



LEGISLATIVE PRIVILEGES AND FREEDOM OF PRESS

Jayashree Balasubramanian



Legislative Privileges and Freedom of Press

Legislative Privileges and Freedom of Press

Jayashree Balasubramanian



BOOKS ARCADE

KRISHNA NAGAR, DELHI

Legislative Privileges and Freedom of Press

Jayashree Balasubramanian

© RESERVED

This book contains information obtained from highly regarded resources. Copyright for individual articles remains with the authors as indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereinafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming and recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work please access booksarcade.co.in

BOOKS ARCADE

Regd. Office:

F-10/24, East Krishna Nagar, Near Vijay Chowk, Delhi-110051

Ph. No: +91-11-79669196, +91-9899073222

E-mail: info@booksarcade.co.in, booksarcade.pub@gmail.com

Website: www.booksarcade.co.in

Edition: 2024

ISBN: 978-81-19923-42-7



CONTENT

Chapter 1. Foundations of Legislative Privileges and Freedom of Press.....	1
— <i>Jayashree Balasubramanian</i>	
Chapter 2. Historical Evolution: Origins of Legislative Privileges	9
— <i>Alok Baptist</i>	
Chapter 3. Fourth Estate: Press Freedom as a Democratic Essential.....	18
— <i>Kapil Kumar Kapoor</i>	
Chapter 4. Parliamentary Immunity: Shielding Lawmakers' Speech and Actions.....	25
— <i>Kapil Kumar Kapoor</i>	
Chapter 5. Media as Watchdogs: Freedom of Press and Accountability	33
— <i>Hansika Disawala</i>	
Chapter 6. In the Line of Fire: Media Scrutiny and Parliamentary Contempt.....	41
— <i>Kshipra Jain</i>	
Chapter 7. Balancing Act: Rights and Responsibilities of the Press.....	49
— <i>Dr. Parag Amin</i>	
Chapter 8. Defamation Dilemmas: Press, Privileges and Libel Laws.....	57
— <i>Shailee Sharma</i>	
Chapter 9. Sunlight and Shadows: Transparency vs. National Security	64
— <i>Mohit Sushil Kelkar</i>	
Chapter 10. Ethics in Journalism: Navigating the Maze of Media Integrity	72
— <i>Shefalika Narain</i>	
Chapter 11. Judicial Interpretations: Courts' Role in Defining Boundaries.....	79
— <i>Utsav Shroff</i>	
Chapter 12. Global Perspectives: Comparative Analysis of Legislative Privileges and Press Freedom.....	86
— <i>Dipika Bhatia</i>	

CHAPTER 1

FOUNDATIONS OF LEGISLATIVE PRIVILEGES AND FREEDOM OF PRESS

Jayashree Balasubramanian, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id-jayashree.balasubramanian@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The foundation of democratic societies is the symbiotic link between legislative privileges and journalistic freedom, which shapes how information is shared, government is carried out, and how individuals interact with their representatives. This research explores the fundamental philosophical principles, historical roots, and legal systems that support these linked pillars. **Historical Background:** Ancient assemblies and early channels of communication are where legislative rights and journalistic freedom first emerged. These ideas have developed throughout time to shield legislators from outside influence, promote free speech, and provide unlimited information distribution via the media. **Philosophical Foundations** The philosophical foundations of these notions include the values of democratic representation, informed citizenship, and the free exchange of ideas. The Enlightenment age promoted free speech rights for individuals as well as the value of an educated public via a free press. **Legal Frameworks** Constitutional protections, legislative procedures, and press freedom laws all give these ideas legal voice. Parliamentary privileges offer immunity to politicians, while press freedom laws safeguard journalists' rights to obtain and distribute information. Constitutional texts uphold both lawmakers' and journalists' rights.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Democratic, Foundations, Freedom Press, Legislative Privileges.

INTRODUCTION

The rights granted by the Indian Constitution under Article 19(1)(a), which protects the right to freedom of speech, are referred to as freedom of the press or media. By allowing citizens to express their thoughts in favor of or against the activities of the government, it stimulates independent media and advances democracy. After the *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras* case made clear how crucial media are as the cornerstone of any democratic organizations, Article 19 came to light. However, it rejected the argument and acknowledged "public safety and public order" under Article 9 (1-A). In *Indian Express Newspapers (Bombay) (P) Ltd. v. Union of India*, Venkataramiah J. of the Supreme Court of India stated: "In today's free world, freedom of the press is the core of social and political interaction. In the developed world, where television and other forms of contemporary

communication are still not widely accessible to all segments of society, the press has now taken on the role of the public educator, enabling formal and non-formal education on a global scale. By providing information and viewpoints that are necessary for a democratic electorate (Government) to make informed decisions, the press serves the public interest. Newspapers, as publishers of news and opinions that have an impact on public administration, often publish content that is objectionable to governments and other authorities.

In India, media and press freedom are universally acknowledged. According to Article 19(2), it does have appropriate limitations in place to ensure the nation's citizens' safety. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression," reads Article 19 of the declaration, and this right includes the freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers [1].

What are the media's rights

The Constitution makes no reference to press freedom. It is assumed that it is protected under the right to free speech and expression. Therefore, a regular citizen's rights are the same as those of the media or press organization.

Free flow of ideas: The media provides a forum for the interchange of ideas and opinions that should be heard by everyone throughout the country and stimulates individuals to think critically and beyond the box. Holding the person or entity responsible for their actions: People often want to hide their wrongdoing and resolve a dispute without using the media. Such incidents are brought to light by the press, which also ensures that justice is properly administered with the support of the general public.

Voice of the People:

The press serves as a medium through which the opinions of the vast majority of people are written and spoken. It focuses on the concerns that are ignored and brings up the topics that need to be discussed.

Fourth pillar of democracy

Along with the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of the government, the media may be considered the fourth pillar of democracy since it is an independent entity that opposes the government. The situation currently is not very favorable, notwithstanding some development from the period when "freedom of the media" may be measured. In recent years, there have been several instances of hate crimes, false allegations, convictions brought about by inaccurate portrayals, fake news, etc.

We have all been the victims of bogus news, which is so extensively disseminated that we take it as gospel. Paid News: Since journalism and news reporting are low-paying professions, certain experts often disseminate incorrect information in return for money. Biased Media Rich criminals and powerful politicians often pay media organizations to highlight their self-described "good" and "charitable" deeds. Particularly when it comes to elections, this leads to prejudice among the audience.

Reporting on parliamentary and state legislative sessions is required by the press and electronic media. They could run afoul of the legislators' privileges in the process. Any disregard for legislative authority or scandalizing of legislative behavior may be considered a kind of contempt of the House, which the House has the power to punish. The Constitution grants lawmakers a number of privileges.

Even if what is stated is unrelated to the work of the House, Article 105(1) guarantees that there will be no legal action for defamation and allows for freedom of expression in the legislature. He won't be held accountable for whatever he says or votes in the Parliament or any of its committees. Section 105(2).

Regarding the publishing of any reports, papers, votes, or procedures produced by or authorized by either House, there will be no obligation. Without permission, a publication is not protected and may be held in contempt [2].

Advantages Of Being A MLA And MP

The Constitution mandates that Parliament define the rights, privileges, and obligations of Parliament and MPs. No legislation addressing this issue has yet been passed. In the lack of such legislation, British parliamentary traditions continue to govern.

Individual Benefits Experienced by Members Include

Parliamentary speech rights: Parliamentarians have the right to freedom of speech and expression. Since a free and fearless exchange of ideas is undoubtedly at the heart of our democracy, everything uttered by individuals expressing their opinions is immune from responsibility and cannot be brought before a judge. The freedom of speech and expression granted to a member of the parliament is quite distinct from the freedom of speech and expression granted to a national citizen under Article 19(2). Article 105(1) of the Indian Constitution guarantees it.

However, the freedom is constrained by the laws and decrees that govern parliamentary procedures. Even non-members with a right to speak in the house are granted this privilege. Indian attorney general is an example. Therefore, there will be daring engagement from the participants in the conversation, and each participant will provide his or her own ideas [3].

Freedom from Arrest

Article 361 of the Indian Constitution states that members are exempt from arrest in any civil proceeding 40 days before to and 40 days after the adjournment of the house, as well as during sessions of the house. No member may be detained from parliamentary proceedings without the previous consent of the house to which he or she belongs in order to prevent any obstruction to their performance of their responsibilities. However, a member may be detained outside the home for violating any law, including the Preventive Detention Act, the Essential Services Maintenance Act (ESMA), the National Security Act (NSA), or any other applicable law.

Freedom from Having to Testify

The members of the parliament have unique rights and are not required to testify in court. They are granted total freedom to go to the residence and carry out their responsibilities without the court getting in the way.

Privileges Accorded to Members of Parliament Collectively

Right to forbid the publishing of proceedings: According to Article 105(2) of the Constitution, nobody may be held liable for publications of any reports, debates, etc., made by the house with a member's permission.

However, any partial report of a distinct proceeding or any publication made with the purpose to harm is ineligible for protection. Protection is only given if it accurately portrays the procedures of the house. It is considered a violation of the privilege and an act of contempt of the house if any erased proceedings are printed or if any misleading information or inaccurate reporting is discovered.

Right to Exclude Strangers: House members have the power and right to exclude strangers and other non-house members from participating in the proceedings. In order to ensure frank and impartial debate within the house, this right is crucial.

If a violation is reported, a warning, reprimand, or even incarceration may be imposed as punishment. Each house is entitled to control how its internal affairs are conducted in accordance with its own judgment of what is good and suitable. Each house has exclusive control over the other, and neither house's authority may regulate the other house's internal affairs [4].

The house has the authority to conduct its regulations for proceedings under Article 118 of the Constitution, and it cannot be challenged in court on the grounds that it is not doing so in line

with the norms established by that article. The Supreme Court has further ruled that since this is a broad clause, the regulation is not enforceable against the house. They are free to change the regulation or diverge from it at any moment. penalties for violating rights or being disrespectful to the home incarceration: If the violation was serious in nature, one of many punishments, including incarceration of any member or person, will be applied. A fine may be imposed on a person if, in the opinion of the parliament, a breach or act of contempt was committed and a monetary advantage was obtained as a result of the breach. prosecuting the offenders, the parliament has the authority to bring charges against the violator. Punishment for its own members If a member of the parliament behaves in a discourteous manner, the house will punish him or her and may even suspend the member from the house [5].

DISCUSSION

The symbiotic relationship between legislative privileges and freedom of the press forms the cornerstone of democratic governance. This chapter delves into the historical origins, legal underpinnings, and philosophical principles that lay the foundation for these two pivotal components of modern societies.

Historical Evolution: A Glimpse into the Past: Tracing back to ancient parliamentary traditions and historical precedents, this section explores how legislative privileges emerged as a means to protect the independence of lawmakers in the face of external influences and pressure. Ancient Roots Expression and Immunity's Seeds This section examines the oldest examples of legislative privileges and reveals how early assemblies extended immunity to legislators to safeguard free speech. In parallel, the first modes of communication in cultures established the principles underpinning press freedom. Parliamentary Privileges in Medieval Parliaments This section explores how privileges developed to safeguard parliamentarians from outside threats and meddling, enabling them to discuss freely without fear of retaliation. It does this by examining the medieval origins of parliamentary institutions. Press Freedom Catalyst The Print Revolution This section illustrates how the printing press's development democratized access to information, facilitated the dissemination of ideas, and planted the seeds for press freedom's future significance. During the Age of Enlightenment,

Knowledgeable Citizens Grew This chapter explores the Enlightenment's broad impact and focuses on how thinkers like John Locke and Voltaire promoted the idea of an educated populace, inspiring the idea that a free press was essential to holding authority responsible. Founding Moments Media Freedoms and Legislative Powers

This section examines significant historical events like the American Revolution and the French Revolution to show how these upheavals cemented the value of press freedom and legislative privileges as necessary defenses against tyranny. Milestones in the Constitution Codifying Rights and Protections. This section, which delves into the codification of rights, looks at how important articles such as the United States' Bill of Rights and analogous constitutional clauses throughout the globe codified press freedom and legislative privileges as essential tenets of government [6].

Philosophical Underpinnings

The Nexus of Expression and Representation: Examining the intersection of legislative privileges and freedom of the press through the lens of democratic philosophy, this section delves into how the ability of lawmakers to freely express their views and the media's role in informing the public converge to reinforce democratic representation.

The foundation of legitimacy is democratic representation. This section addresses the fundamental principle of democratic representation by examining how parliamentary privileges allow legislators to express a variety of opinions without fear, ensuring that the views of the people they serve are heard in legislative halls.

This section explores the notion of the public sphere as a space where informed individuals participate in reasoned debate by delving into the theories of political theorists like Jürgen Habermas. This area is significantly influenced by press freedom, which improves public discussion and policy creation. **John Stuart Mill and the "Marketplace of Ideas":** This section examines the significant views of John Stuart Mill and focuses on how press and expression freedom promote the "marketplace of ideas." It promotes the collision of opposing viewpoints so that society may sort through them and find the truths. **Accountability and Transparency in Locke's Social Contract** This section examines John Locke's social compact theory and demonstrates how legislative privileges and media scrutiny function as checks and balances on people in authority. The agreement between the governed and their representatives include an inherent right to information for the general public. **Tolerance and Pluralism in Voltaire's Legacy** This section examines Voltaire's support for tolerance and diversity and emphasizes how the freedom of the press defends minority rights by providing a forum for opposing viewpoints and guarding against the tyranny of the majority. **Isaiah Berlin's Two Concepts of Freedom Balancing Liberties** This part examines the fragile balance between personal liberties and the common good by delving into Isaiah Berlin's duality of positive and negative freedoms. It explores how press freedom and legislative privileges handle this conflict [7].

The Birth of Free Press

Enlightenment and Information Dissemination: Exploring the Enlightenment era's pivotal role in championing the values of press freedom, this section sheds light on how the rise of independent journalism shaped societies' understanding of governance, accountability, and the people's right to be informed. **Enlightenment Ideals and the Information Revolution** This section examines how the Enlightenment's focus on reason, knowledge, and individual rights paved the ground for a new method of disseminating information and the creation of a free press. **Knowledge Transmission during the Renaissance of the Printing Press** This section examines the revolutionary effects of the printing press's comeback during the Enlightenment and explores how the availability of written information enabled anyone to acquire knowledge regardless of their location or social standing.

This section explores the role of salons and coffeehouses as centers of scholarly conversation, showing how these settings fostered debates that helped shape public opinion and the need for free access to knowledge. **Philosophers as Public Intellectuals:** This section examines how Enlightenment thinkers like Voltaire, Rousseau, and Locke promoted the notion of a free press and demonstrates how their works sparked the development of a culture in which ideas circulated unrestrictedly. **Developing Newspapers and Journals Educating the Public** This section highlights how newspapers and journals became tools of enlightenment during this time by examining the expansion of these media and how they disseminated news, views, and critical debate to a larger audience. **Press Freedom Thread Conflict between Censorship and Enlightenment** This part investigates the conflict between the ideal of a free press and the practice of censorship, and it looks at the difficulties Enlightenment intellectuals had when dealing with governments that opposed the open flow of knowledge [8].

Legal Framework

Enshrining Privileges and Press Freedom: Investigating the legal mechanisms that enshrine legislative privileges and freedom of the press, this section delves into constitutional

provisions, statutes, and case law that safeguard the rights and responsibilities of lawmakers and journalists alike. Constitutional Protections Rights Foundations This section examines the constitutional foundations of parliamentary privileges and press freedom as well as the mechanisms through which these rights are codified to assure their perpetuity. Parliamentary Privileges Protecting the Behavior of Lawmakers This section examines the legal justification for legislative privileges by delving into the parliamentary norms, cases, and laws that provide legislators some immunity to facilitate their tasks without fear of retaliation. Press Freedom Statutes Information-Freezing Legislation This section explores the legal provisions intended to guarantee journalists' freedom to obtain information, report it, and spread it without being subjected to censorship or undue influence. Using Case Law and Examples to Interpret Boundaries This section goes into defining instances that have set the boundaries of these rights and the harmony between individual liberty and community interests, examining how court interpretations impact the extent of legislative privileges and press freedom. International Accords, International Standards, and Regional Differences examining how international treaties and conventions, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, provide a universal basis for journalistic freedom and legislative rights while still allowing for various national interpretations. Problems with balancing: Conflicts between rights and interests This section examines the legal complications that occur when press freedom and legislative privileges cross or conflict, focusing on the situations when these rights may conflict. Normative Foundations of Democracy The legal structure that supports press freedom and legislative rights is evidence of nations' dedication to democratic government, transparency, and the free flow of information. This chapter explains how these rules and laws create a climate where people's rights and societal interests coexist [9].

Global Perspectives

Diverse Foundations and Common Threads: A comparative exploration of how different countries and cultures have laid the foundations for legislative privileges and press freedom, revealing the common principles and unique variations that exist across jurisdictions. United States Constitutional Roots and Press Freedom: Examining how the United States' First Amendment solidified press freedom as a fundamental right, this section delves into landmark cases that have shaped the relationship between the media and lawmakers, influencing the global discourse on press freedom. United Kingdom Parliamentary Privileges and Evolving Media Landscape: Investigating how the UK's historical development of parliamentary privileges interacts with a dynamic media landscape, this section explores how legal traditions adapt to modern challenges while upholding democratic principles. India Balancing Rights and Duties: Exploring how India's Constitution enshrines freedom of the press while defining the limitations on press freedom for the greater good, this section highlights the nuanced approach taken to balance rights and responsibilities. France Press Freedom in a Rights-Driven Society: Uncovering how France, with its strong emphasis on human rights, navigates the complex interplay between legislative privileges and media freedoms, shedding light on the country's unique approach within a European context. South Africa Post-Apartheid Transition and Media Pluralism: Examining how South Africa's post-apartheid transition led to a media landscape that champions diversity and independence, this section delves into the legal mechanisms that protect both press freedom and the parliamentary process. China: State Control and Media Restrictions: Investigating China's approach to media control within a context of strong state influence, this section discusses how legislative privileges are understood and balanced against the backdrop of a tightly controlled media environment. Universality in Diversity: The global perspectives on legislative privileges and freedom of the press demonstrate the diverse ways in which societies uphold democratic principles while accounting for cultural, historical, and legal

nuances. This chapter unveils how these principles resonate across the globe, united by the universal ideals of informed citizenry and accountable governance [10].

