Western Kentucky University
TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects | Graduate School

5-1-2009

The Conceptualization of Genocide in the International Media: A Case Study of Darfur

Kayla Costello
Western Kentucky University, kayla.costello@wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

Part of the Criminology Commons, Inequality and Stratification Commons, Place and Environment Commons, Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons, and the Race and Ethnicity Commons

Recommended Citation
Costello, Kayla, "The Conceptualization of Genocide in the International Media: A Case Study of Darfur" (2009). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects.* Paper 77.
http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/77

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact connie.foster@wku.edu.

The Conceptualization of Genocide in the International Media: A Case Study of Darfur

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Sociology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree
Master of Arts

Kayla Costello

May 2009

The Conceptualization of Genocide in the International Media: A Case Study of Darfur

Date Recommended_April 15, 2009___

Jerry Daday_____
Director of Thesis

Steve Groce_____

Edward Bohlander_____

_____
Director of Graduate Studies Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank Dr. Jerry Daday for all of the help he has given me in preparing this thesis and presenting it. He has been my motivator throughout this project, and chances are I would have given up long ago if it were not for him.

Dr. Joan Krenzin has also contributed greatly to my growth as a writer, teacher, and human being. She has always been supportive and has helped me through many crises, and for that I will be forever grateful.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Drs. Edward Bohlander and Steve Groce for their input and suggestions for this thesis. I am grateful that they agreed to take time out of their lives to evaluate my work and push me to produce a better final product.

Last I would like to thank my husband, Mitch Costello, for putting up with my complaints. Though I have tried to mask the amount of work that has been put into this degree, he has helped me to overcome many challenges simply by listening to me vent and helping me to put things into perspective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABSTRACT vii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW 4

The Situation in Darfur 4

A Brief History of Genocide 8

Stages of Genocide 11

Conceptualization Issues 14

Media Framing 15

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODS 21

Hypotheses 23

The Method 25

List of Deductive Codes 26

List of Inductive Codes 27

Intercoder Reliability 28

CHAPTER IV ANALYSES 31

Usage of the Word "Genocide" by Newspaper 31

Position of Article Author 31

Quotations 35

Context and Labeling 38

CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS 42

APPENDIX A List of Variables with Corresponding

Codes 47

APPENDIX B Analysis of Intercoder Reliability 50

REFERENCES 51

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Usage of the Word Genocide by Newspaper..... 32

Table 2: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Frames 33

Table 3: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Position of Author 34

Table 4: Usage of the Word Genocide by the Sudanese Government 35

Table 5: Usage of the Word Genocide by the U.S. Government 37

Table 6: Usage of the Word Genocide by Humanitarian Agencies 37

Table 7: Usage of the Word Genocide by Other Leaders.. 38

Table 8: Usage of Labels by Newspaper 39

The Conceptualization of Genocide in the International Media: A Case Study of Darfur

Kayla Costello May 2009 Pages 60

Directed By: Jerry Daday, Steve Groce, Edward Bohlander

Department of Sociology Western Kentucky University

Cross-national crime studies are often plagued with conceptualization issues. In specific, some countries may define certain acts of violence as crimes, whereas others may perceive these acts as justifiable or culturally prescribed. This difference in conceptualization is especially the case with the crime of genocide, which the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 defines "as any of a number of acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group." Despite this legal definition, countries, organizations, institutions or individuals may label a crisis as genocide, civil war, or another type of conflict. Because the printed mainstream media reflects and shapes the public perception of international conflicts, this research employs content analysis and quantitative methodology in

examining published accounts of the conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan over the last five years. Using articles from newspapers in the United States, Great Britain, China, and Qatar, I examined the extent to which the term genocide is used to illustrate this conflict within the mainstream media from these four different countries. The results of this study suggest that the geographic location of a news outlet does not necessarily play a role in the conceptualization of genocide. The most important factors in this process are the way in which the author of the article frames the conflict, whether the author chooses to use quotes from certain organizational leaders, and the context in which the term genocide is used when it is chosen in favor of the term ethnic cleansing or civil war. These findings imply that news sources play a large role in public perception of genocide.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to Article I of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948):

> The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

The United States of America signed this convention in 1988 and has since stood by and witnessed three instances of genocide without taking steps or pursuing policies or actions to prevent or punish it. While two of these genocides occurred in the mid-1990s in Rwanda and Bosnia, one of these genocides is currently taking place in Darfur, Sudan, where the Janjaweed Militia, a rebel group supported by the Sudanese government, is systematically killing and displacing members of small villages in Darfur by burning their homes, raping women, poisoning their water, and committing other atrocities against human life (Department of State 2004).

In previous incidents the term “genocide” was not

officially used until after the conflict was resolved. The case of Darfur is unique, however, in the sense that former President George W. Bush officially declared that the atrocities being committed fulfill the criteria of genocide. The use of this term signals a call to action, yet it took several years for any international troops or international peace-keepers to be sent to Darfur to help the victims.

The media has historically been a powerful institution in American society. Newspaper columnists, such as the Pulitzer Prize-winning Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times, have highlighted the atrocities committed by the Janjaweed against Darfurians. While some international humanitarian aid has reached refugees who now live on the Sudan-Chad border, the moral outrage at this genocide has been tame in the mainstream media and among members of society.

This research is an attempt to gauge the perception of this genocide using four printed media publications from four different parts of the world. This research employs content analysis to analyze the discourse used by the New York Times, the Guardian (of the United Kingdom), the China Daily, and Al Jazeera (an Arab news source) to examine how

the acts in Darfur are perceived in various parts of the world. In specific, how similar and/or different is the reporting of incidents in Darfur in a large, influential newspaper in the United States compared to accounts that are published in large media outlets from other parts of the world. The research attempts to uncover the discourse used by these media outlets for the purposes of understanding how the first genocide of the Twenty-First Century is conceptualized, presented, and framed for the citizens living in countries from these different regions of the world.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is an ongoing debate regarding the definition of the term “genocide,” which has led to discrepancies in media reporting of events taking place in Darfur. Because the media influence public opinion to a large extent, it is important that individuals be made aware of how conceptualization issues can affect the information they are receiving from news sources.

