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This article discusses how professionally unethical practices by journalists during collection and dissemination of crime incident information in Africa, could exacerbate harm to victims of terrorist attacks. The views expressed the outcome of a desk-based study on crime reporting in Africa. Writing through the lens of ‘vulnerability’ from a non-western context, this article highlights double standards applied by some foreign and international press, who observe stipulated ethical reporting standards “at home” thereby avoiding further harm to crime victims, while disregarding these guidelines, or applying them selectively “abroad”. Reports on the Westgate Mall 21/9/2017 terrorist attack in Nairobi are used to illustrate the potential of ‘jigsaw puzzle effect’ in leading to additional victimisation by making victims identifiable, compromising their safety and psychological well-being while portraying disrespect for human dignity. The author advocates responsible journalism as a reflection of the duty of care for victims’ welfare and encourages further discussion on ethical considerations in professional crime reporting.
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Introduction

The media plays a pivotal role in connecting the 21st century globalized information age. The World Wide Web avails increasingly interactive, mobile and inexpensive ‘new media’ and interactive platforms, with the potential for collecting, compiling and facilitating the dissemination of both bad and good news across the world faster than ever before. Advancements in information communication technology (ICT) also enable a globally connected and increasingly proactive audience to participate in the content collection, sharing and communication through media websites real-time by posting images and stories as the events unfold. Therefore, when news of terrorism events is relayed in print, audio or visual form unless the content is carefully packaged guided by victim-sensitive professional conduct, the journalists’ interpretation of the facts had the potential to re-victimize individuals and communities who could have already experienced the initial harmful impacts of terrorist attacks. Thus, the editorial challenge for news editing prior to its dissemination remains a professional ethical challenge and responsibility from which the media cannot escape. In recent years, the increase in libel cases arising from content posted on social media, and of defamation cases brought against print and electronic mass media outlets, highlights the potentially serious and costly consequences of misrepresentation of facts by the media. Guidelines that could inform decisions for policy and practice of ethical journalism indicate rules and codex that journalists could follow.

Professional ethical journalist conduct encourages compliance with universal standards recommended for the treatment of those harmed by crime. Such recommendations are tailored to protect the privacy and identity of vulnerable and child victims in order to minimize the avenues for re-victimisation of those already affected by crime. For instance, the United Nations Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power provides a compendium of standards and norms in crime prevention that specifies some practical ways through which secondary victimisation of child victims can be avoided, by stating that:

“Child victims and witnesses should have their privacy protected as a matter of primary importance. Information relating to a child’s involvement in the justice
process should be protected. This could be attained through maintaining confi­
dentiality and restricting disclosure of information that may lead to the identifi­
cation of a child who is a victim or witness in the justice process. Measures should be taken to protect children from undue exposure to the public by, for example, excluding the public and the media from the courtroom during the child’s testi­
mony, where permitted by national law” (Section X. 26-28: The Right to Privacy).

From a Human Rights perspective, recommendations urge the protection of victims’ privacy, while ensuring confidentiality and protection for victims as a basic human right covering both those affected directly and indirectly by crime incidents. In this regard, United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law, recommends that:

“Victims should be treated with humanity and respect for their dignity and human rights, and appropriate measures should be taken to ensure their safety, physical and psychological well-being and privacy, as well as those of their families” (Section IV. 10: Treatment of Victims).

In addition, in instances whereby a victim is a person below eighteen years of age, United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989 (UNCRC) advises that the best interests of the child should guide policy and practice. In this regard, UNCRC states that:

“In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legisla­
tive bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration” (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Annex 3).

The Handbook on Justice for Victims provides practical guidelines for con­
duct by frontline professionals in implementing the Declaration of Basic Prin­
ciples of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power. The handbook cau­tions against publishing the identity of child victims through photographs

---


or broadcasting images that could place the subject in danger. Professionals coming in contact with victims and witnesses are advised to refrain from showing photographs or broadcasting images of deceased victims, body bags and/or seriously injured victims (UNODCCP, 1999).