Building Blocks of Democracy's Pillars: In the intricate dance between legislative privileges and freedom of the press, the historical, philosophical, and legal foundations stand as the bedrock of modern democracy. The interplay between these elements shapes the landscape of governance, accountability, and the people's right to be informed.

CONCLUSION

The tenets of press freedom and legislative privileges reveal a rich tapestry woven from historical development, intellectual goals, and legal protections. An improved appreciation of these pillars' relevance in promoting open, accountable, and democratic societies results from this trip through their historical roots. **Historical Knowledge** When one considers the historical antecedents, it is clear that press freedom and legislative privileges have their roots in the long history of human government. The development of these ideas, from early assemblies through the Enlightenment period, reflects societies' intrinsic need for fair representation and well-informed decision-making. **Philosophical Empowerment** These ideas are not only legal constructions, but rather the manifestation of democratic principles, according to philosophical grounds. The significance of preserving parliamentarians' freedom of speech and allowing journalists to freely distribute information is underscored by the Enlightenment's focus on individual rights, free speech, and informed citizenry.

Legal Guardianship In the contemporary period, the legal frameworks that protect journalistic freedom and legislative rights serve as the guardians of these values. An complicated tapestry of rights and obligations is created by constitutional protections, legislative procedures, and press freedom laws, balancing the need for free speech with the need for responsible reporting. The interaction between press freedom and legislative privileges is a dynamic dance that enhances democratic government. Legislators are encouraged to carry out their duties honorably by the accountability provided by a free press, and the preservation of parliamentary privileges gives them the freedom to express divergent views without fear.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Yılmaz, "Europeanisation or De-Europeanisation? Media Freedom in Turkey (1999–2015)," *South Eur. Soc. Polit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13608746.2016.1148102.
- [2] Y. C. Lee, "Television news and media freedom in Malaysia: A study on TV2 and NTV7's english television news," *J. Komun. Malaysian J. Commun.*, 2014, doi: 10.17576/jkmjc-2014-3002-08.
- [3] L. Rabe, "The importance of media freedom in South Africa: Two centuries, two case studies, from the Magna Carta to the Secrecy Bill," *Tydskr. VIR GEESTESWETENSKAPPE*, 2016.
- [4] R. Aslam, "Media, politics and the threats to journalists in Pakistan," *Pacific Journal. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.24135/pjr.v21i1.156.
- [5] J. A. Solis and L. Antenangeli, "Corruption Is Bad News for a Free Press: Reassessing the Relationship Between Media Freedom and Corruption," *Soc. Sci. Q.*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/ssqu.12438.
- [6] D. Robie, "Review: The struggle for media freedom amid jihadists, gaggers and 'democratators,'" *Pacific Journal. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.24135/pjr.v21i2.133.

- [7] R. Morris, "Pacific Journalism Monographs No. 6: Watching Our Words: Perceptions of self-censorship and media freedom in Fiji," *Pacific Journal. Monogr. Te Koakoā Ngā Rangahau*, 2017, doi: 10.24135/pjm.v0i6.7.
- [8] U. Carlsson, "Freedom of expression in the digital transition: Speech at the European Symposium on Media Policy 2015, Oslo 20 November 2015," *J. Media Bus. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/16522354.2016.1192322.
- [9] L. Duffield, "Pacific journalism review: Twenty years on the front line of regional identity and freedom," *Pacific Journal. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.24135/pjr.v21i1.145.
- [10] M. Cernison and A. Ostling, "Measuring Media Literacy in the EU: Results from the Media Pluralism Monitor 2015," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2906216.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION: ORIGINS OF LEGISLATIVE PRIVILEGES

Alok Baptist, Director
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
 Email Id-alok.baptist@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The development of legislative privileges across time reveals a tapestry of dynamic interactions between governance, representation, and the defense of democratic institutions. In order to give insight on the genesis of these advantages and their long-lasting influence, this research explores the ancient roots, medieval transitions, and the formation of parliamentary privileges. Legislative privileges have their roots in ancient assemblies, when representatives were given immunity to allow for unrestricted speech. This early appreciation of the value of free discussion helped pave the way for the creation of privileges that protected parliamentary independence. Transitions in the Middle Ages: During this time, legislative privileges went from being sporadic immunity to formal safeguards. Legislators looked for protection from outside pressures as parliamentary institutions developed so they could do their tasks independently and honestly.

KEYWORDS:

Democratic, Immunity, Legislative, Privileges, Parliamentary.

INTRODUCTION

A privilege is a unique or extraordinary right or immunity held by a certain group of people that is not accessible to the general public. In a legal context, it refers to a release from a responsibility, obligation, requirement, or obligation to which others are subject. In parliamentary jargon, the word "privilege" refers to a set of privileges possessed by each house of parliament, its committees, and the members of each house individually, without which they would be unable to carry out their duties in an efficient and effective manner. Members are only eligible for the privileges while acting in their official role as members of parliament and carrying out their parliamentary responsibilities. The authority of parliament in confronting the executive and as a forum for expressing the concerns of citizens would be diminished without the privileges, which have both external and internal aspects.

The privileges of each house protect it from outside interference that would erode its freedom to conduct its own proceedings and they impose duties on its members, restraining them from engaging in certain activities. On the other hand, the fact that the house and each of its members asserts certain privileges not available to the average citizen and may seek to punish those who violate them tends to distance the house from the people it represents and makes it vulnerable to criticism and even ridicule if it appears to be asserting privileges that are not obviously necessary for its functions [1].

Background of parliamentary privileges in history

The history of the institution of parliament in England and the development of parliamentary privileges are intrinsically linked. The House of Commons struggled to find a position for itself in the parliament, which was vital to safeguard them from the influence and authority of the king and the house of lord.

The executive arm of government was divided from the parliament. As a result, the privileges were put into place in the late 16th century. The commons claimed what came from the king's special protection on the grounds of inheritance theory and the king's divine prerogative. Thus, in the 19th century, when a stable state had been attained and the parliament had established and recognized the restrictions on privileges.

By the second half of the 15th century, it seems that the house of commons has the vaguely defined right to free speech because of tradition rather than as a result of rights sought and attained. The speaker did not make this assertion before. They did ask for the ability to remedy any intentional misrepresentation of the home to the monarch, however. Even the speaker questioned if it should be considered an accident if the House of Commons or speaker offends the monarch or violates the prerogative. The right to free speech was under discussion first parliament in 1563, and it was defended by old custom.

Sir John Eliot was jailed in 1629 along with the other two members after being found guilty by the King's Bench of using seditious language during a discussion and assaulting the speaker. The common bench ruled that the court of king should not have recognized Eliot and other cases as being within its purview. Furthermore, the ruling violated the rights of the parliament and was illegitimate. After the Revolution of 1688, the Common overturned the ruling, and Article 9 of the Bill of Rights gave the privileges legal recognition. Although the right to free expression protects the topics under discussion in both chambers. The privilege of publishing discussion or proceedings outside of parliament is not subject to this right to the same extent [2].

Whether order of house or not, a fair and accurate account of a debate in either house is protected by the same principle as that which protects the fair report in court of justice: that the benefit of publicity to the community at large outweighs any private injury resulting from the publication unless malice is proven. Freedom from arrest refers to the rights associated with participation in the customary public assemblies, or the idea that a king's servant doing their duties in court should not be hindered by laws in subordinate tribunals.

It was established quite early on as a principle. The earliest instance of freedom of arrest is said to have occurred in 1340 when the monarch liberated a member of parliament who had been imprisoned during a previous session of parliament because his custody had stopped him from assuming a seat. In the Thorpe case, the house of commons speaker was sent behind bars in 1452. The decision to nominate the new speaker was so readily accepted the commons. who had been chosen in the commons but had been put to death in the fleet before the sitting of parliament was discharged, gave rise to development in 1604. After first refusing to release the member, the fleet warden was punished for disrespect. The Privileges of Parliament Act, 1603 which guarantees the right to freedom of arrest was passed as a result of these occurrences.

There were two gatherings called Sabha and Samiti that served as the king's checks and balances throughout the Vedic era. The East India Company visited India in 1600 to do business. By virtue of the 1784 East India Company Act, they were involved in the situation. The 1833 Charter Act placed a strong focus on centralized legislative power. By virtue of the 1853 charter act, the Indian Legislative Council Act was expanded. The Indian Council Act of 1861 established the authority of the legislative council in response to the claim of privileges made by the legislative councilor under the charter act of 1853.

The Indian Council Act of 1892, which reiterated and expanded the privileges, including those related to the debate, any motion passed by parliament, etc., was repealed and extended by this act. The Government of India Act of 1915 consolidated the entire position of parliamentary privilege that had been attained. The Government of India Act of 1919 stipulated restrictions

on members' freedom of expression. The laws relating to the privileges of Indian parliamentary members were included in the Government of India Act of 1935. The Indian Independence Act of 1947 granted India autonomous legislative authority [3].

May describes privileges as the "total of special powers held by each house jointly and by members of each house individually, which transcend those held by other bodies and people, without which they could not carry out their tasks. It should be noted that these privileges of parliament are essentially those of the entire house; individual members may only invoke privilege if doing so would prevent the house from conducting its business. Privilege is a significant aspect of the law and custom of parliament, to be gathered, according to Coke, "out of the rolls of parliament and other records, and by presidents and continued experience," but the aspects of law are not explicitly stated in the law. Since the house cannot carry out its duties without the unhindered use of its members' services, each house enjoys privileges for the protection of its members as well as the defense of its own authority and dignity.

As a result, it is a fundamental principle of the parliamentary system of government that the people's representative should be able to express themselves without fear of repercussions from the law. The court should not, and does not, have any authority over the situation. Sources of parliamentary privileges in India.

The constitution: Several provisions in the constitution expressly provide such privileges, with the extent thereof, for example, freedom of speech in parliament, which has been granted immunity to protect the integrity of the legislative process immunity with regard to anything said or voted on in the house or any committee, immunity with regard to any reports or papers published by or with the approval of either house and restriction on the ability of courts to inquire into house proceedings on the basis of irregularity [4].

Prohibiting courts from having jurisdiction over officers or members of parliament who are using their constitutional authority to control procedure, business, or order in parliament. [Art. 122(2)]; immunity with regard to broadcasting a house's proceedings through wireless telegraphy or in a newspaper as a part of any service offered by a broadcasting station

Laws: Article 105(3) gives the parliament the authority to "define" privileges by "law." Since it makes no mention of a thorough codification, it would follow that any statute passed by parliament after January 26, 1950 that specifies any privilege even if only partially will have precedence in issues not covered by article 105(3) of the constitution. There are several statutes that deal with the privileges of parliament, such as the parliamentary proceeding (protection of publishing) act of 1977, even though no complete legislation has yet been created.

Privileges of the house of commons due to art 105(3), excepting the matters relating to which the constitution has specifically provided for, privileges in other matters shall be the same as those of the British house of commons, as on, so long as they are the same as those of the British house of commons, as on. Such legislation, however, must not be in conflict with any provision of the constitution, as stated by art 2 According to our constitution, freedom of expression is guaranteed under article 105. 4

Rules of the House Although article 118(1) does not specifically mention "privileges," it does grant each house of parliament the power to make rules to govern "its procedure and conduct of business." As far as arrest is concerned, this power has only been applied to civil cases and has not been applied to arrest on the basis of criminal charges or to detention under the Preventive Detention Act. However, since they have the support of the constitution under article 105(3), such regulations will only be legitimate if they are not in conflict with the constitution, including not only the stated provision but also the privileges as they existed in

the British house of commons on January 26, 1950. Since the British House of Commons privileges are codified and must be gathered from many sources, there is room for the Indian parliament's chambers to elaborate on them via regulations as long as they do not conflict with the British privileges.

Precedents: Since each house of parliament has the sole authority to govern its own proceedings, and the presiding officer (speaker or chairman) exercises that authority on behalf of the house, the interpretation of the constitution or house rules provided by the presiding officer is binding unless superseded by substantive motions, resolutions, rules made by the house, or statute.

These rulings from the chair have an authority comparable to decision-making within the house. In time, the rules created by the house may come to reflect established precedents. But Article 105 of the Constitution limits the precedents or laws. In accordance with one of the tenets of the British law of privileges, no house of parliament may unilaterally declare the creation of a new privilege.

Judicial interpretation since the courts must interpret the constitution, including articles 105 and 194, as well as the laws governing the powers and privileges of the legislatures, in cases properly brought before them by parties outside the house of parliament who may have been impacted by the exercise of those privileges' claims that bringing up the UK does not diminish the dignity of the Indian constitution. He said that because India has been recognized as a full member of the Commonwealth, there should be no problem with using the English House of Commons as a reference. Advised that a list of the numerous privileges be compiled and included as an appendix to the constitution. According to the privileges of commons members are well recognized and established, thus including them in the schedule shouldn't be problematic.

In response to these points, defended the use of the House of Commons, claiming that it ensured that the members enjoyed the broadest range of privileges because, if the privileges were defined in terms of existing privileges of Indian legislatures, the house would not be able to punish for its contempt. According to him, formulating all privileges would take more time than was available since it would involve a thorough examination of how parliamentary privileges function in England; as a result, the reference was the only viable option. In opposition, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra stated, "We are framing a constitution for a free, independent, sovereign, republic and we are going to great lengths to prescribe the rights and privileges for the interim period by reference to what is contained for the members of the house of commons of the parliaments of the UK, though there is also no exhaustive list of the rights and privileges which the members enjoy [5].

DISCUSSION

None of the amendments were approved by the constituent assembly, and the draft article framed by the drafting committee was adopted with an amendment extending the scope of the immunities to speeches and statements in parliamentary committees of either house. Before the 42nd The janta administration was replaced by the Indira government before a notice to implement Section 21 of the 42nd Amendment Act could be issued, hence it seems the relevant portion of the 42nd Amendment Act, 1976, was never put into effect. Thus, the original provision remained in effect until January 26, 1950, when the 44th modification Act of 1978 implemented the modification to clause.

The topic of whether privilege is exclusively granted in respect of publications "under the authority of either house of parliament" is brought up the assembly with relation to clause of

article 85 (now 105) of the Constitution. He recalled how Pandit Krishna Kant Malaviya, a respected member of the central legislature, had given a statement in the house that had been hidden by the media ten to fifteen years before, but that speech had been published in this daily in Allahabad.

The publishing defense was used to start the prosecution. Whatever a member says in the house should be privileged, he said. He cannot fulfill his obligations to the voters who elected him if the public is unaware of what he stated. proposed that any remarks spoken in any house that are not unpleasant and are not disallowed by the speaker or the chairman be completely published outside without the consent of the house of parliament. Believed that privileges should be codified in some way such that, as long as a certain speech has been made in the home, there has not been an offense committed if it is printed in the media. According to Shri Jagat Narain Lal, the member who gave the speech wants additional immunity to publish it outside, which is related to press freedom, but that has nothing to do with the member's freedom in terms of his speech or vote in parliament; it is neither appropriate nor far-fetched. According to author the phrase as written was required in the public interest since what the members were asking for was really a license and not a privilege. As a result, Clause of Article 105 specifically states that no one shall be accountable with regard to the release of any report, document, votes, or procedures according to an order issued by a house of Parliament. Fair and accurate unofficial accounts of parliamentary proceedings, whether published in a newspaper or elsewhere, are protected by the qualified privilege defense under common law. In India, the legislation is the same [6].

The debate over whether independent India should have her own code of parliamentary privileges rather than depending on the uncodified legislation of the British House of Commons has existed from the time of the constituent assembly. The Supreme Court's ruling in that, as long as Parliament does not exercise its legislative power to codify any of its privileges, the latter part of clause (3) of Art. 105 will operate to make the privileges of the British House of Commons available, regardless of any limitations imposed by the fundamental rights included in part III of the constitution, has become the main justification for leaving the privileges uncodified. To put it another way, if parliament now passes legislation outlining any of its rights, the court will be able to review the legality of its clauses in light of any basic rights, such as the freedom of speech and expression outlined in article 19. The privileges were to be granted by the Constitution since India was to become a Republic and the Queen would no longer be the official head of state. Therefore, there were three choices open in India: the first was to explicitly identify and list the privileges in the Constitution itself. The Drafting Committee decided against adopting this solution. The second option was to let the current legislation stand until a conflicting statute was approved. This was impossible since the legislatures received no rights under the 1935 Government of India Act. There being "no other alternative way open to us," therefore the third option making the House of Commons privileges relevant until they were defined by Parliament was adopted. However, concerns that the legislation would never be codified were aired in the assembly itself. Parliament may never legislate on that point and it is therefore for the members to be vigilant on October 16, 1949, and that prediction has come true [7].