The Situation in Darfur

The crime of genocide is typically associated with political turmoil, which can make it easy for a nation to explain acts of genocide as being part of a "civil war." The Darfur region of Sudan is no different. The conflict in Darfur began in 2003 and various sources offer divergent viewpoints and perspectives as to whether the actions taken by the Sudanese Government and the Janjaweed militias constitute genocide or civil war.

The Sudanese government claims that the conflict is rooted in oil profits and that force is being used against Darfurians in an effort to prevent their uprising in

response to receiving an unfair share of those profits (Hagan, Rymond-Richmond, and Parker 2005). Human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and the Save Darfur Coalition have labeled the conflict genocide, basing their conclusions on victimization interviews administered to Darfurians residing in refugee camps on the border with Chad in 2004. These victimization interviews are the central focus of a recent publication, entitled "Darfur and the Crime of Genocide," by two prominent criminologists (Hagan and Rymond-Richmond 2009).

In their book Hagan and Rymond-Richmond list several elements present in Darfur that can be considered warning signs or indicators of genocide. The first of these elements is the background of tension between Arab and Black groups in Darfur, which is made visible to outsiders when examining policy changes made in the region during the years preceding the outbreak of the conflict. This tension promoted an "us" versus "them" mentality, causing government-driven conflict and dislike for the oppositional group. The second element is the arming of the Janjaweed militias, which had been taking place for 13 years prior to the beginning of the conflict. The arms were offered by the Sudanese government for the purpose of "cleaning" Darfur of

"dirty slaves," referring to the native "African" Darfurians.

Eventually the build-up of the conflict led to initial bombings and ground attacks on Sudanese villages, which are the third and fourth elements in Hagan and Rymond-Richmond's (2009) model. These attacks are coordinated by the Sudanese government and are very racially charged in nature, with the perpetrators calling out racial epithets in an effort to dehumanize and degrade their victims. This element of race hatred is the fifth element in the model.

The sixth and seventh elements reflect specific acts of violence committed against victims. First, sexual violence against the women of the group is widespread. Many Arab cultures stigmatize sexually victimized women, and the women will rarely become married after their victimization. The purpose of victimizing women in this way is to prevent them from reproducing with members of their cultural group. If a woman is married prior to her victimization, the chances are great that her husband will leave her after the attack. Aside from the sexual victimization of women in these tribes, the property of tribe members (including animals, farming equipment, food supplies, and other personal items) is also frequently stolen and destroyed by

these militias.

The final element of the genocide in Darfur (and possibly the most obvious) is the displacement of Black African tribe members. Over three million of these individuals have been displaced from their homes and forced to find refuge in other areas of Darfur, neighboring regions within Sudan, and within refugee camps. Another 200,000 have found temporary safety in the neighboring country of Chad (Hagan and Rymond-Richmond 2009:5-12).

Hagan and Rymond-Richmond offer significant documentation of the existence of these elements in Darfur, factors that have been present in past cases of genocide. Given these realities, Hagan and Rymond-Richmond (2009) have no reservations labeling the conflict in Darfur an act of genocide by the Arab Sudanese government directed against the Black African people residing in the Darfur region of Western Sudan.

Currently the estimated death toll in Darfur is between 200,000 and 400,000 (Kristof 2007) and over two million other victims are estimated to have been displaced from their homes. There is a major discrepancy regarding the real number of deaths due to exaggeration and de-amplification in reporting by various organizations that

hold different interests in the public opinion of the conflict (Department of State 2004). This discrepancy could also be due to the number of missing persons in Darfur who have not been determined dead or alive at this time. Another factor that must be addressed is whether the deaths that have occurred are truly the result of genocide. Many lives may have been lost in Darfur, but not all of them have been due to direct genocidal intent.

Refugee accounts of the atrocities being committed in Darfur describe a wide range of crimes against humanity. These crimes include males being shot or knifed, women being kidnapped and raped, the burning of entire villages, and the poisoning of village water supplies (Department of State 2004). This information has been gathered mainly through the previously mentioned surveys administered to the refugees of Darfur who are finding safety in neighboring Chad.

A Brief History of Genocide

The act of genocide has been present since the beginning of time; however, this act was not given a formal name until the late 1940s. The international community had reached a breaking point after the incidents of World War II, during which the Nazi regime in Germany successfully

exterminated more than six million Jewish citizens and another five million "undesirables." Survivors and their families were faced with the difficulty of bringing international attention to their situation following the Holocaust. During this period of time the jurist Raphael Lemkin began his efforts to bring recognition to these atrocities and crimes against humanity by coining the term genocide and relentlessly battling with judicial bodies to set punishments for those who commit such atrocities against other human beings (Power 2003).

The Holocaust is quite possibly the most recognized instance of genocide in history; however, an all-too-similar conflict took place in Armenia in the early 1900s. The death of two million Armenian Christians at the hands of the Ottoman Turks gave rise to the term "race murder," and it subsequently prompted Lemkin's initial interest in the development of the word genocide and its definition (Power 2003). The word genocide comes from the Latin *"gens"* and the Greek *"genos,"* meaning birth, race, or kind. Lemkin began formulating his ideas, but a real sense of urgency did not emerge until several members of his own family were victims of the Holocaust. Raphael Lemkin's ideas had been brushed aside until the international community was forced

to deal with the widespread outrage over the actions of the Nazis. Eventually Lemkin's persistence over the issue demanded attention and action, and the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was eventually passed in 1948, with the United States signing the document forty years later in 1988. (Power 2003).

History has seemed to repeat itself since the genocide convention was passed. The convention calls for parties who sign the contract to make efforts to stop genocide before it starts or intervene when it initially begins. However, several genocides have taken place since the document was passed in 1948. These include the Cambodian genocide of the mid-1970s, during which Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge exterminated more than two million educated citizens and those considered to be a threat to their agrarian socialist experiment. Saddam Hussein's efforts in 1987 to eliminate all Kurdish Iraqi citizens led to the deaths of thousands. The Bosnian genocide of the early 1990s represented Serbian attempts to rid the region of Muslim and Croat citizens. During each of these conflicts, world leaders were reluctant to use the word genocide in describing the atrocities committed. It was not until after thousands of

people were dead and the conflicts had passed their climax that the term genocide was used by some to describe these acts (Power 2003).