With respect to the child’s interests, UNCRC Article 16 elaborates on these interests stating that:

“No child shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his or her privacy, family, or correspondence, nor to unlawful attacks on his or her honor and reputations”, and that “The child has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks” (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 16).

Regional and national guidelines to safeguard victims add their voice to the global impetus to shield the most vulnerable in society. In establishing minimum standards on the rights, support, and protection of victims of crime and their families, the European Union Directive 2012/29/EU suggested to its members to consider the protection of victims of crime from secondary and repeat victimisation. In addition, The Directive suggests mechanisms for protecting victims from secondary victimisation, on the rehabilitation and hope for the victim’s recovery, by stating that:

“Measures should be available to protect the safety and dignity of victims and their family members from secondary and repeat victimisation, from intimidation and from retaliation, such as interim injunctions or protection or restraining orders” (European Union Directive 2012/29/EU, Article 20 Section 52).

The Directive goes further to highlight the pivotal role of protection of privacy in preventing secondary and repeat victimisation, intimidation, and retaliation through a range of measures including non-disclosure or limitations on the disclosure of information concerning the identity and whereabouts of the victim (European Union Directive 2012/29/EU, Section 54). In making special reference to victims of terrorism, The Directive emphasizes the crippling social dimension of this crime on individuals’ social relations. It states that:

---

“Victims of terrorism have suffered attacks that are intended ultimately to harm society. They may, therefore, need special attention, support, and protection due to the particular nature of the crime that has been committed against them. Victims of terrorism can be under significant public scrutiny and often need social recognition and respectful treatment by society. Member States should, therefore, take particular account of the needs of victims of terrorism, and should seek to protect their dignity and security” (European Union Directive 2012/29/EU, Article 20 Section 16).

The Directive also provides member states with general parameters for ensuring the protection of victims’ privacy and traceable information in the electronic domain, stating that:

“Member States shall ensure that competent authorities may take during the criminal proceedings appropriate measures to protect the privacy, including personal characteristics of the victim, images of victims and of their family members. Furthermore, Member States shall ensure that competent authorities may take all lawful measures to prevent public dissemination of any information that could lead to the identification of a child victim. In order to protect the privacy, personal integrity and personal data of victims, Member States shall, with respect for freedom of expression and information and freedom and pluralism of the media, encourage the media to take self-regulatory measures” (European Union Directive 2012/29/EU, Article 21, Section 1and 2).

Specific ethical guidelines for journalists, that set rules for their interaction with crime victims when collecting information for public media consumption, contain advice that urges caution when gathering information on sensitive matters. For instance, the Independent Press Standard Organisation (IPSO), the regulatory body for newspapers and magazines in the United Kingdom, seeks to balance press freedom with ensuring ethical journalism. It does so by setting out an Editors’ Code of Practice (Independent Press Standards Organization, 2016), which newspapers and magazines have to abide by in order to uphold the standard of journalism, while at the same time protecting individuals’ rights and holding newspapers to account for their actions. Regarding handling crime victims and witnesses, the code of practice provides clear guidance on how to handle victims in different sensitive circumstances to show respect and dignity. For instance, when relating with grieving
victims, or individuals reporting suicide incidents, or with victims of sexual assault and with child victims, the code advises journalists the following:

Intrusion into grief or shock: In cases involving personal grief or shock, inquiries and approaches must be made with sympathy and discretion and publication handled sensitively.

Reporting suicide: When reporting suicide, to prevent simulative acts care should be taken to avoid excessive detail of the method used, while taking into account the media’s right to report legal proceedings.

Children in sex cases: Even if legally free to do so, the press must not identify children under 16 who are victims or witnesses in cases involving sex offenses. In any press report of a case involving a sexual offense against a child: a) The child must not be identified; b) The adult may be identified; c) The word “incest” must not be used where a child victim might be identified; d) Care must be taken that nothing in the report implies the relationship between the accused and the child.

