



Theses and Dissertations

2004-03-15

An Exploratory Study of the Effectiveness of the CPJ in Defending Journalists and Press Freedom Ideals in Latin America: Transnational Advocacy in the International Sphere

Leticia A. Adams
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Adams, Leticia A., "An Exploratory Study of the Effectiveness of the CPJ in Defending Journalists and Press Freedom Ideals in Latin America: Transnational Advocacy in the International Sphere" (2004). *Theses and Dissertations*. 241.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/241>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CPJ
IN DEFENDING JOURNALISTS AND PRESS FREEDOM IDEALS
IN LATIN AMERICA: TRANSNATIONAL ADVOCACY
IN THE INTERNATIONAL SPHERE

by

Leticia A. Adams

A thesis submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Communications

Brigham Young University

April 2004

Copyright © 2004 Leticia A. Adams

All Rights Reserved

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Leticia A. Adams

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Date

Eliza A. Tanner Hawkins, Chair

Date

Darren G. Hawkins

Date

Allen W. Palmer

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the thesis of Leticia A. Adams in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

Date

Eliza A. Tanner Hawkins
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

Sherry L. Baker
Graduate Coordinator

Accepted for the College

Stephen M. Jones
Dean, College of Fine Arts and Communications

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CPJ IN
DEFENDING JOURNALISTS AND PRESS FREEDOM IDEALS
IN LATIN AMERICA: TRANSNATIONAL ADVOCACY
IN THE INTERNATIONAL SPHERE

Leticia A. Adams

Department of Communications

Master of Arts

The Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) is one of many nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations that work to defend press freedom and the safety of journalists in Latin America. Based on qualitative interviews with employees at the CPJ, open surveys with journalists who have been helped by the CPJ, historical archive research, and informal participant observation, this study shows that organized domestic and international nongovernmental groups can and do make improvements on behalf of journalists and press freedom in Latin America. The CPJ's activities raise issues and place them on the agenda, and they influence discourse, policy, institutional procedures, and state behavior. Effectiveness at these levels is conditioned upon the involvement of local press groups, target audiences, the issues addressed, the credibility and authority of the CPJ, and the organization's connections within the worldwide press freedom network.

This case study helps fill a significant gap in the research on transnational advocacy and its influence, and provides a foundation upon which to further explore the roles of advocacy networks in the international community.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance of my friend and mentor, Dr. Eliza Tanner Hawkins, whose wisdom, wonderful example, and constant support have motivated and inspired me throughout this project. Many thanks go to my committee members, Dr. Darren Hawkins, Dr. Allen Palmer, and the late Dr. Michael Perkins, and also my graduate coordinator, Dr. Sherry Baker, for offering their additional expertise and advice throughout this endeavor.

I am deeply indebted to Carole and her two darling children for opening their home to me while I conducted my interviews in New York. I am also thankful to the CPJ fulltime staff and the journalists they helped for sharing their insights and perspectives into its activities. Of course, the conclusions of this study do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the CPJ or the journalists it tried to help.

Finally, I give a heartfelt thank you to all of my friends and family who have always encouraged me to follow my dreams. I would especially like to thank my mother and father for helping me realize this study; Lauren, James, and Mark for their inspiration; Roxanne, for her willingness to always help me; and Ben, one of my best friends, for his love, patience, interest, and unfailing support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
The Project.....	1
Justifications	3
Overview of Contents	3
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	5
Press Freedom in Latin America	5
Nonphysical attacks.....	6
Physical attacks.....	7
Free speech and democracy.....	9
Explanations for attacks on press freedom.....	11
Efforts to Improve the Protection of Journalists and Press Freedom Ideals.....	12
The Transnational Advocacy Network: A Basic Description	14
A Theory on the Effectiveness of Transnational Networks: Norms Socialization and Levels of Influence.....	17
Case Studies.....	21
Conclusions.....	24
Chapter 3: Methods.....	26
Research Design	26
Research questions and initial expectations.....	26
Definitions and variables.....	29
Qualitative interviews at the CPJ and open-ended survey for participants abroad	34
Informal participant observation and field study.....	36
Historical archive research and survey of activities.....	36
Data collection and analysis.....	37
Limitations and Delimitations	38
Conclusions.....	39
Chapter 4: The CPJ's Background, Goals, and Organizational Structure.....	40
The Development of the CPJ	40
The CPJ's Goals.....	43
The CPJ's Organization.....	44
Conclusions.....	46
Chapter 5: Overview of the CPJ's Campaigns and Activities.....	48
Information Politics	48
Gathering information.....	49
Drawing attention to information.....	52
Symbolic Politics	56
Accountability Politics.....	57
Leverage Politics.....	58
Direct Assistance	60
Survey of the CPJ's Focus and Activities	61
Factors that Affect Case Selection and Strategy.....	63
Conclusions.....	67

Chapter 6: The CPJ's Campaign on Criminal Defamation	69
The Broad Campaign	70
Panama	72
Argentina.....	76
Chile.....	80
Costa Rica	83
Conclusions.....	86
Chapter 7: Imprisonment	89
Unresolved Cases.....	89
Mexico	90
Cuba	92
Low-profile missions.	94
Drawing attention.....	96
Supporting independent journalism	96
Targeting U.S. policy.....	98
Conclusions.....	100
Chapter 8: Violence on Journalists	102
The Broad Campaign	103
Argentina.....	104
Costa Rica and Venezuela	107
Campaigns at the Local Level.....	108
Colombia.....	111
Direct Intervention	112
Conclusions.....	113
Chapter 9: Conclusions of the Study	115
How does the CPJ Try to Improve the Safety of Journalists and Press Freedom?.....	116
Why was the CPJ created?.....	116
What are the CPJ's overall goals?	116
What is the CPJ's organization and relationship with intergovernmental actors, governments, local groups, and other press freedom organizations?..	117
Does the CPJ engage in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics, and if so, how?.....	118
What other strategies besides information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics does the CPJ use in its campaign activities?.....	119
What Press Freedom Issues Does the CPJ Address?	119
What issues does the CPJ focus on?	119
What factors influence the CPJ's selection of cases and strategies?	120
Can and How did the CPJ's Activities make Improvements on Press Freedom Issues? How was the CPJ Effective in Defending Press Freedom Issues According to Keck and Sikkink's (1998) Model of Influence?.....	123
Levels of effectiveness.....	123
Ranking of issues and countries.....	124
Why was the CPJ Effective in Certain Areas and Not in Others? How did Conditioning or Constraining Variables Influence the CPJ's Level of Effectiveness?.....	125

How did the CPJ's activities influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?	126
How did the CPJ's organization influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?.....	127
How did the CPJ's involvement with other advocacy groups, local NGOs governments, and international governments influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?.....	127
How did the issues influence its level of effectiveness?.....	128
How did the natures of the target audience influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness	129
How did the CPJ's Advocacy Help Explain the Influence of Transnational Advocacy? How did the CPJ's Advocacy Participate in the Boomerang Phenomenon?.....	130
Contributions to Theory and Future Exploration.....	132
Conclusions.....	134
References.....	136
Appendix A: Article 13 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.....	151
Appendix B: Ten Principles of the Declaration of Chapultepec.....	152
Appendix C: Interview Topics for the CPJ Employees.....	153
Appendix D: Open Survey for Journalists Living Abroad or Traveling.....	154
English Version.....	154
Spanish Version	154
Appendix E: The CPJ's Fulltime Staff.....	156
Appendix F: The CPJ's Board of Directors	157
Appendix G: Attacks on the Press 2000-2003.....	159
Appendix H: Types of Journalists and Organizations Attacked 2000-2003	163
Appendix I: Alerts and Protest Letters Distributed by the CPJ Regarding Criminal Defamation Issues 2000-2003	166
Appendix J: Alerts and Protest Letters Distributed by the CPJ Regarding Legal Issues 2000-2003	167
Appendix K: Alerts and Protest Letters Distributed by the CPJ Regarding Imprisonment 2000-2003.....	168
Appendix L: Alerts and Protest Letters Distributed by the CPJ Regarding Physical Attacks 2000-2003	169
Appendix M: Alerts and Protest Letters on Killings Confirmed and Unconfirmed to be Related to a Journalist's Work 2000-2003.....	171
Appendix N: Alerts and Protest Letters Issued and Occurrence of Attacks.....	172
Appendix O: Levels of Influence Achieved for Various Issues with Different Audiences.....	175
Levels of influence achieved on criminal defamation cases.....	175
Levels of influence achieved on imprisonment cases.....	176
Levels of influence achieved on violence cases	177

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) is one of many nongovernmental organizations that work to defend journalists and press freedom around the world. A look inside its modest headquarters on the 12th floor of a high-rise in Manhattan confirms its focus. The coffee table in the waiting room is covered with press freedom magazines published by the organization. These reports sit under a book which relates the life of Daniel Pearl, the U.S. journalist who was kidnapped and brutally murdered in Pakistan in 2002. Several of the offices and conference rooms are decorated with maps of the world and framed copies of human rights declarations. The walls are lined with images of journalists in distressing situations. One photo in the conference room captures the image of a few journalists moving an injured colleague into a jeep. A photo in the waiting room depicts a soldier's hand blocking the camera.

With 22 fulltime employees and the support of some of the world's most prestigious journalists and organizations, the CPJ gathers and publicizes attacks on the press to draw attention to and mobilize public opinion against these abuses. For journalists in extremely dangerous situations, the organization will sometimes help these individuals leave the country, receive medical attention, or acquire financial aid. The CPJ works within a dense network of journalists and other human rights organizations around the world as it engages in these activities.

The Project

The purpose of this study is to explore, from the perspective of the CPJ, whether or not transnational advocacy networks result in real improvements for the safety of

journalists and press freedom in Latin America. More specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How does the CPJ try to improve the safety of journalists and press freedom?
2. What press freedom issues does the CPJ address?
3. Can and how do the CPJ's activities make improvements on press freedom issues?
4. Why is the CPJ effective in certain areas and not in others?
5. How does the CPJ's work help explain the influence of transnational advocacy networks in international processes and politics?

This study finds that some of the main issues affecting press freedom in Latin America are criminal defamation laws, imprisonment, and physical attacks on the press. The CPJ plays an active role in addressing each of these. Transnational advocacy groups, although not powerful from a realist's perspective of international politics, can and do make real changes in the safety of journalists and press freedom. The literature suggests that organizations like the CPJ can have an impact in at least one of five ways: (a) raising the issue and placing the issue on the agenda; (b) affecting discourse on the issue; (c) modifying institutional procedures; (d) reforming policy toward the issue; and (e) changing state behavior (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). Based on qualitative interviews, historical archive research, and informal participation with the CPJ, which took place between July 2003 and September 2003, this thesis argues that the CPJ is effective in all these ways. Factors that hinder or enhance the CPJ's activities include the issue addressed, the target audiences, the intensity of the campaign, and the participation of other organizations.

Justifications

This project is one of the first efforts devoted to understanding the influence and effectiveness of nongovernmental organizations that work on behalf of journalists.

Previous research on efforts to improve press freedom have focused on intergovernmental organizations such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and transnational advocacy networks that are interested in protecting human rights in general, such as Amnesty International (Perkins 2001; Scoble & Wiseberg 1974). However, the academic community has not yet examined the role of transnational advocacy organizations that focus solely on the protection of journalists in promoting these issues. This study helps fill this gap.

Research on the CPJ and its activities is valuable for a number of reasons. First, it is important to explore all efforts to improve press freedom and human rights. These two rights are essential for the stability and success of democracy in societies. Secondly, it provides insight into how nongovernmental organizations are organized, how they communicate within and without their organization, and how they work against more powerful groups in their attempts to make change. Finally, this thesis helps explain the role of transnational advocacy networks in today's global political and social structure.

Overview of Contents

To better understand the importance of this study and the context in which the CPJ works, Chapter 2 provides an in-depth review of press freedom and democracy in Latin America. It then describes efforts at the state, intergovernmental, and nongovernmental levels to protect journalists and their work. This is followed by a detailed description of transnational advocacy networks, an explanation of their strategies,

and a theory about their effectiveness. The chapter concludes with several case studies that illustrate the importance of transnational advocacy networks and how they can be effective.

Drawing upon the previous literature on transnational advocacy, Chapter 3 formulates specific sub-questions to answer the general research questions of the study. It then describes the methods used to conduct this study and the limitations of this project. Chapter 4 delves into the findings of this study by describing the origins of the CPJ, its goals, and its organization. Chapter 5 looks at how the CPJ goes about achieving its goals, why the organization believes these activities are effective, and issues that influence the CPJ's case selection process. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 take a closer look at the CPJ's activities and their effectiveness against criminal defamation laws, unjust imprisonment, and violent attacks on journalists. Chapter 9 provides the overall findings of this thesis by explaining trends in the CPJ's effectiveness.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

To provide context to the study's analysis of the CPJ's effectiveness, this chapter describes the main threats against journalists' safety and press freedom in Latin America. Many types of attacks against journalists are rooted in broad legal, political, social, and economic problems that not only affect the practice of journalism in Latin America, but the quality of democracy throughout the entire region. Efforts to overcome these barriers on behalf of journalists and press freedom are wide and varied. They involve the work of governments, local press freedom organizations, transnational advocacy networks, and many other groups. The literature suggests that although leverage on these issues is typically associated with governmental organizations and powerful economic institutions, transnational advocacy organizations can be powerful and significant actors in defending press freedom ideals and journalists. Working within the theoretical framework of transnational civil society, Keck and Sikkink (1998) argue that nongovernmental groups can help journalists by raising issues and placing them on the agenda, and by affecting discourse, institutional procedures, policy, and state behavior concerning press freedom. This study uses Keck and Sikkink's model to evaluate the effectiveness of the CPJ in defending journalists and press freedom in Latin America.

Press Freedom in Latin America

Freedom House's Annual Survey of Press Freedom in 2003 rated only 4 of the 20 press systems in Latin America (Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, and Uruguay) as free, 12 as partly free, and 4 (Colombia, Cuba, Haiti, and Venezuela) as not free (Karlekar, 2003).

Justification for these ratings can be seen in general trends in attacks against journalists throughout the region.

The type, level, frequency, and threat of these assaults vary from country to country. We can group them into two categories: nonphysical attacks and physical attacks. Nonphysical attacks include restrictive press laws, censorship, lack of legal protection for journalists, and expulsion from the country. Physical attacks include any assault or threat of assault on a journalist or media organization, such as bombings, beatings, kidnappings, torture, and murder.

Nonphysical attacks. The most common types of nonphysical attacks in Latin America are restrictive press laws. Since 1992, the CPJ has documented over 200 cases where journalists faced legal suits filed against them by government officials (CPJ, 1992-2002). Some of the more common laws governments apply against journalists are *desacato* (insult or contempt) laws and *colegio* (licensing) laws (Marks, 1997). *Desacato* laws make speech that criticizes government officials and other public individuals a crime (Inter American Commission on Human Rights [IACHR], 1995; Perkins, 2001). *Colegio*, or mandatory licensing laws, grant states control over who can and who cannot be a journalist. These deny many journalists the right to investigate, receive access to information, and publish reports (Badeni, 1999). In 1994, the IACHR formally declared both these types of laws to be violations of Article 13 of the American Convention on Human Rights, which is the leading human rights treaty in Latin America (Perkins, 2001). However, these laws are still implemented throughout Latin America. Almost every Latin American country enforces *desacato* laws, and in Bolivia and Guatemala, special courts exist for journalists charged with defamation (Lanao, 1999; J. E. Lanao, personal

communication, June 6, 2003). Some countries still enforce colegio laws. Two countries require journalists to be members of a press group (Honduras and Venezuela), and six require mandatory journalist licensing (Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Haiti, and Panama, and Nicaragua) (Lanao, 1999, 2003).

Other issues that affect journalism in Latin America are access to information laws, laws failing to guarantee the protection of sources, and laws that enforce rules of conduct. Only four countries in Latin America (Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Mexico) have suitable legal and procedural guarantees that allow journalists access to official and public information (Doyle, 2002; Lanao, 1999, 2003). Journalists in Bolivia, Cuba, Guatemala, and Honduras are not guaranteed the right to protect their sources of information. Most of the legislative bodies throughout the region have enacted rules of conduct for journalists that, if disobeyed, will result in jail time, fines, and sometimes closing of the media outlet. Furthermore, some constitutions grant the executive branch of government sweeping powers to take over the media during a state of emergency” (Lanao, 1999, 2003).

Physical attacks. Physical types of attacks, such as destruction of equipment, assaults, and kidnappings, also persist throughout the Latin American region. Some general statistics illustrate the nature of these attacks. The Inter American Press Association (IAPA) reported that between 1988 and 1999, 87 journalists were kidnapped, 1,731 journalists were assaulted, and 250 media organizations were attacked in the region (1997; Perkins, 2001). Less common, but more severe types of physical attacks against the press are murders and incidental killings (such as a result of crossfire) of journalists. Journalists in Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Guatemala, and Haiti frequently receive death

threats and must go into hiding for fear of their lives. Between 1993 and 2003, the CPJ reported that of the 437 journalists killed worldwide for their work, 77 were murdered in Latin America (CPJ, 2003o, 2003q). The IAPA (1996) reported that between 1988 and 1999, 202 journalists were murdered in Latin America. According to both sets of statistics, the three countries with the highest number of murders were Colombia, Mexico, and Guatemala.

Statistical descriptions about what kind of journalists are being attacked, why, and how they were attacked have not been documented in Latin America (A. Wright, personal communication, November 2002). However, worldwide, the CPJ reports that the types of journalists most frequently murdered are photographers, cameramen, and radio journalists. As to where the killings occur, the CPJ says that, generally, journalists are more likely to be killed in rural areas. Worldwide, however, the CPJ reports that most of the killings do not occur in crossfire or combat-like situations, but rather as a direct retribution for their work (CPJ, 2003n). All sources say that most of the murders in Latin America are rarely investigated by local authorities, and even fewer result in bringing responsible individuals or governments to justice. This is comparable to the CPJ's statistics on murders worldwide, which show that in 94 percent of the cases, the perpetrator is not arrested or prosecuted (CPJ, 2003n).

Overall, a look at the state of press freedom in Latin America shows that attacks on the press in all of their varieties and combinations pervade the region (Buckman, 1996; Lanao, 1999; Ulibarri & Trotti, 1996). These trends are distressing for a number of reasons. Cases where individuals are physically harmed, murdered, or restricted from expressing their opinions violate the most fundamental and basic human rights. These

rights are recognized and outlined in several international charters including the Universal Treaty of Human Rights and the American Convention of Human Rights.

Attacks on the press also hinder the consolidation of democracy in societies.

Free speech and democracy. Despite extensive debate on how to truly define, categorize, and compare democracies, scholars agree that at least one criterion is essential for stable democracies: governments must guarantee the right to free speech, or the right to express ideas freely without censorship from the government or society, if the government is going to be ruled by the people (Munck & Verkuilen, 2002; Henry, 2001; Wiarda, 1980). Milton lays a foundation upon which libertarian thought and many concepts concerning free speech and democracy have emerged. One of the most fundamental freedoms, Milton argues, is the liberty of conscience, which entails the freedom to exchange information and gain knowledge. The space where this occurs, or what has come to be known as the “marketplace of ideas,” will eventually lead society to discover truth. Any activity that threatens the exchange of information in this marketplace threatens the liberty of conscience and ultimately the freedom of the people to govern as they will (Flannagan, 2002).

A later work by Locke recognizes the need for the government to protect individuals’ political and religious rights. The government does not have the power to grant these rights--they are inherent rights possessed by every individual; however, the government has the responsibility to *protect* these rights (Thomas, 1995). This idea, along with those articulated by Milton, greatly influenced the writers of the U.S. Constitution and its First Amendment, which guarantees the protection of free speech in the United States (Vivian, 2003).

Many alternative ideas of democracy and the role of the press exist in the academic literature. Habermas (Calhoun, 1992), for example, elaborates upon the idea of a public sphere that can be occupied by the mass media and individuals who wish to express their views. This space exists for citizens to participate in the community, express their opinions, exchange information, and enhance discourse and deliberation. These activities are essential for a functional and participatory democracy and therefore must be protected.

Other ideas that illustrate the importance of free speech in democracy include attempts to describe essential components or criteria of democracy. Dahl (1998), one of the most widely respected theorists on democracy, describes two of its essential attributes: contestation, which he defines as *competition*; and participation. These, he describes, entail voting equality, enlightened understanding, equal control of the agenda, and inclusion of adults. For genuine participation to occur, for enlightened understanding to be obtained, and for the public to control the agenda, citizens must be guaranteed freedom of expression.

Clearly, the idea of a healthy democracy is tied to the assurance of a free press. Citizens of a democratic community must be able to articulate their opinions, engage in public debate, and become informed if they are to participate. According to Milton's theory, the marketplace of ideas will continue to thrive with the continued protection and availability of alternative and independent sources of information. Attacks on the press, especially in the case of murder, represent the ultimate form of censorship. They limit freedom of expression, reduce the availability of information, discourage public deliberation, and ultimately reduce the quality of democracy in societies.

Explanations for attacks on press freedom. The reasons why attacks against the press occur and often go unpunished can be partially attributed to broad economic, social, and political issues that pervade the region. Many countries in Latin America are experiencing economic recessions, which in turn are affecting advertising revenues and forcing many media outlets into bankruptcy (Chelala, 2003; Lauría, 2002). This places media organizations in a vulnerable position financially, legally, and physically. For example, it may make them dependent upon government advertising, which in turn makes media outlets vulnerable to government pressure to report news in a way that favors government viewpoints and ideas. In addition, many organizations may feel that they do not have the financial means to challenge legal issues that affect journalistic practices or the safety of journalists. In the end, economic difficulties can reduce objectivity or may force media organizations to shut down (Lauría, 2002). While disfavored media groups falter, other organizations may disproportionately thrive. Many of these successful media outlets are owned by a small group of powerful individuals who often have ties to ruling political parties and who may base news coverage on their own political and economic interests. This group can benefit both legally and financially from their elite position while at the same time exclude other journalists from participating in the public debate (CPJ, 2001m; International Freedom of Expression Exchange [IFEX], n.d.).

A vast array of political problems also poses as a threat to journalists. This includes business and government corruption, authoritarian enclaves, lack of political will to improve the situation, flawed press laws, and failure to properly apply press laws (O'Donnell, 1998; Wiarda, 1980). Each of these problems can make it difficult for

journalists to seek justice for a murder, defend themselves in court, or be given the protection needed to fulfill their jobs. In addition, drug trafficking, guerrilla warfare, political unrest, lack of government control, and “sheer lawlessness” (O’Donnell, 1998, p. 8) in some areas make it difficult for governments interested in protecting journalists to do so (Buckman, 1996; Lanao, 1999; Office of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression, 1998a; Trotti, 1999).

Efforts to Improve the Protection of Journalists and Press Freedom Ideals

Many groups are working against these economic, social, and political barriers in Latin America to improve the safety of journalists and promote press freedom ideals. Organizations active at the intergovernmental level include the United Nations (UN) and the Inter American Commission on Human Rights at the OAS. The OAS has played a particularly active role in monitoring press freedom in Latin America and outlining ideals for both human rights and press freedom. The commission is responsible for creating the leading document on human rights in the region, the American Convention on Human Rights, which outlines free speech ideals for all individuals in its 13th article (Perkins, 2001; OAS, 1978a; see Appendix A). All 20 Latin American countries have ratified this document (OAS, 1978b). Through the Inter American court, the OAS has established international precedent in the region to protect journalists (Perkins, 2001). The court established through various cases that governments are responsible for protecting journalists and may be held partly responsible for the murder of a journalist, even those that may have been committed by a private individual. In addition, a journalist’s survivors and supporters can file a complaint to the IACHR and receive compensation for damages from the country. Finally, a government can be held responsible for covering up

facts of a murder or delaying an investigation. This precedent has been established only in the cases of murder, but not for threats, kidnappings, and other types of physical assaults against the press.

In 1998, the IACHR created the Office of Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression to monitor press freedom abuses, take complaints, and report to the IACHR on violations of press freedom (OAS, 1998a). The Special Rapporteur is actively involved in evaluating press freedom across Latin America, offering recommendations to OAS member states, and giving lectures to journalists, universities, and other audiences. It also offers advice to the OAS by drafting resolutions and interpreting international law. For example, in 1999, the Special Rapporteur drafted the “Inter American Declaration of Principles on Freedom of Expression,” which it submitted before the IHACR as a standard against which to judge government behavior (IACHR, 1999; IFEX, n.d.).

In addition to the OAS and other intergovernmental organizations, many nongovernmental organizations work to promote press freedom ideals in specific countries and on a worldwide basis. In Latin America, universities, nonprofit organizations, human rights groups, and local press groups and unions work to persuade governments to change press laws, seek justice for attacks, and prevent attacks in the future. These local institutions have the moral support of many international and regional nongovernmental organizations that work to promote press freedoms around the world. The Freedom House, for example, monitors, rates, and publishes global information about the press using its own standards and methodologies. The IAPA, one of the leading international nongovernmental organizations in protecting press freedom, has united editors and media owners across the Americas to fight abuses against the press (Garrison

& Goodsell, 1996). In 1994, the IAPA sponsored a conference which produced the Declaration of Chapultepec, a 10-point document, which outlines press freedom organization ideals (See Appendix B). The organization holds semiannual meetings to discuss this project and is also pursuing an active campaign to convince governments to accept the declaration. So far, the heads of states from all Latin American countries except for Cuba, Haiti, and Venezuela have endorsed this document (IAPA, 2003).

Other organizations that work actively to promote press freedom ideals include the CPJ, Reporters Sans Frontières (RSF), World Press Freedom Committee, and International Federation of Journalists (IFJ). Finally, a few nongovernmental organizations that focus on human rights in general, such as Amnesty International, take interest in attacks against the press. These groups hold conferences, draft resolutions, share information with each other and with many other audiences. Working alongside each other, groups like the CPJ have created an elaborate network devoted to helping journalists worldwide.

The Transnational Advocacy Network: A Basic Description

Keck and Sikkink (1998) define networks as “forms of organizations characterized by voluntary, reciprocal, and horizontal patterns of communication and exchange” (p. 8). Transnational advocacy networks are those communicative structures that “plead the causes of others or defend a cause or proposition” across national and state boundaries. They are described as organizations bounded by shared values, “dense exchanges of information,” and “common discourse” (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, p. 8) that try to raise issues, influence policy, change discourse, and improve state behavior (Khagram, Riker, & Sikkink, 2002).

The most common themes advocacy networks focus on are human rights, the environment, and women's rights. In 1993, of the 544 advocacy networks reported by the union of international associations, 27 percent of these dealt with human rights issues, 14 percent dealt with the environment, and 10 percent dealt with women's rights (Smith, Pagnucco, & Chatfield, 1997). The other 50 percent dealt with education, health, labor, ethnic conflicts, animal rights, violence, and rights to self determination (Boulding, 1997).

Networks devoted to focusing on any of these topics can include research foundations, the media, churches, trade unions, professional groups, consumer organizations, multinational corporations, refugee groups, or parts of the executive and/or parliamentary branches of governments. Individuals involved can be state citizens, intellectuals, politicians, lawyers, scientists, exiled or expatriate individuals, or economists (Wiseberg & Scoble, 1981). Together, these groups engage in a complex campaign devoted to drawing attention to an issue, placing the issue on the agenda, and ultimately persuading, socializing and pressuring governments to make changes for those for whom they are advocating. These campaigns can take place simultaneously at the national, regional, and global levels and can be directed to public officials, the media, nongovernmental organizations, groups for which they are advocating, or the public as a whole (Boulding, 1997).

Keck and Sikkink (1998) describe four types of activities that make up these campaigns: *information politics*, *symbolic politics*, *accountability politics*, and *leverage politics*. Transnational advocacy networks invest most of their time in information politics, which involves gathering, interpreting, and publishing information to draw attention to issues. The way they distribute the information can involve symbolic and

accountability politics. Advocacy networks will use anniversaries, icons, stories, and other symbols to frame an issue in a way that gives meaning to the audience. Unlike social movements that will use symbolic politics in large public protests, advocacy groups will use symbolic politics in more subtle but equally meaningful ways (Khagram, et al., 2002; Sperling, Ferree, & Risman, 2001). Press freedom advocacy groups, for instance, will show figures of individuals with tape over their mouths to represent censorship. In another example, Rigoberta Menchú used the 500th year anniversary of Christopher Columbus' landing in the Americas to discuss indigenous rights. Transnational advocacy groups will also engage heavily in accountability politics by reminding and pressuring governments to fulfill their domestic and international commitments regarding that issue (Keck & Sikkink, 1998).

When governments fail to be receptive to information, accountability, and symbolic politics, networks will engage in leverage politics, or direct their efforts towards a more powerful actor to take action against the state. This can involve persuading intergovernmental organizations or powerful states to place sanctions on a country, to rule against the country in court, or verbally express their disapproval.