In 1994 a new international reaction to genocide took place in response to the Rwandan genocide. At the time, this conflict was referred to as genocide by several members of the media and a few uninfluential U.S. government officials, but because it was not officially recognized as such, no large-scale intervention took place. The conflict was over quickly, leaving 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus dead after a six-week period. The international community reiterated their call for "never again" following the atrocities in Rwanda (Power 2003).

While the situation in Darfur bears many similarities to each of these prior genocides there is also one major difference. None of the previously mentioned conflicts were officially called "genocide" as they were taking place because the international community lacked the political will and desire to intervene militarily. In the case of Darfur, however, the conflict was officially labeled "genocide" by the United States Government and by the representatives from the United Nations and the European Union as early as 2003, just months after attacks against

civilians began. Despite the label of genocide, the violence continued with no substantial or significant effort from the international community to pursue a military intervention or diplomatic solution (Kristof 2007).

Stages of Genocide

There have been several attempts to create a paradigm to detect or predict genocide. In a 1998 report prepared for the State Department of the United States, Gregory H. Stanton outlines eight stages that have been present in each genocide throughout history.

The first stage is that of classification. Stanton suggests that, because every culture has social categories that allow its citizens to differentiate between groups, it becomes easy to create an "us" versus "them" mentality. Societies that are considered bi-polar are more susceptible to this way of thinking. This condition exists in Sudan, where the majority of the country is comprised of citizens of Arab descent and the minority are of African descent.

Stanton's second stage of genocide is symbolization. During this stage, members of the dominant oppositional group give names to the minority or use other symbols to identify them as being different from the rest of the

population. In the case of Darfur the terms Nuba (a derogatory term for Blacks), dog, donkey, and slave have been used by the Janjaweed to refer to the Black African population (Hagan and Rymond-Richmond 2009). This name calling allows for the third stage of dehumanization to take place. When one group labels another with animal names (such as dogs and donkeys), it dehumanizes the population and removes the notion that killing another human being from that particular group represents "murder."

Eventually the stage of organization begins. According to Stanton (1998), during this stage militias (such as the Janjaweed in Darfur) are formed, armed, and instructed on how to proceed. This process often breeds extremists, who then use their extreme hatred or desire for power to push the opposing groups even further apart during the polarization stage. In the case of Darfur several rebel groups were formed in an effort to combat the Janjaweed. In the sixth stage, preparation, the tasks of creating "death lists" and identifying those to be exterminated are performed.

All of this culminates in the final two stages. The first of these is extermination. This terminology is used to reinforce the idea that the humans being killed are

equivalent to bugs or other creatures. At this point the situation legally becomes genocide. After the killing spree is over, a stage of denial follows. The perpetrators will attempt to cover up their bad deeds, burning and burying bodies in an effort to destroy evidence. They deny any wrongdoing and typically try to blame the victims (Stanton 1998).

These conditions ultimately suggest the creation of an oppositional group, or a group of people who are targeted by a perpetrator or perpetrators for elimination due to some conflicting circumstance (Fein, 2002). These circumstances can cause differentiations in whether different groups believe genocide is taking place. The way that genocide was defined by Lemkin leaves much room for debate as to whether a conflict is genocide or not.

Conceptualization Issues

The discipline of criminology has done little to advance the study of genocide overall (Hagan, Rymond-Richmond, and Parker 2005). Former President George W. Bush officially declared the conflict in Darfur genocide in 2004, but researchers are still hesitant to take on such a sensitive topic. Because of political issues and lack of public interest, there does not appear to be an overt

desire to conduct social scientific research that examines the crisis in Darfur (De Waal 2007).

Although the media have played a large role in determining the public opinion of issues such as war, conflict, and international events (Piiparinen 2007), researchers have yet to study how the media currently portray the situation in Darfur. By using a content analysis research method, this research intends to gather information relevant to this large gap in the literature with the hope of advancing our knowledge of genocide and the way in which it is conceptualized in the media.

Cross-national crime studies are often plagued with conceptualization issues. Some countries may define certain acts of violence as crimes, whereas others may perceive these acts as justifiable or culturally prescribed. Crimes of genocide, which the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 defines “as any of a number of acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group," (Kasfir 2005:199) are especially at-risk for such problems. Conceptualization issues regarding the definition of genocide have provoked a new call to action for lawmakers to clarify which acts constitute genocide as

well as to redefine the responsibilities of the nations that have signed the Genocide Convention to intervene when a conflict has been labeled genocide (Welling 2007).

Media Framing

The concept of media framing has been used to broaden understanding of how the media impact policy formation during times of genocide. Due to the large increase in real-time availability of information on the Internet and from other news sources such as twenty-four hour cable news, media is considered one of the most influential institutions in society (Vincent 2000). The term "media framing" suggests that specific news sources frame information in such a way that viewers or readers interpret it in a different way from the way they would have if they had received the information from a different news source.

"Frames" can be defined as "fixed patterns for presenting and commenting on the news that organize the political debate in a way that it is comprehensible to the public" (Auerbach and Bloch-Elkon 2005:84). Generally the public is not aware of these frames, but in some instances framing is done in an overt effort to shape public opinion or influence government policy. This shaping can also be referred to as the “CNN effect.” The basic explanation of

the CNN effect is that media can have a large influence in the shaping of public policy when that particular policy is uncertain or if conceptualization issues are present, such as in the case of genocide (Robinson 2000). The idea that news sources play a role in creating definitions and policies by influencing the public through framing creates a gray area in research on genocide.

The media always play a role in shaping public opinion on genocide. Samantha Power's book *A Problem From Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* explains how media in the United States portrayed the genocides of the twentieth century and the results that those portrayals had on public opinion and national policy (Power 2003). The media have a large influence on public opinion because of their ability to choose which topics are discussed and how they are discussed through media framing.

