

## Journal of Peace, Development and Communication



Volume 05, Issue 1, January-March 2021  
 pISSN: 2663-7898, eISSN: 2663-7901  
 Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V05-I01-03>  
 Homepage: <https://pdfpk.net/pdf/>  
 Email: [se.jpdc@pdfpk.net](mailto:se.jpdc@pdfpk.net)

<b>Article:</b>	<b>Media and Human Rights: A Study of the Kashmir Conflict in the Indian Press</b>
<b>Author(s):</b>	Farrukh Shahzad Assistant Professor, Department of Media Studies, Bahria University Islamabad
	Umer Shabber Ghuman Independent Media Researcher
	Tehmina Ashfaq Qazi Senior Lecturer Bahria University Islamabad
<b>Published:</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> March 2021
<b>Publisher Information:</b>	Journal of Peace, Development and Communication (JPDC)
<b>To Cite this Article:</b>	Shahzad, Farrukh, et al. (2021). "Media and Human Rights: A Study of the Kashmir Conflict in the Indian Press" <i>Journal of Peace, Development and Communication</i> , vol. Volume 5, no. Issue 1, 2021, pp. 27–39, <a href="https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V05-I01-03">https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V05-I01-03</a>
<b>Author(s) Note:</b>	Farrukh Shahzad is serving as Assistant Professor at Department of Media Studies, Bahria University Islamabad
	Umer Shabber Ghuman is a Independent Media Researcher
	Tehmina Ashfaq Qazi is serving as Senior Lecturer at Department of Media Studies, Bahria University Islamabad

### Abstract

This study examines how the Indian press reported the Kashmir conflict according to the Human Right Journalism model. We applied frame analysis on the 392 news stories of two Indian newspapers, The Hindu and Hindustan Times. The Study uses content analysis techniques to draw inference about the selected frames. The results of the study show that Indian press gave human-wrong journalism approach while reporting the happenings in Kashmir. The findings also show that the Indian press followed the nationalistic narrative and reported the events from distance frames. We found that the journalistic approach in Indian Press is determined by the type of news. In terms of reporting on soft topics, the newspapers reported human-right journalism approach, while reporting on hard topics, human-wrong journalism approach were applied. Limitations of the study are given at the end.

**Keywords:** *Kashmir conflict, Indian press, Human rights & Human wrong journalism,*

### Overview

Past studies of media reporting show that in conflict or security situations, media always supports the security policy of the government of the time. It is considered unpatriotic to criticize the government. On the other hand, critical researchers have developed theories and models to analyze media reporting of security policies and to promote human rights. In this regard, Ibrahim Seaga's well-known human right journalism model has attracted a lot of attention, but so far researchers in South Asia have not worked on this concept. This study would be the first of its nature discussing the concept of the Kashmir conflict and human-right journalism model in the Indian press. So, it is very important to know that how Indian media covers this conflict according to the human right journalism model. In this study, we have investigated the extent of human right journalism in the Indian press on the Kashmir conflict, which is the longest-running dispute in the region.

### **Kashmir conflict**

Kashmir has been the bone of contention between the two nuclear powers, Pakistan and India, since the partition of the subcontinent. At the time of partition, there were also 563 princely states ruled by princes. These princely states were given a free hand to either accede to India or Pakistan. The Jammu and Kashmir was one of the princely states. Its ruler Maharaja Hari Singh initially wanted Kashmir to become an independent state, but in October 1947 he chose to join India. This step escalated the hostilities, and a war broke out between India and Pakistan in 1947 over this region, which ended with a United Nations-mandated ceasefire, resulting in demarcation of the borders, known as the Line of Control. (Lyon, P. 2008, p.80). The UN recommended a plebiscite to decide whether Kashmiris want to join India or Pakistan, but both the countries did not agree to demilitarize the region before the referendum could take place. However, in July 1949, both the countries signed an agreement which divided the region and established a ceasefire line which was endorsed by the UN (BBC, 2019).