In all of these efforts, transnational networks strive to achieve a reliable and credible image. With the growth of the Internet and other telecommunication platforms, networks have been able to develop and maintain the strong communication and cooperation necessary to achieve this image (Boulding, 1997; Cortright, Pagnucco, & Chatfield, 1997; Khagram, et al., 2002; Smith, 1997).

A Theory on the Effectiveness of Transnational Networks: Norms Socialization and Levels of Influence

Theory and research suggest that transnational groups can and do play an important role in international processes. In contrast to realist perspectives on international politics, these theories argue that states and powerful economic institutions are not the only groups capable of changing state behavior, nor are they the only actors that explain improvements for those for whom they are advocating (Boulding, 1997). Working within a worldwide effort devoted to making improvements on behalf of those who cannot do so alone at the local level, transnational advocacy groups contribute to a phenomenon scholars refer to as the *boomerang pattern* (Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Risse, 2000). In the boomerang pattern, groups from within an oppressive state make contact with advocacy groups outside the state, which in turn try to persuade governments and other international actors to put pressure on the target state. Another way transnational advocates can change state behavior is through the *norms socialization* process. When advocacy groups engage in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics, they are working to create principled ideas and raise moral consciousness. These activities can help lead governments to adapt the issue, change institutional procedures to accept the norm, and then use those norms as leverage against states to ultimately change their behavior (Risse, Ropp, & Sikkink, 1999).

Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink (1999) show that state actors can respond to international pressure in various ways that occur in phases. Phase 1 is called “Repression and Activation of Network.” Here, oppression takes place at different levels and to different degrees. This phase continues until the subjugation is exposed and until

information is gathered and distributed. Transnational advocacy networks and lobby groups shame the norm-violating government, inform other governments, and try to gain international support against the target state. When norm-violating governments respond, they will usually respond by denying the accusations. This moves the country to the second phase, the “Denial” stage. Governments will not only deny the accusations, they will also say that it is an illegitimate intervention on the sovereignty of the country. Phase 3, or the “Tactical Concessions” stage, is when governments take immediate, and often short-term, action to appease international protests. This is the most difficult phase to reach and requires the greatest amount of international and domestic pressure. However, achievement of this phase leads to long-term improvements and changes because it is at this phase that governments begin to make commitments (which makes states more vulnerable to international pressure in the future), and local domestic group activity begins to gain more momentum and courage. Governments also start to show more respect for human rights groups and domestic opposition. However, this can also lead to more repression as governments may perceive the rise in domestic opposition (Risse, Ropp, & Sikkink, 1999).

If domestic opposition gains strength, this can encourage the achievement of Phase 4, the “Prescriptive Status” stage. At this level, governments begin to accept the validity of human rights norms and often refer to them as they describe their own activities. Governments will have ratified relevant treaties, institutionalized those treaties in their constitution or laws, given citizens an institutionalized means to complain about violations, and engaged in dialogue with its critics. The final phase, “Rule Consistent

Behavior” stage occurs when sustainable change persists in the country (Risse, Ropp, & Sikkink, 1999).

These phases are not evolutionary, meaning that once a state enters the fourth stage it is possible for it to return to a lower phase. The phases also involve four different groups and interactions: International-transnational interactions among Western states, nongovernmental organizations, international human rights regimes, domestic society in the norm violating state, links between domestic opposition and transnational networks, and the national government of the norm-violating state.

Transnational organizations play an important role in moving these states and other groups through these phases. They put state behavior on the international agenda, raise moral consciousness, remind other states of their obligation to uphold internationally-accepted norms, empower, legitimate, and amplify protests of domestic opposition groups, and bring pressure upon a country from within the country and from outside the country. Keck and Sikkink (1998) specify how this occurs by outlining five different levels of influence: (a) raising issues and placing them on the agenda; (b) influencing discursive positions; (c) influencing institutional procedures; (d) influencing policy change; and (e) influencing state behavior. These levels are helpful because they recognize that, although transnational advocacy networks may not be successful in achieving specific policy changes or even state behavior, they can make small but significant changes that can ultimately pressure states to change their behavior (Smith, 1997). The culmination of activities that achieve at least one of these levels of influence gives transnational advocacy organizations *soft power* (Khagram, et al., 2002).

Effectiveness of an advocacy network's efforts can therefore be measured by whether or not they achieve influence at the five different levels in the international area.

Keck and Sikkink (1998) observe that effectiveness depends in part upon a number of conditions including the issue addressed and the actors involved. When looking at the issue addressed, one must consider the resonance of the issue, whether or not it can be framed easily, whether there was a causal story, whether or not violations are deliberate, whether or not someone is to blame, and the vulnerability of the individual acted against. Issues that involve bodily harm and legal equality, that resonate and can be framed easily, that are deliberate against an individual, and that have someone to blame are more likely to be effective. Issues where there is already international law and precedent also are more likely to be effective (Risse, Ropp, & Sikkink, 1999).

When considering actors involved, one must consider the existence of international and local advocacy groups, the intensity of their campaigns, and their legitimacy and credibility with the targets and those for whom they are advocating. We must also examine their "density," or their ability to regularly exchange information. Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink (1999) point out that actors need not support each other financially or materially to be effective; rather they must support each other in the exchange of information. This alone can result in an effective campaign. Another actor to consider is also the participation of other national states in the campaign, whether or not they are consistent in their application of pressure, or whether or not they have material or economic leverage against the country. One must also consider the target actors and whether or not they are sensitive to material incentives or to sanctions, whether or not leverage exists, and whether or not they are vulnerable to international shaming. Those

countries which are trying to raise their status or become accepted in the international community will be more likely to be sensitive to pressure (Keck & Sikkink, 1998).

Case Studies

The studies Keck and Sikkink (1998) use to develop their model of transnational advocacy are fairly new to the academic community. Although transnational advocacy is a phenomenon that dates back to the 1830s, the earliest research appears in the 1970s, a period when the number of advocacy groups increased (Chatfield, 1997). However, scholars did not give serious attention to the topic until the 1990s, since they assumed advocacy networks to be relatively powerless in the global sphere compared to governments, multinational corporations, and global banking institutions (Boulding, 1997). Researchers who have addressed this topic have been generally optimistic about the role of these organizations in global processes (Jordan, & Tuijil, 2000; Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Nanda, Scarritt, & Shepherd, 1981; Risse, et al., 1999; Sperling, et al., 2001; Trubek, Mosher, & Rothstein, 2000).

Studies have examined advocacy work on the environment, labor laws, women's rights, land mine elimination, and human rights in general, and do so using various methodologies and approaches. Some works, such as Scoble and Wiseberg's 1974 study on Amnesty International, are purely descriptive in nature. Others provide examples of situations where an advocacy network was effective in various situations and issues. One such report describes the Southern Africa Project of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law's efforts to protect black students from human rights abuses. It first describes the organization's structure and history and then provides specific examples of

how it provided legal assistance to students who were expected to face a public beating (Deffenbaugh, 1981).

In another study, Risse (2000) explores how transnational human rights groups created, developed, and reinforced the 1976 Covenant for Civil and Political Rights. In his analysis, Risse looked at how the networks framed the issue and how they worked with each other. He also investigated their involvement with intergovernmental organizations to understand how they placed human rights on the agenda, changed discursive positions, escalated pressures on oppressive governments, and ultimately made an influence in creating the international civil and political rights document. The researcher argued that transnational human rights groups have the moral authority and authoritative claim to knowledge, both of which grant them the power to define human rights abuses, and shape the flow of the discussion at the intergovernmental and state level.

Studies also credit transnational advocacy networks and other non-state actors for drawing attention to the human rights situation in Latin America (especially in Argentina and Chile) and promoting human rights norms internationally. Keck and Sikkink (1998) elaborate upon this argument by comparing efforts in Argentina with efforts in Mexico. They found that in both countries, advocacy networks were extremely important in raising human rights issues and that they provided information that served as a basis for altering governmental policies. These networks' success was dependant upon ideal political situations and vulnerable governments. For example, Mexico at one point was undergoing negotiations for a free trade agreement, making it vulnerable to international pressure to change their internal domestic policy. The advocacy networks used this

situation to their advantage as they engaged in leverage politics to promote human rights issues. Likewise, the networks practiced leverage and accountability politics in Argentina by referring to Argentina's acceptance of human rights norms. The authors concluded that pressure from foreign and domestic governments was not enough to instigate change. Rather, nongovernmental actors, which had identified, documented, and denounced governments for their behavior, were necessary.

Price (1998) demonstrates how transnational advocacy networks were effective in shaping international norms and state interests regarding land mines. He investigates four techniques used by networks to socialize international norms: disseminating information, establishing networks to generate broad support within and without networks, grafting the new norm into existing norms, and reversing the burden of proof from non-state actors to state actors. These activities, Price claims, helped place the issue on the agenda, influenced the way actors talked about the issue, had an influence of institutional procedures regarding the issue. Without the participation of advocacy networks, norms regarding land mines would have remained stagnant. Therefore, transnational advocates not only played an important role in promoting the international land mine norms, but were actual catalysts for making the change.

Hawkins's (1997) study focuses on Chile to evaluate how states respond to international pressure. The author found that international actors played a "necessary but insufficient" role in Chile's change in human rights policy (p. 425). One of the ways in which international actors played a role was by attacking the legitimacy of the former military dictatorship. This, combined with a soft-line faction within the regime, forced the government to alter its policies. In another article, Hawkins (2002) examined the

emergence, growth, and impact of the Chilean transnational human rights network. The researcher found that advocacy groups contributed toward a gradual and partial change in Chilean discourse, policy, and practices by developing norms, persistently monitoring the situation in Chile, using their moral authority, working with churches, and conducting research on the situation. This network helped mitigate some of the worst effects of the human rights abuses by providing legal, financial, and psychological aid. They also preserved the political space for opposition groups to function; and grew and expanded over time.

A few publications describe the work of advocacy groups that work to promote press freedom. Garrison and Goodsell (1996) described how the IAPA works to unite editors and journalists in Latin America to combat press freedom abuses. Ricchiardi (1997) describes the CPJ and some of its activities in giving immediate and direct help to journalists all over the world who are in danger. Both of these works are mostly descriptive of the organization's activities, but they provide a good foundation upon which to understand how the CPJ and other press freedom organizations that work within a worldwide network of advocacy groups to improve press freedom.

Conclusions

The main issues affecting press freedom in Latin America are legal restrictions, most notably, criminal defamation laws, and physical assaults on the press. These attacks violate universally recognized human rights and discourage journalists from gathering and reporting information. Democratic theory affirms that efforts to inhibit press freedom can endanger the full consolidation of democracy in Latin America. Therefore, it is essential for governments to ensure the safety of journalists and freedom of expression.

Realist political theory considers only state actors to be relevant in changing state behavior. However, theories on the role of transnational advocacy groups in civil society recognize that organizations like the CPJ can have an influence by raising and placing an issue on the agenda, and affecting discourse, institutional procedures, policy, and state behavior on the issue. These influences can pressure governments to adopt internationally accepted norms and eventually make changes in state behavior. Some topics resonate more easily in the international sphere than others, such as issues that involve bodily harm and those that concern the legal equality of a group or individual. Some states are more vulnerable to international protests than others. Transnational advocacy groups can use these vulnerabilities to pressure governments into making small, though significant, improvements on an issue. As international watchdogs, nongovernmental organizations can force governments to be more concerned about their behavior. The rest of the study uses this model on transnational advocacy to investigate whether or not the CPJ is effective in pressuring governments.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Theory and literature suggest that the CPJ can contribute toward small, but significant improvements in press freedom in Latin America by engaging in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics. A variety of factors may interfere or enhance its effectiveness, such as the issue, the target actor, and the nature of its activities. To explore this puzzle, this study relied upon multiple methods and resources including qualitative interviews, informal participant observation, and historical archival research. This triangulated approach involved traveling to the CPJ's headquarters in New York City and Washington, D.C., during July 2003, to conduct most of the interviews and to engage in archival research. In addition, it included interviewing four journalists over the telephone or via e-mail who have been assisted by the CPJ. The following sections provide a more detailed description of the research questions and methods used to conduct this research. This is followed by an explanation of how the data were collected and analyzed. Finally, the chapter outlines the study's delimitations and limitations.

Research Design

Research questions and initial expectations. The goal of this project is to understand the CPJ's effectiveness in protecting journalists and improving press freedom in Latin America. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How does the CPJ try to improve the safety of journalists and press freedom?
2. What press freedom issues does the CPJ address?
3. Can and how do the CPJ's activities make improvements on press freedom issues?

4. Why is the CPJ effective in certain areas and not in others?
5. How does the CPJ's advocacy help explain the influence of transnational advocacy networks in international processes and politics?

The first two questions are descriptive because no work has been written on the CPJ to understand the context within which the organization works. The final three questions are more analytical in nature and require the use of theory to address them. Using the literature review, I have developed a detailed list of questions, which serve as subsets or modifications to the main research questions. Below I repeat the main research questions, and state a modifying question for each, if necessary. I then list any sub-questions to each main research question.

1. How does the CPJ try to improve the safety of journalists and press freedom?
 - a. Why was the CPJ created?
 - b. What are the CPJ's overall goals?
 - c. What is the CPJ's organization and relationship with intergovernmental actors, governments, local groups, and other press freedom organizations?
 - d. Does the CPJ engage in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics, and if so, how?
 - e. What other strategies besides information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics does the CPJ use in its campaign activities?
2. What press freedom issues does the CPJ address?
 - a. What issues does the CPJ focus on?
 - b. What factors influence the CPJ's selection of cases and strategies?

3. Can and how do the CPJ's activities make improvements on press freedom issues?

How is the CPJ effective in defending press freedom issues according to Keck and Sikkink's (1998) model of influence? (Modifying question)

4. Why is the CPJ effective in certain areas and not in others?

How do conditioning, or constraining, variables influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness? (Modifying question)

a. How do the CPJ's activities influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?

b. How does the CPJ's organization influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?

c. How does the CPJ's involvement with other TNAs, local NGOs, governments, and international governments influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?

d. How do the issues the CPJ's focuses on influence its level of effectiveness?

e. How do the natures of the target audience influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness?

5. How does the CPJ's advocacy help explain the influence of transnational advocacy networks in international processes and politics?

How does the CPJ's advocacy participate in the boomerang phenomenon? (Modifying question)

A preliminary look at the CPJ shows that the organization deals with all issues that endanger the work of journalists in Latin America. Theory would suggest that the

organization does this by engaging in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics. There are five ways in which these efforts can effectively improve the condition of Latin American journalists. They can raise issues and place them on the agenda, as well as influence discourse, institutional procedures, policy, and state behavior concerning the issue. Whether or not the CPJ is effective in achieving any of these levels of influence depends upon the issue, the target actors, and the density of the network in which the CPJ works. Issues that deal with bodily harm to individuals and equal rights are easier to bring to the attention of target actors and to affect state behavior. As a transnational advocacy group, the CPJ plays an important role in the boomerang pattern described in the literature by bringing local issues to the attention of the international community, which in turn put pressure on governments to modify their behaviors.

Definitions and variables. To evaluate my assumptions, I limited this study's focus to the CPJ's work in 20 Latin American countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. By restricting this analysis to one area of the world, I reduced many of the social, political, and economic differences that exist when looking at the world as a whole. I also chose to focus on the CPJ's efforts on criminal defamation, imprisonment, and physical attacks between 2000 and 2003. Based on the qualitative interviews and historical archive research described below, I found that these issues were the most prevalent problems in Latin America. Some of the research dealt with issues that occurred prior to 2000 to provide context for the more recent issues. However, I based most of the research on the organization's activities since 2000 because the CPJ has a complete archive of its protest

letters and alerts since this year. In addition, few of the employees I interviewed at the CPJ had worked for the CPJ or had information on issues prior to 2000.

Based on the literature review, and the CPJ's web site, I considered an *attack on a journalist* to be any action against a journalist, his or her family, or his or her company, whether intentional or unintentional, that hindered the ability of a journalist to gather and report news in any way (CPJ, 2003f). *Criminal defamation charges* are cases where a journalist is formally accused for criticizing a government or public official. These included gag laws and national security laws that contained defamation provisions. In producing general statistics on the attacks on the press, I distinguished criminal defamation charges from other forms of legal attacks, such as denying a journalist or media organization access to information, censoring a journalist or organization, or charging a journalist or media organization under a press law other than criminal defamation. *Imprisonment* referred to any case where a journalist was detained for any period of time in the custody of government officials for at least 48 hours, which is the definition used by the CPJ (2003f). I considered *physical attacks* to be any situation where a journalist, his or her family, or media organization was harassed, taken captive, murdered, killed incidentally, or threatened with any of these assaults. When describing these attacks in the statistical overview of this study, I divided this category into *killing* that occurred in direct retribution for a journalist's work, *killings, with unconfirmed motives*, where there is not sufficient evidence to claim that a journalist had been killed for his or her work.

The CPJ's *organization* refers to the number of people who work there, where it receives its support, and the hierarchy of the personnel there. It also refers to where they

fit in the transnational network devoted to protecting press freedoms and human rights. The CPJ's *campaigns*, as defined by Keck and Sikkink (1998) are any set of activities "in which members of a diffuse principled network...develop explicit, visible ties and mutually recognized roles in pursuit of a common goal (generally against a common target)" (p. 6). *Activities* that can make up this campaign include information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics. According to Keck and Sikkink (1998), any activity that involves gathering, interpreting, and disseminating information regarding press freedom is information politics. The CPJ engages in symbolic politics when it uses an anniversary significant to press freedom, such as the death of a journalist, or the date a government committed to reforming its laws. It also takes place when the CPJ visually depicts the press as being stifled or constrained in their work, such as being handcuffed, in jail, or wounded. Accountability politics occurs when the CPJ reminds governments, either directly or indirectly, of their verbal and nonverbal commitments to uphold press freedom standards. The CPJ can engage in leverage politics when it requests the intervention of other states or the IHCR.

Effectiveness of these efforts are measured with the five level nominal ranking of influence outlined by Keck and Sikkink (1998): (a) raising an issue and placing it on the agenda; (b) influencing discursive positions on the issue; (c) influencing institutional procedures; (d) influencing policy towards the issue; (e) and behavior. These rankings are ordered hierarchically, with achievement of fifth level of influence being the most effective, and achievement at the first level of influence being the least effective. Therefore, the *overall* measure of effectiveness was determined by the level of the influence achieved. For example, if the CPJ was effective at placing the issue on a state's

agenda for Situation A, and was effective at influencing state behavior for Situation B, it was measured as being more effective overall in influencing change in Situation B.

This study also looks at how these levels are achieved with different audiences: the violating state national government, domestic advocacy groups in the violating state, domestic society in the violating state, international governmental organizations, other transnational organizations concerned with the issue, Western State governments.

The five levels of influence this project uses to evaluate effectiveness are helpful because they recognize that there are several ways transnational advocacy networks can make change in the international and governmental arenas. The first level of influence, placing the issue on the agenda, refers to either bringing the issue to the attention of intergovernmental organizations, individual governments, other transnational advocacy networks, groups interested in human rights, and the public at large. An influence on discursive positions occurs when any of these groups change the way they talk about the issue and approach the issue. This occurs when transnational advocacy networks persuaded states and international organizations to adopt or support international declarations, or when they convince states to change their policy positions.

A change in institutional procedures takes place when governments or international organizations establish procedures to deal with journalists' complaints on abuses committed against them. Policy toward the issue is affected when governments and intergovernmental organizations create legal changes that favor press freedom and the protection of journalists. State behavior refers to both the government's treatment of journalists (either physically or legally), the way the government deals with those who violated press freedom ideals, and also the treatment of journalists by civilians.

Conditional variables explored in this project are those theory suggests might influence the CPJ's effectiveness at any of the five levels (Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Khagram, et al., 2002). These include fall under two main sub-categories, the issue resonance and the actors involved. The *issue resonance* refers to whether or not the main topic addressed by the CPJ can be framed easily and capture the attention of various audiences and actors involved. Issues that resonate easily are those that involve bodily harm and legal equality, where there is an obvious offender or actor to blame, where there is a causal story, and whether or not the audiences considered the victim vulnerable. Finally, the study considers whether or international law has been established on the issue.

Characteristics of actors involved and their behaviors refer to the characteristics of any nongovernmental, transnational advocacy organization, local opposition at the domestic levels, intergovernmental organizations involved, and state governments involved. When looking at transnational organizations and social movements, the study considers the density of the network, the legitimacy of the organization, and the intensity of the campaign. *Density* refers to the organization's ability to regularly exchange information within a network where information exchanges happen, the network's direct or indirect connections to groups at the domestic and international level, and the network's connections to groups at the intergovernmental and state governmental levels. *Legitimacy* refers to whether or not the organization conveys and maintains credibility with the targets and whether or not they are a legitimate actor. *Intensity* refers to the amount of resources and energy used by the organization in the campaign, such as whether it protested from home or went directly to the country.

Intergovernmental actors refer to organizations such as the OAS and the UN and whether or not they have taken a position on the issue or case and whether or not they are shaming the governments. Characteristics of governments other than the violating state include whether or not they are shaming the violating country, whether or not they have material and moral leverage, and whether or not they are consistent in the application of pressure. Characteristics considered of governments that are violating press freedom include, the political and economic stability of the country, whether or not they are trying to become accepted in the international community, whether or not they are trying to maintain their positive image in the international community, their economic and moral vulnerability, and internal sensitivity international pressure.

Qualitative interviews at the CPJ and open-ended survey for participants abroad.

To answer the study's research questions, I engaged in qualitative interviews at the CPJ, issued a survey to journalists the CPJ has helped, observed the CPJ at its headquarters, researched the organization's archives, and generated descriptive statistics on cases the CPJ has documented and the organization's activities. The qualitative interviews involved several members of the CPJ's staff as well as a few journalists in Latin America who have been assisted by the CPJ. In addition, I created an informal survey with a list of my interview questions to accommodate participants who lived abroad or who were traveling. Rubin and Rubin (1995) suggest that the researcher interview as many participants as possible to achieve thick description and reach a point of saturation and redundancy. To do this, I traveled to the CPJ's headquarters in New York City, New York, in July 2003, and conducted in-depth interviews with CPJ employees who worked with Latin America: Carlos Lauría, the head of the America's subcommittee; Sauro

González, Lauría's research assistant; Joel Simon, the deputy director of the CPJ; and Elisabeth Witchel, the CPJ's direct assistance coordinator. I also traveled to Washington, D.C., where I met with Frank Smyth, the CPJ's representative there. Prior to conducting the research, I corresponded with Abi Wright, the CPJ's communications coordinator.

The CPJ's employees referred me to other participants. These were the CPJ's previous America's program coordinator, Marylene Smeets; and Carlos Uceda, the director of the Peruvian press freedom organization, Instituto Prensa y Sociedad (IPYS). In addition, the workers at the CPJ put me in contact with four Latin American journalists whom they have directly helped over the years: Chilean investigative journalist, Alejandra Matus; Mexican journalist, Isabel Arvide; Costa Rican journalist, Mauricio Herrera Ulloa; and Panamanian journalist, Miguel Antonio Bernal. I corresponded with these individuals through e-mail and talked with them over telephone.

Prior to speaking with the journalists the CPJ has assisted, I conducted several preliminary interviews with members of the CPJ. These interviews lasted between one and two hours and followed a semi-structured format (Rubin & Rubin, 1995), which addressed the CPJ's organization, its relationship with other nongovernmental and governmental organizations, how it goes about its activities, its challenges, advantages to the organization, how it evaluates the outcomes of its efforts, previous campaigns, and factors that influence its effectiveness. A complete list of questions that were designed to generate conversation on these topics is provided in Appendix C. All of these interviews took place at the CPJ headquarters and were recorded and transcribed.

After my discussions with the workers at the CPJ, I generated a list of questions to ask the four journalists to whom they referred me. Like my interviews with the CPJ,

interviews over the phone followed a semi-structured approach. These were not recorded or transcribed; however, during the interview, I took detailed notes for future analysis. The duration of some of the interviews over the phone with the journalists in Latin America was short and did not allow for in-depth discussion. To complement this, I issued a survey by e-mail (see Appendix D). This survey contained open-ended questions to allow the participants to respond freely, in essay-style. Follow-up interviews with all participants were informal and took place at the CPJ, over the phone, and via e-mail. Any parts of the interview that were referred to or quoted in this paper were checked with the participants for verification.

Informal participant observation and field study. During the 3 week period of time that I conducted the semi-structured interviews at the CPJ, I underwent some informal participant observation. This was useful because I was able to see how the CPJ works and gain some familiarity with the organization and its activities. Although my time in New York did not permit more in-depth participation and engagement, I was still able to gain some valuable insights to compliment and enhance the findings of my interviews and archival research (Berg, 1998; Pindexter & McCombs, 2000).

Historical archive research and survey of activities. The final part of this study involved researching the CPJ's historical archives. While in New York, the CPJ offered me access to all of its *Attacks on the Press*, since 1989. This book contains all of the cases the CPJ documented during each year. Most of the CPJ's archives are open to the public and available at its web site at www.cpj.org (C. Lauría, personal communication, July 2003; S. González, personal communication, July 2003; J. Simon, personal communication, July 8, 2003). This site contains all of its press releases and protest

letters since 2000. Other publications from the mid-1990s are also included, but none of these are alerts or protest letters. The organization also gave me some general information that is not available to the public. Distribution of this sensitive information is controlled to protect the privacy and safety of journalists it is trying to help.

Data collection and analysis. The historical archives, as well as the interviews and informal participation, provided a holistic view and valuable information about the CPJ's activities and effectiveness. The methods used to gather this information relied upon the guidance of the CPJ and its experiences with various cases. Once I gained a sufficient understanding about the CPJ's goals, activities, focus, and background, I then was able to develop a method by which to approach the historic archives. This resource is full of rich and valuable information, which I found most conveniently organized by topic, rather than by type journalist, country, year, or activity. Missing information in the historic archives or interviews necessitated the need to approach the CPJ again or to refer to other sources.

My analysis of this information first began with the interviews. I conducted a thematic analysis that involved comparing and categorizing cases and information obtained in the transcribed interviews. I then used the archives to analyze cases by issue, country, time, activity, and outcome, in that order, all the while drawing case studies into the larger theoretical framework of transnational advocacy. In addition, I used the historic archives to generate some descriptive statistics to provide context to the CPJ's activities and focus. I did this by comparing the number and types of issues approached in the CPJ's activities to the number and types of issues the CPJ documents.

Limitations and Delimitations

This exploratory study takes a triangulated research approach that relies upon historic archives, qualitative interviews, and informal participation. This methodological approach has many advantages and is ideal for ensuring rigor, credibility, and thick description. However, as with all exploratory research, there were a number of limitations and constraints inherent in the project.

One of the many advantages of the qualitative research approach is that it is naturalistic, or *en vivo* (Thompsen, 2002). This provided the study with rich data and also made it possible to adapt to new situations that arose in the research. These advantages, however, inherently presented some disadvantages to the research (Berg, 1998; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). For example, outcomes and interpretations are subjective because I was unable to control and accurately measure these variables. The project focused on cases that had already taken place and that had occurred over several countries, times, and circumstances. Therefore, it was difficult to control differences across these variables. Furthermore, it is impossible to empirically measure the impact or influence of actors in the international arena (Hawkins, 1997). It is difficult to determine the influence of non-state actors among several other actors in the international arena, as well as to pinpoint why governments made changes. Member checks and employing a triangulated research approach reduced these limitations.

Another limitation of in-depth, qualitative research is that it would be premature to generalize its findings to other advocacy networks. However, the study's rich information and detail can contribute to the methods by which we look at these advocacy networks. The project faced a few other limitations that are not necessarily inherent in

qualitative research. For example, it would have been ideal to compare the CPJ to other transnational advocacy networks, or to how all transnational advocacy groups interested in the protection of journalists influence change. However, I did not have the time or budget to see how the CPJ operates outside of its headquarters. Nor did I have the means to gain insights from state governments, intergovernmental organizations, and other transnational advocacy networks.

Conclusions

Much work remains to understand how transnational advocacy networks operate and the extent of their influence. The archival research on the CPJ's campaigns, the research on overall trends in issues surrounding journalists, and interviews with those who worked in the campaigns helped provide insight into the effectiveness of the organization's overall campaign for journalism and human rights in Latin America. This research design allowed for flexibility to modify some of the methods. It also provided for rich detail and thick description. Although this project faced limitations, Hawkins (1997) points out that these constraints should not discourage the academic community from trying to identify any influence from non-state actors. As several case studies show, many initiatives that resulted in improvement for those suffering under powerful actors would not have succeeded in gaining attention without the non-state actors. The triangulated approach described in this chapter helped ensure that this study achieved the standards of rigor and credibility expected in qualitative research. It also helped me draw useful and informative conclusions on the role of transnational advocacy in the international political system.

