

THE PARADIGM SHIFT IN WAR REPORTING: THE RISE OF JOURNALISM OF ATTACHMENT. A CASE STUDY OF THE BOSNIA WAR OF 1992

Jepchirchir, Julie¹

¹ Girne American University, TRNC

*corresponding author: juliebungei@gmail.com

Citation: Jepchirchir, J. (2020). The paradigm shift in war reporting: the rise of journalism of attachment. A case study of the Bosnia war of 1992. *KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 149-164

ABSTRACT

Journalism of attachment; defined by its founder, Dr. Martin Bell as “journalism that knows and cares” (Bell, 1998, pp.63) is one of the subjective methods of war reporting. The elements of journalism of attachment are totally opposite of objectivity, truthfulness, accuracy, transparency and impartiality; aspects that are considered guiding principles of journalism as a profession. Despite this, journalism of attachment argues that it provides the “naked truth in warzones”, a characteristic that lacks in bystander journalism; as it is restricted by the code of ethics that govern it (Bell, 1998). Using qualitative research design, this study determined the paradigm shift in war reporting in line with the emergence of journalism of attachment. Content analysis was performed on all new reports of the Bosnia war of 1992 as reported by Dr. Bell. His interviews from 1992 to date as well as two of his books; “In Harm’s Way; Reflection of a war zone thug (1997)” and “Through Gates of Fire; A Journey into World Disorder (2003)”; were also analysed. The findings indicated that Dr. Bell’s use of journalism of attachment in the coverage of the Bosnia war steered debates among academics as well as professions in the journalism industry. It thus created a paradigm shift in subjective reporting based on the debates for and those against the practice of journalism of attachment in war reporting. The study therefore concluded that there is need for academics, critiques and professionals in the journalism industry to find a way to balance both aspects of subjective reporting (emotional/ passionate reporting) and professional reporting (objectivity, neutrality, impartiality, and fairness), in the coverage of wars and conflict.

Keywords: War journalism, subjective reporting, News reporting, Journalism of attachment

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Martin Bell, the father of journalism of attachment defines journalism of attachment as the empowerment of journalists to express their opinion, emotions, passion, beliefs, attitudes and feelings in their reporting of wars and conflicts. According to Bell, journalists are human and are genetically wired to cover conflict in

black and white thus seeking sides in their reporting. In as much as he doesn't encourage journalists to campaign in war reporting, Bell introduces a new kind of journalism that is not liable to the most important element that guard's journalism – objectivity.

Bell (1998, p.104), emphasises on the need to “embrace passion and moral journalism” rather than holding back and watch the innocent suffer in the coverage of wars and conflicts. He encourages “emotional journalism over objectivity; attachment over neutrality” (Bell, 1998, p.105). Journalism of attachment does not uphold the core principles of objectivity, truthfulness, accuracy and fairness. Instead, it argues that it provides the “naked truth in warzones”, an aspect that bystander journalism would be restricted to provide because it's bound by the code of ethics for journalists (Bell, 1998, p.104).

Bell's experience in covering the Bosnia war in 1992 led to the rise of journalism of attachment. Bell, against what he refers as “bystander journalism” encourages journalists to be “active participants” and not “spectators” in their reporting of conflict and wars; referring to journalism of attachment as “journalism that knows and cares”. He also states that journalism of attachment is one that is aware of its responsibilities (humanitarianism) and “therefore will not stand in neutrality in the coverage of war and conflict”. By defining it as a moral responsibility, Bell depicts Journalism of attachment as “a form of humanity against powerful aggressors” (Bell, 1998, p.105). He proposes that reporters must assume an “active position” with their influence as journalists in favour of the victims of war who cannot defend themselves.

Using qualitative study therefore, this study will redirect the future of journalism as a profession in light of the emergence of journalism of attachment as a subjective method of war reporting.

Statement of the problem

Whereas the Standard for Professional Journalists (SPJ)'s code of ethics strongly advocates for objectivity, fairness, accuracy and neutrality in reporting, journalism of attachment encourages expression of opinion, and emotion and thus taking sides in reporting. It emphasises on “attachment over neutrality”, and “emotionality over objectivity” (Ruigrok, 2008, p.49). The values guiding Journalism of attachment are thus seen to be the opposite of the SPJ's code of ethics.

When exercising journalism of attachment, reporters not only report news and information but are also actively involved in the war or conflict at hand. Bell (1998) describes them as “active participators” and not “spectators” or “bystanders” in war and conflict reporting. They therefore become campaigners, activists or even combatants and not just transmitters of news (Okrent, 2004). Exercising these kinds of reporting often puts the journalist at a risk as they become targets. Marie Colvin's case is an example of journalism of attachment gone sour as she was allegedly murdered by the Assad Regime (O'Neill, 2012).

