from what the funders actively supported. Many Romani journalism programs directly encouraged non-Roma journalists to participate and, according to organizers, there was never a lack of non-Romani interest. In addition, as discussed in more detail below, almost all of the stories addressed Romani specific topics.

But there were some tensions between the larger socio-political goals of the OSF and the journalistic goals of the trainers and program coordinators. As of 2012, all of the programs funded by the OSF—with the exception of those specifically geared to bringing more Roma into the journalism profession—were for the production of Romani-specific stories. Many of those involved in running the longstanding programs, including Ilona Moricz and Jeremy Druker, were concerned that such restrictions could limit the professional freedom of Romani journalists (Druker, 04232012; Moricz, 05212013). There is an interesting tension between desperately wanting to provide content that counterbalances the negative portrayal of Roma (OSI, 2011, pp. 61–65) and not wanting to “force” Romani journalists only to produce Romani-specific content.

In addition, although there is an increasing interest by funders in creating regional media programs and partnerships (three or more countries), many of the Romani journalists and journalism trainers point to the need to intervene in the increasingly racist and incendiary local media. As of now funding earmarked for local Romani media content is nearly non-existent.46

46 I reviewed two programs geared at a more local level: the Young Roma Journalist Program (run by CIJ), which specifically aimed to increase coverage of Roma and EU issues in Hungary, including local press, and a small
Towards a Progression of Criticality?

“It’s not just a sympathetic audience that may be reading and consuming this, but it may be people who are looking to cherry pick evidence to make their arguments….I do remember that this was something that was very interesting, speaking with the Roma journalists…especially if they were known by their sources…then yes, you are inside the community. And so you have a special obligation or duty perhaps to do no harm.

Like a Hippocratic Oath of journalism: Do no further harm.”

– Michael Jordan, international reporter and journalism instructor

Much to my surprise, I found that the majority of those involved in media training and development in Central and Eastern Europe—including the more experienced journalists—believed (or at least hoped) that good journalism can change what happens within the world. Michael Jordan, who has been an international print reporter for nearly 20 years, half-jokingly referred to himself as a “dinosaur” because he sees “nothing wrong with the media…to be the arbiters of what issues are important.” He lauded the pedagogical role of journalism: “We need to explore these issues, to better inform and educate our audience about the issues affecting them in their daily lives.” When pressed as to why this makes him a “dinosaur,” Jordan continued: “Because I think that the general trend seems to be giving people what they want rather than what they need. You know, titillating and keeping up with the Joneses. [But] journalism should be serving a greater, societal purpose.”

This emphasis on a greater purpose speaks to what I have come to refer to as the “constructed ideal of mainstream journalism,” and I found it common among many of the journalists who chose to work and train in Central and Eastern Europe. For example, Dean Cox, component of the Advancing Romani Visibility Project (run by Transitions through its partner Media Centar Sarajevo). That project aimed to train Romani journalists and aspiring journalists to produce a Roma-focused show for Radio Slon, a well-respected local radio station in Tuzla, Bosnia. Bosnia has a large Romani population (mostly concentrated in and around Tuzla) but had no specific Romani media programs.
who worked as a video, photo, and multimedia journalist for some of the largest media companies in the world, chose to freelance because he is a self-described “journalism idealist.” As he explained, “There is an importance of journalism…what stories and images can do.” But he cautioned that one cannot get swept up in the ideal of being a journalist; one must engage in good, solid journalistic work, for, as he notes, there are standards: “We must be careful. We can’t stop investigating. We can’t stop doing our job” (12172012). The media, as a means of disseminating and framing information (and often misinformation) is recognized as a potential tool for inclusion. There is something in a journalist’s unique role of explaining and filtering the world for others that is potentially transformative (Cox, 05092013; Dervišbegović, 05242013; Jordan).

As Fairclough (1992) argued, there is a back and forth relation between the content of media, media structures, and power dynamics within the real world. Thus, many of the trainers believed that a journalist could reshape the perception of those in power and those who are not. The potential this could have for Roma was stated clearly by Nena Skopljanac who oversaw the multiyear “co-production fund” (pairing Roma with non-Romani journalist to make a media piece): “Roma should be seen as full citizens (by non-Roma), and media is the medium [to do this].” By media, Skopljanac was referring both to the professional relationships between the journalists and the content produced. Marius Dragomir, who pioneered the “shoulder-to-shoulder” reporting program for Transitions throughout Central and Eastern Europe, agreed. In reflecting on newsrooms in his native Romania, he offered a nearly identical assessment:

Some of the stories coming back from Romania and some of the other countries were interesting. Because I think that the integration of these people as respected journalists back in their countries changed the perception somewhat of their colleagues. For a long time, you write stereotypically about these people—give voice to the racist people in football—and you just don’t know anything. You don’t know who these Roma people are or whatever—and then suddenly you
have one of them, a Roma person, in your office. They are your friend, your
colleague, and you start asking and start to learn, and you will not make the
mistakes of this sloppy journalism.

It is important to see that Dragomir’s assumption is not that the journalists are evil or racist, but
rather they are ignorant and therefore “sloppy.” As noted earlier in this chapter, it is clear that
many believe the media’s role is to be pedagogical by bridging the audience (assumed to be the
majority society) with that of the “reality” of Roma. This is evident both in the project proposals
and in interviews with program developers, journalists, and funders. In essence, Romani
journalists are being recruited to serve as “a bridge” between Romani society and non-Romani
society (Jordan). There is also a learning process taking place within the newsroom itself—a
socialization of the journalists as they work (Husband, 2012; Tuchman, 1978). Like Dragomir,
many of those interviewed seemed to believe that the physical distance between Roma and non-
Roma (in neighborhoods, schools, and workplaces) provided a dangerous psychological distance
that resulted in stereotypes and racism (Moricz, 05212013; Skopljanac). Therefore, as Saracini
explained, if the audience just had the “real” information about Roma, they would understand
and behave better. Those I interviewed firmly believed that journalists—both Roma and
informed non-Roma—could, and should be the ones providing this “real” information. Very few
of those interviewed saw this role as problematic, although many acknowledged it was a lot to
ask from one person.

When recruiting Roma for their journalism training programs, many of the trainers and
program administrators plead unabashedly with potential recruits, telling them that both the
Romani community and mainstream society need them as journalists who can be respected
inside and outside of their communities in terms of their journalistic skill and identity. Michael
Jordan said it best when describing his pitch: “Hey! Your community needs you! Your country
needs a Roma voice who can be a serious voice. To be a journalist and produce not just PR but to be a bridge between your community and the majority community...” (my emphasis).

The distinction between public relations and journalism is key. A journalist, as a professional, is seen as having the power to make things better for the community because he or she can bridge with the larger society. This is not necessarily Roma-specific—Jordan thinks it may be the role of every foreign correspondent who is trying to “explain” the country he or she is reporting from to a “fair-minded and decent” person who is not there. The journalist serves as a bridge, and there is responsibility in that bridging. According to Ilona Moricz, many of the people who applied to the RMMIP in Hungary understood this: As journalists, they could fulfill a responsibility to their community, and this embracing of community responsibility distinguished them from other people seeking to get into the journalism profession (03022012).

This idea of community responsibility is a far cry from the distant, dispassionate journalist Lippmann (1920) lauded at the dawn of modern journalism. But there is still a strong commitment to the field and techniques of journalism—to the “serious voice” that keeps journalism separate from what can be written off as public relations—the cherry picking of only positive stories (Beckman, 01072013; Cox; Papinot). But there was tension. Jordan described this as the tension between “the Hippocratic Oath” of journalism—do no harm to your community, which is already disproportionately, and inaccurately, portrayed negatively—and the more standard notion of journalism’s role to expose the good, the bad, and the ugly of society. Donors are looking at media as a tool to counter prejudice “in order to repudiate racism and to transcend perceptions of Roma as an undifferentiated mass of passive victims” (OSF, 2011, p. 61). Although laudable, is this still journalism?
The Balancing Act of the Romani Journalist: Objectivity, Professionalism, and the Hippocratic Oath of (Romani) Journalism

‘It is difficult to for a young Roma person to say, ‘I want to be a journalist! And I want to reveal The Good! The Bad! The Ugly! I am a journalist and I am going to reveal it!’ But also feeling those pressures of their own community like, ‘Hey! You can’t air our dirty laundry! Come on! There is enough of our dirty laundry out there! They already hate us! You are just providing more fodder for people to hate us more!’’”

– Michael Jordan, international reporter and journalism instructor

Ferenc Papinot is a Romani journalist in his early 30s. At the age of 14, he announced to his teachers that he wanted to be a journalist. They all told him that, as the son of the school’s cleaning lady, his ambitions were “too big.” In 2002, he enrolled in the RMMIP, where he excelled. He has since participated in a variety of journalism training programs run by the Center for Independent Journalism (CIJ), often funded, at least in part, by the OSF. Through the internship opportunities offered by the RMMIP and the Young Roma Journalist Program, he was able to work in a variety of newsrooms, including Radio C (the now-defunct Romani radio station) and Nemzeti Sport (a mainstream sports newspaper), as well as the Budapest weekly Heti Válasz and Origo, a popular Hungarian website.47 He also worked professionally for Hungarian National Television and the show “Provocateur,” an OSF-funded program that addresses current issues with a specific human rights focus. When Sosinet.hu, the OSF-funded online news portal covering Romani issues in Hungary, Slovakia, and Romania, launched in 2009, he quickly became one of its most active contributors. After trying all mediums, he decided his favorite is multimedia reporting, and he particularly enjoys sports reporting.

47 The Young Roma Journalist Program ran January–August 2012. It was funded by the European Union to help increase the quality and quantity of coverage of the European Union and European Roma Initiatives in the Hungarian media. The Center for Independent Journalism won the public procurement, building its curriculum from what it had learned over the years with the RMMIP. Ten Romani journalists received both content classroom instruction (100 hours) and six-month internships in leading mainstream Hungarian media. For details, see http://www.cij.hu/en/eu-funded-project-for-young-roma-journalists/
Papinot is very clear that he never hides that he is Roma—that as a graduate of the RMMIP he is known as a “Roma journalist”—but that he also enjoys being able to go into the newsroom and “just be one of the sports journalists.” However, because of the rise of the far right and the increased acceptability of racism and racist language in Hungary, he sees it as his role as a journalist—a “Roma journalist”—to take on different dimensions. His identity, and his responsibility, as a Romani journalist is context specific:

I graduated the RMMIP, so I am always considered a Roma journalist. This is my role. I’m a Rom. Everyone knows it. In national sports, they know it. *In an ideal situation it shouldn’t matter; but now it is very important in Hungary.* … We need a bridge. In an ideal situation, it is not important if someone is Roma…but we need to be holding the people and government of Hungary accountable (my emphasis).

It is telling that Papinot holds the undifferentiated journalist as the ideal—that a journalist is just a journalist. In that way he holds on to traditional Anglo-American ideas of the detached journalist. At the same time, however, he is clear that this is not the reality now. “Mainstream portrayals” of Roma are no longer objective, and thus a more contextualized objectivity is needed (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002a). Papinot explains that his mere presence helps to counteract some of the increasing racism in Hungary, and his knowledge and contacts in the Romani communities contribute to richer and more accurate pools of stories from which to select. This was a point made repeatedly by Romani journalists, trainers, and program coordinators. Rather than seeing the Romani journalist as a threat to objectivity, they felt that having well-trained Romani journalists in the newsroom creates more access to more people, to more sources, and to more stories and therefore results in more objective pieces (Petrovski; Saracini, 05072013).

I was a bit skeptical about this “assumption of access,” but in my observation of three different brainstorming sessions in Budapest and in Prague, I witnessed Romani journalists (from
throughout the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary) offering insight and perspectives on potential characters or storylines of which non-Romani journalists were unaware. Of course, providing such access creates the potential for alternative framing of stories and thus moved issues up the agenda.

One example involves a participant in the *Europe: A Homeland for the Roma* project jointly run by Transitions and the University of Miami and administered through local media development partners in five countries. A Romani journalist from Slovakia suggested visiting the town of Krásna Hôrka to cover how the mayor was responding to the changing demographics of the town (currently 50/50 and becoming increasingly Roma). When the trainer asked if other media cover the story, the Romani journalist responded:

Yes. But I do it differently because most other journalists are working for commercial media. And they are scared. So they don’t go into the field to talk to Roma people, they just go to cover a crime story. They go around the town with the police to get the story. But when I go, townsfolk come out and then they take me to meet [other] people (field notes, May 23, 2013).

Of course, meeting other people who usually do not engage with the media gives journalists access to other stories that do not normally appear in the media and which may not feed the traditional trope of stories about Roma as victims or criminals (Plaut, 2012b).

When we met in March 2012, Papinot discussed why he is more inclined to cover positive stories about Roma than negative ones. He was quick to point out that this was not always the case; his stories in the mid-2000s were much more varied, but his change in story selection is in reaction to the increasingly negative portrayal of Roma in the mainstream
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48 Often this was based on knowing the reputation of a person’s family as well as previous experience in the community (field notes, May 22, 2013).
49 The project involved Romani and non-Romani journalists from five countries and was organized by national media partners. Local coordinators and an international trainer (all from North America) were assigned to each team. I had permission from the trainers, organizers, and participants to attend the trainings in Hungary and Slovakia for the project *Europe: A Homeland for the Roma.*
Hungarian press.\textsuperscript{50} That said, at the time that we met, Papinot had already worked as a professional journalist for nine years and was quick to point out that although story selection may be strategic, the skills and methods employed must be thorough and meet the standards of professional journalism, otherwise it is no longer a journalistic product. For Papinot, objectivity—which he defines as being non-partisan and employing journalistic tools and techniques—is sacrosanct. He gives an example of a Romani man who claims to be on the Hungarian Olympic Team:

SP: OK, so if objectivity is important and you need to present the depth in the stories you write, etc.—then why do you purposefully look for positive stories about Roma? Is that being objective? Why is that not propaganda or public relations?

FP: It is a kind of public relations. It is. But it is not propaganda because we are still using the tools and techniques of journalism. For example, let’s say a man, a Rom, tells me that he is going to be on the national team for boxing—that he is going to the Olympics. I am still going to use the journalist techniques—the fact checking—to find out if that is true. Perhaps he is a very good boxer, but he is not on the list for the Olympic team. He may think he is good enough to be on the Olympic team, he may want to be on the Olympic team, but he is not. This is journalism—to find this out. But I think we need to talk about things beyond conflict—conflict is important, but positive examples are also important.

SP: Why?

FP: Because of the encouragement and because it shows a positive example…

SP: But is this the role of a journalist? Is this what a journalist is supposed to do?

FP: (long pause) Yes. But not every time and everywhere. But in Hungary, now, yes.

It is clear that for Papinot, the skills of journalism (i.e., “the fact checking”) cannot be compromised; otherwise, he is no longer engaged in journalism. He notes that it is the application of journalistic skills that makes the story of the boxer a journalistic piece. But he

\textsuperscript{50} The Roma Press Agency in Slovakia made the similar point that positive stories about Roma can serve as a corrective means of rebalancing a slanted picture (Jordan).
continues that because of Hungary’s current political and social situation, the story itself must be thought of in context: how will both Romani and non-Romani audiences perceive it? In other words, there are consequences to covering, or not covering, certain stories. The importance placed on understanding the role that journalism plays within the larger social and political context cannot be overstated (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002b).

There appears to be a progression towards criticality in story selection by the Romani journalists. Trainers and journalists alike discussed the fact that the stories selected were primarily “softer” humanistic stories that offered a positive portrayal of Roma (Beckman 01082013; Jordan). When pushed to articulate the distinctions between Romani and non-Romani journalists, Cox reflected on the reticence many Romani journalists had to tackle critical stories. However, he was quick to note:

I have no opinion if this is good or bad. I have a feeling they [Romani journalists] would not want to take on a critical story within the Roma community because there are enough of those being published by non-Romani media. It is totally fine. I have no problem with it but I hope in the future that they would be able to take on critical stories [within their communities] as well and not just be positive image promoters of their communities (12172012).

Producing critical stories and engaging in investigative reporting takes time, and, according to the trainers and coordinators, there was never enough time. The majority of the stories produced were not critical of events taking place within the Romani community. Because of project-based funding limitations, the goal is to make a journalistic product, not Romani media. In Transitions programs, for example, journalists and trainers often had only one week to work together. But the

---

51 In addition, one can ask about the placement of a story itself as well as the headline, accompanying images, and captions. People other than the journalist—often the section editor—tend to make these decisions. This is one of the reasons why those who are organizing journalism trainings discuss the need for including editors in such trainings and express frustration at editors’ failure to participate (Druker, 04232013; Moricz, 03022012; Skopljanac). It may also explain the increased interest of Romani journalists and those designing Romani journalism programs in turning to multimedia and Web-based media. They are not only easier to distribute, but also easier to control in terms of format.
trainers interviewed believed that if was not just time limitations rather Romani journalists were making a strategic choice to put forth a more positive image of the community rather than engaging in critical investigative reporting. This strategy aligns with Jordan’s understanding of the journalistic Hippocratic Oath. Many of those interviewed assumed that exposing “the good, the bad, and the ugly” of society, including Roma society, could and would take place at a later time when Roma had a stronger—perhaps more accepted—place within the larger society. As I have argued, the goal in training Romani journalists is increasingly to move towards reaching the largest possible public, as it is assumed that power for socio-political change lies there. As I go into detail about the three models used to train Romani journalists, noting their strengths and challenges, I pay particular attention to how these programs understand objectivity, credibility, and professionalism, and how the norms, skills, and challenges of this understanding are taught to the next generation of Romani journalists.

Three Training Models for Romani Journalism and Romani Journalists

“As a journalist, you need to look at an issue from all sides to make sure you are talking to everyone concerned. To be skeptical. To check your facts. It’s the basics and not specific to the Roma projects. You need to ask if your interviewee has a particular interest. You need to be balanced. Be careful to take into account different views. When you are working as a journalist you keep testing it by various means. Of course, it is easier said than done.”

– Tihomir Loža, Deputy Director of Transitions, March, 5, 2012

As noted previously, starting in 2005, there was a growing trend to have more Romani journalists trained in non-Roma-specific environments. The focus of these trainings was on skill sharing and development through co-producing pieces to be aired by non-Romani media outlets. This signals a different goal: Whereas the RMMIP aimed to produce a cadre of new journalists, the second kind of training scheme focused on working with good or promising Romani
journalists to make them even better—“to work with the stars” (Dragomir; Druker, 04172012). It is important to note that although these two approaches are different, they are not necessarily in conflict. Nonetheless, the goal does determine how success is evaluated. As stated in an external evaluation of Transitions’ Romani programs:

Conducting programs where Roma journalists cover Roma issues may not end up resulting in greater number of Roma journalists in mainstream or international media. That is because a) these journalists already know how to cover Roma issues as they know them too well; they may need training simply to be better journalists or to cover mainstream issues better and b) participation in training programs targeting Roma journalists may actually hinder their employment prospects because they will at best end up being narrowcast in mainstream newsrooms and assigned only Roma stories, or at worst be seen as Roma activists rather than objective journalists and not hired at all (Walter, 2010, pp. 38–39).

This evaluation brought about some changes in Transitions-run programs as well as other OSF funded Romani journalism programs. Both Struthers and Moricz pointed out that these two approaches to training can actually be seen as complementary; they respond to different needs and contexts (Moricz, 055212013; Struthers, 02292012). Many of these changes were external, reflecting larger socio-political trends and the role of journalism and the journalist within these contexts. For example, according to Moricz, EU accession and the launch of the Decade of Roma Inclusion made the need for Romani journalists writing in English even more apparent (English was quickly becoming the lingua franca of European bureaucracy). In addition, changes in the journalistic landscape worldwide—more journalists, less advertising revenue, stronger media regulations, all resulting in fewer jobs in journalism—have forced journalists to become familiar with, if not fluent in, a larger variety of technically sophisticated tools and skills.

In reviewing project proposals, grant reports, and evaluations, it became evident that—with the exception of an OSF-supported Romani radio program in Tuzla, Bosnia—the goals of Roma-specific programs have become more and more centered on professionalizing those who
are already working within the field of journalism to create “good-quality Romani content” (what I refer to as “skills-based training”) rather than creating “Romani journalists” (what I refer to as “cohort structure”).

The Roma Mainstream Media Internship Program and Subsequent Spinoff Programs

The first iteration of the RMMIP began in 1997. In 1998, the program moved to the Center for Independent Journalism (CIJ) in Budapest, where it has remained. Versions of the program have run in Romania, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Macedonia.\textsuperscript{52} Janis Overlock, an American journalist who came to Hungary in the early days after the fall of socialism, designed the program. She noticed that while all the economic journalism praised the benefits of unfolding capitalism, the Romani population was getting poorer and poorer. This reality was not being covered in the news. In her assessment, one of the reasons for the lack of coverage of how Roma were fairing in the transition was that there were no Roma in the newsrooms. She sought to change that by designing a training program that targeted Roma with a minimum high school education who wanted to become journalists. Since 1998, the program has trained more than 200 Roma to become journalists (Jankovic, 05072012; Moricz, 03022012; Struthers, 02202012; 02292012). The goal of the program is to use a cohort structure to train people who identify as Roma in journalistic skills and give them the confidence to recognize themselves as Romani journalists capable of working in both non-Romani and Romani media.

The original program was 10 months in duration. Participants attended a four-month intensive (9 a.m. to 5 p.m. every day) skills- and content-based training and a six-month

\textsuperscript{52} In the spirit of full disclosure, I helped start the program in Macedonia in 2004 and secured part of its initial funding. The program ran from 2005 to 2008. In 2008, the School for Journalism and Public Relations started in Macedonia, three full-time scholarships for Roma students were allotted annually, and the RMMIP ceased operation (Struthers, 02292012; Trajkovska).
internship at a mainstream news organization. (In some countries students had the option of working at a Romani or a mainstream news outlet). Recognizing that these participants were often supporting families, everyone was paid during their 10 months. In order to ensure they were focused on their studies, they were not permitted to work an outside job during that time. Participants were paired with mentors (experienced journalists at the news outlets) during their internships and, when finances permitted – particularly in the first few years of the program — the mentors were paid as well. Students would meet as a cohort once a week during their internship to discuss how things were going and what they were learning and to share best practices and troubleshoot any potential problems.

The RMMIP was a flagship program and respected by donors, media training centers, and many of the graduates (Lange, 2006, pp. 5, 9, 52–53; Papinot; Saracini, 05072013; Struthers, 2008, pp. 59, 62; Struthers, 02292012). Although numbers are always a tricky business in the world of NGOs, Yasha Lange noted that as of 2006, based on the information provided by the coordinators of the programs, 20–25% of the alumni were working in mainstream media and another 25–35% were working in other media. During the first six to seven years of the program, the majority of graduates were able to find jobs after graduation. However, journalism is intimately woven into the larger socio-economic and political worlds and, according to Ilona Moricz, after EU accession the job prospects dropped drastically. After the economic crisis of 2008, “there were just no media jobs.” Similar socio-economic changes took place in Romania

---


54 This model of praxis-based training including long-term supervised internships with financial compensation for both participants and mentors is still held as the model in designing other media training programs, most recently a Romani journalism training program funded by the EU and the Hungarian Government to focus on covering EU and Roma issues in the Hungarian media (Fiatal Roma Ujsagirok Program, 2011; Moricz, 05212013).

55 By 2008 the numbers had dropped: 40% of graduates were working in “media-related fields,” and 20% specifically in mainstream media.
and Slovakia, where the program was also well established. By 2010, Moricz decided to “focus on ensuring that our alumni had jobs and were able to stay in the profession,” so she ceased the RMMIP until the media job market opened up again (03022012). Even some of the best journalists, such as Ferenc Papinot, have had to leave the journalism profession to find consistent employment that can support them and their families (Moricz, 03022012; Papinot, personal communication, July 15, 2013).

In Macedonia, the situation is different but the results are the same: journalism is a key ingredient and symptom of larger socio-political and economic realities. Since 2009 it has become increasingly politicized and regulated, with journalists receiving extremely low salaries. According to Petrit Saracini, the average starting salary for a journalist is 250 Euro a month, whereas people living in Skopje (the capital) need a minimum of 500–600 euro a month to cover their basic living expenses. In addition, political repression of journalists is increasing throughout the country. Roma who have language and technical skills are recruited to work in NGOs or international organizations, or, if they are politically connected, public administration, where the salaries and working conditions are much more attractive (Jordan; Plaut, 2013; Saracini, 03082013). Other journalists and trainers from the Balkans expressed similar sentiments: journalism as a profession has been losing prestige, and it cannot compete for multi-lingual Roma with good writing and technical skills (Dekic; Dervišbegović, 05242103; Walter, 2010, pp. 26, 35–36). When asked why so few Roma journalists who graduated from the RMMIP were working full time within the journalism field, Struthers shook her head in frustration:

56 In April 2013, the Macedonian government passed a new media law that heavily regulates the already restrictive media market. The law was scheduled to go into effect 10 days after it was passed, but this was later extended to 60 days. This sparked massive debate throughout the country, including public forums organized by journalists and NGOs, but was barely covered in domestic press. Macedonia slipped to 116th out of 179 countries in terms of media freedom; in 2009, when the current government took power, the country was 34th (Balkan Media Watch, 2013). For more information on the new law, see http://www.osce.org/fom/102135.
How can we control if they get a job? Our aim was to provide good-quality journalism training so they are in a better position to get a job. But you can’t blame a journalism program for the state of the economy and the broad public sentiment of the population (02292012).

As of 2013, none of the original RMMIP offerings are running. Although all those interviewed spoke highly of the RMMIP and saw the benefits of having an intensive cohort-structured education that provided a good theoretical and practical education with strong Romani content, there seemed to be a feeling that there were other, more pressing media needs now—such as providing professional education for Roma who are working as journalists so they may have the opportunity to work as journalists and change what is seen in mainstream media (Moricz, 05212013; Saracini, 05082013; Petrovski). As Struthers reflected, “The fact that the RMMIP doesn’t run doesn’t mean they are a failure in every way. I don’t know if the exact same need is present at this time. After all, we do have a core of journalists working in the media now” (02292012). The needs of Romani journalists are not the same as they were, nor is the role of journalism (or “media initiatives”) focusing on Romani issues the same as when the program started. This resulted in changes in the training of Romani journalists.