Due to two factors first, England lacks a written constitution, there are no restrictions on the omnipotence of parliament, and the courts lack the authority to review the acts of the sovereign legislature the English system of granting unrestricted freedom to the legislature in this regard is not entirely applicable in India. In India, things are different. If the privileges of the parliament are given such weight that the basic rights are rendered meaningless in that area, the constitution is worthless. Second, there is no reason why we cannot trust our courts with

the same authority as respects the privileges of parliament, provided that they are included in the legislation, since the legitimacy of a legislative enactment, solemnly enacted, is subject to judicial scrutiny. The majority of English common law is still not codified. On the other hand, although not being codified, the privileges of the parliament are often established by leaving treatises and precedents in the same way as the rest of common law. On the other hand, statute law has taken over in India, where only a relatively small number of legal disciplines still rely on common law.

Without codification, the situation is a little unclear, and this alone is probably going to cause more privilege violations than would have occurred in the absence of a code. Mr. Hidayatullah, a former chief justice of the Indian Supreme Court, vehemently opposes codification on the odd grounds that "if the privileges were codified, you will be exposed to an alien body" (the judiciary), and that if they were left uncodified, the speaker or chairman would have the final say in each case without interference from "another body. Privileges pertaining to the House's constitution: The House of Commons has the right to construct an appropriate constitution that is in accordance with the law. This privilege has its roots in the fifteenth century. Henry VIII gave the speaker, speaking on behalf of the house, the power to grant members permission to adjourn early in 1515. Even though Cromwell had been promoted to the peerage before to the start of the session in 1536, the king permitted him to continue to sit in the commons. Even though such measures had traditionally needed the lord steward's approval, in 1571 a select committee permitted returns from boroughs that had not chosen representatives to the previous parliament. In 1576, the house made important decisions on the sick, including whether a member who was also the queen's serjeant should sit in the commons or serve as an official aide in the lords.

The house also established broad guidelines on a person's ability to continue to sit in the house after being arrested for debt, charged with a crime, or even expelled. When the house was informed of a vacancy in the 1580s, the chancery started issuing writs for fresh elections only then, and for the first time, the house determined the result of contested elections. The committee of privileges, which had first been established in 1584–1585, was given the responsibility of scrutinizing elections and results in 1593. The parliamentary election statute of 1695 recognized the commons' authority to decide on election rights. While investigating competing claims of candidates or seats in parliament during the 18th century, the commons nonetheless retained exclusive authority to decide whether electors had the right to vote. This continued until the house transferred its jurisdiction over cases not otherwise covered by the statute to the court of law in 1868 [8].

Meaning of Parliamentary Privilege

Members of legislatures all around the world are given special rights or benefits known as parliamentary privileges. The legislatures and its members often get particular advantages in democracies in order to work effectively. Privilege is in some ways an exception to the general law, even if it is a component of state law. It wouldn't be inaccurate to say that privilege is to Parliament what prerogative is to the Crown. Just as the Crown is free to exercise its privileges without the aid of or hindrance from Parliament or the courts, the House of Parliament is also free to do so. One of the few historical occurrences in which representative institutions were gradually established and developed by a foreign power is India. In India, the privileges and immunities of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha are referred to as parliamentary privileges.

Origin of Parliamentary Privilege

The introduction of parliamentary privileges in India dates back to the Charter Act of 1833, which expanded the governor-general's council by one by adding a fourth member. A brand-

new kind of legal framework was created. This served as the foundation for a group that later developed into a legitimate legislative body. The official resistance to legislative privileges decreased when the Indian Council Act of 1909 created indirect election to the assembly. In a legal context, the Government of India Act of 1935 provided freedom of expression. Some of the privileges of Parliament, its members, and Parliament Committees are stated in the Constitution, and there is presently some legislation and rules of procedure for the House. Other privileges, however, continue to be governed by House of Commons precedents. Articles 105 and 122 of the Indian Constitution's main body discuss the privileges of Parliament, whereas articles 194 and 212 discuss the same powers for states. Article 105 (1) of the Indian Constitution states that there is freedom of expression in the Parliament, subject to the provisions of the Constitution and the rules and standing orders controlling the functioning of Parliament.

Legislative Privileges Constitutional Rules

The members of the committees in each of the two houses of parliament are granted certain rights, privileges, and exemptions under Articles 105 and 194. If they speak or participate in any committee of the Parliament, they are among those who are given these powers, along with the Attorney General of India and Union Ministers. These privileges are not available to the president, who is a member of the parliament. The 44th Amendment to the Indian Constitution changed Article 105 (3) so that it now includes two sections. The power, rights, and immunities that may be sometimes imposed by law by the Parliament must be enjoyed by each House of Parliament, its members, and Committees.

These privileges, powers, and immunities will be the same as those enjoyed by the House of Commons on January 26, 1950, unless otherwise defined by Parliament. These advantages continue to remain until Parliament makes a legislation, despite the fact that the House of Commons is not directly named in Article 105 (3).

Personalized legislative privileges

These are the rights that each member of parliament has under the law. For instance, MPs are free to voice their views in the House and are not prohibited from being detained in civil proceedings 40 days before to or after the start of the current session of Parliament. They are also not required to serve on juries. While the legislature is in session, no member may be imprisoned. Additionally, members may not be detained 40 days prior to, after, or during the session. Free speech is allowed in the legislative chambers.

They are not the subject of any legal action as a consequence of their statements made in the parliament or its committees. However, it is governed by the rules [9].

Collective Legislative Privileges

an individual's capacity to publish discussions, reports, and proceedings while simultaneously restricting the actions of others. Press freedom allows for the publication of truthful accounts of court processes without the House's consent. However, this right of the media does not apply when there are private House discussions. Keep outsiders away from the gathering, and arrange quiet conversations to discuss important topics.

Make policies to control its own company operations and affairs and to reach judgments on them. A person has the right to prompt notice of their arrest, detention, guilty judgment, incarceration, and release. Ask questions and demand to be seen. The activities of a House or its committees are not subject to judicial scrutiny.

Benefits of Parliamentary Privileges

It lessens hostilities between the two arms of government, cultivates goodwill, and promotes collaboration: The advantage of parliamentary privileges under this kind of administration is that it encourages collaboration between the executive and legislative branches. faster and more precise decision-making: To enable speedier and more effective decision-making, the parliamentary system is linked to the legislative and executive arms of government. Less staff and resources are needed since the legislative and executive branches work together to manage a cabinet government system under a parliamentary form of government. Unlike a presidential form of government, which divides up and staffs each branch with a distinct group of individuals. The parliamentary system of government also encourages excellent administration for the effective management of the nation because of the individual and collective obligations assigned to the parliament. This is so that it motivates all cabinet members to put in a lot of effort. Honesty and openness are also guaranteed.

Issues with Parliamentary Privileges

While it may appear that a parliamentary system is always in favor of good governance, it may also produce politicians who are overconfident and powerful, which can lead to the abuse of political power. Members of parliament will be elevated and made untouchable by the legislative system. Since he is directly elected as the leader of his party under a parliamentary form of government, the prime minister is more committed to his party than to the people of the nation.

As a result, he will be more devoted to his party than to his constituents. In a parliamentary form of government, the prime minister's position is definitely insecure since the legislature has the authority to overthrow him at any moment with a "vote of no confidence." A crisis, segregation, or erratic government might result from this. Members of the cabinet may be overworked as a result of the overlap of legislative and executive tasks, and some ministers may not be able to keep up.

The parliamentary system demands individuals to perform both legislative and executive functions, but it's crucial to remember that a minister's lack of experience might result in inefficiencies in one aspect of the government's power. for more information on parliamentary privileges [10].

CONCLUSION

The development of legislative privileges historically provides a fascinating look at the complex web of governmental control, individual freedom, and democratic representation. This investigation examines the origins of legislative privileges and the continuing influence they have on contemporary politics by delving into ancient roots and medieval changes. The realization of the necessity for unrestricted conversation in ancient assemblies is where the roots of legislative protection were first planted, according to old wisdom.

These first indications established the foundation for privileges that would later establish themselves as pillars of democratic administration. Transformations throughout the Middle Ages: Legislative privileges underwent a transformation during the Middle Ages, changing from rare immunities to regular protections.

These advantages solidified into crucial barriers against outside forces that would undercut parliamentarians' independence in the furnace of developing parliamentary institutions. Parliamentary Maturity The establishment of parliamentary privileges was a watershed moment in history, ushering in a time when freedom of expression, the right to be unarrested,

and the defense against legal action were fundamental tenets of government. As institutions developed, these advantages made sure that lawmakers could have spirited discussions, strengthening the basis of representative democracy.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. R. Jha, "India's Anti-corruption Authorities: Lokpal and Lokayukta," *Indian J. Public Adm.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0019556118788480.
- [2] T. Kuzio, "Nationalism and authoritarianism in Russia: Introduction to the special issue," *Communist Post-Communist Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.postcomstud.2015.12.002.
- [3] M. Goihman-Yahr, "History, dermatology, and medicine: Another outlook," *Clinics in Dermatology*. 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.clindermatol.2013.08.021.
- [4] A. L. Spray, "Evolution of nutrition policy in Senegal: analysis and perspective - 15 years of experience in the development of nutrition policy in Senegal.," *Evol. Nutr. policy Senegal Anal. Perspect. - 15 years Exp. Dev. Nutr. policy Senegal*, 2018.
- [5] C. A. Ruiviejo and E. S. Morales, "From Saving Banks to Capitalist Societies and Foundations: A new approach on the managing and implementation of the Social Work," *CIRIEC-Espana Rev. Econ. Publica, Soc. y Coop.*, 2017.
- [6] M. Coban, A. E. Esatoglu, and M. C. Izgi, "Historical evolution of home care applications in legislative base in Turkey," *Turkish J. Bioeth.*, 2014, doi: 10.5505/tjob.2014.29392.
- [7] W. Widmaier, "From Bretton Woods to the Global Financial Crisis: Popular Politics, Paradigmatic Debates, and the Construction of Crises," *Rev. Soc. Econ.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/00346764.2014.912389.
- [8] A. Kemmerling, "How Labour ended up taxing itself and why it matters: The long-term evolution of politics in German labour taxation," *J. Eur. Soc. Policy*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0958928713517918.
- [9] J. M. Lubin, "Race and the politics of health reform: Antigovernment opposition to national health insurance from the new deal to the affordable care act.," 2015.
- [10] E. Aja and C. Colino, "Multilevel structures, coordination and partisan politics in Spanish intergovernmental relations," *Comp. Eur. Polit.*, 2014, doi: 10.1057/cep.2014.9.

CHAPTER 3

FOURTH ESTATE: PRESS FREEDOM AS A DEMOCRATIC ESSENTIAL

Kapil Kumar Kapoor, Director
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id-kapil.kapoor@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The Fourth Estate, sometimes known as press freedom, is crucial to maintaining democracy's core values. This research explores the value of press freedom as a fundamental cornerstone of democratic nations. The media plays a crucial role in democratic systems of governance by promoting openness, accountability, and the public's access to factual information. The media serves as a watchdog, keeping an eye on the conduct of institutions, authorities, and other people in positions of authority. This watchfulness stops the misuse of authority, corruption, and the degradation of democratic principles. An educated public discourse is required for voters to make informed choices about their government, and a free press serves as a conduit between the people and their elected officials. Additionally, press freedom gives people the ability to exercise their right to information access and freedom of speech. A multifaceted knowledge of complicated topics is made possible by a diversified and independent media environment that encourages the interchange of many viewpoints and ideas. Citizens' ability to create ideas based on a variety of perspectives strengthens democracy by promoting fruitful conversations and debates.

KEYWORDS:

Article, Constitution, Democratic, Fourth Estate, Press Freedom.

INTRODUCTION

The most important basic right guaranteed to people by the constitution of the biggest democracy in the world is the freedom of speech and expression. The media is seen as the fourth pillar of democracy and is crucial to the social, political, economic, and foreign affairs of a nation. Therefore, it should go without saying that a free press is necessary for a democracy to exist, flourish, and maintain the values of good and transparent administration. Based on the news that was reported about them by the media, India has previously seen the rise of political parties (the Modi government), the fall of governments (Rajiv Gandhi's government), the collapse of the economy (the 2008 crisis), and the skyrocketing of stock markets (the bullish Indian stock market after the US-China Trade War). The kind of news that predominates about a country in the foreign press has a significant impact on its reputation abroad and its overall perception.

In my native Colombia, on December 17, 1986, journalist Guillermo Cano Isaza was murdered in front of the headquarters of his daily, *El Espectador*. The news stories he was looking into as a journalist made him a target. Every year on World Press Freedom Day, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) honors his memory by presenting the Guillermo Cano World Press Freedom Prize to an individual or organization from any country who has defended press freedom, particularly in the face of danger to themselves or others [1]. Today, as we commemorate the 30th anniversary of the UN General Assembly establishing World Press Freedom Day, which first made me aware as a young person of the dangers that journalists in my own family faced in the course of their work and the dangers I would also face if I chose to follow in their footsteps. I would later pursue a career as a news producer in Colombia, where I would meet two courageous colleagues who I now

honor on this day: Jaime Garzon, a journalist, comedian, and peace activist who was killed in 1999, and Orlando Sierra Hernández, a columnist and deputy newspaper editor who was killed in 2019. I would continue to be steadfast in my mission. According to UNESCO'S Observatory of Killed Journalists, both fatalities were related to their jobs as journalists. Because of these personal encounters, I now see press freedom as a vital human value that ought to be maintained, preserved, and extended in all circumstances. Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which reads as follows.

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, which includes the freedom to do so without hindrance and the freedom to use any media or method, regardless of boundaries, to gather, process, and disseminate information and ideas [2]. The fourth estate is undermined when journalists feel threatened and uneasy about their safety, which prevents the public from being able to hold those in authority responsible. These dangers to the independence of journalists and other media professionals are becoming worse every day.

They deal with rising politicization of their job and efforts to silence them from several angles, from global health to the climate catastrophe, corruption, and violations of human rights. 86 journalists and media professionals were murdered worldwide in 2020, making it one of the most hazardous years to be a journalist, according to UNESCO.

This is a 50% increase from the previous year. Furthermore, even with the background of international events in the Ukraine and other areas of the globe, Latin America and the Caribbean emerged as the deadliest location for journalists last year. This reflects the disproportionate danger local journalists take when reporting subjects like crime, corruption, gang violence, and the environment. According to author Mexico, Ukraine and Haiti, were the three nations where journalists were killed the most last year.

The danger faced by journalists covering the nation has risen as Haiti battles a multifaceted crisis brought on by three years of economic contraction, a deadlock in politics, and record levels of gang violence.

We are working at the UN to help all journalists and media professionals. There are still several Caribbean nations where the media cannot report and conduct investigations without fear of retaliation, despite the fact that many of these countries have less dangerous workplaces. Journalists from all around the area recount cases of physical assault, harassment, and intimidation, all of which undermine democracy's core tenets.

Governments in Suriname and the larger Caribbean region must continue bolstering steps to preserve press freedom and pass legislation that provide journalists legal and whistleblower protection in order to solve these issues.

Citizens may also promote press freedom by pressing elected authorities for openness and accountability. Citizens may contribute to the development of a more open and democratic society by opposing censorship and promoting independent media. Globally, the larger international community must take part in lobbying for press freedom in their own nations as well as globally. Holding governments responsible for their deeds and ensuring journalists may operate without fear of reprisal are two examples of what this entails. Never forget that it is the job of journalists to bring attention to violations of human rights and to fight for the rights of weaker groups.

These wrongdoings may go unreported and uncontested in the absence of a free and independent press. I therefore promise my support for the defense of press freedom in the Caribbean Area as well as the support of the United Nations Information Centre for the

Caribbean Area as someone who has experience working in a setting where press freedom is often threatened [3].

DISCUSSION

What Is Press Freedom?

Regarding any form of communication, including print (newspapers, magazines, journals, reports), audio (radio, podcasts), video (news channels, OTT platforms like YouTube), and other electronic mediums like news apps, social media feeds, etc., freedom of the press refers to the minimal interference of the state in the operation of the press.

According to Lord Mansfield, "printing without any license subject to the consequences of law constitutes press freedom. We may thus infer that having the ability to communicate one's opinions without seeking advance legal approval is referred to as having freedom of the press.

Why Is Press Freedom Important?

According to *Indian Newspapers v. Union of India*, the goal of the press is to support the public interest by publishing the information and viewpoints that the nation's people need in order to make educated decisions. The core of social and political interaction is pressing freedom. The judiciary's primary responsibility is to defend press freedom and reject any legislation or governmental acts that do so in violation of the constitution. A free and fair press serves as the foundation of a civil society that is capable of critical and independent thought and forms its opinions about the nation and the government after carefully examining the available information. The press serves as a vehicle for providing knowledge and disseminating important information about events, developments, and incidents of national interest to the entire nation [4].

Press Freedom and Article 19

Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution, which guarantees freedom of speech and expression under Part III (basic rights), also implicitly guarantees freedom of the press. When Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar responds to a question about "Article 19 not including "freedom of the press", he says that the press is just another way of quoting an individual citizen and when anyone chooses to write in a newspaper, they are merely exercising their right of expression.

Therefore, there is absolutely no need to separately mention "freedom of the press" anywhere in the Constitution.

Article 19(1)(A)'S Definition of Press Freedom Includes the Freedom to Disseminate Information.

The freedom of the press is meaningless without this freedom. *Romesh Thapar v. State of Madras* makes this right explicit, despite the fact that it is also implied in the freedom of speech. The primary distinction between freedom of the press and freedom of speech for an individual is that the former allows for publishing on a variety of media, including print, broadcast, electronic, etc., while the latter allows for mass communication. As a result, the freedom to disseminate knowledge is integral to journalistic freedom.