Apart from facing threats, journalism of attachment is neither credible nor is it trusted compared to everyday journalism. Stephen (1998), argues that this is because journalism of attachment encourages expressions of feelings and emotion in addition to enabling journalists to take sides in reporting wars and conflicts. A reporter who exercises journalism of attachment may support the “good” party against the “evil” party which leads to biased reporting as objectivity (the guiding principle for journalism) is thrown out of the window (Rosen, 1994, p.12).

Attached journalists according to Tumbler and Prentoulis (2003), risk encountering flaks mostly from government or politicians who would label them as unprofessional. In instances where reporters practicing journalism of attachment do not encounter flaks, the public often accuses them of colluding with powerful forces such as the government. Rosen (1994) explains that such scenarios happen when journalists seek international appeal in their coverage of war and conflict.

Journalism of attachment may aim to seek military as well as help from international peace keeping organizations. By so doing, journalists put themselves in the position to “judge” what “right” is verses “wrong”, “good” vs “evil”. Such was the case with Colvin’s journalism of attachment in reporting the war in Syria (O’Neill, 2012, p.2). Whereas some scholars argue that campaigning journalism is clearly for a good course, military or foreign interventions may worsen the conflict situation. To prevent this, SPJ’s code of ethics encourages journalists to observe objectivity at all times in their reporting (SPJ, 2014).

Loyn (2003), argues that seeking celebrity status is one of the reasons why journalists choose journalism of attachment. He further explains that Bell’s attachment to the news made him the news. The consequences of journalism of attachment thus include facing threats, risk of loss of life, loss of reputation career-wise, and in some instances loss of job opportunities (Moore, 2018).

Despite the restrictions that accompany journalism of attachment, it encourages reporters to exercise their freedom of expression. With journalism of attachment, reporters take sides and structure news depending on how it helps the victims of war (Moore, 2018). With the freedom to express their opinions rather than allow objectivity to overshadow the “truth”, reporters in journalism of attachment feel empowered, at peace and have inner satisfaction of not just being channels of passing information but active participators and problem- solvers in the society (Bell, 1998). In conclusion therefore, scholarly articles show that subjective journalism has existed throughout the history of journalism. Journalism of attachment on the other hand is an emerging trend that developed in the 90s. This study will thus seek to highlight incidences in which Journalism of attachment was employed in the coverage of the Bosnia war. In addition, the implications of journalism of attachment will be discussed as well as what the future hold for this subjective method of reporting.

Research questions

1. In what instances during the reporting of the Bosnia war did Dr. Martin Bell practice Journalism of attachment?
2. Does the use of journalism of attachment in the covering of the Bosnia war by Dr. Bell create a paradigm shift in subjective reporting?
3. How does journalism as a profession adapt to the paradigm shift in war reporting as challenged by the journalism of attachment?

LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL REVIEW

Concept Review

Goodman (1991) explains how journalism of attachment began with one journalist, William Howard Russell. In his reporting from the Crimean war in 1854, Russell shifted from objective reporting to sending emotional letters that depicted the “truth” of the ongoing war. His letters gave a vivid account of what was happening during the war, an aspect that the ideals of objectivity shielded him from undertaking in his reporting for the London Times.

As we moved deeper to the 21st century, journalism of attachment has been embraced more. This kind of subjective reporting became more predominant in the 1990s due to the coverage of the Bosnia war of 1992. It was even better embraced in the coverage of the 9/11 terror attack. Cameron (1978, p.39), argues that objectivity in war reporting is “hopeless and worthless”, as it prevents journalists from getting the truth. Bell, (1997) in defining journalism of attachment; encourages journalists to humanely report the emotional effects of war instead of acting as channels of transmission of information. He describes journalism of attachment as “one that knows and cares; is aware of its social responsibilities; that distinguishes good vs evil, wrong vs right, victim vs aggressor” (Bell, p.52). According to Bell therefore, journalism of attachment is both “balanced and principled” as it goes beyond representing both sides by making it clear the evil and the good. The BBC veteran who was a war reporter for over 30 years and reported in over 80 countries was injured while reporting in Bosnia. Despite this, he encourages journalists to make the difference they can in a world where aggressors often win. According to Campbell, it was this injury among other factors, which caused him to argue for journalism of attachment (Campbell, 1998).

Marie Colvin was another reporter who chose journalism of attachment in her reporting of wars and conflicts and in the process put herself in danger. She argued that “journalists had a moral obligation towards the victims of wars; and ignoring the responsibility was cowardly” (O’Neill, 2012, p.2). Colvin was murdered while reporting the ongoing war in Syria by an alleged missile fired by Bashar al – Assad’s regime (O’Neill, 2012, p.2).