CHAPTER 4

THE CPJ'S BACKGROUND, GOALS, AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The CPJ was founded by a group of U.S. journalists in 1981 in an effort to protect their colleagues around the world from repressive governments and regimes (CPJ, 2003f; C. Lauría, personal communication, July 2003). The inspiration for this organization came after two of its founders, Laurie Nadel and Michael Massing, launched an international campaign that resulted in the successful release of a Paraguayan journalist from prison. This chapter uses Massing's account of this event, as well as that of the CPJ's employees, to answer the first three research questions of the study, which concern the CPJ's origins, its goals, and its organizational structure. This analysis helps explain why transnational advocacy groups are created and how they link to other advocacy groups. It also provides a foundation upon which to understand the CPJ's activities.

The Development of the CPJ

In 1980, Alcibíades González informed Nadel, a CBS news writer, that he had received an arrest warrant from the Paraguayan government. González, one of Paraguay's most respected columnists and head of the Paraguayan News Writers Association, was in the United States on a one-month business trip and faced three years in prison if he returned to Paraguay (Massing, 2001). The journalist was charged for criticizing the Paraguayan criminal justice system in a series of articles published a month prior. This was not the first time the journalist had been imprisoned for his work as a journalist, nor was it the first time that international pressure would result in his release. In 1979, the Paraguayan government charged González for his writing under a state siege law but released him after the Paraguayan News Writers Association launched an international

campaign to dismiss the charges against him (Hoge, 1980). When González received notice of his second arrest, he asked Nadel if she might inform his colleagues in Paraguay and support them in their campaign to release him (Lauría, 2003; Massing, 2001). After discussing the situation with Massing, editor of the *Columbia Journalism Review*, the two sent a United Press dispatch to the journalists in Paraguay and started writing a story on González's situation. Unable to find an organization prepared to further assist González, they contacted the U.S. State Department and other nongovernmental human rights organizations (Massing, 2001).

When González returned to Paraguay, he found his family and 40 concerned colleagues waiting for him at the airport prepared to protest his likely arrest. However, apparently worried about negative publicity, the police chose not to apprehend González until the next morning, when he was on his way to appear before the judge (Massing, 2001). Within days of the arrest, Gonzalez's case became an international incident (J. Simon, personal communication, July 8, 2003). Domestic and international news outlets covered the circumstances related to his arrest. The *New York Times* made reference to the Paraguayan government's previous detention of González and the efforts of the local press organization that resulted in his release. It also cited González's lawyer, Francisco José de Vargas, who attributed his first release to international pressure. The *New York Times* quoted him saying, "Pressure from abroad is the only power the dictatorship respects. Big countries like Argentina and Chile can resist, but this is a small country" (Hoge, 1980, p. A4). This quote proved to be accurate once again when the Paraguayan government released the journalist three weeks later (Massing, 2001).

Throughout the course of this campaign, Nadel and Massing realized that González's situation was not isolated to Paraguay or Latin America; it was a situation that journalists faced all over the world. Inspired by González's release, Nadel and Massing wondered if they might be able to create an organization that, as Massing (2001) stated, might "somehow mobilize the great prestige and power of the U.S. press on behalf of our colleagues abroad" and enlist "the right people, journalists whose very names would communicate the nature and seriousness of our mission" (para. 12). The "big break" came when Walter Cronkite agreed to be the honorary chair for the committee (Simon, 2003). With his name attached to the organization, other important journalists agreed to serve on the board. The *Washington Post* printed an article on the CPJ's activities, which prompted Dan Rather and other journalists to join. With the support and guidance of these journalists and other nongovernmental organizations, the CPJ was officially established in 1981. Working out of donated office space during their spare time, Nadel, Massing, and another volunteer, Peggy Seeger, gathered information on attacks on the press and distributed them to a list of contacts they were creating (Massing, 2001).

The first evidence that their efforts were making a difference occurred less than one year later when two British journalists called to thank the CPJ for the role it played in mobilizing international pressure on the Argentine government (Massing, 2001; Simon, 2003). The journalists and one other colleague were detained for 77 days and charged for espionage charges during the Falklands/Malvinas War in 1981 (Winchester, 2001). From New York, the small committee sent 300 letters to the press, human rights organizations, and governments, which in turn sent letters to the Argentine government (Massing, 2001).

About 10 days after the CPJ released the letters, it found out that the Argentine government had released the journalists (Massing, 2001). Prior to the CPJ's efforts, several other organizations unsuccessfully lobbied for the three journalists' release including the Swiss Embassy, the United Nations secretary general, and the Catholic Pope. "And then came the letter from Walter Cronkite," Winchester (2001), one of the British journalists, wrote.

All three of us [the imprisoned journalists] were delighted to see that he, and a new committee of which he was a leading member, had taken up our case....In a letter to my wife and children, I wrote that I was beginning to feel that the end was in sight, because [the] CPJ and Walter Cronkite had expressed their concern. (para. 21)

For the three imprisoned journalists, the CPJ provided the moral support they needed to endure this difficult situation.

The CPJ's Goals

These initial cases illustrate that the CPJ can influence government attitudes and behavior regarding freedom of expression. This is the underlying goal of the CPJ. As expressed by Simon (2003) the CPJ works so "that every journalist...is able to work freely without having to fear for his or her life or liberty merely for reporting news or expressing an opinion--to promote press freedom around the world." The organization does not have any illusions about the difficulty of its work and the utopian nature of its mission (Simon, 2003). However, it feels that there is always something it can do to improve the situation for journalists (Lauría, 2003).

The main ways the CPJ tries to defend journalists is by strengthening journalists' power and prestige. This study identifies four immediate and interdependent goals designed to achieve this:

1. Strengthen the press freedom network
2. Draw attention to abuses against the press
3. Support local press groups
4. Maintain the CPJ's authority on press freedom issues in the international community

When journalists are respected and united within a large network of journalists, the CPJ believes that it can mobilize public opinion against governments, which in turn can pressure governments to modify their behavior.

The CPJ's Organization

An essential part of the CPJ's ability to fulfill its goals is the structure of its organization. The CPJ considers itself a network of journalists that works with many other organizations and individuals to promote press freedom (Lauría, 2003). The prominent nature of these associations has helped establish the CPJ as one of the most prestigious and well-respected organizations devoted to protecting journalists. Operating with \$2.8 million budget, the CPJ involves 22 fulltime employees who include editors, publishers, research assistants, program coordinators, area specialists, representatives, public relations specialists, and a web master (Simon, 2003; see Appendix E). Dealing specifically with the Americas are Carlos Lauría, the America's program coordinator, and his research assistant, Sauro González Rodríguez. Although Lauría and González are the only two focused specifically on Latin America, all of the CPJ's workers contribute to

campaigns in Latin America (CPJ, 2003p; S. González, personal communication, July 2003; Lauría, 2003). For example, Elisabeth Witchel, the direct assistance coordinator, coordinates with the America's region to help journalists receive special assistance and Susan Ellingwood works as the editorial director (CPJ, 2003p; E. Witchel, personal communication, July 8, 2003).

Almost all of these individuals at the CPJ are experienced in the media industry and others have gone on to work for other press freedom organizations. For example, former America's program director, Marylene Smeets, worked at the UN after her work at the CPJ; and another former America's program director, Suzanne Bilello, went on to become the director of the Freedom Forum's new Latin American Center (CPJ, 1997a; M. Smeets, personal communication, July 2003). Prior to joining the CPJ in 2002, Lauría worked as U.S. bureau chief correspondent, where he wrote and edited hundreds of stories for Editorial Perfil, including its magazine, *La Nación*, the largest circulating, Spanish-language magazine (CPJ, 2003p; Lauría, 2003). Directing the CPJ's activities are Ann Cooper, the CPJ's executive director, and Joel Simon, the deputy director. Cooper worked for nine years as a radio journalist for NPR news radio, and Simon, the previous America's coordinator, has written numerous books and articles on press freedom in Latin America (CPJ, 2003p). All of these individuals are supported morally and financially by a board of trustees that includes over 30 individuals from the media and other industries (CPJ, 2003f). A complete list of the members and organizations on this board is provided in Appendix F. Members of the board often participate in the CPJ's activities and some also write articles for the CPJ (see, for example, Garrels, 2002).

All of these members at the CPJ work within an elaborate network of journalists, human rights groups, and other press freedom organizations (Lauría, 2003; Witchel, 2003). Some of the organizations the CPJ works with at the international level are the RSF, International Press Institute, IAPA, and Human Rights Watch. At the local and regional levels, the CPJ Americas works frequently with Latin American press groups like Instituto Prensa y Sociedad (IPYS), a Peruvian organization; Fundación para la Libertad de Prensa (FLIP), a Colombian organization; Periodistas, from Argentina; and Sociedad de Periodistas, from Mexico. It receives information from many of these groups and others through the International Freedom and Exchange Network (IFEX), an online resource that receives and distributes information from over 60 organizations worldwide (Simon, 2003). As a council member of the IFEX network, Cooper represents the CPJ and plays an active role in IFEX's activities and organization (IFEX, 2003). The CPJ is not affiliated with any governmental organizations, nor does it accept funding from governmental organizations. However, it still maintains a good working relationship with the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression in the IAHCR and other governmental organizations that deal with press freedom (Lauría, 2003; González, 2003).

Conclusions

This chapter answers the first three research questions of this study by describing how and why the CPJ was created, its overall goals and organization, and its relationship with other groups involved in the protection of journalists and press freedom. According to Keck and Sikkink (1998), transnational advocacy networks can form because of the lack of interest that exists concerning oppressed individuals or groups. Massing's account and that of the CPJ's workers suggest that this was the case when the CPJ was established.

When it started, the CPJ wanted to draw attention to journalists who were being attacked for their work and who were often ignored by governments and other groups. Seeing a lack of help available to journalists, the CPJ's founders believed that they could take advantage of the press's power and use its ability to readily gather and distribute information to publicize abuses on the phress. This proved effective in the González's case, which has been used a model for the CPJ's goals and activities ever since his release.

After this initial case, the CPJ immediately linked to local press organizations and international advocacy groups. Over the years, this international network has expanded and become more complex. The CPJ's participation in this network has been a vital condition for the CPJ's effectiveness. As Chapter 5 illustrates, part of the CPJ's activities have involve building and strengthening this network. The CPJ encourages local groups to organize so that they can more readily exchange information. The organization has also worked to build its contacts within the press freedom network. It continues to strengthen and build these connections as it tries to achieve its goals, which include bringing prestige and power to journalists by publicizing attacks. Chapter 5 discusses the specific activities the CPJ engages in to achieve these goals and Chapters 6, 7, and 8 evaluate whether or not these activities and achievement of its goals are effective within Keck and Sikkink's (1998) model of transnational advocacy.

CHAPTER 5

OVERVIEW OF THE CPJ'S CAMPAIGNS AND ACTIVITIES

The CPJ engages in a wide variety of activities that work toward building its prestige, expanding the press freedom network, uniting journalists, and publicizing information. Although these activities have been refined over the years, they follow the basic model and principles that ran the organization's campaigns when it started more than 20 years ago (J. Simon, personal communication, July 8, 2003; C. Lauría, personal communication, 2003). Some of the CPJ's activities include holding conferences, meeting with governments, advising journalists, and publishing reports and articles. This chapter addresses the study's third and fourth descriptive research questions by discussing how the CPJ uses information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics in its campaign activities; why the CPJ believes these efforts are effective in helping journalists; and what factors seem to influence the CPJ's activities and focus (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). It also explores other types of activity the CPJ engages in, which the literature may or may not consider typical advocacy work. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 discuss how the CPJ's activities are used in campaigns, and evaluate how these campaigns contribute to an improvement in press freedom in Latin America.

Information Politics

All of the CPJ's activities somehow involve information politics. Whether it is meeting with governments, journalists, or the general public, or sending out a news release, the CPJ's activities are geared toward exchanging information. Every year, the CPJ researches and publicizes more than 600 attacks on the press (2003f). Some of the main purposes of this activity are to expose government repression, draw attention to

issues that affect press freedom, and mobilize international opinion. According to the CPJ's deputy director, Joel Simon, there are at least two reasons why achieving these goals can be effective. First, these goals expose information that motivated attacks on journalists in the first place. Simon (2003) elaborated on this point by saying, government attacks on the press are usually not directed toward

the individual journalist. Usually, [these attacks] are directed against the information—it is an effort to suppress information...by publicizing the abuses themselves...we are subverting that motivation. Instead of [remaining] local, now [that information] is a big international story.

A second reason why publicizing abuses on journalists is important is because it gives prominence to journalists. Simon (2003) said the following:

If you think about it, why is it that a *New York Times* correspondent working in a dangerous place is any safer than a local journalist? It is their visibility, we try and give that same level of visibility to local journalists by covering abuses against them....Documenting these cases and publicizing them is just the first step, but it is a critical step.

This section describes how the CPJ “shines a light on these abuses” by describing how the organization documents and draws attention to attacks on the press (Simon, 2003).

Gathering information. The CPJ learns of attacks on the press through both first-hand and second-hand sources. First-hand accounts can come directly from the journalist, as well as his or her family and colleagues via the postal system, telephone, fax, or e-mail. The CPJ works diligently to build and maintain its relationships with journalists in the Latin American region. One of the ways it does this is by attending and sponsoring

conferences (Lauría, 2003). Elisabeth Witchel (personal communication, July 8 2003), the CPJ's journalist assistance coordinator, said that many journalists who have not met with the CPJ in person have at least heard about it through "word of mouth." The CPJ also receives "cold calls," from individuals who knew nothing about the organization prior to making with contact it (Witchel, 2003).

Secondary sources provide the majority of the CPJ's leads (Lauría, 2003). The CPJ's AP correspondent in Colombia, Mike Eastbrook, relays reports he gathers from all across the region to the CPJ. Every day, Carlos Lauría, the CPJ's Americas program coordinator, and Sauro González, the CPJ's Americas research associate, will also read through the main newspapers in Latin America and look for reports of attacks on journalists (Lauría, 2003). They also receive news from the IFEX information center and other nongovernmental and governmental organizations (S. González, personal communication, July 2003; Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003; F. Smyth, personal communication, July 2003).

As a rule, the CPJ always confirms secondary sources with at least two independent sources. Lauría (2003) said that, oftentimes, he even uses three or four sources. "It's not that we do not trust [other organizations]," he said, "we trust all press organizations; [however], we conduct our own proper investigation." González (2003) commented, "Some organizations do a great research job, however, others are not as accurate; so I [would] rather trust my own work." In every case, the CPJ will contact the affected journalist or talk with the journalist's family and colleagues to gather details on the attack and see how it can be of assistance (Lauría, 2003).

Gathering accurate information is critical to the organization for two main reasons. First, the CPJ wants to make sure that a case or issue falls within its mandate, which is to protect and defend journalists from attacks or harassment for reasons related to the journalists' work. The CPJ considers a journalist to be anybody who writes or broadcasts, including political analysts and human rights activists. For the CPJ to accept the case, it must confirm that the individual matches this description, and that the journalist was attacked in direct retribution for his or her work (Lauría, 2003). Secondly, the CPJ wants to build upon its image as a professional and serious actor in the press freedom community. By ensuring credibility and authority in its reporting, the CPJ becomes the "authoritative voice" (Smyth, 2003) on press freedom issues, which, according to Frank Smyth, the CPJ's Washington, D.C. Representative, is the most important thing the CPJ can do.

Once the CPJ confirms and gathers information on a case, it will store that information in a database under at least one of ten types of categories: attacked, censored, expelled, harassed, imprisoned, killed, killed (unconfirmed if it was not related to work as a journalist), legal action, missing, and threatened (CPJ, 2003f). It will continue to gather information on a case as it develops. Lauría (2003) said that he regularly calls journalists who have been attacked to find out how they are doing and to learn more information about their case.

In addition to gathering information on individual cases, the CPJ also gathers information on overall press freedom issues. According to González (2003), this is extremely strenuous work for such a small organization. He said that the CPJ has to research "what happened in [each] country throughout the year, and then talk about those

developments as they affect press freedom in that country, so it is very intense work.” To do this, the CPJ Americas section divides up the countries in Latin America and then gathers information from academics, journalists, and politicians. For some areas of Latin America that are particularly problematic for press freedom, the CPJ will conduct fact-finding missions to prepare its reports (González, 2003; Lauría, 2003).

Drawing attention to information. Once the CPJ confirms and documents the information it has received, it will try to “generate maximum publicity” (Simon, 2003) to capture the attention of the rest of the international community. Lauría (2003) said, “when there are things to report...we work as reporters...trying to get the information out there as soon possible to [inform] the community of what is going on.” There are a variety of ways the CPJ does this. One way is through its web site. This site receives over 1 million hits a month and contains information on all of the CPJ’s publications, activities, and protests (Massing, 2001). All information that relates to the Americas is distributed in Spanish, in addition to English, so that Spanish-speaking journalists in Latin America can use the material.

One of the publications available on its web site is a copy of the CPJ’s annual book, *Attacks on the Press*. The CPJ considers this book to be one of the most comprehensive reports on attacks against press freedom worldwide (CPJ, 2003f). This document contains information on the most serious attacks the CPJ documents throughout the year. In addition, it provides summaries on the press freedom situation in all countries around the world. Each year, the CPJ holds a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., to announce the release of the annual edition of this book and invites members from various organizations to attend. After holding this

press conference, the CPJ distributes a copy to its donors, as well as to press organizations, governments, and nongovernmental organizations (Lauría, 2003). Another publication the organization issues is its bi-annual magazine, *Dangerous Assignments*. This publication features reports about countries around the world where press freedom is most endangered and where journalists have been brutally attacked (Simon, 2003).

Other ways the CPJ draws attention to issues are through special missions, meetings with governments, conferences, and lectures at universities and forums. During a special mission, members of the board will meet with journalists and talk with government officials, including the president, if possible. During their discussions, the CPJ will raise its concerns and offer its recommendations to the country (Lauría, 2003). González (2003) believes that these missions can be fruitful. He says that they can develop a relationship with the government and the journalists. It also shows the journalists that they are not alone and that their issues are taken seriously. The CPJ also engages in these discussions with U.S. politicians as well as foreign ambassadors to the United States (Smyth, 2003).

In addition to sharing information through meetings with governments, the CPJ participates in conferences with journalists and human rights groups. It also is invited to attend conferences hosted by governments. Sometimes governments offer to sponsor the stay of the CPJ; however, as a nongovernmental organization, the group refuses to accept government funding of any kind. For example, when Lauría (2003) attended a conference hosted by the Norwegian government in the Dominican Republic in February 2003, Norway offered to pay for his hotel and traveling expenses. Lauría refused the offer. He explained, “We want to keep our independence from governments because we [know we

will] have to criticize them afterwards. We have to be really independent.” The CPJ’s interest in remaining independent from governments is also a reason why it does not directly sponsor or become involved in any government bills or legislation. It will protest against or promote these bills from a distance and then wait until the bill is passed to review and critique it (Lauría, 2003).

One of the more publicized activities the CPJ sponsors is the International Press Freedom Awards Banquet (Witchel, 2003). Members of the CPJ’s board and government officials will attend this ceremony to recognize five journalists from around the world for their work in promoting press freedom (Lauría, 2003). This banquet and other activities that the CPJ engages in are published in news alerts to generate as much international attention as possible. New alerts are also issued in response to an attack on a journalist. Lauría (2003) said that the CPJ Americas section sends out about 60 to 70 alerts a year.

When the CPJ feels that there is evidence of a pattern of “particularly egregious cases” (Simon, 2003) believed to be the fault of the government, the CPJ will send a protest letter to that government. These letters are sent out less frequently than alerts and use much stronger language. For this reason, Lauría (2003) feels that protest letters are one of the most effective ways to emphasize the gravity of a situation. Although protest letters are addressed to governments, the CPJ will also send a copy to various organizations including the U.S. State Department and the government ministries of other countries. These organizations appear in the letter’s *CC list* to inform the recipient of the letter that other groups received the information. The CPJ encourages other groups to join in the protest and provides the contact information of the addressee in the letter if they wish to take action (Gonzalez, 2003). Sometimes an embassy or organization will answer

these letters, although this is very rare (Simon, 2003). However, other organizations that receive the protest letter may engage in activities that elicit a response from the government, or at least make the government more aware of the CPJ's concerns. For example, the local press may cite the letter in its reports, or may ask the government for a response to the letter (Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003).

Just as a news organization or public relations firm will issue a press release, the CPJ tries to issue its alerts and protest letters at a time that will draw the most attention. The CPJ will sometimes contact an editor to see if he or she would be interested in publishing the story. After releasing a publication, the CPJ will look through the U.S. and Latin American newspapers to see if its reports are printed. According to Smyth (2003), the CPJ is frequently quoted in the Latin American press. One explanation for the attention the CPJ receives from the Latin American press is that there is "elasticity" (Smyth, 2003) with regards to human rights issues because citizens in Latin America are familiar and interested in these topics. In addition, the CPJ's publications and reports have appeared in many U.S. media outlets including *The Baltimore Sun*, the *Chicago Tribune*, *The New York Times*, *The Boston Globe*, *The Washington Post*, *The Washington Times*, *The Miami Herald*, the *Columbia Journalism Review*, and *World Press Review*. The CPJ has also been cited on C-SPAN's "Washington Journal" program, CNN's "World News today," and Fox's "Fox in Depth" (CPJ, 1997a). Governments have also cited the CPJ. For example, in the 2002 Human Rights Report on Mexico, the U.S. State Department (2003) used information from the CPJ, along with data from the Inter American Press Society, Reporters without Borders, and Inter American Press Institute to discuss violence and criminal defamation in Mexico.

Symbolic Politics

In addition to engaging in information politics, the CPJ can draw attention to issues by engaging in symbolic politics. In the literature, symbolic politics is most often seen in large group protests (Khagram, et al., 2002). Although the CPJ does not play an active role in gathering groups of people to protest, it is aware of the power of symbolism and uses it in its publications and in the timing of its activities.

Some of the symbolism the CPJ uses can be seen in the pictures and logos posted on its web site and used in its publications. For example, one image on the CPJ web site depicts a man with his mouth covered with the phrase *the silence* (Carboni, 2002). Another example appears on the front cover photo of the 1999 issue of *Attacks on the Press*, which depicts two student supporters of Iranian President Mohammad Khatami in a peaceful protest with a newspaper in their hand and with tape over their mouths (CPJ, 2000d). The CPJ will also use pictures of familiar journalists who have been killed or attacked to remind audiences of other journalists who have been attacked in their work (see, for example, CPJ, 2001k). Images like these portray how press freedom is violated and symbolize the effects of press restrictions. The CPJ's logo, on the other hand, depicts an image of hope and progress. It is the organization's acronym, *CPJ*, with a flame coming out of the top of the *J* (see, for example, CPJ, 2003h). This image suggests that the CPJ is a guiding light in the darkness for journalists all around the world.

The CPJ will also use symbolism in the timing of its activities. For example, each year on world press freedom day, the CPJ will release its "Top Ten Worst Enemies of the Press" list (CPJ, 2001i). The CPJ also plans special missions and other activities around anniversaries of other events, such as the death of a journalist, a journalist's release from

jail, or a government's commitment to uphold press freedom, are also used in the timing of the CPJ's activities (Lauría, 2003).

Accountability Politics

Publications, alerts, and other activities the CPJ engages in frequently cite commitments that governments have made to protect press freedom. Many governments have made promises, during meetings with advocacy groups like the CPJ, and at other times, to repeal restrictive press laws and other injustices against the press (see, for example, CPJ 1999h). All Latin American governments, except for Cuba, have signed the American Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees the right to freedom of expression (OAS, 1978b). Latin American countries also supported the creation of the IACHR's Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression in 1998 (Canton, 2000). This position evaluates whether or not government behavior is consistent with international law, monitors governments, and issues recommendations. Although the rapporteur's publications are not legally binding, it provides an official position on how the IACHR interprets international law in regards to press freedom (Simon, 2003). The CPJ played an active role in the creation of this organization when it engaged in discussions with U.S. President Clinton's staff on how to improve press freedoms in Latin America. The CPJ has continued to support the work of this office by using this position's interpretations and recommendations as a standard governments should strive to achieve (Lauría, 2003c; Simon, 2003).

In addition to citing documents that outline expectations of Latin American governments, the CPJ will also refer to recommendations applied to other parts of the world. For example, it has cited a United Nations Educational, Science, and Cultural

Organization's (UNESCO) declaration on press freedom in the Arab world when protesting press freedom abuses in Latin America (Debevoise & Plimpton, 2001). The CPJ not only engages in accountability politics with Latin American countries, it also directs this activity toward the U.S. government. The CPJ sees Latin American governments using the U.S. government's treatment of press freedom issues to justify their actions. For this reason, the CPJ takes an active role in encouraging the U.S. government to uphold press freedom ideals as well (Smyth, 2003).

Leverage Politics

The CPJ believes that information, symbolic, and accountability politics are often powerful enough to draw attention and modify government behavior. According to Smyth (2003), Latin American governments are more responsive to organizations like the CPJ compared to other countries. He said,

We can put out alerts and they respond...The problem with countries like Tunisia and Morocco [is], you put an alert out on the CPJ's web site and the Moroccans and the Tunisians aren't too worried about it; [whereas], if you put something out about Colombia, it may well make [the] Colombian press.

When alerts and protest letters do not produce an effect, however, the CPJ will sometimes work through more powerful actors to influence change (Lauría, 2003). One way the CPJ tries to do this is by requesting that members of the U.S. Congress write a letter or make a public statement concerning an issue. This approach, Smyth (2003) said, is not only intended to pressure foreign governments, but is also an effort to capture the attention of the U.S. Executive branch of government. He said:

One of the things that I have been doing in working with CPJ is to work more with Congress, because we're finding that if we get Congress involved, the administration tends to take things a little more seriously. [The administration does not] care if we write a letter, but if a member of Congress writes a letter then it tends to get some interest in the administration when the issue is raised.

However, Smyth, speaking for himself, and not for the CPJ, sees many problems in relying upon the U.S. government to pressure other states. First, he feels that the U.S. government has a poor human rights record itself, which has become even less admirable after September 11, 2001. Because of this, Smyth believes other governments will not take the United States' reprimands seriously. Secondly, he sees the U.S. government as being very selective on issues and countries. Smyth (2003) said,

There are certain countries that people only want to talk about. We don't want to talk about any one country in Latin America; we would rather talk about press freedom in the region so that we are not being used for another agenda.

For this reason, Smyth, when working for the CPJ, takes into consideration congressmen's viewpoints, position, and interest when seeking for intervention or support.

Sometimes the organization may be more effective in appealing to international bodies such as the United Nations and, more frequently the IACHR, to change state behavior (Witchel, 2003). It may refer the journalist to somebody that is familiar with the OAS system, or help the journalist present the case to the IACHR by preparing *amicus curiae* documents (Lauría, 2003). An *amicus curiae* is a report filed on behalf of a journalist by an uninvolved party that provides information and recommendations on a particular issue. Working with the Debevoise and Plimpton law firm through CPJ board

member, James Goodale, the advocacy group will consult with a journalist's lawyer as it prepares this document (Lauría, 2003).

Direct Assistance

In addition to engaging in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics, the CPJ will sometimes take more direct approaches to helping journalists in need. This can involve referring journalists to organizations that might be more suited to help them, or providing information on fellowships and other international programs devoted to helping journalists in need. Other times, it involves helping journalists receive asylum in another country by helping them with the paper work, or writing a letter to an embassy (Witchel, 2003). The CPJ's direct assistance program also deals with giving special recognition to journalists whose work has contributed to improving press freedom in the region.

For urgent cases, the program helps journalists acquire medicine they may need if they are in jail and are not receiving adequate health care, or if they are hospitalized because of an attack. The CPJ will also try to raise funds to help a journalist pay expenses for transportation, legal costs, or relocating to another country. The CPJ does not consider these activities to be pure advocacy work, nor does it consider it to be its main focus. However, it feels that it is important to try to help journalists in extremely dire circumstances (Witchel, 2003). The CPJ will sometimes work with many different organizations in these endeavors (Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003; Witchel, 2003). For example, it works with FLIP and IPYS to help journalists leave Colombia if they are in danger. The CPJ may coordinate with other groups to see that a journalist will receive medical attention, legal representation, or asylum (Lauría, 2003). One organization may

help a journalist with transportation, for instance, while another may help a journalist receive medical attention (Witchel, 2003).

A more proactive approach that the CPJ is starting to develop is a journalist security program. Smyth, the director of the program, has worked extensively to provide journalists with practical recommendations to keep them safe, such as receiving insurance or wearing protective gear. This is primarily directed towards journalists in war zones (Simon, 2003; Smyth, 2003; Witchel, 2003).