The Right to Criticize

The press has the freedom to criticize the government, its officials, its policies, its acts, its laws, its pronouncements, etc., just as people do. The press cannot, however, misuse this liberty by inciting the populace against the government or by supporting riots, insurrections, mutinies, or other threats to the security of the state or the administration.

Receiving Information Without Restriction

The right to freedom of the press, once again. Lack of information prevents the press from educating the public and renders the right to free speech meaningless since there is no access to the information that may serve as the foundation for any expression [5].

Having The Right to Interrogate Anybody

This right is essential for educating society as a whole and obtaining firsthand information from subject matter specialists on specific topics. There are three limitations to this privilege, notwithstanding the fact that it is not absolute Interviews may only take place with the interviewee's permission; they must end when the interviewee decides they should; and the interviewer is not allowed to make the interviewee answer any questions against his or her will.

Freedom To Report on Court Events

The spirit of justice, in the words of Jeremy Bentham, is publicity. The Supreme Court ruled in Sahara India Real Estate Corpn Ltd v. SEBI that the media has a right to report on legal processes. The Supreme Court ruled in Saroj Iyer v. Maharashtra Medical (Council) of Indian Medicine that the freedom to publish accurate accounts of the court procedures one has seen exists even when doing so in opposition to quasi-judicial institutions.

Access To and Reporting on Parliamentary Proceedings

We have the right to publish a kosher report of the legislative proceedings according to Article 361 of the Constitution. This freedom is only constrained by the need that publications have no malicious purpose. When parliamentary privileges (A.105 and A.194) and the right of reporting legislative proceedings, which is implicitly included in the right of expression (A.19), conflict, the right of speech and expression should take precedence. The live broadcast of legislative sessions is now required.

Freedom To Serve as A Platform for Advertising

We are aware that the majority of outlets whether it be a radio station, news channel, mobile application, or newspaper rely heavily on advertising revenue. The Supreme Court included the right to advertising as a component of the right to freedom of speech after *Tata Press v. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam*.

Freedom To Communicate

Power to broadcast is crucial in today's technological era since it is one of the main avenues for information dissemination.

This freedom extends to online content including websites, blogs, and mobile apps as well as broadcasting on radio and television news programs. On sites like Alt News, The Print, The Wire, Quint, etc., we have seen some of the most trustworthy journalism. Reasonable Press Freedom Restrictions Unrestricted freedom, or liberty without any justifiable limitations, is known to undermine the exact goal of providing that freedom in the first place that is, to empower individuals—because it causes individual rights to collide with one another. The following are the reasonable restrictions placed on Article 19(1)(a), which are applicable to the freedom of the press since it draws its authority from that provision.

State Integrity and Sovereignty

It was included via an amendment to rein in the out-of-control protests for separate entities for the various regions of India. This limitation would apply to any utterance or kind of

communication that impairs the integrity or sovereignty of the state. It is forbidden to let the freedom of speech and expression be used as a weapon to undermine a state's integrity or sovereignty. It is crucial to recognize at this point that "sedition" is not a justification for imposing reasonable limits as outlined in Article 19(2) of the Constitution.

State-Wide Security

The practice of freedom of speech is not permitted in any way that poses a danger to national security. This limitation would apply to any communication that encourages citizens to revolt, engage in violence, riot, or other forms of discontent against the government and its subjects. The Supreme Court ruled in *State of Bihar v. Shailabala Devi* that anyone's speeches citizen or noncitizen that incite others to commit crimes like dacoity, murder, robbery, etc. pose a clear danger to the safety of the state. As a result, such speech will be seen as being against the sovereignty or integrity of the state, and A.19(2)'s provisions for reasonable limits will apply to any orders to cease or limit such communication.

Public Peace

The Constitutional (First Amendment) Act of 1951 introduced this phrase. This provision was adopted to mitigate the impact of *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, in which the Supreme Court ruled that the right to freedom of expression's essential organ is the right of circulation. The word "public order" has a wide definition and refers to a variety of behaviors that might jeopardize national security. According to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Madhu Limaye v. Sub Divisional Magistrate Monghyr*, "public order" may be defined as "no insurrections, riots, or disturbances to public peace. v. State of UP in *Ramji Lal Modi* Section 295A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)'s legality was under scrutiny. The claim made was that Part III of Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution's protection of freedom of speech and expression is violated by the aforementioned clause. The petitioner, who was also the publisher, editor, and printer, was found guilty of crimes under IPC Section 295A. Furthermore, it was argued that the reasonable limitations of A.19(2) of the constitution do not apply to this clause, giving it no protection. The SC rejected this argument and concluded that a person might be charged under the cited clause, which is covered by reasonable limits, if exercising his or her right to free speech results in public disturbance.

Morality or decency

The state has the right to restrict a person's freedom of expression in order to uphold morality or decency in the nation. Sections 292 to 294 of the IPC elaborate on this topic in more detail. The aforementioned parts include a variety of actions that are considered crimes, including selling pornographic books to children and making lewd gestures in public. In *Ranjit Udeshi v. State of Maharashtra*, the Supreme Court ruled that S. 292 of the IPC is constitutional because it forbids obscenity in public settings and promotes morality and public decency. In *Chandrakant Kalyandas Kakodkar v. State of Maharashtra*, the Supreme Court added that when addressing the issue of morality and decency, the court must take into account the question of whether the young people's minds were sufficiently tainted by the immoral or indecent acts or whether there was a chance that their minds would become depraved [6].

Misconduct in Court

There is no question that sustaining and promoting justice and fairness are as important to society's growth as is freedom of speech and expression. The right to free speech and expression is recognized, but it cannot be used to overturn a court's decision in favor of justice. The SC is authorized to impose sanctions for contempt of court under Article 129, while the HCs are

authorized by Article 215 of the constitution. Furthermore, it was decided in the case of *C.K. Daphtary v. O.P. Gupta* that Articles 129 of the Constitution and Section 228 of the Indian Penal Code are legitimate and fall inside the ambit of reasonable limits outlined in Article 19(2) of the constitution. Thus, it follows from the above explanation that Articles 19(2), 129, and 215 of the constitution have the potential to restrict freedom of speech and expression. Article 19(1)(a) on defamation expressly forbids harming a person's reputation in the name of freedom of speech or expression. A severe restriction on the freedom of speech and expression is the act of defamation, which is defined as doing harm to someone's reputation. No one has the right to use any word, sign, or gesture to subject another person to hatred, mockery, or contempt. The Civil Laws of Torts forbid defamation since it is seen as a very serious offense. Additionally, it violates S. 499 of the IPC. It is apparent that anything has a defense under the reasonable constraints of Article 19(2) of the Constitution since it is prohibited by two legislation and is defined as wrong [7].

Amiable Interactions with Other Nations.

Through the Constitution (First Amendment) Act of 1951, this basis was also added to Article 19(2) of the Constitution, just way the word "public order" was. The major reason for adding this ban was to combat false and hostile propaganda against any foreign nation that could have favorable ties to the Republic of India. Such actions might compromise the government's attempts to establish and maintain good relations with other countries and produce fruitful outcomes for India. According to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Jagan Nath v. Union of India*, all commonwealth nations are foreign nations for the purposes of Article 19(2). However, another point to be aware of is that for the purposes of the Indian constitution, members of the Commonwealth, including Pakistan, are not considered to be citizens of foreign nations [8].

Incitement To Commit A Crime

The act of inciting or aiding an offense is considered a separate and independent offense per se under criminal law. It would be deemed a danger to the public order to use one's freedom of speech or expression to encourage criminal behavior. The Constitution (First Amendment) Act of 1951 included this justification for reasonable limitation in the constitution, along with the phrases "public order" and "friendly relations with foreign states". In *State of Bihar v. Shailabala Devi*, the Supreme Court ruled that any communication that encourages criminal activity may be banned, and any order imposing such a prohibition shall be subject to the reasonable limitations envisioned by Article 19(2) of the Constitution. The seven reasons for justifiable limits listed above serve as a dividing line for the freedom of speech and expression, which also encompasses the freedom of the press. Therefore, it may be concluded that the freedom of the press persists within the limits of justifiable limitations outlined in Article 19(2) of the constitution [9].

CONCLUSION

The Fourth Estate, which represents the press as a cornerstone of democracy, acts as a steadfast defender of freedom, accountability, and educated public opinion. A fundamental democratic principle, press freedom is the light that shines on the halls of power, provides openness, and defends individual rights. As we consider the complex relationship between media and democracy, it becomes clear that a strong press serves as a diligent watchdog, scrutinizing institutions and promoting a democratic society. The Fourth Estate's ability to expose wrongdoing, highlight underrepresented viewpoints, and promote open conversation creates a thriving democratic discourse. It creates a culture of knowledgeable citizens who are able to make well-rounded choices that affect the future of their countries. To distinguish between trustworthy media and false information that poses a danger to undermine democracy's core

underpinnings, we must exercise caution in this digital era of quick information distribution. While defending the essential value of press freedom, we must also be aware of the difficulties facing the Fourth Estate, including threats to journalists, the commercialization of news, and social media echo chambers. But the commitment to upholding this democratic need endures. It is everyone's responsibility to protect press freedom, advance media literacy, and encourage ethical journalism.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Howie, "Protecting the human right to freedom of expression in international law," *Int. J. Speech. Lang. Pathol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/17549507.2018.1392612.
- [2] M. Ananny, *Networked press freedom: Creating infrastructures for a public right to hear*. 2018. doi: 10.1177/1461444819873862.
- [3] C. Van Der Bank, "The Boundaries of Freedom of the Press in South African Law," *Acad. J. Interdiscip. Stud.*, 2014, doi: 10.5901/ajis.2014.v3n4p409.
- [4] A. 19, B. Mugundhan, and C. Renuga, "A Study On Freedom Of Press In India: With Reference To Introduction," *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 2018.
- [5] A. A. Senghore, "Press freedom and democratic governance in The Gambia : A rights-based approach," *African Hum. Rights Law J.*, 2012.
- [6] C. Grossman, "Challenges to freedom of expression within the inter-American system: A Jurisprudential analysis," *Human Rights Quarterly*. 2012. doi: 10.1353/hrq.2012.0026.
- [7] J. Lichtenberg, "Foundations and limits of freedom of the press," in *Democracy and the Mass Media*, 2012. doi: 10.1017/cbo9781139172271.005.
- [8] S. Craft, "Press Freedom and Responsibility," in *Journalism Ethics: A Philosophical Approach*, 2010. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195370805.003.0003.
- [9] J. Chen, "Book review: Privacy Revisited: A Global Perspective on the Right to the Left Alone," *SCRIPTed*, 2016, doi: 10.2966/scrip.130316.382.

CHAPTER 4

PARLIAMENTARY IMMUNITY: SHIELDING LAWMAKERS' SPEECH AND ACTIONS

Kapil Kumar Kapoor, Director
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id-kapil.kapoor@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

A key idea in democratic administration, parliamentary immunity acts as a barrier to protect politicians' words and conduct in the legislative setting. This idea, sometimes known as legislative privilege, allows lawmakers to have frank discussions, voice their opinions, and make choices without constantly worrying about facing legal ramifications. However, there are restrictions and a limit to this protection, which often prompt discussions regarding its moral ramifications. This research explores the complex nature of parliamentary immunity by tracing its historical roots, analyzing its range and intent, and addressing the continuing debate over its use. It emphasizes the fine line that democratic government must walk between protecting legislative autonomy and maintaining accountability.

KEYWORDS:

Actions, Civil Lawsuits, Lawmakers, Parliamentary, Speech.

INTRODUCTION

A key component of democratic administration, parliamentary immunity, also known as legislative immunity or legislative privilege, provides politicians with a cover that allows them to carry out their responsibilities without fear of legal repercussions. Parliamentary immunity is a legal theory created to protect the independence and integrity of the legislative branch under democratic regimes all over the globe. It is based on the fundamental principles of separation of powers. Fundamentally, this immunity acts as a barrier, protecting legislators from certain legal proceedings - whether they civil lawsuits or criminal prosecutions resulting from their speech and activities carried out within the revered halls of the legislature. The history of parliamentary immunity goes all the way back to the beginnings of representative government. It reflects a fundamental understanding that for a democracy to work well, its elected officials need to be given some protection so they can participate actively in debate, exercise their legislative powers, and represent the interests of their constituents without worrying about being harassed, intimidated, or burdened unfairly by potential lawsuits.

In short, parliamentary immunity acknowledges the need for MPs to fulfill their responsibilities while maintaining their independence. This complex legal concept has a wide range of components, each of which is essential to comprehending its subtleties. Parliamentary immunity is a topic of significant importance in democratic administration, from the breadth of its coverage to the purpose it serves, from the restrictions it imposes to the debates it creates. It is evidence of the fine line that must be drawn between the need to safeguard the legislative process' operations and the need to hold elected officials responsible for their deeds. The protection it provides to legislators, its roots in democratic thought, and the current discussions around its application in modern society must all be explored in order to properly comprehend the ramifications and subtleties of this concept [1].

People often respond negatively and tend to see immunity as a way for state officials to exempt themselves from the rule of law and justice when asked what they think of it. High-profile instances continue to raise this issue, such as the one involving former German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who acknowledged to breaching the rules on political parties by collecting covert

financial contributions but ultimately avoided prosecution. The BBC hosted an online discussion in December 2005 after the governor of Nigeria's Bayelsa state, who had been accused with money laundering in the UK, had skipped bail and returned to Nigeria, where he was immune from prosecution, demonstrating the unfavorable public perception of immunity. Transitional justice talks now center heavily on the issue of immunity for high state leaders, including heads of State. This topic was widely discussed after the Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet was apprehended in London in October 1998 on the basis of a Spanish warrant accusing him of crimes against human rights committed in Chile while he was in power. It was also one of the main topics of discussion during the debates over the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. No one, not even a head of State, is protected from prosecution for crimes against humanity today, which is a truth universally acknowledged in society [2].

The reality that lawmakers require some level of security in order to do their duties has sometimes been obscured by the perception of immunity as a barrier to the administration of justice. Immunity specifically safeguards the right to free speech that they need to express themselves and strengthens the institution of parliament as a whole. Undoubtedly, only powerful parliaments that can depend on the unhindered service of their members will be able to handle the difficulties of conflict prevention as well as strengthening and assisting transitional processes. Therefore, the UNDP Initiative on Strengthening the Role of Parliaments in Crisis Prevention and Recovery places a high priority on the issue of immunity, including its scope and legal structure. Parliamentary immunity is widely understood to be the whole of the particular privileges that the institution of parliament and its members individually hold that are distinct from those of other entities or people and without which they would be unable to carry out their duties.² The study will concentrate on the parliamentary immunity, or immunity granted to members of parliament, and only briefly discuss the corporate privileges of parliament when absolutely essential. With a focus on the legislative standards in place in the parliaments covered by the UNDP effort, the paper therefore provides an overview of the main parliamentary immunity systems now in use, as well as their historical context and operational characteristics.³ The link between parliamentary immunity and human rights will also be examined since it is crucial for transitional societies to understand this relationship [3].

DISCUSSION

The Objective of Parliamentarians' Immunity

A parliament's efficient functioning is ensured by the institution of parliamentary immunity: It grants members of parliament certain rights and benefits, most significantly the right to free expression. In fact, members of parliament use their freedom of speech as a tool in their work to carry out their duties as the people's representatives through legislation, passing budgets, and monitoring governmental operations. They cannot fulfill their duties if they are afraid of retaliation from the executive branch or other influential parties and are unable to speak out, criticize the government, or look into and report violations. They may highlight concerns about the public good that would be difficult to express elsewhere due to the potential of legal action thanks to freedom of expression. They need immunity so they may speak out without interference, worry about being arrested, or any other kind of harassment. Parliamentary immunity is a privilege for the benefit of the people and the institution that represents them, the parliament, rather than a personal advantage conferred to individual members of parliament. Any profit that an individual legislator receives does not come from personal possession; rather, it stems from the hard-won immunity that legislatures have deemed essential for the accomplishment of their duties on behalf of the citizens they serve in the past. Parliamentarians are consequently unable to usually disavow it since it concerns matters of public order. Parliamentary immunity guarantees that it can carry out its duties and conduct

business without interference from outside parties. Undoubtedly, a parliament can only function if its members are free to do their duties. This is very clearly reflected in Rule 6, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament, which states that "In exercising its powers with respect to privileges and immunities, Parliament shall seek in the first instance to uphold its integrity as a democratic legislative assembly and to secure the independence of its Members in performance of their duties." Therefore, immunity is necessary to ensure that a parliament can really operate as an independent institution and preserve its own authority and dignity [4].

Scope: Parliamentary immunity typically covers actions taken within the context of the legislative process. This includes speeches made on the floor of the legislature, votes cast, committee work, and other activities directly related to a lawmaker's role as a legislator.

Civil Lawsuits

Parliamentary immunity generally provides lawmakers with protection against civil lawsuits for statements made or actions taken in the course of their legislative duties. This means that individuals who feel harmed by a legislator's speech or actions in a legislative context cannot typically sue the legislator for damages arising from those actions. Civil lawsuits, also known as civil litigation or civil actions, are legal proceedings initiated by individuals, organizations, or entities (plaintiffs) against others (defendants) in order to resolve disputes or seek redress for a perceived wrong or harm. Unlike criminal cases, where the government prosecutes individuals for violating laws, civil lawsuits involve private parties seeking legal remedies, such as compensation, injunctions, or specific performance, to resolve conflicts. Here are the key components and stages of civil lawsuits [5].