Evans (2003, pp.49-52), insists, “A journalist’s first duty is to humanity; there are no exceptions therefore where duty should override humanity”. Many reporters in their coverage of the Bosnia war had to abandon their journalistic duties, to help save the

lives of children and women. ITV reporter Nicholson Michael for instance participated in the evacuation of two hundred children out of an orphanage in Sarajevo. He even later adopted one of the orphans (McLaughlin, 2002).

Kempf (2003), also argues for journalism of attachment stating that the main reason why Dr. Bell opted to employ this subjective method in his reporting is because he was calling for international appeal on behalf of victims who were mostly children and women who had been seriously injured in the war. Bell (1998), complains on the unwillingness of international bodies to intervene earlier as he states, so many lives would have been saved.

Prentoulis and Tumber (2003), acknowledge journalism of attachment as a paradigm shift in subjective reporting. This they say is through the rate at which subjective reporting in war is being absorbed into the culture of journalism. Journalism of attachment thus challenges the ideals of objectivity in war reporting. This form of journalism that embraces emotional reporting; revolutionizes the traditional ideology of journalism from “detachment to attachment; verification to assertion; objectivity to subjectivity” (Prentoulis & Tumber, 2003, p.228).

Amanpour, a CNN reporter who also reported the Bosnia war, argues for journalism of attachment by stating that it gives the audience a deeper understanding of the warfare. She explains that, “as much as journalists have an obligation to cover news objectively, a war reporter must give all sides a fair hearing but not treat them as equals but as victims and aggressors” (Amanpour 1996, p.31). By so doing, she argues, reporters avoid “aiding” evil but problem solvers in their non-neutral reporting of wars and conflict. According to Amanpour, “by being a bystander journalist in war reporting, a reporter takes an extreme step in supporting the aggressor and thus supporting the “evil” in a conflict”. In addition she says, “Being neutral in war reporting is equivalent to promoting injustice” (Amanpour, p.31).

By highlighting a direct link between journalism of attachment and pleading for western interventions, Bell (2003, p.56) distinguishes that journalism of attachment is more than just reporting news and information but a rally for support for “good” and against the “evil”. He further argues that bystander journalism is more vulnerable as politicians target such platforms to run their ideas and propaganda. Therefore, journalism of attachment becomes more efficient in rallying for various issues rather than transmitting information as is expected of a journalist (Bell, 2012).

Whereas Bell (1996) argues that crying for help as can be portrayed in journalism of attachment and in the process catching the attention of forces such as NETO or the UN makes it a worthy course. O’Neill (2012) disputes that by highlighting Colvin’s death as an example of the dangers of journalism of attachment. He explains that, “if attached journalists choose to become moral combats in their reporting of wars and conflict, they shall be treated as combats and not as journalists”, (O’Neill, 2012, pp.1-2)

therefore putting themselves in dangers of being attacked.

Ward (1999), rallies for the merging of both objective and subjective reporting to create what he terms as interpretative reporting. Through interpretative reporting he says, the “humane” aspect of war reporting will have been accounted for while at the same time keeping the core aspects; objectivity, impartiality and fairness intact. Nonetheless, he relinquishes journalism of attachment as a viable alternative to objective reporting; citing the dangers that come with it.

In his book, Hume (1997), argues against journalism of attachment by stating that it only seeks to attract military or western intervention and not to report news effectively. He says that the coverage of the Bosnia war was one sided because it was based on emotions and not facts an aspect that that he describes as degrading to journalism as a profession. He further argues that attached journalists not only risk putting themselves in harm’s way but also risk worsening the war situation. He also asks the tough question, “Who gives journalists the mandate to discern “evil” from “good”? Hume (1997, p.5). Because proclaiming the good and evil he states, becomes a dangerous approach to a conflict. He explains that the public trusts journalists to give them truthful information but not to rule out their judgement in what they perceive as good or evil (Hume, p.5).

Nickel (2009) also critiques journalism of attachment by stating that it reflects conflicts as battles between the “good” and “evil”. He also states that attached journalists appoint themselves as the judges, an aspect that goes against any code of ethics for journalists all over the world. He concludes by saying that in wars and conflicts, inhumane acts are committed by both parties and therefore, “ignoring one’s side’s conflict and justifying them as “good” is not ethical and is totally wrong” (Nickel, 2009, pp.11-14).

Gowin (1997), compares journalism of attachment to a cancer which is infecting the profession. Using the metaphor, he implies that journalism of attachment is prohibited as it is fatal and is negatively affecting subjective reporting as well as the professional at large. He strongly objects journalism of attachment by adding that, “the only cure for this kind of “cancer” is either surgical removal or chemical treatment to prevent it from spreading to other parts” Gowin (1997, pp.5). Foerstel (1999), concurs with Gowin, by calling journalism of attachment “a new journalistic virus” Foerstel (1999, pp.1). He claims that the use of journalism of attachment in the coverage of the Bosnia war created a public impression that the Serbs were fully responsible for the war while the other parties (Croats and Bosniaks) were victims and thus blameless.