On 26 January 1950, India enforced Article 370 of its Constitution on its controlled part of Kashmir in a bid to prevent it from acceding to Pakistan and vested the region with some powers. The constitutional provision gave the region a special status in the form of autonomy. The article allowed the Jammu and Kashmir valley to have a separate flag and to make own laws. But the defense, communications and external affairs remained with the central government. The Article also keeps the Indian citizens from settling and purchasing property in the state. It also gives authority to Kashmiris that they can make their own residency, property, and fundamental laws (BBC, 2019). However, in the late 1980s, the Kashmiri youth embarked on waging an armed campaign, which they believed, was the only option to get rid of Indian control. Pakistan also supported the armed struggle to seek revenge from India for it taking over of the valley after the 1947 war (Hajni, 2008).

Over the last seven decades or so, tens of thousands of people have laid down their lives in their struggle to seek freedom from the Indian rule. The past decades have seen so many street protest against the killings, often blamed on the Indian army. The death and destruction at the hands of the Indian military continues even today without any letup. Reuters (2008) claims there were 3,400 disappearance cases and the conflict has left more than 47,000 people dead, which also includes 7,000 police personnel as of July 2009. Nonetheless, the number of deaths in the state dropped when India and Pakistan started a slow-moving peace process. But it has hit snags often, not being able to strike a deal acceptable to the Kashmiri people. Some human rights groups have reported more than 100,000 deaths since 1989 (Express Tribune, 2011). In last thirty years, up to 9,600 people have been killed, 1,144 women have been raped and human rights grossly violated.

The Kashmir tragedy took a worst turn when use of pellet guns by the India army blinded 1,253 people, according to Jammu and Kashmir Coalition of Civil Society. In 2018 alone, 160 civilians were killed, with 10,810 people having been maimed from 2008 to 2018.

Alongside the high number of killings, rapes and human rights violations, lack of basic necessities of life has also been observed in Kashmir through the years. From April 2017 to May 2018, the most shutdowns of Internet were observed in South Asia with India topping the list. Among these shutdowns in India, half of them were reported in Kashmir. Only in the first four months of 2019, 25 shutdowns were observed in the occupied valley (UNESCO, 2019). The human rights situation in Indian occupied Kashmir got worst on 5 August 2019, when New Delhi revoked the Article 370, which gives the special status to Kashmir, and imposed a curfew to resist any adverse reaction from the people. However, the revocation of the special status has resulted into a continuing spiral of unrest. The held valley was put under lockdown on 5 August 2019 with deployment of thousands of troops there despite the fact that the region is already one of the heavily militarized places in the world. With the enforcement of the lockdown, a number of politicians were also house arrested (CNN, 2019). Ever since the curfew was imposed in the aftermath of the withdrawal of the special status, the people have been confined to their homes and telephone networks and Internet have been cut off. The menacing curfew has left the people with little or no access to information. The people do not have any connection and interaction with rest of the world (Reuters, 2019). According to the Rights Groups' International, crackdown in Jammu and Kashmir is unprecedented in the history of the region, which has caused widespread fear and alienation among the people. "The communication blackout, security clampdown and detention of the political leaders in the region has made it worse," said Arkal Patel, head of Amnesty International India chapter. The revocation of the Article 370 is invalid constitutionally as it is against the promises India had made to Kashmiri people (Frontline, 2019). The relentless curfew has also trampled on the people's right to worship as people are not allowed to go for prayers. Kashmiris are even not allowed to celebrate their festivals. The revocation of the Article 370 has also badly affected the healthcare provision as people are not allowed to access hospitals. The withdrawal of the Article 370 and 35 (A) in IOK has jolted the regional powers, with China having rejected the idea of division of IOK, particularly Ladakh. Housen (2019) has studied the psychological impact upon Kashmiri people by exposure to continuous resentment, distress, and traumas. He used the Harvard Trauma Questioner (HTQ) and Hopkins Symptoms Checklist (HSCL-25) to measure the extent of stress. The results of the study were significant as it declared that daily stress factors must not be ignored among the population.

The continuous curfew has caused a humanitarian crisis in the held valley. Up to 4,000 Kashmiri people were arrested in the month after the revocation of the Article 370 (TRT, 2019). In this grave situation, it seems that Indian media is just promoting the New Delhi's agenda and narrative and international media is also neglecting the importance of this purely human rights issue (Chemmencheri, 2015). This study has been designed to study the reporting of Kashmir conflict by the mainstream Indian press and key approached used by them.