Co-production Fund

“The main goal was to have a kind of more balanced, in-depth, sophisticated coverage of Romani issues. Most people in the mainstream just don’t know Roma at all. At least two-thirds of the Roma are physically segregated from mainstream so at least through the media there can be some sort of contact.” – Nena Skopljanac, director of Medienhilfe

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, in the fall of 2003, Romani and non-Romani journalists from all over the Balkans who were interested in Romani issues came together in Ohrid, Macedonia. Although the goal of a sustainable media network has not materialized as of 2014, the organization that hosted the workshop, Medienhilfe (meaning “media assistance” in
German), did play an important role in the development of Romani media for the next six to seven years. Most notably, the organization helped shift the idea of journalism training and multi-ethnic interaction from the classroom into a practical pedagogy of Roma and non-Roma producing works of journalism together. Medienhilfe was an organization based in Switzerland that focused on offering “media help” to emerging journalists and journalistic outlets throughout the former Yugoslavia. Strengthening Romani journalism and journalists specifically was one part of the organization’s work.

Skopljanac also understood Romani media development as having two goals: to strengthen Romani media outlets and to create contacts for mainstream media that would help counter the typical coverage, which was fuelling racism and discrimination. Her idea was to try to forge professional and personal cooperation between Romani and non-Romani media outlets by having them “co-produce” a piece. There were drastic differences in the training and resources between Romani and non-Romani media, and training both partners together was part of the process. The result was a piece that could air on both Romani and non-Romani media outlets (Lange, 2006; Struthers, 02202012). The goal of the piece was to provide “another image of Roma than what people usually see in the mainstream media. It is presenting another perspective, more in-depth, more nuanced,” while also teaching Romani journalists more sophisticated journalism skills and providing the outlets with media products that were of “at least minimal quality” (Skopljanac 02202012). The training involved three to four days of storyboarding and then weeks of production with a trainer available as needed. Most of the trainers were local journalists from the region.

The project expanded quickly in the various countries in the Balkans, but, in 2005, when the Decade of Roma Inclusion chose not to include “media” as a priority issue in its mandate,
funding was drastically reduced. This was a turning point. Although the Decade of Roma Inclusion did not offer additional funding, the fact that media were *not* included signalled to donors and states alike that Romani media were not important. This had drastic financial consequences.

Romani media, which had always struggled, were now struggling even more, and staff turnover was quite high. Consistency was lacking in partnerships, and it had become harder to build on pre-existing knowledge, relationships, and skills. Romani media organizations, which had their core funding support cut, were surviving on co-production funds (Lange, 2006; Skopljanac; Struthers, 2008; Struthers, 02202012). Given the lack of consistency of participation, this was an unsustainable approach. Skopljanac explained, “I had to adjust our priorities but keep the same actors and partners.”

In 2005, the OSF asked Medienhilfe to oversee funding distribution for all Romani media production. It is clear that too little money was being distributed to too many media organizations, and Medienhilfe’s role as an intermediary was at times challenging. As one grantee who preferred to remain anonymous explained, “Why is the media content on my radio show in Serbia being dictated by Switzerland?” After a few years the project stopped and, as of 2012, there was no longer a partnership between the OSF and Medienhilfe (Struthers, 03232013). That said, the training component of Medienhilfe’s work, the process of learning by doing and forging professional relationships between Romani and non-Romani journalists, remains a cornerstone of many of OSF-funded media projects, both Romani and non-Romani (Struthers, 02292012). The focus on reaching out to non-Romani audiences and using media to change their perception has only increased.
“Working with the Stars”: Shoulder-to-Shoulder Reporting as Pioneered by Transitions

In 2004, Gordana Jankovic, founder and then-director of the Open Society Foundations’ Network Media Program, approached Jeremy Druker, Executive Director of Transitions, to see how they might be able to work together. Jankovic’s idea was to create a cadre of Romani journalists who would be able to publish in international English-language publications like Transitions Online.57 Druker’s expertise is in training journalists from Central and Eastern Europe, often through intensive mentorship, to produce high-quality journalism (Druker, 04172012). Journalists from Transitions had covered Romani issues since its inception in 1999, but prior to 2004 it had not particularly focused on working with Romani journalists.

Transitions initiated an innovative training approach the organization called “shoulder-to-shoulder” reporting in 2005. This training program paired experienced journalists (usually non-Roma) with a Romani journalist or small group of journalists. They would go together into the field and cover a story “shoulder-to-shoulder” in a mentor-mentee relationship (Dragomir). The model was simple: The trainer (for the first couple of years it was only Marius Dragomir) engaged in one-on-one mentoring with each journalist in the different countries throughout the region. They worked on the story together, with constant back and forth until it was ready for publication. If the story was of suitable quality, it was published in Transitions Online and the journalist was paid the standard Czech market rate for his or her work. The Romani journalists would then take those skills and experiences and use them in their independent work and would still be able to call upon the mentor for advice as needed.

Tihomir Loza, deputy director of Transitions, and the person primarily responsible for

57 Although Transitions Online (http://www.tol.org) has some breaking news, its focus is in-depth reporting and analysis. It is an award winning online-only English-language publication. Most of its subscribers are local and international universities, policymakers, think tanks and NGOs.
Roma-specific projects since 2008, explained, “What we call shoulder-to-shoulder reporting is simply collaborative reporting in which trainees and trainers work together on story assignments.” He explained that although the sophistication of the projects has changed over the years — from “how to do a decent blog post to how to conceive, plan, produce, and sell a 20-minute video” to be distributed internationally, the method of teaching, learning, and assessing the work has remained the same (personal communication, June 26, 2013).

What has changed, however, is the availability of EU funds. The EU is interested in building the European project and thus is attracted to, and may have a mandate to pursue, multi-country projects. In the past, the trainers would move from country to country to work with Romani journalists on stories written for an international English-speaking audience but focused on the local context. Now, however, there is a push to have Romani journalists from different countries work together on larger projects. This allows the Romani journalists to be trained together for general skills and then go to the field in smaller—often country-specific—teams, with some returning to work together on editing (Center for Independent Journalism, 2013; Cox, 05072013; Transitions, 2009; field notes May 21–22, 2013; field notes May 24, 2013).

Based on internal and external evaluations, evaluations by trainees, and the distribution of media content, this model of training has been deemed highly successful by all involved. The journalists have continued to produce high-quality stories even when they are no longer in the training program and have been able to improve their skills consistently, sometimes sharing them when returning to their media outlets “back home” (Struthers, 02202012). Shoulder-to-shoulder

---

58 All of those involved in running the journalism programs recognize the specificity of the socio-political, economic, and cultural context and how it affects Roma and non-Roma populations. As evidenced by Sosinet and Tocak, there is a slow move towards producing more media in local languages for both the domestic press and local language news sites, although this effort is sporadic and not well funded. These local media productions are well used and appreciated by local and national media, but they have not been nearly as generously funded as the larger pan-European projects.
training serves as a cornerstone for all Romani, and many non-Romani, training programs run by Transitions and is promoted by the OSF’s Network Media Program as an innovative technique to be replicated by other grantees (Druke, 04172012; Struthers, 02292012). However, there are some concerns with the model noted by both external reviewers and trainers. Specifically, there was a limited number of people that fit into the category of “the stars.” These “stars” need to be Roma who not only are highly talented and dedicated journalists but also have at least functional written and spoken English (so they could work with their trainers, who are almost all English speaking) and have enough flexibility in their jobs that they can participate in these programs (Dragomir; Jordan; Walter, 2010, p. 26). These were published in the internal review of Transitions Roma projects conducted by Walter in 2010. Since this evaluation was shared with Transitions, some changes have been made for the ostensible purpose of opening up the pool of eligible participants. In 2013, during the Europe: A Homeland for the Roma project, which involved 20 journalists (Roma and non-Roma) from five countries and primarily North American trainers, English language proficiency was not a requirement and simultaneous translation was used in all trainings (field notes May 21–22, 2013; field notes May 24, 2013).

The Party Line: A Journalist is a Journalist!

“You cannot have this Roma angle in everything you do when you are trying to teach them and explain something. You leave the Roma thing aside. They are journalists. They are just journalists! So we put the whole Roma thing away.... What was important was the skill of multimedia storytelling. It doesn’t mean that it won’t be present later—the Roma angle will come back. But once you master this thing—how to make a good video story—you will always find a way to put your Roma angle into it.”

– Nedim Dervišbegović, journalist for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, journalism trainer

As can be seen from the description of the three main Romani journalism programs above, OSF-funded journalism training programs have always been marked by tension. On the
one hand, no one wants to have “yet another Roma program” that could potentially “pigeonhole” journalists of Romani origin, and on the other, the OSF has a “commitment” to developing and supporting media training programs that specifically promote Romani journalists (Jankovic, 06202012; Struthers, 02292012). This is seen as a delicate balance. One example is the fact that although the trainees in both educational schemes are Roma, the trainers for shoulder-to-shoulder reporting are almost always non-Roma. Although concerted efforts were made in the RMMIP to ensure that successful Romani intellectuals, journalists, members of civil society, and so on returned to the trainings as mentors, such an approach is not considered a priority for the more skills-based training programs. As Loza explained, trainers were selected based on skill and availability—the ethnic background of the trainer was it “simply not a priority.” Since the focus was on the skills themselves, the question became, “What difference would that make anyway in terms of the training?” (06052013).

Dragomir designed the Romani Journalism Advancement Project for Transitions and considers “getting Roma out of the box” to be one of his greatest achievements. He believes that actively foregrounding the identity of the participants as journalists, rather than specifically Romani journalists, increased not only the popularity of the program during an era of many “Roma projects,” but also the quality of the journalism. He gave the example of a “brilliant” written story about the first Romani policeman in Romania, noting, “Working this way they got better and more interesting stories than what you normally see of just poverty.”

Because the goal of Romani journalism has changed from covering Romani issues for a

59 Loza and I had many discussions on the demographics of the international journalism trainers. For Loza, this was a moot point. His concern is not the ethnicity, gender or nationality of trainers (he pointed out that although the international trainers were mostly from North America and male, the local partners are often Roma and more often female) but the structural changes that need to take place so that Romani journalists can enjoy equal rights, opportunities, and professional upward mobility once they are in the newsroom (personal communication, December 28, 2013)
Romani audience to producing “good-quality Romani content” for a mainstream audience (Struthers, 02292012), the language used to describe the field has changed. Struthers explained that, rather than “Romani media” or “Romani journalists,” the preferred term is now “Romani media initiatives.” This broader term includes filmmaking, news agencies, blogging, or “whatever it is that furthers good-quality content on Roma issues and is able to reach and speak with credibility to as large an audience as possible” (Struthers, 02292012, my emphasis). Struthers was quick to point out that this work can be done by Romani or non-Romani media makers and broadcast on Romani or non-Romani media outlets.

For some, this broader approach has worked well. As noted previously in this chapter, Ferenc Papinot, a Romani graduate of the RMMIP, has written stories addressing the rise of racist attacks in the Hungarian Press for Sosinet.hu but has also covered soccer matches for Nemzeti Sport. He was respected as a multimedia sports journalist by his colleagues. Others, such as Daniel Petrovski, a Romani journalist from Macedonia, see their journalism as a method of activism. Petrovski chooses to focus on Romani stories as a means of ensuring different angles, and perspectives on Roma are made available to both Romani and non-Romani audiences. He is quick to say that this is his choice, not a choice made by his colleagues or editors.

This push to make sure Romani journalists are “taken out of the box” is not only a move to ensure intellectual freedom. Although it is never said directly, there seems to be an unspoken assumption that neither the participants of the Romani programs, nor the media outlets, nor audiences see journalists who foreground their Roma identity as equal to “real” journalists—who may or may not be of Romani origin (Dragomir; Druker, 04172012). In an internal report reviewing Transitions programs, Walter (2010) quotes the editor of Romea.cz as stating that
“alumni from ‘Roma programs’ may actually have a harder time getting jobs in mainstream media because they may be perceived as having an agenda” (p. 21). And tension does exist. Kinga Rethy, deputy director of the Roma Initiatives Program, stated that Romani journalists have to be “excellent journalists because you will be attacked on fact versus opinion all the time” (my emphasis).

In reflecting on the internship experiences of RMMIP participants, the people running the program in both Macedonia and Hungary acknowledged that the interns often had to “prove themselves” before they could work on non-Romani stories. Petrit Saracini explained, “In a lot of newsrooms, our interns got that attitude: OK, because you are Roma, you work on Romani issues. But, but, if you are good, you get to work on other issues” (05072012). There is almost a sense of a progression. Mainstream media initially pigeonhole Roma as Romani journalists who thus need to be assigned “Romani stories.” The goal is to minimize this distinction—which is assumed to decrease the status of Romani journalist in the eyes of the larger journalistic field in the region (Beckman, 01072013; Cox, 12172012, 05242013; Loza, 03052012, 06052013).

The Romani journalism training programs are skills-based trainings that enable journalists (almost always working in teams comprised of Roma and non-Roma) to produce “good-quality Romani content.” The trainings are usually seven- to ten-days and are focused on preparing participants to use the hardware, going out into the field, editing video, and synching audio (Dervišbegović, 06052013; Transitions, 2013). It was assumed by nearly all the journalism trainers that by providing the participants with the technical skills needed, a good and persuasive story would emerge; identifying and catering to one’s specific audience was seen as nearly irrelevant. When pressed on this point, many of those I interviewed appeared impatient with questions about audience: We’re just training them to be good journalists! (Beckman, 05242013;
Loza, 0162012, 06052013). The audience for such media pieces was often assumed to be “everyone” or “the general public” (Loza, personal communication, December 28, 2013). But if the goal is to change opinions in order to change how Roma are perceived and treated, then what knowledge and perspectives do journalists assume *audiences* bring to a piece—and how does this affects the way stories are framed?

In every interview I conducted with journalism trainers, I asked, “What is a journalist?” The answers were rich and varied but often included answers such as, “to inform and educate,” a “messenger,” or the “eyes and ears of the public.” I would then ask what, if anything, distinguishes a Romani journalist from a non-Romani journalist. The initial response was typically that, ideally, there was no distinction at all: “A journalist is a journalist.” There would perhaps be some caveats about Romani language or what media outlet the person works for, but, at least at the beginning of the conversation, no distinction was made between a journalist who is Roma and a journalist who is not Roma. To make that distinction was to take away from the Romani journalist’s professional identity as a journalist.

However, after we had established that Romani journalists should not have to cover *only* Romani issues and that, even if they came from a lower socio-economic or educational background, Romani journalists were just as capable of learning journalistic and technical skills as anyone else, these same journalists and journalism trainers would start discussing how Romani journalists had better access to stories and people, and that this actually made them better journalists when covering Romani issues. They would know what questions to ask and could better understand what was being said and what was not being said. They would be able to look for and possibly get the unique angle that makes a good journalist a great journalist. Even Tihomir Loza, who had been quite insistent that there was no distinction between Romani and
non-Romani journalists, explained it this way:

We are not really encouraging journalists of Romani origin to only cover Roma issues, but there is an advantage if you are a journalist and you cover an issue you know a lot about because you know the language and cultural and social norms. But you shouldn’t be limited to those issues. Just like a journalist in Finland covers Finnish affairs but they shouldn’t be made to only cover Finnish affairs (03052012).

Petrit Saracini explained it by drawing a map of Shuto Orizari, the largest Romani mahaala (neighborhood) in Europe. When most journalists are assigned to cover Shuto Orizari, they walk to the main street, stop, talk to some people, see what is happening, and walk out with a story; a Romani journalist, by contrast, would know the side streets, the shop owners, and the people in the bazaar and would be able to get better, richer, and more nuanced stories (05072013). The goal is to then reach the major news channels so that non-Romani viewers can see these rich stories. The skills and background to which Loza refers—language, cultural context, familiarity with persons and institutions, and nuance—are assumed to be part of the Romani journalist’s existing toolkit (Loza, personal communication, December 28, 2013). They are not specifically cultivated or taught in the journalism training. Nedim Dervišbegović, a journalist for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and one of the trainers for Transitions’ Advancing Romani Visibility Project, explained his approach this way:

Your role is as a Roma journalist, or a journalist working for Roma media or any other media reporting on Roma issues. If you are a journalist, you have developed, or you should have developed, a sense of your news judgments and journalistic skills [as well as] other story selection skills—what is important, what is not, how to explain this situation, and so on…these are the basics (05242013). Over and over again I was told that priorities in the trainings were to create the best piece possible with the highest technical skill. There was “no time” for discussing more “philosophical questions” like audience or perspective (Cox, 05132013; Dervišbegović, 05242013, 06052013; Loza, 04162012). This is an important distinction from the training of Saami journalists, as will
be seen in Chapter 5, as well as from the cohort structure that was developed in the Roma Mainstream Media Internship Program. No longer was the goal to cultivate Romani journalists as Romani journalists but rather “just journalists.”

**Conclusion**

“Yes, creating specialized programs and opportunities for journalists of Romani background can be seen as activism, but it can also be seen as conducting good professional journalism. Because good professional journalism brings public interest issues to the broadest public possible. If that means readjusting the balance (by having specific projects for producing good-quality Romani content), so be it.”

– Marie Struthers, senior program officer for the OSF Network Media Program

The skills of fact checking, searching for multiple perspectives, creating good story arcs and compelling characters, and technical craftsmanship are universally upheld as the hallmarks of “good” journalism. As Struthers explained, this is what makes a journalistic piece credible as journalism (02292012). Good journalism creates an attractive and accurate story that “decent-minded people who want to be informed and educated about the reality” find compelling and interesting (Jordan). As Jankovic explained, Romani journalism also has another role—to change how non-Roma audiences perceive Roma and thus (it is hoped) to change how Roma are treated by non-Romani people and institutions. As I discuss in more detail in Chapter 6, those interviewed made a direct connection between representation within the media, production of the media, and larger social and political structures (Fairclough, 1992). The goal is to provide “good-quality content” to the largest possible audience, which means content that challenges prejudice and stereotypes, provides other tropes and possibilities, and thus strengthens democracy, tolerance, and debate within the local, national, and transnational societies.

From the mid- to late 1990s through the mid-2000s, the OSF invested in Romani media outlets and Romani training programs. The goal was to create Romani media based on the
minority media model common throughout Europe but without the political will and pressure often exercised by an “external homeland” (Brubaker, 1996; Gross & Spaskovska, 2011). Most of the training programs were evaluated as successes, but the Romani media outlets themselves were not (Lange, 2006). Now, a cadre of more and more highly skilled Romani journalists (and non-Romani journalists with a particular interest in Romani issues) exists, but funding for the stories these journalists produce is, and has been, drying up. Journalism as a field is struggling, and journalism within Central and Eastern Europe is facing the competing pressures of increased politicization, media restrictions, and capitalism run amok. Journalists are losing their jobs, and a journalist without a place to run his or her work is not a working journalist. As Ilona Moricz explained:

Opportunities are different now than they were five to 10 years ago. Even talents who are already there cannot easily show themselves. But without a job you certainly cannot show your talent. You cannot write for yourself—you need a job.

[Long pause]

One of our graduates recently went to work for the unemployment office—at least there she has a job for living. And when she has the time, she writes for Sosinet.hu (03022012).

From grant applications written since 2009, it is evident that a new trend is emerging: media platforms are built into the training program schemes (Transitions, 2009, 2010). This enables the participants to have an outlet and develop a portfolio while also exposing the content to a real audience (and, ideally, generating discussion). In addition, because of EU funds and the push towards more online journalism, programs have become increasingly transnational since 2005 in terms of both content and the composition of participants. However, as noted above, the outlets are not financially self-sustaining, and neither the states nor the EU have the political will to ensure sustained journalism and journalistic outlets. Both journalists and editors must be paid. As
noted earlier in this chapter, there is a stigma attached to journalism reliant on donors, and yet without consistent and non-partisan public funds, “public service journalism” is deemed “unsustainable” and thus not viable (Dekic; Jovanović; Loza, personal communication, December 28, 2013; Moricz, 03202013; 03212013). Without funds there is no new content except for what people are willing to do for free (Loza, 06052013).

Romani issues are increasingly subject to “European” framing, which can be both strategic and problematic. There is cachet in securing international cooperation and distribution. However, the local press is often more extreme than the national or international press (Sobotka & Vermeersch, 2012). Examples include the coverage of the now-infamous wall dividing the Roma and non-Roma neighborhoods of Usti and Labem in the Czech Republic and the coverage of segregated schooling in Hungary and Bulgaria. Whereas the national media was critical of these moves, the local press fanned the flame of racism. Although there have been some moves to try to bring Romani stories, if not Romani media, back to the local level, these initiatives are more difficult to justify to funders than larger, “splashier,” and much better funded, internationally focused (English-language) projects (Jovanović; Moricz, 05212013; Rethy).

Donors and Romani journalists have different ideas of what it can mean to be a “good” Romani journalist. My research shows that the overwhelming current (although not uniform) trend is to see a good Romani journalist as someone with excellent technical and journalistic training who happens to be Romani, rather than someone trained to pursue a story from a Romani perspective (Dervišbegović; 05242013; Jordan; Moricz, 03212013; Waisbord, 2013). It is important to note this is not how it has always been in the nascent world of Romani media. This is a response to (and perhaps fuelling) the social and political realities of where Roma fit within the countries of Europe and within the evolving idea of Europe.
How are Roma negotiating a transnational identity and framing their socio-political realities within, between, and across borders? The strategy that has gained the most prestige at this time is to have Romani voices, perspectives, and realities seen and recognized as equals by the non-Romani population. Therefore, the targeted audience is increasingly non-Romani people both within the state and across Europe. According to the donors funding such media, it is the non-Romani population that must be educated through media, as that is where the power for change is assumed to lie. This model of transnational political advocacy supported by donors has become increasingly Europeanized and is strikingly different from the case of Saami journalism, which advocates for media as a form of nation building and an exercise in self-determination, as shown in the next chapter.

As Lange pointed out in his 2006 assessment, there is no push to create a “Romani framework” or “model” of journalism. While Lange saw this as a failure of Romani media, it appears that he was applying a “national minority media” frame, which is inappropriate for Romani media. Roma do not have an “external homeland” protecting them, and their political goals and strategies must operate in the transnational and domestic realm, where the media can be a powerful tool. At the same time, there is risk in over-Europeanizing the approach so that the audience, and journalism, become geared towards “everyone.” In this process, Roma once again risk becoming marginalized and excluded.
Chapter 5 — “You are thinking from Sápmi, not Oslo!”: Building and Serving the Nation through Saami Journalism

“It takes time to understand that nothing is neutral. It takes a long time for [the students] to understand that the Norwegian media is not neutral either. It’s hard for them to understand that the Saami society and the Norwegian society are equal. It used to be that when a person wanted to be a fine man, to wear fine dress, he would take off his Saami clothes and put on Norwegian clothes. There was this belief that the Norwegian clothes were better than the Saami clothes...

[SP: And how does this reflect in Saami journalism?] Just the fundamental idea that Saami journalism is equal to non-Saami journalism. And that no one is neutral.”

– Arne Johansen Ijual, co-director of the Journalism Program at Sámi allaskuvla

On November 8 and 9, 2011, as the sun was about to set for the winter, 13 Saami journalists, journalism instructors, media executives, and “veterans” of the Saami movement came together in Guovdageaidnu/Kautokeino to discuss the role of media in the larger project of Saami determination. What resulted was a spirited discussion that pointed to both the unfolding understandings of self-determination and the larger conversation of the role of media, specifically Saami media, in covering and framing these conversations. There were many opinions, at times disagreements, and no clear-cut answers. The meeting was internal, and I was not able to participate, but I was informed about it from numerous sources. However, 18 months later, a summary of this discussion, an analysis of its implications, and a full list of participants were published in English on the website for Galdu, the Resource Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This level of transparency speaks to what appears to be the three main goals of Saami journalism: nation building, “facilitating the debate within society,” and developing and
maintaining professional journalistic standards. This chapter examines how these goals of Saami journalism, which I argue are both shaped by and reflective of larger socio-political realities, are taught to the next generation of Saami journalists.

Based on conversations with journalism educators and people in positions of power in various Saami institutions, I have identified five key considerations in producing and teaching Saami journalism, which may at times be in tension with the norms of mainstream journalism\(^{60}\):

1. language choices;
2. topic selection (what is deemed important to the presumed audiences);
3. journalists and editors’ assumptions about the audience’s cultural knowledge and familiarity (referred to by those interviewed as the “starting point” of the audience and of the journalist);
4. how to create news that grabs the audience’s attention without harming the community\(^{61}\);
5. journalistic ethics in a small, often interrelated society.

Saami media, which are often expressed as a manifestation of the Indigenous right to self-determination, are also inherently tied to the larger socio-economic and political norms of professional journalism, the state educational system, and the Nordic models of public access to media and social democratic governance. These different institutions and values can create a more nuanced media but can also cause tension in articulating the role and practice of journalism and the training of the next generation of journalists. It is for this reason that I reference them as both considerations and tensions. These tensions have informed many conversations taking place in curricular, political, and policy circles as well as “on the ground” within both mainstream and

---

\(^{60}\) In Chapter 6 I compare how these considerations affect Saami and Romani journalism programs.

\(^{61}\) Media that is created to grab audience’s attention is referred to in Nordic media as “tabloid” but that word does not have the same connotations as North American press (celebrity gossip, alien landings etc.)
more specialized, including Indigenous, journalism institutions (Browne, 1996; El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002b; Hackett & Zhao, 1998; Markelin, 2003; Markelin & Husband, 2007; Pietikäinen, 2003, 2008a; Solbakk, 2006a; Wilson & Stewart, 2008). They have also led to new, unique media institutions and programming.

For example, in 2008, nine directors of Indigenous television sections/channels came together to create the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Network (WITBN) (Påve; field notes, March 25, 2012). The goal of the network is to create a space for the sharing and co-production of Indigenous media content. Every two years, the network directors and key staff get together for a face-to-face conference to enable skill sharing and networking. The theme for the third World Indigenous Television Networking Conference, hosted by The Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation—Sápmi (NRK Sápmi) and Sámi University College in 2012, was “Developing Indigenous Journalism”; the aim was to explore these issues through both academic and practical lenses.

