

July 1. Media Monitoring

General Conclusion

An incident of July 1, 2008 was the first ever extraordinary event shocking the public in the history of Mongolia since choosing the democratic system with an appearance of confrontation situation in the society.

1. In the course of this event, media means worked overtime than normal days, and information related with the July 1 episode was operatively delivered to the public.
2. Media means involved in the monitoring session had turned its attention much to a reason of eruption, its situation, and measures taken in connection with this condition as well as its consequences. In doing so, information was delivered to the public under coverage of own way and style of each media body. Broadcasting of real information turned into like fighting of political parties and voices of different positions and views. Media means explained the reason of July 1 event in 16 different ways.
3. In making analysis to the professional level of Mongolia's mass media, they covered the reporting in good manner when they covered a July 1 demonstration and a post-demonstration situation, for example, they performed the coverage relying on real facts other than forcing their views. However, professional norm failed in terms of a number of information sources, a representation and contents. Because of this, they could not keep a balance while reporting the incident and information were biased-handling and polarized.
4. In view of the proportion of all information about July 1 event delivered through mass media, information about the violence of human rights occupied the smallest percent. Information about human rights was 0.4 percent on July 1. After declaration of a state of emergency, information about human rights had increased 57 times. The number of information sources and representation had been balanced in comparatively. But, in a term of content, it had divided into two poles like "human rights were violated" and "human rights were not violated". It had dominated a pole "human rights were not violated".
5. When media means report about human rights, they used only one information source, especially; sources were unbalanced during the state of emergency. Official position extremely dominated in a term of the representation, and information on human rights violence was extremely polarized. Position of human right NGOs considering "human rights were violated" was less than two percent in the coverage of mass media.
6. The Mongolian National Public Television Broadcasting (MNPTB) reported about a loss of human lives for the first time. Information about a loss of human lives was published in daily newspapers much more than televisions.

July 1. Media Monitoring

7. 97.2 percent of information on human rights violence was covered in the less information about human rights with mentioning a total of 30 kinds of violence. Almost one third of such information was spread by reporter who based on his/her facts obtained. This shows that majority of journalists respected human rights. However, spread of such information was restricted by a President's decree on declaration of the state of emergency. Moreover, MNPTB's operation under strict control of the state had limited to the spread of such information as well.
8. In the course of the state of emergency, daily newspapers were only alternatives sources for the people. The newspapers delivered more the people's voices to the society.
9. In accordance with the Mongolia's President's decree on declaration of the state of emergency, operation of all televisions except MNPTB was stopped for four days, and a state censorship was restored in Mongolian National Public Radio and Television limiting groundless the freedom of expression of the people and rights and freedom of having access of real information. This shows that press freedom in Mongolia has been comparatively sensitive.
10. It exceeded over the competence of a clause on "put control in public media means and ceasing operation until the lifting of the state of emergency of the 1995 Law on State of Emergency. It also violated some definite provisions of 1999 Press Freedom Law and 2005 Public Radio and Television Law.