Pleadings

1. **Complaint:** The plaintiff initiates a civil lawsuit by filing a complaint with the appropriate court. The complaint outlines the plaintiff's claims, the legal basis for those claims, and the relief sought. The defendant is then served with a copy of the complaint.
2. **Answer:** The defendant responds to the complaint by filing an answer, admitting or denying the allegations, and raising any defenses or counterclaims.

Pretrial Phase:

1. **Discovery:** Both parties engage in the discovery process, which involves gathering evidence through methods such as depositions (sworn testimony), document requests, interrogatories (written questions), and requests for admissions.
2. **Motions:** During this phase, the parties may file various motions to resolve legal issues, such as motions to dismiss, motions for summary judgment, or motions to compel discovery.
3. **Settlement Negotiations:** Parties often engage in settlement negotiations, which can lead to the resolution of the case before trial through a settlement agreement.

Trial

1. **Jury Selection:** In cases where a jury trial is requested or required, the process of selecting a jury takes place. Both parties and the judge participate in jury selection.
2. **Opening Statements:** Attorneys for both sides present opening statements to outline their respective cases.
3. **Presentation of Evidence:** The plaintiff and defendant present their cases by calling witnesses, introducing documents and exhibits, and making arguments.

4. **Closing Arguments:** Attorneys provide closing arguments to summarize their cases and persuade the judge or jury.
5. **Verdict:** In a jury trial, the jury deliberates and reaches a verdict. In a bench trial (where the judge decides the case without a jury), the judge issues a ruling.

Post-Trial Phase:

1. **Judgment:** If the plaintiff prevails, the court issues a judgment specifying the relief awarded, such as monetary damages, injunctive relief, or specific performance.
2. **Appeals:** Either party may appeal the trial court's decision to a higher court, arguing that legal errors occurred during the trial.
3. **Enforcement of Judgment:** If the judgment requires the defendant to take specific actions, such as paying a monetary award, the plaintiff may need to take further legal steps to enforce the judgment.

Criminal Prosecutions

In many countries, lawmakers are also protected from certain criminal prosecutions for actions taken in the course of their legislative duties. However, this protection is not absolute and may vary from one jurisdiction to another. Some jurisdictions may still allow for criminal prosecutions in cases of serious criminal conduct. Investigation Law enforcement agencies' investigations are usually the first step in any criminal case. In order to establish the facts of the case and identify prospective suspects, this step entails acquiring evidence, speaking with witnesses, and compiling data. Charges The prosecuting authority often a prosecutor or district attorney files formal charges against the accused if there is sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that a crime has been committed and a particular person or organization is accountable. These accusations set out the alleged crimes and provide the foundation for the prosecution. Arrest and Detention: A warrant for an arrest is often issued as a result of the accusations made. The suspect may be detained and placed under arrest. The accused may be held in custody until trial or released on bail or bond, depending on the gravity of the alleged offense and the applicable legal jurisdiction. Arraignment: The accused's arraignment marks their first court appearance. The accusations are officially read during this procedure, and the accused is advised of their rights. Additionally, a plea is requested, which is often "guilty," "not guilty," or "no contest. Motions, discovery, and plea bargaining are just a few of the pretrial actions that take place before the actual trial.

The defense or prosecution might submit motions to address legal concerns, demand evidence, or contest specific elements of the case. Trial If a plea agreement is not reached, the matter goes to trial. Both the prosecution and the defense present their cases throughout the trial by calling witnesses, presenting evidence, and making arguments. The accused's guilt or innocence is subsequently decided by the judge or jury. Verdict The judge or jury issues a decision after the trial. If the defendant is found guilty, the court may decide on the appropriate sentence during a separate sentencing phase. If the defendant is found guilty, the court will sentence them, which may include jail time, fines, probation, community service, or other legal sanctions. Sentences may take into consideration elements like the defendant's criminal history and the circumstances of the offense in order to be commensurate to the seriousness of the crime. Appeals If the prosecution or defense feels there were procedural or substantive mistakes during the trial, they both have the right to appeal the decision or punishment. Appellate courts examine the case for legal flaws and, if necessary, may order a new trial or change the punishment. Post-Conviction processed: Following a conviction, there may be ongoing post-conviction processes, such as appeals, habeas corpus petitions, or requests for pardons or mercy. These legal actions are intended to remedy possible errors in the administration of

justice or to get redress for the guilty party. In democratic democracies, criminal prosecutions are an essential part of the legal system. They defend people's rights, maintain the rule of law, discourage illegal activity, and seek redress for victims and the community. Legal precautions and standards are used throughout the process to guarantee that guilt or innocence is decided fairly and objectively [6].

Purpose: The primary purpose of parliamentary immunity is to preserve the separation of powers and ensure that lawmakers can freely engage in debates, express their views, and make decisions without the constant threat of legal action. It is seen as a crucial component of democratic governance.

Limits: Parliamentary immunity is not an absolute shield. There are limits to this protection. For example, it generally does not cover actions that are not related to legislative functions, such as personal criminal activities. Additionally, some countries may have specific rules or procedures for lifting parliamentary immunity in cases where there is a legitimate need to prosecute a lawmaker for a crime.

Controversy: Parliamentary immunity can be a subject of controversy. Critics argue that it can sometimes be abused, allowing lawmakers to engage in unethical or illegal behavior with impunity. On the other hand, supporters argue that it is necessary to protect the integrity of the legislative process and ensure lawmakers can perform their duties effectively.

Freedom of expression and protection against legal action

Members of the House are free to express themselves and are not subject to legal action for whatever they say or do while they are in the House or any committee thereof. Members of the House must have the freedom to speak freely in order to effectively carry out their legislative responsibilities; otherwise, they may not be able to do so in a way that leaves them unafraid to voice their opinions. The immunity granted to Members of Parliament from civil or criminal prosecutions in a court of law for having made any speeches or disclosures or for having cast any votes within the House or a committee thereof highlights the importance of this protection for them. Any inquiry conducted outside of Parliament into whatever a member says or does while performing his parliamentary responsibilities is a significant violation of the member's right to free expression in the House. As a result, it would be a grave breach of a member's privilege to attack a member or to take, threaten to take, or even think about taking any action against him due to whatever he said or any vote he cast on the House floor.

Thus, the specific constitutional provisions included of Article 105 provide a comprehensive and definitive law on the right to free speech as well as immunity from legal repercussions for anything spoken in the House or for the publishing of its findings. Therefore, everything that is not covered by these clauses may be dealt with by the courts in line with the law. As a result, if a member publishes questions that the Chairman has rejected and which are defamatory, he will be subject to legal action under the defamation legislation. The constitutional provisions and the rules of procedure, however, place restrictions on the right to free expression in the House. The Chair is given sufficient authority by the rules to address a situation when a member has broken one of the rules.

Due to the immunity granted to the member's right to speak and act in the House, its abuse may have a major negative impact on the rights and freedom of those who would otherwise seek legal protection. Members have a higher responsibility to use this privilege with the greatest caution and without violating the law of the state since they are the representatives of the people. The Committee on Privileges has emphasized that a member of the House does not have unfettered freedom of expression within the chamber [7].

Legislative Immunity's Legal Foundation

Parliamentary immunity is a constitutional right in the vast majority of nations. The Parliament Act in Canada, the Parliamentary Privileges Act in Australia¹⁵, and the Powers and Privileges Act in Sri Lanka are just a few examples of particular legislation that outline the privileges of parliament. In some nations, particular legislation governing the status of deputies or the rules of Parliament have immunity provisions. The primary legal safeguard for the right to free speech in the United Kingdom continues to be Article 9 of the British Bill of Rights, which states that "the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place outside of parliament." For a handful of Commonwealth nations, this is also accurate. Additionally, there is a plethora of legislative precedent and customs, which are especially significant in nations that use common law [8].

With the exception of Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe, and Indonesia, all of the nations included by the UNDP program have their constitutions specify the rules regulating parliamentary immunity. Such provisions are included in the Powers and Privileges Acts in Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe, which were passed with special constitutional permission, while the Law on the Structure and Composition of Legislative Bodies in Indonesia specifies a right to immunity. It is important to highlight that lawmakers cannot assert their immunity in another State¹⁷. However, if they are in possession of a diplomatic passport, they may assert the privileges accorded to holders of such credentials under international law. The extent of free speech (parliamentary non-accountability) The history of free speech in parliament is intertwined with the squabble between the House of Commons and the Crown and the constitutional development of the United Kingdom.

The Commons, Lords, and the King all agreed that a judgment that sentenced someone to death for treason because they had presented a bill to parliament to reduce the excessive cost of the Royal Household was in violation of the privileges of parliament and was to "be annulled and of no force and effect." This is generally considered to be the first time that parliament upheld that freedom. Since Article 9 of the Bill of Rights, as stated earlier continues to be the primary legal source in matters pertaining to the exercise of freedom of speech in the United Kingdom and a number of Commonwealth countries, the Glorious Revolution and the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1689 is unquestionably the pinnacle of parliament's claim to the privilege of freedom of speech. Of fact, Commonwealth parliaments are not the only ones that recognize freedom of expression as a basic right of a member of parliament. With the exception of a small number of nations (such as Cuba and Belarus), parliamentary nonaccountability is assured either by national constitutions or by specific laws, making it a necessary component of all parliamentary systems based on the free representational mandate. As Marc van der Hulst remarked, parliamentary non-accountability is not only a fairly stable norm globally but also a remarkably similar concept in all applicable laws.²¹ First and foremost, members of parliament, including ministers in nations where such positions are not incompatible, benefit from the right of free expression [9].

This privilege has been extended in many nations, particularly those that follow the Westminster model but also in France, to all individuals who are required by their role to participate in parliamentary debates and proceedings, including officers of parliament as well as witnesses called to testify before parliamentary committees during inquiries. As a result, witnesses often have complete immunity from prosecution for anything spoken at such discussions. However, not everybody grants witnesses automatic immunity. For instance, in the United States, a congressional body may ask a judge to grant witnesses "use" immunity, which protects them from prosecution for anything they say in their testimony aside from perjury or making a false statement (18 U.S. Code collection, paragraphs 6002, 6005), if they

refuse to testify before the body on the grounds of their privilege against self-incrimination. On the recommendation of the investigating committee and with the approval of the Senate President or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, witnesses in legislative investigations in the Philippines may be admitted into a witness protection program when, in the committee's opinion, there is a pressing need for such protection. In Zimbabwe, the presiding officer of the legislative body where the evidence was presented must provide a certificate in order for witnesses to be protected.²² It is significant that the ability of a parliament to carry out its oversight duty depends critically on witness protection. Additionally, legislative publications' publishers and printers often have absolute privilege, which is immunity from any legal challenges [10].

CONCLUSION

Parliamentary immunity stands out as a crucial thread in the complicated web of democratic government, protecting politicians' words and deeds while guiding them through the perilous waters of accountability. This legal theory, also known as legislative privilege, has its roots in the fundamental ideas of representative democracy and upholds the need that elected officials to discuss, make decisions, and express disagreement without fear of legal repercussions. Its importance in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process is evident, enabling lawmakers to speak for their constituents and participate in open, unrestricted discussion. However, parliamentary immunity is not without its difficulties and debates, as with any protective measure. Critics contend that it might sometimes insulate legislators from fair penalties, allowing unethical or illegal acts to go unpunished. However, proponents contend that it is essential for ensuring that democracy functions normally and that elected officials are not burdened by the fear of legal action. In the development of democratic government, the dynamic interaction between protecting politicians' words and deeds and the quest of responsibility has persisted.

The specific requirements and ideals of various communities might be reflected in its outlines, which can vary from one jurisdiction to another. However, the underlying tenet that a democracy's health depends on a careful balance between legislative independence and citizen accountability remains unchanging. Parliamentary immunity continues to be a safeguard and a source of debate in a constantly changing political environment, demonstrating the continuous contradiction involved in the pursuit of democratic values and government.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Y. Alrfua, A. H. A. Sabah, and A. Y. M. Alrfoua, "Parliamentary Immunity in International Legislation," *Asian Soc. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.5539/ass.v14n6p71.
- [2] S. Wigley, "Parliamentary immunity in democratizing countries: The case of Turkey," *Hum. Rights Q.*, 2009, doi: 10.1353/hrq.0.0087.
- [3] K. T. Ndouba, "Request to waive the Parliamentary Immunity and politics. Parliamentary praxis and keys issues of the doctrinal debate on the judicial review of the parliamentary power of denial the requests," *Revista de Derecho Politico*. 2018. doi: 10.5944/RDP.103.2018.23207.
- [4] C. Negoită, "From the Concept to the Practice of Parliamentary Immunity 1," *Polish Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2014, doi: 10.1515/ppsr-2015-0021.
- [5] G. Koçan and S. Wigley, "Democracy and the Politics of Parliamentary Immunity in Turkey," *New Perspect. Turk.*, 2005, doi: 10.1017/s089663460000426x.

- [6] R. Viorescu, "Parliamentary Immunity – Form Of Protection And Care For Lawmakers," *Eur. J. Law Public Adm.*, 2015, doi: 10.18662/eljpa/2015.0203.10.
- [7] G. Buonomo, "Immunità parlamentare in Italia: una nuova proposta interpretativa," *Misión Jurídica*, 2016, doi: 10.25058/1794600x.132.
- [8] G. Kurian, "Parliamentary Immunity," in *The Encyclopedia of Political Science*, 2014. doi: 10.4135/9781608712434.n1133.
- [9] M. Onofrei and S. Gradinaru, "Parliamentary Imm(p)unity," *Procedia Econ. Financ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/s2212-5671(15)00096-9.
- [10] K. Lenaerts, "The principle of democracy in the case law of the European court of justice," *Int. Comp. Law Q.*, 2013, doi: 10.1017/S0020589313000080.

CHAPTER 5

MEDIA AS WATCHDOGS: FREEDOM OF PRESS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Hansika Disawala, Assistant Professor
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
 Email Id-hansika.disawala@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The media, frequently lauded as the "Fourth Estate" alongside the conventional departments of government, serves as a strong protector of openness and accountability in the complex web of democratic nations. This research explores the interdependent nature of the media, press freedom, and the need to hold the powerful responsible. It demonstrates the media's multifarious function as alert watchdogs who examine governmental acts, expose corruption, and defend individual liberties. This complex interaction is a defining characteristic and a cornerstone of democratic administration. The watchdog function of the media is crucial to the functioning of democracy. It is fundamentally a tool for the communication of knowledge, critical evaluation, and examination of individuals in positions of authority. The media raises problems of public concern via investigative journalism, news reporting, and opinion, giving the public a prism through which to assess the effectiveness of their institutions and elected representatives.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Journalism, Media, Press, Watchdogs.

INTRODUCTION

Watchdog journalism aims to make our public officials, as well as other public figures and institutions, more transparent and accountable. It is a kind of investigative journalism that often uses research, interviews, and fact-checking to increase the transparency of topics or occurrences.

Journalistic Watchdog Bertie

If you've ever heard the word "watchdog," it probably makes you think of a guard dog that looks out for your best interests and keeps you safe. And when the phrase is used to describe persons or organizations, such is the inference. This is particularly true with watchdog journalism, which helps to preserve the same democracy it monitors in addition to bringing intriguing and crucial facts to the public's notice.

Definition of watchdog journalism

Watchdog journalism aims to make our public officials, as well as other public figures and institutions, more transparent and accountable. It is a kind of investigative journalism that often uses research, interviews, and fact-checking to increase the transparency of topics or occurrences. The phrase "watchdog" is often used to refer to departments, groups, or people who have the responsibility of keeping an eye out for compliance with the law. For instance, Liberties is referred to as a "watchdog organization" because it keeps an eye on and makes public government and corporate actions to ensure that it respects the rights of people [1].

What does watchdog journalism aim to accomplish?

Journalism that acts as a watchdog is essential to democracy. Citizens need to have a thorough awareness of what is going on in their nation in order to cast informed ballots. Watchdog

journalists try to determine if politicians follow the law, whether public works are free from theft, and whether lobbying groups have an undue impact on the legislative process. This is how watchdog media safeguards democracy on a daily basis by exposing improper conduct when it occurs. Additionally, through educating the populace, it contributes to the long-term preservation of the fairness of elections and the health of democracy. Another indication of a robust democracy is the very existence of watchdog journalism.

A nation's media is robust and independent when journalists are free to examine politicians and corporations and free to report their findings without interference or concern about retaliation. And it's no accident that once in power, authoritarian-minded dictators prioritize attacking investigative press [2].

Journalistic Watchdog Bertie

If you've ever heard the word "watchdog," it probably makes you think of a guard dog that looks out for your best interests and keeps you safe. And when the phrase is used to describe persons or organizations, such is the inference. This is particularly true with watchdog journalism, which helps to preserve the same democracy it monitors in addition to bringing intriguing and crucial facts to the public's notice.

Watchdog Journalism

Watchdog journalism aims to make our public officials, as well as other public figures and institutions, more transparent and accountable. It is a kind of investigative journalism that often uses research, interviews, and fact-checking to increase the transparency of topics or occurrences. The phrase "watchdog" is often used to refer to departments, groups, or people who have the responsibility of keeping an eye out for compliance with the law. For instance, Liberties is referred to as a "watchdog organization" because it keeps an eye on and makes public government and corporate actions to ensure that it respects the rights of individuals [3].

What does watchdog journalism aim to accomplish?

Journalism that acts as a watchdog is essential to democracy. Citizens need to have a thorough awareness of what is going on in their nation in order to cast informed ballots. Watchdog journalists try to determine if politicians follow the law, whether public works are free from theft, and whether lobbying groups have an undue impact on the legislative process [4].