Survey of the CPJ's Focus and Activities

The CPJ has helped numerous journalists using at least one of the above-mentioned strategies. Between 2000 and 2003, the CPJ documented 53 criminal defamation cases, 22 other legal attacks, 45 imprisonments, 342 physical attacks, 27 murders confirmed to be related to an individual's work as a journalist, and 22 cases unconfirmed to be related to the journalist's work (see Appendix G). One-hundred and eighty-eight cases dealt with print journalists or organizations, 128 concerned TV journalists or organizations, and 83 concerned radio journalists. Other journalists worked for Internet journals and other types of news agencies. Some practiced more than one type of journalism (see Appendix H).

The number of special reports, conferences, alerts, and protest letters the CPJ issued regarding these issues, and the number of journalists it has tried to help directly give a general idea about which issues the CPJ devotes most of its attention. Between 2000 and 2003, the CPJ has devoted links on its web site to the imprisoned journalists in Cuba and criminal defamation as a whole throughout Latin America, and published special reports on various countries and situations in Latin America including Haiti,

Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala. It has also engaged in numerous conferences on all types of press freedom issues (Gonzalez, 2003; Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003).

In addition, the advocacy group issued 165 alerts and 35 protest letters for press abuses that occurred in Latin America. Twenty-eight alerts concerned criminal defamation, 24 dealt with other types of legal issues, 23 dealt with imprisonment, 57 reported attacks, and 33 concerned killings (see Appendices I - M). Many of these alerts and protest letters focus on more than one case at a time, while some only focus on one. Appendix N compares the number of alerts and protest letters that the CPJ has issued to the number of cases it has documented for each type of attack on the press. This table does not account for the number of journalists mentioned in each alert or protest letter; however, it does show which countries and types of attacks the CPJ has focused on. For example, it shows that the CPJ issued an alert or protest letter for killings in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, and Colombia. It did not, however, issue an alert or protest letter for killings that occurred in Bolivia and Paraguay. The table also shows that the CPJ devoted attention to attacks that occurred in Brazil, Honduras, Mexico, Haiti, Colombia, Bolivia, Argentina, Peru, Guatemala, Venezuela, and Cuba. However, the CPJ did not issue a protest letter or alert for any of the five physical attacks that took place in the Dominican Republic or the two that took place in Nicaragua. This is interesting considering that the CPJ issued two protest letters for at least one of the five physical attacks that took place in Paraguay and released an alert for at least one of the physical attacks that occurred in Brazil.

In addition to the special reports, alerts, and protest letters, the CPJ offered or was currently in the process of giving direct assistance to 27 journalists (Witchel, 2003).

Twelve of these journalists were from Colombia, 3 were from Cuba, 11 were from Haiti, and 1 was from Mexico. The CPJ helped, or was at that time trying to help, 20 of these journalists go into hiding, evacuate, or resettle. It offered two journalists medical help and assistance, and had been trying to collect resources to help a journalist with legal fees. The CPJ gave an International Press Freedom Award, or was considering giving an award to three journalists.

Factors that Affect Case Selection and Strategy

There are many explanations for the CPJ's case selection and strategy such as the amount of information the CPJ can acquire on a certain issue or the time and resources available to the organization. With 22 full time staff members, working with a limited budget, the organization must prioritize how it will allocate its time, resources, and money. Although the CPJ is one of the larger press freedom organizations, the organization cannot help every journalist nor engage in all of the activities it would like. At times, for example, the CPJ is entrusted with financial resources to help journalists and it must carefully consider where it will be the most useful (Witchel, 2003). Regarding conferences, Lauría (2003) said that there are so many they cannot attend all of them. González (2003) said, "If one leaves, it's pretty much impossible, it's impossible" to run the organization. Nor can the CPJ write a protest letter for every alert or protest letter for every situation and every journalist. "That would be impossible," he said, "for every case you sent a letter, you have to think how productive it could be if you sent a government a letter each time there is an attack....We wait for patterns" in abuses against the press. The small nature of the organization is also part of the reason why the CPJ does not coordinate many of its activities with other press freedom groups. Smyth (2003) said,

It's just too difficult...the CPJ is the largest organization of its kind in the United States [and the] RSF [is] the largest organization of its kind in Europe. We operate on our own. It's just too difficult for us. We will coordinate with the OAS if appropriate, but we pretty much operate on our own.

The CPJ must also be selective in the types of cases it chooses to document and make sure that those cases fall within the organization's mandate. Lauría (2003) said,

There are so many things going on...our staff is limited, so we take cases that are very, very serious, and the most important cases. There are some cases that we are not able to document throughout the year. Maybe it's an incident which is not so serious in a country, [or maybe] I'm traveling and Sauro is keeping track of some other, more serious abuse. We are not able to document every single case.

But...we document the most serious cases in most of the countries.

Lauría (2003) observed that the way the CPJ approaches the cases it documents “depends on the situation, on the attack, the kind of threat... almost each case is a world in itself.” Depending upon the issue the CPJ can engage in a “hierarchy of activities”—from simply documenting the case to taking it to the OAS. The issues that receive the highest priority are those where a journalists' life is in danger (Simon, 2003). Simon said,

physical attacks always get our attention at first...[other issues, like] access to information is a concern, but it's not our primary concern, concentration in media ownership in Latin America is a significant concern, but again, our emphasis is on physical safety and liberty.

Physical attacks, especially in the case of murder, are extremely distressing to the workers at the CPJ. Fortunately, they do not occur as frequently as other abuses against

the press. However, the CPJ decides to focus on murder cases first, not only because of their severity, but also because the issue is “a good opportunity to raise awareness about press freedom conditions in that country and to tell the government, you have to do something about it—Even a murder is useful for us to do advocacy” (Lauría, 2003).

Other issues that the CPJ chooses to focus on seem to be those that may set precedent in the way governments deal with press freedom issues (such as a case that is brought to the IACHR). The CPJ says that it does not discriminate against journalists who are less prominent. Lauría (2003) explained, we take

those journalists who have less power to defend themselves, or hire a lawyer— those journalists who are more vulnerable to attacks from the governments, like journalists working in the provinces or in the interior of the countries. I think that it’s very important we do this. That is why we get a lot of recognition at the same time, because we are ready to defend those journalists and make them feel like they have support from an international organization that has recognition and a reputation.

Neither does the CPJ discriminate against those who might share different political views. He continued by saying that the CPJ helps journalists, regardless of their political viewpoints. “We defend the principles [of press freedom] although sometimes we do not agree with the journalists” he said. “[It is] not a question of defending an ideology or political decision, it is just a question of principle...the right to freedom of expression.”

The main issue that seems to affect the CPJ’s selection of cases is not the journalist or his or her political viewpoints, but rather, whether or not he or she can get in

contact with the organization. Some prominent journalists have resources to capture the attention from the press freedom network. However, González (2003) noted, “if it’s somebody from the interior in Colombia, that person has probably never heard about CPJ [and] it’s hard for that person to get in touch with us.” To overcome this problem, the CPJ encourages journalists to become part of the international press freedom network and join or establish a press organization devoted to monitoring abuses on the press. The CPJ also tries to pay for traveling costs for these journalists to attend conferences with other journalists (Lauría, 2003).

González (2002) believes that the CPJ’s small staff and limited resources hinder the organization’s efforts to help as many journalists as it would like. However, he believes that even if the organization hired more people on its staff, it still would not be able to accomplish everything it wants to do. In fact it might even become more difficult. That is “one of the limitations of an NGO...,” González (2003) said, “we are small.... funding [is also a problem]. I wish we had ten people and we were like Human Rights Watch.” However, despite these factors that hinder the work of journalists, the CPJ recognizes that it benefits from other advantages. One is the expanding press freedom network in Latin America, which has come about partly because of the rise of the Internet, and the integration of Latin America with the rest of the world through trade, information, finance, and immigration (Simon, 1997). It is now possible for the CPJ to gather and distribute information quickly and accurately. Simon (2003) said, “our ability to do our work has increased dramatically...we can read newspapers all over Latin America, we can be in touch instantaneously with the journalists throughout the region.” Smyth (2003) said in regards to this, “the reporting of the CPJ and the quality of the reporting has

increased markedly... I think [it] has to do with the Internet. It's been great. And in fact, it's been much easier to maintain contacts." Indeed, the Internet has made it possible for the CPJ to strengthen its network and distribute a large amount of information all over the world. Although the CPJ may not be able to publicize every abuse, it can publicize some of the most severe cases, which may be enough to lead to long-term changes in press freedom.

Conclusions

The CPJ's use of information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics are a main part of its campaign activities. Like all transnational advocacy networks, the majority of the organization's activities involve information politics. As the CPJ exchanges information, it will often use symbolic and accountability politics. When these approaches fail to produce change, the CPJ will turn to more powerful actors to intervene. It does this by engaging in discussions with U.S. politicians and turns its efforts to the IACHR on behalf of journalists. The organization does not consider its more direct approaches to helping journalists as part of its advocacy work because helping a journalist in individual cases is not expected or designed to improve long-term improvements in press freedom. However, working inside the worldwide press freedom network, the CPJ hopes that these more direct activities will contribute toward small improvements in the region as a whole.

The CPJ carefully considers how it will allocate its time and resources, and what kind of issues and activities it will focus on. Priority is given to the most severe cases where journalists have been attacked or killed. The CPJ recognizes, as do Keck and Sikkink (1998), that issues dealing with physical attacks will draw more attention to a

case compared to other press freedom issues. The CPJ is also actively involved in protesting other issues that affect press freedom. The CPJ's focus may change depending on the nature and frequency of attacks. Between 2000 and 2003, the issues that were at the forefront of the CPJ's campaigns were criminal defamation, the imprisonment of 29 Cuban journalists, and physical attacks on journalists. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 describe the CPJ's campaigns in each of these different areas, and explore whether or not the campaigns are effective according to Keck and Sikkink's model of influence. These chapters identify various conditioning or constraining variables that influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness.

CHAPTER 6

THE CPJ'S CAMPAIGN ON CRIMINAL DEFAMATION

Some of the most common threats for journalists in Latin America are legal in nature. Restrictive press laws such as criminal defamation, licensing, and access to information, exist on the legal books of most Latin American countries, and their governments frequently apply them. Since 2000, the CPJ documented 72 cases where journalists faced legal suits filed by their government under these laws in Latin America. Fifty-three of these cases concerned criminal defamation. The countries with the most number of cases were Panama, with 18 cases; Chile, with 8 cases; Mexico, with 6 cases; Argentina, with 5 cases; and Peru and Venezuela with 4 cases each (CPJ, 2000d, 2001i; 2002d; 2003o; see Appendix G). Application of these legal statutes significantly limits journalists' ability to write objectively, criticize the government, and express their personal views.

With support from the Tinker Foundation, the CPJ has launched an extensive campaign to eliminate one of the most notorious press laws in the Americas: criminal defamation (CPJ, 2000a). Criminal defamation, contempt, or *desacato* laws, give political authorities special rights to privacy, thus protecting them from criticism in the press (Lanao, 1999). Although these laws are common all over the world, and more journalists are prosecuted and imprisoned under these laws outside of Latin America, the CPJ has started its campaign in this region because, as Cooper stated, "we think this is where journalists can make the first crucial progress toward elimination of these laws" (CPJ, 2000a, para. 2; Simon, 2000).

This chapter describes in detail the CPJ's use of information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics in its campaign against this issue in Latin America and more specifically in Panama, Argentina, Chile, and Costa Rica. In doing so, it answers research Question 3, which concerns the CPJ's level of effectiveness in its activities. How conditional variables, which are outlined in Question 4, enhance or hinder the CPJ's activities and effectiveness is analyzed in the conclusions section.

The Broad Campaign

The CPJ uses two main approaches to deal with criminal defamation laws. "One is simply to publicize these laws and say their application is unacceptable," said the CPJ's deputy director, Joel Simon (personal communication, July 8, 2003). "The other," he said, "is to call on international bodies, particularly the Human Rights Commission of the OAS, to become involved and to speak out about the application of these laws." As with all of its campaigns, the CPJ engages heavily in information politics when approaching legal attacks on the press. Its link, "Journalism is Not a Crime: Legal Resources for Journalists in Latin America," is intended to educate journalists about criminal defamation laws. It lists U.S. legal decisions on these issues and provides links to other organizations with information on the topic, such as the IAPA's press law database (CPJ, 2003m).

The CPJ also posts on its website numerous alerts and protest letters regarding criminal defamation. One of the most frequently cited documents in these publications is the 1994 "Report on the Compatibility of Desacato laws with the American Convention on Human Rights," which argues that these laws interfere with Article 13 of the American convention (IACHR, 1995). In addition, the CPJ will often cite rulings and

formal condemnations of specific state behavior. For instance, when Eduardo Bertoni, the IACHR Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression, issued a communiqué decrying the Venezuelan Supreme Court's decision to uphold several desacato laws in the country, the CPJ cited his protest (CPJ, 2003e).

It is unknown how many people access the CPJ's link on criminal defamation and how many people read its reports, alerts, and protest letters. However, the CPJ's publications on criminal defamation are cited frequently in newspapers, magazines, and other publications. For example, the CPJ's opinion on this issue is cited in the U.S. State Department's 2002 Human Rights Report (U.S. State Department, 2003). By referencing the CPJ's reports, the State Department helps elevate interest and influence discourse on the issue.

In addition to publicizing information on criminal defamation, the CPJ works behind the scenes in a few countries, as it meets with governments and holds conferences with journalists. In some cases, the CPJ will engage in leverage politics by helping journalists appeal their case to the OAS (C. Lauría, personal communication, July 2003; Simon, 2003). All of these activities show governments that there is international support for journalists prosecuted under criminal defamation. In addition, these actions influence state discourse, state policy, and state behavior. In Panama, activities that involved information and accountability politics were sufficient to produce these changes. However, in Chile and Argentina, no changes took place until the issue was taken to the IACHR.

Panama

The CPJ's campaign against criminal defamation in Panama came to its peak during the late 1990s. By 2002, as many as 90 journalists faced pending criminal defamation charges under Panama's gag laws, and almost 70 percent of these abuses were filed by the government (CPJ, 2002g; Lauría, 2003). These laws not only prohibited journalists from criticizing governments, but they also established prison terms for defamation, permitted prior censorship, and granted the government the right to license journalists (CPJ, 1999c).

The Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression of the OAS called these gag laws a "tool frequently used by public officials to silence their critics" (CPJ, 1999c, para. 4). Italo Isaac Antinori Bolaños, the government ombudsman, complained that these laws were a "systematic and permanent campaign" to silence and persecute journalists (CPJ, 1999c, para. 4). In protest, local journalists would block the police from issuing warrants to their colleagues, challenged the government in court, and picketed in front of the Panamanian Supreme Court (CPJ, 1999c; 2001f). The CPJ supported these journalists in many ways, including awarding Gustavo Gorriti, one of the leading journalists in these local protests, with an International Press Freedom Award (CPJ, 1998a). In addition, the CPJ and the rest of the international community joined these local journalists in their protest by publicizing journalists' trials, issuing protest letters, and eventually meeting with government officials. In 1999, the CPJ directed a protest letter to Panamanian President Pérez Balladares and argued that the prosecution of these journalists posed as a threat to both press freedom in Panama and also Panama's consolidation of democracy. Citing the IACHR's ruling that contempt laws violate "the most fundamental principle of

a democratic system,” the CPJ also argued that Panama was violating international law (CPJ, 1999h, para. 15).

A few months after the CPJ and other groups issued the protest letters, and with only 37 days left before he left office, Balladares proposed some new provisions, which he claimed would eliminate the gag laws. Although press freedom groups appreciated Balladares’ acknowledgment of the problem, they felt that his proposal actually strengthened the existing gag laws. The new law raised the minimum fine for publishing information about someone’s private life from \$2,500 to \$10,000. Instead of a 10-day jail sentence, the government would now be able to sentence a journalist to jail for 30 days (CPJ, 1999g). In one protest letter, the CPJ accused the government of making proposals that were “masquerading as an effort to reform Panama's onerous gag laws” (CPJ, 1999g, para. 1). It also accused the president of not keeping his promises to repeal the laws, but rather harming press freedom. The letter closed with a statement saying, "May we suggest that expanding the legal means for repressing journalists is not a fitting legacy for a president who came to power pledging to strengthen Panamanian democracy” (CPJ, 1999g, para. 5). A few months after this letter was written, the government withdrew the bill. The CPJ attributed this change in policy to the international protests in which the CPJ was a participant (CPJ, 1999c).

By this time, Balladares had already left office and was replaced by Miereya Moscoso. Panama’s criminal defamation issues were of such concern to the country that, during the election campaign, Moscoso included promises to repeal Panama’s gag laws on her campaign platform (CPJ, 2000b). Press freedom groups wasted no time to meet with the new president (CPJ, 2000c). In a September 1999 meeting, Moscoso promised a

CPJ delegation that she would repeal the gag laws as soon as possible but cautioned that the process could take time. Speaking at the Freedom Forum's Latin America Media Forum the next day, she said, “restrictive press laws had ‘no possible justification’ in Panamanian society” (CPJ, 1999c, para. 6).

Under her leadership, the Panamanian Legislative Assembly approved a bill that significantly reduced some of the more harmful provisions of the gag laws. The proposal required the Ministry of Government and Justice to submit a bill to bring Panama’s press laws fully in line with international standards within 180 days. On December 20, 1999, CPJ board member, Alberto Iburgüen, and president of the IAPA, Tony Pederson, attended the ceremony where President Moscoso signed the bill into law (CPJ, 1999c). However, despite the partial repeal of the gag laws, the government continued to charge journalists. The government also failed to meet its June 2000 deadline to reform the remaining laws. Instead, on May 25, 2000, the Legislative Assembly committee approved a draft bill that actually strengthened the existing criminal defamation law. Widespread vocal protest from the Panamanian press caused the government to withdraw the legislation on June 28, 2000, and postpone its hearing until September of that year (CPJ, 2000c).

After a meeting with Santiago A. Canton, the OAS Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression, the Panamanian government committed itself once again to repealing the country's contempt laws. In July 2000, the CPJ sent another protest letter praising the government for talking with Canton, but criticizing the government for its lack of progress. The letter cited two more cases where journalists had been charged with criminal defamation and devoted an entire section reminding the government of its

commitment to change its laws. The CPJ closed the letter by offering the government the CPJ's services to help in the reform process (CPJ, 2000f).

The letter and public protests did not seem to have any overall impact, however. Rather, Moscoso had filed her own criminal defamation suit against a journalist and also extended Panama's restrictive press laws by signing a bill that broadened official definitions of privacy and confidentiality (CPJ, 2000b). The new law applied harsh sanctions to officials who released classified material. In an alert, Cooper stated, "by signing it, President Moscoso has undone much of the progress achieved during her first months in office. We call on the government to repeal this unjust legislation, along with existing laws used to stifle independent journalism in Panama" (CPJ, 2000b, para. 10).

Although international protests saw little change in government policy, it did see some. For example, the Panamanian government used a proposal issued by Transparency International to develop an access to information law, which established fines of up to 2,000 balboas (US\$2,000) and even dismissal of government employees who do not release public information in a timely manner. In addition, the Panamanian government continued to meet with the Special Rapporteur and discuss changes in its laws (CPJ, 2001f). The government also dismissed charges against a few journalists who had been charged with criminal defamation. For example, in October 2002, it finally acquitted columnist, radio journalist, and lawyer, Miguel Antonio Bernal, who was accused in May 1998 for criticizing the National Police over public radio (M. A. Bernal, personal communication, August 25, 2003). In an e-mail, Bernal told Carlos Lauría, the CPJ's Americas program coordinator, "I think I was acquitted because of the overwhelming international support my case...attracted" (Lauría 2003; CPJ 2002f, para. 9).

Although the Panamanian government has not yet fulfilled its commitment to repeal its gag laws, it has made some significant progress in doing so because of pressure from the CPJ and other press freedom groups. Its activities made the issue an international concern, forced the Panamanian government to address local journalists' complaints, and motivated both Balladres and Moscoso to formally declare that they would try to eliminate the gag laws. The CPJ saw Moscoso eliminate the more severe parts of these laws and take significant steps for future reform. Panamanian journalists still work under many legal constraints; however, the CPJ and other press freedom groups have shown Panamanian journalists that there is international support for their cause, and have pressured the government to make small, but significant steps toward abolishing criminal defamation laws in Panama (Bernal, 2003).

Argentina

Similar changes occurred in Argentina as a result of the CPJ and other press freedom groups' efforts. However, information and accountability politics alone at the state level did not effectively produce this change. The CPJ had to help journalists take their protests to the intergovernmental level. This approach pressured Argentina to dismiss charges against an individual journalist and voice commitment to repeal criminal defamation laws. In addition, the Argentine government made significant progress in eliminating criminal defamation laws by seriously considering a bill proposed by local journalists.

The CPJ's campaign against criminal defamation in Argentina focused on supporting the efforts of investigative journalist and columnist, Horacio Verbitsky. For more than a decade, Verbitsky led the Argentine press in protesting against the

government and also engaged the OAS to pressure the Argentine government into reforming its restrictive press laws. In 1991, after the Argentine Supreme Court found him guilty of criminal defamation for criticizing a judge, Verbitsky complained to the IACHR, and fearing that the IACHR would rule against the country, the Argentine government immediately reversed Verbitsky's conviction and told the journalist that it would work with him to reform Argentine criminal defamation laws (CPJ, 2001n). The IACHR's intervention also seemed to cause the Argentine government to become more sensitive to international protests. For example, in May 1995, the CPJ said that "after fierce domestic and international debate," the Argentine government withdrew a bill that imposed a fee of US\$200,000 and a prison sentence of up to 6 years for journalists charged with criminal defamation (CPJ, 1995a, para. 1). The Argentine government also withdrew a bill that would have required journalists writing controversial stories to reveal their sources. While international and local protests continued against Menem's efforts to push other proposals through Congress, Verbitsky successfully united prominent journalists from various political and ideological backgrounds in Argentina, forming the organization that was formally named Asociación Periodistas, or "Periodistas," in 1996 (Simon, 1998).

The CPJ highlighted these developments in alerts, special features, and other publications. In addition, in June 2000, the CPJ worked with Periodistas to sponsor a two-day conference in Buenos Aires, which brought together dozens of journalists, lawyers, and academics from throughout the region (Simon, 2003). Among the attendees were the CPJ's Christopher Bell and Michael Cronin, a delegation from the IAPA, the executive director of Human Rights Watch/Americas, and the vice president of the

IACHR. The Argentine Minister of Justice, Ricardo Gil Lavedra, was also present (CPJ, 2000a).

The purpose of the conference was “to raise awareness about how such laws are used to stifle independent reporting and punish journalists who criticize powerful officials and to discuss ways to work for their elimination” (CPJ, 2001g, p. 134). At the conference, participants reviewed and discussed criminal defamation laws in Argentina, expressed support for the work of the Special Rapporteur for freedom of expression, and discussed ways in which Periodistas could work with the government to eliminate these laws. At the end of the conference the participants drafted the “The Buenos Aires Declaration,” which summarized some conclusions of the conference and expressed the participants’ commitment to defend journalists who were charged for criminal defamation (CPJ, 2000a).

Another outcome of the conference was Lavedra’s declaration that “the protection of information related to the public interest represents a great responsibility for the state” (CPJ, 2000a, para. 6). Lavedra also pledged support for a bill Periodistas would present to the Argentine congress later that year. This bill proposed that the government use the “actual malice” standard established by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1964 *New York Times v. Sullivan* case in its application of criminal defamation laws (Simon, 2000). When Periodistas presented this bill to congress, the government took it seriously. The two presidential candidates at the time committed to pass the bill. However, after the press exposed a bribery scandal involving some of the politicians who supported the legislation, the congress stalled the bill indefinitely (CPJ, 2001n).

This was a great disappointment to all press freedom groups who hoped that the Argentine government would set an example for other Latin American governments by reforming its criminal defamation laws (CPJ, 1999d; CPJ, 1999a). Despite this setback, the CPJ continued to work on behalf of Argentine journalists. Instead of directing its activities toward Argentine politicians, however, the CPJ went through the OAS. In November 2001, CPJ board member and columnist for the *Washington Post*, Clarence Page, and several other journalists and lawyers, accompanied Verbitsky and Eduardo Bertoni, legal advisor to Verbitsky, to the OAS to present a 68-page complaint to the IACHR on behalf of Periodistas and *Noticias*. The document asked the IACHR to suspend an Argentine verdict that charged Verbitsky for criminal defamation for a series of articles written about Menem's relationship with a school teacher in 1995 (CPJ, 2001n; 2001h). Whether the IACHR has consented to do this was not yet determined by December 2003.

While in the United States, the CPJ awarded Verbitsky with an International Press Freedom Award. In his acceptance speech at the award ceremony in New York, Verbitsky praised Periodistas for its success in mobilizing the press against Argentine criminal defamation law. He also thanked the CPJ for supporting Periodistas in these efforts by saying, "The CPJ helped us to...bring the suffering of the Argentine people to the attention of the world....And it is helping us again, to get rid of antiquated criminal defamation laws" (CPJ, 2001n, para. 21).

Indeed, the CPJ's efforts have helped Periodistas raise the criminal defamation issue in Argentina and all over the world. The international press freedom awards were widely publicized in many newspapers and were also broadcast on "Nightline" (CPJ,

2001n). The CPJ's activities and reports helped bring international support to Periodistas' bill. However, real change in Argentine discourse, policy, and behavior did not take place without the intervention of the OAS. Such was the case in 1992 when Verbitsky took his case before the IACHR, which pressured the Argentine government to dismiss charges against Verbitsky and also committed the government to reform its laws. Verbitsky's appeal appeared to also force the government into becoming more sensitive to international and domestic pressure. This was evidenced in the fact that the Argentine government began to take local journalists' complaints and recommendations more seriously. Although the CPJ and other press groups did not see the Argentine government fulfill its commitments to revoke these laws, they did help make it a domestic issue and showed the government that local journalists had international support. The CPJ will continue to support Verbitsky's second case in the OAS with the hope that it will bring about more significant changes in Argentine press law.

Chile

As with the Argentine government, the CPJ only helped influence Chilean discourse, policy, and state behavior after participating in appeals to the OAS. The appeals initiated with investigative journalist, Alejandra Matus, who claimed that the Chilean government's ban on her book, *The Black Law of Justice*, violated international law. On April 14, 1999, under the State Security Law which permitted the government to censor materials it deemed harmful to national security, a court ordered her book to be removed from stores and her publishers to be arrested (CPJ, 2001d). Soon after, the book appeared on the Internet, where it received 20,000 hits the first day it was posted. In protest to the charges against Matus, Chilean legislators walked into the Supreme Court

carrying a large pair of cardboard scissors to symbolize “the cutting off of information” (Smeets, 1999a, para. 6) and President Eduardo Frei immediately proposed a new law to modify the laws under which the journalist was charged.

Matus was able to avoid arrest by fleeing to Argentina, where she remained in hiding for several months. Prior to doing so, Matus warned her friends over e-mail that if they did not hear from her, this meant that there were problems with her book and she had gone into hiding. After not hearing from Matus, one of her friends contacted the CPJ to inform it of the situation (A. Matus, personal communication, 2003). The CPJ, in turn, contacted Matus to see how it could be of assistance to her. In the months that followed, the CPJ sent numerous alerts and protest letters to publicize her case. In May 1999, a CPJ representative also met with the Chilean Ambassador to the United States, Genaro Arriagada, to discuss the situation. Arriagada told the CPJ that he disagreed with Matus’s prosecution and would do what he could to help her (CPJ, 1999b; Debevoise & Plimpton, 2001).

In November 1999, Matus received asylum in the United States (CPJ, 2001b). While there, the Debevoise and Plimpton Law firm worked on behalf of the CPJ with Matus’s lawyer to prepare an amicus curiae to present before the IACHR in October 2001. This document provided a summary of the case and the CPJ’s recommendations to the commission (Debevoise & Plimpton, 2001). In the manuscript, the CPJ urged the IACHR to recommend the Chilean government to repeal all its defamation laws including Article 6b, dismiss Matus of all charges, adopt an “actual malice” standard for all defamation cases, reject prior censorship under some of Chile’s laws, and allow her book to be circulated.

After reviewing her case, the commission sided with Matus and recommended the case for review by the Inter American Court, which, in October 2003, decided to accept the case (A. Matus, personal communication, 2004). As of December 2003, the Chilean courts had not yet lifted the ban on her book, nor had it agreed to pay Matus damages as the IACHR had ordered (CPJ, 2001b; Lauría, 2003). However, Matus' complaint to the international commission provided an opportunity for the Chilean government to publicly state that it needed to reform the State Security Law. It also pushed the Chilean government to move a proposal that had been introduced to the Senate eight years prior that would modify many of Chile's defamation laws. Although the final version of the law maintained certain provisions that can restrict press freedom (such as only recognizing journalists who have a journalism degree), it did eliminate many of the criminal defamation laws found in the State Security law, and Matus was able to return to Chile without fearing arrest (CPJ, 2001a; 2002e). The Inter American Court's hearing of Matus' case may also provide the needed leverage to further reform the Chilean government's behavior toward Matus' book.