Another example of the ongoing, unfolding conversation on what constitutes “Saami journalism” can be seen in the curriculum created for the Master of Arts in Indigenous Journalism being put forth by Sámi allaskuvla (Sámi University College). The MA curriculum was approved by the Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (the body that approves accreditation of new university programs throughout Norway). With a projected start date of September 2014, the program will be the first of its kind in the world. The student body is expected to be at least half Saami, but the University College also hopes to recruit other Indigenous journalists so the students can learn from each other’s experiences.\(^62\) Mandatory coursework includes two classes that directly address the evolving definitions of Indigenous

journalism and the Indigenous journalist: “What is Indigenous Journalism” and “Ethics, Law and Professional Identity” (Sámi allaskuvala, 2011). The content of the curriculum is yet another example of how the tensions of nation building and the norms of professional journalism are both constitutive of the journalism education process. The curriculum identifies a “gap” between “what is” and the “what ought to be” in media performance and explores the individual Indigenous journalist’s professional practice. The goal is for such self-reflexivity to potentially lead to “changing professional norms of journalistic production” (Sámi allaskuvala, 2011, p. 23).

Throughout this chapter, I illustrate how various institutions of Saami journalism and Saami journalism education attempt to develop and teach these standards to the next generation of journalists. Unlike Romani media training, Saami journalism education primarily occurs in two places: on the job with other working journalists or through formal journalism training, including at Sámi allaskuvala, where students can currently receive a BA in journalism taught in Saami language. I argue that both forms of education are shaped by the five considerations noted above. Saami journalism and journalism education are shaped by and engaged with the larger socio-political contexts of Saami realities as an Indigenous people living in the rural areas of prosperous countries creating media within, between, and across borders.

**Media Context Within the Nordic Public Service Model**

Journalism is recognized and promoted as an important function, indeed a public service, throughout all the Nordic countries (Losifidis & Steemers, 2005; Salokangas, Schwoch, & Virtapohja, 1997). The state guarantees and funds media based on the premise that they provide the service of informing, building, and entertaining the (implicitly singular) nation for the purpose of facilitating a self-governing democracy. Both within the law and in social practice,
Saami media are recognized as a right within the Nordic countries and to some extent in Russia (Graham, 2010; Haetta, 2013). The states have assumed financial responsibility and all Saami media are dependent on state support either by being a part of a public media outlet or by receiving direct and substantial subsidies (Markelin, 2003).63

Without being prompted, all of my interviewees consistently reiterated that all Saami media are financially dependent on the state. Although they were aware that state funding creates limitations, they also saw it as a continuation of the state’s responsibility to financially support media that entertain and educate. According to those interviewed, access to consistent quality programming in Saami language is both a right for and a service to the Saami people and majority population, if not the larger world. As RK, a Saami journalist for NRK-Sápmi explained, “You cannot underestimate the tradition of broadcasting in the Nordic countries; without the public broadcasting corporation [the Saami division], Saami journalism, as we know it, would not exist.”64 Unlike the case of Romani media, it was rare for people to raise concerns about the sustainability of state funding. The majority of those interviewed saw the funding of NRK-Sápmi (and SR/SVT and Yle Sápmi) and the press subsidies of Avvir and Ságat as the state accepting its legal and moral responsibility to ensure, support, and develop the media of its Indigenous people, as it would any other form of public broadcasting (Browne, 1996; Graham, 2010; Markelin, 2003; Markelin & Husband, 2007). Some, like Torkel Rasmussen (a former journalist and head of the journalism program at Sámi allaskuvla) and John T. Solbakk (a media historian and publisher) bemoaned what they considered a lost opportunity to create a financially

---

63 The Norwegian, Finnish, and Swedish states all support Saami language radio and television on their public broadcasting channels, and the Norwegian state provides financial subsidies to the two daily Saami newspapers, one of which is written in Norwegian (Ságat) and the other in Saami (Avvir), and both of which have a printed circulation of under 3,000.

64 RK and PS both agreed to be quoted but asked to remain anonymous.
independent, pan-Sápmi media outlet, but they were by far the minority.

As a person from United States who was raised with the idea that the separation of the press and the state is sacrosanct, what was perhaps more striking for me was the lack of discussion about the possibility that state dependence might lead to cooptation of the Saami movement. When I pushed the discussion, some people, such as Solbakk and Ande Somby65 (and other people who could be seen as “veterans” of the Saami movement), spoke about the possible co-optive potential. Others, although aware of the issue, responded in a very pragmatic matter. As Katri Somby explained:

I spent 10 years working in NRK-Sápmi. There were five or six people working in NRK in the 1980s and now there are 70–80 people. It’s like the BBC having its own Indigenous branch. It’s a frontrunner in Saami media. Some people would say it’s not Saami self-determination, but after working there for 10 years I have to say I don’t know where else we would go…we have a foot in the biggest media in the world, economically and politically.

As I have explored in other work, it appears that state support, which enables a financially solid, consistent form of media, may actually be a form of self-determination (Plaut, 2014). This differs greatly from the model of constantly struggling grant-based projects seen in the funding of Romani media projects. The question raised is: What are the implications for the transnational identity of Saami people and their framing of socio-political realities across borders when relying on the state system for funding, infrastructure, and airwaves? Does such consistent financial support enhance the potential for transnational mobilization or does it dampen its potential? Is it a situation where the “soft rights” of culture and language placate the possibility of advocating for the “hard rights” of economic and political self-determination? Or can journalists, if they can concentrate on journalism and are not constantly struggling, actually do their job and “facilitate a

---

65 As four of the people whom I interviewed have the last name Somby, I refer to them using either full names or first names to avoid confusion.
debate” within society and thus provide the information and framing that enables change to take place?

Who and What are Saami, Saami Media Outlets, and Saami Journalism?

An estimated 70,000 Saami live in the territory that is currently known as Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and the Kola Peninsula of Russia; the area is called “Sápmi” in Saami language. Of the approximately 70,000 Saami, approximately 30,000 speak one of the nine Saami languages. Figure 5.1 is a map of Sápmi. The different colors represent the distribution of different Saami languages, and the checkered areas show the traditional reindeer patterns of migration. Many of these languages are not mutually understandable, and some are nearing extinction. What the map fails to show is the very large Saami populations in Oslo, Helsinki, and Stockholm. The Saami broadcasting arms all recognize this reality, and all ensure that their radio (if not television) programs can be accessed in the capital cities (Eira; Näkkäläjärvi; NRK-Sápmi, 2010). The most commonly spoken Saami language is “North Saami,” which is represented in dark green on the map; unless otherwise noted, when I use the term “Saami language,” I am referring to North Saami (Fjellheim; Solbakk, 2006a; Lehtola, 2004; Magga).

---

66 Sápmi as a unified region existed for the Saami before the creation of modern states. Thus, when Saami refer to the countries (or activities taking place in the countries) that are now in Sápmi, they refer to “sides,” that is, Saami on the Norwegian side of Sápmi have different rules for reindeer herding than those on the Finnish side. I follow that usage in my work as well.
The definition of who is Saami is based on both subjective and objective criteria. Norway, Finland, and Russia recognize Saami as an Indigenous population; Sweden classifies Saami as original inhabitants with special rights but does not use the term “Indigenous” in its constitution. Only Norway is a signatory to International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 169, which lists detailed rights but does not specifically mention the right of self-determination as articulated in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Grote, 2007; Henriksen, 2009, 2011). There is a long and painful history of colonization in all four

---

67 ILO 169 is a legally binding treaty that codifies the minimum standard of rights for Indigenous peoples, including language and other cultural rights as well as the need for consultation on any issues that may directly affect them (development, resource extraction, etc.), to ensure “free, prior and informed consent.” The declaration states, “The spirit of consultation and participation constitutes the cornerstone of Convention No. 169 on which all its provisions are based. The Convention requires indigenous and tribal peoples to be consulted on issues that affect them. It also requires that these peoples are able to engage in free, prior and informed participation in policy and
countries, which has had a drastic effect on the socio-economic conditions and the sense of cultural worth among the Saami. Although a “Saami revival” began in the 1970s, as can be seen from the Ijäs quote at the opening of the chapter, the idea of being a “fine man” is often internalized as subsuming one’s Saami identity: to be a “fine man,” one had to take off one’s Saami clothes. Thus, according to my interviewees, for many generations Saami would try to “pass” as a member of the majority society and/or deny their Saami origins. Thus, the notion of “Saami identity” is evolving.

There is an elected representative body for Saami people in the Norwegian, Finnish, and Swedish sides of Sápmi.68 A person is eligible to vote in the elections for the Saami Parliament if one of his or her parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents spoke Saami as a first language and if that person feels he or she is Saami.69 The rationale behind this decision is partially based on the forced linguistic and cultural assimilation policy targeting Saami in all four countries, especially Norway.70 The definition of “Saami-ness” can, of course, also lead to interesting situations in which some members of some families are registered as Saami and vote in Saami Parliamentary elections but their siblings are and do not.71

---

68 There are Saami Parliaments in Sweden, Finland, and Norway. At this time, the Saami on the Russian side do not have a Saami Parliament, although there are ongoing discussions to start one with or without Kremlin permission. In addition, the Saami Parliamentary Council brings together the Saami Parliaments of all three countries and representatives from the Russian side and the Saami Council (as observers) to discuss cross-border Saami issues (Fjellheim). “The Sámí Parliamentary Council came into being because the Sámí Parliaments saw the need for a close cooperation across national borders at a parliamentary level, since many types of affairs touch the Sámí people as a whole. The objective is that those elected by popular vote can, through such a council cooperate and coordinate Sámí points of view in matters of common interest and in current Nordic and international issues” (Solbakk, 2006a, p. 243).

69 For more information on the discussions that helped solidify this definition, see Ahren et al. (2008).

70 The policy in Norway, for which the Norwegian government formally apologized in the 1980s, was referred to as the Norwegianization policy. For more information on the effect this has had on language, see Kangas-Skutnabb & Dubar (2010).

71 The 2009 film Suddenly Saami by Ellen-Astri Lundby offers a very compelling narrative illustrating this situation.
History of Saami Journalism

Self-identified “Saami media” began in 1873, when the newspaper *Muitalægje* launched, followed by the more famous *Nuorttanaste* in 1898 (Somby, 2009). That said, radio and, more recently, television, rather than written publications, have become the cornerstones of Saami media. Quite quickly after the end of World War II, Saami language was present on the radio. The Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation (NRK) began broadcasting Saami news in 1946, and Finnish public broadcasting (Yle) followed suit a year later. Swedish radio (SVR) has had Saami programming since 1953. In 1992, Saami Radio (now NRK-Sápmi) was founded as its own division of NRK; it boasts seven regional offices. The head of NRK-Sápmi reports directly to the director general of NRK.

Presently, Saami media comprise television, radio, newspaper, and online content. Each country in Sápmi, with the exception of Russia, produces Saami language radio and television content through the publically funded broadcasting network. The various public broadcasters also participate in program/file sharing across state borders (NRK-Sápmi, 2010). Although the language of transmission is primarily North Saami, each radio station makes a concerted effort to have programming in other Saami languages. Only Yle Sápmi has its own radio station (in Ánar/Inari); the Swedish and Norwegian programming runs on the main channel in both countries but is available only in certain areas although more radio content is available online.

Two newspapers are printed and distributed five days a week: *Avvir* (in Saami language)

---

72 Although personally run Web pages exist and social media use is quite common (later in this piece I discuss a film about Saami reindeer herders using Facebook—*Viddas Facebookgutter* by “Anything,” 2011), in this section, I only review online content formally connected to a media institution.

73 In 2002, with the support of the Saami Council, NRK-Sápmi engaged in a three-year project to create a Saami radio station on the Russian side of Sápmi. Many of the most senior and respected Saami journalists (such as Liv Inger Somby) were engaged in that program. Unfortunately, the radio station was not sustainable. However, many of those Saami journalists continue to contribute to Saami media throughout Sápmi, and there is now an Internet radio station broadcasting out of the Kola (Eira 05252011; Rasmussen, L. I. Somby).
and *Ságat* (in Norwegian). Both are printed on the Norwegian side of Sápmi. Additional publications come out less frequently, including a magazine focused on Saami women and a Christian periodical, both of which are in Norwegian, as well as *Samefolket* from the Swedish side of Sápmi, which is written in Swedish (Berg-Nordlie, 2011; Solbakk, 2006a, pp. 174–175; Somby, 2009). Starting in 2013, the largest newspaper in Northern Finland *Lapin Kansa*, began publishing a Saami-language insert (*Näkkäläjärvi*). The online presence is linguistically mixed: NRK-Sápmi’s website is primarily in Norwegian, and SVR Sámiradion’s website is in Swedish, but Yle Sápmi’s website is primarily in Saami language with increasing amounts of Finnish. Yle Sápmi is also unique in that it is the only online source of news in Skolt Saami and Inari Saami (two Saami languages that are unique and struggling for revitalization).
Table 5.1 Saami Media Outlets and Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of media outlet</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Head of the outlet (at time of research)</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Transnational content/initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avvir</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Sara Beate Eira (has since taken leave)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.avvir.no/">http://www.avvir.no/</a></td>
<td>Has freelancers in every country in Sápmi, including Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ságat</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Geir Wulff</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sagat.no/">http://www.sagat.no/</a></td>
<td>Primarily focused on the Norwegian side of Sápmi, especially Sea Saami issues. Has taken an active role in covering issues throughout Sápmi, particularly in its editorial pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yle Sápmi</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Radio, online, some TV programming</td>
<td>(As of October 2012) Pirita Näkkäläjärvi</td>
<td><a href="http://yle.fi/uutiset/S%C3%A1pmi/">http://yle.fi/uutiset/Sápmi/</a></td>
<td>Contributes to and broadcasts Oddasat; associate member of the WITBN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of media outlet</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Head of the outlet (at time of research)</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Transnational content/initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVT</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Per Johannes Marainen</td>
<td><a href="http://www.svtplay.se/oddasat">http://www.svtplay.se/oddasat</a></td>
<td>Contributes to and broadcasts Oddasat; associate member of the WITBN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samefolket</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Magazine, online magazine</td>
<td>Catherine Hälgren</td>
<td><a href="http://www.samefolket.se">http://www.samefolket.se</a></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Network (WITBN)</td>
<td>Online presence</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Currently Nils Johan Haetta, changes every two years</td>
<td><a href="http://www.witbn.org">http://www.witbn.org</a></td>
<td>Produces <em>Indigenous Insight</em>—a show tackling one theme from a variety of Indigenous contexts that is distributed and broadcast to all its members; engaged in file sharing of other shows. NRK-Sápmi is a founding member; SVT and Yle are associate members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galdu</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Janne Hansen was acting director at the time of research, now Laila Susanne Vars</td>
<td><a href="http://www.galdu.org">http://www.galdu.org</a></td>
<td>Covers Indigenous issues worldwide; produces the policy/academic journal <em>Gáldu Cåla</em>. Publications are often translated into English to ensure a wider audience; certain stories are only available in Saami.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although all Saami media outlets are explicit that their primary audience is Saami, non-Saami do consume Saami media, especially TV broadcasts, which are all subtitled in the state language.

Every weekday, a 15-minute television news program (Oddasat) is broadcast across Sápmi (those on the Russian side can pick it up from NRK-Sápmi) in Saami language and subtitled in the majority language of the state. Journalists from TV stations across Sápmi contribute material, but the program is cut and edited at NRK-Sápmi headquarters in Kárášjohka/Karasjok. Although there are only 70,000 Saami, according to the director and deputy director of NRK-Sápmi, Oddasat averages 300,000 viewers daily. This suggests that at least three-quarters of those watching do not identify as Saami (Haetta; Valio).

Unlike Roma interviewees nearly all of those interviewed identified “Saami media” as media aiming to address a Saami audience in their local communities, and across Sápmi, rather than Saami journalists working to produce content to inform a non-Saami audience. This definition is consistent with Saami journalism curricula (Sámi allaskuvla, 2008, 2011), the historical policy documents that established these media outlets (NRK-Sápmi, 2010), and the Galdu report summarizing the 2011 workshop referenced at the beginning of this chapter (Henriksen, 2011). In fact, the official NRK-Sápmi brochure (English version) states:

> Through its programme policy Sámi radio will activate an inherent wish among the Sámi People throughout to live and act in Sámi ways. Likewise Sámi Radio must generate greater knowledge inside the populations of Norway about matters [concerning] Sámi and Sámi people, their culture and society (p. 1).

Many have argued that by having “their own media,” Saami are better able to serve their nation in cultivating and developing the desire and the knowledge to “live in Saami ways.” Thus, although much attention is paid to content, the sheer existence of Saami media is seen as an

---

74 According to Valio and Näkkäläjärvi, at the end of 2013, NRK-Sápmi and Yle Sápmi began broadcasting five-minute segments about news taking place on the Norwegian and Finnish sides of Sápmi, respectively, to be broadcast nationally.
enactment of self-determination. This is an important distinction from Romani media, which, as discussed in Chapter 4, have seen a shift away from Romani-specific media outlets to Romani content aired for a non-Romani audience.

**Understanding the Saami within the Larger Indigenous Movement**

Saami have played and continue to play a leading role within the global movement for Indigenous rights. Partially due to the financial advantage of living in the affluent and peaceful Nordic states, the Saami have been able to build up international, regional, and local structures and systems that work for their own communities, other Indigenous nations, and Indigenous movement worldwide (Fjellheim; Lam, 2006; Plaut, 2012a; Sanders, 1980; Wilmer, 1993, pp. 2, 18–19). Along with other Indigenous peoples, most notably the Maori and the Inuit, Saami played a founding role in the World Council of Indigenous People, The Arctic Council, the United Nations Permanent Forum for the Rights of Indigenous People (they were also active participants in drafting the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples), and the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Network (Sanders, 1980; Wilmer, 1993, pp. 2, 138). The Saami Parliament system and the Draft Saami Nordic Convention, which places Saami Parliaments in direct conversation with governments of nation-states, is a model of self-determination admired by many other transnational Indigenous peoples (Ahren, Scheinin, & Henriksen, 2007). The Saami are well aware that their experiences can serve to support other Indigenous communities but that each Indigenous community needs to develop its own models of resistance, accommodation, and governance based on its own needs (Sámi allaskuvla, 2011, p. 3; Henriksen, 2011, Chapter 3). As I have noted in previous work, there is a politics of “cooperation without co-optation” among Arctic Indigenous communities (Plaut, 2012a). Like
Inuit diplomacy, Saami politics are rarely centered on confrontation; rather, there is an attempt to accommodate, cooperate, and legislate, and then build systems that work smoothly (Abele & Rodon, 2007; Solbakk, 2006a; Henriksen, 2008).

The Nordic model of democratic socialism also provides an environment in which a more centralized form of governance and funding is recognized as normal and unproblematic, as long as the governance is by the Saami from Sápmi rather than those from Oslo, Stockholm, Helsinki, or Moscow (Fjellheim). This is in stark contrast with Romani political advocacy, which sees competing parties and NGOs vie for the attention spans and resources in “a competitive marketplace” (Bob, 2005) of causes and funding.

**The Role of Saami Language**

The issue of language is sensitive because, although there are no official statistics, it is believed that less than half of the Saami population on the Norwegian side of Sápmi (where the language is considered the strongest) speaks Saami, and less than 10,000 read and write Saami (Berg-Nordlie, 2011; Gaski, 1997; Lehtola, 2004; Solbakk, 2006a; K. Somby). Nonetheless, the use of Saami language in journalistic practice continues to influence how media makers, managers, and editors identify *Saami* media (Pietikäinen, 2008b, p. 186).

Several scholars (Browne, 1996; Fraser, 1991, 2007; Graham, 2010; Kelly, 2011; Rasmussen, 1999) have written about marginalized peoples’ production and circulation of media and the relationship between such media and socio-political change. Some of these media makers self-identify as Indigenous, ethnic minorities, linguistic minorities, and/or part of a sub-/counter culture. For Indigenous peoples, and to some extent other national and ethnic minorities (particularly in Europe), much of the conversation has revolved around the relationship between
media and language based on the assumptions that (a) media both preserves and develops minority languages, and (b) language is a cornerstone of protecting, preserving, and promoting culture (Donders, 2002; Kymlicka, 1995; Magga). Of course, the state (colonizing) language has become the first language for many Indigenous peoples. Thus, Indigenous languages are not used in media to ensure communication per se, but as a means of teaching the language (to children and adults) and as a source of pride (Browne, 1996; Graham, 2010; Wilson & Stewart, 2008). One interviewee who preferred to remain anonymous recalled that the first time his mother heard Saami on the radio, she stopped washing the dishes, looked up, cocked her head and said “Oh! Our language can be used here, too!”

Those interviewed recognized that preserving and nurturing Saami language may not, and perhaps should not, be the explicit goal of Saami media because other institutions have been established specifically for this goal. As Sara Beate Eira, editor of Avvir, the only daily Saami language paper, explained, “[i]t’s not our official role to keep the language alive, but we’re doing it by our sheer existence” (05252011). In fact, many of the arguments by those involved in Saami media production and journalism education drew parallels between the goals of Saami media and the language policies of other Saami institutions, arguing that where the use of Saami language becomes the norm, a Saami worldview becomes normalized and, in turn, valued as equal to that of the majority society (Magga; Solbakk; A. Somby; Pedersen).

Quite a few journalists who identify as Saami do not work in Saami language, including people I interviewed for this project. Some work for Saami media outlets, including Ságat.

---

75 Knowing and using one’s “mother tongue” is a right enshrined in various international and regional treaties such as the European Convention on the Rights of Minority Languages, the Convention on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, and the Convention on the Right of the Child. The right to media in one’s language is specifically mentioned in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Graham, 2010; Markelin, 2003; Rasmussen).
written in Norwegian, whereas others work for non-Saami media outlets. Thus it was a bit puzzling that interviewees, even those who work in non-Saami languages, almost always assumed that by Saami media I meant *Saami-language* media. In other words, it seemed much easier to identify *Saami-language* media than to articulate (a singular) Saami *perspective* within a media story or media outlet. This assumption is telling because when asked directly if one needs to use Saami language in order to be considered a Saami journalist, nearly all those interviewed said no. They were quick to clarify that “Saami media” involved issues surrounding ownership, perspective, story selection, and editorial control, as well as an assumption of audience.

Another key point emerged—what was often referred to as the journalist’s, and audience’s, “starting point”: the lens through which the story is both cast and consumed. This can help explain why journalists working for Ságat are considered Saami journalists, and why, regardless of ethnicity, the majority of people tuning in to Oddasat are non-Saami speaking. Saami stories are assumed to differ from those of the majority society in content, framing, and access. But there is still work to do to better understand what it is about the “starting point” that helps shape the media content—in terms of the stories selected and how they are presented. In other words, how can one cultivate and practice a Saami starting point, or what Sandra Harding (1993) might refer to as a “standpoint,” while working both within and outside of the language?

**Media as a Form of Self-Determination: Nation Building, “Watchdogging” and Facilitating “Debate within Society”**

One of the ways in which media are seen as serving the Saami community is by enacting many of the “traditional” roles of media, such as keeping an eye on people and institutions of
power (“watchdog journalism”) and unearthing issues (“investigative journalism”) to highlight opportunities for change. As Stein Svala, a veteran journalist who now works for Ságat, but has previously worked for both Saami and non-Saami media outlets worldwide, explained, “We are very sensitive to misuse of power among our own. Money. Public money. Typical watchdog issues of journalism.”

Not wanting to presume my own North American definitions and assumptions of journalism, the first question I asked those interviewed – as I did with those involved in Romani journalism – was, “What is a journalist?” The response was surprisingly uniform: a person who helps inform the people as a form of public service about the debate within society. Society in this case means Saami society, but not only within Sápmi—Oslo, Helsinki, Stockholm, and the rest of the world get quite a bit of coverage. This is in line with Silvio Waisbord’s (2013) understanding of journalism as a public service (pp. 126–130). As Jan Gunnar Furuly, who identifies as Saami and writes for Aftenposten, one of Norway’s largest newspapers, explains, “A journalist should want to tell modern stories for your own people, and also, a journalist should have a motivation to change society. Something should be different after you run the story.”

Noble as Furuly’s ideals are, this process can become particularly complicated for a transnational, Indigenous minority within a state-funded media system. In trying to make sure something is different after the story runs, specifically what kind of change is sought, and for whom? Who are “your own people?” For whom are you reporting, and whom do you choose to investigate? How does this actually work in the world of professional journalism, which has so often promoted the distance between the journalist and the world as it is observed (Lippmann, 1920)? Ande Somby, a Saami law professor and veteran of the Saami movement, explains this need for balance as a kind of dance:
Saami media is in a very delicate position. On one hand, they need to serve the Saami population stories, and on the other hand they need to fulfill the role of media in general….Saami journalism has to relate to the fact that what they produce can be hurtful to the Saami society and used against you by the Norwegian society.

If we understand that “fulfill[ing] the role of media in general” can be understood as watchdog journalism, then this dance brings up an inherent tension identified by many interviewed. How does a Saami journalist “prove” his or her journalistic credentials, and by whose standards? Does being objective mean being against the Saami (S. Somby), or does it mean engaging in fact checking and the journalistic rigor of “critical media” (K. Somby)?

According to Ande Somby, too often there is an overeager desire to prove that Saami media are “real” media without necessarily examining what criteria are used to define and assess real media. There is also a fear that negative information/coverage can be used against Saami by those in power (both Saami and non-Saami), which Ande Somby referred to as a “bird shitting in its own nest.” An example of this can be seen in the very real problems facing overgrazing, leading to malnourishment and internal fights, in the reindeer herding community. I discuss this in greater detail towards the end of the chapter, but suffice to say that at times the fights over resources resulted in the tundra being referred to as “the Saami wild west,” including snowmobile shoot-outs and all. These are issues that warrant serious media coverage but can also result in sensationalism and accusations of Saami being incapable of regulating their own people and industry. All these issues are weighed carefully when deciding how to craft a media piece and for whom – how can this piece be helpful and how can it be used against the community? Ande illustrated the tensions by drawing out a diagram, which I have duplicated as Figure 5.2.
A bird shitting in its own nest

Thin/trivial media

“Resistance Radio”—a “soldier marching to his own cause” (activist media/propaganda)

CRITICAL MEDIA = not being that bird, that soldier or that thin media

Figure 5.2 Four Typologies and Tensions of Saami Media; designed by Ande Somby.

Like Furuly’s notion of media needing to create positive change in the society, Ande Somby suggests that Saami media should aim to be critical media, and he was not unique in this view. When asked what “good Saami media” look like, nearly all those interviewed (journalism educators as well as those working in Saami institutions) defined good media as putting “a critical eye on Saami society” and “airing the debate within society.” Steinar Pedersen, then rector of Sámi allaskuvla, explained that Saami journalists “are persons who are able to put a critical eye/focus on different parts of the Saami society where it is necessary to put critical questions. And without critical questions, no society will be able to develop.” An example of this “critical eye” can be seen in the next section which explores Galdu’s journalistic decisions in covering the contentious, multi-year negotiation between the Saami Parliament and the Norwegian government regarding Saami fishing rights.