Four months before the Armenian genocide of 1915 broke out, reporters from *The New York Times* in the United States began publishing warnings of what was to come. Henry Morgenthau Sr., a United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, matched these accounts with his own experiences and decided to push for intervention in Armenia. World War I was taking place at the same time, however, and President

Woodrow Wilson chose not to draw attention to the atrocities taking place for fear that U.S. public opinion would call for intervention (Power 2003).

During the Cambodian genocide several journalists from the United States were caught in the middle of the conflict. Sydney Schanberg, a foreign correspondent for *The New York Times*, was stationed in Phnom Penh when the city was invaded by the Khmer Rouge (Power 2003). Schanberg and his team had the opportunity to evacuate but vowed to stay in the country and do whatever they could to draw attention to the situation. Like the reporters in Armenia, they issued reports highlighting the actions of the Khmer Rouge and their intent to create an agrarian socialist society. However, U.S. government officials did not want to get involved because of the United States' involvement in Vietnam. Moreover, many government officials and humanitarian agencies did not believe that the events about which they were reading or were learning from Cambodians who escaped the killing fields by fleeing to Vietnam and other surrounding countries were taking place (Power 2003).

In the case of the Bosnian genocide, several news sources throughout the United States and Western Europe reported the events of the conflict. Reporters and

journalists were once again placed in the middle of the fighting and killing and were capable of using television news to broadcast live video and other images to the public. Several newspaper articles were published each day highlighting the events taking place, comparing the atrocities being committed, such as the murder of 7000 Bosnian men and boys in Srebrenica, to the Holocaust of World War II. The public was outraged and called for the United States to become involved. President George H. W. Bush condemned the atrocities taking place, but was hesitant to become involved due to the perceived high cost of intervention (Power 2003).

Previous studies have addressed the issue of how the concept of "framing" can influence public opinion during times of genocide or conflict. One study in particular looked at how the media represented the events in Bosnia in the early 1990s (Auerbach and Bloch-Elkon 2005). Using predetermined criteria for categorizing the position taken by news articles, Auerbach and Bloch-Elkon performed a content analysis of two different United States newspapers, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. A Likert scale was used to determine the position of article regarding the degree to which the international community should

intervene. The categories were Pro, Pro with Reservations, Neutral, Anti with Reservations, and Anti. Categories were also developed to determine the frames used by the authors of the articles. These frames could be categorized as being humanitarian, economic, or national-security based.

The results of Auerbach and Block-Elkon's study suggest that ultimately media influences public opinion. The Auerbach and Block-Elkon study serves as a launching point for this research project, which examines media framing for the genocide in Darfur. This research essentially employs the same criteria as the Auerbach and Bloch-Elkon study with a few modifications in order to better fit the circumstances of Darfur. The primary research question is whether usage of the word genocide differs in frequency and context in newspapers from different regions of the world.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

This study consists of a content analysis of newspaper articles taken from four different news sources: *The New York Times* in the United States, *China Daily* in China, *The Guardian* in the United Kingdom, and *Al Jazeera* in Qatar. These newspapers were selected because their primary media markets represent people from different cultures with different political attitudes. Each of these is also a major news source for residents from these parts of the world.

All articles discussing Darfur were selected from each of the news sources between the dates of January 1, 2004 and July 31, 2004. These dates were chosen for their timeliness relative to the study and also to limit the sampling frame in an effort to collect the most relevant articles. Choosing articles from this time period ensured that selections prior to and following former U.S. President George W. Bush's labeling the conflict genocide would be included. The articles used could be defined as

“hard-news” articles and were almost purely informational. Opinion pieces were also initially included in this study because of their potential to influence the opinions of their readers. However, these opinion articles were not included in the statistical analyses because opinion pieces were not available for all four of the individual news sources.

All of the articles used in this study were obtained from electronic databases located on the individual newspapers’ web sites. A search was performed in each separate database to find articles that fell within the desired date range of January 1, 2004 and July 31, 2004. A keyword search using the search term “Darfur” was used to find these articles. The word “Darfur” was chosen in an effort to maintain neutrality in producing articles that referred to the conflict as “genocide” as well as those that did not. A total of 301 articles that fit the criteria were obtained. After editorial articles were excluded from the sample due to them being unavailable in two of the newspapers, there were 82 articles from *Al Jazeera,* 24 articles from *China Daily,* 84 articles from *The Guardian,* and 81 articles from *The New York Times,* leaving a total sample size of 276 articles. The articles were then

individually printed and assigned case numbers.

Content analysis was used to provide in-depth analysis of the material in a qualitative fashion. The articles were coded both inductively and deductively. Quantitative analyses in the form of cross-tabs and Chi-Square tests were also used to determine the relationships between variables of interest and their statistical significance.

Hypotheses

This research is an attempt to test the following hypotheses:

> H1: Western newspapers will use the term genocide more frequently than will non-Western newspapers.

This hypothesis was developed taking into account the fact that the Sudanese government in Khartoum considers itself to be "Arab." I hypothesized that Arab media outlets like *Al Jazeera* would be less likely to use the word genocide. Moreover, China gets oil from Sudan so it would seem *China Daily* would be less likely to use the word genocide, also. Another basis for this hypothesis is the previous reaction from the Western world regarding genocide. When the word genocide is used to describe a conflict, there is typically an expectation that countries who have signed legislation on genocide, especially those with powerful military forces such as the United States and other Western European

nations, will be heavily involved in any intervention that may take place. Many media outlets in nations such as the United States and Britain are known worldwide, and past events such as those in Armenia, Cambodia, and Rwanda have shown the great efforts of Western journalists to bring attention to genocides as they are taking place.

> H2: Articles employing humanitarian frames will be more likely to use the word genocide than will articles using non humanitarian frames.

This hypothesis stems from the fact that humanitarian organizations such as Amnesty International and the Save Darfur Coalition consistently use the word genocide to describe the events in Darfur. If the author of a newspaper article chooses to frame the article in a humanitarian way, the author will also likely use the terminology used by humanitarian organizations.

> H3: Articles using quotes from Western leaders will use the term genocide more often than will articles with quotes from non-Western leaders.

