

Two. Media reports on human rights violence

In view of a proportion of information related with July 1 riot, information concerning human rights was 14.2 percent (15 hours) in TV coverage and 10.4 percent (12347 cm²) in newspaper coverage. Such information was only 0.4 percent on July 1, and 11.1 percent during the state of emergency as well as 22.8 percent after the state of the emergency.

- 97.3 percent of total information about human rights occupies information on human rights violence.
- 2.7 percent of information covers “there was no human rights violence”. This word was said by the National Human Rights Commission, the Police organization, the State Investigative Department, the parliamentary sub-committee on human rights, the MPRP and some citizens. Meanwhile, NGOs engaging in human rights, some civil movements, and advocates, families of victims and some political parties and coalition had made information that there have been human rights violence.
- There was no information saying “human rights were not violated” on July 1. But, during the state of emergency when MNPBT run its activity, information claiming “human rights were not violated” was 14.8 percent. Such information increased to 85.2 percent after the lifting of the state of emergency.
- 28 percent of total information on human rights through television was covered by Eagle TV, 25 percent by C1 TV, 22 percent by MNPBT.
- 44 percent of total publication on human rights through newspapers was published in Odriin Sonin (Daily Newspaper). This was most the highest showing.
- Media reported about 30 kinds of human rights violence committed. 21.4 percent of information about body assault to detainees by policemen was broadcast by television and 22.2 percent was covered by newspapers.
- Media could not deliver the public a real information on human rights violence. For example:
 - Television channels breached the professional standard by using only one information source. But TV 9 channel had equal number of information sources.
 - Newspapers used two information sources qualifying professional standards.

July 1. Media Monitoring

- When media makes reporting on human rights violence, they used representation of sources in comparatively well manner keeping balance. For televisions, 23.5 percent of sources was from officials, 22.9 percent from NGOs and 21.4 percent was from civil representation. For newspapers, 24.7 percent of sources was from officials and 38.4 percent was from the civil representation.
- Making analysis to contents of information on human rights violence, about 30 kinds of violence were disclosed and published. For example, a form of torture by beating detained citizens (21.4 percent); arresting non-adults and pregnant women with treating them inhumanity (12.8 percent), and violation of the rights of disable citizens (10.5) etc.
- When MNPBT worked during the state of emergency, it had dominated one information source. For the representation, 58.2 percent were of officials. It proved that state censorship served there and expression on human rights was made by a position of state organizations.
- A total of six news coverage on human rights violence were broadcast by television on July 1. During the state of emergency, information on position of NGO representation dropped to 1.9 percent and civil representation decreased 5.1 percent. After the lifting of the state of emergency, position of NGO representation increased to 27.6 percent and position of civil representation to 25 percent. Journalists reported 26.9 percent of total information on human rights violence. Position of official source decreased to 30.8 percent but it was still more than others. Eagle TV kept most balanced position of sources.

In the society respecting human rights, media must itself be away of violating human rights. Journalists should prevent from human rights violence during sudden confrontation condition. Unfortunately, Mongolia media failed to pursue this principle.

When television made live broadcast or interview, they did not use a transformation methodology of hiding faces of witness and victims, and changing their voices. Police used these live broadcasts against suspects and detainees. Television must not work for providing police with proof materials; they must make reporting to provide the public with information.