Speaking Inside; Speaking Outside—The Example of Galdu’s Story on Fishing Rights

Although many people associate Saami with reindeer, in actuality only 10% make their living through reindeer herding. A much larger portion survives by farming and fishing. Those whose living is based on fishing are called “Sea-Saami.” In early spring 2011, the Saami
Parliament and the Norwegian government reached an agreement regarding the recognition, or lack of recognition, of historic water rights for Saami who make their livelihood from fishing.\footnote{For an in-depth review of the issue and the various ways it was framed within Northern Norway’s media, see Søreng (2008).} This was a contentious issue, as some Saami felt that the Saami Parliament compromised too much with the Norwegian government and failed to ensure that Saami had access to both traditional waterways and fish. The Galdu Resource Center for the Rights of Indigenous People (Galdu) was one organization heavily involved in covering and providing analysis of this issue. Galdu is a publically funded research and advocacy organization charged with being independent and non-political. According to Janne Hansen, then Galdu’s acting Director, one of the main ways it fulfills its mandate is through the production of accurate and timely news and analysis regarding issues concerning Saami and other Indigenous people.\footnote{For more information, see www.galdu.org}

Galdu had covered water rights issues for some time, both in its hard copy journal, \textit{Gáldu Čála}, and on its website. In addition, the director at the time, Magne Ove Varsi, had published numerous articles framing water rights as a human right in the Norwegian-language Saami newspaper, \textit{Ságat} (Hansen). When the fishing rights decision was to be announced, Galdu decided to send Silja Somby, an advisor for Galdu who is fluent in Saami, to cover the story and elaborate on its possible implications. When she arrived, Silja recalled, “Everyone said that they didn’t have high expectations going in, but it was obvious as the meeting progressed…It was obvious that the Saami were very, very sad.” It was obvious to Silja that this was “an injustice” that the majority society, and thus the majority media, would “want to bury.” Given this, she chose to write a feature piece about the meeting and the reaction to the meeting using evocative descriptions of how people were sitting and their facial expressions. Galdu does not normally run
feature pieces, but, ultimately, the organization decided to publish the story but to do so in Saami language only. Acting Director Janne Hansen explained,

The last article Silja has published in Saami we decided not to (translate)...We decided to just publish in Saami because it is a little bit...It's about the situation when they made the final decision on fishing rights...It was very tender. She was trying to show the emotions, not that people have, but what people show, and it was...Well, we decided to keep it internal information (My emphasis).

The question then arises: Why did Galdu staff feel it was advantageous to keep this “internal information?” As Søreng (2008) points out in his review of the public fishing rights debates that took place over 10 weeks in Nordlys (the largest newspaper in Northern Norway), it is important to note “the kinds of stories these stakeholders tell and the narratives they create about fishing rights” as a kind of strategy of seeking support from what they presume to be a supportive audience (pp. 81–82). Is this a strategic use of private space, as detailed by Nancy Fraser’s (1991) conceptualization of subaltern counter publics, or is it a case of Galdu not wanting to risk losing the financial support of the Norwegian government? Decisions about audience and framing are examples of the considerations and tensions discussed at the beginning of the chapter—what Ande Somby referred to as “the dance.” How much “disagreement” should be exposed to a larger—historically oppressive—public, and how much should be kept internal? What are the benefits to having a safe, “counter-public” in order to air such differences of opinion and strategy? How can this assist in developing both strategies of resistance and alternatives? And what role can journalism, and journalists, play in this process? As can be seen from this example, it is a dance that is ongoing.
The Role of the Media in Nation Building and the Reality of Multiple Audiences

There was not one common understanding of the role of media within Saami society. Although all agreed that media should keep an eye on those in power and “reflect the debate within [Saami] society,” there were differences in which powerbrokers should be getting the most scrutiny as well as understanding journalism’s place in nation building. At times, there were heated discussions, as some journalists, such as Jan Gunnar Furuly, saw nation building as incompatible with the watchdog or investigative journalism that is the “engine” and “fire” of “good journalism.” Other people, such as media historian and former NRK journalist Katri Somby, saw much more synergy between the two goals, noting:

You can build up the nation—your nation—by being critical. Only by having Saami journalism education and Saami journalists are you building up the nation. You need to be critical to society, to the system—you can bring positive stories, but you need to be critical too, and then sometimes you need to be critical of your own people. You need to have both. What does Saami society do wrong, and what does the majority society do wrong? It’s not about having Saami propaganda but a living culture—a true people, not an image. There needs to be debate to have a society that is vibrant, living, and evolving.

At the same time, it is recognized that “wisdom” is required when being critical: there are multiple audiences with inherently different levels of power, and, as discussed, being critical can be interpreted by those on “the outside” as being internally divided (A. Somby). At the 2011 workshop, Arne Johansen Ijäs, then-director of the Saami Journalism program at Sámi allaskuvla, was quoted as saying, “Saami media has [sic] a duty to both [be] contributing to the nation building and also being critical to what happens in the Sámi community…[and] through critical journalism, Saami media has actually contributed to strengthening the Saami community” (Henriksen, 2011, p. 41).78

---

78 Further on in the chapter I illustrate examples of how two different Saami journalists chose to cover a rash of suicides among reindeer herders, exposing social and economic pressures, even though public discussion of suicide was deemed taboo in both Saami society and Norwegian journalistic practice.
**A Saami Starting Point**

The Saami perspective is very much shaped by place. An example of this from outside journalism can be found at SIIDA, the Saami Museum in Ánar(Inari) on the Finnish side of Sápmi. One is greeted with an image of the planet—from the Northern perspective. This orients, or disorients, the guest to a different starting point from which to digest the information in the museum. Likewise, Liv Inger Somby—a senior journalist who has worked on the Norwegian, Swedish, and Russian sides of Sápmi, as well as in Oslo—drew a map of the North and explained, “most people in the south think that the Arctic is far away, but when one starts from the north, all of a sudden China, Russia, Canada, etc., become very close.” This is a different, and particularly Saami, way of seeing, approaching, and reporting on the world.
Figure 5.3 The world from up north, seen upon entering Siida, the Saami Museum in Ánar /Inari, Finland.

The dots note the different Indigenous peoples who call the Arctic their home. Permission granted by Arja Jomppanen, head curator of Sámi Museum—Siida.

It is this process of creating a common, Saami orientation that Saami journalists and journalism educators identify as a Saami “starting point.” Everyone I spoke with heralded the importance of media in this process. As Nils Johan Haetta, director of NRK-Sápmi, explained,
media create common points of interest and discussion by providing a singular program of news and entertainment, thus creating and maintaining a common audience. This process, found in all national and/or public service media, helps create and develop a more unified identity and can be identified as a nation-building project (Anderson 1983/1991; Hallin, 1994). But does the goal of nation building negate the role and responsibility of watchdog journalism? As evidenced in my interviews and in Galdu’s report on the 2011 media workshop (Henriksen, 2009), there is no settled answer. Haetta argues that all journalists are involved in a form of nation building by bringing their worldviews and identities to the story at hand, particularly if they belong to one of the groups affected by a story. He reflected on a piece that ran on Oddasat in 2005 as an example of a starting point:

There was a report in Norwegian news, in the main news program in NRK. Statoil, the biggest oil company in Norway, had a big success in Northwestern Russia. They were really doing well, I think they found some oil in an Indigenous area and they were really doing well. It was a story highlighting success. We also ran a story the same week, but our entire story showed that Statoil, the Norwegian company, was spoiling the Indigenous land in Russia and there was a lot of pollution made by the Norwegian company. So that is NOT a very successful story. That is the differences in how we (NRK-Sápmi) choose to tell things.

Haetta repeated this point in the 2011 workshop, noting that “balanced media coverage” means that people will “reflect on their own point of departure and any prejudiced opinions” but that a journalist’s ethnic background and identity “would always affect their priorities, emphasis, focus and form of presentation” (Henriksen, 2011, p. 35). According to Haetta, this is because of the “borderlines” between “us” and “them” and how these manifest when investigating and framing a story (Henriksen, 2011, p. 35). Once the story is selected, the lines are already drawn and there will be different stories—a practice of agenda setting is already underway (Carpenter, 2007; Wade, 2011). Aslak Paltto, a Saami journalist on the Finnish side of Sápmi and president of the Saami Journalism Association, put it simply: “When you want to make the news for your people
and the whole country, you have two totally different cases (stories).”\(^{79}\) Again, Sandra Harding’s work on understanding the standpoint as an achievement to enable a stronger form of objectivity can help us here. Suddenly the question changes; one is no longer negating one’s worldview or trying to distance oneself but rather engaging with that worldview through journalistic means.

**Reindeer Herders on Facebook: How to Negotiate a Saami Starting Point when Working With, and For, a “Double Audience”**

“\([W]\)hen we were making our film,\] we were quite loyal to our idea about wanting to show this very traditional profession/lifestyle...as a modern thing that is under development. And we knew that people would expect this very romantic and exotic thing and we knew there were people who wouldn’t like that we didn’t show that because there were expectations. And that was something that...[the professor] said to us. Because he is from Southern Norway...He said that he would have liked us to show more of the exotic thing because we have been out in the tundra...He would like to see more of... the mountains and the sunset and the reindeer....so we had to really defend ourselves... “

—“Anything,” a Saami journalism student who chose to attend a non-Saami-specific institution\(^{80}\)

“Anything” was a student of journalism. She was born and raised near Guovdageaidnu, and her mother comes from a reindeer-herding family. Rather than study at Sámi allaskuvla, “Anything” decided to study journalism at another university in Northern Norway. Staying in Northern Norway had some advantages for “Anything”: It was close enough to home to allow her to be near extended family while far enough away not to be “home.” “Anything” believed being exposed to a variety of cultures and perspectives would help her in her studies and future career as a journalist:

---

\(^{79}\) Many journalists in Sápmi used the term “cases”’ to speak about the journalistic stories (news or features); according to socio-linguist Jon Todal, this appears to be a Norwegianized borrowing from English (personal communication, January 16, 2012.) To ease understanding for an English audience, I have noted this in the quotes by using “(story)” next to “case.”

\(^{80}\) “Anything” preferred to remain anonymous. When I asked her if she would like to choose a name; she said “Anything is ok.”
I chose to study [outside of Guovdageaidnu] because I have lived here all my life. I thought it would enrich my education to study with people…with different backgrounds. To get another perspective on things….Because I think it is really important when you are a journalist to know different kinds of people and many people.  

The irony is that half of the students in her cohort are Saami, and yet all but one of the instructors are ethnic Norwegians.

I met with “Anything” on a Sunday afternoon for nearly two hours, and we spent a good amount of time talking about the film she made with two classmates, another Saami from a reindeer-herding family and an ethnic Norwegian. The film, about reindeer herders using Facebook, is 12 minutes long and follows two young reindeer herders in their 20s out on the tundra; one of the young men has Internet access and the other does not.

For “Anything,” the goal was to make a film by young people, about young people, and for young people and to “speak to the old people in reindeer herding who criticize the young people who want to participate with modern technology when they are out there.” In the end, though, she felt like it spoke more to a Norwegian audience. According to “Anything,” this was both because of the influence of the Norwegian student in the group and because the Norwegian professor kept trying to push them to make a more “traditional” film, even citing Nanook of the North (which is notorious for its staged events and colonial approach) as a positive example:

But of course it would have been very easy for us to make this romantic traditional movie and get credit from our instructor. We knew that that would be very easy. To make something for someone from southern Norway—to film

---

81 Many of the people I interviewed expressed similar reflections on their time “down south.” Silja Somby, Ole Henrik Magga, and Katri Somby all discussed how their time “down south” taught them that “the North” in general is just not part of people’s realities and thus provided them the opportunity to reflect on how the rest of the country sees them and learn how better to communicate cross-culturally. As Magga explained, “I went to school in Southern Norway and I was living with a family. The mother of the family, when I would talk to her, I would have to think how to explain this (pointing to the outdoors) to her. She is in Southern Norway, and from Southern Norway, and had been to Finnmark once…I have to think, to really understand, how she may think…and then try to have her understand how we think. And that is what we need to do.”
reindeer and Saami people. We knew that, but we wouldn’t go there because that wouldn’t be our story and we couldn’t take the movie home and go and show it to our dad or mom... If we had made a romantic [mythical/stereotypical] movie about the Saami people, I would feel embarrassed to show it to my people, you know. Because it wouldn’t be something I could stand for.

In the end, according to “Anything,” the film took on a life of its own—or perhaps a life of its three filmmakers and the professor. It is not the film that “Anything” set out to make, and she is not sure if she is proud of it as a final product. That said, “Anything” does not regret the process; she feels she learned a lot about teamwork and compromise, and most importantly she learned the importance of audience and how assumptions about the audience’s knowledge shape the production of the film:

We had a lot of discussions and goals in our group. It was really a good learning experience because I think that we were the group that had to be really conscious of who is our audience because we came from different backgrounds. And I think that we all wanted to make a movie that we could be proud to show to mom and dad at home...[but] we had to make it understandable for people who don’t know the reindeer-herding culture. So we cut a lot of clips that were too based on knowing the culture, too specific. So we had to cut that so that people [not as familiar with the culture] would understand. That was one thing. And we also texted (subtitled) in Norwegian and had a voiceover in Norwegian.

“Anything’s” experience making this film demonstrates some of the strategic decisions made based on assumptions of the audience’s starting point. When “Anything” was beginning to make this film she assumed her audience would be other Saami who already had in-depth knowledge of the language, culture and tensions as well as the inter-generation debates within the reindeer herding community. As Raheja (2007) points out, this use of film in general can be an act of de-colonization—there is no need, nor desire, to make it accessible to non Indigenous people because the audience was internal. But as the making of the film progressed, it became obvious for all three students that there would be multiple audiences and thus the various “starting points” for both the filmmakers and the audience became clearer. What could be seen as
objective or “neutral” to some people—long tundra scenes with frolicking reindeer in the distance, a soundtrack of joik (traditional Saami music)—would be seen as trite and stereotypical by others. However, by jumping directly into a story on the use of Facebook without any background on what is considered “normal” on the tundra (How long are people usually on the land? Are they usually alone or with others?) would leave other audience members confused. There was no longer “an” objective story, rather the practice of what El-Nawawy and Iskandar (2002a) refer to as “contextual objectivity,” came into play. Objectivity needed to be negotiated.

**Saami Journalism: Cultivating, Strengthening, and Promoting Self-determination**

The introductory video on the front page of the Galdu website begins, “We are Saami, and we want to be Saami, without being any more or less than other people in the world” (Galdu.org & Johansen, 2007). According to Rune Fjellheim, Director General of the Saami Parliament on the Norwegian side of Sápmi, this statement was made almost in passing at the launching of the Saami Parliament. It speaks to the approach Saami take towards their politics: self-determination.

This context is important to understand, as it helps explain how policy and politics work in Sápmi. Saami rarely fear physical threats and attack (anymore), and thus most of the concerns surround control over Saami lives: Are the rights of Saami, as the Indigenous peoples of the land, respected (Fjellheim; Plaut, 2012a)? Are Saami provided with what they need to not only preserve but develop their culture and identity as Saami people? If, as Wilmer (1993) defines it, self-determination is the ability for people “to determine their own cultural, economic, social and political context” (p. 7), then what role do journalists play in creating the conditions and information to engage in these debates? As Fjellheim mused, “When people are fed and warm
and safe, how do you advocate?”

That is one reason that the mandate of NRK-Sápmi is to “activate an inherent wish among [all] Sámi people…to live and act in Saami ways” (NRK-Sápmi, 2010). Although, on the surface, it can appear that this is similar to the idea of “cultural preservation” as seen in the tradition of “minority media” in Europe discussed in Chapter 4, there are significant differences. Rather than having an “external homeland” (Brubaker, 1996) safeguard Saami rights or, as in the case of the Roma, use media as a way to gain inclusion into full citizenship, the Saami are creating and using media to “activate an inherent wish” as a means of self-determination—the desire to be Saami stands in resistance to the attempted extermination of Saami culture through colonialism.

Knowledge of one’s history, society, and contemporary ways of being is a political act. As Wilmer (1993) explains, “Political activism of Indigenous peoples in national and international forums calls attention to the macro-historical context in which the present world social systems developed” (p. 7). Journalists play a pedagogical and political role in this process as agents that should speak to the nation—not to create a monolithic idea but to encourage the vibrancy and development of the nation. Henriksen (2011) quotes Ijäs at the media workshop saying, “Sámi media has a special responsibility towards the Saami community due to its social responsibilities, including the duty to provide information, comments and criticism” (p. 39). In fact, one of the most important functions noted by many of those interviewed is the airing of different perspectives and “debates” within the nation (Haetta; Pedersen; Rasmussen; K. Somby; Valio). The learning outcomes for the forthcoming class “Ethics, Law and Professional Identity” put it clearly:

At the end of the course, students are expected to have a sophisticated analytic basis from which to develop their journalistic practice and their understanding of
the position of Indigenous media in a wider context. This will provide a deepened understanding of their own role as Indigenous journalists with responsibility to their own community and multicultural society (Sámi allaskuvla, 2011, p. 23, my emphasis).

The notion of “responsibility to their own community” is key and was reiterated by journalists and journalism educators working in both Saami- and Norwegian-language media. Also reiterated in interviews, books, and other documents produced by Saami is that Saami are not a homogenous group; there are differences between communities, and communities comprise individuals who, at times, make mistakes or act in ways other people do not agree with (Henriksen, 2011, p. 36).

That said, there was caution not to get caught up in and distracted by scandal and thus lose sight of the big picture—of who has power. Repeatedly, those interviewed criticized the airtime spent covering the internal bickering in the Swedish Saami Parliament or counting the number of mini-bottles of alcohol consumed on a flight by Saami parliamentarians (RK; PS; Solbakk; A. Somby). Who is served by this coverage, who is hurt, and how does this align with the goals of Saami journalism? At the same time, Stein Svala, a journalist for Ságat, was quick to point out that Saami are very sensitive to “the misuse of power amongst our own” and often want to “break a bad story first” rather than having a non-Saami journalist do so. This is very different than the Roma journalists and journalism trainers’ approach to “bad stories” within Romani journalism where the goal is to counter-balance the overwhelmingly negative stories in mainstream media. Here the desire is for Saami journalists to engage in good, investigative and watchdog journalism within the Saami community. How, then, are students being taught the standards and skills to be good Saami journalists?
Sámi Allaskuvla

Sámi University College (Sámi allaskuvla) was founded in 1989 as an institution of higher education serving Saami-speaking students and cultivating Saami-focused research. Instructors and students are recruited from throughout Sápmi, and North Saami is the language of instruction and administration. Founded originally to produce Saami-speaking teachers, Sámi allaskuvla now offers Bachelor of Arts degrees in education, Saami language, duojdi (traditional Saami crafts), and journalism. Sámi allaskuvla is one of the few institutions to offer a Master of Arts in Saami language (O. H. Magga, personal communication, May 1, 2013).

In 1991, Sámi allaskuvla began offering its first Saami-specific journalism program (Rasmussen; L. I. Somby). What began as a preparatory program to enable Saami-speaking students to pursue journalistic studies in other institutions of higher education “down south” eventually evolved into a “candidate studies” two-year professional degree with the possibility of a third year to earn a bachelor’s degree. According to Torkel Rasmussen, coordinator of the journalism program at the time of my fieldwork, about 40 students have gone through some formal, professional journalism training at Sámi allaskuvla (personal communication, January 16, 2012). I asked Steinar Pedersen, then rector of Sámi allaskuvla, about his goals for the

---

82 For more information on the history and philosophy of Saami-focused higher education, see Keskitalo (2006). For more information about Sámi allaskuvla specifically, see http://www.Sámiskhs.no. For more information on the journalism program, see http://www.Sámiskhs.no/index.php?c=604&kat=Indigenous+Journalism&p=.

83 There is also a long history of Saami students attending journalism school outside of Sápmi. In fact, more than half of the professional Saami journalists I interviewed received their education “down south.” For example, nearly half of the journalists at NRK-Sápmi (which offers the most competitive salaries within the world of Saami journalism and often has “first pick” of the students) have journalism degrees, and of those 25 people, half (13 people) went to Sámi allaskuvla. However, the numbers are quite different at Yle Sápmi, where out of the 38 full-time and freelance journalists working for the station, five have formal journalism training and two attended Sámi allaskuvla (Näkkäläjärvi; K. Valio, personal communication, April 30, 2013).
journalism program. He answered by contextualizing it within the larger mission of Sámi allaskuvla, which sees Saami higher education as a manifestation and instrument of Saami self-determination:

Well, we must look at the overall goal of the Sámi University College. That we are an institution which is designed to serve the Saami society and produce candidates who will be able to promote or develop different parts of the Saami society. And journalism and the media is of course a very vital arena for bringing forward Saami language and culture (my emphasis).

But he also noted that journalists, in their professional role as journalists, offer certain specific things to society, particularly Saami society,

because they [journalists] are people who are able to promote Saami culture, language, and also, of course, and not at least, they are persons who are able to put a critical eye/ focus on different parts of the Saami society where it is necessary to put critical questions. And without critical questions, no society will be able to develop. And they learn that technique and they will be very relevant persons to put forward those critical questions.

I want to emphasize Pedersen’s belief that a journalist’s role in society is to “ask critical questions,” and that this role is fundamental to the development of that society. The focus of Saami media on speaking with, to, and for Saami society is very clear in the pedagogical goals and differs significantly from that of Romani media. Whereas Romani media often purposefully choose positive stories to counterweigh the overly negative media coverage, Saami media often try to break the “bad story” about something taking place in Saami society rather than being misrepresented by the ethnic-majority media (Svala).

Jan Gunnar Furuly gave a painful example of “breaking the bad story” in a series he ran in the late 1980s in the Norwegian-language newspaper Finnmark Dagblat covering the alarming rate of suicides among Saami reindeer herders. Although Norwegian media had traditionally not spoken openly about suicide, and Saami culture often refrains from discussing the public tragedy of a family, after eight suicides in a period of eight months, “we had parents coming to us, asking
and urging us to write stories about this problem. To stop this. So we wrote some stories about it...” The series helped create the initiative for public meetings open for the entire community, which was also covered by the newspaper. Reflecting on this more than 20 years later, Furuly concludes, “I am sure we saved lives because we broke the taboo and put it in the spotlight.”

Referring back to Ande Somby’s description of the “dance” Saami media performs to address the tensions between thin media, resistance media, critical media, and “the bird shitting its own nest,” Saami media strive to achieve the watchdog role of media so that the story is investigated and presented from within Saami society (Solbakk; A. Somby).

The Core Elements of Saami Journalism Education

Charles Husband, a professor of communications at the University of Bradford and one of the founders and architects of the journalism education program at Sámi allaskuvla, noted in his address to the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Conference that there is a difference between formal and informal education, the former with “explicitly laid-down curricula and specified learning outcomes” and the latter based on “everyday experience to others, where knowledge…of the ‘old hands’ is passed on in a process of osmosis by shared participation in the craft” (Husband, 2012; field notes, March 26, 2012). However, he was also clear that these differences do not have to be confrontational but rather can be generative and inform one another. He argued that to become “professionalized,” one learns the limits of one’s professional responsibilities, and that “going beyond those expectations runs the risk of being accused of being unprofessional…” Nearly all of the people I interviewed noted that they aspire to be professional journalists creating and operating within professional media institutions (Eira

84 Svala also covered similar stories when working at Finnmark Dagblat.
As in Romani media, being skilled and appreciated for one’s professional journalistic talent is fundamental to journalistic identity. As Haetta explained, his number-one hiring criterion is that one has the skills to be a journalist (field notes, March 26, 2013). To be deemed “unprofessional” as a journalist by fellow journalists, Saami or non-Saami, is a serious insult (PS).

This desire to be able to work as a professional journalist is key and, as Ijäs and Rasmussen both reminded me, they only have a limited amount of time with the students. Based on the original curriculum design from the early 2000s, students could take a two-year professional degree in journalism or add an additional third year to earn a Bachelor of Arts in journalism. Rasmussen decided that the first two mandatory years would focus on the basics of journalism; the in-depth work on Saami-specific journalism and journalism ethics (interrogating the Saami starting point) was relegated to the final, optional, year of the degree. By 2010, this was deemed unsatisfactory, and the curriculum was revamped. Partially to comply with the EU’s Bologna process (to harmonize higher education degrees across Europe), but also to respond to a need for deepening and integrating Saami content within the journalism program, the two-year program was discontinued. In addition, more effort was made to integrate Saami language, culture, history, and journalistic ethics—as well as larger Indigenous politics and perspectives—throughout the entire three years. In the winter of 2013, all the Saami media outlets were invited to a meeting to give their feedback on what was needed to make better Saami journalists for the workplace. Saami language, technical, and writing skills were all deemed to be in need of improvement, including through in-house training (T. Moring, personal communication, July 8, 2013). The need for graduates to have a more in-depth understanding of Saami society and perspectives in order to shape the news also came up repeatedly (Näkkäläjärvi).
“Everyone Knows Everyone”: The Ethics of Journalism in Sápmi

“Perhaps it is more important not to travel out but to go inside our small Saami world and try to get something out of it.” – Sara Beate Eira, Editor of Avviri

When seeking to “professionalize” a craft the accepted wisdom is often to standardize practices and thus standardize the profession. Like education and the medical field, this process has been attempted for journalism, and, like these other professions, the reality, is that standardization does not always work (Folkerts, J., Hamilton, J. M., & Lemann, N, 2013; Waisbord, 2013). How do the particularities of working in Sápmi—a large, remote land mass of one nation over four countries coupled with the small population that is often related by blood and/or marriage—affect the practice of journalism? Are there differences in journalistic techniques such as finding and identifying sources or engaging in investigative practices? What about story selection? RK, a journalist from NRK-Sápmi, explained, “everyone knows everyone. If there is normally five degrees of separation, with Saami it’s two.” How does this affect the assessment of conflict of interest or professional ethics? (RK; Sámi allaskuvla, 2008, 2011; Waisbord, 2013).