Since Matus' case was heard at the IACHR, new developments have taken place regarding Chilean press laws. On World Press Freedom Day, May 3, 2002, Chilean government spokesman Heraldo Muñoz announced that the government would present a proposal to the Chamber of Deputies to eliminate laws that make opinion a crime. The government said that the relationship between freedom of expression and the right to privacy would be addressed in the proposal (CPJ, 2002a). Later in September 2002, the presidency submitted a bill to revise several articles of the Penal Code and the Code of Military Justice that criminalize insults against public officials (CPJ, 2001d).

Matus credits the international attention her case received for pushing the government to commit to reforming its press laws, actually making improvements in Chilean press law, and allowing Matus to return to Chile. She said that Chile was already in the spotlight because of Augusto Pinochet's arrest in London, making it easier for her case to draw attention and be publicized. However, she also credits the work of nongovernmental organizations, especially the CPJ, for bringing international attention to her case (Matus, 2003).

Costa Rica

The CPJ continues to fight against these criminal defamation laws throughout all of Latin America by publicizing and criticizing governments' applications of these laws, and when necessary taking the issue to the IACHR. Based on the cases of Chile and Argentina, the CPJ's campaign against Costa Rica at the intergovernmental level may prove the most promising. However, this time, it may not only affect Costa Rica; it could affect the entire region.

On February 26, 2003, the CPJ issued an alert saying that the Inter American Court on Human Rights had accepted to hear the first criminal defamation case in its history (CPJ, 2003a). The case concerned Costa Rican journalist, Mauricio Herrera Ulloa who was charged \$190,000 and 120 days' wages for writing a series of 1995 articles in which he cited Belgian press reports accusing former Costa Rican diplomat Félix Prezedborski of corruption (personal communication, September 2, 2003). Lauría (2003) said, that the court's acceptance of this case was significant to press freedom activists because "any decision on that [will make] jurisprudence in the region." He continued,

“although I think there are going to be more cases [we will always be able to] refer to that [decision].”

This important development came about partly because of the CPJ and other organizations. Around November 12, 1999, Herrera Ulloa (2003) contacted the CPJ because he knew “that the CPJ was a respected and credible organization.” He also contacted other organizations like RSF, Article 19, the IAPA, and the OAS. The CPJ advised him to exhaust all internal remedies possible, and then if that failed, to appeal to the IACHR. After the Costa Rican court rejected Herrera Ulloa’s appeal in December 1999, Herrera Ulloa and his newspaper, *La Nación*, did just that. They filed a petition to the IACHR, which later told the Costa Rican government to suspend the ruling so that the commission could study the case. The Costa Rican government ignored the order, so in April 2001, the IACHR requested the Inter American Court to confirm the suspension. The court did so a month later; however, again, the Costa Rican government failed to comply (CPJ, 2001e).

Four months later, on September 7, 2001, the Inter American court issued an order only used in cases of “extreme gravity and urgency, and when necessary to avoid irreparable damage to persons,” according to the American Convention on Human Rights (quoted in CPJ, 2001e, para. 10). It issued a “provisional measure,” ordering the Costa Rican court to keep Herrera Ulloa off the official list of convicted criminals until the Inter American court resolved the case (quoted in CPJ, 2001e, para. 9). In addition, it ordered the Costa Rican authorities to not enforce an order requiring *La Nación* to publish the Penal Court’s ruling. On October 3, 2001, the Costa Rican Penal Court agreed that it would abide by the Inter American court’s decision. However, it failed to comply with

another request of the IACHR issued in October 2001. The commission had asked Costa Rican President Abel Pacheco to respond in two months to its request; however, by the year's end, the government had not done so (CPJ, 2001e). Two years later, the Inter American court decided to accept the case for review (CPJ, 2003a).

The IACHR and Inter American Court found the Costa Rican government to be extremely difficult to work with, which suggest that it is unlikely that transnational advocacy groups could play a major role in persuading the Costa Rican government to change. However, the CPJ did do so indirectly through the OAS. According to Herrera Ulloa (2003) the CPJ played an important role in helping his case move forward through the IACHR by publicizing his case and offering him legal advice. The CPJ helped demonstrate that Herrera Ulloa's situation was important to the international community. Herrera Ulloa said,

Its activities showed the Costa Rican government that there was international interest in my case...The CPJ provided information and talked about why this was important for the press freedom community in Latin America.

The CPJ's activities also united the international community, which put pressure on the Costa Rican government. In addition, the CPJ gave Herrera Ulloa advice on how best to approach the issue. Now that the case has been accepted by the Inter American Court, the CPJ will file an *amicus curiae*. Lauría (2003) said that the CPJ's lawyers and Herrera Ulloa's lawyers are

working on that. We are thinking of capturing a lot of attention on that because we think it's a good case. It is a prestigious paper, he is a very good journalist, and we think that [the] case is very good. So, we are very excited,

although,...maybe the Inter American court [will not start] seeing this case [until the] beginning of 2004 and the decision may come late [in] 2004, or maybe early 2005; but in the mean time, we... will file the brief in the Amicus Curia, sending a [news] release that we have done so, ...and try to put that case in [the context of] other defamation [cases]--to advocate.

Conclusions

The CPJ's work in Panama Argentina, and Chile did not result in complete reform in the press laws of Panama, Argentina, and Chile; however, it did help achieve small changes that may eventually see their complete elimination. Panama, Argentina, and Chile all changed their discourse and policy regarding the overall issue of criminal defamation law. These governments also made changes in their behavior for individual criminal defamation cases. According to the norms of socialization theory, these partial changes are significant. Each of these states reached the tactical concession stage, whereby acknowledging that there was a problem and that they need to make improvements, perhaps leading to actual reform in the future.

The CPJ's ability to contribute to these changes was dependent upon several factors including the organization's activities, the involvement of local groups, the target actor, and the issue. The nature of the CPJ's activities depended in part on the target actor. In Panama, the CPJ's engagement in information and accountability politics seemed sufficient to produce these changes on the overall issue of criminal defamation law, which in turn resulted in a change in state behavior for an individual journalist. The Panamanian government was more open to receiving international advice, so the CPJ was able to visit with the presidents and politicians. However, in Argentina, Chile, and Costa

Rica, the CPJ had to turn to more powerful actors to intervene. In Argentina, this eventually made the government more receptive to local suggestions. Chilean journalists did not receive the same attention as those in Argentina; however, they found that many politicians in Chile were interested in reforming criminal defamation laws and weakening the power of the Chilean court, which still maintained remnants from the authoritarian regime. In addition, Chile was already in the spotlight with Pinochet's arrest in London, which contributed toward transnational advocacy groups' ability to help attract attention and scrutiny.

The nature of the issue and the journalists concerned also influenced the CPJ's effectiveness. The efforts of transnational advocacy networks helped change state behavior regarding a single journalist; however, these efforts did not modify state behavior for other journalists regarding the issue as a whole. One common condition in the effectiveness of the CPJ's activities in every case was the active involvement of domestic press groups, which provided the CPJ with information. In addition, the local groups put pressure on the governments from within the state, which combined with that from the international community and led to changes in state behavior and policy. The CPJ's association with local groups in Argentina and Panama, which had addressed the government directly in previous campaigns, made it feasible for the CPJ to speak directly with the government. This resulted in formal commitments from politicians to eliminate criminal defamation laws, as well as some real attempts to reform them.

Part of the CPJ's effectiveness can also be attributed to its participation in a large international protest against the governments. However, according to Bernal (2003), Matus (2003) and Herrera Ulloa (2003), the CPJ was one of the most important groups

advocating their cause. Indeed, in all of these cases, the journalists acknowledged that the CPJ's activities were essential for the success of their case and attributed this to the organization's prestige and credibility.

The role of the CPJ's activities remains subject to interpretation. However, according to all of the journalists, the CPJ was essential. It was key to informing other organizations and securing the support of the international community. This in turn, pressured the target governments to dismiss charges against individual journalists, acknowledge flaws in their laws, place the issue on the agenda, and carefully re-evaluate their policies.

CHAPTER 7

IMPRISONMENT

Unjust imprisonments of journalists are much less common in Latin America than they were when the CPJ started more than 20 years ago. However, they still occur. Between 2000 and 2003 the CPJ documented 45 cases of imprisonment. Thirty-seven of these occurred in Cuba and 6 occurred in Colombia (CPJ, 2000d, 2001i; 2002d; 2003o; see Appendix G). Part of the CPJ's campaign against imprisonment involves investigating whether or not they warrant documentation. The CPJ also works to prevent journalists from being detained in jail, as it is doing in the case of Mexican journalist Isabel Arvide. However, the CPJ's main campaign against imprisonments is focused on the release of 29 journalists who were arrested in Cuba in 2003. This campaign involves gathering information on the state of the journalists, supporting the independent press in Cuba, and also addressing U.S. policy toward Cuba. In answer to Question 3, the CPJ's efforts in Mexico on behalf of Arivde show that the CPJ can work directly with countries like Mexico, by influencing state behavior, and by preventing the long-term detainment of a journalist. The organizations' activities in Cuba provide an example of how transnational advocacy groups can support independent journalists despite many obstacles and risks. In addition, these initiatives show that the CPJ is in a position where it can influence U.S. policy on Cuba.

Unresolved Cases

A main part of the CPJ's campaign against imprisonments involves gathering details on journalists' imprisonment and then publicizing that information. The CPJ depends upon the government and the journalists' personal relationships, and sometimes

the journalists themselves, to gather details on their imprisonment. As with all issues, the CPJ first confirms that a journalist was imprisoned for reasons related to his or her work as a journalist. The organization may consult with the journalist directly or speak with other people knowledgeable about the case.

At other times, the CPJ may request government documents concerning the case. This is what the advocacy group did in February 2003 when it requested the Peruvian Ministry of Justice to provide more information on the imprisonment of a Peruvian journalist who was sentenced to 10 years in prison. According to a 100-page document that the CPJ had received from the journalist's lawyer, the Peruvian government charged the journalist for being involved with the terrorist group, Shining Path. After the CPJ and its lawyers reviewed the document in detail, it concluded that the government's arguments against the journalist were unclear and weak (C. Lauría, personal communication, July 2003). However, the CPJ did not want to assume that the government had imprisoned the journalist for his work as a journalist without consulting the government first. With RSF, the CPJ sent a letter of inquiry to the Peruvian government requesting more information (CPJ, 2003). By sending the letter together, the CPJ and RSF hoped that the government would take their inquiry more seriously and respond quickly. As of July 2003, the Peruvian government had not responded to the CPJ and RSF's letter. However, the CPJ will continue to investigate the case until it has found satisfactory answers to its questions (Lauría, 2003).

Mexico

The CPJ learned of the detention of Arvide, Mexican freelance journalist and author of *Muerte en Juárez*, in 2002 from her son, who contacted the CPJ at the

recommendation of *Revista's* lawyer (I. Arvide, personal communication, September 4, 2003). This was the first of two times that the journalist was detained for reasons related to her writings. The CPJ did not document these as imprisonment cases because Arvide's detention lasted less than 48 hours, which is the minimum amount of time a journalist must be detained for it to be considered an imprisonment by the CPJ (2003n). However, these cases demonstrate that the CPJ can be effective in preventing the long-term detention of a journalist by engaging in information and accountability politics, and also by using its power and prestige in the international community.

Arvide's imprisonment originated from an article written on June 2, 2001, in which she accused Rodríguez Borunda, owner of Editora Paso del Norte publishing company, which runs several dailies in Chihuahua, for drug trafficking. Borunda filed a complaint against the journalist for "moral damages" and requested \$50 million pesos (U.S. \$5,000,000). In August 2002, the journalist was arrested and placed in an isolated cell. Twenty-four hours later, the judge issued a bail of 100,000 Mexican pesos (U.S. \$10,000) (CPJ, 2003g).

During and after her detainment, the CPJ gathered details on the case and prepared an alert, which was immediately released to the international community (CPJ, 2002e). It also contacted the journalist and offered recommendations on how she could defend herself against the criminal defamation charges set against her. In addition, it put Arvide in contact with other international organizations, including RSF and UNESCO (Arvide, 2003).

By the time Arvide was detained for the second time four months later, she had the support of numerous press freedom organizations. These groups protested the

journalist's detention, called it a violation of international law, and demanded her immediate release (CPJ, 2003d). While these protests carried on, the CPJ worked through Arvide's son to negotiate her release with the judge (Arvide, 2003). The judge settled on allowing the journalist out of jail on bail of 100,000 Mexican pesos (U.S. \$10,000) on condition that she appear before the court every 15 days (CPJ, 2003g). Although these efforts did not result in a complete dismissal of her case, it did stop her from serving long-term jail time. Arvide (2003) said:

I am convinced that the presence of the CPJ, its name, and its communication with my son, were some of the reasons that the judge allowed me to be released...If it were not for [the CPJ and other international organization's] support, I would have been forced back into jail...[These groups] gave me much more security and protected me when I was in a vulnerable position.

The CPJ continues to help Arvide as she carries out her bail requirements. It is trying to acquire funds to help pay for her transportation fees and legal costs (E. Witchel, personal communication, July 8, 2003). It is also giving the journalist the assurance that if she is arrested again, as she fears she might be, she will have the support of the international community to monitor her case and ask for her release.

Cuba

Unfortunately, the Cuban government is not as responsive to international pressure. The CPJ repeatedly lists Cuba as one of the worst places to practice journalism and President Fidel Castro as one of the top 10 worst enemies of the press (see for example, CPJ 2000e). The press suffers the constant threat of harassment, expulsion, revoked licenses, and imprisonment for violating Cuban law (CPJ, 2002c). Cuba is the

only country in Latin America that does not tolerate an autonomous press and is the only country where journalists are imprisoned for practicing independent journalism (Bilello, 1996a). In April and May 2003, the Cuban government raided the homes of 28 journalists, arrested them, and sentenced them to 14 to 17 years in prison, bringing the total number of imprisoned journalists in Cuba that year to 29. In a U.S. Congressional hearing on the imprisonment of these journalists and Cuban dissidents, Carlos Lauría, the CPJ's Americas coordinator, stated, "The jailing of journalists is among the most effective strategies employed by repressive regimes to control the media" (Federal News Service, 2003). Many of these individuals belonged to the press group, Sociedad de Periodistas Manuel Márquez Sterling, which was founded in 2001 and continues to work on the famous *Revista de Cuba* (CPJ, 2003i). By 1999, Sociedad de Periodistas was one of around 20 independent agencies operating in Cuba (CPJ, 1999e).

Evidence suggests that Cuban citizens are in favor of efforts to form a free press. Cubans are anxious to obtain information from independent sources such as *Encuentro de la Cultura Cubana*, a highly-demanded magazine that is published by Cuban exiles and circulated by hand throughout Cuba. Eleven-thousand Cuban citizens have signed a petition known as the Varela Project, which requests that five proposals, one of them requesting the right to freedom of expression, be submitted to the national referendum. The Cuban government has said that it will consider the issues on the referendum for review if it receives the signatures of 10,000 eligible voters (2002c).

The CPJ has directed many of its campaigns on a variety of press freedom issues towards the Cuban government. But, as Smyth (2003) says, "They don't really care."

Cuba is a particularly difficult target not only for the CPJ and other non-profit organizations, but also for companies and democratic governments. The Cuban government stubbornly refuses to listen to or be influenced by international protests and recommendations, so it is almost impossible for organizations like the CPJ or any other groups promoting democratic ideals to have a direct influence on the government in any way (González, 2003). Furthermore, Cuba strictly controls entry visas and information flows, making it extremely difficult for the CPJ to gather information and to help journalists, let alone promote press freedom ideals. For example, a day after Nestor Bager of *Independent Press Agency of Cuba* (APIC), informed the CPJ of the temporary detentions of three APIC reporters in July 1995, authorities confiscated his fax machine and disconnected the telephone line (CPJ, 1995b).

“Clearly, the CPJ has limited leverage here,” Smyth (2003) said; however, “the Cuban government is obviously going to get heat... for this latest move” (the crackdown on the independent press). The CPJ works around the many barriers to offer direct assistance to journalists, show support for them, and gather information on their conditions. It does this through at least four approaches: a) conducting carefully planned, low-profile missions; b) capturing the attention of the public and U.S. government on this issue; c) directly supporting the independent press movement in Cuba; and d) addressing U.S. policy toward Cuba.

Low-profile missions. Carefully-planned, low-profile missions to the country are designed to assist the journalists directly and gather information to spread to the international community. These missions can be extremely difficult and dangerous for both advocacy groups and Cuban journalists. The Cuban government frequently denies

entry to human rights groups, and expels them if they are found in the country. For instance, when a member of RSF arrived at Jose Marti International Airport in Havana, the Cuban government denied him entry into the country. In a previous trip, the RSF member was expelled because he was found smuggling funds to finance independent news reporting (CPJ, 1996). Meetings with advocacy groups can also pose as a threat to the press in Cuba. For example, the government arrested a journalist of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Journalists a day after meeting with Danielle Mitterrand, president of the French Human Rights group, France Liberté (CPJ, 1996).

The CPJ has experienced its own set of problems while conducting its missions. In July 1996, the Interior Ministry and immigration officials arrested the CPJ Americas' coordinator at the time, Suzanne Bilello, in her hotel, four days after her arrival. The Cuban government expelled her from the country after detaining her for eight hours and interrogating her. It also confiscated some basic supplies that Bilello had brought in for the journalists, such as pencils, paper, and money donated from private groups. Almost a month after this incident, the government arrested three journalists from *La Patria* who had met with the CPJ representative. The authorities interrogated these journalists for four days before releasing them (Bilello, 1996a).

Because of the dangers in traveling to Cuba, the CPJ was extremely pleased that renowned Peruvian journalist Gustavo Gorriti, who traveled to Cuba on behalf of the CPJ in July 2003, accomplished his mission without any difficulties (Lauría, 2003). During the mission, Gorriti met with the family members of several of the journalists who are detained to receive details of the journalists' health and prison conditions. While there, Gorriti delivered medicine to Arévalo Padrón, who was arrested in 1997 for

“disrespecting” Castro in a report to a radio station based in Miami (CPJ, 2003b). Gorriti was also able to give letters of support to some of the imprisoned journalists.

Drawing attention. Almost immediately after the completion of this mission, the CPJ issued an alert announcing its success and findings (CPJ, 2003b). Lauría (2003) expressed some disappointment in the timing of this release, because it did not go out in time to appear in the Sunday papers. Nevertheless, he still felt that the alert would get some coverage in the Latin American press. This alert is one of dozens that the CPJ has issued over the years to publicize the imprisonment of these journalist and other issues concerning press freedom in Cuba (see Appendix K).

Another way the CPJ tries to draw attention to the imprisoned journals is through its world wide web page devoted to the imprisoned journalists in Cuba. This site contains photos and information on these individuals, as well as information on Cuban press law. One of the more personal pieces on the site is a letter written by Moroccan journalist, Ali Lmrabet, to imprisoned Cuban journalist, Raul Rivero. Another link contains journal excerpts by writer and poet Manuel Vázquez Portal, which were smuggled out by Portal’s wife during one of her visits. In his diary, Portal describes the terrible conditions of the prison and his hopes for a better Cuba (CPJ, 2003j).

By drawing attention to the issue in these ways, the CPJ is showing the families of the imprisoned journalists that they have the support and concern of the international community. According to Lauría (2003), “this is very important to them...to keep the issue alive, to still campaign for them...and show them they are not forgotten.”

Supporting independent journalism. The CPJ believes that its efforts to draw attention to the imprisoned journalists have been effective in raising awareness of the

issue. Another essential part of the CPJ's campaign for the imprisonment journalists is to address the overall issue of press freedom in the country. Lauría (Federal News Service, 2003) stated, "Any chance of reforming Cuba will be due to the persistence and courage of independent journalists such as those who are now imprisoned." The CPJ believes that with access to information, Cuban citizens will be more capable of pressuring the government to change (Billelo, 1996).

Direct efforts to financially or technically support the independent press are often stifled by the Cuban government and pose a great danger to journalists, who may be seen as associating with antigovernment organizations (Witchel, 2003). Therefore, the CPJ does not support the journalists financially. However, the CPJ engages in many other activities to show its support for the independent press. One of the early examples of this was the CPJ's participation in the release of press freedom activist Yndamiro Restano from prison. Restano, who founded the first unofficial Cuban independent press association in 1987, was imprisoned in 1992 for trying to start a human rights organization. After the lobbying efforts of Danielle Mitterrand, wife of former French president, President Francois Mitterrand, he and about a dozen other prisoners were released three years later (Suarez, n.d.). The CPJ, along with other press freedom organizations, publicized and supported Mitterrand's efforts (CPJ, 1996). According to Billelo (1996) this event was the "catalyst" (para. 4) for the independent press movement in Cuba.

The CPJ also showed its support for the independent press movement with the International Press Freedom Award. In 1999, it awarded then imprisoned journalist, Jesús Joel Diaz Hernández, for being "one of a number of independent journalists in Cuba who

show great courage, tenacity and cunning in the inventive use of the Internet to circumvent censorship and confront President Fidel Castro's systematic campaign to suppress free expression” (CPJ, 1999f, para. 2). The journalist was not able to formally receive the reward at the award ceremony in 1999 because he remained in prison. At the award ceremony that year, the CPJ gathered 312 letters, which it delivered to the Cuban government in protest of the journalist’s detainment (CPJ, 2001c). When the journalist was released two years later, he was finally able to receive the award in person. The publicity that comes with the International Press Freedom Award helped raise awareness of the Cuban journalist’s struggle for press freedom. The CPJ will continue to highlight this issue as it campaigns on behalf of 29 imprisoned journalists.

Targeting U.S. policy. The CPJ’s efforts in Cuba are widely publicized throughout the news. However, the CPJ may have more success in promoting press freedom in Cuba by targeting U.S. policy. After the mission to Cuba, the International Relations Hearing invited Lauría to participate in a panel discussion on the Cuban crackdown on the journalists and other Cuban dissidents. Lauría described the circumstances in which they were arrested and detained, and urged the government to give more attention to this issue on behalf of the journalists (Federal News Service, 2003). He stated,

The CPJ believes that the timing of the arrests is not coincidental: the Cuban regime took clear advantage of the fact that the international attention has been focused on the war with Iraq and launched an unprecedented wave of repression to stamp out a growing dissent movement. (para. 168)

By discussing other issues related to the journalists’ arrests, the CPJ heightened the U.S. government’s awareness of Cuba and how U.S. policy can influence developments there.

The CPJ does not take an official position on the U.S. trade embargo; however, it has offered recommendations to revise these provisions as they apply to journalists (Smyth, 2003). The CPJ has believed that the United States is inadvertently supporting Castro in his campaign against journalists. Bilello (1996) wrote, “Essentially, independent journalism and its practitioners in Cuba are being held hostage to the political conflicts between the United States and Cuba” (para. 14). The CPJ at that time believed that some aspects of the U.S. government’s trade embargo on Cuba had restricted journalists’ work in Cuba because it made it difficult for both U.S. and Cuban journalists to travel between the two countries and prohibited Cuban news bureaus from establishing themselves in the United States. This policy, the CPJ argued, had alienated independent journalists from exposure to democratic journalistic practices.

In 1994, the CPJ worked with other press freedom organizations in a two-year campaign that saw the Clinton Administration withdraw some of the embargo’s restrictions on journalism in Cuba by signing the “Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996” in October 1995. This bill permitted Cuban news bureaus to operate in the United States. However, to the dissatisfaction of press freedom groups, this was conditioned upon the Cuban’s agreement to allow the U.S. government to establish a Radio and TV Martí office in Cuba, among other provisions (Bilello, 1996a).

At the Congressional Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights at the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere on June 27, 1996, Bilello voiced her disapproval of the policy. However, she encouraged the United States government to continue working toward establishing U.S. news bureaus in Cuba. Citing the viewpoints of five different Cuban news agencies she had met with in Cuba, Bilello (1996) suggested

that establishing a U.S. news bureau in Cuba would bring about a “radical improvement” (para. 33) for independent journalism in Cuba if the U.S. government would allow these bureaus to employ Cuban citizens. She stated, “the creation of job opportunities for stringers, reporters, editors, cameramen, and other newsroom positions would give Cuba's independent journalists much-needed training in how to operate as effective and objective professionals” (para. 33). Bilello also presented these suggestions to the U.N. Human Rights Commission on August 1996. In February 1997, Clinton gave permission to 10 U.S. news gathering organizations to establish news bureaus in Cuba (Associated Press News Service, 1997). Whether or not this results in an improvement in press freedom in the region has yet to be seen.

Conclusions

The CPJ's efforts in Mexico and Cuba showed that the organization can help raise issues, influence discourse, and in some specific instances, change state behavior. This was dependant upon the CPJ's involvement with other groups, its own organization and activities, and the target actors. The CPJ's efforts would not have achieved any of Keck and Sikkink's (1998) levels of influence without the participation of other press freedom networks. The CPJ needed these groups to spread and gather information. However, the CPJ's reputation as a reliable and credible actor in press freedom also made it possible for it to be in a position to influence U.S. policy and secure the release of Arvide.

The CPJ's efforts also provide a clear example of how the CPJ's work is dependent upon the country toward which it is directing its protests. The Mexican government permitted Arvide to talk with her son and with the CPJ while she was in prison; the journalists imprisoned in Cuba, however, are restricted from making contact

with their families. In Mexico, the CPJ was able to speak with the Mexican government on behalf of the journalist, which resulted in Arvide's conditional release. In Cuba, however, the CPJ could not make its presence known there without being forced to leave.

Despite the barriers the CPJ faces in regards to Cuba, it continues to do what it can to make changes. The U.S. government's interest in Cuba has provided incentive for the United States to approach groups like the CPJ for recommendations and testimony.

The CPJ's activities and the combination of conditions that ensure their effectiveness might eventually lead to long-term improvements for the journalists in Cuba. The Cuban government's strict control of information demonstrates that information poses as a threat to the regime. Lauría (2003) commented that he suspected the Cuban government would be upset by finding out that the CPJ was able to gather information on the condition of the imprisoned journalists. If the CPJ can continue to support independent journalists by investigating and publicizing their condition, while at the same time advising U.S. policy toward this issue, it might contribute to bringing internal and external pressure against the Cuban government. Despite the limited leverage the CPJ had in approaching Cuba, Lauría stated that he will continue to work on behalf of the Cuban journalists so that the international community "will not forget about it and to remind the Cuban government every day [that we] won't cease in our effort until the last journalist is liberated and is released from jail" (Lauría, 2003).

CHAPTER 8

VIOLENCE ON JOURNALISTS

The CPJ gives highest priority to violent attacks on the press. The countries with the greatest number of journalists killed between 2000 and 2003 for reasons related to their work were Colombia, with 13 cases; Guatemala, with 3 cases; Haiti, with 2 cases; and Mexico with 1. The number of cases where a journalist was killed for reasons unconfirmed to be related to his or her work were Colombia, with 16 cases; and Mexico, with 2 unconfirmed cases (CPJ, 2000d, 2001i; 2002d; 2003o; see Appendix G). Of the confirmed cases for killings related to a journalist's work, 17 individuals worked with radio, 5 worked with print, and 3 were television journalists. Of the unconfirmed cases, 13 individuals were radio journalists and 7 worked in print (see Appendix H). The CPJ also documented 342 incidents where a journalist or organization was physically attacked. One-hundred and five occurred in Colombia (see Appendix G). Of these journalists or organizations attacked, 121 were print, 110 were TV, and 48 were radio (see Appendix H). Most of these kinds of attacks did not occur in incidental situations, such as cross-fire or during a public protest. Rather, most were intentional and designed to stop a journalist from reporting (CPJ, 2003n). In an effort to prevent attacks and seek justice for journalists who have been attacked, the CPJ engages heavily in information, symbolic, and accountability politics. This chapter answers Questions 3 and 4 of the research project by discussing the effectiveness of the CPJ in its efforts on physical attacks on the press.

The Broad Campaign

The CPJ's campaign against abuses on the press is directed towards journalists, governments, and the public at large. On the large scale, the organization publishes numerous alerts and protest letters, books, and magazines to inform these groups about attacks when they occur and efforts to seek justice for these attacks. Between 2000 and 2003, the CPJ issued 57 alerts concerning physical attacks on journalists, and 16 protest letters. The organization issued 33 alerts and 6 protest letters on cases where a journalist was killed or murdered (see Appendices I-M). Many of these alerts mentioned more than one case at time while others mentioned one single case.

The CPJ's efforts to document incidents of attacks provide news groups with information to report to the public, which in turn, help place issue of attacks on the press on the agenda. The organization's publications and reports between 2000 and 2003, especially its annual statistics on journalists killed through each year, were widely publicized in the press and other reports (see, for example, Associated Press, 2002; Park 2002; Lee, 2003). References to the CPJ placed it in a position where it could influence discourse on the overall issue of physical attacks on the press.