## **Literature review**

### **Media and human rights violations**

Joseph (2000) talked about the human rights violations and absence of their mention in the Indian media. He says that human rights violations in Kashmir have been documented by national and international organizations in a substantial way, but still a common reader cannot get the extent of human rights abuses in Kashmir in the Indian press. The study says that the Indian media projected the national policy regarding Kashmir and neglected each instance of human rights abuses by simply portraying them as caused by militancy and insurgencies.

Oftentimes, the Indian media not only tries to justify the security forces' excesses and gloats over human rights violations, but also blocks the condemnation of such excesses by

other countries (Sredharan, 2009) argues in his study that Pakistani and Indian media both play a negative role in the Kashmir conflict, always trying to portray the other side in a negative frame. Newspapers on both the sides promote the 'give us vs them' impression, in which 'we are victims, and they are perpetrators'. The coverage of both the media is anti-peace rather than pro-peace, and their neutrality is ambiguous. These findings were gathered by Saddiqa (2019), who conducted the Comparative Study of the Kashmir Conflict Coverage in the context of the Pakistani and Indian Press and found no significant neutral difference between the press of the two countries regarding peace and war journalism. The study shows that coverage of the press talks only highlight the violent feature of the conflict, leaving aside the peaceful alternative. Though war journalism is clearly the dominated factor in both the press, war journalism in India press is more dominant than that of Pakistan. The study concludes that Indian press blames Pakistan for insurgency and terrorism in Kashmir, while the Pakistani media blames India for depriving the Kashmiri people of the fundamental rights. Bakht (2020), also had a similar thought in his study of comparative frame analysis of the coverage of the Kashmir conflict in the Indian and Pakistani newspapers from War/Peace Journalism perspective, and concluded that both the Indian and Pakistani media were tilted towards war journalism and presented the things in uni-perspective instead of multi-perspective which shows that Kashmiris have a lesser chance to raise their voices in uni-perspective coverage of mass media, and as far as comparison of Pakistani and India media is concerned, the latter is more war-oriented.

Another scholar Faiza (2020) conducted a study on escalation in Kashmir conflict after Burhan Wani's killing and came up with the similar thoughts like those of Bakht that war journalism dominated the Pakistani and Indian media regarding the death of the freedom fighter. However, she was of the view that Indian press was more war-oriented than Pakistan's. Faiza (2020) also argued that the dominance of war journalism in both the media was one of the main obstacles to the de-escalation effort in Kashmir. Gadda (2014) says Indian media overlooks the sentiments of Kashmiri people when it comes to Kashmir conflict reporting and follows the partial journalism policy. The national media has adopted 'partial journalism' policy when it comes to reporting on the Kashmir conflict. The fake encounters and the human rights violations in Kashmir are hardly observed, but the operations against the militant groups are highly overplayed just to show the presence of militancy in the valley.

Khalid (2015) conducted a study on media propaganda and the Kashmir disaster. His study claims that the reporting of Indian media on Kashmir 2014 was biased and subjective. The Indian media tried to portray the good image of army during the rescue activities and ignored the efforts of local volunteers. The Times of India gave 57% coverage to the army's relief activities and NDTV focused 97% on the government's role in handling the crises. This security-centric reporting appeared to be aimed at creating sympathetic political spaces within Kashmir for the Indian armed forces, typically seen as occupiers in the region. He says that Indian media shows every Kashmiri a terrorist by playing up fake stories. The Indian media shows that the stone pelting people are assisted by either Pakistan or separatists, but this is not true. The Indian media is not showing the occurrences like killing of innocent people, mass rapes, fake encounters, infrastructural damage and use of pellet guns which not only injure the people, including women and children, but also blind them for rest of their lives. Ahmad Wani (2018) conducted several surveys to analyze the Kashmiri and the role of media. He concluded in his results that the Indian national media painted Kashmiri youth as Pakistani agents or terrorists, and badly failed to highlight the extensive use of force in Kashmir. Moreover, the media's coverage is widening the gulf between the Indian and Kashmiri people, and only focuses on their TRP. The more Indian media publishes the anti-Kashmiri stories, the more pro-Pakistani sentiments arise.