There is no uniform response to these questions. Most people interviewed focused on language and a “starting point,” but the vast majority assumed, at least in the initial parts of the conversations, that the techniques of journalism would be the same. Many people said that “journalism is journalism,” and that all journalism students need to be comfortable with the basics. Some, however, did believe an additional skill set is necessary to be a journalist in Sápmi (Eira, 06152012; Furuly; Paltto; Svala). With further discussion it became clear that the journalism education at Sámi allaskuvla is unique. Arne Johansen Ijäs, Director of the journalism program from 2011 to 2012, explained that he has two “missions”: to teach students how to be
journalists in terms of techniques and laws, and to teach that they “should be Saami journalists, not Norwegian journalists!” (05312011). When I inquired whether the education journalism students receive at Sámi allaskuva is the same as what they could receive in Oslo, Ijäs (05312011) was clear that, in his opinion, Sámi allaskuva’s education is more robust:

AJI: I think the Saami journalism students have a better education because they have a broader horizon. The Norwegian students don’t know anything else and when they look away, when they look for another perspective, they look South, they don’t look North.

SP: Is it important that the Saami journalists are educated?

AJI: Yes, they need to know the standards of journalism, but there are special Saami ethics/Indigenous ethics.

Ijäs and others noted the importance of “starting point,” and of making sure that stories are relevant to the presumably Saami audience. It is this specific emphasis on cultivating, strengthening, and encouraging a “Saami perspective” and a “Saami starting point,” as well as the protocols of Saami ethics that connects journalism and media to self-determination. Ijäs was quite clear: “You are thinking from Sápmi, not from Oslo or Tromsø!” Pirita Näkkäläjärvi, head of Yle Sápmi, wants to hire more graduates from Sámi allaskuva’s journalism program both for their technical expertise and for their knowledge of Indigenous issues on a global scale. But she cautioned that at times the specific Saami point of view could get lost:

Yes, they need the basic technical education, of course, but also more understanding of Saami society in Finland, Sweden, and Russia, not just in Norway. Many of the graduates may know about the Indigenous people in Venezuela, but not about the amount of representatives in the Saami Parliament in Sweden!

It is clear that Saami value getting the information they need from their media. How can learning to get, recognize, and craft a good story—what Ande Somby referred to as “critical journalism”—be taught?
Covering the Reindeer-Herding Crisis from Within the Community

Compared to NRK-Sápmi, Avvir, with its staff of twelve, is a relatively small operation. Sara Beate Eira, editor in chief at the time of my research and herself a graduate of Sámi allaskuvla, was recruited in 2009 to help turn around what was then a struggling paper. She knew Avvir could not compete with the speed or financial resources of well-funded Saami media institutions. Rather than seeing this as a liability, she focused on the strengths of her staff: all of them spoke Saami, and many had deep roots within the various Saami cultures. Using these skills and starting points, Eira walked me through how Avvir chose to cover a potentially very controversial story.

In May 2011, 83 reindeer were found dead in a pen in Kárásjohka. Reindeer herding holds considerable prestige within Saami society, but in all four countries of Sápmi, it is a profession that has become highly bureaucratized. In Norway, only Saami men who come from reindeer-herding families are able to herd reindeer. Even with this restriction, there are problems with overgrazing. Because of past colonial practices (including closing the borders for traditional migration patterns across Sápmi), there are also competing claims to grazing and migrating territories. Thus, what is held up as one of the most esteemed professions within Sápmi is actually one of the least financially lucrative. Worse, there has been a spate of suicides, vandalism and other kinds of conflict within the community (Svala). This has been referred to as the “reindeer crisis.” Eighty-three reindeer being found dead was a scandal that the TV media, both Saami and non-Saami, gave ample coverage.

As a print newspaper, Avvir could not break the story and, as Eira explained, “people don’t want to read today in the paper what they read yesterday online” (05252012). Avvir staff knew the story could be used against the Saami—to cultivate and continue feuds between
families and different reindeer herders and to once again resurrect the debate about the “reindeer crisis.” So, rather than focus on the shock value (“the tabloid”), *Avvir* took another approach: They spent days developing a rapport with the owner of the reindeer and then told his side of the story.

You will need to go a little bit deeper before you can make the headline, the tabloid headline about the reindeer crisis…. It is so clear for me when you haven’t gone deep, when you’ve just gone on the surface to make a story…. There was probably some kind of crisis there, but you have to go deeper, and you have to tell. You have to tell the story with the knowledge (Eira, 05252012).

Through the use of personal contacts, patience, and a nuanced appreciation for language, *Avvir* journalists focused on unearthing systemic problems and highlighting potential solutions from within Sápmi rather than on the sensationalist scandal. For Eira, much of this focused on word choice: what terms were used for older reindeer and younger reindeer, and for the reindeer herder himself? Having the language skills and the cultural literacy allowed for a “richer” story to emerge, one that did not create an “us” versus “them” of reindeer herders versus non-reindeer herders. It was understood by the writer, the reader, and the protagonist that there must be a very bad situation to result in the death of so many reindeer. Eira explained how decisions were made about what pictures to print—not of the reindeer carcasses (which is culturally offensive), but of the reindeer herder looking forlorn and of the overgrazed tundra.

For *Avvir*, the story focused on unearthing why the reindeer died. What bureaucratic decisions or failure to comply or enforce the Saami and state laws led to this catastrophe? And, perhaps most importantly, what needed to happen so that this tragedy (rather than scandal) would not occur again? This kind of coverage is an example of the critical journalism that can facilitate a debate within society (Pedersen; A. Somby; K. Somby). This was journalism created by and for the Saami community; the journalists involved were aware of, and respected, the context in
which the story was crafted and told.

El-Nawawy and Iskandar’s (2002b) understanding of contextual objectivity can help explain Eira’s approach to this story. The cultural and historical context that surrounds and creates the story must be considered in conjunction with the context in which people consume the story. According to Eira and others reflecting on Saami media, this is particularly important in Saami society given how community oriented it is and how important people’s reputations are to their greater social and economic health. Thus, the consequences of appearing to “attack” someone’s reputation can be greater within Saami society than in other, more individualistic cultures (Magga, A. Somby; S. Somby). Engaging in “critical debate” for the betterment of Saami society is good, but publically destroying a person’s reputation is not acceptable. As Silja Somby explained:

Saami should be much more sensitive to aggressive journalism. I mean this in terms of what you do to go and find an answer. In Saami journalism you should be more cautious with ethics because already we are living in a double society. Already Saami, we are constantly representing ourselves in Norwegian [mainstream] media and in our own Indigenous society. And in mainstream society we are already marginalized—Saami individuals are already vulnerable and much more affected by reputation, by what is said.

Neither Silja Somby nor Eira advocate for “thin” journalism. They see good, critical journalism as very important. But the focus of journalism should be on examining why things happen. The readers who flooded Avvir with letters to the editor and congratulatory emails seemed to agree.

As an editor, Eira could identify what she considered good journalism, but as an editor she struggled to articulate exactly how this different form of journalism could be taught:

And we have people who are working here who are coming from Saami communities and they are…they don’t have that…that founding…they don’t have the [journalistic] basics. They learn the basics from us in this institution, in Avvir. We learn from each other. But I think that opens up to think in a different way. You can think to tell stories and articles in another [way]…you can have a more open mind to make the story…how to build it up.
And I think [those without formal journalism education] are more grounded in trying to be respectful, and I think...for us it’s important, before we send them out to make the big stories, that they have an understanding of what are Saami communities, what do Saami believe...to try and get a picture that they haven’t maybe thought of before. Because...sometimes we [are] focused on the [techniques]...when we should be focusing on why, why...why is it like this?

But...but I think that is the main thing the journalist has to get before they start working as a journalist: How things work in Sápmi. And how the differences work; because there are also big differences inside our community. So instead of focusing so much on the ground rules of this and this and do it like that and ask like this...you have to get the understanding of what is it you are going to tell, and what [you need to] understand in order to tell it...

We need education, but I think that it is a bit different for us... Because I don’t think it is healthy to copy the models of Bergen or Oslo...I think we have to think a little bit different. And I think...we are able to do it, but we have to dare to do it (06152011).

It is very interesting to note the main points Eira struggles with: being “professionally trained” while also maintaining an awareness of how to work within a particular society, including how to recognize what you are actually seeing and the diversity within the community. As of April 2013, of the 13 people currently working for Avvir (11 journalists and two editors), three have formal journalism training and the rest learned the basics on the job (personal communication, April 26, 2013). According to Eira, some of the best journalists do not have formal journalism education but bring with them a strong background in certain aspects of Saami society, be it reindeer herding or fishing or farming or social history. In addition, Eira is clear that “copying the models of Bergen and Oslo,” could dilute the goal and purpose of Saami journalism. However, like others, she struggled to come up with viable alternatives within a formalized journalism education. Within the two fairly extensive interviews we had, she kept repeating that as long as they had the “fire” to want to be journalists writing for and in Saami, she was willing to teach them the journalistic basics; the problem was finding those with both the
knowledge of the Saami society and the journalistic fire.

**What Does Transnational Formal Saami Journalism Education Look Like?**

During the 2012–2013 school years, the Sámi allaskuvla journalism program went on hiatus due to a lack of students. Since the inception of the program, there has always been a problem attracting and retaining journalism students. Although the formal “language rule” is a cornerstone of the education at Sámi allaskuvla—students must be able to read, write, and follow lectures in Saami language—all of those interviewed note that this limits those who would even consider attending the institution.

In Winter 2013, Sámi allaskuvla held a meeting to solicit input from the Saami media institutions throughout Sápmi for the design of the MA program and the re-design of the BA program to ensure they were meeting the needs of the media outlets. In addition, a brainstorming session was held to discuss recruiting students from other parts of Sápmi, for although students from across all four countries in Sápmi do attend, nearly everyone interviewed, including the rector, wished for more diversity within the Saami student body, particularly for the urban Saami, Sea Saami, and Saami who speak Saami languages other than North Saami (Moring, personal communication, July 6, 2013; Näkkäläjärvi). In fact, there is a joke that Sámi allaskuvla is the private university of Guovdageaidnu and Kárášjohka (the major towns of “the Saami heartland”).

Jon Gunnar Furuly believes there are other reasons for the lack of students pursuing an education in Saami journalism. According to Furuly, students lack the necessary “journalistic...

---

85 The former rector, Steinar Pedersen, discussed the importance of using the language in everyday functions, but also mentioned reaching out to Saami who have “lost their language” by offering scholarships for intensive one-year Saami language instruction followed by admission to Sámi allaskuvla’s programs—including journalism. There are provisions to assist students who are not academically fluent in Saami, but Rasmussen figures that since 2000, perhaps only four students have begun their journalism studies by taking Saami introductory language courses.
“fire,” which affects the quality of journalism itself. As he explains,

The problem today is that there are very few Saami young people who really have an urge to become a journalist...If you spoke to the management of the Saami radio in Kárásjohka, they have a huge problem: They can’t get enough motivated people. They are taking kids and youngsters in from the street with no clue...no journalistic fire inside of them. It’s just a 9–4 work for them. And it’s...I don’t think that creates high-quality journalism.

Everyone I spoke with at Sámi allaskuvla and the various Saami media outlets expressed the need for Saami journalists, particularly those who can work in Saami language. It is literally a problem of not being able to “produce” the journalists to meet this need (Furuly; Pedersen). As Torkel Rasmussen describes it, the “resource problem is terrible...There is more work than people.”

Nils Johan Haetta and Sara Beate Eira both agree; they often find themselves eagerly awaiting the next class of journalists to graduate from Sámi allaskuvla as potential employees. However, neither NRK-Sápmi nor Avvir requires its staff to have a journalism degree; less than half of the staff at these outlets studied journalism.86 There are no reliable statistics from Ságat, although according to a senior journalist, none of the journalists have a bachelor’s degree in journalism. When asked why there are so few students enrolled in the journalism BA program, Rasmussen figures it is because “no one really needs the journalistic study to get the job as a journalist.”

At the same time, when I asked Rasmussen, Furuly, and Svala—all of whom were critical of the journalism program at Sámi allaskuvla—if they believed the program should shut down, all were adamantly against that idea. As Svala, a senior journalist at Ságat, who writes in Norwegian (and, at times, English), explained

86 Saami media on the other sides of Sápmi have a similar breakdown—although even fewer of the journalists have studied specifically at Sámi allaskuvla (Moring; Nákkäläijärvi). Rasmussen estimates that perhaps five of the graduates of the journalism program were from the Swedish side of Sápmi.
I will defend that education till my end because I think it is absolutely necessary to have as broad as possible education to the Saami-speaking part of the Saami population. For me, it is not a question—it is obvious. [This is necessary] if we talk equality between cultures.

This focus on the need to demonstrate “equality between cultures” by ensuring that institutions are devoted to journalism education for both Saami and non-Saami is crucial. This “equality” is one way of demonstrating a nation-to-nation relationship: It is an example of how media, education, and self-determination are understood in practice (Graham, 2010). One needs to train people to work in these institutions, and to train them adequately to be good Saami speaking and non-Saami speaking journalists.

There were mixed feelings about the need for formal journalism education. Some, such as Svala, swore to the method of learning journalism by doing journalism. This is a traditional view, and one that many journalistic old-timers (which Svala, with more than 30 years of journalism experience, certainly is) share. As Charles Husband noted in his 2012 talk at the World Indigenous Television Broadcasting Conference, there is a strong culture in journalism of the “old hands teaching the craft.” Even Ijäs, who at the time directed Sámi allaskuvla’s journalism program, conceded, “I have to accept that a BA is a BA—they will get educated, but they will learn how to be journalists by doing.” The question of how to be a journalist does bring the conversation back to what are the roles of a journalist within Saami society—And how journalism engages with larger ideas of politics and socio-political change within Saami, and non-Saami societies.

A Desire to Professionalize in Saami Way(s)

Over and over again, people made a distinction between the Saami journalism of “then” – which was referred to as propaganda, not “real” journalism – and that of “now.” Now people
have degrees, they are credentialed, sometimes even by a Saami institution! They are “real”
journalists. When Pirita Näkkäläjärvi, the head of Yle Sápmi told me only five of her staff had
journalism degrees, her attitude was familiar: “Isn’t that sad? And only two from Sámi
allaskuvla.” She continued,

If we want to develop and come to 2013, then I need trained journalists. Currently, the journalists have university degrees, but not in communications or journalism. If Yle really wants to be a world-class public service, a Saami service house, a public institution, we can’t do it without professionals—people who have the basic professional and technical training, the theoretical understanding, and, even more importantly, the Indigenous world view and Saami context they can get from places like Sámi allaskuvla.

All the heads of the media institutions expressed this desire to professionalize but to do so within a Saami worldview, and, as Husband (2012) explained, this knowledge is learned both in the classroom and in the newsroom. Recently, when I contacted Eira to get the most recent statistics on how many people have journalism degrees at Avvir, she was obviously proud to tell me that not only were there no job vacancies, in fact, the two new hires were both graduates in journalism from Sámi allaskuvla (personal communication, April 26, 2013).

Perhaps the best definition of “professionalizing” Saami media was put forward by John Tryvge Solbakk (2006a), founder and director of the largest Saami publishing house, Čálliid Lágádus AS, who distinguished between creating rigorous Saami media “adjusted to the particular demands a long-oppressed minority society has regarding the transmission of information to its own citizens” and “just bad copy of Norwegian media” (p. 181). Solbakk warned that attempting to replicate Nordic media models would not work, and is not what is needed. Similar to Eira and Silja Somby, Solbakk (2006b) warns that journalistic techniques such as setting up oppositional and polarizing views and playing them off of each other not only diminishes the content of the issues at hand (thus reducing journalism’s pedagogical and
democratic purpose) but also runs counter to Saami society’s ways of functioning, which
privileges deliberation and tries to avoid confrontation (pp. 185–186).

Thus, some Saami journalists and journalism educators advocate for the codification of
unique Saami modes of engaging in and producing journalism. These Saami-specific ideas
demand further exploration of the five key distinguishing points noted earlier in the chapter:
language choices, topic selection, creating from a Saami “starting point,” attracting audience
interest without harming the community, and developing journalistic ethics in the Saami society.
These five points are key to the founding goals of the Sámi allaskuvla journalism program but
too often have been crammed in between the mandatory courses on media law and editing
software required in a credentialing journalism degree (Ijäs; L. I. Somby). One of the main
reasons that the two-year journalistic professional degree was replaced by the three-year BA was
to ensure that all students received a Saami-specific education. In addition, according to the
curriculum and proposal submitted to the Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in
Education, the primary impetus for the MA in Indigenous journalism is to help cultivate the next
generation of journalism administrators and leaders to create and sustain media outlets (Sámi
allaskuvla, 2011, pp. 2, 17). The MA will provide more seasoned Indigenous journalists (many,
but not all, of whom will be Saami) and journalists interested in Indigenous issues the space for
professionalization and self-reflection on what it means to be an Indigenous journalist. Although
the goal is to professionalize, it is a professionalization designed and directed from Saami
perspectives.

**Must there be Tension between Professionalization and Objectivity?**

All the journalists and journalism educators to whom I spoke expressed the desire to be
recognized as thorough, competent, credible journalists by other journalists. It was also clear that Saami journalists did not feel like this was always the case. Saami journalists often expressed a frustration that they were held to a higher, perhaps impossible, standard of objectivity than journalists of the ethnic majority simply because it was assumed that, as Saami, they were incapable of being professional, critical journalists (RK; PS, 05242011). There was much resentment to the majority media's "doubting of Saami journalists professionalism." (Furuly, Solbakk; RK; PS 05242011)

Those I spoke to nearly universally disregarded the term “objectivity” and almost never used the term “neutral,” but they did push for professionalization. Many drew a distinction between Saami journalists “before” (usually referencing the 1970s and early 1980s) and Saami journalists now. Some, such as Kent Valio, deputy director at NRK-Sápmi, saw this as positive,

There is no such thing as objectivity. What is objectivity? Is it your version or mine? What is the starting point? So we try to tell our version. But we are not activists like the Saami journalists before us. They call it professionalization. We aren’t Saami PR agents. We try to tell the truth, not just the part that is positive for us. You have to tell the truth, but whose truth? There is no such thing as objectivity.

Others, such as Silja Somby, were concerned with the change they saw in the mainstream Saami media: “Before, it was Saami radio, but now [they are] NRK-Sápmi….Before, you knew that Saami Radio would be on your side, but now…” In drawing the distinction between Saami Radio and NRK-Sápmi, Silja was referring to the change in 1992 when NRK-Sápmi became its own separate media outlet as part of the larger NRK, thus gaining more status but also becoming potentially more entrenched within a bureaucratic structure. Silja was concerned with what she sees as a “Norwegianization” of the Saami media, not in terms of language but in formatting and story selection. Others also voiced concern that the desire to be “objective” was becoming a code for adopting a non-Saami perspective in story selection, investigation, and presentation (Ijäs;
Solbakk; A. Somby; Rasmussen). This has resulted in some Saami journalists being overly critical of Saami society as a way of proving their objectivity (Eira, 06152011; Paltto; Solbakk).

Like Sandra Harding’s critique of “weak objectivity,” many questioned whether journalistic “objectivity” should even be the goal of Saami journalism (Haetta; L. I. Somby). Linda Smith (1999, 2005), Sandra Harding (1993), Edward Said (1978/1994), and other feminist and/or post-colonial scholars have stated repeatedly that those in power are often too entrenched to engage in the self-reflexivity necessary to recognize their positionality. Nils Johan Haetta used the example of Norwegian media’s coverage of a “fishing crisis” between Iceland and Norway to explain this point:

In my role, many times, I have heard and experienced that Norwegian editors and Norwegian journalists say that Saami journalists are not objective when they are dealing with Saami items. And my answer is quite clear. I just ask, “do you think that you were objective when you were dealing with this fisheries crisis between Norway and Iceland 15 years ago, because you weren’t! Not at all! You were taking part! You were speaking from the Norwegian interests, not the Icelandic interests! And that is also my point of view. I am speaking on Saami interests, not from the Norwegian interests. But I am very honest, I say I do that. But you try to hide it!”

Jon Gunnar Furuly, who identifies as a Saami journalist, is often critical of the quality of Saami media and journalists; however, he never questions the capability of Saami to be high-quality professional journalists simply because they are Saami journalists. He expressed frustration with his ethnic Norwegian colleagues who believe Saami journalists are innately incapable of objectively covering issues in Sámí, noting, “I find that very strange. We don’t say…we Norwegians shouldn’t cover Norway because we are Norwegian.”

**Conclusion**

In his 2006 English-language piece entitled “Saami Mass Media: Their Role in a
Minority Society,” John Tryvge Solbakk reflected back on a conversation he had in 1980—at the height of the Alta Dam hunger strike—^—with Saami journalists working for Norwegian and Saami language media. Sitting in his office more than 30 years later, he elaborated further:

We were journalists. Saami journalists writing in Saami, or even if we were writing in Norwegian, we were first of all Saami journalists because we had the outside world—the world outside the Saami area [was] filled with lots of media who wrote [about us] from the Norwegian perspective. Always.

So my question [to the journalists gathered] was: Would you admit that we are working for different audiences? Are you aware for whom you write…? Who do you want to inform? And who do you want to read your newspaper?

If you admit these are two different worlds—the Saami and the Norwegian—then you have to be aware of what you are doing. And be conscious about your role. You have first of all the responsibility for the Saami society, whether you are a professional or not, that is what your concern is. So, see who are the people you are writing for and make your work based upon that fact first.

But that does not mean that we are doing propaganda. [Rather,] we are informing people on what is happening.

It is interesting to note the importance placed on informing the Saami community about the things that are important in the Saami society but doing it consciously from a Saami starting point. It is here where El-Nawawy and Iskandar’s (2002a) understanding of contextual objectivity serves us well. Good journalism still needs to happen—that is crucial—but it is journalism that serves a particular audience within a particular context. As noted in the previous chapter on Romani media, “good journalism” indicates transparency, fact checking, having a
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87 I discuss the Alta Dam conflict in much more detail in Chapter 6 but, in brief: In 1978 the Norwegian government initiated the building of a dam on the Alta River without consulting with the Saami. The Alta River is a rich fishing river in Sápmi. For nearly two years there were protests, sit-ins and hunger strikes by Saami and others in solidarity. In early 1981, the Norwegian government called in the police to forcibly remove 600 people resulting in outrage throughout the country. This time period “The Alta Dam conflict” served as a turning point for the Saami movement in Norway and throughout Sápmi resulting in the publication of more overtly political Saami newsletters, more organized negotiations with the governments and cultivating support in Oslo as well as with other Indigenous communities internationally (A. Somby; Solbakk; Magga) The Norwegian government eventually did build the dam but later apologized. Many believe that the public shaming of the Norwegian government’s actions laid the ground work for more official governmental support for Saami issues (Solbakk, 2006b).
multiplicity of sources, and thus establishing credibility (Struthers, 02202012). It is for this reason that although the larger society should be addressed, it is seen as secondary in importance.

Katri Somby reiterated this point:

> The most important thing is that the Saami media is for the Saami society, that is the most important goal, but the secondary goal must be to reach out to the larger society as well. And being a minority and an Indigenous people, you are dependent on the majority society. Inform them and give them a chance to support us. Many times it is the lack of information that is the biggest enemy, so we need to explain to them. But our own people first! We need it more!

Unlike the goals of intervention expressed by Romani journalists, Saami journalists always viewed reaching non-Saami society as a secondary concern. In fact, if it appeared that “too much” attention was placed on non-Saami audiences (e.g., the decision for the NRK-Sápmi website to be in Norwegian), the number-one accusation was a lack of privileging Saami audiences. As Arne Johansen Ijäs repeatedly stated in the 2011 workshop, Saami media have a responsibility to the Saami people (Henriksen, 2011, pp. 38–41). Again, this is quite different from what can be seen in Romani media, which began with a focus on the Romani community and then, by the 2000s, focused on integrating Romani voices, perspectives, and bodies within mainstream media outlets. I argue that this is a reflection of the different political contexts in which Roma and Saami people exist and the role that journalism plays within these politics. Roma are a transnational ethnic minority seeking to hold the state accountable to its contract with its citizens, which requires the state to recognize Roma as equal citizens. Saami are a transnational Indigenous community seeking to build up parallel, respectful but not necessarily intersecting, nations. Thus, these journalists, in their respective contexts as the people taking up the charge of informing and educating the (a) public, have very different roles and yet share tools for doing, and teaching, good journalism.
Chapter 6—“Then People Know and [Then] Maybe Things Can Change”: How Transnational Peoples’ Journalism Shapes and is Shaped by Transnational Politics

It is a truism that to be a good journalist you need to be an unapologetic and unrelenting skeptic. I have been told numerous times, in numerous countries, that a journalist should not believe anything that anyone says: “Believe no one, not even your own mother!” Such advice could lead to the belief that all journalists, or at least all good journalists, see the world through a very dark cloud. Combine that with the stereotypes of black Balkan humor and the sober even-handedness of the Nordic North and the picture is grim. But forget all of that. Romani and Saami journalists are optimists: they are optimistic about the future of journalism, the inherent goodness and righteousness of people, and the functioning of democracy. They believe they can reach citizens and make real change in society.

And, of course, these journalists are also realists. Many have seen or even lived through wars, totalitarian regimes, and/or the attempted extermination and suppression of their languages and identities. Some have been persecuted because of their journalistic work. These are not naive or gullible people, but they do believe that power is neither inherent nor static (De Jong et al., 2005; Doty, 1996; Husain, 2006), and that journalists play a role in shaping society, primarily by providing the information and analysis citizens need to create alternatives. Those of us involved in journalism and human rights have much to learn.

In this chapter, I directly engage with the five research questions that guide my project, and show how the research questions engage with one another. The first three are descriptive—comparing and contrasting Romani and Saami journalism and the dynamics that shape their approaches to journalism and the training of the next generation of journalists—whereas the last
two are more suggestive of bringing together journalism and a transnational peoples’ standpoint in order to approach human rights from a non-state-centric perspective. This project also highlights opportunities for journalists and media outlets, as intentional political actors, to recognize and engage with productive power.

I begin with the premise that journalism plays an important role in human rights—both in terms of the right to media and the media’s role in providing people with information, and appropriate frames, so they can better recognize and expose human rights violations as well as propose and build solutions. As noted in Chapter 2, there is a lot of literature that connects media and politics, but “the media” is often portrayed as a disaggregated and often anthropomorphized force. In addition, the vast majority of the literature does not distinguish between media as an institution and the journalists that both comprise and create said media institutions. I have demonstrated that a journalist’s embrace of a transnational identity in his or her journalism provides that journalist with a particular and unique “starting point” that locates power within, between and beyond that of the state. My first three research questions detailed transnational peoples’ journalism as a quintain—a greater whole and process comprised of distinct case studies (Stake, 2006)—and how transnational peoples’ journalism is shaped, and shaped by, particular political contexts. Focusing on the quintain, I can more clearly understand the commonalities and differences between the transnational identities and politics of the Saami and the Roma and, in turn, how self-identified transnational journalists understand, engage with, and teach these concepts to the next generation of journalists.