Hammond (2002), argues that journalism of attachment focuses way more on emotional reporting than factual reporting and is thus, “the opposite of everything it claims to be” Hammond (2002, pp.2-4). He thus claims that it does not represent the truth in the war or conflict scenario as it ignores facts that do not side with its narrative.

He further argues that the humanitarian aspect of journalism of attachment leads to advocacy journalism which suggests celebration of injustice against those perceived to be evil doers who might be undeserving of the judgement. Hammond (2002), claims that journalism of attachment seeks to worsen the conflict situation in order to justify its agenda of the evil vs good. He thus interchanges the “humanitarian” role of journalism of attachment with “barbarism” Hammond (2002, p.5).

In conclusion, SPJ’s code of ethics strongly advocate against biasness in reporting. However, Bell, Amanpour, Colvin, Tumber, Prentoulis and many other scholars as explained above, argue for morality in war reporting but in the process, objectivity is lost. In as much as journalism of attachment brings about personal fulfilment for the reporter who will feel like by expressing the emotions and pain of a conflict thus attracting western interventions he has solved a problem, there are dangers that align with journalism of attachment. Risk of facing death threats, loss of objectivity and thus loss of credibility in news reporting, as well as worsening conflict situations are a few examples of dangers of journalism of attachment.

Journalism of de-attachment on the other hand, upholds objectivity, accuracy and fairness in reporting information. It is neutral and more credible. At the end of the Bosnia war, the news media as done after the coverage of any war, did a self-analysis. A great debate among professionals in the industry role about how Dr. Martin of BBC, Maggie O’Kane, the Guardian reporter as well as Christiane Amanpour of CNN covered the Bosnia way in favour of advocacy (Sjovaag, 2005).

The question therefore remains, should we abandon objectivity, fairness and accuracy and let journalists be the judges of what is morally right or wrong in matters of war and conflict reporting? This study expounded on the studies that have been conducted, to assess the implications of journalism of attachment with the perspective the coverage of the Bosnia war of 1992.

Theoretical Framework

The Agenda – Setting Theory

Agenda setting is defined as the creation of public awareness on specific issues by the media (Scheufele, 2006). In the Agenda Setting theory, Shaw and McCombs argue that, “the media does not reflect the reality but filter and shape it” (Shaw & McCombs, 1971, pp.121-127), by concentrating on a few issues that lead the public to perceive them as urgent, and more crucial in comparison to important incidences that are actually taking place right under their noses (Shaw & McCombs, 1971).

Agenda Setting Theory further states that the media has a very powerful influence on the audience in that it determines what issues the public should consider more important than others. Cohen argues that although the media does not tell the public what to think, it sure tells them what to think about (Cohen, 1963). They argue that if the media covers an issue more frequently, thus giving it more attention (frequent

coverage) the public will regard it as an important issue (Shaw & McCombs, 1968).

Dearing and Roger (1988), criticizes the agenda setting theory by arguing that its' accuracy is difficult to measure based on the fact that the media content as well as the audience's viewership is divided into broad groups and thus the results are dimmed too inflated and irrelevant. Despite this argument, improvement of technology in today's society brightens the future of the agenda setting theory. For instance, unlike decades ago when communication was a two-way process, the internet provides a means for the audience to engage and provide feedback that can be used to gauge the efficiency of the agenda setting theory (Freeland, 2012).

The Agenda Setting theory is therefore applicable in this study in the sense that frequent coverage of war and conflict in a specific way, attracts not only the attention of the readers but also influences their opinion on that particular incident. Kempf (2002), argues that Bell's coverage of the war in Bosnia created a long-lasting impression on the failure of the United Nations through its inefficient peace keeping mandates that would have prevented the war in the first place. He further adds that the journalism of attachment as applied by the veteran, Martin Bell pinpointed the aggressors and the victims of the war, therefore enabling its' audience to take sides and thus influencing their opinion on the matter (Kempf, 2002).

Wanta and Lee (2004), argue that although mass media is considered as responsible in shaping public opinion, such influencing are in some instances unintentional. They further state that in matters of public concerns such as information on citizens' safety, public welfare and demands, the media does not necessary disseminate such information with intentions of swaying the publics' opinion. One can thus argue that war reporting is of public' concern and is thus aired with no intentions of influencing public' opinion.