Victims of sexual assault: The press must not identify victims of sexual assault or publish material likely to contribute to such identification unless there is adequate justification and they are legally free to do so (Independent Press Standards Organization, 2016).

Apart from these international and national policies, in-house editorial rules have been instrumental in directing policies and practice by corporate mass media organizations when dealing with victims and witnesses. Thus having a policy in place reflects corporate social responsibility for responsible journalism. National guidelines to enhance protection of victims have played a role in influencing ethical journalism and regulating the media. However, the conduct of some journalists continues to project ethical journalism contrary to practical guidelines provided in their policy and practice, and even when such editorial parameters are published on their websites. A random check on the BBC website revealed that their editorial policies and guidelines take into account the protection of crime victims and witnesses by anonymising vulnerable and child witnesses, and not divulging any of their personal information to ensure that they are not traceable. In this regard, the policy states the following:

Disguising Identities: There may be legal reasons why the identities of people involved in a trial are not included in crime reports. If it is necessary to protect the identity of crime victims and witnesses, anonymity would normally entail
exclusion of the name, address, photograph, or any other clue that could reveal the victim’s identity either directly or indirectly through a ‘jigsaw effect’. This occurs when separate reports, which could be in different media, provide different details of a case that when pieced together reveal the identity of the person involved. The risk is at its highest when reporting the sexual crime within the family. In this regard, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) provides commendable guidelines to journalists reporting on incest as serious sexual offence. It specifically advises them to “take care not to refer to incest where the victim could be identifiable” (BBC Editorial Guidelines: Section 6 Fairness, Contributors, and Consent 6.4.10 - 6.4.12 and Section 18 The Law: 18.6 - 18.9).

Children and Young People: We must take great care when dealing with anyone under 18 involved as a witness or victim when reporting an investigation into an alleged criminal offense in the UK. We must make judgments about their vulnerability before revealing their name, address, school or another educational establishment, place of work, or any still or moving picture of them (BBC Editorial Guidelines: Section 9: Children and Young People as Contributors). If criminal proceedings follow, “there are legal restrictions surrounding the publication of information leading to the identity of anyone under 18 who is a witness or a victim” (BBC Editorial Guidelines: Section 18: The Law: 18.9).

In this article, my observation that some international journalists apply these regulations selectively is substantiated by illustrating how they adhere to professional ethical guidelines ensuring victim protection while reporting similar incidents in their countries while flaunting such rules when reporting on terrorism incidents in Africa. Thereby exposing victims and potential witnesses of criminal incidents in Africa to further harm during interviews intended to glean the facts from them about the incidents. Using the Westgate Mall specific terrorism event online reports posted, this article discusses some specific ways in which the media failed to exercise duty of care when reporting on terrorism events in Africa. The instances include divulging of the identity of victims, and of investigating officers, in a manner that makes the individuals traceable, degrading them and susceptible to further harm.
Challenges of Terrorism Incident Reporting in Africa

From a general survey of open-sourced news reports on recent terrorism-related events in Africa, one observes that the media has provided an avenue through information on these incidents be publicised in a manner that could be counter-productive for direct victims and other individuals affected by these incidents. Reports of terrorist incidents in Africa both by media houses based inside and outside Africa, appear to project disrespect for victims’ dignity, by compromising the safety of eyewitnesses while also posing a threat to the psychological well-being of vulnerable individuals, including people closely associated with the victims of such events. In this way, reports on these incidents have the potential to re-victimise people, who might have already experienced the initial harmful impacts of the criminal event(s). When tragic and violent incidents occur, and when the crime scene bears terrorists’ trademark, then news of a terrorist attack often travels fast and further afield. The speed with which such tragic news spreads, can be attributed to a combination of the increased role of social media platforms in the collection and dissemination of incident information, and the improved ability for bystanders to upload such information to mass media news outlets in text, video recorded and live-streamed form in real-time. Thus, information technology is crucial in providing first responders and mass media organisations with both solicited and unsolicited information on incidents (Simon et al., 2014). However, unless the first-hand incident information is handled with caution, edited prior to dissemination and publicised responsibly, the content can be harmful for both the viewers and the victims. This is particularly true in the case of child victims.