This leads to the last two research questions, which squarely situate my research at the crossroads of many academic disciplines (as noted in Chapter 2) and provide a strong, practical connection between the fields of human rights and journalism.
Pulling from the Saami and Romani case studies, I begin by identifying three common characteristics of transnational peoples’ journalism that expand on Brysk’s (2013b) notion of “communication politics” (pp. 6–9). I move beyond the solidarity work of campaigning to creating political alternatives that work within, between and beyond the state through journalistic information and framing. Specifically, transnational peoples’ journalism focuses on:

1. Informing and thus potentially mobilizing people within, between, and across borders by providing information and analysis that is shaped by, and shapes how power and politics are recognized and used (Barnett & Duvall, 2005; Brysk, 2013a; Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Risse & Ropp, 2013);

2. Demonstrating a strong commitment to the Habermasian tradition and ideal of journalism, specifically: being vigilant for abuses of power, holding the powerful to account, truth seeking, democracy building and maintenance, and educating/informing a citizenry (Habermas 1964/1974; Strömbäck, 2005); and

3. Embracing the role of providing a “media alternative” as a contribution to the greater society, including, but not limited to, seeing media as a potential corrective to dominant discourses/power dynamics.

Both Roma and Saami journalists use two distinct approaches that can be helpful when attempting to develop strategies for socio-political change beyond a state-centered approach (research question 4) as well as developing a journalism focused on human rights (research question 5). The first is the conscious framing of stories, including the construction of potential alternative frames (Baer & Brysk, 2009; Bob, 2005; Plaut 2012a). The second involves the awareness and strategic use of identity/identities, including showcasing (or choosing not to showcase) language, culture, and history for both internal and external audiences (Husain, 2006;
Thus, my research questions help provide a better understanding of the tensions between the cases and the quintain (Stakes, 2006). The chapter is structured to explore and illustrate these tensions and common tactics (as noted above). Like Fairclough (1992; 1995), I argue that communication is not only content but also the media platform and the journalistic process itself. Such communication helps reshape and re-envision political possibilities that go beyond that of the state as the primary, and even most powerful, source of power. But of course, there are very real differences. Whereas the Saami media claim that their goal is to speak within the nation, the majority of the Romani media programs appear to seek to intervene within the dominant media. These respective approaches to journalism shape and are shaped by the political and financial contexts. They also illustrate the different relationships that Saami, as a transnational Indigenous people, and Roma, as a transnational ethnic minority without an external homeland, have with the state. For although both negotiate and make use of the state and state power, their strategies—and their use of journalism within this process—are quite different.

**Distinctions between Saami and Romani Journalism and Journalism Education**

Although I knew there would be vast differences because of the geographic location, history, and culture of journalism as well as the socio-political positions of Roma and Saami within the state, when I designed this project I also assumed there would be many similarities in their approaches to journalism. My assumption was based on the fact that both Saami and Roma
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88 As with all rules there are exceptions. When Roma who were citizens of Romania were *refouled* from France in the summer of 2010, two or three media collectives created music video parodies of the expulsion processes and had them circulated in more mainstream media outlets such as the *EU Observer* (Plaut, 2012b). The exaggerated use of stereotypes and strategic use of Romani language indicate that the videos were clearly aimed at both Romani and non-Romani audiences.
are transnational peoples who are engaged with journalism. In some ways, this presumption holds true—both groups of journalists operate within, between, and across state borders, but the relationship between their journalism and their politics is more complex. This section lays out the differences, which are illustrated in Table 6.1 using criteria I identified in Chapter 5. I then demonstrate why I still believe there is something distinctive about a transnational standpoint that can help us better understand the relationship between journalism and human rights within, between, and across borders. In addition, I highlight the different political goals in bold. These considerations are addressed quite differently in Saami and Romani media, and may at times be in tension with the norms of mainstream journalism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Romani journalism/journalism education</th>
<th>Saami journalism/journalism education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>Education is nearly always in the state language or in English translated into the state language.</td>
<td>Education takes place in Saami language with occasional guests/instructors lecturing in the state language or English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic selection</td>
<td>Primarily positive stories and/or human interest stories that show Roma in a non-stereotypical light; many stories focus on discrimination, education, and music.</td>
<td>Critical stories address socio-political and cultural concerns in the community and larger domestic, regional, and international issues that affect the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption of audience’s cultural knowledge and background</td>
<td>Many stories assume little knowledge of the Roma and/or assume the audience holds prejudiced views.</td>
<td>Most stories assume the audience is familiar with Saami history, society, and personalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalistic goals</td>
<td>Become a good journalist able to work within mainstream media/society; educate the audience and thus change the perception of the audience; expose and thus combat racism and discrimination.</td>
<td>Become a good journalist to serve Saami society; educate the Saami population about issues affecting them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of secondary importance: Teach Roma about their history and language.</td>
<td>Of secondary importance: provide Indigenous-focused (not just Saami-specific) news to members of the majority society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical goal</td>
<td>“Hippocratic oath of journalism”: Do not cause further harm to the community.</td>
<td>“Put a critical eye on our society; facilitate the debate within our society.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary political goal</td>
<td>Intervening in the dominant discourse</td>
<td>Speaking within the nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It goes without saying that when discussing an entire group of people, there is a risk of over-generalizing. Both Roma and Saami journalists and media programs/institutions hold their own dominant approaches to journalism and politics (and the interplay between the two), and of course there are diverging views as well. However, it is important to note that the dominant framing of journalism and politics shapes the funding, structure, rhetoric, and evaluation surrounding both Romani journalism and Saami journalism. I detail the distinctions below.

**Saami**

The politics of self-determination guide the goal of Saami journalism, the structures that support their media outlets, and the training of their journalists (Henriksen, 2011). The dominant view is that journalism is a way of maintaining and speaking to their nation while recognizing the diversity within that nation. This is seen, for example, in the use of Saami language in the media—it is promoted not simply as a matter of pride but as a means of communicating within the nation.\(^89\) Ođđasat, in some ways a modern manifestation of what began with the pan-Saami newspapers at the turn of the twentieth century, is a good example. Ođđasat is broadcast across Sápmi as means of informing Saami about important issues and providing information to allow discussion of these issues within a specific Saami context. This process was referred to by many of those interviewed as “informing the debate within the society” and was often considered one of the main goals of Saami media. It is also the reason why pan-Sápmi cooperation of journalists through trainings, conferences, and daily journalistic production—which is inevitably challenging—is also viewed as indispensable. At the same time, each state has a separate, state-

\(^89\) As discussed in Chapter 5, there are complications with this strategy given that the majority of Saami do not speak (let alone read or write) Saami and that Northern Saami is used as the lingua franca, leaving many smaller Saami languages such as Skolt Saami, Inari Saami, and Southern Saami underrepresented. That said, Yle Sápmi and, to some extent, NRK Sápmi have made a concerted effort to produce content in other Saami languages.
funded branch and produces journalistic content more specific to local contexts. These initiatives are recognized as *complementing* rather than competing with pan-Sápmi media and the pan-Saami identity. The process of working together and supporting one another despite differences while creating journalistic content is a key element of a Saami approach to politics (Plaut 2012a). There are, however, limitations to this approach.

It is important to remember that the different state governments within Sápmi provide the funds used to create Saami media. Saami media is solely funded by the governments of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and, to a much more limited extent, Russia. As noted in Chapter 5, there are no longer any alternative forms of professional media aside from those dependent on state support which limits the possibilities for political action outside of bureaucratic structures. More importantly, the majority of people involved in Saami media do not seek to directly confront how such Saami–state relations may shape the framing of political alternatives.90

In the model that has developed, the Saami media seek to be equal to, but separate from, the state media; it is a parallel media structure. Saami media are presumed to be one more manifestation and result of Indigenous self-determination (Graham, 2010; Henriksen, 2011). This has caused concern among a few Saami journalists, particularly those who were more involved in the Saami movement of the 1970s–1980s and were involved in the formation of parallel formal political institutions. Such “veterans,” as well as younger Saami from the Finnish, Swedish and Russian sides, expressed some similar concerns: the concessions made to secure cultural rights (language, education, and media institutions) may have involved a sacrifice in “hard” rights (land and financial resources). Referring back to the case of the Sea-Saami and fishing rights discussed in Chapter 5, it is worth noting that although there was some contestation

---

90 I thank Eben Friedman for his assistance in clarifying this point.
within the Saami and Norwegian media (Søreng, 2008), in the end the Norwegian state enforced
the fishing limits for all people, including Saami. The Fisheries Minister made this
announcement while standing next to the then-president of the Norwegian Saami Parliament.

Roma

“In a way the Roma Decade did not address Roma media—Roma media addressed the Roma
Decade...The Decade was a lost opportunity for strengthening further the Romani media”
– Gordana Jankovic, founder and director of OSF’s Network Media Program

The dynamics behind Romani politics and Romani journalism are very different. Roma are an
ethnic minority in every state in which they live, although levels of marginalization vary
considerably between different states (V. Friedman, 2001). The view most commonly expressed
by those involved in Romani advocacy is to seek recognition—inclusion—by the ethnic majority
and the government as (equal) citizens within the state (Sobotka & Vermeersch, 2012).
Journalism is one tool in this process. Since the fall of socialism, the financial support for this
process has always come from outside the state—most notably, from Western donors (especially
the OSF) and now, to some extent, the European Union.

In the past, Romani media funders, program coordinators, and journalists envisioned
Romani media as reaching both non-Roma and Romani audiences, but since EU expansion and
the launch of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, speaking to Roma is considered much more
secondary. One of the primary goals of the Decade of Roma Inclusion was to help streamline
Romano-related policies and funding per state. The hope was that bringing the governments of
different European countries together to discuss specific, tangible concerns facing Roma would
provide a European point of norm creation, leverage, and accountability. The concerns
selected—housing, education, health, and employment—were supposed to help integrate Roma
as citizens through state policy, oversight, and financing. As noted in Jankovic’s opening quote, the media were not included in this strategy.

Cultivating a Romani-specific approach to journalism (as in previous cohort-model programs such as the Romani Mainstream Media Internship Program or Romani-specific radio stations) was in fact seen by many of those designing and funding programs as suspect, as marginalizing Roma from “mainstream” (read: non-Romani majority) journalism and society. Rather, journalism and media were marked as “neutral,” and thus could became a vehicle of integration into majority society as full, un-marked, citizens: “Roma journalists are just journalists!” This can be seen in both journalistic product and process: co-production funds, shoulder-to-shoulder training programs, and the use of national languages with English subtitles. This is markedly different from the “Right to Media” promised to both ethnic minorities throughout Europe and Indigenous peoples worldwide (Graham, 2010). In fact, when I spoke with OSF evaluators and program managers, I was assured that the goal was no longer Romani media but rather “good-quality Romani content” (Struthers), which was seen as progress—as “not putting Roma in the Roma box” (Dragomir). When I asked journalism trainers and program developers who the audience of the journalism programs was, I was told, almost dismissively, “everyone”: everyone within the state, the region and throughout Europe. De-emphasizing the Romani identity of the journalists and media outlets was seen as allowing their identity as journalists and the respect they earned to grow within the larger population, including that of other journalists.

When I spoke with Romani journalists themselves, the picture was a bit murkier. At times they wanted to be “just” journalists, and at other times they wanted to foreground their Romani identity. Unlike the trainers, program developers, and funders (all of whom were non-Roma) the
realities of day-to-day power imbalances and non-acceptance by the majority—as well as internalized racism—meant many journalists did not feel they had the “luxury” to “just be a journalist” at this time. Their place as citizens, both within the state and within Europe at large, was becoming increasingly marginalized. Their role as Romani journalists had become increasingly marked, even as the funding and political strategy was attempting to turn them from a distinct group into simply a storyline—a kind of “journalistic content.” Unlike Saami journalists, Romani journalists rarely had their own outlets anymore, and certainly did not control the funding or design their own strategies.

**Transnational People’s Journalism as a Quintain**

The Saami and Roma bring unique perspectives to politics, to journalism, and to the interplay between the two. As people who are often physically, socially and economically on the periphery, both are keenly aware of the state’s pressure and its edges. They see the state, and state mechanisms, as *one* source of power, but not the *only* source of power. For Roma, outside funders, transnational NGOs, and the European Union are significant actors; for Saami, transnational cooperation in the Saami, Arctic, and larger Indigenous worlds is a crucial manifestation of self-determination. In addition, both peoples recognize their identities in relation to the state as multifaceted: as citizens, as ethnic minorities, and as transnational peoples. These identities are not distinct *per se*, but rather work *with* one another. As both Roma and Saami journalists reminded me time and time again, they recognize the presence of the state—and the benefits they will at times enjoy from such citizenship in terms of travel, national courts and legislative bodies, as well as state financial obligations, but they are clearly aware of the limits as well. One of the unique roles of transnational peoples’ journalism is that it exposes
these complex realities of the state from the standpoint of nations that test these borders.

As discussed in Chapter 3, a quintain is the greater whole or target of comparative and other multiple case study research. I examine the quintain of transnational peoples’ journalism and journalism education through the specific case studies of Romani and Saami journalism education. To be clear, I define transnational journalists as people who choose to foreground their transnational identity as part of their journalistic identity. As can be seen in the previous chapters, this is a contentious position. There are many questions about how a journalist’s identity affects objectivity, professionalism, credibility, and the practice of journalism itself. But these journalists, and those who provide training and funding for this kind of journalism, have crafted ways of engaging with such tensions. The ingredients of the journalism (and the journalist) are partially determined based on the audience: is the goal of the media to speak inside the nation or to intervene outside the nation in the dominant discourse? The strategy is most often based on larger ideas of politics and power. As noted in the previous section, Romani journalism programs predominantly aim to change the dominant society’s view of the Roma. The media programs’ goals are to show Roma as full citizens within the states in which they live as well as within Europe, and to provide journalists (both Roma and non-Roma) with the skills needed to do this well. Saami journalists predominantly aim to “build up” the Saami nation by providing information to Saami to help them become better citizens within that nation, whose borders cross over those of a single state. On an individual level, one journalist may choose to highlight or diminish his or her transnational identity in particular pieces, stories, and news outlets (Dervišbegović, 06052013; Furuly; Papinot; Svala). As I have argued in previous work (Plaut, 2010; 2012a), rather than see this as inconsistent, one can see it as a strategic use of one’s identity and a calculated reading of one’s audience(s). In the end, what matters is what is going
to be the most effective for short- and long-term goals (Brysk, 2013b, pp. 8–9, 10).

Of course, belonging to a transnational people and foregrounding one’s transnational identity does not negate the political, economic, and social contexts that shape the practice of journalism. Each country has different rules and cultures of practicing journalism (Paltto; Rasmussen; Waisbord, 2013), as well as a unique political and ethnic makeup. As I was reminded time and time again, transnational persons are the product of the countries they (primarily) call home—the states where they primarily grew up and received their formal education. They are transnational, but, as PS, a Saami journalist who works for NRK-Sápmi explained and prefers to remain anonymous, stated, “We like to talk about ourselves as one people in three different countries, but, of course, there are state borders, and we are raised in the state system. So yes, we are one people, but we are in our country as well” (05252011, my emphasis). Tihomir Loza, Deputy Director of Transitions and the person primarily responsible for the organization’s Roma-specific projects, gave a similar example: “Your life [as a Romani journalist in Romania] isn’t only dictated by the Romani issue; it is influenced by ethnic Romanians and Hungarians and society as a whole” (03052012, my emphasis).

Particularly telling in both PS and Loza’s statements is that these different identities are seen as complementary rather than contradictory. Self-identifying as a transnational journalist creates a heightened awareness of the different political, economic, and cultural factors that influence identities for all people. Feminist, post-colonial, and critical race scholars describe the phenomenon of being an “outsider within” (Hill Collins 1986/2008; L. T. Smith, 1999). Similarly, transnational people who are journalists can help elucidate larger questions of state and nation as well as the ideals and practices of journalism. It is for this reason that, while acknowledging the vast differences between the Romani and Saami contexts, I choose to
approach transnational peoples’ journalism as a quintain.

Information as Power: People Can Change Their Minds…If Only They Know Better

“It’s not just Saami journalist good and outside journalist bad…it’s not that simple. What is important for us is not always what is important for them, the readers. What’s the bridge? How do you reach them?...One of the journalists that was probably the most influential in helping to change the perception of Southern Norway for the Saami was a non-Saami person from the southernmost place in Norway...he did something no one had ever done before; he just interviewed people. Saami people, going about doing their daily things. With their name and photos and the space to just talk. It had never been done before.”

– Ole Henrik Magga, former president of the Saami Parliament (Norwegian side) and the United Nations Permanent Forum on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

The use of media in the Alta Dam conflict mentioned briefly in Chapter 5 provides a clear historic example to better explore my second and fourth research questions: How do self-identified transnational journalists understand transnational politics, and what can be learned from transnational peoples’ journalism when developing strategies for socio-political change beyond a state-centered approach? Although Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) definition of information politics and symbolic politics and Brysk’s (2013b) enriching contribution of communication politics are helpful here, I argue that the Alta Dam conflict actually allows us to see transnational politics beyond the state.

Briefly, the conflict emerged between the Norwegian state and the people living near and using the Alta River—both Saami and non-Saami—in Finnmark, the northernmost county in Norway. Ande Somby, Ole Henrik Magga, and John T. Solbakk were all engaged in mobilizing against the Alta Dam, and they all mentioned the importance of reaching out to ethnic Norwegians living in southern Norway. The goal was to show an alternative perspective to the one put forth by the Norwegian government (Magga; RK; Solbakk). One of the most powerful
ways of providing alternative information was through *Charter 79*, a manifesto-like document modeled after Czechoslovakia’s *Charter 77*. *Charter 79* presented the Saami position and demands in forceful, clear language. According to Ande Somby, who helped print the document, *Charter 79* sold 80,000 copies in a country of less than five million people. Perhaps more importantly, *Charter 79* provided an alternative perspective on the situation and forced the issue into mainstream media. “The Alta Crisis” emerged as an issue, and fairly quickly the Saami in Norway were able to gain control of the frame (Carpenter, 2007; Baer & Brysk, 2009; Brysk, 2013b) and “reverse the burden of proof” (Price, 1998). Saami people are the original inhabitants of the land—including the river, so why was the Norwegian government in Oslo forcing decisions on the use of the land? Moreover, why is the host country of the Nobel Peace Prize using violent force to do so? Ande Somby explained,

> The media sensed that that the street support changed, and then they changed their direction. One example is *VG* [one of the larger papers in Norway]. *VG* was very unfriendly. They were so unfriendly that when the hunger strikers had their press conference, we refused to allow the reporters from *VG* to attend. This was quite a big blow to *VG* because this was the story. The editor had to go in person and offer to change the reporters to people [who were] more sympathetic. This was a big lesson to me. We *changed* the mainstream media and then the mainstream media *changed* the executive branch and within a few years we had the Saami Rights Commission, and in less than 10 years we had the Saami Parliament. (emphasis in original)

Here, Somby demonstrates the synergistic relationship between the crafting and distribution of information and the understanding of “facts.” When the Norwegian press was the only source of information and framing, the citizenry had no alternative way to evaluate and interpret “reality”: It was the Saami against the Norwegian state. Therefore, citizens supported the solutions by the Norwegian government put forth as the only feasible solutions. When different information was provided, different framing of the problems and actors as well as the possible solutions become more visible. New political solutions became credible and, in turn,
possible. Suddenly there were possibilities beyond the need to preserve the power, and sanctity, of the state. As Torkel Rasmussen explained, when presented with different information, people understand that “things don’t have to be the way they are now.”

This is classic “information politics” at both domestic and international levels (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 19–22), because it both challenged and created ideas of governance beyond the state. But I argue it also goes beyond information politics. It is also an example of productive power because it was the change in discourse that created the change in political possibilities and political will which in turn changed the discourse. Thus such politics creates new possibilities for imagining and exercising power (Barnett & Duvall, 2005). The availability of different information, combined with public pressure resulting from demonstrations and the state’s reaction (symbolic politics), changed the political realities on the ground. According to Ande Somby, “street support” changed precisely because Saami media provided a different frame of what was at stake for the different actors. The power (im)balance between the Norwegian government and the Saami in the North became clear. The issue changed from “What’s wrong with the Saami?” to “Why is the Norwegian government behaving this way?” As Price (1998) explained, what ensued was a “reversal of the burden of proof” (pp. 632–633). Ande Somby reflected, “All of a sudden, it was like, ‘What? We, Norway, are treating the happy little Laplanders so bad?! They just look after their reindeer and sing their strange songs! Why are we treating them so badly?!’” (my emphasis). A “framing contest” ensued (Baer & Brysk, 2009) to win the “hearts and minds” (Brysk, 2013a) of the ethnic Norwegians over to the idea that not only should Saami not be treated poorly in the name of the Norwegian state, but that they should in fact be treated differently because they are Indigenous.91
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91 Although there were differences within the Saami perspective (as well as among the Norwegians), at this point a desire for a more unified Saami front was seen as the most important political strategy (Magga; Solbak; Solbakk,
The Saami media response to the Alta Dam conflict could be read as a form of media intervention similar to that of Romani media, and in fact it did seem to begin that way because of the political realities at the time: There was much polarization between “members of the Saami movement,” conservative Saami, conservative Norwegians, environmentalists (who may or may not be Saami), and the vast majority of the un-politicized Norwegian public. In fact, the framing of information in Charter 79 became a tool for shifting the crisis away from the dam to that of Norwegian state control and the denial of Saami self-determination. By the end of the process, new institutions that were not part of the Norwegian state were created: the Saami Parliament, NRK-Sápmi, and the Arctic Council, as well as legislation and norms that tried to codify Saami self-determination. This is possible largely because of the politicking that took place—including the use of symbolic and information politics—that exposed the gaps within state power. This becomes a story—and provides space for re-framing that took place in journalistic works.

Because of the street hunger for the Saami perspective, the “alternative” quickly became more mainstreamed in the Norwegian and international press. Suddenly, VG’s editorial line, which had been hostile but still mainstream, became seen as extreme. As the mood of the street changed, VG had to shift its frame as well. Journalists helped paint a different reality, which, in turn, provided citizens with the information and motivation to help push the Norwegian government to take new action, which began to create political opportunities and power outside of the state structure: the creation of the Saami Act, the ratification of ILO 169, the creation of the Saami Parliament, and, perhaps most important to this discussion, a reconfiguration of Saami media that explicitly made it a separate division from the NRK.92 Saami and non-Saami on the

---

Finnish and Swedish sides of Sápmi, some of whom were involved in the Alta crisis, saw this and, in turn, pressured their own state governments to act as well (Solbakk, 2006a). Within 15 years all the countries in Sápmi, even Russia, had state-recognized Saami deliberative bodies. In addition, the pan-Sápmi Parliament was created, modeled after the Inuit Circumpolar Council (Abele & Rodon, 2007; Plaut, 2012a).

This, of course, is the unique thing about transnational peoples’ journalism. The citizens transnational journalists hope to reach reside within, between, and across multiple states. In reflecting on the Alta Dam case, it is important to remember that the Saami reached out for support not only to southern Norwegians but also to Inuit, Maori, and the First Nations communities in Canada (Sanders, 1980; Solbakk). This broadens the understanding of both journalism and democracy beyond the response of one government to the needs and wishes of its (state-bound) citizens. Both Saami and Romani journalists spoke of the possibility of learning from the experiences of other Indigenous communities and/or ethnic minorities facing similar struggles in their own contexts (Hansen; Loza, 2013; Petrovski). As Aslak Paltto explained,

> You have the possibility to take information and examples and inspiration from New Zealand, Australia, Sápmi, Guatemala…Why aren’t we looking at that and then translating it into Saami language and then publicizing it? It could be so much more powerful if you could have the Saami support of something happening in Nunavut!

Paltto explains that when he states that “it” can be more powerful he is referring to the possibilities of political change. He continues, explaining that he wakes up every morning and goes to his computer to scour Galdu.org, Indian Country Today, and other online sources of Indigenous news in order to see how it may be incorporated into Yle Sápmi’s website and radio programming. Transnational peoples’ journalism can showcase both problems and responses as a means of creating transnational political solidarity through cooperation without cooptation.
The Ideals of Journalism and Democracy

“Journalism and the media could be one of the ways of addressing the situation of the society that creates and perpetuates disadvantages....If you don’t get accurate and timely information about the situation, then you don’t progress—that is clear.”
– Tihomir Loza, Deputy Director of Transitions, March 5, 2012

Over and over again, I was told that a journalist’s role, in general, is to educate and inform his or her audience so that they can make good, well-informed decisions, thereby mobilizing and applying pressure on those in power. Journalism’s role in democracy was unquestioned and the supremacy of democracy was unquestioned, although all acknowledged what democracy looks like differs across the larger political-cultural contexts (Rasmussen; Strömbäck, 2005). From the Arctic to the Balkans, the same roles for journalism emerged: watchdogging, holding the powerful to account, truth seeking, democracy building/maintaining vigilance over the democratic process, and educating and informing a citizenry. Jon Gunnar Furuly explained this colorfully in an interview:

JGF: The best stories are the ones that hit the readers in the gut and they will (raise) HELL! They’ll read it and be like, “What the hell? What the fuck is going on?!” That is our dream story.

SP: And what are the readers supposed to do?

JGF: They are supposed to go to action. (emphasis in the original)

Research question 5 asks what can be learned from different forms of transnational peoples’ journalism when developing a journalism focused on human rights issues. According to all those interviewed, journalists themselves are not supposed to engage in activism; rather, they are supposed to provide information to the citizenry. It is then the citizens who can use said information to construct their ideas and opinions and mobilize—“raise hell!” The media provides
information that “enables people to act” (Moricz, 03022012). Jan Hansen, who was serving as the Acting Director of Galdu while I was conducting fieldwork in Sápmi, called words and information her “ammunition” to point out problems. But she was very clear that this was to “provide [the audience] with as much information, or good information, so they can do a good job” (my emphasis). She viewed the decision to take action as belonging to the audience, not the researchers and reporters working for Galdu (Hansen).