The CPJ also engages in many other activities that raise awareness and influence discourse on physical attacks on the press, such as sponsoring and attending regional conferences. In addition, the organization engages in information, symbolic, and accountability politics in specific countries. The CPJ's activities in each country vary depending upon the nature and frequency of the attacks, as well as the country. Many of the countries where attacks occurred most frequently are plagued with guerrilla warfare, paramilitaries, political unrest, and organized crime (C. Lauría, personal communication,

July 2003). In these circumstances, it is very difficult to investigate attacks against journalists, or to even protect journalists from these situations (Sauro, 2003). According to the CPJ's Americas program coordinator, Carlos Lauría (2003), "It's sometimes frustrating...there's a war going on there." In other countries where attacks occur, journalists face governments unresponsive to murders of journalists. Although it can be difficult to protect journalists in areas where there is civil unrest or even a lack of political will to improve the situation, the CPJ believes that it can still be effective in these circumstances by bringing local protests to the international level, educating and supporting journalism groups, and meeting with governments (J. Simon, personal communication, July 8, 2003).

Argentina

One of the ways the CPJ protests attacks on the press are through publicizing local protests through alerts and protest letters. This sometimes has helped launch large international campaigns against specific countries to investigate a violent attack on a journalist. The CPJ frequently cites its participation in the campaign regarding the murder of Luis Cabezas to be one of the most effective campaigns in helping bring attention to a violent crime, mobilizing the international press, and then pressuring governments to do something about it (Lauría, 2003; Simon, 1997).

On January 25, 1997, Cabezas, one of *Noticias'* best photojournalists, was kidnapped, shot in the head, and then burned in a car near an exclusive Argentine resort in Pinamar. Lauría (2003) called this "the most cruel murder since the restoration of democracy in Argentina in 1983." Cabezas was the only photographer who had taken pictures of one of Argentina's most mysterious and powerful businessmen, Alfredo

Yabrán. Prior to the murder, *Noticias* had obtained evidence that he was head of the Argentine mafia, and after the murder, suspected that Yabrán was the mastermind behind Cabezas's murder (Lauría, 2003).

Within hours of finding his body, *Periodistas* issued a news alert condemning the killing, demanded the government to not allow impunity to prevail (as it often did), and to investigate the case immediately (Simon, 1998). However, Argentine President Carlos Menem insisted that it was only a common crime, not a political murder; therefore the government was not responsible for investigating it. Menem seemed motivated to not investigate the murder to better his chances in the 1999 elections against another prominent Peronist Leader, Eduardo Duhalde, governor of the Buenos Aires province. Duhalde was spending his summer in a resort near Cabezas's murder site and Menem believed that he could benefit from leaving the case unresolved to make it appear as if Duhalde had arranged for the crime (Lauría, 2003). According to Lauría (2003), Menem had the power to "manipulate justice," and so succeeded in stalling the investigation of the murder. Duhalde, on the other hand, suspected that the journalists' murder was a plot to ruin his chances of becoming presidential candidate, and therefore persisted in investigating the case (Lauría, 2003). In protest to Menem's lack of response, thousands of people, including journalists and ordinary citizens, took to the streets demanding justice. Joel Simon (1998), the CPJ's previous Americas program coordinator and current deputy director wrote,

Posters of Cabezas, with the slogan 'We will not forget!' began to appear all over the city. There were low-speed caravans from Buenos Aires to the site of the murder in Pinamar; eerie moments of silence before soccer matches; and massive

coverage of the murder in the newspapers, on the afternoon radio talk shows, and on the nightly news.

To the Argentine people and for journalists all around Latin America, Cabeza's murder became a symbol of Latin America's struggle for freedom and for democracy (CPJ, 2001n).

The CPJ and other organizations like it publicized these protests, issued protest letters of its own, and reported every development in the case. Lauría (2003) said that "it was first international organizations . . . that made the government realize that this was so big that they wouldn't be able to distract attention and say 'no this is a common crime.'" The international community's involvement, he said, was extremely important to the local journalists because it showed that there was support for their efforts. International protests were so strong that when Clinton visited Argentina in 1997, he expressed his concerns to Menem both publicly and privately. When Clinton returned from Latin America, his staff aids consulted Simon about what could be done to ensure more protection for journalists (Simon, 1998). The CPJ said that discussions like these encouraged Clinton to promote the idea of creating the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression (Simon, 2003).

Eventually, the government found and captured those who carried out the murders and sentenced them to life in prison. However, to the international community and Argentina, this was not enough; they wanted those responsible for the crime, "the masterminds," (Lauría, 2003) to be punished. The government soon went after Yabrán himself, who did indeed turn out to be guilty of committing the crime. After going into

hiding for a couple of days, the police caught up with him, at which point, he committed suicide.

Costa Rica and Venezuela

The CPJ continues to report and bring to the attention of the international community attacks on the press, no matter where they occur. For example, the CPJ issued a protest letter and report on the murder of Parmenio Medino. Medino was a popular radio journalist for a nonprofit organization devoted to press freedom in Latin America, who was shot in July 2001--on the night he was to receive a press freedom award from the organization. As of December 2003, the government refused to release the names of the suspects of the murder, and so the CPJ continues to support local protest to pressure the government into taking a more active role in investigating the case and making these investigations public (Carboni, 2002).

In Venezuela, the CPJ conducted a fact-finding mission to investigate and report attacks on the press that occurred leading up to and after the April 2002 coup (González, 2003). The CPJ's findings shed light on the plight of journalists in this country, which work in an intensely polarized situation. Many journalists are caught between their organizations for which they work and the public to which they are reporting as they try to cover news (González, 2002). Some community media stations have complained that the CPJ has failed to recognize their, which have generally supported Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez, and instead focused only on attacks against larger media corporations in Venezuela that have taken a major role in opposing Chávez. In an open letter to the CPJ, Narco News (2002) wrote,

Your organization, in its behavior regarding Venezuela and its abandonment of persecuted journalists who don't agree with your inaccurate and interested assessment of what has occurred there, has done great harm to the very principles you are organized to defend. (para. 39)

Many other organizations wrote to the CPJ and asked the organization to take consideration for the community media stations, which were ignored and continue to be ignored by many news and press freedom organizations. However, the CPJ has addressed these issues in a special report on its special mission to Venezuela, to the general approval of Narco News. In a letter sent to its network, Narco News stated that although it claims the report has some inaccuracies, the “new CPJ statement marks an encouraging shift in direction and the beginning of the correction of its grievous errors and misstatements of facts that sadly characterized its reports on Venezuela over the past four years” (Giodano, 2002, para. 10). The CPJ, according to Narco News, was the only organization that took this positive approach (Giodano, 2002). This demonstrates that the CPJ is interested in helping all journalists, regardless of their political leanings and viewpoints, as long as the journalists remain independent of the government.

Campaigns at the Local Level

The CPJ helped the local journalists in Argentina draw attention to their protests and helped show the government that there was international support by publicizing alerts and protest letters on the issue. This eventually resulted in a change in institutional procedures at the international level by instituting the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression. The CPJ continues to work in these ways on behalf of Medino's murder, as well as for the journalists in Venezuela on both sides of the political conflict. The CPJ

helps local journalists in other ways as well. One is by educating them, meeting with the public, and counseling governments directly. These efforts not only raise the issues of physical attacks on journalists, they also help see real change in discourse concerning the protection of journalists in Latin America.

The CPJ's conferences with journalists deal with a variety of issues including where to attain protective gear, secure insurance, and how to administrate first aid. The CPJ does not hold training sessions for journalists covering dangerous places, but it does provide information on where a journalist can acquire instruction on these and other issues. This has been a more proactive approach that has been developing over the years (Smyth 2003). When the CPJ meets with journalists, it also discusses how journalists can organize and more easily gather information and inform the international community of attacks on the press in their country. The CPJ does not devote a full campaign to promoting the creation of local press freedom organizations; however, Lauría (2003) said that whenever a group of journalists comes to the CPJ and expresses a willingness to organize, it will encourage them to do so. In Colombia in 1995, for example, the CPJ and Gabriel García Márquez co-hosted a meeting with a group of journalists to create the local organization, "Foundation for a Free Press" (Arana, 1995). In February 1996, under the direction of Ignacio Gómez, this group finally raised enough money to start its operation. It now does this out of a small office with one full-time staff member (Simon, 1998). In Mexico, the CPJ sponsored a workshop that resulted in the creation of "Society of Journalists" in 1998. This group consists of an eight-person commission devoted to investigating attacks on the press in Mexico (Simon, 1998).

In addition to creating workshops designed to organize press groups, the CPJ has also sponsored or participated in conferences that addressed a wide variety of issues that affect the safety of journalists in various countries. In January 1998, for example, Simon attended a conference in New Orleans on the Mexican press, sponsored by a Chilean University (CPJ, 1998b). In April of that year, Simon spoke at the Summit of Americas on the role of the government in protecting press freedom (CPJ, 1998b). The CPJ was also invited to give lectures at universities. For example, in 1997, Suzanne Bilello was invited by two universities in Colombia to speak about human rights and the press (CPJ, 1997a). On another occasion, in November 1998, Simon gave a speech entitled, “Surviving the Dangers of Investigative Reporting” at Harvard University. Gustavo Gorritti and Iqbal Athas, two International Press Freedom Award recipients, spoke as well (CPJ, 1998b).

These conferences and lectures raised issues, mobilized support, and sometimes provided governments with the opportunity to publicly express their commitment to protect journalists against violence. For example one of the participants at IAPA’s conference in Guatemala City, entitled, “Unpunished Crimes against Journalists,” was President Alvaro Arzú Irigoyen, a long-time opponent of press freedom. However, during the conference, Arzú promised that his government would pursue investigations into two unsolved murder cases against journalists (CPJ, 1997a).

More recently, the CPJ has engaged in many other activities to promote the protection of journalists. In August 2003, the CPJ sponsored a mission to Haiti at which time it met with Haitian Prime Minister, Yvon Neptune; the Haitian Minister of Justice and Public Security, Calixte Delatour; and Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to

express its concerns about the escalating attacks on journalists in the country (CPJ, 2003c). The CPJ originally planned to conduct this mission on the anniversary of the murder of Haitian radio journalist, Jean Paul Dominique, but had to postpone the mission because of a conflict in schedule with Dominique's wife, Michèle Montas Dominique, who had been proactive in working with the government in seeking justice for her husband's murder (Lauría, 2003). When the CPJ carried out the mission, it received commitments from all of the government officials it met with to seek justice for the murder of this journalist (CPJ, 2003c). After its meetings, the CPJ issued a letter to remind the government of these statements (CPJ, 2003c).

Colombia

The CPJ's meetings with governments helped raise the issue, place issues on the agenda, and carry out real change in discourse, policy, and state behavior. Nowhere was this more evident than in Colombia, which over the years, has received advice from press freedom organizations like the CPJ on how to offer more protection for its journalists (Simon, 2003; Smyth, 2003). In response to a letter by the CPJ issued in March 2000 on the escalating attacks on journalists, the Colombian government said that it would "strengthen the actions it [had] taken in defense of freedom of expression" (quoted in, CPJ 2001j, para. 9). A few months later, in August 2000, Colombia instituted the Interior Ministry's Program for the Protection of Journalists and Social Communicators, which has provided bodyguards for several journalists, and has helped some relocate from a dangerous area.

According Frank Smyth, who speaks frequently with Colombian government representatives in Washington, D.C., Colombia takes international protests and attention seriously. He said, Colombia gets

upset about [negative publicity...]They get concerned, they definitely get concerned because this can affect their economic relations, their political relations, their economic relations, and how the country is perceived. They're concerned about their image.

Because the government officials are so concerned about the country's image, Colombian officials go through great lengths to "charm" (Smyth, 2003) international press freedom organizations. Although Colombia does not always respond explicitly to international protests, international attention does change its discourse, policy, and behavior. As Smyth (2003) said, international protests raise

the political costs of governments[international pressure] changes their rhetoric almost immediately because they don't want to be labeled as abusers of journalists. But also I think to some degree it changes the behavior, it influences their behavior.

Direct Intervention

The CPJ sometimes is able to directly help journalists whose lives are in danger. Several organizations have donated funds to the CPJ specifically for this purpose (Witchel, 2003). The transnational advocacy group has used the resources to help journalists go into hiding, leave a country, or receive medical attention. Witchel, the coordinator for the direct assistance program, worked with all five regions of the world in these endeavors; however, she believed she devotes about half of her time to Latin

America and Africa combined. Over the past 4 years, the CPJ assisted, or was in the process of assisting, 33 journalists in Latin America, most of which are from Colombia, Haiti, and Guatemala (CPJ, 2003k; Witchel, 2003). Many of these journalists received direct threats on their lives, but were able to avoid danger through the CPJ's help (Witchel, 2003). This is an extremely limited resource and the CPJ can not help every journalist in this way; nor is direct intervention always necessary. However, when it can, the CPJ tries to help these journalists with assistance.

Conclusions

The CPJ's efforts in Argentina, Costa Rica, Haiti, Mexico, Guatemala, and Colombia have contributed toward some improvements in discourse and policy concerning the safety of journalists. In Argentina, the CPJ was able to help capture enough international attention that Clinton felt compelled to express his concern to Menem. This resulted in a change in state behavior regarding Cabezas' murder. It also led to a change in institutional procedures with the creation of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression. In Guatemala, Mexico, Colombia and other countries, the CPJ helped educate journalists and also organize local press freedom groups. This support not only expanded and strengthened the press freedom network, but it may have helped prevent attacks on the press as journalists took more measures to protect themselves.

The CPJ's influence depended on various conditions, such as the issue, the target governments, the activity of local press freedom organizations. The CPJ was effective on the issue on how to prevent physical attacks on the press; however, has had a more difficult time seeing governments investigate attacks on journalists. This can be a result of the target governments and their attitudes towards these issues. Colombia, Haiti,

Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico were all interested in their international image, and agreed that more needed to be done to prevent attacks, which made these countries open to suggestions from international organizations. Still they were not quick to investigate attacks on the press. These governments faced many political internal struggles which have made it difficult for politicians to fulfill commitments to improve press freedom.

Another condition that influenced the work of the CPJ was a strong domestic base of journalists interested in defending themselves and seeking justice. The case of Argentina showed that an active domestic base of journalists could help overcome government and political barriers. The CPJ and other international press freedom organizations were the link local journalists in Argentina had to the rest of the global community. Groups in Argentina and throughout Latin America continue to maintain contact and help these domestic groups. As Simon (2003) and Smyth (2003) expressed, the CPJ's work will not end the wars in Colombia or Guatemala; nor will it end corruption and political unrest in Argentina and Haiti. However, it can raise the political costs of governments and show states that they are being watched. This was the case in each of the countries addressed in this chapter.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

This study helps fill a significant gap in the research on transnational advocacy and its influence, and provides a foundation upon which to further explore its roles in the international community. Transnational advocacy networks like the CPJ explain many of the reasons why press freedom issues have been brought to the attention of the public, governments, journalists, and many other audiences. Their activities also help us understand why these issues are placed on national agendas, and why governments change their discourse, policy, institutional procedures, and state behavior on attacks on the press. This phenomenon is particularly interesting, considering that many transnational advocacy groups are small, nongovernmental, and nonprofit actors in the international sphere. Equally remarkable is how press freedom groups are able to use their ability to spread and distribute information, and how these activities have real and significant influence.

This study provided detailed case studies to explore factors that influence the effectiveness of international press freedom groups through the perspective of the CPJ. It investigated the motivations, goals, and organizational structure of the advocacy group, how the CPJ goes about its activities, the issues it focuses on, factors that influence its case selection and strategy, how the organization and its activities are effective, and conditions that influence its effectiveness. Qualitative interviews with the CPJ's employees who work with the Americas and with journalists who have been helped by the CPJ, historical archive research, and informal participation observation provided

abundant information with which answer the project's questions. This chapter outlines and answers each of these questions and sub-questions.

How Does the CPJ Try to Improve the Safety of Journalists and Press Freedom?

Why was the CPJ created? It is important to review the origins of the CPJ in order to understand its goals, activities, and organization. The CPJ was created "in response to the often brutal treatment of [journalists around the world by] authoritarian governments and other enemies of independent journalism" (CPJ, 2003, para. 2). The inspiration for its creation came from the 1980 arrest and imprisonment of Paraguayan journalist, Alcibíabes González, who was arrested by the Paraguayan government for criticizing the imprisonment of another individual. Unable to find an organization prepared to help González, Michael Massing and Laurie Nadel, two of the CPJ's founding members, made contact with various organizations, including journalists in Paraguay, to inform them of his imprisonment (Massing, 2001). Within days of the arrest, González's situation made international news (J. Simon, personal communication, July 8, 2003). After the journalist was released, Massing and Nadel approached Walter Cronkite about creating an organization that might be able to help other journalists. Cronkite agreed, and the organization immediately began building contacts with journalists in the United States and around the world (Massing, 2001).

What are the CPJ's overall goals? This study identified four main goals that have defined the CPJ's work since its beginning: to build the prestige and power of journalists by a) strengthening the press freedom network; b) drawing attention to abuses on the press; c) supporting local press groups; and d) maintaining the CPJ's authority on press freedom issues. These interdependent goals can subvert motivations to attack the press,

improve journalists' ability to report and protest attacks on the press, and place the CPJ in a position where it can help journalists around the world (Simon, 2003).

What is the CPJ's organization and relationship with intergovernmental actors, governments, local groups, and other press freedom organizations? When the CPJ first started, it tried to accomplish these goals with only three individuals and the support of a few other prominent journalists and organizations. These individuals worked laboriously to build contacts with other journalists and organizations (Massing, 2001). More than 20 years later, the CPJ has grown into an organization that works with 22 fulltime employees and with the support of over 30 prominent organizations and individuals (CPJ, 2003f).

The CPJ has also built a strong network of contacts with press freedom, human rights, and journalistic groups throughout the world. At the international level, the CPJ works with many organizations including Human Rights Watch, the IAPA, RSF, and IPI. In Latin America, the CPJ works most frequently with IPYS, a Peruvian organization; FLIP, a Colombian organization; Periodistas, from Argentina; and Sociedad de Periodistas, from Mexico (C. Lauría, personal communication, July 2003). It receives information from many of these groups and others through the International Freedom and Exchange Network (IFEX), an online resource that receives and distributes information from over 60 organizations worldwide (Simon, 2003). The CPJ is strictly a nongovernmental organization, so it does not participate in government activities; however, it has contacts within governments throughout the world, with whom it talks to discuss concerns and gather information (González, 2003; Lauría, 2003).

Does the CPJ engage in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics, and if so, how? Working within the organization and network of contacts the CPJ has developed, the advocacy group engages in all of the strategies typical of transnational advocacy. All of these activities can form an overall campaign, which are designed to achieve the CPJ's goals. All of the CPJ's campaigns involve information politics. By gathering and distributing information, the organization hopes to raise issues, place issues on the agenda, and influence discourse. Before informing the international community of a case, the CPJ must confirm that the individual attacked was a journalist, and that the individual was attacked for his or her work as a journalist (Lauría, 2003). The CPJ strictly applies this measure. The CPJ also makes every effort to gather credible information on each case, including speaking with the journalist or speaking with the journalist's family or colleagues (González, 2003; Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003).

The CPJ also engages in symbolic politics as it carries out its activities. Many of its missions and campaigns are planned around anniversaries significant to press freedom and many of its photos carry symbolic images for press freedom. Accountability politics is frequently used by the CPJ as it carries out information politics and as it reminds governments of their commitments and obligations. When all of these other activities fail, the CPJ will engage in leverage politics. When the CPJ engages in leverage politics, it directs its efforts towards more powerful actors to encourage them to intervene on behalf of journalists (Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003).

What other strategies besides information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics does the CPJ use in its campaign activities? In addition to engaging in information, symbolic, accountability, and leverage politics, the CPJ will take more direct measures toward helping a journalist by providing legal assistance, protection, or medicine (Lauría, 2003; Witchel, 2003). The CPJ does not consider these activities to be a large part of its advocacy work, as it is not able to help all journalists in this way. It reserves this activity for journalists whose lives are in immediate danger. However, for 27 journalists in Latin America, the CPJ's assistance between 2001 and 2003 has offered them more protection and safety. The CPJ has also assisted many other journalists by giving them information, helping them fill out paperwork for asylum, or giving them advice (Witchel, 2003).

What Press Freedom Issues Does the CPJ Address?

What issues does the CPJ focus on? The CPJ focuses on all issues that affect the legal and physical safety of journalists (Lauría, 2003; Simon, 2003). These include criminal defamation cases, access to information laws, colegio laws, harassment, physical attacks, and murders. Between 2000 and 2003, the CPJ documented 53 criminal defamation cases, 22 other legal attacks, 45 imprisonments, 342 physical attacks, 27 murders confirmed to be related to an individual's work as a journalist, and 22 cases unconfirmed to be related to the journalist's work (see Appendix G).

Among its many activities, the CPJ offered or was currently in the process of offering direct assistance to 27 journalists, most of who were in extremely dangerous situations between August 2001 and July 2003 (CPJ, 2003k; Witchel, 2003). In addition,

the organization has issued 165 alerts and 35 protest letters that concern these issues (see Appendices I - M).

The CPJ says that it gives the highest priority to killings and the immediate safety of journalists. The CPJ tried to draw attention through alerts or protest letters to almost all of the murders that occurred in Latin America, whether they were confirmed to be related to a journalists' work or not, and to at least one of the imprisonments that occurred in various countries where imprisonments occurred that year. The CPJ also tried to draw attention to non-criminal defamation legal issues that occurred in nine out of the twelve countries where this was a problem and also to criminal defamation issues that occurred in eight of the ten countries where criminal defamation was a problem.

This thesis focuses on the CPJ's work on individual and overall issues of criminal in Panama, Argentina, Chile, and Costa Rica; imprisonments in Mexico and Cuba; and physical violence on and murders of journalists in Argentina, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Colombia, Mexico, Honduras, and Haiti. These are some of the most problematic press freedom issues in each of these countries and the CPJ has devoted an intense campaign in each of these areas. However, as Appendix N illustrates, these issues or the countries where they occur are not the only issues or places to which the CPJ has devoted its attention.

What factors influence the CPJ's selection of cases and strategies? The CPJ says that its focus and activities are not dependent upon the kind of journalist attacked, where he or she is from, or his or her political views (Lauría, 2003). The CPJ will address the needs of journalists as it can and when issues and situations arise. However, the CPJ must prioritize which cases it will focus and how it will approach those issues because of its

limited staff and resources (González; Lauría, 2003). As demonstrated above, the organization usually gives precedence to issues that affect the immediate, physical safety of journalists (Simon, 2003). The CPJ conducts special missions, meets with the governments, and features in its reports Colombia, Guatemala, and Haiti, because attacks on journalists are more common in these areas than in other places in Latin America. In addition, the CPJ focuses on the 29 Cuban journalists who were imprisoned in spring 2003. It also focuses on cases that can draw attention to and represent the press freedom struggle in Latin America (Lauría, 2003). For example, the CPJ issued alerts on the murder of Cabezas and other journalists who have been killed in countries where there were relatively few murders, not only because of the severity of these cases, but also because they represent how journalists lives are often endangered because of their work.

The CPJ will also focus on issues or cases that can set international precedence in the region. For example, Carlos Lauría (2003), the Americas program coordinator, stated that the CPJ will try to capture a lot of international attention on Bernal's case and help him present his case before the Inter American Court because the decision of the court can set precedence in the region. It has already started to do this by issuing three alerts on just Herrera Ulloa's case (see for example, CPJ, 2003a). The other cases addressed in this study that revolved around a single journalist are also significant for press freedom. Matus and Verbitsky's cases were both brought to the attention of the OAS and helped create international precedent at the IACHR.

Another decisive factor in the CPJ's strategy and selection of cases is whether or not the case had the support of local press groups. The CPJ may not have been able to issue an alert or protest letter for attacks that occurred in various countries because there

was no information available. The organization may not have engaged in an extensive campaign in a country where criminal defamation was an issue because the local press freedom group was not taking initiative. Protests on all the criminal defamation cases initiated within local community of journalists. Criminal defamation cases exist all throughout Latin America; however, most of the criminal defamation cases that the CPJ focused on and documented between on between 2000 and 2003 occurred in countries where there was a strong and organized domestic group of journalists. In many of these countries where criminal defamation was an issue, the CPJ was able to speak directly with the governments in special missions because of the connections the local groups had already made with the government. The CPJ's mission to Haiti on violence in that country was also able to take place because Dominique, the wife of Jean Dominique, who had been murdered for his radio journalism, had already done extensive work on trying to protect journalists in Haiti (Lauría, 2003).

The nature of the CPJ's campaigns and activities were also influenced by the characteristics of the target country and the attitudes of the target country on the issue. The CPJ and other press freedom groups had to capture attention on Cabeza's murder because the government was not taking measures to seek justice. Cuba is completely unresponsive to international human rights groups and even takes measures to prevent them from carrying out their activities, so the CPJ had to modify its activities by conducting carefully-planned, low-profile missions to Cuba to get around these barriers (Smyth, 2003). The organization also had to address U.S. policy on its relations with Cuba (Bilello, 1997). Haiti, Colombia, and Guatemala all appeared to be interested in the safety of journalists in the countries and were also concerned about their international

image; therefore, these countries were more receptive to the CPJ's suggestions and efforts to improve the safety of journalists (Smyth, 2003). On the issue of criminal defamation in Panama and Argentina, and to some extent in Chile, the governments all at one point became interested in conforming to international standards, at which point they agreed to speak with the CPJ.

A final factor that influenced the CPJ's activities was the prestige of its organization. The organization is backed by the support of several reputable journalists and organizations. In addition, the CPJ has established itself as a reliable and credible authority on press freedom issues. These characteristics have made it possible for the CPJ to meet with government representatives, build connections within the OAS, and gain support in its activities from other human rights groups and organizations (Arvide, 2003; Bernal, 2003; Herrera, 2003; Lauría, 2003; Smyth, 2003).

Can and How did the CPJ's Activities make Improvements on Press Freedom Issues?

How was the CPJ Effective in Defending Press Freedom Issues According to Keck and Sikkink's (1998) Model of Influence?

Levels of effectiveness. The CPJ's activities contributed toward an improvement in press freedom issues at various levels and with different audiences for all of the case studies and issues addressed in this study (see Appendix O). The cases and issues that achieved the highest level of influence (change in state behavior) with the national government of the norm violating state were individual cases of criminal defamation in Panama, Argentina, and Chile, the imprisonment of Arvide in Mexico, and the lack of immunity in Cabezas' murder in Argentina. In all of these individual cases, the outcome of international protests was an immediate, though somewhat restricted, change in state

behavior. Chile, in regards to its broad criminal defamation issue, made small, yet significant changes in state policy. Colombia did the same in regards to overall violence in Colombia.

Pressure from the CPJ and other groups also helped result in a change in discourse at the state governmental level on the overall criminal defamation issue in Panama, Argentina, the broad issue of violence in Haiti, Guatemala, and Honduras, and seeking justice for Dominique's murder in Haiti. The countries and cases where international pressure was least influential was Costa Rica on seeking justice for an individual murder and Cuba on the imprisonment cases.

The CPJ also contributed to changes with intergovernmental organizations and governments other than the norm violating state. For example, the OAS issued a formal statement on its position of criminal defamation issues in Argentina in response to charges against Verbitsky and Matus. It also used its power to suspend defamation charges against Herrera Ulloa in Costa Rica. In addition, the OAS changed its institutional procedures by creating the position of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom after the murder of Cabezas in Argentina. This case also followed with a change in discourse on violence in Latin America with the United States and other Western governments. Finally, the CPJ has contributed toward discourse in the United States on the imprisonment of the Cuban journalists.

Ranking of issues and countries. Based on this information, this case study ranks individual criminal defamation issues as receiving the highest overall level of influence with national governments, but violent attacks on journalists as receiving the highest levels of influence internationally. The CPJ helped achieve the same level of

effectiveness with national governments in regards to broad criminal defamation issues as it has with physical violence on the press.

The countries that were most responsive to intense international pressure in regards to individual criminal defamation cases were Panama, Argentina, and Chile. Among these three, Panama is considered the most responsive because changes were made without the direct intervention of the OAS. Although Argentina and Chile eventually reached a higher level of influence by reforming their state policies, the catalyst for this change was the intervention of the OAS. The country that was most responsive to the CPJ on imprisonment cases between Mexico and Cuba was Mexico. Finally, the countries that were most responsive to violence against the press was Colombia since the interviews suggested that Colombia has made the most reform and is concerned about its international reputation. Colombia is followed by Honduras, Guatemala, and Argentina. Venezuela, Costa Rica, and Cuba were the least responsive to international pressure.

Why was the CPJ Effective in Certain Areas and Not in Others? How did Conditioning or Constraining Variables Influence the CPJ's Level of Effectiveness?