H3 follows the same logical path that is used in H1 and H2. The United States was the first governmental body to call the situation in Darfur genocide. If the author of a newspaper article chooses to include quotes from leaders who consider the conflict genocide, it seems more likely that the author will use the term genocide themselves. If Arab leaders are less likely to use the term genocide, Arab

newspaper authors should be less likely to use the term genocide, also.

> H4: Western newspapers will be more likely to label the violence in Darfur as genocide than non-Western newspapers.

This hypothesis suggests that the authors of Western newspaper articles will be more likely to use the term genocide as a label for the situation in Darfur. There is a significant difference between this hypothesis and H1. H1 focuses only on whether the term genocide appears in the article or not. H4 takes into account the context in which the term genocide is being used. This hypothesis assumes that the authors of articles will be more likely to use the term genocide themselves either because they are using the same terminology their nation's leaders are using or because they themselves feel that the acts in Darfur constitute genocide. If the author labels the conflict genocide on his or her own, it can be assumed that he or she is overtly trying to shape public opinion.

The Method

Content analysis was chosen for this particular study because it combines both qualitative and quantitative analysis and is extremely useful in studying print media. This method was used to examine several variables found

within the sample of news articles. The articles were hand-coded according to a preconstructed coding sheet as they were read. The coding sheets were then entered into an SPSS data file after all coding was complete. There were several instances during which new codes were added inductively and all articles had to be subsequently recoded for the new variables.

This content analysis was performed in an effort to replicate a similar study done by Yehudith Auerback and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon (2005) that focused on media framing in the Bosnian genocide. This study employed deductive codes similar to those used in their study. Each variable category was determined to be mutually exclusive and exhaustive so that no one variable was placed into two separate categories. Each category was clearly defined to assist in intercoder reliability.

List of Deductive Codes

The codes used from the Auerback and Bloch-Elkon study focused mainly on the position on intervention taken by the author of the article and the framing procedures used by the author to convey his or her message (for more detail please see Appendix A). Other variables that were determined prior to the start of the coding process

included the newspaper name; whether the author was male or female; the article date; the type of article; whether the words genocide, civil war, or ethnic cleansing were present in the article; and whether the author referenced any type of legislation on genocide. There were also several categories of quotations coded, including quotes from U.S. Government, Arab leaders, humanitarian agencies, or leaders from other nations.

List of Inductive Codes

As the coding process progressed, several other patterns in the newspaper articles emerged that might influence the findings of this study. The variables determined by these patterns were added to the code book, and each article was re-coded to include the variable. The variables that were inductively coded included questions about whether the article included photos or not; if so what type of photos were shown; whether the article included a quote from one of the Sudanese rebel groups; a context variable that determines whether the conflict in Darfur is being called genocide rather than the term simply appearing in the article; and, finally, if the article was being labeled genocide, a category was included to determine who was labeling the conflict as such.

The variable for "context" was determined by recoding each article in which the word "genocide" was present. Each article was re-read and coded based on how the author of the article was using the word. The word usage was placed into one of three categories: "labeled genocide," "word used but not to label the conflict genocide," or "word not used."

Intercoder Reliability

To assess the reliability of the coding procedure employed for this content analysis, a graduate student from the Department of Sociology at Western Kentucky University volunteered to code a sample of the newspaper articles used for this study. A sample of 36 articles (a little over ten percent of the total sample) was selected randomly and coded according to the guidelines created for this study (please see Appendix A). The intercoder data were then linked to the original data file and analyses were performed to determine the level of agreement and consistency between the author and the volunteer coder (please see Appendix B).

The results of this analysis suggest a high level of agreement for the following variables: the word “genocide” was used (89%), the word “civil war” was used (89%), the

word “ethnic cleansing” was used (80%), a quote from a victim was used (94%), a quote from a member of the Sudanese government was used (80%), a quote from a member of the U.S. government was used (80%), the name of a human agency was mentioned (94%), and a quote from a rebel group was used (91%).

The results also suggest a low level of agreement for several variables. The “position taken by the author” variable had a 55 percent level of agreement ,and the “frames used” variable had a 50 percent level of agreement. These low percentages are most likely due to the subjectivity of the variable. Regardless of the coding guidelines, it is still ultimately the reader’s decision as to into which category the author’s writing style fits. These particular variables were open to interpretation and are based on the reader’s personal impression of the article and the author of the article.

Other variables with low levels of agreement were: a quote from another world leader was used (58%), a quote from a humanitarian agency was used (66%), and a reference to legislation on genocide was used in the article (52%). The low levels of agreement for these variables seem to be caused by a lack of clarity or understanding of what each

category entails. It may have been unclear to the volunteer coder which items belong in these groups. An effort was made to alleviate this problem through readjusting the coding guidelines for these variables to include lists of all people, groups, or titles of legislations that would fall into these categories.

After the coding of the documents was completed, all data were entered into SPSS for quantitative analyses. The hypotheses listed above were tested using a series of cross-tabs with chi-square tests of statistical significance. A p-value of less than .05 was used in this study to determine a statistically significant relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES

In an effort to incorporate mixed methods into this study, statistical analyses were used to quantify results and test the significance of the findings. Through the process of coding, qualitative data were converted into numerical form and entered into SPSS in order to analyze the data quantitatively.

Usage of the Word "Genocide" by Newspaper

Hypothesis 1 stated that Western newspapers will use the term genocide more frequently than will non-Western newspapers. The results in Table 1 suggest that there is no support for this hypothesis. The word "genocide" appeared in 19.6 percent of the *New York Times* articles (N=11), 18.5 percent of the *Al Jazeera* articles (N=15), 25.4 percent of the articles from *The Guardian* (N=15), and 34.5 percent of the articles from *China Daily* (N=10). The chi-square value of 3.65 was not statistically significant with a $p<.05$.

Position of Article Author

Hypothesis 2 stated that articles employing

humanitarian frames will be more likely to use the word genocide than will articles using non humanitarian frames.