The Saami and Romani journalists who choose to foreground their identity are more nuanced in their approach. They recognize that, as a journalist, it is imperative that they engage in good journalism—diversity of sources, fact checking, and transparency—but were also keenly aware that their identities as Saami and Romani journalists can, and should, affect the framing of the stories. Slobodanka (Boba) Dekic of Media Centar Sarajevo explained the journalistic role as follows:

> Journalism is a profession where you need to provide information to the people. And that information needs to be correct, accurate, precise, objective, and this entire thing that you call professional standards. But apart from that, your job is to provide information to the politically responsible citizens who will then react upon that information if something is wrong.

Those who choose to highlight their credentials as journalists are extremely protective of the professional boundaries between journalism and activism: journalists provide information—otherwise, they “cross the line” into something other than professional, credible journalism (Dekic; Hansen; Papinot). Kent Valio, deputy director of NRK Sápmi, made the distinction clearly, stating, “We are Saami journalists, not Saami PR agents!” 93

---

93 Of course, as previously discussed in Chapter 2, Wade’s (2011) piece details how journalists used a series of editorials and articles to build consensus against female genital cutting in the 1990s, showing that this “line” is malleable in practice. Magne Ove Varsi, former director of Galdu and one of the architects of the journalism program at Sámi allaskuvla, wrote pointed editorials supporting fishing rights for Saami in Ságaat for six months
This line, however, is not static. As noted in Chapter 4, Ferenc Papinot and Daniel Petrovski, Romani journalists from Hungary and Macedonia, respectively, both spoke at great length about why, given the increase in racism against Roma, they have adjusted their journalistic practice. Both currently choose to focus on “positive stories” about Roma. This is a conscious decision in reaction to the current socio-political realities in Central and Eastern Europe as well as a way to combat what they see as increasing internalized racism. But they recognize the tension and were very clear that they do so while adhering to high journalistic standards and practices of good journalism: fact checking, transparency, and diversity of sources (Struthers, 02212012). As Kinga Rethy, deputy director of the Roma Initiatives Program, noted previously, a Romani journalist has to be “an excellent journalist” because he or she “will be attacked on facts versus opinion all the time.” And as Zelizer (2004) explains, the journalistic profession holds factuality to a near-holy level. Facts are so important partly because they are seen as so fundamentally tied to ideas of democracy: facts provide the citizenry with the information they need to take well-considered action. To mislead the citizenry would be to compromise the practice of democracy (Strömbäck, 2005, pp. 335–337, 341). But let us not forget that “facts do not speak for themselves, there is a learned discursive strategy that makes information effective” (Brysk, 2013b, p. 5). In other words, the frames that journalists choose to let the facts tell a story influence the story and the way the story is received. Self-identified transnational journalists can choose frames based on context variety of contexts, thus enacting contextual objectivity.

during the negotiation process. Varsi’s actions as an individual were tolerated, but they did caused some concerns about Galdu’s stance as an organization (Hansen).
Operationalizing Transnational Media Cooperation

One way that ideas of democracy and politics are pushed beyond a state-centered lens is through the structuring of transnational cooperation—through training programs and media outlets themselves. This practice is specifically written into the multi-state design of the various Romani and Saami journalism programs. Saami journalism initiatives, all of which are either part of the public broadcasting branches or are state-supported, have included negotiating with various state television broadcast companies to show Ođđasat and other programs (e.g., children’s programs) on the different state channels.\(^94\) Again, the goal is to reach an audience across all three Nordic countries, Saami and non-Saami.

It is important to remember that the vast majority of Romani media are funded through inconsistent donor support—programs and projects, so for Romani media, transnational interaction is institutionalized through programmatic design. Partially as an attempt to strengthen the notion of European identity and European cooperation, many EU funds for journalistic and cultural exchange programs require cross-border collaboration between organizations and journalists in member states.\(^95\) This creates financial incentives for these journalistic programs and outlets to cultivate transnational cooperation and media production (Dekic; Druker; Transitions, 2009, 2010, 2013). As discussed in detail in Chapter 4, racism against Roma has risen substantially in Europe since the mid-2000s, and because the Schengen zone allows people to travel without border checks, the movement of people—Roma and non-Roma—has increased

---

\(^94\) As noted in Chapter 5, in the fall of 2013, Yle and NRK-Sápmi began producing news about Saami issues in Finland and Norway, respectively. This will be broadcast on their own channels, and will also be available to be broadcast in Finland, Norway, and Sweden. There is increased awareness of the importance of providing Saami with news across Sápmi, as well as offering a Saami perspective on what is taking place in each country (Näkkäläjärvi).

\(^95\) There have also been attempts to create a Romani Media Network for Romani journalists and media managers throughout Europe since at least 1999, but many question whether the desire for the network comes more from the Romani journalists themselves or from donors (Skopljanac; Struthers, 02212012).
across state borders. European states and some non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and funders have tried to develop a European response to the discrimination faced by Roma—framed as “inclusion” within the European project and the state machinery—with very limited success. The Open Society Foundations (OSF) were pioneers in this approach. Gordana Jankovic explained the reasoning behind the OSF’s targeted focus on Romani media at the European level:

The Open Society Foundations work to assist communities in opening up their societies and, amongst other issues, to strengthen the plurality and diversity of voices. Therefore, having Romani media contributes to the opening of those societies by bringing into the debate voices of Roma. The informal network that Romani community media have created allowed them to have more informed dialogue on Romani issues. It also allowed them to improve inter-community dialogue among Romani communities in different countries in Europe and to formulate better requests directed towards European governments.

Here, Jankovic details the programmatic recognition of multiple audiences: Romani media allow Roma “to improve inter-community dialogue among Romani communities in different countries in Europe” for the purpose of engaging in politics. As explained in Chapter 4 and in other work, I am hesitant to support this approach because of the potential to both reify Roma as a single homogenized group and allow states to abdicate responsibility (Curcic & Plaut, 2013; Vermeersch, 2012).

One of the effects of this European approach to Roma is seen in the kind of journalism produced. After evaluating expenditure sheets and speaking with donors and grantees, it became obvious that since the Decade of Roma Inclusion was launched in 2005, donors’ support of Romani media is becoming increasingly regional and Europeanized. This is both reflective of and shapes Romani politics, which have also become more regional and Europeanized. Teams of

---

96 The Schengen zone is made up of 27 countries. A person who lives in the Schengen zone and/or holds a Schengen passport is entitled to travel throughout the entire area without needing to show any additional visas or even a passport. For more information, please see [http://www.visa-schengen.info/en/schengen-area.html](http://www.visa-schengen.info/en/schengen-area.html).
journalists from different countries are producing more media, and they are using a wider range of formats which can easily cross borders: blogs, online television spots, and multimedia pieces that can be accessed by audiences within, between, and across states. While recognizing that media alone will not eliminate systemic and structural discrimination (Struthers, 02292012), funders and those designing journalism programs see journalism as a way of reframing the relationship between Roma and Europe. Put simply, according to donors, the role for Romani media appears to be advocating for Roma to be recognized as citizens of Europe. This perspective, however, is not necessarily in line with those of Romani journalists or advocates for the human rights of Roma.

As demonstrated in the title of Transitions’ latest project, *Europe: A Homeland for the Roma*, which received half a million euro from the European Union, “Europe” has become the focus, and “Europeans” the audience. This involves reframing the Romani presence in Europe not as an “invasion” into particular countries but as a fundamental part of the European fabric.97 Presumably, then, European countries who are members of the EU can hold each other accountable—through a community of democracies—and promote European standards of citizenship, including non-discrimination against the “most vulnerable” populations (Brown, Dwyer, & Scullion, 2013; Transitions, 2013; UNDP, 2011).98

Does this change of frame regarding Roma—and a strengthening liberal democratic “European Project”—facilitate a change in actual power relations (Barnett & Duvall, 2005; Fairclough, 1992; 1995)? Unfortunately, much of the most violent discrimination taking place on

---

97 Once again, Price’s (1998) understanding of “reversing the burden of proof” is useful here: Roma no longer have to justify why they are in Europe. Instead, Europe has to justify why it is not providing the safe home it should for its largest transnational population.

98 This may also be why the frame of Roma as “victims” of society is so commonly, and problematically, used in much of the media—but this is also actively challenged (Beckman, 01072012; Cox 12172012; Dragomir; Plaut, 2012a).
the ground is occurring at the local and municipal levels, often in response to a feeling by local people that they have been abandoned by their national governments for Europe. Therefore, while media intervention at the European level supports the European Project, it may actually exacerbate local animosity: “recognizing Roma as equal citizens” is reduced to “being nice to Roma” or, even more insidious, “being soft on Roma.” Given the current socio-economic realities, non-discrimination is framed as a value for the far off European Court of Human Rights in Brussels rather than something that matters to villagers in rural Northeast Hungary. This is one of the problems that occur when institutions—be they well-intentioned funders or members of the politically minded European Union—try to shape the frame of transnational politics for transnational peoples rather than enhancing journalists’ skills so they can create their own frames.

Transnational Politics Shaping, and Shaped by, Transnational Journalism: Examples

As demonstrated throughout Chapters 4 and 5, Saami and Romani journalists operate in extremely different contexts and have different strategies for achieving socio-political change within, between, and across borders. The economic resources as well as the international organizations and movements available to them vary greatly. These are all significant considerations in the understanding of journalism. Saami (with the exception of those on the Russian side of Sápmi), live in Norway, Sweden and Finland—some of the most affluent countries in the world that are often held up as the models of deliberative democracy. Saami are organized in a bureaucratic fashion in different countries, as well as across Sápmi and the pan-Indigenous communities, and have access to influential political bodies. Roma, on the other hand, live in countries that, nearly a quarter of a century later, are still “transitioning” from
Socialism into hyper-capitalism and increased nationalism.\textsuperscript{99} Between twenty and forty percent of the people in the region are officially unemployed and far right parties becoming increasingly mainstream (OSF, 2014; UNDP, 2011). In addition, whereas the Nordic countries have a long history of public broadcasting press subsidies, state support for media in Central and Eastern Europe is decreasing, as is the overall quality of journalism (Loza; Đerđišbegović; Saracini; Moricz). And although there are pan-Romani organizations (many based in Western Europe with leadership originally hailing from Central/Eastern Europe) they are struggling to have real political power on a state, regional or European level. In addition, the EU, although it recently pledged some financial and rhetorical support, is a political body responding to the political calculations of its member states. In other words, on Romani issues the EU can best be considered an “inconsistent” point of leverage.

Thus, the political realities and strategies of the two transnational groups are different: Saami employ a political strategy of Indigeneity whereas Roma, although almost always citizens of a state, appeal to the rights of being an ethnic minority without a historic homeland (Brubaker, 1996). These different political realities—in terms of claim making and politicking—in turn shape, and are shaped by, journalism.\textsuperscript{100} Table 6.1 illustrated how their journalistic strategies are different—Romani journalists primarily aim to intervene within the dominant discourses of the states in which they live, whereas Saami journalists primarily speak within the nation. Below I offer two in-depth examples as can be found in Roma and Saami journalism, respectively.

Before Europe: A Homeland for the Roma, itself a classic example of contesting the exclusion of Roma, Transitions spearheaded a project entitled Colorful but Colorblind, which I

\textsuperscript{99} I thank Gergely Romsics for his thoughts on the “never ending transition,” which he shared at a workshop at Columbia University The Internal Other in East Central Europe, December 3, 2013.

\textsuperscript{100} By using this term I include not only issue formation but also the identifying points and strategies of leverage that locate power outside the state (Tarrow, 2006).
discussed briefly in Chapter 4. Five EU countries are profiled in *Colorful but Colorblind* with five stories each for a total of 25 stories. The videos are four to six minutes long and produced in the state language with subtitles in English. Each video is tagged with a topic. Some topics coincide with beats that would be found in most newsrooms: Religion, Family, and Sports. But there are also more unique beats: Prejudice and Discrimination, Tradition, and Giving Back to Community. Richard Beckman, who played a lead role in both projects, reflected on the tensions that arose in both projects between balancing the (non-Romani) audience’s preconceived notions and prejudices with legitimately compelling stories. One video profiled a grandfather discussing his dying trade as a shoeblack in Bulgaria, and another a young woman who was sold into marriage against her will at the age of 12 in Romania. Both are high-quality stories with compelling characters and show the nuances and tension of social pressure, changing economics, and poverty, and the protagonists’ strength in analyzing their situations. Both protagonists unsettle the idea of victimhood. They denaturalize poverty and childhood marriages, respectively as part of Romani culture and express hope for members of subsequent generations to make different decisions. However, the production team (a mix of Roma and non-Romani journalists) was hesitant to include the stories because they could feed into pre-existing stereotypes. In the end, the team involved in *Colorful but Colorblind* decided to keep the stories.

This is one example where the desire to portray “positive stories” to Europe was being negotiated with the responsibility and role of journalism as a forum for deliberative democracy. It was one of the few examples where Romani journalists (and the non-Romani journalists working as partners) chose to showcase the diversity within the communities in English language media—and were provided the financial, technical and journalistic support to do so. It was also an example of the politics of transnational self-representation through media. The website itself
can be searched by country or by theme; thus one can see the diversity of experiences of “sports” or “discrimination” across the region as well as the richness of Romani stories within a particular country. That said, it is clear that the audience is international; almost all videos are in the state language, not Romani, and subtitled in English. The website is in English. This is reflective of the political goals of Romani journalism—to insert Roma into the state and the European conversation.

Romani media goals are markedly different from Saami media goals. Saami journalism focuses on demonstrating self-sufficiency and providing thorough coverage of stories that will affect them as Saami. These can be local stories or analysis of decisions being made at a state or international level but with a “Saami” lens. This can be seen in the Chapter 5 example of Avvir’s coverage of the incident involving the 83 dead reindeer in Kárášjohka. By focusing on in-depth discussion with the reindeer herder and an analysis of subsidies and grazing laws, Avvir moved the frame away from the sensationalist images of carcasses (which is how it was covered by the non-Saami media) to a conversation about systematic issues of land management and accountability (Eira; PS). As Avvir is only published in Saami language, it shapes the conversation of Saami-specific politics, reaffirming power within the community and not that of the state.

As can be seen from the examples above, the realities that shape Romani and Saami politics are quite different, and this in turn shapes the claims made by, and through, journalism. At the same time, the journalism itself—the stories selected, the journalistic mediums/outlets, as well as the framing of the story in terms of language choices and content as well as media transmission and distribution—affects the politics. In both cases the state is important, but is by no means the sole source of power. The transnational reality shows the very limits and tensions
of the state as a non-totalizing source of power and identity.

**Media as a Corrective for All of Society**

*“Journalists are like a goldfish in his or her own bowl. The goldfish may not be conscious of what kind of water they are in, but the Saami journalists need to jump into different bowls, find food, and then go back in their own bowl.”* – Ande Somby

A central finding that emerged from this research was the belief by Saami and Romani journalists that members of the majority society were simply unaware of how much they were shaped by their own nationalism and worldview. Presented with an alternative viewpoint and reality, the majority society learns about what is happening in Saami or Romani society (Magga; Saracini, 05082012); in addition, a clearer picture emerges for the majority society about the existence of its own worldview (Haetta). De Jong et al. (2005) explain this synergistic relationship well:

> Media and their sources frame the news agenda, structure the debate and create what we perceive as the reality in which we live. In this sense, news media play a hegemonic role in our society—their perceptions and interpretations of the world become common sense. However, this process is continuous and creative, not static and rigid... *It is this common sense that has to be both engaged with and challenged by those seeking to achieve social change.* (p. 6, my emphasis)

Awareness of one’s positionality is important not only in making decisions, but also in filtering through the information presented. It helps one recognize the various frames presented. By questioning the “common sense,” people are better able to see, question, and change the machinations of power within their own society and can therefore act as more informed citizens. This makes for good journalism. It is also an important part of good human rights advocacy. As Brysk (2013b) reminds us, it is important to remember that the entire human rights regime has been shaped by the state-focused nationalism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (p. 25).
According to Ole Henrik Magga, members of the majority society often do not reflect on their own positionality, whereas like Hill Collins’ (1986/2008) “outsider within,” Saami must be able to think from multiple perspectives. Thus, Saami and, I would argue, most self-identified transnational journalists, are better able to identify and negotiate where power lies and how it is protected and wielded. This is what Ande Somby meant when he described journalists as goldfish: Saami journalists, because they jump from bowl to bowl, are more aware that the bowls exist and that different bowls have different characteristics. The media’s role is to expose the bowl and the water in a factual and critical way: “People need to know who is responsible. People need to know how things are” (Magga). The political and economic structures that maintain and perpetuate inequality and power imbalances are exposed. In addition the social and political systems that normalize this—often through Culture Talk—are actively refuted. Harding’s (1993) notion of strong objectivity can help us here; those who do not benefit from the status quo—for example, people who are transnational and thus have a complicated, contested, and at times problematic relationship with the state—often consciously work to create a clearer picture of “how things are.” This “work” is often educational and self-educational, as can be seen from the topics covered in Saami journalism education and co-production or shoulder-to-shoulder strategies in Romani media projects.

In sum, a transnational standpoint does exist, and it is an important contribution to both journalism and human rights advocacy because it questions the assumed, reified existence and supremacy of the state and the state system. For those with a transnational standpoint, it is clear that states are constructed and not a given. Sovereignty and systems of governance exist at different levels—within, between and across states. This does not simply mean that states are failing to exercise their power, but rather that power is exercised, negotiated and challenged
differently. International politics involve not only the relationships between states; they can include other nations, entities, and organizations that may use the state, go beyond the state or directly confront the state. In other words, politics—including accountability and leverage politics—do not have to be limited to an interstate dynamic (Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Risse & Ropp, 2013). Examining stories on the Draft Nordic Saami Convention or the Decade of Roma Inclusion or the Arctic Council, it becomes clear that these kinds of politics are not just in the realm of theory, but have direct impacts on the ground and are being wrestled by real people in very real ways (Plaut, 2012a). Through good journalism, such information—framed in particular ways—provides a more nuanced and more accurate way of seeing the world. Further, the credibility cultivated and protected through the profession of journalism makes such perspectives—and alternative ways of structuring the world—available and viable to others. As Torkel Rasmussen said almost in passing, journalism has the potential “to show that things don’t need to be like they are now.”

Specific Contributions to the Various Literatures

This project aimed to bring together a variety of different literatures in order to better understand the possibility of teaching a form of journalism that focuses on framing and investigating issues through an intentional transnational standpoint, but in such a way that the journalism remains credible. I also make a direct connection between the lessons we can learn from this kind of journalism when addressing human rights issues (violations, analysis and potential solutions) through journalism. This project works with and across a variety of fields of literature, borrowing, expanding and problematizing some core assumptions and, in turn, aiming to shape future conversations.
In the field of **International Relations** the project aimed to place the *journalist* and the role of *journalism*—rather than simply “the media”—in the conversation of agenda setting and framing. In this way, I recognized that *journalism* (including the funding, outlets and education) is both shaped by politics and shapes politics on a state and interstate level. Journalism *is* a part of Barnett and Duvall’s (2005) contribution of recognizing productive power within world affairs. As de Jong and colleagues (2005) correctly point out, “media and their sources frame the news agenda, structure the debate and create what we perceive as the reality in which we live” (p. 6). At the same time, my dissertation highlights that the *journalist* can be an intentional political actor who can both perpetuate and disrupt how problems and solutions are framed within, between and across state lines.

One of the most interesting findings generated by this project is a questioning of “the state” as a single unit of analysis—unvarying across national contexts, cultures and dynamics. As is evidenced throughout this work, the culture of “the state” directly affects how media, media outlets and, in turn, journalism and the journalists are understood and supported financially and institutionally. In the Nordic countries, with their history of democratic socialism, “the state” is often framed as the protector of and provider to the citizens. A strong state, monitored and evaluated by an informed public, through a well-funded public media, is a functioning state that is fulfilling its obligations (Strömbäck, 2005); discord erupts when that promise to provide and protect—as defined by various publics—is broken. By contrast, in Central and Eastern Europe, there is a long history of the state overreaching its powers, of amassing economic and political power for its own gain under the rhetoric of providing and protecting the citizens. For that reason, many citizens in this context often presume the state to be corrupt and suspect. Although public broadcast systems have always existed, rather than being framed as a public service for
debate, such newspapers, radio stations and television were recognized as the mouthpiece of the state’s interests.

In short, the politics of the state shape the media landscape and the media landscape affects journalistic content, which in turn can affect the state. But how the state, media landscape and journalistic content shape one another differs in different contexts. People in formal positions of power make decisions regarding the funding of media outlets, the regulations of broadcasting license, the taxing of advertisement and the accreditation of journalists. These are all political and economic decisions that are shaped by a cultural understanding of what the roles of the state and the media, and the relationship between the two, should be on an institutional level. On a personal level such an understanding shapes how journalists envision their role in relation to the state—and other forms of power—and that is what I term “the journalistic ideal.” This ideal varies based on the positionality of the journalist as well as the media outlet. Journalists with a self-identified transnational standpoint are well aware of the presence, power and limitations of the state in the framing, or absence, of certain stories. This can offer important insights for all journalists as noted by Nils Johan Haetta when discussing the “fishing crisis” between Iceland and Norway: Saami journalists could see the presence of the state in the Norwegian press coverage of the fisheries whereas ethnic-Norwegian journalists who do not identify as transnational, did not. It is here where I turn to journalism and communications literature.

In the fields of Journalism and Communications, I seek to show how a critical approach to the political economy of media is enhanced by an appreciation of more critical understandings of objectivity—one that detangles objectivity from neutrality. Institutions are shaped by, and are shaping, the discourse surrounding them. With regard to the political
economy of media outlets, I borrow from Fairclough (1992, 1995) in recognizing that the funding of media outlets is often tied to the state in terms of varying levels of financial support as well as types of regulation. Such institutional decisions are shaped and in turn shape the understanding of the role of media within that particular society. My research shows that the importance of media outlets, as well as their financial stability, cannot be overstated. Important consequences flow, however, from different forms of financial support. Exclusively relying on state funding, as can be seen in the Saami case, provides a stable media outlet but can at times stifle direct criticism of the state. This, in turn, can lead to a more insular media and limit the vision of alternatives and advocacy that can have wider political effects. At the same time, a lack of state support, as can be seen in Romani media, puts journalists in a constant state of scrambling and survival which can compromise both the journalism itself – the “journalistic brand” (Struthers 02292012). Journalism/media production, in this case, then becomes part of an “NGO culture” (Dekic; Dervišbegović, 05232013), a project satisfying the perspectives and desires of foreign donors, with their own social, economic and political interests.

In other words, both of these economic models have direct effects on how the content of the media itself is created as well as how the story is framed: if the journalist is seen as serving the nation, this affects the media outlet and the framing of the story. If the journalist is seen as a watchdog and agitator to the state, this too frames the story. It is here where a more robust understanding of objectivity—bringing in contextual objectivity with strong objectivity—is useful. Both journalism that is “serving the nation” and journalism that is “intervening in the dominant discourse” require people to be skilled journalists, but what those skills are, and how they are taught and assessed, varies.

With the Internet and its role in creating more access to creating, distributing and
consuming content, the field of journalism education is currently in great flux. Some have even questioned whether there is a need for formal journalism education at all (Folkerts, Hamilton, & Lemann, 2013.) My work offers an argument for formal journalism education as well as ongoing professional development within the varied and evolving journalistic culture. Journalism education allows people to take a step back from the daily pressures of finding and filing stories under ever tightening deadlines to identify, reflect on, and interrogate one’s lens. To ask “why” an incident becomes a story—why is it important? For whom? Who are the various actors involved: institutions, people, structures -- and how does power flow between them? How can one go about covering that story? And perhaps just as importantly, by covering this story, what stories are being missed and what are the consequences of covering, or not covering, particular stories?

This kind of inquiry requires a bit of distance from the field; just as a news outlet invests in Twitter training or new cameras, they will need to invest in teaching the background, the content and the contexts, to better frame stories. This kind of journalism education is what is being supported at Sámi allaskulva, and it was the basis of the Roma Mainstream Media Program; both approaches ensured that a distinct worldview (language, politics and history) was woven into the education. An example can be seen in the evolving approach to the formal teaching of Saami journalism. For nearly a decade students in Sámi allaskulva’s journalism program could choose between a two-year program that focused on the technical aspects of journalist work or a Bachelor’s degree that included an additional third year providing a basis in Saami language, culture, politics and history. In 2012 it was decided, after consulting with students, as well as the Sámi media outlets and the instructors, that all students, if they are to receive their degree from Sámi allaskulva, need to have a strong foundation in things that are
Saami from across Sápmi. In that way they distinguish themselves as Saami journalists and can approach their journalism from a “Saami starting point.” Therefore the policy was changed and all students in the journalism program must study for the full three years. But such education is not, and need not be, limited to the classrooms. One can see the different ways that Avvir and NRK-Sápmi, both Sámi journalistic outlets, chose to cover the scandal of the 83 dead reindeer, a decision made in the newsroom and in the field. The ability to reflect on these decisions can, and should, be encouraged by those already practicing the craft.

Journalism education cannot simply be limited to those just entering the field; rather, editors and more senior journalists also need continuing professional development opportunities in which they stop and question: as mentors they, too, need to explore why certain practices have become normalized and if there are other ways to go about understanding what “good journalism” can be. These kinds of questions are often seen, at best, as luxurious, and, at worst, as annoying—getting in the way of getting the work done. I argue that journalism education is work, because it is helping to strengthen the fields of journalism. In order to be a good journalist, one must have the language, skills and background to find and investigate stories in a solid and thorough way. As Dekic, Papinoit and Furluy explain from opposite ends of Europe, when approaching stories about human rights, this journalistic rigor is what distinguishes between human rights advocacy, which uses facts to push for a particular course of action, and human rights journalism, where a journalist investigates and frames actors, problems and solutions in a story so that a well-informed audience can make a well-reasoned decision about what actions they choose to take. Just like Romani journalists working in Romani media or Saami journalists, in order to do this, and do this well, a journalist must have a strong foundation in journalism as well as human rights language, laws, actors, debates, institutions as well as methods.
Next Steps to Thinking and Doing Human Rights Journalism

This project attempts to bring into conversation critical media theorists, media practitioners, IR scholars, and feminist standpoint theorists in exploring the bridge between journalism and advocacy when engaged in creating change in the world. There are, however, certain points that emerge in thinking through these issues that are notably absent in the literature and deserve further attention. I will end this chapter by highlighting three points that deserve further discussion and provide suggestions for how to do human rights journalism.