The CPJ gives priority to seeking justice for the murder of journalists and physical violence against the press, and even appears to devote most of its energy to this topic. However, among the cases observed in this study, the CPJ had almost equal success at the national governmental level in raising issues, placing issues on the agenda, influencing discourse, and influencing institutional and policy behavior with Arvide's imprisonment in Mexico, and broad criminal defamation issues as it has with broad physical violence issues. This is not the case with individual cases within each of these

categories, which achieved a higher level of influence at the national governmental level. It would even appear that the CPJ has less success in individual cases of violence than it had with criminal defamation at the national governmental level. At the international level, however, the CPJ seemed to be more effective in raising broad physical violence issues. Several conditional variables may have accounted for these variances.

How did the CPJ's activities influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness? One conditional variable that explains the variance is the intensity of the CPJ's campaigns. According to all of the journalists interviewed, the CPJ's activities were critical in the successful outcome of their cases. Indeed, all of the CPJ's activities are intended to help raise issues, influence discourse, change policy, and influence state behavior. However, some required more energy than others. Depending on the issue, the situation, and the country, the CPJ had a hierarchy of responses that ranged from simply publishing an attack in a book, issuing a protest letter, meeting with the government, or requesting the intervention of the OAS (Simon, 2003).

At the international level, the CPJ seemed to have devoted more attention to issues on the broad issue of violence than criminal defamation by issuing special reports and attending more conferences on the issue. This may help explain why the broad issue of violence received so much attention internationally. However, at the local levels, the CPJ seemed to have devoted just as much attention to criminal defamation issues in countries where this was a problem as it had to violence in countries where this was a problem. The outcome of campaigns on broad physical violence and criminal defamation issues where the CPJ had visited with government officials were about that same in most cases at the local level. They all saw a change in discourse and almost saw a change in

policy. However, this study only identified campaigns on individual criminal defamation cases as being the most effective at the local level. This may be because the individual cases of criminal defamation were taken to the OAS for review, while this study did not find a single individual act of violence taken to the OAS.

How did the CPJ's organization influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness? One reason the CPJ was able to raise issues, place issues on the agenda, and influence discourse with governments and the international community, as well as influence state behavior in some situations is because of its international reputation, credibility, prestige, and connections (Arvide, 2003; Bernal, 2003; Herrera; 2003; Lauría, 2003; Smyth, 2003). In addition, it was able to unite parts of the international community concerned with press freedom. Furthermore, the CPJ is part of a network of journalists who have the ability to gather and distribute information in a fast and efficient way.

How did the CPJ's involvement with other advocacy groups, local NGOs, governments, and international governments influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness? Another explanation for the variation in effectiveness was the CPJ's involvement of international organizations and local groups. The CPJ's connection with journalists, human rights organizations, governments, and press freedom organizations makes it possible for the CPJ, with 22 fulltime individuals, to spread and magnify its message all over the world and gain the support of many other groups to put pressure on states from both inside of the country and outside the country.

The CPJ continues to encourage journalists to unite, for their own protection, and to better gather and distribute information. In Costa Rica, where there is an active domestic base, the CPJ has not yet seen a change in the investigation of Medino's murder.

However, the CPJ's deputy director, Joel Simon (1998), partially attributed the successful investigation and prosecution of Cabezas's assailants to a unified group of Argentine journalists, who were able to inform the international community and Argentine citizens of the crime. Since the mid-1990s, journalists have started to organize press groups (CPJ, 2002b; Simon, 1998). Recognizing the need for a press freedom group in Chile, Matus created the Periodistas por la Libertad de Expresión (Journalists for the Freedom of Expression) in September 2002 and 50 prominent journalists joined the organization (CPJ, 2002b). Indeed, one of the most common factors among all of the successful or partially successful cases was the presence of an active domestic base.

How did the influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness? In addition to the support of local press groups, the issue the CPJ focuses on was also an important explanation for the outcome of the CPJ's campaigns. Keck and Sikkink (1998) predict that issues that involve physical violence and issues that involve legal equality are able to capture attention more easily than other issues. In addition, issues where the cause of the problem can be easily described and for which international precedent has already been established are most likely to have more success. This study confirmed these predictions to be true in regards to the international audience. The CPJ's statistics of journalists killed are frequently reported in the news around the world. The CPJ's work on imprisonment in Cuba was also able to capture attention since many are interested in Cuba and the struggle for press freedom and other democratic practices in the country. Criminal defamation cases are more complicated, and are more difficult to convey to the public compared to physical attacks and imprisonments in Latin America. Therefore, it seemed harder for the CPJ to capture the attention of the general public on this issue.

The nature of the issue also seemed to affect the overall response of the general public in each of these cases. The murder of Medino in Costa Rica and Cabezas in Argentina drew large crowds and demonstrations from the public. However, generally the nature of the issue did not seem to affect the overall outcome of the CPJ's effectiveness with regard to national governments. Rather the most important factor was whether or not there was an active domestic base, whether the OAS was involved, and whether transnational advocacy groups met with the government.

Another possible factor not explicitly stated in the literature, could be the popularity and activity of the journalists the CPJ has helped. Matus, Arvide, Verbitsky, Dominique, Herrera Ulloa, Bernal, Hernández, and other journalists studied in this project were all very active and involved in press freedom issues. Some, such as Medino, were popular news programmers. Others were not only journalists but were active in politics, were controversial, and also seemed intent on drawing attention. However, some, like Cabezas, were not very known to the public. Cabezas' murder initially drew attention because Verbitsky and his press group publicized the case in Argentina and informed international press freedom groups.

How did the natures of the target audience influence the CPJ's level of effectiveness? Many complicated issues affected target audiences receptiveness and sensitivity to the CPJ and other international groups. In Argentina, for example, Menem was reluctant to investigate Cabezas' murder because Menem thought that doing so would lessen his chances in an upcoming presidential election. However, Menem eventually investigated the murder after pressure from the U.S. government and the OAS; this pressure was brought about because of an active domestic base and nongovernmental

protests. In Cuba, the government regime opposes an independent press. In Panama, many politicians disapproved of comments written about them by Panamanian journalists. In Chile, the Congress opposed to the Supreme Court's decision on Alejandra Matus' book and was already interested in weakening the strength of the Supreme Court. Chile was also in the spotlight because of Pinochet's arrest in London. Colombia, Guatemala, and Haiti were all sensitive to international pressure. However, except in the case of Cuba, international pressure did not seem to affect whether or not the CPJ was able to raise issues, place them on the agenda, or influence discourse with governments. Rather, pressure from the international community only seemed to influence their policies and behavior on the issue.

How did the CPJ's Advocacy Help Explain the Influence of Transnational Advocacy? How did the CPJ's Advocacy Participate in the Boomerang Phenomenon?

The CPJ's efforts have contributed toward long-term improvements in press freedom. When the CPJ started more than 20 years ago, the main issues that affected press freedom in Latin America were government-sponsored death squads, drug mafias, and paramilitary groups (Bilello, 1996b). Latin America was considered the most dangerous place in the world to be a journalist (Simon, 1997). Although journalists still face the threat of physical attacks, journalists today work in an environment "arguably more benign...but far more complex" (Bilello, 1996b, para. 5). The CPJ played a role in these improvements and will continue to do so as it address other issues that affect press freedom, including legal suits filed against journalists for their work (Bilello, 1996b).

The CPJ contributed toward improvements as it participated in the boomerang pattern of influence. In the boomerang pattern, transnational advocacy groups bring

protests to the international levels, which in turn put pressure on governments (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). According to all of the journalists who participated in this study, the CPJ's power and prestige made the organization one of the most important links local groups have in the international arena. The CPJ had the ability to unite other press freedom groups and put pressure on the governments. In several cases, many of which have been described in this study, the CPJ was able to have an influence in remarkable ways.

In one case Simon (2003) recalled, the CPJ organized a campaign for the release of a Peruvian radio journalist had been arrested for statements he had made. Simon said that the journalist told him that a local military commander was astonished that the international community was able to hear of his case. Simon said,

The military official [asked the journalist] 'how do you have all of these friends in the United States and Europe? They are all writing these letters. Who are you? You are some journalist in a little town in the jungle. How do you know all of these people?'

The CPJ showed the Peruvian military officials that abuses on the press cannot always be hidden and will not be ignored. Those who attacked the Peruvian journalist, Simon said, must have thought "No one is watching me. It's some little isolated part of Peru. I don't like what this guy did and it's my business.'" However, Simon points out, that in the case of Peru, the CPJ can turn it into an international incident and a diplomatic problem for Peru.

Indeed, the CPJ has found that countries in Latin America are aware of the power of international press freedom groups. Smyth said that the Colombian government

frequently tells him, “Why don’t you guys work on Brazil?...Leave us alone” because the Colombian government is concerned about their image. The work of the CPJ and other groups raised the political costs of crimes, helped journalists who may not otherwise have been helped, and may have prevented attacks. Smyth summarized this by saying that one has to think about what the situation would be like

if groups like the CPJ and others didn’t exist.... things could be a lot worse. It would be a lot easier to intimidate journalists, a lot easier to kill them, and a lot easier to control the story and ultimately the press in society.

In the cases investigated in this study, the work of transnational advocacy groups like the CPJ had an influence on several audiences, at various levels. The CPJ’s ability to have an influence at any of these levels made, and continue to make, small but significant improvements, which are moving governments through the stages of *norms socialization* (Risse, et al., 1999). Almost all of the countries had reached the tactical concession stage on each of the issues addressed in this study by acknowledging that there was a problem and that efforts needed to be made to improve the situation. All members of the OAS had achieved the prescriptive status stage by endorsing the American Convention on Human Rights, and many were beginning to modify their policies and laws to conform to internationally accepted norms.

Contributions to Theory and Future Exploration

As theory suggests, the CPJ’s advocacy work contributed to these changes through the boomerang pattern of international pressure. In most of the cases, domestic groups informed the CPJ, which in turn informed other international actors. These nongovernmental international groups gave legitimacy to local protests, drew the

attention of other governments, and pressured the violating governments to make concessions.

This study also verified that the reaction of a target state is conditioned upon many conditional variables such as the issue and the actors involved. However, the study demonstrated that the roles these variables play changes depending upon the audience and the issue. Future research and theory should consider effectiveness with the international public, national public, and journalists. It should also distinguish between broad issues that affect all journalists and issues that are directed toward a single individual. We should look more at these individuals' popularity, motives, goals, incentives, and abilities. In many of the cases studied, changes on broad issues came about because of the work of a single individual. Theory should therefore account for the importance of single, individual cases.

This study also shows that advocacy groups can play a large role in promoting local press groups and bringing them into the advocacy network. Future theory should emphasize the role of transnational advocacy groups in doing this. In addition, future research should specify the importance of other issues that make state governments vulnerable to international protests, such as internal political issues, economic issues, and international protests on other issues not related to those addressed by transnational advocacy groups. The theory currently addresses the economic and political vulnerability of state governments in regards to the state's relationship with other countries, but it does not specify the importance of considering internal affairs of the country. Although this study did not specifically focus on economics and internal politics, there were many instances where this was an issue.

Finally, theory should consider why and how advocacy groups select cases and their campaign strategy for those cases. This study suggests that the CPJ gives priority to violent attacks on the press, to events where there is a strong domestic base, to cases where the issue can set international precedent, and to issues where there is information. Recognizing the way transnational advocacy groups select cases will enhance theory on transnational advocacy activity and success.

Future research on transnational advocacy can further contribute to the existing theory by focusing more on which issues are more likely to get the attention of various audiences, exploring how audiences react to advocacy groups' campaigns, and investigating the use of the media in delivering these messages. Future research on the role of the CPJ specifically can provide empirical descriptions on the types of journalists attacked, why they are attacked, where they are from, the CPJ's response to these attacks, and the outcome of these attacks. Such research could contribute to an understanding of attacks on journalists in Latin America, as well as the role of transnational advocacy.

Conclusions

This case study of the CPJ shows that organized domestic and international nongovernmental groups can and do undermine seemingly more powerful forces to make improvements on behalf of journalists and press freedom in Latin America. They raise issues and place them on the agenda, and they influence discourse, policy, institutional procedures, and state behavior on issues. The CPJ's ability to be influential at all of these levels will help journalists see long-term improvements in press freedom. Transnational advocacy groups can work around barriers encountered within different countries by making use of local groups, other international groups, and governments. They place

themselves in a position to work with these groups by building their reputation, credibility, and authority on press freedom issues. These efforts benefit many journalists who might otherwise not be helped. They show governments that they are being watched and make them accountable for their actions. They make individuals aware of the problem, which in turn make it more difficult to attack journalists. As the CPJ and other groups continue to pressure governments, they will see more improvements in press freedom and the safety of journalists in Latin America. Although the CPJ is limited in the extent of its activities and case selection, its efforts convey the struggles of many journalists in Latin America and contribute toward real improvements on the overall issue of press freedom. They also help prevent many attacks from happening by subverting motives to attack journalists. Even when the CPJ cannot have practical influence, it will always show journalists that they have the moral support of the international community.

REFERENCES

- Arana, A. (1995). *The Americas*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks95/att95americas.html>
- Associated Press News Service. (1997, February 13). *Clinton allows U.S. to set up news bureaus in Cuba*. Retrieved December 2003, from The Minnesota Daily Online: http://www.daily.umn.edu/daily/1997/02/13/world_nation/wn13c.ap/
- Associated Press. (2002, March 26). 37 journalists were killed in 2001. *Deseret News*, p. A04.
- Badeni, G. (1999). The age of communication allows no restrictions. In *Freedom of the press and the law: Laws that affect journalism in the Americas* [Electronic version] from Inter American Press Association Web site: <http://www.sipiapa.com/projects/badeni.cfm>
- Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bilello, S. (1996a). *Cuba's independent journalists struggle to establish a free press*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks96/sreports/cuba.html>
- Bilello, S. (1996b). *Overview of the Americas*. Retrieved December 15, 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks96/regions/am/amsum.html>
- Boulding, E. (1997). Foreword. In C. Chatfield, J. Smith, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (p. ix-xi). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Buckman, R. T. (1996). Current status of the media in Latin America. In R. Cole (Ed.), *Communication in Latin America: Journalism, mass media, and society* (pp. 3-35). Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc, Jaguar books on Latin America; No. 14.

- Calhoun, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Habermas and the public sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Canton, S. A. (2000, April 13). *Report of the Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression 1999*. Retrieved December 2003, from Summit of the Americas Information Network: <http://www.summit-americas.org/Human%20Rights/Freedom-Expression-1999.htm#A.%20Mandate%20Information>
- Carboni, M. S. (2002). *Special reports from around the world: The silence*. Retrieved September 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/Briefings/2002/Costa_rica_july02/Costa_rica_july02.html
- Chatfield, C. (1997). Intergovernmental and nongovernmental associations to 1945. In C. Chatfield, J. Smith, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 19-42). Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Chelala, C. (2003, December 24). The wrong kind of American aid; A military preoccupation [Electronic version]. *The International Herald Tribune*, p. 6.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1992-2002). *Attacks on the press: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists*. New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1995a). *Attacks on the press: Argentina*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks95/attlist95.americas.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1995b). *Attacks on the press: Cuba*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks95/attlist95.americas.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1996). *Cuba*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks96/countries/americas/cases/cubaexp.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1997a, Spring). *Dangerous assignments: News about press freedom around the world: CPJ and the world*. Retrieved October 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/dangerous/newsletter95_97/spring1997/cpjnews.html
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (1998b). *CPJ and the world*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/dangerous/Spring98/cpjworld.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1998a). *1998 International Press Freedom Awards*. Retrieved November 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/awards98/ipfawards.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999a). *The Americas: 1999: Argentina*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks99/americas99/Argentina.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999b). *The Americas: 1999: Chile*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks99/americas99/Chile.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999c). *The Americas: 1999: Panama*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks99/americas99/Panama.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999d). *Argentina set to repeal criminal defamation law*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/1999/Argentina14dec99.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999e). *Country report: 1999: Cuba*. Retrieved September, 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks99/americas99/Cuba.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999f). *CPJ honors journalists with international press freedom awards for courage in reporting the news: Jesús Hernández*. Retrieved December 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/awards99/Awards.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999g, July 26). *CPJ protests: Panama: Proposed 'reform' of gag law would further restrict press freedom*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/protests/99ltrs/Panama26July99.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (1999h, March 4). *CPJ protests: Panama uses gag laws to muzzle press: Statutes Criminalize defamation and criticism of government*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/1999/panama4march99.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000a, June 13). *2000 news alert: Journalists, lawyers in the Americas call for end to criminal defamation*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2000/Argentina13june00na.html>

- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000b, August). *2000 news alert: Panama: New law restricts access to information*. Retrieved September 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/news/2000/Panama03august00na_2.html
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000c). *The Americas: 2000: Panama*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks00/americas00/Panama.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000d). *Attacks on the Press in 1999: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists*. New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000e, May 3). *CPJ names 10 enemies of the press on world press freedom day*. Retrieved December 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/enemies/enemies_01.html
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000f, July 21). *CPJ protests: Panama: Jail for journalists as government drags heels on gag-law reform*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/protests/00ltrs/Panama21july00pl.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001a, April 20). *2001 news alert: Chile: Congress repeals 'disrespect' statute*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2001/Chile20april01na.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001b, August 29). *2001 news alert: Chile: Court refuses to consider lifting ban on controversial book*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2001/Chile29aug01na.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001c, January). *2001 protest letter: Cuba: Independent journalist released after two years in jail*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/protests/01ltrs/Cuba18jan01pl.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001d). *Americas 2001: Chile*. Retrieved September 2001, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks01/americas01/chile.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001e). *Americas: 2001: Costa Rica*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks01/americas01/costa.html>

- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001f). *Americas 2001: Panama*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks01/americas01/panama.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001g). Argentina. In *Attacks on the press 2000: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists* (pp. 134-136). New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001h, November 15). *Argentina: CPJ awardee presents case to Inter American Commission on Human Rights*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2001/Argentina15nov01na.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001i). *Attacks on the press 2000: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists*. New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001j). Colombia. In *Attacks on the press 2000: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists* (pp. 141-143). New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001k, Summer). *Dangerous Assignments: Covering the global press freedom struggle*. New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001l). *Enemies of the press 2001*. Retrieved September 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/attacks01/pages_att01/acrobat_att01/Back.pdf
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001m). Guatemala. In *Attacks on the press 2000: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists* (pp. 150-151). New York: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2001n). *International Press Freedom Awards 2001*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/awards01/verbitsky.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002a, May 7). *2002 news alert: Chile: Executive branch pledges to reform criminal defamation laws*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2002/Chile07may02na.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002b). *Attacks on the press in 2001: Chile*. Retrieved

December 19, 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks02/americas02/chile.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002c). *Attacks on the press in 2002: Cuba*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://cpj.org/attacks02/americas02/cuba.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002d). *Attacks on the press: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists*. New York: Author.

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002e). Chile. In *Attacks on the press in 2001: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists* (pp. 214-215). New York: Author.

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002f). Panama. In *Attacks on the press* [Electronic version]. Retrieved December 15, 2003 from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks02/americas02/panama.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2002g). Panama. In *Attacks on the press in 2002: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists* (pp. 109-111). New York: Committee to Protect Journalists.

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003a, February 26). *2003 news alert: Costa Rica: Inter American Court to hear criminal defamation case*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2003/Costarica26feb03na.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003b, July 18). *2003 news alert: CPJ's mission confirms dire situation for imprisoned journalists and their families*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2003/Cuba18july03na.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003c, August 15). *2003 news alert: Haiti: Officials agree to review CPJ press freedom cases*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2003/Haiti15aug03na.html>

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003d, March 7). *2003 protest letter: Mexico: CPJ protests detention and criminal prosecution of journalist*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/protests/03ltrs/Mexico07march03pl.html>

- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003e, October 7). *2003 news alert: Venezuela: CPJ concerned by administrative proceedings against TV station*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/news/2003/Ven07oct03na.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003f). *About CPJ: CPJ at a glance*. Retrieved August 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/zinfo/aboutcpj2html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003g). *Cases 2003: The Americas*. Retrieved December 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/cases03/americas_cases03/mexico.html
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003h). *Committee to Protect Journalists: A nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to the global defense of press freedom*. Retrieved August 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003i). *Crackdown on the independent press in Cuba*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/Briefings/2003/cubacrackdown/index.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003j). *Crackdown on the independent press in Cuba*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/Briefings/2003/cubacrackdown/index.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists . (2003k). *Direct assistance given by the CPJ*. Unpublished manuscript: Author.
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003l, February 13). *Letter of inquiry: Peru: CPJ and RSF send letters about journalist's imprisonment*. Retrieved October 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/inquiry/2003/Peru13feb03inq.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003m). *Journalism is not a crime: Legal resources for journalists in Latin America*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/defamation/defamation.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists (2003n). *Journalists killed in the line of duty during the line of duty: Statistics for 1993-2002*. Retrieved August 2002, from http://www.cpj.org/killed/Ten_Year_Killed/stats.html

- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003o). *Journalists killed in the line of duty during the last ten years: The toll: Journalists killed 1993-2002*. Retrieved April 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/killed/Ten_Year_Killed/Intro.html
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003p). *Staff biographies*. Retrieved from April 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/zinfo/cpjstaff.html>
- Committee to Protect Journalists. (2003q). *Twenty-eight journalists killed in 2003*. Retrieved December 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/killed/killed03.html>
- Cortright, D., Pagnucco, R., & Chatfield, C. (1997). Limits to transnationalism: The 1980s freeze campaign. In J. Smith, R. Pagnucco, & C. Chatfield (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 159-175). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Dahl, R. (1998). *On democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Debevoise & Plimpton. (2001, March 23). Brief of Committee to Protect Journalists as Amicus Curiae in Support of Alejandra Matus Acuna et al. Retrieved November 2003, from Committee to Protect Journalists Web site: http://www.cpj.org/news/2001/Chile_matus.pdf
- Deffenbaugh, R. (1981). The Southern Africa project for the lawyers' committee for civil rights under law. In V. P. Nanda, J. R. Scarritt, & G. W. Shepherd (Eds.), *Global human rights: Public policies, comparative measures, and NGO strategies* (289-303). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Doyle, K. (2002). Mexico opens the files [electronic version]. *Nation*, 275(5), 7.
- Federal News Service. (2003, September 4). *Hearing of the senate finance committee: United States-Cuba economic relations*. Retrieved October 2003, from LexisNexis: <http://80-web.lexis-nexis.com.erl.lib.byu.edu/universe>
- Flanagan, R. (2002). *John Milton: A short introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Garrison, B., & Goodsell, J. N. (1996). Professional news organizations in Latin America. Current status of the media in Latin America. In R. Cole (Ed.),

- Communication in Latin America: Journalism, mass media, and society* (pp. 51-63). Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc, Jaguar books on Latin America; No. 14.
- Garrels, A. (2002). Preface. In *Attacks on the press in 2001: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists* (pp. iv-v) New York: Committee to Protect Journalists.
- González, S. (2002). *Special reports from around the world: Cannon Fodder*. Retrieved December 15, 2003, from Committee to Protect Journalists Web site:
http://www.cpj.org/Briefings/2002/ven_aug02/ven_aug02.html
- Giordano, A. M. (2002, August 11). *Committee to Protect Journalists responds to our letter*. Retrieved December 15, 2003, from
<http://lists.indymedia.org/mailman/public/imc-sf/2002-August/002941.html>
- Hawkins, D. G. (1997). Domestic responses to international pressure. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(4), 403-434.
- Hawkins, D. G. (2002). Human rights norms and networks in authoritarian Chile. In S. Khagram, J. V. Riker, & K. Sikkink (Eds.), *Restructuring world politics: Transnational social movements, networks, and norms* (pp. 47-70). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Henry, G. T. (2001). How modern democracies are shaping evaluation and the emerging challenges of evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(3), 419-429.
- Hoge, W. (1980, June 27). Paraguay imprisons a columnist, critic of regime, for second time; Arrested outside court [Electronic version]. *New York Times*, p. A4.
- International Freedom of Expression Exchange. (n.d.). Inter American declaration on freedom of expression spurs support and controversy. Retrieved December 31, 2003 from <http://www.ifex.org/en/content/view/full/27616/>

- International Freedom of Expression Exchange. (2003). *IFEX council members 2002-2004*. Retrieved November 2003, from <http://canada.ifex.org/en/content/view/full49422>
- Inter American Commission on Human Rights. (1995). Report on the compatibility of 'desacato' laws with the American Convention on Human Rights. In *Annual Report 1994*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Inter American Commission on Human Rights. (1999, 7 June). *Inter American declaration of principles on freedom of expression: Preamble*. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from Technical Secretariat for Legal Corporation Mechanisms <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/ga-res99/eres1609.htm>
- Inter American Press Association (1994, March 11). *Declaration of Chapultepec*. Mexico City, Mexico. Retrieved April 3, 2003, from <http://www.sipiapa.com/projects/chapul-pres.cfm>
- Inter American Press Association. (1996). *Press freedom in the Americas: 1997 annual report: Unpunished crimes against journalists*. Miami: Author.
- Inter American Press Association. (2003). *Declaration of Chapultepec: Heads of state endorsements*. Retrieved September 15, 2003 from <http://www.declarationofchapultepec.org/>
- Jordan, L., & Tuijil, P. (2000). Political responsibility in NGO. *World Development*, 2051-2065.
- Karlekar, K. D. (Ed.). (2003). *Freedom of the press 2003*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Khagram, S., Riker, J. V., & Sikkink, K. (2002). From Santiago to Seattle: Transnational advocacy groups restructuring world politics. In S. Khagram, J. V. Riker, & K.

- Sikkink (Eds.), *Restructuring world politics: Transnational social movements, networks, and norms* (pp. 3-23). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lanao, J. E. (1999). *Freedom of the press and the law: Laws that affect journalism in the Americas*. Miami, FL: Inter American Press Association.
- Lauría, C. (2002). *Overview: The Americas*. Retrieved April 2003, from Committee to Protect Journalists Web site:
<http://www.cpj.org/attacks02americas02/americas.html>
- Lee, J. B. (2003, April 1). Twenty journalists slain in 2002, fewest in 17 years, group says. *New York Times*, p. A8.
- Marks, L. H. (1997, March 18). *Desacato: Insult to press freedom*. Paper presented at Panama City, Panama. Retrieved August 13, 2003, from World Press Freedom Committee: <http://www.wpfc.org>
- Massing, M. (2001). *The twentieth anniversary: In the beginning*. Retrieved August 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/Briefings/2001/DA_20th/Massing.html
- Munck, G. L., & Verkuilen, J. (2002). Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: Evaluating alternative indices. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(1), 54-34.
- Nanda, V. P., Scarritt, J., & Shepherd, G. W. (1981). *Global human rights: Public policies, comparative measures, and NGO strategies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Giordano, A. M. (2002, August 11). *Committee to Protect Journalists responds to our letter*. Retrieved December 15, 2003, from
<http://lists.indymedia.org/mailman/public/imc-sf/2002-August/002941.html>
- Narco News. (2002, July 29). *An open letter to Ann Cooper of the Committee to Protect Journalists: Venezuela and speech critical of media*. Retrieved December 15, 2003, from <http://www.narconews.com/cpjletter1.html>

O'Donnell, G. (1998). Polyarchies and the (un)rule of law in Latin America. In G.

O'Donnell & P. Pinheiro (Eds.), *The rule of law and the underprivileged in Latin America* (pp. 1-2). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Office of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression. (1998a). *Report of the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression* (chap. 1). Retrieved November 25, 2003, from

<http://www.cidh.oas.org/Relatoria/English/AnnualReports/AR98/ChapterI1998.html>

Organization of American States (1978a, July 18). *American convention on human rights "pact of San Jose, Costa Rica" treaty (series No. 36, 1144)*. Retrieved September 21, 2003, from University of Minnesota Web site:

<http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/oasinstr/zoas3con.htm>

Organization of American States (1978b). *American convention on human rights "pact of San Jose, Costa Rica": Signatories and ratifications*. Retrieved September 21, 2003, from <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/Sigs/b-32.html>

Organization of American States. (1998a). *Special rapporteur on freedom of expression announced*. Retrieved December 1, 2003, from

<http://www.oas.org/main/main.asp?sLang=E&sLink=http://www.oas.org/oaspage/searchformas>

Pagnucco, C. Chatfield, & J. Smith (Eds.) (1997). *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Park, S. (2002, March 28). Panel reports 37 journalists killed last year over work.

Washington Post, p. A13.