Nickel (2009), on the other hand argues that Bell's journalism of attachment allowed him to take sides - wrong vs right; the evil vs good in his reporting of the war. By so doing, he set the public agenda. He influenced the public's opinion about the on-goings of the war. Therefore, journalism of attachment promotes the Agenda setting theory and vice versa.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative data analysis method. A case study; in this case the Bosnia war on 1992 not only provides in-depth information that is relevant to the study but also leads the findings, recommendation and conclusion of the study. The Bosnia war of 1992 is thus appropriate for the study as it entails works of an eyewitness reporter who transmitted war information from the ground as opposed to relying on third parties. In addition, it fits the study conducted because it highlights subjective reporting in wars which thus provides guidelines to highlighting journalism of attachment in Dr. Bell's reporting of the Bosnia war. Sjovaag (2005), explains that the

Bosnia war had such strong effects on the correspondents covering the conflict, to the point that most of them who were eye witnesses to the massacre of innocent children and women in Sarajevo abandoned their journalistic roles to plead for the UN and NATO interventions. The 1992 Bosnia War is also a perfect case study because of the debates it ignited in terms of the reliability of objectivity in war/ conflict reporting (O'Neil, 2012).

The case study focuses on newspaper articles as well as TV news aired by BBC from the start of the war in April 1992 to December 1995. In addition, interviews of Dr. Bell conducted within and after the war also provide information for analysis. Two of Dr. Martin's books; "In Harm's Way; Reflection of a war zone thug (1997)" and "Through Gates of Fire; A Journey into World Disorder (2003)", are the centre of this case study. In addition, TV News stories; "How far should we go?" (British Review, 1997); "The truth is our currency" (Harvard International Journal of press and politics, 1998) as well as Hume's pamphlet, "Whose war is it anyway? The Dangers of the Journalism of Attachment" (Hume, 1997) were keenly explored. Apart from that, this study analyses a few autobiographies; written by journalists including Nicholson (1997), Bell (1997), Maass (1996), Loyd (2003) as well as Steele (2002), who reported the Bosnia war.

The data gathered for study is thus the works of television, print, audio, camerapersons, editors, as well as photojournalists that covered the Bosnia war alongside Dr. Bell. This study also examines a series of interviews done throughout the career of Dr. Bell after the coverage of the Bosnia war as they represent his opinion on the matter.

Instrumentation

This study uses the method of document analysis to provide a critical review of the paradigm shift in subjective war reporting. Green and Thorogood (2010), explains that document analysis is based on existing sources for instance; government reports, personal journals, newspaper articles, books, medical reports as well as TV shows and interviews. Through analysis of books, newspaper articles as well as TV news, the study is able to gather its data. The data chosen for analysis is from the BBC News, where Dr. Bell was a correspondent. The BBC News thus has a direct link with the case study above and will thus provide credible findings and conclusions.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

In order to further analyze Dr. Bell's coverage of the 1992 Bosnia war, this study performed a documentation analysis and later divided the data gathered into codes and then categories that later created themes. The meaning as well as the implications of the themes created will thus be explain in details to describe the findings of the paradigm shift in subjective reporting of war and conflict of course with the case study of the Bosnia war of 1992.

The various themes derived from the content analysis were categorized as humanitarianism, subjective reporting, partisanship, biased reporting, advocacy and

agenda setting as discussed below.

Subjective reporting

The Society of professional Journalism (SPJ, 2014), defines objectivity as the conveyance of news by a reporter, with disregard to their feelings, emotions and attitude in order to foster fairness and accuracy in the process of dissemination of information to the public. Objective reporters therefore neither receive gifts, endorsements, nor sponsorship from their sources of information; to avoid conflict of interest in reporting.

Cunningham (2003, pp.1-3) in the Columbia Journalism Review, deters journalists from being “aggressive analyzers and explainers” of news insisting a journalist’s job is strictly to act as a medium and that transfer information from the media to the audience. According to the content analysis performed by this study, there are several instances where Dr. Martin Bell disregarded objectivity in his coverage of the war.

For instance, in his coverage of the ongoing war he says, “The Bosniak Muslim refugees are unarmed yet the Serbs and the federal army continue to fire at them” he continues in another incidence to say, “The heaviest fighting has been in the town of Gorazde, where 100,000 people are cut off, including 30,000 refugees, 10,000 of them children” (Bell, 1992). In these two incidences, his choice of words and quotation of numbers of the victims of the war illustrate his passion, which leads to bias towards the victim of the war and against the Serbs who he termed as the “aggressors”.

In his book, *In Harm’s Way* (1995), Dr. Bell says, “The reporting that I practised in the Bosnia war merely encourages journalists to report with the heart and mind”, he further says, “In my coverage of the Bosnia war, the standards of the bystander journalism was inadequate to represent the ongoing of the war” (Bell, 1995, pp.163-165), these indicate a journalist whose mind is made up in line with subjective journalism when it comes to the coverage of war and conflict.