Firstly, with the exception of Clifford Bob in his work Marketing Rebellion (2005) where he illustrated the “competitive marketplace” of causes, there is very little discussion of the role of communication departments within NGOs as a form of journalism. Many IR scholars discuss how media organizations are beginning to turn to certain NGOs as sources of reliable information. More attention needs to be paid to which NGOs are deemed credible, and which ones are deemed too biased (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 18-20). Most IR literature focuses on NGOs distributing information to international organizations, states and the media, but it has rarely classified this as a form of journalistic practice. Recent developments within Human Rights Watch (supported in part by the MacArthur Foundation) have shown that NGOs are quite aware of the decreasing size of international news bureaus and are beginning to position themselves as a bridge between formal “mainstream news” and their own advocacy agendas (Bogert, 2011). Questions that need to be explored further are: What criteria are used by journalists to make this assessment? What interests shape the frames they use to gather information for potential stories? How are they assessing credibility? How does this change the reporting practice, including sourcing, fact-gathering, and editing?

Secondly, although Barnett and Duvall’s contribution of “productive power” does discuss
the importance of framing, there is a dearth of research in international relations focusing on what, if any, thought is taken to influence domestic opinion in recognizing human rights concerns. How can repairing human rights violations (both at home and abroad) be seen as within a state’s interest? If one recognizes that the “republican-liberalism” stream of international relations (Moravscik, 2000) is a dominant theory in much state policy (especially in the United States) it would behoove activists and media makers alike to think about how to shape domestic norms in recognition of the importance of international human rights principles. What role could mainstream media play in this? Fraser (2009) has suggested that the way social justice concerns are framed as representation or redistribution or recognition is too limiting and that justice claims are instead nearly always an intersection of all three and must be addressed as such. This is not novel to many social change advocates, but it is not the way issues are typically framed in mainstream media. What relationships could mainstream media cultivate with more radical, community, or alternative media—media that often embodies the role of connecting the “global” to the “local” as their starting platform? As El Nawawy and Iskander (2002a) challenge us, there is a way to present a “true representation of real events while appealing to public opinion” (2002a, par 8) – but I would offer that in doing so, one can also choose to engage in strategies that change the public’s opinion.

Lastly, much attention has been paid to chronicling the various “media rituals” and socialization strategies that go into creating the image and practices of a journalist. These rituals and practices are not a fait accompli. They were manufactured, and they have changed over time due to external and internal dynamics. What are some alternative forms of professional socialization that can enable the journalist to engage in credible reporting, while also recognizing that the default methods of “neutrality” and “balance” in the name of a weak objectivity actually
uphold the current power structures? What can mainstream media learn from transnational peoples’ media about how journalists can help educate other journalists who see their journalistic work as a way of creating a more dynamic, just, indeed “fair” world?

The relationship between journalism and human rights is often assumed, but rarely specifically discussed. Media is assumed to be passive—a mere conduit for amplifying various positions or perhaps evidence to be used to bring people to justice or help those seeking refuge. But within this discussion somehow, there are no people involved in this process, let alone people with agency. Rather, there is simply “the media.” With the changes of technology enabling a more interactive approach to the news, this narrow way of understanding journalism is being challenged. But I argue that this needs to be taken one step beyond the discussion of “social media” and “transparency as the new objectivity”; I challenge journalism schools and training programs to take their responsibility in molding the next generation of journalists even more seriously. If everyone can blog, tweet, and publish, then the journalist should be even more equipped to investigate, synthesize, and explain the world around them.

Below are a few ideas, based on what I have learned from transnational peoples journalism education, to point us in the direction of how to engage in human rights journalism.

Table 6.2 What is Human Rights Journalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT IS HUMAN RIGHTS JOURNALISM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All the attributes of “good journalism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizing and acknowledging your own perspectives/frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A basic literacy in international and domestic human rights law, language, and structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A heightened understanding of the contexts in which the news is being produced AND the audience(s)—being particularly aware of the threat of “culture talk” (Mamdani, 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Striving to investigate the story from the perspective of those NOT benefiting from the current balances/structures of power
• Focusing not only on what the problem is, but where solutions may be found (people, structures, ideas…) and how the framing of the problems shapes possible solutions
• Challenging yourself, and your audience, to go beyond the easy narrative

Conclusion: How a Transnational Standpoint Helps Write New Possibilities of Doing Human Rights, and Human Right Journalism

Both Roma and Saami are transnational peoples, and those who choose to identify as such bring the added political standpoint of belonging to a transnational people. Human rights activism (so often seen as “naming and shaming” states into taking the right action) must take this reality into account. Activism can and must go beyond the state. As the increased attention on gender-specific violence helps demonstrate, non-state actors (be they family members or corporations) will often misuse or abuse the notion of “culture” to justify some of the most vicious violations of human rights. Activists have responded by calling attention to this abuse through various strategies of communication politics. Much of the human rights literature within the past decade has focused on international terrorist networks, civil wars, and Internally Displaced Peoples (IDPs). As these examples show, state borders and control are fairly arbitrary and at times harmful when trying to respond to real human rights violations. Rather than simply writing this phenomenon off as an example of a state’s weakness, a transnational people’s standpoint can show that the “state” never was, nor should be, the unit of analysis from which to approach such human rights violations. A transnational standpoint allows not only for a reframing of what exactly the problems are, but also what and where the solutions may be. Just as it is not only the state that violates human rights, it is also not only the state that determines and implements what success may be.
People get their information, through frames, from many different places. They can also subvert such frames, which in turn can change the information and the realities on the ground. Transnational people’s journalism often engages in this process with a conscious understanding, and negotiation of the state and its limits. This is a powerful concept that can contribute to a much richer understanding of world politics and human rights. Too often human rights are assumed much too narrowly, as simply a lens and framework that protects an individual from the state and/or obligates the state to protect the individual (Brysk, 2013b; Osiatynski, 2009; Risse, Ropp, & Sikkink, 1999; 2013). In either case, the state is seen as the locus of power. A transnational standpoint helps question this assumption.

A transnational standpoint can offer a powerful lens through which to approach human rights because it does not conflate the nation, state, and government, nor does it assume that states hold the ultimate power and agency. It contributes to what Borzel and Risse (2013) term a needed “disaggregation of the state” (p. 82). Journalism plays the role of presenting and interpreting facts and in turn shaping the realities the political possibilities or policy and structures. This is what Barnett and Duvall term productive power. When transnational journalists unearth and publicize realities that address the nation, and cross state borders, it becomes very clear that the state is just one frontier and vehicle of politics. As the mobilization of Saami and other Indigenous peoples in response to the Alta Dam crisis reminds us, sometimes it is easier to secure policy change across borders than within them (Brysk, 2013b p. 274).

Thus, a transnational standpoint allows for a more robust understanding of “human rights” beyond individual protection by, or from, the state (Osiatynski, 2009). A failure of human rights compliance is often either written off as an unwillingness of the state to intervene or a case of “limited statehood”—where the state does not have complete control of the people,
institutions or use of force within the territory. Both explanations are too limited as both still presume that the state should have ultimate control over its territory (and the people and resources within it) but, unfortunately, sometimes fails to do so (Borzel & Risse, 2013; Risse & Ropp, 2013, pp. 3–4). Rather, a transnational standpoint contributes to the recognition that a distinction must be made between “statehood as an institutional structure of authority on one hand and the kind of governance structures on the other” (Borzel & Risse, 2013, pp. 65–66). A transnational standpoint helps bring this distinction to the forefront, but the in-depth analysis of Romani and Saami journalism and journalism education programs shows that context-specific considerations must be recognized. Transnationality itself is understood and operationalized differently by different transnational peoples, and by the various states and supra-state and non-state actors. This has direct implications for human rights advocacy, which is so often limited by its state focus.

For Roma, “transnationality” is conceived of and operationalized within a minority rights framework rather than an “emancipatory” framework. Partially because of the fact that Roma are a minority without a “historical homeland” (Brubaker, 1996), Western funders (most notably the OSF) have been the historical “protectors” of Roma. The goal of these funders is to ensure Western-style multi-ethnic democracy and the European Project. This goal has only increased over the past ten years with the expansion of both the EU and the Schengen Zone, the subsequent migration, and the accompanying increase in anti-Roma racism. Therefore, as discussed in depth in Chapter 4, the political approach to “Roma” has become increasingly Europeanized. There has been very little support to create a Roma-specific approach to politics; in fact, my research shows that such an approach appears to be increasingly discouraged. Increasingly, the goal is to make “good journalists” who can convince a non-Romani audience that Roma are equal citizens (of the
This differs significantly from the Saami approach to political and social change. Saami politics operates within an Indigenous self-determination framework. This too is reflected in the goals, structures, and funding of the journalism. The goal here is to have the state provide Saami with the resources they need to run their own affairs in a deliberative democratic manner (to ensure the “debate within society”). This encourages a “Saami perspective,” or a “Saami worldview” distinct from that of the majority society operating solely within the domain of “Saami affairs.” Saami politics and Saami journalism rarely focus on confronting the state as a governing apparatus—rather they build and maintain a parallel, Saami, world. “Transnationality” here is operating across Sápmi as well as within the Arctic and the larger world of Indigenous politics. Thus, Saami aim to be self-contained in their journalism as in their politics.

Why do both groups choose to use journalism as a key part of their political strategy? As I stated at the beginning of this chapter, it is because both groups strongly believe that journalism can inform, educate, and entertain and because of the idealized notion that journalists can speak truth to power. The question, then, is where power is assumed to lie. Too often, the “transnational dialectic of communicative action,” which Brysk (2013b) defines as a combination of information and symbolic politics, still presumes that governments of more powerful states need to be persuaded to support human rights (p. 260). Although Roma and Saami have very different understandings of politics—and even who or what may be “transnational”—one thing they share is a skeptical view of supremacy of the state. They both see power lying within, between, and across states. This can teach us something about the idea of human rights, in terms of both what
rights are (not simply individual vs. group rights) and how violations and solutions may be understood, proposed, implemented, and monitored.

What I term “intervening outside” and “speaking within” in terms of journalism is a reflection of the political strategies that in turn affect media strategies. It is truly a co-constructed process. The means of creating political alternatives is tied to the socio-political contexts of an individual’s transnationalism and the historical roles of journalism. This helps shape how new political realities are imagined and actualized. This is not simply a situation of a minority rights perspective versus an Indigenous rights perspective. Both “intervening outside” and “speaking within” are tied to political and historic (and in turn economic and structural) conditions. Journalism, and the training/socialization of people within this profession—for both the Romani and Saami journalists interviewed very much see it as a profession—is the medium used to inform, educate, and entertain. In this way transnational peoples, non-transnational peoples and the states themselves, can begin to imagine and enact new possibilities of power and politics.
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## Appendix A: Romani Media Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organizational affiliation and specific project</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Duration of project and current status</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Petrovski</td>
<td>Romani journalist Alumnus of the Roma Mainstream Media Internship Program (RMMIP) Participant in the Advancing Romani Visibility Project; journalist for Tocak</td>
<td>Advancing Romani Visibility Project—project involved Macedonia, Bosnia and Serbia but he primarily reported about Macedonia</td>
<td>Has been a journalist for a variety of Romani and non-Romani media outlets since 2006; currently freelancing and supplementing income by tutoring at a public school</td>
<td>In person at the School of Journalism and Public Relations in Skopje with email follow-up</td>
<td>May 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Cox</td>
<td>Photojournalist (formerly with AP and CBS); journalism trainer at Hong Kong University and for Transitions and other media organizations Co-trainer for Colorful but Colorblind and the Advancing Roma Visibility Project</td>
<td>Colorful but Colorblind: Slovakia, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary Advancing Romani Visibility Project: Bosnia, Macedonia, Serbia</td>
<td>Colorful but Colorblind was a 1-year project; the Advancing Romani Visibility Project was 2 years; trainings were 7 days</td>
<td>Two interviews: phone and Skype</td>
<td>December 17, 2012 and May 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferenc Papinot</td>
<td>Romani journalist Alumnus of the RMMIP, the Young Roma Journalism Training Program, and <em>Colorful but Colorblind</em></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Journalist since 2003, now working as a Press officer in the state Secretariat for Social Inclusion</td>
<td>In person at a restaurant in Budapest</td>
<td>March 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gordana Jankovic</td>
<td>Founder and Director, OSF Network Media Programs Supervises the overall budget of OSF Network Media Programs; approached Transitions for Romani-specific programs</td>
<td>Based in London; programs operate worldwide</td>
<td>Involved with the OSF for more than 20 years</td>
<td>Two phone interviews</td>
<td>May 2, 2012 and June 20, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Moricz</td>
<td>Director, Center for Independent Journalism (CIJ) — Hungary Oversaw the RMMIP 2006–2010; runs Sosinet.hu; designed the Young Roma Journalism</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Involved with the CIJ since the mid-1990s; RMMIP was a 10-month project, in hiatus since 2010; the Young Roma Journalists Programs was a one-off 6-month program; Sosinet.hu has been in operation</td>
<td>Three in-person interviews, two at the CIJ, one at a restaurant in Budapest; extensive email correspondence</td>
<td>March 2, 2012, May 20, 2013, and May 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Druker</td>
<td>Program; national partner with <em>Colorful but Colorblind</em> and <em>Europe: A Homeland for the Roma</em></td>
<td>Based in Prague; programs operate throughout Central/Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union</td>
<td>(sometimes sporadically) since 2009</td>
<td>Two Skype interviews plus extensive email correspondence. We also met in Vancouver and Prague for more informal conversation.</td>
<td>April 17, 2013 and April 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kinga Rethy</em></td>
<td>Executive Director, Transitions; Editor in chief of <em>Transitions Online</em>—</td>
<td>Located in Hungary; works on projects throughout Europe</td>
<td>Helped found Transitions; director since 1999;</td>
<td>In person at the OSF office in Budapest</td>
<td>March 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Marie Struthers</em></td>
<td>Deputy Director, Open Society Foundations (OSF)—Roma Initiative Emergency funds for Radio C and Roma Press Agency</td>
<td>Based in London; programs operate worldwide</td>
<td>Has been at the OSF in some capacity for more than 10 years</td>
<td>Two in-person interviews at the OSF office in London; one follow-up phone interview</td>
<td>February 20, 2012, February 29, 2012, and March 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Marius Dragomir</td>
<td>Program Manager, OSF’s Network Media Program; former coordinator for the Transitions Roma programs</td>
<td>Based in London; Roma-specific programs operated in Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Romania, Macedonia, and Serbia</td>
<td>Designed and lead project (2005–2008.); developed he shoulder-to-shoulder reporting method for Transitions</td>
<td>In person at the OSF office in London</td>
<td>February 21, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jordan</td>
<td>International reporter; journalism educator in Hong Kong, Lesotho and Slovakia; trainer for Transitions and other media organizations</td>
<td>Currently based in Lesotho, but worked in Slovakia and with journalists in Bulgaria, Serbia, and Macedonia</td>
<td>Usually 3-week projects with follow-up; has not engaged with a Roma-specific project since 2009</td>
<td>Skype interview</td>
<td>December 19, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedim Dervišbegović</td>
<td>Multimedia producer for Radio Free Europe’s Balkans Services; journalism</td>
<td>Based in Prague; worked on projects in the Czech Republic and Bosnia</td>
<td>1-week training, 10 days in the field, follow-up via email; has not engaged with a Roma-specific</td>
<td>In person at Radio Free Europe offices in Prague; follow-up Skype interview</td>
<td>May 23, 2013 and June 5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trainer and Co-trainer for <em>Colorful but Colorblind</em> and the Advancing Roma Visibility Project</td>
<td>project since 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nena Skopljanac</td>
<td>Executive Director, Meidenhilfe</td>
<td>Based in Switzerland; ran projects throughout the former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Intensive project-production-based work (month-long productions) in addition to coordinating 3–4 day trainings; as of 2012 OSF, ceased formal cooperation with Medienhilfe. It is unclear whether Medienhilfe is still in operation.</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>February 20, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrit Saracini</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Macedonian Institute for the Media; lead coordinator the Advancing Romani Visibility Project</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>The RMMIP was a 10-month program that ran for three years; the program ceased operations in 2009 when the School of Journalism and Public Relations in Macedonia opened.</td>
<td>Two in-person interviews at the offices of the Macedonian Institute for the Media, Skopje</td>
<td>May 7, 2013 and May 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beckman</td>
<td>Professor and Knight Chair of Visual Journalism at the University of Miami</td>
<td>Based in the U.S.; works on projects worldwide, including Roma projects in Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, and Romania</td>
<td>Projects are 2 years in duration; Beckman is also part of the development, training, and editing process, which extends his involvement.</td>
<td>Phone interview and in-person interview; follow-up during the training in Prague</td>
<td>January 7, 2013 and May 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slobodanka (Boba) Dekic</td>
<td>Media Centar Sarajevo (MCS)</td>
<td>MCS is based in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but the project involves 3 countries: Macedonia, Bosnia, and Serbia</td>
<td>Two years: <a href="http://www.tocak.org">www.tocak.org</a> is without funding and updated on a volunteer basis; the Roma radio program is, as of July 2013, still running</td>
<td>Skype interview</td>
<td>May 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tihomir Loza</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Transitions</td>
<td>Based in London; programs operate throughout Central/Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Involved with Transitions since 2000; majority of fundraising responsibility; in charge of all Roma-specific programs since 2008</td>
<td>Five phone/Skype interviews and extensive email correspondence. We also met in Prague for more informal conversation.</td>
<td>March 5, 2012, April 16, 2012, May 8, 2012, May 21, 2012, and May 5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former journalist</td>
<td>Based in the</td>
<td>Research for report took</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>February 20,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasha Lange</td>
<td>now media development researcher and evaluator Conducted research and wrote the report <em>Roma (in the) Media</em> in 2006</td>
<td>Netherlands; works worldwide Roma evaluation: Bulgaria, Hungary, Macedonia, Slovakia</td>
<td>three months</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaneta Trajkovska</td>
<td>Director, School of Journalism and Public Relations in Macedonia Former director of Macedonian Institute for the Media (MIM) approved the RMMIP in Macedonia; now oversees the recruitment and scholarship of 2–3 Romani students per year</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>The RMMIP was a 10-month program that ran for three years; the journalism school is 3 years old; sponsorship of Roma students is ongoing.</td>
<td>In person at the School of Journalism and Public Relations in Macedonia</td>
<td>May 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organizational affiliation and specific project</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Duration of project and current status</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Željko Jovanović | Director, OSF—Roma Initiative Program  
Emergency funds for Radio C and Roma Press Agency; former manager of a Roma Radio station in Serbia | Located in Hungary; works on projects throughout Europe                   | Director since 2010                          | In person at the OSF office in Budapest | March 6, 2012    |

* In spring 2012, the Open Society Foundations assumed new leadership; the organization is undergoing major organizational and financial restructuring, including the Network Media Program and the Roma Initiatives Office. Gordana Jankovic resigned from OSF in December 2013.
## Appendix B: Saami Media Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Anything”</td>
<td>Journalism student</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person and email correspondence</td>
<td>June 26, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ande Somby</td>
<td>Law professor and “veteran” of the Saami movement</td>
<td>Tromsø, Norway</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>August 2, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arne Johansen Ijäs</td>
<td>Head of the journalism program at Sámi allaskulva</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 24, 2011 and May 31, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aslak Paltto</td>
<td>Journalist for Yle Sápmi; head of the Sámi Journalism Organization; alumnus of the journalism program at Sámi allaskulva</td>
<td>Lemenjohka/Leammi, Finland</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 28 - May 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile Lindvall</td>
<td>Communications Director of Riddu Riddu</td>
<td>Kajford, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>July 21, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Gunnar Furuly</td>
<td>Journalist for <em>Aftenposten</em></td>
<td>Oslo, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>August 2, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Roger Ostby</td>
<td>Communications Director for Sámi Parliament</td>
<td>Kárášjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>June 23, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janne Hansen</td>
<td>Galdu</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>July 8, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tryvge Solbakk</td>
<td>Publisher and former journalist</td>
<td>Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>July 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katarina Påve</td>
<td>NRK- Sápmi; organizer for 2012 World Indigenous Television Conference</td>
<td>Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 27, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katri Somby</td>
<td>Former journalist (10 years NRK- Sápmi)</td>
<td>Tromsø, Norway</td>
<td>Formal phone interview, informal in person meeting and email correspondence</td>
<td>May 24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Valio</td>
<td>Deputy director, NRK-Sápmi</td>
<td>Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person and significant email correspondence</td>
<td>May 27, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lia Markelin</td>
<td>Dissertation on Saami media; journalism researcher; helped start the Sámi allaskuvla MA program</td>
<td>Helsinki, Finland</td>
<td>Formal phone interview, informal in person meeting, and email correspondence</td>
<td>June 28, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liv Inger Somby</td>
<td>Senior journalist for NRK-Sápmi</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu/ Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>June 26, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“RK”</td>
<td>Journalist for NRK-Sápmi</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu/ Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 23, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Johan Haetta</td>
<td>Head of NRK-Sápmi</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu/ Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>June 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“PS”</td>
<td>Journalist for NRK-Sápmi</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu/ Kárásjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 and May 24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ole Henrik Magga</td>
<td>Professor at Sámi allaskulva; former head of the Sámi Parliament and United Nations Permanent Forum on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNPFII)</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person and email correspondence</td>
<td>June 3, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirta Nääkkäläjärvi</td>
<td>Head of Yle Sápmi</td>
<td>Anar /Inari, Finland</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>July 2, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rune Fjellheim</td>
<td>Sámi Parliament</td>
<td>Kárášjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 27, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Beate Eira</td>
<td>Editor of Avvir; alumna of the journalism program at Sámi allaskulva</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person and email correspondence</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 and June 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silja Somby</td>
<td>Galdu and independent journalist</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>May 30, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein Svala</td>
<td>Journalist for Ságat</td>
<td>Kárášjohka, Norway</td>
<td>In person and email correspondence</td>
<td>July 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinar Pedersen</td>
<td>Rector of Sámi allaskulva</td>
<td>Guovdageaidnu, Norway</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>June 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Moring</td>
<td>Journalism professor at the University of Finland, Helsinki; helped initiate the Sámi allaskuvla MA program; teaches an international course in Sámi allaskuvla journalism program</td>
<td>Helsinki, Finland</td>
<td>Formal phone interview, informal in person meeting, and email correspondence</td>
<td>June 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torkel Rasmussen</td>
<td>Former journalist; former head of the journalism program at Sámi allaskuvla</td>
<td>Ohcejohka/Utsjoki, Finland</td>
<td>In person and extensive email correspondence</td>
<td>July 14 - July 15 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Questions for Romani media outlets and journalism educators:

1) What is a journalist?
2) What, if anything, distinguishes a Romani journalist from a non-Romani journalist?
3) What is the role of journalism within the Romani community? Within the non-Romani communities (the state? The region of Europe i.e., Balkans or former socialist countries or Europe)?
4) How are stories and sources selected? What makes a “good” story?
5) What do the terms “objectivity,” “neutrality,” and “credibility” mean when employed by Romani journalists? Are the practices and understandings any different than in non-Romani journalism? If so, why?
6) How do you teach those standards to others?
7) What are the criteria for a “good Romani journalist” and “good Romani journalism,” if there is such a thing? What are your criteria for evaluation?
8) What kinds of journalists would you hope to create? To support?
9) Who do you imagine is reading or watching or listening to the news and stories produced by Romani journalists? Why do you think that is the audience? Would you like to expand that, if so who else would you like to be in your audience? Why do you think they are not already part of the audience?
10) What, if any, connection do you see between socio-political change and journalism? Can you give a specific example that affects Romani people?
11) How would you define the terms advocacy or activism? What if any relationship does journalism have in advocacy or activism? What can be some of its strengths or some of its pitfalls?
12) Where do you get your funding? When did you start to get funding? How often do you renew? What kind of annual reports or “evidence” do you submit?
13) I know that funding for Romani media programs has changed over the years but can you explain how it has changed? Do you know why? How has this affected the Romani media? Has this had any effect on how Roma are covered in non-Romani media? How about Romani lives in general?

Donor (Open Society Foundation) Specific

3) What benefit does good Romani journalism have for Open Society Foundation? How does it further Soros’ goals and vision?
4) What role does training and education play in determining the feasibility of a Romani media project? In your experience, who identifies these needs? Who determines its importance?
5) When thinking specifically about Romani media training or education, who determines the trainers? The topics? The curriculum? The assessment?
6) Many people speak of the “donor dependence”—how would you define this? What does this mean when specifically addressing Romani media?
7) How do you define sustainability? How do you define sustainability specifically in the context of Roman media? Can you give some examples?
Appendix D: Questions for Saami Journalists/Journalism Educators

1. What is a journalist?
2. What, if anything, distinguishes a Saami journalist from a non-Saami journalist?
3. What is the role of journalism within the Saami community? Within the non-Saami communities (Norwegian or Scandinavian as well as other Indigenous or Transnational peoples)?
4. How are stories and sources selected? What makes a “good” story?
5. What do the terms “objectivity,” “neutrality,” and “credibility” mean when employed by Saami journalists? Are the practices and understandings any different than in non-Saami journalism? If so, why?
6. How do you teach those standards to others?
7. What are the criteria for a “good Saami journalist” and “good Saami journalism,” if there is such a thing? What kinds of journalists would you hope to create?
8. Who do you imagine is reading or watching or listening to the news and stories produced by Saami journalists? Why do you think that is the audience? Would you like to expand that, if so who else would you like to be in your audience? Why do you think they are not already part of the audience?
9. What, if any, connection do you see between socio-political change and journalism? Can you give a specific example that affects Saami people?
10. I know Saami University College teaches some journalism courses in English and these reach out to non-Saami students, can you tell me more about this process? I know some have Inuit students or other Indigenous students, are particular people or types of people recruited? If so, how? When did it start? What was the idea/goal behind the project? Who funds it? Is it connected to University of the Arctic at all or are there other institutional relationships? What, if any follow up is built into the project?

Galdu specific:

1) What are the goals of Galdu?
2) How is Galdu funded?
3) Who are its members?
4) Galdu has such a strong media presence—updated website and press conferences, academic journals videos etc. what are the goals of this communication? Who is the audience? Who are they reaching out to? How do you measure who is actually reading and utilizing your information?
5) In terms of the “Self Determination and Media” workshop—is this part of a larger workshop? If so, how was this topic selected? How are you defining journalism? What are the goals? How are you determining participants? What are the working languages?