- Perkins, M. (2001). Violence against the press in Latin America: Protections and remedies in international law. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(2), 275-290.
- Pindexter, P. M., & McCombs, M. E. (2000). *Research in mass communication: A practical guide*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Price, R. (1998). Reversing the gun sights: Transnational civil society targets land mines. *International Organization*, 52(3), 613-644.
- Ricchiardi, S. (1997). Journalism's red cross. *American Journalism Review*, 19(10), 34-40.
- Risse, T. (2000). The power of norms versus the norms of power: Transnational civil society and human rights. In A. M. Florini (Ed.), *The third force: The rise of transnational civil society* (pp. 177-209). Washington, D.C.: Japan Center for International Change and Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikkink, K. (1999). *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Press.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London: Sage.
- Scoble, H. M., & Wiseberg, L. S. (1974). Human rights and Amnesty International. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 413(11), 11-26.
- Simon, J. (1997). *Overview of the Americas*. Retrieved December 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/attacks97/americas/americas_overview.html
- Simon, J. (1998). *CPJ special report: Banding together*. Retrieved September 2003, from <http://www.cpj.org/attacks98/1998/Americas/americasSR.html>
- Simon, J. (2000, August). *When criticism becomes a crime*. Retrieved November 2003, from <http://www.icij.org/about/simon.html>

- Smeets, M. (1999a). *Dangerous assignments: Report on Chilean injustices spurs more of the same*. Retrieved December 2003, from Committee to Protect Journalists Web site: <http://www.cpj.org/dangerous/spring99/2Chile04March99.html>
- Smith, J. (1997). Characteristics of the modern transnational social movements. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 42-52). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Smith, J., Pagnucco, R., & Chatfield, C. (1997). Social movements and world politics: A theoretical framework. In J. Smith, R. Pagnucco, & C. Chatfield (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 59-80). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Sperling, V., Ferree, M. M., & Risman, B. (2001). Constructing global feminism: Transnational Advocacy networks and Russian women's activism. *Signs*, 115(186), 1155-1187.
- Suarez, J. (n.d.). *Notes from the Cuban underground*. Retrieved December 2003, from <http://www.fiu.edu/~fcf/notes.html>
- Thomas, D. L. (1995). *Locke on governmnet*. New York: Routledge.
- Thompsen, S. (2002). *Positive and interpretive approaches to reserach*. Unpublished manuscript, Brigham Young University.
- Trotti, R. (1999). The early battles against impunity. In R. Trotti (Ed.), *Impunity no more*. Miami, FL: Inter-American Press Association.
- Trubek, D., Mosher, J., & Rothstein, J. S. (2000). Transnationalism in the regulation of labor relations: International regimes in international and regional politics. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 25, 1187-1217.
- U.S. State Department. (2003). *U.S. State Department 2002 human rights report*. Retrieved November 2003, from <http://www.state.gov>

- Ulibarri, E., & Trotti, R. (1996). Difficulties and dangers for the free press in the Americas. In R. Gonzales (Ed.), *Media and democracy in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Science, and Cultural Organization.
- Vivian, J. (2003). *The media of mass communication*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wiarda, H. J. (1980). Westview special studies on Latin America and the Caribbean: The struggle for democracy and human rights in Latin America: Toward a new conceptualization. In H. J. Wiarda (Ed.), *The continuing struggle for democracy in Latin America*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Winchester, S. (2001). *The twentieth anniversary: Jailhouse memories: Living in an Argentine prison during the Falklands War*. Retrieved November 31, 2003, from http://www.cpj.org/Briefings/2001/DA_20th/Falklands.html
- Wiseberg, L. S., & Scoble, H. M. (1981). Recent trends in the expanding universe of NGOs dedicated to the protection of human rights. In V. P. Nanda & others (Eds.), *Global human rights: public policies, comparative measures, and NGO strategies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

APPENDIX A

ARTICLE 13 OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought and expression. This right includes freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, in print, in the form of art, or through any other medium of one's choice.
2. The exercise of the right provided for in the foregoing paragraph shall not be subject to prior censorship but shall be subject to subsequent imposition of liability, which shall be expressly established by law to the extent necessary to ensure:
 - a. respect for the rights or reputations of others; or
 - b. the protection of national security, public order, or public health or morals.
3. The right of expression may not be restricted by indirect methods or means, such as the abuse of government or private controls over newsprint, radio broadcasting frequencies, or equipment used in the dissemination of information, or by any other means tending to impede the communication and circulation of ideas and opinions.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 2 above, public entertainments may be subject by law to prior censorship for the sole purpose of regulating access to them for the moral protection of childhood and adolescence.
5. Any propaganda for war and any advocacy of national, racial, or religious hatred that constitute incitements to lawless violence or to any other similar action against any person or group of persons on any grounds including those of race, color, religion, language, or national origin shall be considered as offenses punishable by law. (OAS, 1978a)

APPENDIX B

TEN PRINCIPLES OF THE DECLARATION OF CHAPULTAPEC

1. No people or society can be free without freedom of expression and of the press. The exercise of this freedom is not something authorities grant, it is an inalienable right of the people.
2. Every person has the right to seek and receive information, express opinions and disseminate them freely. No one may restrict or deny these rights.
3. The authorities must be compelled by law to make available in a timely and reasonable manner the information generated by the public sector. No journalist may be forced to reveal his or her sources of information.
4. Freedom of expression and of the press are severely limited by murder, terrorism, kidnapping, intimidation, the unjust imprisonment of journalists, the destruction of facilities, violence of any kind and impunity for perpetrators. Such acts must be investigated promptly and punished harshly.
5. Prior censorship, restrictions on the circulation of the media or dissemination of their reports, forced publication of information, the imposition of obstacles to the free flow of news, and restrictions on the activities and movements of journalists directly contradict freedom of the press.
6. The media and journalists should neither be discriminated against nor favored because of what they write or say.
7. Tariff and exchange policies, licenses for the importation of paper or news-gathering equipment, the assigning of radio and television frequencies and the granting or withdrawal of government advertising may not be used to reward or punish the media or individual journalists.
8. The membership of journalists in guilds, their affiliation to professional and trade associations and the affiliation of the media with business groups must be strictly voluntary.
9. The credibility of the press is linked to its commitment to truth, to the pursuit of accuracy, fairness and objectivity and to the clear distinction between news and advertising. The attainment of these goals and the respect for ethical and professional values may not be imposed. These are the exclusive responsibility of journalists and the media. In a free society, it is public opinion that rewards or punishes.
10. No news medium nor journalist may be punished for publishing the truth or criticizing or denouncing the government. (IAPA, 1994)

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW TOPICS FOR THE CPJ EMPLOYEES

1. The history of the organization.
2. The number of workers involved in each campaign.
3. The amount of money the CPJ spends on its activities.
4. The CPJ's selection of cases; why and how.
5. The CPJ's strategies, and why.
6. Differences in activities and strategies for various topics and issues approached.
7. The CPJ's goals.
8. How the CPJ measures effectiveness.
9. Campaigns it considers effective or ineffective and why.
10. Issues that enhance or hinder the CPJ's effectiveness and why.
11. Changes in the CPJ's activities over time and why?
12. The CPJ's relationship with other press freedom groups, human rights organizations, and governments.
13. The CPJ's regular routines.

APPENDIX D

OPEN SURVEY FOR JOURNALISTS LIVING ABROAD OR TRAVELING

English Version

1. How did you first hear about the CPJ?
2. Briefly describe the situation(s) you faced when the CPJ offered its assistance.
3. Why did you choose to contact the CPJ?
4. Describe how the CPJ tried to help you.
5. How long has the CPJ been involved in your case?
6. Describe the outcome of the situation for which the CPJ helped you.
7. Do you feel that the CPJ's activities helped your situation, and if so, how and why?
8. Without the help of the CPJ, do you think your situation would be any different?
9. Describe factors that you feel hindered or enhanced the CPJ's efforts to help you.
10. Did you contact any other organizations (nongovernmental and governmental) besides the CPJ? If you did, why did you do so, and which ones did you contact? If not, why not?
11. If applicable, describe the kinds of activities other organizations engaged in your behalf.
12. If applicable, did the CPJ work with these organizations in any way, and if so, how?
13. Without the help of these organizations, do you feel the situation would have turned out differently?

Spanish Version

1. Como supo del CPJ por primera vez?
2. Brevemente, describa la(s) situacion(es) en que el CPJ le ha tratado de prover asistencia.
3. Por que eligió a el CPJ para que lo asistiera en su situación?

4. Describa como el CPJ trató de ayudarle.
5. Por cuanto tiempo el CPJ ha estado participando en su caso?
6. Por favor describa la corriente situación en que el CPJ le ayuda.
7. Piensa Ud. que las actividades del CPJ le ayudan en la situación? Como, y porque?
8. Sin la ayuda del CPJ, como y por que su situación sería diferente?
9. Describa condiciones en que la CPJ le ayuda o impide esfuerzos de ayudarlos.
10. Trató Ud. de contactarse con otras organizaciones gubernamentales o no gubernamentales en adición al CPJ. Si es así, porque, y cuales? Si no, porque no?
11. Si es applicable, describa los actividades de otras organizaciones.
12. Trabajó el CPJ con otras organizaciones para ayudarle? Como?
13. Sin la ayuda de estas organizaciones, piensa Ud. Que la situación sería deferente?

APPENDIX E
THE CPJ'S FULLTIME STAFF

DECEMBER 2003

1. Ann Cooper, Executive Director
2. Joel Simon, Deputy Director
3. Susan Ellingwood, Editorial Director
4. Amanda Watson-Boles, Deputy Editor
5. Mike Stern, Webmaster and system administrator
6. Frank Smyth, Washington, D.C. Representative
7. Wacuka Mungai, Communications Coordinator
8. Julia Pimsleur, Communications Coordinator
9. Dan Bolger, Development Associate
10. Elisabeth Witchel, Journalist Assistance Coordinator
11. Lade Kadejo, Director of Finance and Administration
12. Julia Crawford, Africa Program Coordinator
13. Adam Posluns, Africa Research Associate
14. Carlos Lauría, Americas Program Coordinator
15. Sauro González Rodríguez, Americas Research Associate
16. Abi Wright, Asia Program Coordinator
17. A. Lin Neumann, Asia Program Consultant
18. Sophie Beach, Asia Research Associate
19. Alexander Lupis, Europe and Central Asia Program Coordinator
20. Joel Campagna, Middle East and North Africa Senior Program Coordinator
21. Hani Sabra, Middle East and North Africa Research Associate
22. Alexis Arieff, Research and Special Projects Assistance (CPJ, 2003p)

APPENDIX F
THE CPJ'S BOARD OF DIRECTORS
DECEMBER 2003

1. Walter Cronkite, Honorary Chair
2. David Lavenhol, Chair
3. Terry Anderson, Honorary Co-Chair
4. Ann Cooper, Executive Director
5. Franz Allina
6. Peter Arnett
7. Tom Brokaw, NBC News
8. Dean Baquet, *Los Angeles Times*
9. Josh Friedman, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University
10. Anne Garrels, National Public Radio
11. James C. Goodale, Debevoise & Plimpton
12. Cheryl Gould, NBC News
13. Charlayne Hunter-Gault, CNN
14. Alberto Ibarguen, *The Miami Herald*
15. Gwen Ifill, PBS
16. Walter Isaacson, CNN
17. Steven L. Isenberg
18. Jane Kramer, *The New Yorker*
19. David Lavenhol, Columbia Journalism Review
20. Anthony Lewis

21. David Marash, ABC News
22. Kati Marton
23. Michael Massing
24. Geraldine Fabrikant Metz, *The New York Times*
25. Victor Navasky, *The Nation*
26. Frank del Olmo, *The Los Angeles Times*
27. Burl Osborne, *The Dallas Morning News*
28. Charles L. Overby, The Freedom Forum
29. Clarence Page, *Chicago Tribune*
30. Erwin Potts, McClatchy Newspapers
31. Dan Rather, CBS News
32. Gene Roberts, Philip Merrill College of Journalism, University of Maryland
34. Sandra Mims Rowe, The Oregonian
35. John Seigenthaler, The Freedom Forum First Amendment Center
36. Paul E. Steiger, *The Wall Street Journal*
37. Paul C. Tash, *St. Petersburg Times* (CPJ, 2003f)

APPENDIX G

ATTACKS ON THE PRESS 2000-2003

Country Attack Type	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Argentina					
Defamation	1	3	0	1	5
Legal	0	2	1	0	3
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	5	1	4	4	14
Killed 1 ^a	0	0	0	0	0
Killed 2 ^b	0	0	0	0	0
Bolivia					
Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
Legal	0	0	0	0	0
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	1	7	0	2	10
Killed 1	0	1	0	0	1
Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil					
Defamation	0	4	0	0	4
Legal	0	0	2	0	2
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	2	0	0	0	2
Killed 1	1	0	1	1	3
Killed 2	0	1	1	1	3
Chile					
Defamation	0	7	1	0	8
Legal	0	1	0	1	2
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	0	6	0	0	6
Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Colombia					
Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
Legal	0	0	0	0	0
Imprisoned	5	0	1	0	6
Physical	24	24	36	21	105
Killed 1	3	3	3	4	13
Killed 2	4	5	5	2	16

Country	Attack Type	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Costa Rica						
	Defamation	0	1	0	0	1
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 1	0	1	0	0	1
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Cuba						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	0	1	1	2
	Imprisoned	6	1	1	29	37
	Physical	6	8	10	3	27
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Dominican Republic						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	1	0	0	0	1
	Physical	0	2	0	3	5
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Ecuador						
	Defamation	0	1	0	1	2
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
El Salvador						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0

Country	Attack Type	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Guatemala						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	2	7	7	29	45
	Killed 1	1	1	0	1	3
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Haiti						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	0	3	15	10	28
	Killed 1	1	1	0	0	2
	Killed 2	1	0	0	0	1
Honduras						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	2	0	0	2
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	1	0	0	1	2
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico						
	Defamation	2	2	1	1	6
	Legal	1	0	0	0	1
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	2	2	1	0	5
	Killed 1	0	1	0	0	1
	Killed 2	2	0	0	0	2
Nicaragua						
	Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
	Legal	0	1	0	0	1
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	0	2	0	0	2
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Panama						
	Defamation	7	9	0	2	18
	Legal	0	0	0	0	0
	Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
	Physical	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
	Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Attack Type					
Paraguay					
Defamation	0	1	0	0	1
Legal	0	0	0	0	0
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	2	3	0	0	5
Killed 1	0	1	0	0	1
Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Peru					
Defamation	0	3	1	0	4
Legal	5	0	0	0	5
Imprisoned	1	0	0	0	1
Physical	17	1	5	0	23
Killed 1	0	0	0	0	0
Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Uruguay					
Defamation	0	0	0	0	0
Legal	0	0	0	0	0
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	0	0	0	0	0
Killed 1	1	0	0	0	1
Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Venezuela					
Defamation	2	2	0	0	4
Legal	0	1	0	3	4
Imprisoned	0	0	0	0	0
Physical	0	0	55	8	63
Killed 1	0	0	1	0	1
Killed 2	0	0	0	0	0
Latin America					
Defamation	12	33	3	5	53
Legal	6	7	4	5	22
Imprisoned	13	1	2	29	45
Physical	62	66	133	81	342
Killed 1	7	9	5	6	27
Killed 2	7	6	6	3	22

Note. Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists (2000-2003). *Attacks on the press*

2000-2003: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists. New York: Author.

^aKillings confirmed to be related to a journalist's work. ^bKillings unconfirmed to not be related to a journalists' work.

APPENDIX H

TYPES OF JOURNALISTS AND ORGANIZATIONS ATTACKED

2000-2003

Type of Attack	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Type of media					
Defamation					
Print	12	28	1	2	43
Radio	0	1	0	1	2
TV	1	1	1	2	5
Internet	0	0	0	0	0
News gathering agency	0	0	0	0	0
Freelance	0	3	2	2	7
All types	0	0	0	0	0
Legal					
Print	2	4	3	0	9
Radio	2	1	0	0	3
TV	2	1	0	4	7
Internet	0	0	0	0	0
News gathering agency	0	0	0	1	1
Freelance	0	1	0	0	1
All media	0	0	1	0	1
Imprisoned					
Print	2	0	1	0	3
Radio	0	0	0	0	0
TV	3	0	0	0	3
Internet	0	0	0	0	0
News gathering agency	0	1	1	29	31
Freelance	-	-	-	-	-
All media	0	0	0	0	0
Physical					
Print	34	23	34	30	121
Radio	3	9	24	12	48
TV	23	26	52	9	110
Internet	0	0	0	1	1

Type of Attack	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Type of media					
Physical (continued)	0	0	0	0	0
News gathering agency					
Freelance	0	0	0	2	2
All media	1	8	0	0	9
Killed 1 ^a					
Print	1	2	2	0	5
Radio	6	6	0	5	17
TV	0	0	3	0	3
Internet	0	0	0	0	0
News gathering agency	-	-	-	-	-
Freelance	0	1	0	0	1
All media	0	0	0	0	0
Killed 2 ^b					
Print	3	2	2	0	7
Radio	3	4	3	3	13
TV	0	0	0	0	0
Internet	0	0	0	0	0
News gathering agency	0	0	0	0	0
Freelance	1	0	0	0	1
All media	0	0	0	0	0
All Types of Attacks					
Print	54	59	43	32	188
Radio	14	21	27	21	83
TV	29	28	56	15	128
Internet	0	0	0	1	1
News Gathering agency	0	0	0	1	1
Freelance	1	5	2	4	12
All media	1	8	1	0	10

Note. Total numbers within each category and row may not add up to the total number of cases because some organizations of journalists may have been engaged in more than one type of journalism;

Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists (2000-2003). *Attacks on the press 2000-2003: A worldwide survey by the Committee to Protect Journalists*. New York: Author.

^aKillings confirmed to be related to a journalist's work. ^bKillings unconfirmed to not be related to a journalist's work.

APPENDIX I

ALERTS AND PROTEST LETTERS DISTRIBUTED BY THE CPJ REGARDING CRIMINAL DEFAMATION ISSUES 2000-2003

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Argentina					
Alerts	1	1	0	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil					
Alerts	0	0	1	0	1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Chile					
Alerts	0	5	1	2	8
Letters	0	0	1	0	1
Colombia					
Alerts	0	2	0	1	3
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Costa Rica					
Alerts	0	2	0	1	3
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico					
Alerts	2	0	2	0	4
Letters	1	1	0	1	3
Panama					
Alerts	2	1	1	2	6
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Peru					
Alerts	4	0	0	0	4
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Venezuela					
Alerts	0	0	0	0	0
Letters	1	0	0	0	1
Latin America					
Alerts	9	9	5	5	28
Letters	2	1	1	1	5

Note. Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000-2003). *CPJ Archives*. Retrieved

October-December 2003, from Author Web site: <http://www.cpj.org>

APPENDIX J

ALERTS AND PROTEST LETTERS DISTRIBUTED BY THE CPJ REGARDING
LEGAL ISSUES 2000-2003

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Argentina					
Alerts	0	0	2	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil					
Alerts	0	0	2	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Chile					
Alerts	0	0	0	1	1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Colombia					
Alerts	0	0	2	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Cuba					
Alerts	2	1	0	0	3
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Panama					
Alerts	1	0	1	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Paraguay					
Alerts	0	2	0	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Peru					
Alerts	4	0	0	0	4
Letters	2	0	0	0	2
Venezuela					
Alerts	0	1	1	4	6
Letters	0	1	0	0	1
Latin America					
Alerts	7	4	8	5	24
Letters	2	1	0	0	3

Note. Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000-2003). *CPJ Archives*. Retrieved October-December 2003, from Author Web site: <http://www.cpj.org>

APPENDIX K

ALERTS AND PROTEST LETTERS DISTRIBUTED BY THE CPJ REGARDING IMPRISONMENT 2000-2003

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Colombia					
Alerts	1	0	0	0	1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Cuba					
Alerts	1	4	2	12	19
Letters	1	2	0	1	4
Dominican Republic					
Alerts	0	0	0	0	0
Letters	0	0	0	1	1
Panama					
Alerts	1	0	0	0	1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Peru					
Alerts	1	0	0	1	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Latin America					
Alerts	4	4	2	13	23
Letters	1	2	0	2	5

Note. Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000-2003). *CPJ Archives*. Retrieved

October-December 2003, from Author Web site: <http://www.cpj.org>

APPENDIX L

ALERTS AND PROTEST LETTERS DISTRIBUTED BY THE CPJ REGARDING
PHYSICAL ATTACKS 2000-2003

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Argentina					
Alerts	1	0	0	2	3
Letters	0	0	1	0	1
Bolivia					
Alerts	1	0	0	2	3
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil					
Alerts	0	0	1	0	1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Colombia					
Alerts	6	4	14	6	30
Letters	2	0	0	0	2
Cuba					
Alerts	0	0	2	0	2
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Guatemala					
Alerts	0	1	0	3	1
Letters	1	0	1	1	3
Haiti					
Alerts	0	0	5	3	8
Letters	0	1	0	1	2
Honduras					
Alerts	0	0	0	0	0
Letters	1	0	0	0	1
Mexico					
Alerts	1	0	0	0	1
Letters	1	0	0	0	1
Paraguay					
Alerts	0	0	0	0	0
Letters	1	1	0	0	2
Peru					
Alerts	1	0	1	0	2
Letters	2	0	0	0	2
Venezuela					
Alerts	0	0	3	0	3
Letters	0	0	2	0	2

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Latin America					
Alerts	10	5	26	16	57
Letters	8	2	4	2	16

Note. Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000-2003). *CPJ Archives*. Retrieved

October-December 2003, from Author Web site: <http://www.cpj.org>

APPENDIX M

ALERTS AND PROTEST LETTERS ON KILLINGS CONFIRMED AND UNCONFIRMED TO BE RELATED TO BE A JOURNALIST'S WORK

2000-2003

Country	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000-2003
Brazil					
Alerts	0	1	3	1	5
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Colombia					
Alerts	3	6	5	1	15
Letters	1	0	0	1	2
Costa Rica					
Alerts	0	0	0	0	0
Letters	0	1	0	0	1
Guatemala					
Alerts	1	1	0	1	3
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Haiti					
Alerts	0	0	0	2	2
Letters	1	0	1	0	2
Mexico					
Alerts	3	3	1	0	7
Letters	0	1	0	0	1
Uruguay					
Alerts	1	0	0	0	1
Letters	0	0	0	0	0
Latin America					
Alerts	8	11	9	5	33
Letters	2	2	1	1	6

Note. Information obtained from Committee to Protect Journalists. (2000-2003). *CPJ Archives*. Retrieved October-December 2003, from Author Web site: <http://www.cpj.org>

APPENDIX N

ALERTS AND PROTEST LETTERS ISSUED AND OCCURRENCE OF ATTACKS

2000-2003

Attack Type Country	Occurrence	Alerts	Protest Letter
Defamation			
Argentina	5	2	0
Brazil	4	1	0
Chile	8	8	1
Colombia	0	3*	0
Costa Rica	1	3	0
Ecuador	2	0	0
Mexico	6	4	3
Panama	18	6	0
Paraguay	1	0	0
Peru	4	4	0
Venezuela	4	0	1
Latin America	53	28	5
Other Legal Issues			
Argentina	3	2	0
Brazil	2	2	0
Chile	2	1	0
Colombia	0	2	0
Cuba	2	3*	0
Honduras	2	0	0
Mexico	1	0	0
Nicaragua	1	0	0
Panama	0	2*	0
Paraguay	0	2*	0
Peru	5	4	2
Venezuela	4	6	1
Latin America	22	24	3

Attack Type Country	Occurrence	Alerts	Protest Letter
Imprisoned			
Colombia	6	1	0
Cuba	37	19	4
Dominican Republic	1	0	1
Panama	0	1*	0
Peru	1	2	0
Latin America	45	23	5
Physical			
Argentina	14	3	1
Bolivia	10	3	0
Brazil	2	1	0
Chile	6	0	0
Colombia	105	30	2
Cuba	27	2	0
Dominican Republic	5	0	0
Guatemala	45	1	3
Haiti	28	8	2
Honduras	2	0	1
Mexico	5	1	1
Nicaragua	2	0	0
Paraguay	5	0	2
Peru	23	2	2
Venezuela	63	3	2
Latin America	342	57	16
Killed 1 and Killed 2			
Bolivia	1	0	0
Brazil	6	5	0
Colombia	29	15	2
Costa Rica	1	0	1
Guatemala	3	3	0
Haiti	3	2	2
Mexico	3	7	1

Attack Type Country	Occurrence	Alerts	Protest Letter
Paraguay	1	0	0
Uruguay	1	1	0
Venezuela	1**	0	0
Latin America	49	33	6

Note. Each alert and protest letter may mention more than one attack, while others only mention one.

Therefore, these numbers are not an accurate representation of how many individual attacks the CPJ chooses to focus on.

*The CPJ issued an alert or protest letter when no actual attack had taken place. In these instances, the CPJ was protesting a proposal that could have posed as a potential threat to journalists and press freedom.

**The CPJ protested this killing while it was protesting general attacks on the press in Venezuela.

APPENDIX O

LEVELS OF INFLUENCE ACHIEVED

Levels of influence achieved on criminal defamation cases

Target country (Overall or Individual) Level of Influence	Government of norm violating state	Domestic opposition groups in norm violating state	Domestic society in norm violating state	Trans- national advocacy groups	State govern- ments	OAS
Argentina						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue	X	X		X		X
Agenda	X	X		X		X
Discourse	X	X		X		X
Procedures*	X			X		X
Policy	X			X		X
Behavior	X					
Argentina						
(Overall)						
Raise Issue	X	X		X		
Agenda	X	X		X		
Discourse	X	X		X		
Procedures*						
Policy						
Behavior						
Chile						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue	X	X		X		X
Agenda	X	X		X		X
Discourse	X	X		X		X
Procedures *	X					
Policy	X					
Behavior	X					
Chile						
(Overall)						
Raise Issue	X	X		X		X
Agenda	X	X		X		X
Discourse	X	X		X		X
Procedures*	X			X		
Policy	X			X		X
Behavior						
Costa Rica						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue	X			X		X
Agenda	X			X		X
Discourse				X		X
Procedures*						X
Policy						
Behavior						

Target country (Overall or Individual) Level of Influence	Government of norm violating state	Domestic opposition groups in norm violating state	Domestic society in norm violating state	Trans- national advocacy groups	State governments	OAS
Costa Rica (Overall)						
Raise Issue	X			X		X
Agenda	X			X		X
Discourse				X		X
Procedures* Policy Behavior						X
Panama (Individual)						
Raise Issue	X			X		
Agenda	X			X		
Discourse	X			X		
Procedures* Policy Behavior	X					
Panama (Overall)						
Raise Issue	X	X		X		
Agenda	X	X		X		
Discourse	X	X		X		
Procedures* Policy Behavior						

Levels of influence achieved on imprisonment cases

Target country (Overall or Individual) Level of Influence	Government of norm violating state	Domestic opposition groups in norm violating state	Domestic society in norm violating state	Trans- national advocacy groups	State governments	OAS
Cuba (Individual)						
Raise Issue				X		
Agenda				X		
Discourse				X		
Procedures* Policy Behavior						
Cuba (Overall)						
Raise Issue		X			X	
Agenda		X			X	
Discourse					X	
Procedures* Policy Behavior						
Mexico (Individual)						
Raise Issue	X	X	X	X		
Agenda	X	X	X	X		
Discourse	X	X	X	X		
Procedures* Policy	X					

Levels of influence achieved on violence cases

Target country (Overall or Individual) Level of Influence	Government of norm violating state	Domestic opposition groups in norm violating state	Domestic society in norm violating state	Trans- national advocacy groups	State governments	OAS
Argentina						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue	X	X	X	X	X	X
Agenda	X	X	X	X	X	X
Discourse	X	X	X	X	X	X
Procedures*	X					X
Policy	X					
Behavior	X					
Colombia						
(Overall)						
Raise Issue	X	X				
Agenda	X	X				
Discourse	X	X				
Procedures*	X	X				
Policy	X	X				
Behavior						
Costa Rica						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue		X	X			
Agenda		X	X			
Discourse		X	X			
Procedures*						
Policy						
Behavior						
Guatemala						
(Overall)						
Raise Issue	X	X				
Agenda	X	X				
Discourse	X	X				
Procedures*		X				
Policy						
Behavior						
Haiti						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue	X	X				
Agenda	X	X				
Discourse	X	X				
Procedures*						
Policy						
Behavior						
Haiti						
(Individual)						
Raise Issue	X	X				
Agenda	X	X				
Discourse	X	X				
Procedures*						
Policy						
Behavior						

Target country (Overall or Individual) Level of Influence	Government of norm violating state	Domestic opposition groups in norm violating state	Domestic society in norm violating state	Trans- national advocacy groups	State governments	OAS
<hr/>						
Honduras						
(Overall)						
Raise Issue	X	X				
Agenda	X	X				
Discourse	X	X				
Procedures*		X				
Policy						
Behavior						
<hr/>						
Venezuela						
(Overall)						
Raise Issue		X				
Agenda		X				
Discourse		X				
Procedures*						
Policy						
Behavior						

Note. Blanks indicate that not enough sufficient data was obtained to provide evidence that this level of influence was achieved or not achieved.

*Institutional Procedures