Researchers emphasize the negative effects of exposure of child victims in the media, by stating that: “When the names of child victims and other identifying information appear in the media it can exacerbate trauma, complicates recovery, discourages future disclosures and inhibit cooperation with authorities for the children involved” (Jones, Finkelhor, Beckwith, 2010: 348)

Vulnerability – Exacerbating Reporting

If a vulnerable victim is understood to constitute one who is susceptible to the criminal conduct against them, by virtue of their protected characteristics, including age, physical or mental condition (The Law Dictionary, 2017)
then children, and adults who were either injured, in shock and/or survivors fleeing the site of the attack could each be regarded as vulnerable victims. Thus interviewing an incapacitated or fleeing survivors could be regarded as eliciting information under duress. A brief perusal of some news reports of the Westgate terrorist revealed some worrisome content. Firstly, the narration of unnecessary graphic details of the terrorist attack and the printing of full names of those who testified of having gone through those experiences. In some cases, such reports contained photos of the named victim/survivor, thereby revealing the identity of survivors. This complete disregard of the need for anonymity of direct victims, re-victimizes them by exposing them and the information they knew about the incident. While the intimidation, bribing and ‘disappearance’ of witnesses in high profile criminal cases in Kenya is not uncommon (Mueller, 2014: 33), unmasking of witnesses by journalists reporting on the Westgate attack, was a malpractice that made the victims susceptible to further risk of harm as they could be targeted by the terrorists to deter them from featuring as investigation witnesses.

Secondly, in some cases divulging of the identity of vulnerable victims, including children and those bereaved by the incident, made both sets of victims easily identifiable and/or traceable. In the Westgate Mall incident, some foreign journalists working for well-established foreign print and electronic media organizations could be culpable in exposing victims by flaunting safeguarding guidelines that they normally adhered to in their countries, when reporting on this incident. For instance, both live footage as well as news items posted online about victims of the Westgate attack, included photographs of victims, their full names, places of work, residential addresses, children’s schools, universities some victims attended and even course studied. In the light of the stipulations on victim protection outlined in the UN Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power mentioned earlier in this article, the practice of interviewing survivors, minutes after they miraculously escaped from the crime scene, amounted to journalist professional misconduct. Such traumatized direct victims having had no psycho-social support yet, could be vulnerable. Therefore, the duty of care for victims needs to motivate the prioritization of the safety and emotional welfare of those harmed by crime. Furthermore, the publishing photo of wounded victims was an invasion of their privacy at a moment of extreme vulnerability when the casualty is unable to evade journalists.
To illustrate this concern, online reports by the well-known UK based newspaper about the Nairobi Westgate Mall attack in Nairobi accessible online, provided the particulars of some of the victims who survived the attack including their names, nationality, profession, her husband’s name and her account of what she had witnessed. The report read as follows:

“Amber Prior, the mother of that young boy, tells of her family’s terrifying ordeal at the hands of the militant Islamist group Al Shabaab. Mrs. Prior, a French national who runs a production company with her British husband Daniel, describes how she was seriously injured, witnessed the deaths of many around her and how she successfully pleaded for the lives of her two children and two others when she came face to face with the gunman” (The Telegraph, 2013).