Riaz (2018) talks about the barrier of journalism in Kashmir in his study and claims that draconian laws in the valley forbid the media to report the actual situation. These laws are Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act, 1987, Jammu and Kashmir Disturbed Area Act, 1990, Armed Forces Special At, 1990, Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act, 1990 and Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002, which really give strength to Koul's (2018) arguments that the Indian authorities are preventing the publication, seizure of issues of newspapers and controlling the communication medium like the internet and telephones in a way of censorship. Moreover, he claims that a working journalist of Kashmir believes that there is no freedom of speech and free space for unbiased journalism as the present laws are the main barriers. Riaz (2018) also claims in his study that Pakistani media gives more coverage to the Kashmir conflict in a positive manner, whilst Indian media uses negative frames to portray the conflict. He says that most of the time the Indian media dubs the Kashmiri's movement for freedom as militancy and insurgency and blames Pakistan for supporting freedom fighters in Kashmir. The findings of the study also support the idea that Indian media is spreading jingoism and religious hatred in South Asia and follows the nation policy of Indian government regarding Kashmir, whereas Pakistani media advocates the peaceful resolution of the Kashmir issue.

### 1.1 Human rights journalism

Shaw (2012) argues that journalists have great responsibility to promote peace. The values of news, accuracy and objectivity are not the good standard of reporting. Therefore, he gives a special model of human rights journalism to promote peace and highlight all types of human rights violations, thus focusing on 'diagnostic reporting'. Shaw (2012) mentioned that this is supported by Galtung's (1996) Diagnosis-Prognosis-Therapy triangle from his Attitude, Behavior and Contradictions (ABC) Conflict Theory which suggested that before taking any action, the causes of the conflict should be diagnosed. Thus diagnostic reporting is sort of where journalists first chalk out the type and reason of violence before rendering the news of conflict whether it is structural (such as political repression and economic exploitation) or cultural (such as cultural discriminations).

The ultimate goal of human rights journalism is to promote peace through a proactive approach rather than a dramatic, reactive or prescriptive journalistic role in actual practice. A proactive approach means promoting understanding of the reasons for such violations and preventing or remedying them so that they do not lead to imbalances or human rights violations in the future "(Shaw 2012, p. 47) Through such a "proactive approach", according to Galtung (1996), peace can be differentiated into negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace is "the absence of all violence" (Galtung 1996, p. 31). Positive peace is a cooperative system beyond a "passive peaceful coexistence" which can bring harmony. "Therefore, a holistic approach to peace must address all forms of violence and the creation of positive peaceful harmony. Holistic human rights, civil rights, political and positive rights, economic, cultural and social rights comply with the International Bill of Human Rights, to implement the truth in its entirety. Plexus (Shaw 2012). This holistic approach of peace embodies HRJ's guidelines for "exposing all human errors" and "solving holistic problems" (Shaw 2012, p. 47). The creation of HRJ is journalism alternative to what Shaw (2012) calls traditional journalism of Wrong Human Journalism (HWJ). HWJ, as defined by Shaw (2012), is journalism that "addresses problematic imbalances of representation in society. It reinforces rather than challenges ... the concentration of power in the hands of the creative and political community of society.

HRJ can be described as "normative journalistic practice" and "rights-based journalism" for everyone, regardless of "skin color, nationality, race, gender, location, etc." inspired by Kant's ideals of the Enlightenment and cosmopolitanism. This is where HRJ's role in relation to traditional journalism is paramount. It does not resolve the power imbalance in

the hands of certain powerful sectors of society or question their status quo in such a way that it cannot violate the rights of the weak. Shaw identifies five characteristics of traditional journalism - remote hiring, evocative, responsive, hands-free journalism, and war journalism - that have led him to call it "Human Error Journalism (HWJ)" (Shaw 2012, p 96). ). On the other hand, the diagnostic and prognostic role of HRJ, which is characterized by criticism/empathy, diagnosis, pro-activity, interventionism, and peace journalism, "challenges the status quo of powerful dominant voices in the marginalized society by promoting and not strengthening the protection of human rights and peace. "(Shaw 2012, p. 46) HRJ prioritizes the use of critical empathy frameworks to foster caring and proactive attitudes and approaches by interventionists to promote and protect human rights. Fight violence directly and indirectly against power imbalances in society. These five HRJ framework conditions are linked and mutually reinforce through the dimensions of human rights and conflict transformation. For example, critical empathy framework conditions reveal suffering. The problems of victims in a conflict strengthen the diagnostic framework for building a social reality, which in turn contributes to build a (global) and) "compassion."