Donate Now to Help Us Keep Politicians' Bad Behavior Under Control.

This is how watchdog media safeguards democracy on a daily basis by exposing improper conduct when it occurs. Additionally, through educating the populace, it contributes to the long-term preservation of the fairness of elections and the health of democracy. Another indication of a robust democracy is the very existence of watchdog journalism.

A nation's media is robust and independent when journalists are free to examine politicians and corporations and free to report their findings without interference or concern about retaliation. And it's no accident that once in power, governments with authoritarian tendencies prioritize attacking investigative journalists [5].

DISCUSSION

Examples Of Watchdog Journalism

There are several well-known instances of watchdog media stumbling onto stories that have brought down authorities, destroyed corporations, and sparked significant change. Each instance serves to highlight the value of watchdog journalism and, more generally, a free and

independent media environment. The Watergate scandal, which brought down US President Richard Nixon in 1974, is one of the most well-known recent instances of watchdog journalism. In their articles for the Washington Post, journalists Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward utilized interviews and in-depth investigation to demonstrate connections between the Nixon administration and the burglars who stole into the opposing Democratic Party's headquarters in Washington, D.C. Following Nixon's resignation, the significance of the media in exposing corruption and other crimes received fresh focus.

What impact does watchdog reporting have on democracy?

Support for investigative reporting shouldn't be shocking. Investigative journalists uncover fresh, pertinent, and often fascinating information. People are then better able to understand how their government is operating, if there is corruption or rule-breaking, and how it is impacting society. This is also the reason why media censorship and government control of media outlets are so important to authoritarian governments. By just bringing vital facts to the public's notice, watchdog journalists do not improve democracy. Investigative journalists' sheer presence has the effect of keeping politicians and corporate executives in check since they are less inclined to flout the law if they know they may be caught and exposed for doing so [6], [7].

What potential does watchdog journalism have in the future?

Rising threats to watchdog journalism include authoritarian governments like those in Poland and Hungary that want to stifle or seize media organizations, as well as new tactics like SLAPP lawsuits, which aim to intimidate watchdog journalists with the threat of financial ruin. However, watchdog journalism is stronger than ever in several areas. Information may now be shared much more easily and widely than ever before thanks to the internet and social media. There are, of course, drawbacks to this; you have to filter through a lot of garbage that often passes for investigative journalism. Overall, however, it is harder for watchdog journalists' targets to silence them and simpler for them to spread information to more people. And that's advantageous. The level of protection provided to investigative journalists will also determine the future of watchdog journalism. Watchdog journalists have experienced threats, company closures, legal actions, and even murder for their work, as the EU has observed. Watchdog journalists need robust legal safeguards, and these rights must exist and be upheld on a national scale. Laws that ensure a free and diverse media environment, provide journalists access to publicly elected leaders, and shield these journalists from pointless and costly litigation should all be included in this.

Media have a crucial role in today's politics and society at large in preserving the openness of democratic processes. It often serves as a "watchdog" in this capacity. Access to information, accountability and validity of people, institutions, and processes, as well as legitimate participation and public discourse, are just a few of the many areas where transparency is necessary. An electorate must be given all the information they need in order to make educated decisions and be able to hold politicians and institutions responsible. This is what it means to be transparent as it relates to information access. Access to judicial and administrative processes as well as information about people and institutions are all included in this. An EMB, for instance, is required to make the public aware of its goals, decisions, and activities with regard to elections. Public people that are appointed or elected to an EMB body need to represent the public's interests. As a result, the public has open access to information about their connections, backgrounds, and performance in office. The media serves as a medium for the investigation and prevention of charges of wrongdoing or infractions. This monitoring duty goes beyond politicians' responsibility for their deeds while 'in office' to include whole

procedures. Since there are complete protections for free expression and media freedom to operate impartially and independently, media presence at voting and counting centers, for instance, is crucial to combating election fraud. The people must be completely able to participate in elections and must be free to exercise their right to vote in order for them to be considered democratic. As a result, the media play a crucial role in ensuring that there is a public, or transparent, forum for discussion and involvement. The people should be represented by candidates. Election transparency contributes to ensuring that this is indeed the case.

Further protecting and facilitating public engagement in these procedures is the openness of particular processes (such as voting, counting, registration, candidate nomination, campaigning, and so forth). These crucial facets of openness are best shown by the moving example of the 2000 Serbian elections: A number of significant independent media sources in Serbia had a role in Miloevi's popularity decrease. Since 1989, the B-92 radio station has provided unbiased, expert coverage of Miloevi and his government. Goran Mati, a co-founder of B-92, was also crucial in creating a local radio and television network that would air independent newscasts. The ANEM network, a group of media outlets including a news agency, a few free dailies and weeklies, and a television station, assisted in providing Serbians with news from sources other than the state-run media. The public's support for Miloevi was weakened by critical coverage of his wars, economic policies, and brutal arrests and mistreatment of young protesters by his administration. Independent media reportage of official vote fraud in September 2000 prompted enraged Serbians to go to the streets. Miloevi had shut down B-92 at the moment, but ANEM and Radio Index in Belgrade made sure that coverage didn't stop. It would have been far more difficult to mobilize the public without these media sources [8], [9].

Democrats are significantly more likely to support the work of today's watchdogs than Republicans, who often see them as being excessively confrontational. Both parties' majorities support the media's monitoring function. Over the years, the Center has often posed a poll question regarding the watchdog role of media, although with a slightly different wording.¹ In general, the replies showed that the idea of media monitoring of individuals in power was broadly supported, while there were some political variances depending on which party was in the White House at the time. But after the 2016 election, those long-standing partisan divides grew significantly. In 2017, there was a staggering 44 percentage point difference between Democrats and Republicans who agreed that political leaders' criticism in the media prevents them from acting inappropriately (82% vs. 38%, respectively). This question was made more complex by the Election News Pathways survey. First, it prompted respondents to consider issues outside the present political climate and indicate whether they believed it was crucial or not for journalists to act as watchdogs on elected authorities.

Majorities of both parties think that role is important: 83% of Democrats and Democratic leaders and 61% of Republicans and Republican leaders. However, there is still a significant political divide, although one that is much narrower. Next, respondents were asked to rate how well journalists are currently doing that role. There are also wildly different political assessments in this area.

Republican and leaning voters mostly agree that media are presently going too far in their role as watchdogs (59%) compared to 22% who disagree and 16% who believe they are doing a good job. In contrast, 43% of Democrats and Democratic leaders believe that media generally get things correctly. A similar percentage (41%) believe that journalists could do more to act as watchdogs. And the fewest percentage of Democrats, 14%, agree that journalists sometimes go too far [10].

According On the News Diet, Evaluation of Journalists' Work As Watchdogs Differs.

Democrats' and Republicans' news diets, or the sources they rely on for political and election news, are related to their perspectives on the news media's watchdog function. In addition to these watchdog questions, respondents were also questioned about the 30 news sources they used in the previous week to get their political and electoral news. Based on this information, researchers conducted an analysis of the variety of news sources individuals used as well as the political make-up of each source's audience. (For further information on the study's design, see the box below.)

Examining Partisans' News Intake

The categories included in this analysis derive from research on the sources that partisans use to get their political and electoral news. The political make-up of each of the 30 news organizations featured in the Pew Research Center's Election News Pathways study is categorized. A media outlet is said to have a left-leaning audience if at least two-thirds more of its viewers identify as liberal Democrats (including leaners) than as conservative Republicans; if the opposite is true, the media outlet is said to have a right-leaning audience; and if neither is true, the media outlet is said to have a more mixed audience.

Data on the audience is gathered from those who claim to have gotten political and electoral news from a source in the previous week. Using this methodology, it is found that 17 of the 30 news sources have audiences that lean left (including The New York Times and Vice), six have audiences that lean to the right politically (including Breitbart and Fox News), seven have mixed audiences (including ABC, CBS, and NBC News), and six have audiences that tilt to the left politically.

Discover how we selected the 30 news sources we used for our project and browse the whole list by audience profile. Based on the news sources that each party's supporters used to stay up to date on political and electoral news throughout the last week, Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents) and Republicans and Republican supporters are each separated into three categories. Another group consists of those who didn't get news from any of the 30 sources in the previous week.

how many Americans there are in each category 70% of Republicans who primarily consume their political news from media with a right-leaning readership believe that journalists overstep their bounds in their capacity as watchdogs.

Republicans who obtain their news from a variety of sources, some with right-leaning audiences and others with mixed and/or left-leaning audiences, see a drop in that percentage to 61%. About half (47%) of Republicans who get their news from sources without audiences who tilt to the right believe that journalists have overstepped their bounds [11], [12].

Different Media Diets Among Partisans Influence How They See The Media's Watchdog Function.

With changes in news consumption, so does the percentage of Republicans who believe journalists get it right. solely 5% of those who solely read political news from sources with right-leaning audiences have this sentiment. Republicans who get their news from a variety of sources with right-leaning and non-right-leaning audiences saw a rise in this to 13%. 29% of those who don't read any news from outlets with right-leaning readers think journalists get the news about correctly. Democrats' opinions vary depending on their news diets as well. 10% of Democrats who solely consume political news from sources with left-leaning readerships believe that journalists sometimes go too far. However, that figure almost doubles to 24%

among Democrats who don't read any news sources with left-leaning readers. Depending on how they consume news, Democrats are more or less likely to have this opinion. Democrats who get their political news from a combination of left-leaning and other kinds of venues report that 40% of them believe that journalists are not doing enough to act as watchdogs, compared to roughly half (51%) of Democrats who solely receive their political news from sources with left-leaning audiences. And just 32% of Democrats who do not get their news from publications with left-leaning readerships agree that journalists should be more forceful in their role as watchdogs.

People who primarily depend on Fox News and MSNBC have significantly different perspectives on how well journalists are doing in their watchdog roles. The specific source that individuals identify in an open-ended question as the one they use most often for political and election news may be used to gauge a media diet at a more detailed level. Two-thirds (66%) of Americans who cite Fox News as their primary source of political news (representing 16%) believe that journalists are overstepping their bounds in their capacity as watchdogs under the Trump administration. Two out of ten people (21%) feel that journalists are not going far enough, while 9% believe they are getting it about right. A significantly different viewpoint is held by the 4% of American people who cite MSNBC as their primary source.

Only 6% of people believe that journalists go too far, while 46% believe they don't go far enough and about the same number (47%) are happy with how things are going. These key sources closely match the party identity. Nine out of ten people (93%) who identify Fox News as their primary source are Republicans or lean Republican, whereas nine out of ten people (95%) who identify MSNBC as their primary source are Democrats or lean Democrats. (In addition, a significant majority (70%) of Republicans, the group previously described, who primarily consume news from publications with a right-leaning readership, select Fox News as their primary source for political news.) Democratic respondents who mention NPR and The New York Times are also far more likely to believe that journalists should be doing more to act as watchdogs (48% and 51%, respectively) than that they have done too much to shine a spotlight on political officials (8% and 7%) [13].

The Influence of The Watchdog

By exposing misconduct, supporters of this role for the media want to reduce corruption. In practice, however, certain institutions are immune to responsibility, despite the fact the media may "make waves" via watchdogging. Timing, the reputation of the news organization, the quality of the investigation's creation, and the balance of political forces are all variables that may affect efficacy. According to the data included in the paper, "[t]he media may alter public perceptions, but they don't always inspire people to engage in political activity. Since political elites are far more sensitive to how the media portrays them, the press may have a greater impact on how they think and act. Therefore, if the political environment is conducive to reform, watchdog reporting may result in change. By enhancing the legitimacy of the media, educating the populace, and advancing democratic debate, it may start a cycle of media and governmental changes. Such a role is crucial during democratic transitions, when the media is still claiming its independence from the executive branch and assisting in the creation of the new standards for official interaction.

Its negative aspect

The politics of permanent scandal" includes the function of the media watchdog, according to the opposing viewpoint. According to certain theories, transitional cultures are more prone to political slanting caused by "uncleanness" claims made by opponents. Others believe that the publicizing of scandals is a ceremonial cleansing of public life. However, the tactic of

"watchdogging" may enhance the quality of conversation, involve the public, and help to the reconstruction of a public sphere. The results of exposés are not assured; the press can also lose credibility. The press's role as the protector of the public interest, which is the most cherished myth in journalism, is also perpetuated by this. The notion that disclosure and vigilance may prevent abuses of power is sustained among journalists and people, which may be the greatest long-lasting effect of watchdog journalism [14].

CONCLUSION

The media's watchful watchdog role in defending the holy values of press freedom and accountability in the big theater of democracy is a significant and essential task. This conclusion emphasizes the complex interactions between the media's responsibility to hold the powerful responsible, the basic right to press freedom, and the foundation of government. The media's status as the "Fourth Estate" highlights the important part that it plays in democracies. It pierces the cloak of government secrecy via rigorous investigative journalism, brave reporting, and smart commentary, revealing topics of public importance and enabling individuals to make informed decisions. Given that it preserves the core principles of democracy, this crucial duty is not just a luxury but a necessity. The fundamental value of press freedom is at the core of this synergy. Journalists are able to navigate the turbulent landscape of power relations without fear of censorship or retribution because of this constitutional and ethical pillar. It serves as a symbol of democratic principles by allowing journalists the freedom to conduct in-depth investigations, unearth untold stories, and confront authorities in an effort to create a society that is fairer and more equal.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Tamam and A. N. Abdullah, "Malaysian journalists' perceptions on the role of the media," *Soc. Sci. J.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2014.08.004.
- [2] A. Kalogeropoulos, H. M. Svensson, A. Van Dalen, C. De Vreese, and E. Albæk, "Are watchdogs doing their business? Media coverage of economic news," *Journalism*. 2015. doi: 10.1177/1464884914554167.
- [3] H. M. Kim, J. Whitten-Woodring, and P. James, "The Role of Media in the Repression-Protest Nexus: A Game-theoretic Model," *J. Conflict Resolut.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0022002713520481.
- [4] M. Evans and M. S. Kaynak, "Media framing in religious-secular conflict in Turkey and Israel," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0192512113512147.
- [5] N. S. Dahmen, "Watchdog, voyeur, or censure?: An eye-tracking research study of graphic photographs in the news media," *Journal. Pract.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/17512786.2014.950883.
- [6] F. C. Chishala, "Ethical Challenges Posed by Online Media to Journalism: Case of the Zambian Watchdog," *Glob. Media J. African Ed.*, 2015, doi: 10.5789/9-1-190.
- [7] J. E. Relly, M. Zanger, and S. Fahmy, "Democratic Norms and Forces of Gatekeeping," *Journal. Mass Commun. Q.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/1077699015573195.
- [8] M. Lynch, "How the media trashed the transitions," *J. Democr.*, 2015, doi: 10.1353/jod.2015.0070.
- [9] S. Saeed, "Phantom Journalism: Governing India's proxy media owners," *Journal. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2015.1054174.

- [10] P. Mufune, "To what extent do media promote democracy in Southern Africa?," *J. Polit. Mil. Sociol.*, 2015, doi: 10.4324/9781315126609-5.
- [11] L. Hellmueller and C. Mellado, "Watchdogs in Chile and the United States: Comparing the networks of sources and journalistic role performances," *Int. J. Commun.*, 2016.
- [12] G. Hannis, "The Len Brown Affair: The roles of new and old media in a New Zealand political sex scandal," *Pacific Journal. Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.24135/pjr.v22i2.63.
- [13] M. B. Ahmad, C. Pride, and A. K. Corsy, "Free speech, press freedom, and democracy in Ghana: A conceptual and historical overview," in *Political Influence of the Media in Developing Countries*, 2016. doi: 10.4018/978-1-4666-9613-6.ch005.
- [14] C. Bruns and O. Himmler, "Mass media, instrumental information, and electoral accountability," *J. Public Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.01.005.

CHAPTER 6

IN THE LINE OF FIRE: MEDIA SCRUTINY AND PARLIAMENTARY CONTEMPT

Kshipra Jain, Assistant Professor
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id-kshipra.jain@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The delicate dance between press freedom and parliamentary privilege, which represents a complicated ballet between openness, accountability, and the integrity of legislative processes, is at the core of democratic government. This research dives into the fundamental issues raised in "In the Line of Fire: Media Scrutiny and Parliamentary Contempt," highlighting the difficulties and significant ramifications that result from the interaction between media criticism and the defense of legislative bodies. It draws attention to the difficult balancing act needed to manage this dynamic connection while also emphasizing the importance of the media as a watchdog and the need to protect the integrity of legislative processes in democratic nations.

KEYWORDS:

Democratic, Freedom, Line Fire, Media Scrutiny, Parliamentary Contempt.

INTRODUCTION

The media functions as the watchful sentinel and the ferocious interrogator in the intricate system of democratic administration, shedding light on the activities of the powerful while exposing them to unrelenting criticism. This mutually beneficial connection, which is a tenet of open societies, embodies the democratic principles of accountability and openness. The ideals of press freedom and legislative privilege are locked in a constant and sometimes heated war at the center of this complex web of interactions.

The media, which closely monitors the actions of lawmakers and other government representatives, occasionally errs on the side of parliamentary contempt, drawing attention to the conflict between the need to hold the powerful accountable and the requirement to preserve the integrity of legislative proceedings. In the contemporary democratic age, the media's function as the Fourth Estate, a check on the authority of the executive, legislative, and judicial institutions, is essential. Armed with the constitutional protection of press freedom, journalists and media organizations enter the halls of power to look into, investigate, and expose matters of public concern.