Biased reporting

Neutrality is defined as the act of practising lack of biasness and impartiality in reporting. It entails maintaining accuracy, accountability, clarity and fairness. Neutrality is acting independently in the coverage and reporting of news and information, meaning resisting internal and external pressure in the coverage of news. Neutrality is reporting both sides of the story without favouring either of them (Delli, 2004).

From the content analysis performed, Dr. Bell is seen in more than one occasion to disregard neutrality in his reporting of the Bosnia war. He is biased towards those he terms as the “victims” of the war and is against the “aggressors”. For example, in his coverage of the massacre in the village of Zornvik he says, “It is a great and tragic displacement of people for no other reason other than the Bosniak Muslims are weaker and the Serbs are stronger” (Bell, 1994). This clearly illustrates his biased

reporting towards the Bosniak Muslims and against the Serbs. His choice of words, “Stronger” vs “weaker” indicates biasness in reporting.

Hume (1997), argues that Dr. Bell’s active involvement in the Bosnia war and conflict solicited for the exercise of biasness in terms of the about the war that was collected and disseminated. He says that Dr. Bell’s coverage was tailor made to fit the “victim” vs “aggressor” angle and anything that disapproved that was omitted in the covering of the Bosnia war of 1992.

Agenda setting

Subjective journalism often comes with an agenda at hand based on the degree of the reporter’s altruism. Dr. Bell’s coverage of the war was not an exception to this as he was always on the side of the victims of war. Agenda setting is defined by McCombs (2003), as the creation of public awareness on specific issues by the media. In the Agenda Setting, the media does not reflect the reality but filter and shape it by concentrating on a few issues that lead the public to perceive them as urgent. It therefore involves without necessarily skewing facts and figures, improving the story in order to better align with a specific issue (Scheufele, 2006).

By forming an opinion on the “good” vs “evil”, “Victim” vs “aggressors”, in his reporting of the Bosnia war, Dr. Bell influenced the way the public not only view but understood the war (Hume, 1997, p.7). Dr. Martin who was on the ground acted as an eye witness journalism, an aspect that put more weight on his judgement of the war among the audience. His choice of words in reporting also formed an agenda among the public. For example, he said, “this is an ethnic cleansing in Zvornik” (Bell 1993). The choice of the word ethnic cleansing in his reporting creates a sense of emergency among its views. It makes them emphatic towards the “victims” who in this case is the people living in the region of Zvornik. It makes the viewers to feel the need to act against the “aggressors” of the war.

In his interview with the British Journalism Review (1997), Dr Bell states that, “television is a powerful tool that has the capability to influence the public opinion; the presence of TV in Bosnia thus made the situation marginally less bad than it would have been” (Bell, 1997, p.10). This illustrates his awareness of the influence that the media has on the audience and thus intentionally exploiting that power to drive his agenda of helping the victims of the Bosnia war.

Humanitarianism

Humanitarianism is defined as the act of benevolence. It is the assistance of human kind with intentions to reduce their suffering. Being at the centre of the Bosnia war pushed Dr. Bell to perform humanitarian acts.

For instance, his choice of word while covering the war created empathy among the audience as well as non- governmental organizations. He says,“ the refugees are

looking for help; from the European community, the UN and the refugees commission”, in another news coverage he adds, “ the sign in this village of Sponik is a cry for help as soon as possible; we are the first sign they have had in days that anyone out there cares about them” (Bell, 1992). The tone is that of hopelessness, and a society that is in dire need of help.

Surrounded by too many wounded soldiers, children and women in the village of Sponik, Martin Bell explains that he had no option but to disregard the traditional journalism of being a by-stander journalists and became an active participator in the Bosnia war. “I therefore became an ambulance driver using my Land rover that was at my disposal to offer first aid to wounded victims and thereafter attempt to take them to the nearest hospital” (Bell, 1996, p.127), he says.

In his reporting of the conflict in Gorazde town of Bosnia, Dr. Bell said, “the heaviest fighting has been in the town of Gorazde, where 100,000 people are cut off, including 30,000 refugees, 10,000 of them children” (Bell, 1992). The choice of words as well as the tone used to cover this particular news item indicates human feeling of compassion and need to reach out for help from the outside world. It in fact according to Dr. Bell, led to the intervention by the Dutch UN organization that attempted to transport food and drinks to the wounded soldiers and victims of the war.

Advocacy

Just like humanitarianism, advocacy seeks to better humanity. Advocacy involves rallying/ campaigning for a cause, a political party or a nation. In his coverage of the Bosnia war, Dr. Bell didn't shy away from rallying and campaigning for military as well as western intervention to mitigate the number of victims of the war. In his interview with Prospect magazine he says that if only western military had intervened earlier, the number of people who perished in the war wouldn't be that much.