There are several types of reporting, but the diagnostic type of problem-solving reporting, which provides a critical analysis of the experiences and needs of victims of human rights violations, is known as human rights journalism (Shaw 107). The main conceptual goal of human rights journalism is to focus on the journalist's role in exposing human rights violations, known as human rights reports, second to freedom of expression. Human rights journalism is rights-based journalism that denounces all human errors and prevents direct violence, based on the Universal Declarations of Human Rights of 1948, respectable for all people. Human rights journalism seeks to understand the root causes of the problem in order to prevent further human rights violations and to find solutions to stop causing more violence. Human rights journalism appeals to the elite of global voices and local societies. (Shaw, p. 107) In other words, journalism based solely on justice and not on borders, challenges the social, cultural, economic and political imbalances of society on a global and national level. The main focus of human rights journalism is to highlight human rights violations through diagnostic and proactive reporting, peace journalism and interventionist approach, and the main goal is to bring peace to society, while poor human journalism is war-oriented that spreads plans to commit human rights violations. Bad Human Journalism "tends to reinforce rather than question journalism, the problematic imbalances of representation in society and the concentration of power in the hands of a few people and political communities within global society" (Shaw (2011). False human journalism frames things by far with startling accounts that promote the interest of the ruling social elite. Human Evil Journalism is war-driven and ignores human rights violations in a conflict area.

### **Research questions**

Following are the research questions designed to analyze

1. What is the distribution of human right and human wrong journalism in two selected newspapers?
2. What are the dominant frames in human wrong and human right journalism in the selected newspapers?
3. Which topics got more dominance?
4. What are the dominant frames in Hindustan Times and the Hindu?
5. How human right journalism and wrong journalism vary in terms of topics?

### **Method: Content Analysis**

#### **1.2**

The relevant literature shows that scholars have applied the technique of content analysis to investigate the human right journalism. This study is mainly concerned about investigating the role of Indian media according to the human right journalism approach

during the Kashmir siege after the revocation of the Article 370A. So, the researcher has selected two main newspapers, The Hindu and Hindustan Times, for the purpose of content analysis. Through the census approach, all the news opinion and stories related to the Kashmir conflict were selected during the first 60 days after the revocation of the Article 370A. The newspapers data for the content analysis was retrieved through the American Centre. The researcher collected 392 stories from The Hindu and Hindustan Times and placed them in the sample frame for the content analysis.

### 1.3 Human right journalism model

#### 1.4

Human right journalism	Human wrong journalism
Empathy/critical frame	Empathy/ distance frame
Diagnostic reporting	Evocative reporting
Proactive	Reactive
Interventionist	Non-interventionist
Peace journalism	War journalism

#### 1.5

### Data Coding

Following Lee and Maslog (2005) and Hussain and Siraj (2018) for the coding purpose, a single unit of a paragraph was taken. All the stories were analyzed and identified either in human wrong journalism or human right journalism according to the ten indicators of human right journalism model of Shaw (2012). All the news stories were analyzed on the basis of dominant frame.

### Results

#### Table 1: Distribution of types of journalism in terms of newspapers

RQ1: What is the distribution of human right and human wrong journalism in the two selected newspapers?

Types of Newspaper	Types of journalism		Total
	HRJ	HWJ	
The Hindu	81 (38.94%)	127 (61.05%)	208 (100%)
Hindustan Times	79 (42.93%)	105 (57.06%)	184 (100%)
Total	160 (40.81%)	232 (59.18%)	392 (100%)

Table 1 shows that 392 stories were reported in the two selected newspapers on Kashmir. Out of 392 stories, 40.81% were reported in human right journalism and 59.18% in human wrong journalism. If we talk about the selected newspapers separately, 38.94% stories of The Hindu were reported in human right journalism, whereas 61.05% stories were reported in human wrong journalism regarding the Kashmir conflict. In Hindustan Times, 42.93 % Kashmiri stories were reported in human right journalism and 57.06% stories in human wrong journalism. These figures clearly show that human wrong journalism is dominant type of journalism in selected newspapers of Indian press regarding the Kashmir conflict.