Table 1: Usage of the Word Genocide by Newspaper

Word Genocide Used	Newspaper Name			
	NYT	Al Jazeera	Guardian	China Daily
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)
Yes	19.6 (11)	18.5 (15)	25.4 (15)	34.5 (10)
No	80.4 (45)	81.5 (66)	74.6 (44)	65.5 (19)

Chi-square=3.65, p<.01

The results in Table 2 suggest that there is support for this hypothesis. Table 2 compares the "word genocide used" variable to the authors' perceived positions on intervention and the framing techniques used in the news sources. The "position" variable was re-coded during analyses to exclude editorial-style articles that were present in *The New York Times* and *The Guardian* but not in the other two papers. The "frames" variable initially included four coding options: humanitarian, economic interests, national security, and other. These categories were collapsed and recoded due to the small number of cases in the nonhumanitarian categories.

With regard to the "frames" variable, 28 percent of the articles (N=46) that were coded as using "humanitarian" frames used the word "genocide," while only 8.2 percent (N=5) that were coded as using frames other than humanitarianism used the word "genocide." These results

were also shown to be statistically significant at p<.01 level through a chi-square test. These results show that articles using humanitarian frames were significantly more likely to use the word "genocide" in conjunction with their framing practices compared to articles with non-humanitarian frames.

Table 2: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Frames

Word Genocide Used	Type of Frame Used	
	Humanitarian Frames % (N)	Other Frames % (N)
Yes	28 (46)	8.2 (5)
No	72 (118)	91.8 (56)

Chi-square=9.996**, p<.01

Analysis of the "position" variable was used to offer more detail regarding the results in Table 2 by accounting for the overall position on intervention taken by the author of the article. Generally speaking, an author that frames the article in a humanitarian way would be more likely to frame the article toward a pro-intervention policy and use the term genocide more frequently. If the article is framed in a political or economic way it would be less likely that the author would frame the article in a pro position or use the term genocide. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3. This variable represents the authors' position on whether intervention is necessary

or not. The word "genocide" was used in 28.1 percent of the articles (N=39) in which the author's position was determined to be "pro-intervention." The word "genocide" was used in 8.3 percent of the articles (N=6) in which the author was considered "neutral," and 42.9 percent of the articles (N=6) in which the author was considered "against intervention."

The chi-square test for these variables found the results to be significant at the $p<.01$ level, which means that authors who were "against" intervention were significantly more likely to use the word "genocide" in their articles. These results are the opposite of the prediction in Hypothesis 2. The likely explanation for this difference is that the authors were not labeling the conflict genocide but were using the terminology either in quotations or in a manner that critiqued others' usage of the word to describe the conflict. This difference in context is further examined by the analyses presented in Table 5 that examine a context variable that was added later in the study.

Table 3: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Position of Author

Word Genocide Used	Author Position		
	Pro % (N)	Neutral % (N)	Against % (N)
Yes	28.1 (39)	8.3 (6)	42.9 (6)

No	71.9 (100)	91.7 (66)	57.1 (8)

Chi-square= 13.999**, p<.01

Quotations

Several variables were created to capture quotations used in the newspaper articles. The categories created included the measurement of quotations from Sudanese government officials, United States government officials, humanitarian agencies (such as Amnesty International or the Save Darfur Coalition), the rebel groups fighting against the Janjaweed militia in Darfur, and leaders from other countries. An analysis was performed examining the relationship between the presence of these quotes and whether the word "genocide" was used in the article. This analysis was an effort to gauge whether the word was being used by the author of the article or by some other important figure in the Darfur crisis. Hypothesis 3 stated that articles using quotes from Western leaders will use the term genocide more often than will articles with quotes from non-Western leaders. The results in Tables 4-7 suggest that there is some limited support for this hypothesis.

Table 4: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Quote from Sudanese Government

Word Genocide Used	Quote from Sudanese Government	
	Yes	No
	% (N)	% (N)

Yes	29.7 (22)	19.2 (29)
No	70.3 (52)	80.8 (122)

Chi-square=3.14, p<.01

The relationship between whether a quote from a Sudanese Government official was present in the article and whether the word genocide was used is shown in Table 4. The word "genocide" was used in 29.7 percent of the articles (N=22) in which there was also a quote from the Sudanese government compared to 19.2 percent of articles that used the word genocide when there was no quote from a Sudanese leader. The chi-square analysis of these data was not significant, suggesting that articles containing the word genocide do not differ based on whether a quote from the Sudanese Government was contained in the article.

The relationship between whether a quote from a member of the United States Government official was used in the article and whether the word genocide was used is shown in Table 5. Results suggest that out of the 48 articles in which a quote from the United States government was present, the word genocide was used in 39.6 percent of them (N=19). However, 18.1 percent of articles that did not have a quote from a U.S. Government official used the word genocide.

The chi-square analysis of these data shows

statistically significant results (p<.01), suggesting that the term genocide is used more often when the article contained a quote by a U.S. Government official.

Table 5: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Quote from the U.S. Government

Word Genocide Used	Quote from U.S. Government	
	Yes	No
	% (N)	% (N)
Yes	39.6 (19)	18.1 (32)
No	60.4 (29)	81.9 (145)

Chi-square=9.962**, p<.01

The relationship between whether a quote from a humanitarian agency was used in the article and whether the word genocide was used is shown in Table 6. The word "genocide" was used in 22 percent of the articles (N=24) with a quote from a humanitarian agency, as shown in Table 6. The chi-square analysis of these data does not show a statistically significant relationship which suggests that articles with quotes from humanitarian organizations do not use the term "genocide" more or less frequently compared to articles that do not have quotes from humanitarian organizations.

Table 6: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Quote from Humanitarian Agency

Word Genocide Used	Quote from Humanitarian Agency	
	Yes	No
	% (N)	% (N)
Yes	22 (24)	23.3 (27)
No	78 (85)	76.7 (89)

Chi-square=0.05, p<.01

The relationship between whether a quote from any other world leader appeared in the article and whether the word genocide was used is shown in Table 7. The results show that 27.1 percent of the articles containing a quote from another world leader used the word genocide compared to 21.1 percent of articles that did not have a quote from another world leader that used the term genocide.

Table 7: Usage of the Word Genocide Compared to Quotes from Other Leaders

Word Genocide Used	Quote from Other Leader	
	Yes	No
	% (N)	% (N)
Yes	27.1 (16)	21.1 (35)
No	72.9 (43)	78.9 (131)

Chi-square=0.9, p<.01

The p-value shows a statistically insignificant relationship, which suggests that articles that contain quotes from other world leaders do not use the word genocide significantly more frequently than articles without a quote from another world leader.