They serve as the people's eyes and ears in this endeavor, exposing the inner workings of government and making public servants responsible for their deeds. On the other hand, parliamentary privilege is a legal theory that defends the autonomy of legislative bodies, guaranteeing that legislators may discuss, debate, and reach conclusions without excessive intervention or intimidation. In the legislative setting, it shields their speech and conduct by granting them various immunities and safeguards [1].

This philosophy is based on the core tenet that vigorous, unrestrained discussion is necessary for the passage of legislation and the upholding of democratic ideals. But when these two democratic foundations meet, conflicts often arise.

The constant monitoring of the media might reveal controversies, moral failings, or even probable crimes inside the legislative halls, which can result in charges of parliamentary

contempt. The conflict between the media's watchdog function and the parliamentary privilege system raises significant concerns about the bounds of each, as well as broader consequences for democratic government. This investigation of the interactions between legislative disapproval and media scrutiny aims to clarify this intricate connection.

It will explore the difficulties and issues that occur when the media utilizes its right to examine politicians and governmental acts, sometimes stepping beyond the bounds of parliamentary privilege. It will look at instances from the past and the present when this conflict has been prominent, investigating the complex definitions of parliamentary contempt across different democratic systems. Additionally, it will clarify the basic queries surrounding this complex issue: What boundary should be established between the media's obligation to serve as the people's eyes and ears and the need to protect the integrity of legislative proceedings in light of this constant conflict, how can the precarious balance between openness, responsibility, and legislative independence be maintained [2], [3].

DISCUSSION

The intersection of media scrutiny and parliamentary contempt is a terrain fraught with complexities, as it forces democratic societies to grapple with the inherent tension between the watchdog role of the press and the necessity to protect the integrity of legislative processes. This discussion delves into the key dimensions of this intricate issue, considering the challenges it poses, the implications it carries, and the potential avenues for resolution.

Freedom of the Press vs. Parliamentary Privilege

At the heart of this discussion is the fundamental clash between two essential pillars of democracy: freedom of the press and parliamentary privilege. Freedom of the press is enshrined in constitutions and international agreements as a fundamental right, empowering journalists to scrutinize those in power and hold them accountable. Parliamentary privilege, on the other hand, safeguards the independence of lawmakers to ensure that they can engage in robust debates and decision-making without fear of external influence or harassment [4].

1. **Fundamental Right:** Freedom of the press is a cornerstone of democratic governance, enshrined in many constitutions and international agreements. It empowers journalists and media outlets to investigate, report, and criticize government actions without censorship or fear of retribution.
2. **Watchdog Role:** The media plays a crucial role as a watchdog, scrutinizing those in power, exposing corruption, and informing the public about matters of public interest. It acts as a vital check on government authority and ensures transparency in governance.
3. **Public Right to Know:** The public's right to know what transpires within government institutions is paramount. A well-informed citizenry is essential for making informed decisions and holding public officials accountable for their actions.

Parliamentary Privilege:

1. **Legislative Independence:** Parliamentary privilege is designed to protect the independence and integrity of legislative bodies. It ensures that lawmakers can engage in robust debates, express their views freely, and make decisions without fear of external influence or intimidation.
2. **Uninhibited Debate:** Without parliamentary privilege, legislators might self-censor their statements and actions out of fear of legal repercussions, inhibiting the free and open exchange of ideas and hindering the legislative process.

3. **Preserving Order:** It helps maintain order within legislative chambers, preventing disruptions or legal actions that could compromise the functioning of parliamentary proceedings [5].

Key Challenges and Implications:

1. **Boundary Disputes:** The fundamental challenge lies in defining the boundaries of press freedom within parliamentary settings. Determining when media scrutiny spills over into parliamentary contempt can be subjective and contentious.
2. **Erosion of Trust:** Conflicts between the media and legislative bodies can erode public trust in both institutions. An overzealous press can be perceived as invasive, while parliamentary bodies seen as overly secretive may face accusations of opacity.
3. **Accountability vs. Legislative Independence:** Striking the right balance between accountability and legislative independence is a perpetual challenge. Overemphasis on one may undermine the other, potentially compromising the effectiveness of democratic governance.

Potential Resolutions

1. **Legal Framework:** Developing clear legal frameworks that delineate the boundaries of media scrutiny and parliamentary privilege can help mitigate conflicts. These frameworks should balance the imperatives of accountability and legislative independence.
2. **Mediation Mechanisms:** Establishing mechanisms for mediation and dispute resolution between media outlets and parliamentary bodies can provide a structured approach to resolving conflicts while respecting both sides' interests.
3. **Public Engagement:** Engaging the public in discussions about the boundaries of press freedom and parliamentary privilege can promote awareness and understanding. Public input can help shape laws and guidelines that reflect societal values.

Controversies and Challenges

The media's role as the Fourth Estate inevitably leads to situations where it exposes controversies, ethical breaches, or potential misconduct within parliamentary chambers. These revelations can give rise to allegations of parliamentary contempt, such as revealing confidential information or disrupting proceedings. This dynamic has led to numerous legal and ethical quandaries in democratic societies [6].

1. **Boundary Disputes:** One of the primary challenges is defining the boundaries of media scrutiny within parliamentary settings. Determining when media coverage transitions from a legitimate exercise of press freedom to parliamentary contempt can be subjective and contentious. This often leads to disputes and legal battles over what is considered acceptable reporting.
2. **Privacy vs. Public Interest:** The media's duty to inform the public can sometimes clash with lawmakers' right to privacy. Media outlets may publish personal details or engage in intrusive reporting in the pursuit of a story, leading to concerns about the invasion of privacy versus the public's right to know.
3. **Ethical Reporting:** Maintaining ethical standards in journalism can be challenging when covering parliamentary proceedings. Sensationalism, bias, and the rush to break news can lead to inaccurate or unfair reporting, undermining the credibility of the media and potentially harming individuals' reputations.
4. **National Security and Confidentiality:** Media reporting on sensitive parliamentary matters, particularly those related to national security or confidential information, can

pose significant challenges. Balancing the public's right to information with the need to protect state secrets and sensitive data is a complex endeavor.

5. **Public Perception and Trust:** Conflicts between the media and parliamentary bodies can erode public trust in both institutions. An overzealous press can be perceived as invasive, while parliamentary bodies that are overly secretive may face accusations of opacity. Balancing transparency and maintaining public trust is an ongoing challenge.
6. **Legal Battles:** Controversies often result in legal battles, with lawmakers or parliamentary bodies taking legal action against media outlets for alleged parliamentary contempt. These legal battles can be protracted and resource-intensive, consuming valuable time and resources.
7. **Public Accountability:** Ensuring that lawmakers remain accountable to the public while respecting their privileges is a delicate balance. The media plays a critical role in exposing wrongdoing and holding officials accountable, but this can sometimes be met with resistance from lawmakers seeking to protect their reputation.
8. **Rapid Information Dissemination:** In the digital age, information spreads rapidly. Misinformation and sensationalized stories can go viral, leading to hasty judgments and potential damage to individuals' careers and reputations. Maintaining responsible reporting in the age of instant news is a significant challenge.
9. **International Implications:** In an interconnected world, controversies involving parliamentary privilege and media scrutiny can have international repercussions. Diplomatic tensions may arise when media outlets report on sensitive international matters involving lawmakers.

Boundaries and Balancing Acts

Determining the boundaries of media scrutiny within the parliamentary context is a complex endeavor. On one hand, citizens have a right to know what transpires within legislative bodies, as it directly impacts their lives. On the other hand, legislators must have the space to engage in open debates without fearing reprisal or legal action. Striking the right balance between these imperatives is a constant challenge [7].

1. Press Freedom and Accountability

1.1 Balance: Defining the boundaries means finding a balance between the media's duty to hold public officials accountable and the need to respect the privileges and rights of lawmakers.

1.2 Legal Framework: A legal framework can provide guidelines for responsible reporting while safeguarding the media's freedom to investigate and inform the public.

2. Respect for Parliamentary Processes:

2.1 Legislative Independence: Protecting parliamentary privilege is essential for ensuring that lawmakers can engage in robust debates without fear of external interference.

2.2 Orderly Proceedings: Maintaining the integrity of parliamentary proceedings requires mechanisms to prevent disruptions and protect the decorum of legislative chambers.

3. Privacy and Public Interest:

3.1 Ethical Reporting: Media outlets must navigate the ethical terrain of reporting, balancing the public's right to know with an individual's right to privacy.

3.2 Consideration of Consequences: Journalists and editors should consider the potential consequences of their reporting on individuals' lives and reputations.

4. National Security and Confidentiality:

4.1 National Interest: Balancing the public's right to information with the need to protect national security and confidential government matters is a critical challenge.

4.2 Responsible Reporting: Media organizations must exercise responsible journalism when handling sensitive information, seeking to minimize harm to national interests.

5. Legal Mechanisms and Mediation:

5.1 Clear Guidelines: Establishing clear legal guidelines that outline what constitutes parliamentary contempt and what falls within the realm of responsible reporting can help mitigate disputes.

5.2 Mediation: Implementing mechanisms for mediation and dispute resolution can provide a structured approach to addressing conflicts between media outlets and parliamentary bodies.

6. Public Perception and Trust:

6.1 Transparency: Maintaining transparency in parliamentary processes and media reporting can help build and preserve public trust in both institutions.

6.2 Accountability: Holding both media outlets and lawmakers accountable for their actions, including ethical breaches or abuses of privilege, is essential for upholding democratic values.

7. Continuous Public Engagement:

7.1 Awareness and Education: Engaging the public in discussions about the boundaries of press freedom and parliamentary privilege can promote understanding and awareness of the complexities involved.

7.2 Public Input: Public input can influence the development of laws, regulations, and guidelines, reflecting societal values and expectations.

8. Responsible Reporting in the Digital Age:

8.1 Verification: Ensuring accurate and verified reporting is crucial in the digital age when information spreads rapidly.

8.2 Fact-Checking: Incorporating fact-checking and responsible sourcing into journalism practices can mitigate the dissemination of false or misleading information.

Implications for Democracy

The tension between media scrutiny and parliamentary contempt carries significant implications for democracy. On one hand, a free and robust press is essential for a well-informed citizenry and transparent governance. On the other hand, a breakdown in the respect for parliamentary privilege can undermine the effectiveness of legislative bodies and erode the trust placed in them by the public [8].

1. Transparency and Accountability:

Positive Implication: A vigilant and free press enhances transparency by shedding light on government activities, decisions, and potential wrongdoing. This transparency, in turn, reinforces accountability as elected officials are more likely to act in the public interest when they know their actions are subject to public scrutiny.

Negative Implication: Excessive media scrutiny, if not balanced, can hinder effective governance. Lawmakers may become reluctant to engage in candid debates, leading to a decline in open and informed policymaking.

2. Informed Citizenry:

Positive Implication: A robust media enables citizens to make informed decisions about their government and representatives. It empowers them with the knowledge needed to vote, participate in civic activities, and engage in the democratic process.

Negative Implication: Misinformation and sensationalism in the media can distort public perception and contribute to a misinformed or polarized citizenry. It becomes a challenge to ensure that the information presented is accurate and unbiased.

3. Public Trust and Confidence:

Positive Implication: A media that holds public officials accountable can bolster public trust in government institutions. Knowing that unethical behavior or corruption will be exposed reinforces faith in the system.

Negative Implication: Controversies and conflicts between the media and parliamentary bodies can erode public trust in both institutions. Perceived overreach by the media or parliamentary secrecy may lead to skepticism about the democratic process.

4. Checks and Balances:

Positive Implication: The media serves as a vital check on governmental power, offering an additional layer of checks and balances. It complements the roles of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches in ensuring that no one branch becomes too powerful or unaccountable. Negative Implication: An overly aggressive media may disrupt the delicate balance of power, undermining the functioning of government and creating a perception of chaos or instability.

5. Legal Frameworks and Protections:

Positive Implication: A well-defined legal framework that respects both press freedom and parliamentary privilege can provide clarity, mitigate conflicts, and establish clear boundaries for responsible reporting. Negative Implication: Poorly defined or overly restrictive legal frameworks can stifle investigative journalism, curb press freedom, or, conversely, allow for abuses of parliamentary privilege [9].

6. Public Discourse and Engagement:

Positive Implication: Controversies surrounding press freedom and parliamentary privilege can stimulate public discourse and encourage citizens to engage with issues related to governance, media ethics, and individual rights.

Negative Implication: If not managed responsibly, such controversies can polarize public opinion and lead to divisions within society, hindering constructive dialogue.

7. International Relations:

Positive Implication: A free press can uncover issues of international significance, contributing to the global dialogue on human rights, democracy, and governance.

Negative Implication: Media reporting on sensitive international matters may strain diplomatic relations, requiring careful navigation of national interests and global responsibilities.

Resolution and Mediation

Addressing this issue requires careful consideration and, in some cases, legal and procedural reforms. Various democratic systems have established mechanisms to mediate disputes between the media and parliamentary bodies, often involving ombudsmen or press councils. These mechanisms seek to find a middle ground that respects both press freedom and parliamentary privilege.

Public Discourse and Education

Engaging the public in this discussion is essential. Citizens need to understand the nuances of this issue and its implications for democracy. Public discourse can also influence the development of laws and guidelines that strike a fair balance between media scrutiny and parliamentary privilege. The dynamic relationship between media scrutiny and parliamentary contempt reflects the ongoing struggle to reconcile the imperatives of accountability, transparency, and legislative independence within democratic systems.

It is a complex issue that requires careful consideration, public engagement, and a commitment to upholding the core principles of democracy while safeguarding the functioning of legislative bodies. Striking the right balance is a continuous challenge, but it is one that democratic society must confront to ensure the vitality of their political institutions and the preservation of press freedom [10].

CONCLUSION

By illuminating the complex and sometimes controversial connection between press freedom and parliamentary privilege, "In the Line of Fire: Media Scrutiny and Parliamentary Contempt" highlights the subtle difficulties and wide-ranging ramifications within democratic government. This investigation highlights the fact that the conflict between these essential democratic values is a genuine dynamic with practical repercussions, not just a theoretical argument. Finding the fine line where the media may play a crucial role as a diligent watchdog while upholding the dignity of legislative procedures is a problem. The disagreements and difficulties that result from this junction call for careful analysis and complex solutions. It is still difficult to strike a balance between the requirements of legislative independence and orderliness and the imperatives of openness, accountability, and the right to know. It becomes clear from negotiating this difficult terrain that democracy flourishes when both legislative bodies and the media behave properly.

A culture where democracy thrives may be shaped through ethical journalism, parliamentary privilege respect, clear legal frameworks, and conflict resolution procedures, among other factors. In the end, "In the Line of Fire" serves as a reminder that the strong and responsible interaction between these essential democratic institutions is essential to the health of a democracy. Although at times difficult, media criticism is a crucial force for accountability, and the sanctity of legislative procedures is the cornerstone of good legislation.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. D. Cooper, "Implications of media scrutiny for a child protection agency," *J. Sociol. Soc. Welf.*, 2005, doi: 10.15453/0191-5096.3094.
- [2] A. C. Peyronel, "Media Scrutiny of Higher Education: An Ongoing Challenge and Long-term Trend," *Int. J. Educ. Adv.*, 2003, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.cijea.2140005.
- [3] D. Sutter, "Media scrutiny and the quality of public officials," *Public Choice*, 2006, doi: 10.1007/s11127-006-9025-0.

- [4] D. S. DeVries and K. R. Fitzpatrick, "Defining the characteristics of a lingering crisis: Lessons from the National Zoo," *Public Relat. Rev.*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2006.02.010.
- [5] F. J. Pérez-Latre, I. Portilla, and C. S. Blanco, "Social networks, media and audiences: A literature review," *Commun. Soc.*, 2011, doi: 10.15581/003.24.36221.
- [6] M. Djerf-Pierre and J. Pierre, "Mediatized local government: Social media activity and media strategies among local government officials 1989-2010," *Policy Polit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1332/030557315X14434624683411.
- [7] S. Jacobs and T. Schillemans, "Media and public accountability: Typology and exploration," *Policy Polit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1332/030557315X14431855320366.
- [8] C. M. Georgescu, A. P. Olimid, D. A. Olimid, S. D. Georgescu, and C. L. Gherghe, "Monitoring media scrutiny of eu official information and documentation. A content analysis of the european online news coverage (January–May 2017)," in *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 2017. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-71117-1_8.
- [9] M. Reid, "Fear of Media Scrutiny," *Index Censorsh.*, 1985, doi: 10.1080/03064228508533897.
- [10] S. Weza, "Zimbabwe's media under scrutiny: The work of the Media Monitoring Project Zimbabwe," *Round Table*, 2002, doi: 10.1080/0035853022000012577.

CHAPTER 7

BALANCING ACT: RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRESS

Dr. Parag Amin, Associate Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id-parag.amin@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Balancing Act Rights and Responsibilities of the Press explores the complicated interaction between the rights and obligations of media outlets in democratic nations as well as the intricate web of press freedom and ethical journalism. The varied topics covered in this conversation are summarized in this summary, which emphasizes how crucial it is to preserve a delicate balance between the unrestricted exercise of press freedom and the moral requirements that underpin responsible journalism. This conversation focuses on the significant significance of press freedom, which is a basic democratic right and a cornerstone of the democratic system rather than just a luxury. The media's crucial role in guaranteeing government accountability, defending individual freedoms, and promoting an educated populace is highlighted by its functions as the Fourth Estate, a watchdog, and a channel for the spread of many viewpoints. But this conversation goes beyond just praising press freedom; it also examines the obligations that come along with this valued liberty. Truth, impartiality, and the public interest are expectations of ethical reporting standards, thorough fact-checking, and responsible journalism. A well-informed society, encouraging fruitful public conversation, and preventing damage from sensationalism or the spread of false information are all responsibilities of the media.