Reporting on the same incident in a front-page article entitled ‘Courage: Amelie and Elliott next to a body outside Westgate Shopping Mall in Nairobi’, The Mirror published an image (obtained from Reuters), of Amber Prior’s children standing beside the body of a dead victim holding a packet of chocolate. The article stated that one of the attackers had given the children the chocolate (Fletcher, 2013). Both The Mirror and National Post named the children and published their photos in a digital newspaper without pixelating the children’s faces (National Post Staff, 2013). This directly contravenes the guidelines provided for professionals interacting with child victims, as stipulated in The Handbook on Justice for Victims (UNODCCP, 1999). It would have been preferable if the children had been anonymized. To add insult to injury, the National Post newspaper went further in narrating the verbatim between one of the children and the attackers and between the attacker and the children’s mother. Also included in the report was the name of the children’s father’s uncle and the city from which their father hailed. Although the mother’s photo is not shown, mention of her particulars in the article about the same incident published in a third publication, The Telegraph, completes the ‘jigsaw effect’ by making both the children, their parents, and relatives traceable and remained vulnerable victims in need of protection. This is worrisome because at the time the current journal article was submitted, the attackers remained at large. This fact further highlighted the risks to which divulging of the identity of victims/survivors of terrorist attacks exacerbates their vulnerability both as victims and as potential witnesses.
Furthermore, it remains unclear whether or not the survivors/victims’ consent was obtained to publish their personal information to a global audience, and if so, whether in answering questions posed by a cameraman, a fleeing survivor’s cooperation can be construed to amount to informed consent. In addition, the Westgate incident photos remained posted online and freely accessible years later, and even at the time this article was submitted for publication. The victims who were interviewed or photographed escaping the Westgate Mall crime scene, their relatives and the relatives of those deceased by the incident, who might have watched the live footage remain susceptible to multiple levels of victimisation. Firstly, the victims experienced direct victimisation by the terrorists who attacked the mall. Secondly, they were re-victimized by the journalists who interviewed or photographed them outside the mall. Thirdly, they experienced secondary victimisation by the mass media through four practices, including: (a) posting on their websites of pictures of the traumatizing incidents depicting the victims in terrible attacks; (b) displaying detailed narratives of the incidents on their websites long after the incidents have occurred; (c) replaying video clips of tragic incidents on anniversaries of terrorist incidents; and (d) drawing similarities between new incidents and tragic events that occurred in the past. These practices emotionally harm the surviving victims and hinders their attempts to bring closure to their suffering.

Immediately after a terrorist attack, mobile recording devises such as smartphones, digital buttons, and smartwatches enable bystanders, strangers and freelance journalists out in the field to capture and upload video clips of incidents onto social media. Thus, the raw footage could find its way onto social media and interactive mass media websites. The sensitivity with which the media handles such information and information depicting vulnerable victims, provides editors with the opportunity to exercise duty of care for victims. In this regard, journalists could adhere to the practice of temperance in selecting news content while protecting the identity, dignity and privacy of crime victims. Although crime affects individuals differently, it is an accepted practice that victims often require some level of counselling to attain some measure of emotional and mental equilibrium before their consent to participate in an interview about the attack could be construed to be an informed decision. It remained unclear whether the journalists requested the consent of victims to interview, photograph or publish the reports on the
Westgate attack. In the interest of public safety, editorial diligence needs to be exercised in broadcasting of information on (suspected) terrorist incidents. Opportunities to vet news content prior to its dissemination include scrutinizing video clips depicting footage from crime scenes, verifying the content of recorded eyewitness testimony for authenticity, revisiting crime scene video footage prior to going on air, or online publication. Such simple measures could go a long way in limiting the avenues through which the safety of victims and witnesses could be compromised. This could also limit the monitoring of events at the scene by the perpetrators (Simon et al., 2014) and the possibility of intimidation or elimination of witnesses considered as prima facie crucial for investigation of the criminal incident.