A chi-square statistic was performed on each of these

variables. The only variable that showed a significant result ($p < .01$) was the quote from a member of the United States government, suggesting that the authors of articles were significantly more likely to use the word genocide when a quote from a member of the United States Government was also used in their articles.

Context and Labeling

The final area of analysis looked at how the term "genocide" was being used. Hypothesis 4 stated that Western newspapers would be more likely to label the violence in Darfur as genocide than would non-Western newspapers. The relationship between whether the conflict in Darfur was referred to as genocide, ethnic cleansing, or civil war and the newspaper name is shown in Table 8. The results presented in Table 8 suggest that there is support for this hypothesis, which suggests that authors from *The New York Times* were significantly more likely to label the conflict in Darfur genocide than were *Al Jazeera, The Guardian,* and *China Daily*.

Table 8: Usage of Labels by Newspaper

	Newspaper Name				
	NYT	Al Jazeera	Guardian	China Daily	X2
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)	
Context of term "genocide"					
Labeled as "genocide"	23.5 (19)	7.4 (6)	8.2 (7)	17.2 (5)	18.459**
Word used, not labeling	16 (13)	11.1 (9)	25.9 (22)	17.2 (5)	
Word not used in article	60.5 (49)	81.5 (66)	65.9 (56)	65.5 (19)	
"Ethnic Cleansing" used					
Yes	30.9 (25)	32.1 (26)	31.8 (27)	31 (9)	0.034
No	69.1 (56)	67.9 (55)	68.2 (58)	69 (20)	
"Civil War" used					
Yes	22.2 (18)	16 (13)	21.2 (18)	20.7 (6)	1.124
No	77.8 (63)	84 (68)	78.8 (67)	79.3 (23)	
Totals	100 (81)	100 (81)	100 (85)	100 (29)	N= 276

**p<.01

The "context" variable yielded the only statistically significant results from this group with a chi-square value of 18.459 (p<.01). Authors of articles from *The New York Times* were significantly more likely to label the conflict in Darfur genocide than were authors of any other newspaper in the study, with 23.5 percent of the articles (N=19) doing so. Only 7.4 percent of the articles from *Al Jazeera* (N=6), 8.2 percent from *The Guardian* (N=7), and 17.2 percent from *China Daily* (N=5) labeled the conflict genocide. *China Daily* did not have as many articles included in the study as the others, which may have had some effect on these results. Additional analyses were not conducted using “context” as the dependent variable because

of the low number of articles present in the “labeled as genocide” category.

The usage of the terms “ethnic cleansing” and “civil war” were also analyzed in comparison to the newspaper name. Neither of these analyses yielded statistically significant results. The term ethnic cleansing appeared almost equally in each newspaper, with 30.9 percent (N=25) of articles from *The New York Times*, 32.1 percent (N=26) of articles from *Al Jazeera*, 31.8 percent (N=27) of articles from *The Guardian*, and 31 percent (N=9) of articles from *China Daily* using the term. The term “civil war” was used in even smaller percentages for each newspaper, appearing in only 22.2 percent (N=18) of *The New York Times* articles, 16 percent (N=13) of the *Al Jazeera* articles, 21.2 percent (N=18) of articles in *The Guardian*, and 20.7 percent (N=6) of the articles from *China Daily*.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This research sought to identify conceptualization issues that are present in cross-national crime studies. The specific focus of this research dealt with differences in media framing and word usage among four major newspapers from different areas of the world. The primary research question sought to determine whether usage of the word genocide differs in frequency and context in newspapers from different regions of the world. Several hypotheses that were based on previous research and literature regarding media framing were formulated prior to conducting the study.

Hypothesis one predicted that Western newspapers (such as *The New York Times* and *The Guardian*) would use the term "genocide" more frequently than non-Western newspapers (*China Daily* and *Al Jazeera*). This hypothesis dealt only with the frequency of articles in which the word genocide appeared and did not take into account any contextual information or the number of times the word was used in

each article. Based on the analyses presented in the previous chapter, this prediction was not upheld. *China Daily* had the greatest percentage of articles that used the word "genocide" for all articles that contained the word "Darfur" between January 1st and July 31st of 2004. Because China is a major trading partner with Sudan and relies on Sudan as a source of oil, one would expect the Chinese media to refrain from calling acts in Darfur genocide. This expectation is especially the case considering the fact that media in China are subject to rigid government censorship. Based on the data from this study it must be concluded that there is no significant difference in the percentage of articles that use the term genocide in different regions of the world; however, further study in this area with a larger sample size is necessary.

A second prediction based on previous literature was that articles that employed humanitarian frames would be more likely to use the word genocide than were articles that employed nonhumanitarian frames. The results provided support this hypothesis. If the author of a newspaper article chose to frame his or her writing in a humanitarian manner, the author was also significantly more likely to use the word genocide than were authors who use other

framing strategies. This finding may suggest that when articles focused on the humanitarian aspects of the crisis in Darfur, genocide was the context used. If other framing strategies were used, such as economic or national security interests, the context of civil war or ethnic cleansing was used.

The third hypothesis predicted that articles that used quotes from Western leaders (such as government officials from the United States or European nations) would be more likely to employ the word genocide compared to articles that used quotes from non-Western leaders. The data presented in the previous chapter found support for this prediction, suggesting that the word "genocide" was appearing in articles with quotes from Western leaders more frequently than in articles with quotes from non-Western leaders. This finding, in combination with the findings of Hypotheses two, suggests that further research must be done in order to shed more light on whether the presence of the word genocide is due to the framing strategy being used by the author or the quotations being used in the articles.

The final hypothesis for this study was that Western newspapers would be more likely to label the violence in Darfur as genocide than would non-Western newspapers.

Unlike the first prediction for this research, this hypothesis takes into account how the word genocide is being used in each article rather than focusing on whether or not the word is present in the article itself. Analysis of the data in the previous chapter showed that articles from *The New York Times* were significantly more likely to label the conflict in Darfur genocide than were those in any other newspaper in the study, while the articles from other media outlets such as *Al Jazeera* were much more likely to use more neutral terms such as "ethnic cleansing" or "civil war."