#### Table 2: Distribution of frames in terms of types of journalism

RQ2: What are the dominant frames in human wrong and human right journalism in the selected newspapers?

Types of journalism	Frames	Results
	Critical frame	57 (35.62%)



<b>Human right journalism</b>	Diagnostic reporting	34 (21.25%)
	Proactive reporting	8 (5%)
	Interventionist	11 (6.87%)
	Peace journalism	50 (31.25%)
<b>Total</b>		160 (100%)
<b>Human wrong journalism</b>	Distance frame	68 (29.31%)
	Evocative reporting	69 (29.74%)
	Reactive reporting	12 (5.17%)
	Non-interventionist	42 (18.10%)
	War journalism	41 (17.67%)
<b>Total</b>		232 (100%)

Table 2 shows 35.62% news stories of selected newspapers were reported in critical frame whereas 21.25% stories were reported in diagnostic frame, 5% in proactive reporting, 6.87% in interventionist and 31.25% in peace journalism. Table 2 also shows that in human wrong journalism 29.31% stories of both the newspapers were reported in evocative reporting style whilst 29.31% in distance frame, 18.10% in non-interventionist, 17.67% in war journalism and 5.17% in reactive reporting.

In types of journalism as far as frames are concerned, Table 2 shows that in human right journalism both the selected newspapers used the critical frame (35.62%) the most, which is followed by peace journalism (31.25%). In human right journalism, proactive frame (5%) was used the least, and in human wrong journalism both the selected newspapers reported the evocative frame (29.74%) the most, which is followed by distance frame (29.31%) and reactive frame (5.17%).

**Table 3: Distribution of newspapers in terms of topics**

RQ3: Which topics got more dominance in the selected newspapers?

Newspaper	Topics					Total
	Politics	Economics	Defense	Foreign policy	Sports	
<b>The Hindu</b>	80 (51.2%)	30 (57.69%)	47 (50.53%)	37 (56.06%)	14 (56%)	208 (100%)
<b>Hindustan Times</b>	76 (48.71%)	22 (42.30%)	46 (49.46%)	29 (43.93%)	11 (44%)	184 (100%)

Table 3 shows the distribution of topics in both the newspapers separately. According to the table 3, 51.2% stories of politics were reported in The Hindu and 48.71% in Hindustan Times, 57.69% news of economy were reported in The Hindu and 42.30% in Hindustan Times, 50.53% news of defense were reported in The Hindu whilst 49.46% in Hindustan Times, 56.06% of foreign policy in The Hindu and 43.93% in Hindustan Times, and 56% news of sports were reported in The Hindu and 44% in Hindustan Times.

**Table 4: Distribution of frames in terms of newspapers**

RQ4: What are the dominant frames in Hindustan Times and The Hindu?

Frames	Newspapers	
	The Hindu	Hindustan Times
<b>Critical frame</b>	28 (13.46%)	29 (15.7%)
<b>Diagnostic frame</b>	24 (11.53%)	17 (9.23%)
<b>Proactive</b>	14 (6.73%)	20 (10.86%)
<b>Interventionist</b>	4 (1.92%)	4 (2.17%)
<b>Peace journalism</b>	6 (2.88%)	5 (2.71%)
<b>Distance frame</b>	29 (13.9%)	21 (11.41%)
<b>Evocative</b>	36 (17.30%)	32 (17.39%)
<b>Reactive</b>	34 (16.34%)	35 (19.02%)
<b>Non interventionist</b>	7 (3.36%)	5 (2.71%)

<b>War journalism</b>	26 (12.5%)	16 (8.69%)
<b>Total</b>	208 (100%)	184 (100%)

Table 4 shows dominant frames in selected newspapers. In The Hindu (17.30%) news stories were reported in evocative frame, which is the highest percentage of news stories reported in frames, and likewise 19.02% news stories of Hindustan Times were reported in the reactive frames.

**Table 5: Distribution of topics in terms of types of journalism**

RQ5: How human right journalism and human wrong journalism vary in terms of topics?