In addition, video recordings of victims’ and eyewitness’ reports obtained at the scene are posted in the public domain without their consent. Human beings are not mere repositories of information. Each person owns their views, has a right to be consulted prior the capturing of their image or voice either on electronic devices or in print. The victim also has the right to receiving an explanation about what information was required, and to what end, the information that they provided could be used. In this way, an individual providing eyewitness testimony is provided with an opportunity to make an informed decision regarding the sharing of their reconstruction of the circumstances that pertained to the terrorism event being reported on. Notwithstanding the freedom of expression, obtaining informed consent from a victim or bystander, prior to televising these reports is a basic and fundamental human right (UNODCCP, 1999). It is unclear from reports on terrorism incidents in Africa, whether or not obtaining of informed consent is considered or not prior to dissemination of news on these events.

It is universally acceptable duty of care for the next-of-kin to be treated with dignity (Penson et al., 2002: 251). This could include their preparation (counseling) prior to informing them of the death, sudden hospitalization, injury or disappearance of a family member, work colleague or a close associate. This works on the principle that when receiving bad news, and especially about tragic events affecting those close to them, this could trigger psycho-social and emotional distress with serious health implications (Gibson, 2006). From a survey of a handful of reports on terrorist incidents, the violent nature of these unfortunate incidents, and especially the incidents that occur in Africa, appear to be sensationalized in the press, without any sensitivity to
the impact that news of the incident may have on the surviving victims and local communities affected. Most terrorism incident news reports covering information on the crime scene often contain photographs of the incident scene, that may or may not include the deceased, and yet to be identified, or who may still be missing or who are held captive. A typical incident scene may depict bloodied personal items, clothed corpses, body parts and personal items strewn around, or photos of familiar premises adjacent to the incident site. Most offices and recreation venues now have televisions left on for the entertainment of clients. When terrorist attacks occur, people watch the televised news on terrorist attacks. Occasionally the sight of a familiar location such as an office building, hotel or popular beach, or of personal items strewn on a crime scene, or the registration number of a car damaged by the impact of an explosive, might provide the first inkling to an unsuspecting viewer of the fate that may have befallen their loved one or close associate. Therefore, it is important that such tragic breaking news be packaged and presented in a manner not likely to cause unnecessary distress to viewers.

Breaking news and updates crime incidents such as the Westgate terrorist attack and two-day siege that followed, are occasionally preceded by a written warning to viewers about the graphic character of the pictures contained in the news, stating that: ‘The following report contains graphic content. Viewer discretion is advised’. Then after a few seconds of such a cautionary announcement, the news video clip is played. To make such warnings meaningful to the viewers, perhaps such warnings could be followed by a realistic time break, such as a commercial break, to allow the audience time to decide whether or not to watch the graphic content.

It is the position of this paper, that such a short notice appears to be more of a formality since the interval between the viewer warning and the playing of the news video clip does not accord the audience sufficient time to decide whether to watch the graphic details or not. This illustration further fuels the debate on the balance between viewers’ discretion, TV violence and regulation of the media (Kim, 2009: 1385).
Conclusion

This article is an opinion piece derived from personal observations of how unethical journalism could lead to re-victimization of terrorism incident survivors during the following three phases of news information generation: during journalists’ interactions with incident survivors during news information collection; in determining the content of news broadcasted; through the mode of dissemination of terrorist incident reports. Each of these phases provide additional avenues through which crime victims could experience additional harm unless deliberate steps are taken to ensure that victim protection is incorporated in information communication policy and practice. Using three open-sourced news articles on The Nairobi Westgate Mall attack carried out in Nairobi in September 2013, this article illustrates how incident reports posted online had the potential to re-victimize the direct, indirect and tertiary victims. The discussion and illustrations focused on two major flaws by the media when reporting on this specific tragic terrorism event in Africa. These were the lack of privacy and practices that led to divulging the identity of victims and of their relatives as well. The article invites an inter-disciplinary discourse between journalists and victimologists on the need for journalists to apply uniform standards in safeguarding children and vulnerable adult victims when reporting on terrorism incidents, even in absence of national victim protection regulatory mechanisms. The article suggests an in-depth content analysis of a broader range of reports on crime incidents in Africa, to assess whether there is a general tendency for foreign journalists reporting on criminal activities in Africa to play by different set of rules when reporting at home and abroad. While acknowledging the small sample of news briefs used to illustrate this point in this article, the aim is to provoke a discussion around the journalists’ duty of care in safeguarding victims through responsible and ethical journalism in all jurisdictions. In conclusion, therefore, the author advocates for responsible journalism in Africa as one means through which the media could directly contribute to mitigating the risk of secondary victimisation of crime victims, and their family members.