This research shows that there are marked differences among newspaper contexts in the terminology used to describe the conflict in Darfur. These differences can be explained by the geographic location of the news source, the media-framing practices used by the authors of news articles, and the involvement of government or humanitarian organizations in news reporting. Previous research by Auerbach and Bloch-Elkon (2005) found that media framing practices greatly influence public opinions. The results of this study add to these previous findings, suggesting that there are several factors that contribute to the framing procedures used by various media outlets located in

different areas of the world.

This research may be generalized only to the articles and news sources used for the study. There were several limitations to this study, including small sample sizes and a limited time span during which newspaper articles were selected. Future research should expand upon this study and include other major world newspapers and articles from other time periods during the conflict in an attempt to create greater generalizability. There may have also been issues regarding the translation of *China Daily* and *Al Jazeera* from their native languages into English. It is suggested that future research on this topic take into account these shortcomings and attempt to correct them.

APPENDIX A

List of Variables with Corresponding Codes

Variable 1: Main Position Taken by the Article

1. Pro (for intervention in Darfur)
2. Pro with reservations (for intervention in Darfur, but only under specific conditions)
3. Neutral (neither for nor against intervention in Darfur)
4. Anti with reservations (against intervention in Darfur, unless specific events take place)
5. Anti (against intervention in Darfur)

Variable 2: Frames

1. National Security (involvement/non-involvement in Darfur will directly effect the lives of the public)
2. Economic interests (involvement/non-involvement in Darfur will provide economic gains)
3. Humanitarianism (involvement/non-involvement in Darfur is necessary because killing others for any reason is wrong)
4. Any combination of these

Other Variables:

3. Newspaper Name

4. Author (male/female)

5. Article Date

6. Type of Article (opinion, story, editorial)

7. Word “genocide” used (yes/no)

8. Word "civil war" used (yes/no)

9. Word “ethnic cleansing” used (yes/no)

10. Quote from victim (yes/no)

11. Quote from member of Sudanese Government (yes/no)

12. Quote from US Government Official (yes/no)

13. Quote from Arab leader (yes/no)

14. Quote from a humanitarian agency such as Amnesty International, USAid, The Save Darfur Coalition, Doctors Without Borders (yes/no)

15. Quote from a leader of another country

16. Reference to legislation on genocide (the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide) (yes/no)

17. Mention of humanitarian organization (yes/no)

17a. Which humanitarian organization is mentioned?

18. Does the article include photos? (yes/no)

18a. What type of photos are included?

1= victims
2= governments officials
3= landscape
4= military

19. Quote from a rebel group (the Sudan Peoples' Liberation Army) (yes/no)

20. Is the situation being CALLED genocide? (yes/no)

20a. If "yes," who is calling it genocide?

1= the author of the article
2= a governmental body
3= a humanitarian organization

APPENDIX B

Analysis of Intercoder Reliability

	Level of Agreement				
	Same codes applied		Different Codes applied		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Position	20	0.55	16	0.45	36
Frames	18	0.50	18	0.50	36
Word Genocide Used	32	0.89	4	0.11	36
Civil War	32	0.89	4	0.11	36
Ethnic Clean	29	0.80	7	0.20	36
Victim Quote	34	0.94	2	0.06	36
SudanGovtQt	29	0.80	7	0.20	36
USGovtQt	29	0.80	7	0.20	36
LeaderQt	21	0.58	15	0.42	36
HumanAgencyQt	24	0.66	12	0.34	36
Legislation	19	0.52	17	0.48	36
HumanAgencyMen	34	0.94	2	0.06	36
RebelsQt	33	0.91	3	0.09	36
LabelGenocide	27	0.75	9	0.25	36
WhoCalls	3	1.00	0	0.00	3

REFERENCES

Auerbach, Yehudith and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon. 2005. "Media Framing and Foreign Policy: The Elite Press vis-à-vis US Policy in Bosnia, 1992-95." *Journal of Peace Research* 42(1):83-99.

Department of State. 2004. "Documenting Atrocities in Darfur." Prepared by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Available at <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/36028.htm> accessed 26 March, 2008.

De Waal, Alex. 2007. "Darfur and the Failure of the Responsibility to Protect." *International Affairs* 83(6):1039-54.

Fein, Helen. 2002. *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hagan, John, Wenona Rymond-Richmond, and Patricia Parker. 2005. "The Criminology of Genocide: The Death and Rape of Darfur." *Criminology* 43(3):525-62.

Hagan, John and Wenona Rymond-Richmond, 2009. "Darfur and the Crime of Genocide." New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kasfir, Nelson. 2005. "Sudan's Darfur: Is It Genocide?" *Current History* 104(682):195-202.

Kristof, Nicholas D. 2007. "The Death Toll in Darfur." *New York Times* 14 August. Available at <http://kristof.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/08/14/the-death-toll-in-darfur/> accessed 26 March, 2008.

Piiparinen, Touko. 2007. "The Lessons of Darfur for the Future of Humanitarian Intervention." *Global Governance* 13(3):365-90.

Power, Samantha. 2003. "A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide". New York: Basic Books.

Robinson, Piers. 2000. "The Policy-Media Interaction Model: Measuring Media Power During Humanitarian Crisis." *Journal of Peace Research.* 37(5):613-33.

Stanton, Gregory H. 1998. "The Eight Stages of Genocide and Preventing Genocide." Genocide Watch. Available at <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/8stagesofgenocide.html> accessed 20 March, 2009.

United Nations Convention on Genocide. 1948. [WWW Web Site] Available at <http://www.hrweb.org/legal/genocide.html> accessed 12 February, 2008.

Vincent, Richard C. 2000. "A Narrative Analysis of US Press Coverage of Slobodan Milosevic and the Serbs in Kosovo," *European Journal of Communication*. 15(3):321-44.

Welling, J. J. 2007. “Non-Governmental Organizations, Prevention, and Intervention in Internal Conflict: Through the Lens of Darfur.” *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 14(1):147-79.