Topics	Type of journalism		Total
	Human right journalism	Human wrong journalism	
<b>Politics</b>	68 (42.5%)	88 (37.93%)	156 (39.79%)
<b>Economy</b>	19 (11.87%)	33 (14.22%)	52 (13.26%)
<b>Defense</b>	38 (23.75%)	55 (23.70%)	93 (23.72%)
<b>Foreign policy</b>	19 (11.87%)	47 (20.25%)	66 (16.83%)
<b>Sports</b>	16 (10%)	9 (3.87%)	25 (6.37%)
<b>Total</b>	160 (100%)	232 (100%)	392 (100%)

Table 5 differentiates the division of topics in terms of dominance and types of journalism. The highest number of stories in terms of topics was reported in political topics, and if we differentiate stories in terms of types of journalism, 39.79% of the total stories were reported from political topics. Among these stories, 42.5% belong to human right journalism and 37.93% to human right journalism. Least number of stories were reported in sports topic which is just 6.37% of the total news stories, and among these, stories of sports stand at 10%.

**Table 6: Distribution of frames in terms of topics**

How are the main topics in the study distributed in terms of frames of human wrong journalism and human right journalism?

Table 6 shows that a total of 57 stories were reported in critical frame in both the

Frames	Topics					Total
	Politics	Economy	Defense	Foreign policy	Sports	
<b>Critical frame</b>	29 (50.87%)	7 (14%)	12 (21.05%)	6 (10.52%)	3 (5.26%)	57 (100%)
<b>Diagnostic</b>	16 (47.05%)	5 (14.70%)	9 (26.47%)	3 (8.82%)	1 (2.94%)	34 (100%)
<b>Proactive</b>	4 (50%)	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)
<b>Interventionist</b>	7 (63.63%)	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0%)	11 (100%)
<b>Peace journalism</b>	12 (24%)	5 (10%)	12 (24%)	9 (18%)	12 (24%)	50 (100%)
<b>Distance</b>	33 (48.52%)	14 (20.58%)	10 (14.70%)	8 (11.76%)	3 (4.41%)	68 (100%)
<b>Evocative</b>	22 (31.88%)	10 (14.49%)	24 (34.78%)	8 (11.59%)	5 (7.24%)	69 (100%)
<b>Reactive</b>	6 (50%)	1 (8.33%)	2 (16.66%)	2 (16.66%)	1 (8.33%)	12 (100%)
<b>Non interventionist</b>	14 (33.33%)	2 (4.76%)	7 (16.66%)	1 (2.38%)	0 (%)	42 (100%)
<b>War journalism</b>	13 (31.70%)	6 (14.63%)	12 (29.26%)	10 (24.39%)	0 (%)	41 (100%)

selected newspapers. Out of 57 stories, 50.87% stories were reported in politics types followed by defense 21.05%, economy 14%, foreign policy 10.52% and sports 5.26%. Thirty-four stories were reported in diagnostic frame, of which 47.05% were reported in politics, 26.47% in defense, 14.70% in economy, 8.82% in foreign policy and 2.94% in sports. As far as proactive frame is concerned, out of total 8 stories, 50% were reported in politics, 37.05% in defense and 12.5% in sports. In interventionist frame, 63.63% stories were reported in politics, 18.18% in defense, 9.09% each in economy and foreign policy, respectively. In peace journalism, 24% news stories were each reported in politics, defense

and sports, respectively, 18% in foreign policy and 10% in economy. In distance frame, a total 68 stories were reported in selected time. Of 68 stories, 48.52% stories were reported in politics, 20.58% in economy, 14.705 in defense, 11.76% in foreign policy and 4.41% in sports.

### 1.6 Conclusion

The study has found that according to the types of human right journalism of Ibrahim Shaw, the human wrong journalism is more dominant in the selected newspapers of Indian press where communication manipulates the events in favor of the ruling elite of the dominant class. Overall, results of the study show that journalism of Indian press during the selected time period of the study was elite-oriented and safeguarded the Indian national policy, which discourages the advocacy or intervention of the third party in the Kashmir conflict. The highest number of evocating style news stories in the study show that reporting of the Indian press in the Kashmir conflict is emotions-based brimming with stereotypes and myths rather than the facts and truth. As far as the internal affairs of Kashmir, Indian press used the frame of peace journalism and tried to give an impression that it highlighted the issues of Kashmiri people, but when it comes to external affairs, finance and defense, the Indian media tilted towards human wrong journalism and reported the superficial. Moreover, the findings also show that when it comes to soft news related to sports or economy both the selected newspapers reported the stories according to the human right journalism, but when it comes to hard news related to foreign policy, politics and defense, the Indian media reported these hard news subjects according to the human wrong journalism.