Some simple but practical steps have been suggested that could be followed by journalists to project a responsible attitude when collecting and reporting on crime events in Africa. The call to frontline journalists and stringers in the field to exercise duty of care by reducing the vulnerability of the (potential)
crime victims covered in their stories cannot be over-emphasized. They include anonymising victims through pixelating their faces in audio recordings and photos, an online search for illustrations of good practice by the media worth replicating, to empowering crime victims with ideas on how to deal with the media. These include providing them with information on available support systems within easy reach, as an invaluable resource that victims could refer for guidance on how to handle the press in the aftermath of a crime incident. In this regard, Victim Support UK website provides freely available information about the need for victims to exercise caution in dealing with the media. Information provided could enable victims to make informed decisions on how to handle the media in the aftermath of a tragic event. The notice states that:

“If you’ve been affected by a crime and you’re getting calls or visits from the media as a result, you need to think about the pros and cons of speaking to the press before you talk to them. There are systems in place to help protect you, but there are some risks that you need to be aware of. There are a number of people you can talk to about your options” (Victim Support UK, 2017).

As information on criminal incidents continues to feature in to capture the public’s attention through print and electronic media, perhaps there is a need to train journalists reporting on terrorist incidents in Africa on the practicalities of ethical journalism. A hope-filled future for responsible journalism in Africa could be helped with the establishment of an Ombudsman to implement the process of holding the media to account (Pritchard, 2000: 2), to monitor and regularly conduct due diligence on media representation of crime in Africa. Such an office could also fulfill the role of collecting evidence on crime reporting in Africa that could contribute to building an evidence-base for policy and practice of responsible journalism in Africa, as a first step towards exercising duty of care for those harmed by crime.
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Mediji: Minimiziranje reviktimizacije kroz dužnost da se brine o žrtvama i odgovorno novinarstvo

Ovaj rad analizira na koji način profesionalno neetička praksa novinara tokom prikupljanja i diseminacije informacija o kriminalnim incidentima u Africi može da pomoć pri odsustvu primarnih viktima i štetama koje su pretrpele žrtve terorističkih napada. Stavovi izloženi u radu predstavljaju rezultat pregledne studije o izveštavanju o kriminalitetu u Africi. U radu, koji je pisan kroz prizmu „ranjivosti”, i to u kontekstu koji nije „zapadni”, ukazuje se na postojanje dvostrukih standarda koje primenjuju neki strani i međunarodni novinari, koji poštju etička pravila prilikom izveštavanja u svo-
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Jim zemljama kako bi sprečili dalju štetu po žrtve, dok zanemarjuja ta ista pravila ili ih selektivno primenjuju kada su u inostranstvu. Medijska izveštavanja o terorističkom napadu u tržnom centru Westgate, izvršenom 21. septembra 2017. godine u Najro-biju, iskorišćena su da ilustruju potencijal „efekta slagalice“ koji dovodi do dodatne viktimizacije i to kroz identifikovanje žrtava, kompromitovanje njihove bezbednosti i psihološke dobrobiti, uz istovremeno pokazivanje nepoštovanja njihovog ljudskog dostojanstva. U radu se zalaže za odgovorno novinarstvo kao refleksiju dužnosti da se brine o dobrobiti žrtava i podstiče se na dalju diskusiju o etičkim pitanjima u profesionalnom izveštavanju o kriminalitetu.
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