In his coverage in the village of Ahnici on the 14th of April 1992 he says, “We are covering from Ahnici where it is a massacre really as the Bosnia Croats have killed over 100 civilians most of who women and children, their corpses are so charred therefore unidentifiable” (Bell, 1992). His choice of words; specifically; “massacre”, “corpses so charred they are unidentifiable” indicate advocacy for intervention. An objective reporter in reporting this incident would only give facts and figure of the wounded, who ordered the action as well as what happened. A subjective reporter in the other hand, in this case as highlighted above will go further to report passionately towards the victims as well as condemn the attackers. In his reporting here, the murder of children and women according to Dr. Bell is itself an act of evil.

In his reporting of a news item on BBC News, the headline was, “Ethnic cleansing in Zvornik”. In the coverage of the same news he further stated that, “the war should be considered a war crime and the locals appeal for international interventions following the dead of thousands of civilians” (Bell, 1993).

In the *British Journalism Review*, Dr. Bell explains that the Bosnia war led him to disregard the traditional journalism of reporting news from a spectator's point of view. It fuelled him to become an active participator by practising journalism that "knows and cares" (Bell, 1997: 10). He therefore advocates for a new kind of journalism, the Journalism of attachment. Dr Bell therefore not only practised advocacy during the Bosnia war but also throughout his career following the war as he advocates for Journalism of attachment.

Partisanship

Partisanship is the aspect of being strongly attached to a particular group, party, cause or a nation without consideration of the obvious facts underlying the matter. It therefore is an indication of bias and emotional support in a conflict (Brooner, 2005). The Bosnia war as explained by Sjovaag (2005), had adverse effects on the correspondents who reported the war specifically; Amanpour, O'Kate as well as Bell that they blindly aired news that was in support of the "victims" of the war.

Although the reporters of the Bosnia war were not quite successful in persuading the international community, the role of the media had an influence on the United States, United Kingdom as well as the United Nations' politics (Jakobsen, 2000). According to Hoijer, (2003), this is evident in one instance where the UN intervened to air lift a girl called Irma who was orphaned and had been injured in Sarajevo. This is after her photographs were televised in the BBC News. This therefore is argued to be partisanship on the end of the British politicians who took action through the UN officials despite their resistance to participate in the war initially.

According to Feinstein, (2003), the war experience produces feelings of empathy among reporters who often start to feel like they can make a difference through their coverage of events after all; the key role of journalists is to expose the wrong doers for the benefit of the public. Partisanship is therefore often viewed as fighting for a cause. Nicholson (1997), who was a correspondent covering the Bosnia war says, "The war made a great impression on me personally because you find it difficult to resist subjective reporting when living in the midst of the civilians in the violent areas of Sarajevo with little to non-protection from either the NATO or the UN" (Nicholson, 1997, p.21). He adds that, "Although reporters were free to move from one point to the other to collect news, it was in great danger as the entire war resulted in the death of 84 correspondents; a devastating brutality that shocked every correspondent to the core" (Nicholson, 1997, p.23).

As demonstrated by Nicholson (1997), the emotionality of war reporting takes a toll on professionalism. In his interview with *Prospect* magazine, Bell says, "experiencing violence - first hand, watching children and civilians being shot at, being kidnapped, being surrounded and attacked, injured as a result of targeted bombing, knocked me into subjective reporting" (Bell, 2003, p.165). His choice of words therefore, indicate

subjective reporting as well as partisanship. For instance he said, "I was unwilling to be neutral between the armed and the unarmed; the victim and the aggressor" (Bell, 2003, p.56), this indicate intentional taking of sides in reporting with the aim of attracting western and military intervention thus, partisanship.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

The use of journalism of attachment in the coverage of the Bosnia war

The invention of journalism of attachment has greatly defined subjective reporting and at the same time highlighted the inefficiency of objective reporting in the coverage of wars and conflict therefore; signalling a paradigm shift in the profession. Journalists in covering war therefore have to choose whether to be "attached or detached" in order to accomplish their civic duties.

This study concluded that journalism of attachment was used in the coverage of the Bosnia war of 1992 by Dr. Bell; a type of reporting that this study determined is a personal decision among the war reporters. Sjoavaag (2005, pp.88-89), concurs with this stating that due to the paradigm shift in war reporting, the biggest problem among war journalists is not whether to be "attached or detached" because that's obvious! "It is how to be both at the same time", in the coverage of war and conflict.

It is evident from the literature review of this study that Dr. Bell has steered a debate on war coverage in the profession. He insists that journalism of attachment is misunderstood as its intentions are pure - "it is not a licence for campaigning or advocacy" (Bell, 1997: 10). He therefore according to Mclaughlin (2002, p.70), intentionally or unintentionally redirected the profession on the proper role of a war journalist. He asserts that a war journalists bears a responsibility to the society at large through the information he is transmitting.