This study also suffers from a number of limitations. Due to constraints of time, researchers have chosen only two leading newspapers of the Indian press. In future studies researchers may opt for more than two newspapers from Indian or Pakistani press to compare the overall orientation of human right journalism on a broader scale. The researchers found that this research domain is understudied. It is suggested that this area should be studied further to understand the key debates within this research area.

### References

- Article 370: India strips disputed Kashmir of special status. (2019, August 05). Retrieved July 15, 2020, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-49231619>
- Kashmir dispute: Hundreds detained as anger grows. (2019, June 20). Retrieved June 28, 2020, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-49277021>

- Bhat, I. A. (2019). Violation of Land Rights of Structural Society Through Different Ways for Changing the Structure of Society. *Social Work Chronicle*, 8(1), 130.
- Bhat, S. A. (2019). The Kashmir conflict and human rights. *Race & Class*, 61(1), 77-86. CNN Online 2019
- Gadda, D. N. (2014). 'Partial Journalism'--A study of national media of India and Kashmir conflict. *Trends in Information Management*, 10(1).
- Galtung, J. (2002), Media: Peace journalism, <https://www.nicr.ca/programs/PeaceJournalism.htm>, last accessed on November 20, 2005
- Hajni, M. (2008). The Kashmir Conflict: A Kashmiri Perspective. *Swords and Ploughshares, winter 2007-8*.
- Hussain, S., Siraj, S. A., & Mahmood, T. (2019). Evaluating war and peace potential of Pakistani news media: Advancing a peace journalism model. *Information Development*, 0266666919893416.
- International Federation for Human Rights Online (2019). Retrieved June 10, 2020, from <https://www.fidh.org/en/region/asia/india/update-on-human-rights-violations-in-indian-administered-jammu>
- Joseph, T. (2000). Kashmir, human rights and the Indian press. *Contemporary South Asia*, 9(1), 41-55.
- Khan, M. U. H. (2019). Kashmir and Power Politics. *Defence Journal*, 23(2), 48.
- Kim, S. H., Carvalho, J. P., & Davis, A. C. (2010). Talking about poverty: News framing of who is responsible for causing and fixing the problem. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 87(3-4), 563-581.
- Koul, S. Human Rights of Journalists Working in Kashmir: An In-depth Analysis.
- Latif, F., Siddiqua, A., & Iftikhar, U. (2020). Escalation in Kashmir Conflict after Burhan Wani's Killing: A Comparative Study of the Coverage by Pakistani and Indian Press. *sjesr*, 3(2), 83-90.
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2010). A global standard for reporting conflict and peace. *Peace journalism, war and conflict resolution*, 87-104.
- Lyon, P. (2008). Conflict between India and Pakistan: an encyclopedia. Abc-Clio.
- Majid, A., Ali, S., Abbas, F., & Kousar, S. (2019). Kashmir: The Major Source of Conflict between Pakistan and India. *South Asian Studies* (1026-678X), 34(2).
- Malik, V. P. (2006). *Kargil from surprise to victory*. HarperCollins Publishers India, a joint venture with the India Today Group.
- Misri, D. (2019). Showing humanity: violence and visuality in Kashmir. *Cultural Studies*, 33(3), 527-549
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political communication*, 10(1), 55-75.
- Rawan, B., & ur Rahman, S. I. (2020). Comparative Frame Analysis of Coverage of Kashmir Conflict in Indian and Pakistani Newspapers from War/Peace Journalism Perspective. *sjesr*, 3(2), 338-345.
- Riaz, S., Shah, B. H., & Ahmad, S. Kashmir issue and pak-indian press: content analysis of leading newspapers.
- Saddiqua, A., & Ullah, F. (2019). A Comparative Study of the Kashmir Conflict Coverage in Pakistani and Indian Press. *Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR)*, 1-9.
- Shaw, I. S. (2012). Human rights journalism. *Advances in Reporting Humanitarian Interventions, Basingstoke: Palgrave*.
- Sreedharan, C. (2009). *Reporting Kashmir: an analysis of the conflict coverage in Indian and Pakistani newspapers* (Doctoral dissertation, Bournemouth University).