The findings indicate that Dr. Bell employed subjective reporting in his coverage of the Bosnia war of April 1992 to December 1995. He disregarded the basic principles of objectivity, neutrality, as well as independence in his reporting as he was greatly struck by what her termed as "unfairness of the war" (Bell, 2003, p.165), that he felt the need to be actively involved in the war. Therefore, by using subjective reporting, he coined the term, journalism of attachment.

Implication of the Use of Journalism of Attachment in War Reporting

The literature review indicate that the shift towards a more lenient, emotional, passionate thus subjective reporting in war began in the early 90s. According to Nicholson (1997), the reporting of the Bosnia war began professionally; with all the professional standards of objectivity and detachment adhered to. However, since the world leaders did not take action, subjective reporting prevailed. Dr. Bell said, "The unwillingness of the NATO, the UN, EU as well as the US to intervene was something he found unacceptable" (Bell, 1996, pp. 126).

Although paying closer attention to the victims of the war is not directly linked to subjective reporting in the study, humanitarianism which is closely associated with emotionalism strongly promotes subjective reporting in war and conflict. This study also concluded that subjective reporting is more prevalent now compared to two decades ago, due to the change in the perception of war reporters as “subjects” and not “objects” and thus diminishing the objective role of war reporters.

The Bosnia war gave rise to the journalism of attachment; a form of subjective reporting that has received criticism from academics and professionals in the journalism industry. The main objection of journalism of attachment according to the findings is that it breaks the established code of ethics for journalists. The media sets the agenda among the public; an opportunity which subjective war reporters exploit with intentions to bring justice or end the war.

In examining the reasons for the rise in subjective reporting in war over the past two decades, this study concluded that it is a personal decision from the end of the correspondent who is usually desperate to improve the situation at hand. The defiance among war reporters against objective reporting therefore signals a transformation in how war will be reported in future. In addition, the acceptance of emotional reporting as indicated by subjective reporting rallies for inclusion of subjective reporting in the professional standards for journalists.

REFERENCES

- Bell, M. (1995). *In harm's way. Reflection of a war zone*. London: Hamish Hamilton Publishers.
- Bell, M. (1998). The Truth is our Currency. *Harvard International Journal of Press*, 3(1): 101-120.
- Bell, M. (2003). *Through Gates of Fire; a Journey into World Disorder*. London: Hamish Hamilton Publishers.
- Bell, M. (2012). *In Harm's Way: Bosnia: A War Reporter's Story*. London; Icon Books Ltd.
- Bell, M. (2017). *War and the Death of News*. London: One world Publications.
- Cunningham, B. (2003). Rethinking Objectivity: *Columbia Journalism Review*. Retrieved from; https://archives.cjr.org/feature/rethinking_objectivity.php?page=all December 2019.
- Goodman, G. (1991). *The rise of Journalism of attachment*. New York: Macmillan Publishers.

- Gowin, N. (1999). *Media coverage: Help or hindrance in conflict prevention?* New York: Carnegie Publishers.
- Green, J., & Thorogood, N. (2010). *Qualitative methods of research analysis*. (ED). London: Sage Publishers.
- Hume, M. (1997). *Whose War is it anyway?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lloyd, J. (2004). Martin Bell- by proposing a “journalism of attachment,” Bell led lesser reporters down a false trail. *Prospect Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/martinbell> on 13/04/2018.
- Martin Bell BBC News: A reflection of Jon Snow. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WVR75YaDcW4> 16:20 December 2019.
- Martin Bell BBC News: Reporting on the fighting in Bosnia in 1994. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1qAA5CGC2Hg> 14:46 December 2019.
- [Martin Bell BBC News: Troubles in Zvornik, Bosnia, April 1992. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-7SvJ1UVdc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-7SvJ1UVdc) 14:47 December 2019.
- Martin Bell: The art of writing silence. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ulikQ23URH8> 16:50 December 2019.
- McCombs, M. (2003). *The Agenda- Setting Role of the Mass Media in the Shaping of Public opinion*. Los Angeles: Sage Publishers.
- Nicholson, M. (1997). *Natasha’s story: Welcome to Sarajevo*. London: Pan Books Publishers.
- Nickel, J. (2009). *Journalism of Attachment* <http://lexilogia.gr/forum/showthread.php?5008-journalism-of-attachment>
- O’Neill, B. (2012, March 4th). Debating the Journalism of attachment”. *Australian Broadcasting Corporation News*; p. 3.
- Sjovaag, H. (2005). *Attached or Detached: Subjective methods of war journalism*. Norway: University of Bergen Publishers.
- SPJ. (2014). *Code of Ethics for Journalism*. <http://www.spj.org.Ethics> retrieved on November 2019.
- Ward, S. J. (1999). Pragmatic news objectivity: Objectivity with a human face. *Joan Shorenstein centre on press, politics and policy*.