KEYWORDS:

Court, Democratic, Freedom, Press, Responsibilities.

INTRODUCTION

The European Union portrays itself as an example global power and a role model for press freedom. Although several of its 28 member nations rate well in worldwide rankings of press freedom, there are still considerable obstacles that press freedom must overcome, and new dangers are always arising. Several member states still have criminal defamation and blasphemy laws in place, which have a chilling effect on journalism; widespread surveillance threatens the privacy of journalists' sources; information access is still restricted; and counter-terrorism measures have resulted in laws and procedures that restrict a journalist's rights and ability to work.

Although it is uncommon, criminal gangs have attacked journalists in Italy and Bulgaria, police have intimidated them in Spain, and religious fanatics have assassinated journalists in France. By giving authoritarian nations ready-made justifications for their own oppressive actions, the EU's failure to address these issues harms journalists not just inside member states but also threatens the EU's ability to defend press freedom abroad.

How can the EU expect to persuade other countries, from Turkey to China, to improve their press freedom records if it is itself at fault? Philippe Hensman's, director of Amnesty International Belgium, asked CPJ [1]. As stated in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which outlines the principles and standards to which EU policy must conform, the EU should place a high emphasis on ensuring that member states maintain it, according to journalists and press freedom activists who talked with CPJ for this research.

This study reflects these concerns and identifies instances where the EU has failed to tenaciously and consistently safeguard press freedom by failing to hold member states accountable. The EU's dedication to its basic ideals is being compromised by certain member states' retreat from their pledges to democracy.

For instance, under Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, CPJ has documented how the state media in Hungary have become mouthpieces for the government, how state advertising has been used to reward friends and punish dissenters, how independent journalists have been marginalized, and how restrictions have been placed on the country's Freedom of Information Act law, making it difficult for journalists to look into allegations of corruption. Despite the fact that Orbán's challenge was seen as a blatant assault on journalists and a core EU principle, it went unanswered. The EU delayed, with the exception of a few restricted infringement cases and legislative decisions. At a symposium on illiberal regimes this year, Rui Tavares, a former Portuguese Green MEP and author of a 2013 study on Hungary, stated, "I'd like the EU to be as imaginative on fundamental rights [as] it has been on austerity programs [2]."

The EU failed to activate its rule of law mechanism, which is meant to sanction members who fail to uphold their obligations and may have stopped the situation in Hungary from becoming worse, in response to pressure from member states keen to maintain their sovereignty. According to Miklos Haraszti, "Viktor Orbán's increasingly illiberal governance is in itself a denial of European democratic values." The former OSCE representative for media freedom and scholar from Hungary said he regarded the EU's tolerance of Hungary to be "perplexing. The European Commission, Council, European Parliament, and Court of Justice seem to be underprepared to combat infringement of press freedom. They cannot defend the sources of journalists or overturn national defamation laws. Instead, enforcing action to safeguard press freedom is often left to member states or European intergovernmental organizations like the Council of Europe or the European Court of Human Rights. However, since it controls the working conditions for journalists, the EU's authority to issue directives on issues like public service broadcasting, the digital agenda, trade secrets, and framework rules on racism and xenophobia has a direct influence on them. It also plays a role in coordinating member nations on matters like financing for academic and research institutions and counterterrorism measures. The European Newspaper Publishers Association executive director Francine Cunningham told CPJ that because of its scope, "everything the EU does may have an impact on journalism and media freedom." Additionally, reporters must be continually vigilant to make sure that measures, like a planned trade secrets directive that would limit the information they may expose about businesses, do not infringe on their right to freedom of expression.

EU institutions are hardly transparent role models, despite creating mountains of information and operating an outstanding communications system. Although the EU is "less closed than 20 years ago," according to Aidan White, head of the Ethical Journalism Network, access to crucial papers and meetings that would enable journalists to execute their responsibility as watchdogs remains too restricted. The gates fall and spokespersons don't really help you when you ask for information or documents that might contradict the official narrative." Whistleblower assistance and protection are also seen as lacking. Only two of the nine EU institutions have adopted the necessary internal whistleblower procedures, and member state disagreements over the policy have further impeded EU efforts in this area. The EU seems to have made press freedom a requirement when bargaining with potential member nations. The European Parliament's rapporteur on Turkey, Kati Piri, told CPJ that the EU should emphasize the rule of law and freedoms more because of lessons learned from past accession procedures. The EU has the greatest clout during these discussions and has the power to demand significant changes, such those to a candidate country's laws and criminal code. Such leverage may

provide crucial assistance to journalists who are trying to do their jobs in oppressive environments like Turkey or Serbia. Press freedom is valued during these discussions as both a value in and of itself as well as a means of achieving other goals that are essential to the country's viability as a potential member of the EU, such as combating corruption or changing oppressive laws. However, there is still a chance that the EU may ultimately put economic and geopolitical interests or political expediency ahead of journalistic freedom. The treaty clauses that state that the EU's foreign operations must be guided by the values upon which it was created serve as the foundation for its press freedom diplomacy. The EU is able to further these principles democracy, the rule of law, and human rights through a number of tools and initiatives. It has taken on a constructive role in international settings, supporting the United Nations Plan of Action for the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity, opposing the adoption of a U.N. resolution on the Defamation of Religion, and thwarting efforts, primarily by authoritarian states, to bring Internet governance under U.N. control. The EU also has several alliances that make press freedom and other human rights fundamental components of accords [3].

However, pragmatic *realpolitik* often prevails over idealistic rhetoric. A study published in September 2014 by the Leuven Center for Global Governance Studies in Belgium found that inconsistent monitoring and implementation of human rights laws might result in unfair treatment of certain groups. When it comes to diplomacy in oppressive nations that are significant trading partners or strategic allies, press freedom and human rights advocates who talked with CPJ noted that the EU is inconsistent. This strategy enables scenarios in which Burundi, a nation with little strategic relevance, to face worse punishment for its acts than China. For instance, the EU has declared its intention to develop greater political and economic ties with Azerbaijan. But CPJ has discovered that this vital energy supplier is a top jailer of journalists and human rights defenders.

The EU's ability to act is constrained by the amount of authority member states are willing to commit to Brussels, despite the fact that human rights are promoted as the golden thread running through all of its programs. "The powers that the EU has are attributed powers, in other words, powers that the member states have chosen to grant to the EU," said EU Ombudsman and former Irish journalist Emily O'Reilly in a lecture to the Law Society of Ireland. Especially when the exercise of such control has an influence on their own activities or vital interests, "member states are frequently unwilling to grant supranational control bodies such strong powers.

Although member states have a right to be concerned about these legal and political issues, they cannot be used as an excuse to renege on the EU's commitment to press freedom. The EU must vehemently defend core principles if it is to be relevant over the long run. The legitimacy and consistency of its press freedom diplomacy, which is founded on values and devoid of double standards, will play a significant role in determining the future of its worldwide impact. This will include not just its ability to rectify wrongs among member nations. The EU should see press freedom and human rights as a strategic asset that not only helps the EU express its ideals but also defends its key interests overseas, according to human rights expert Andrea Subhan, who spoke with CPJ. The ensuing proposals from CPJ outline actions that the EU and its members may take. Among them are requests for the EU to demonstrate its support for press freedom by utilizing tools like the suspension of voting privileges when member states disobey agreements made in the basic rights charter. It should make sure that both member states and those wanting to join the EU don't renege on their obligations to provide access to information and support a free and active press.

The EU could show that it is committed to being an open and transparent organization by enhancing access to documents and information across all of its institutions and member states. Additionally, by adopting robust encryption, the EU would provide better safety for journalists and sources. EU member states should also show their adherence to the founding ideals by repealing legislation that punishes libel, blasphemy, and defamation, and by ensuring that rules against hate speech and anti-extremism are not abused to stifle critical reporting.

According to the new Master of the Rolls, Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury, "publicly perceived and generally accepted social and moral standards change, and the legislature and courts must, within bounds, reflect those changes, if they are to retain democratic relevance and public confidence." Lord Neuberger emphasized the need of striking a balance in his speech on "Rights and Responsibilities: Civic Duty and the Rule of Law". In 1949, Lord Denning himself said that freedom was "the freedom of every law-abiding citizen to think what he will, to say what he will, and to go where he will on his lawful occasion without let or hindrance from other persons.

" He said, "What sixty years it has been." Although it is hard to be didactic or exact about the scope of these fundamental values, Lord Neuberger claimed that there are some "immutable" ideals. But he was able to list a few. The right to a fair trial, which is a "substantive, free standing right," the right to liberty and security (including the "right to privacy," which the courts have crammed into the law of confidence, and freedom of expression, which is "the means by which truth is told to power," are among the most important rights and obligations.

However, rights and obligations must be respected since doing so puts us at risk of abusing them ("the more we think of them as well established, the greater the danger of our abusing them"). Although human rights have a lengthy history, he said that "achieving their universal acceptance is still a work in progress." In this situation, the judges and legislators must establish a balance between rights and obligations. They must decide how to weigh one right against another, a right against its "internal limits," and a right against the overriding imperative to safeguard the very existence of the country.

He acknowledged that the courts have two obligations, including not only upholding the right to a fair trial but also actively working to ensure it. He finished by supporting the notion that when the objectives of freedom are "nicely balanced" against the obligations that impose restrictions on them, "the scale goes down on the side of freedom," as his illustrious predecessor had once said [3]–[5].

DISCUSSION

Ease of Information Access

It is crucial that the media have unrestricted access to information sources in order to educate the public about current events and topics, accurately represent political, social, and cultural currents, and encourage wide-spread and free discussion. Press freedom is a necessary prerequisite for informed public opinion and discussion. Without obstruction, intimidation, or retaliation, journalists and the media must be allowed to obtain information about facts and occurrences. They must be allowed to use their editorial discretion when determining what to cover and how to cover it. It's possible that outside involvement or influence in this process amounts to censorship.

Governments are required to increase the transparency of their operations.

This democratic ideal must be upheld, and public institutions and authorities have a responsibility to make access to public records easier. Both Quebec (in its adoption of An Act

Respecting Access to Documents Held by Public Bodies and the Protection of Personal Information, RSQ, 1982) and Ottawa (in its adoption of the Access to Information Act, adopted in 1983) recognized the principle that the state exists to serve its citizens and is accountable to them.

The right of citizens to be fully informed about the choices and acts made by their governments and public authorities is unalienable. When a government prohibits or postpones the release of information, claiming the public interest, it should not presume that the press would share its opinion of what the public interest is.

Governments must distinguish between the public interest and their private interests. Information on the government and all other public institutions and organizations must be available to the press. Any obstacle, whether judicial or administrative, undercuts press freedom and people's constitutional right to know about the happenings, choices, and acts that have an impact on them [6].

Having Access to Court and Quasi-Court Proceedings

Despite the private and delicate character of certain situations, the administration of justice is a matter of public concern and it must be carried out in an open manner. Only in the most unusual circumstances could courts and tribunals keep the public out; even then, the press should be present to cover issues of public interest and the administration of justice. Legislation that would simultaneously better balance the right to personal privacy, the open and public administration of justice, and the right of the public to be informed on subjects of public concern should create separate standards of access for the press and the general public.

Confidential Material and Source Protection

The right of journalists to maintain the confidentiality of certain information sources is essential to press freedom and the public's right to knowledge. There are no protections of privilege protecting the Quebec media from being forced to testify, divulge their sources, or turn over information by courts or quasi-judicial organizations. The Press Council acknowledges the right of journalists to silence. The judge has a responsibility to examine the conflicting interests carefully and intelligently.

According to the council, the justice should confirm that the secret information a journalist has is essential to the conclusion of the case and that there is no other reasonable method to access it before ordering them to cooperate with courts or tribunals. It should be made clear that journalism itself, not journalists as people, is what has to be protected. In order to guarantee the public's access to thorough information on all topics of public interest, journalistic activity that is, the gathering, processing, and transmission of information as well as the conditions necessary to practice journalism must be protected [7].

Polls

A way to obtain and analyze data to identify or pinpoint trends in public opinion is via polls. Even during an election or referendum campaign, attempting to stop or restrict their publishing or transmission constitutes a restriction on information freedom, the public's right to access, and press freedom. However, it is crucial that the accuracy of the data gathered through surveys can be independently verified.

The audience must be given the required background information in order to be able to analyze poll findings intelligently and independently, including the names of the sponsors and authors, the kind of sample used, the statistical analysis technique, the margin of error, etc.

Marketing

Advertisers are able to choose whatever medium they like. In addition, taxpayer-funded public agencies and institutions are not permitted to use advertising as a tool to commend, criticize, or exert influence on media organizations based on their ideological or political viewpoints or on the effectiveness of their coverage of their respective agendas. Private companies, organizations, teams, and people should likewise avoid utilizing their advertising in this manner. The right of the public to information is violated when advertising is withheld as a pressure technique to sway coverage or incite self-censorship by one or more media outlets.

Processing And Dissemination of Information

A media publishing or broadcasting company disseminates true news as the work of one or more journalists. Investigative procedures and the collecting of information must be followed in order for journalism to take place. This activity shouldn't be interfered with or put under unjustified restrictions.

Cynism And Government Interruption

News reporting, commentary, and opinion articles should not be subject to legislative restrictions or censorship, particularly those that address political problems. The right or capacity of the press to criticize any level of government, including local government, should never be restricted by the law.

The circumstances for the existence and growth of a free and excellent press may be helped by governments. They should promote the public's ability to obtain thorough and accurate coverage of the current events and topics. The state should refrain from taking any actions or passing any laws that might restrict or change the content of news media [8], [9].

Journalistic Forms and Editorial Freedom

The media's dissemination of information to the general public is a result of several editorial choices. Information may be delivered in a variety of formats (such as news articles or commentary), at various durations, with or without visuals, and in other ways. These decisions are up to journalists' editorial judgment and are within their rights as well as the rights of the media. Journalists and members of the media must be able to report on events and provide their opinions on them without interference, threat, or retaliation. There is no mandate for the press to follow any one philosophy. Therefore, any media outlet is free to publish the stories it wants to and give them the attention it thinks they deserve. Investigative reporting The word "investigative" in this context refers to a specific procedure for obtaining and confirming facts, which may involve research, the scrutiny of documents, witness testimony, and expert interviewing. Investigative reporting entails a more thorough and in-depth analysis of a topic or issue than do other forms of journalism.

Because of their complexity or because they were formerly cloaked in secret, some events and social phenomena may not be commonly known or understood, but "investigative journalism" sheds light on them. It is sometimes acceptable to use covert techniques to gather information and evidence, such as using hidden microphones and cameras, hiding one's identity, infiltrating organizations under false pretenses, and covertly following people, due to the challenges and problems inherent in conducting investigations.

The Press Council acknowledges that sometimes the press needs and should utilize these techniques, but it mandates that they only be employed in exceptional circumstances, such as when doing so is in the public interest or when more traditional techniques are inadequate to

get the necessary material. Variety programs with news content Variety shows may first seem to be of little relevance to the news media, however the news and current affairs elements of these programs must adhere to the guidelines outlined in this paper.

Internet journalism

Over the last several years, online journalism has grown significantly and quickly. Online publications like newspapers and magazines are becoming commonplace. The goals and content of online journalism are the same as those of conventional print or electronic journalism. Only the technology it uses makes a difference. As a result, the moral guidelines that should guide online journalism are almost similar to those that apply to conventional media. The different freedoms of the press and the public's right to information, as well as its attendant rights and obligations, are fully applicable here [10].

CONCLUSION

The book "Balancing Act: Rights and Responsibilities of the Press" elucidates the complex interplay between the inalienable right to freedom of the press and the moral obligations that support ethical journalism. This conversation highlights the fact that press freedom is not only a special luxury but a vital part of the democratic system that requires a careful balance between rights and duties. By examining this complex interaction, it becomes clear that press freedom has a significant impact on how democratic countries operate. In order to keep those in positions of power responsible and to ensure that the public is informed, the media's function as a watchdog, an informant, and a conduit for many opinions is essential. This conversation also makes clear that press freedom, although important, is not unqualified. Accuracy, impartiality, and a dedication to serving the public interest are requirements for responsible journalism, along with ethical reporting and fact-checking. A well-informed society, encouraging fruitful debate, and preventing damage from sensationalism or false information are all responsibilities of the press. The conflicts and controversies that arise as a result of this delicate balancing act highlight how media ethics are always changing as well as the complex problems that modern journalists must deal with. It is not only a matter of rights against obligations; rather, there is a constant effort to balance them in a way that maintains democratic principles. In the end, "Balancing Act" serves as a reminder that press freedom is both a right and a duty, with the potential to affect public opinion, legislation, and individual lives. By sustaining these values, we reaffirm our dedication to a dynamic, responsible, and informed democracy where the press plays a crucial role in advancing our shared pursuit of truth, justice, and the common good.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Krishnamurti, S. Shams, and E. Velayutham, "Corporate social responsibility and corruption risk: A global perspective," *J. Contemp. Account. Econ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jcae.2018.02.002.
- [2] A. Cassese, "Balancing the prosecution of crimes against humanity and non-retroactivity of criminal law: The Kolk and Kislyiy v. Estonia Case before the ECHR," *J. Int. Crim. Justice*, 2006, doi: 10.1093/jicj/mql016.
- [3] N. Tegambwage, "Rights and responsibilities of the press in the frontline states," *Dev. Dialogue*, 1991.
- [4] H. H. Lewis, "Book Review. Academic Motherhood: How Faculty Manage Work and Family," *NASPA J. About Women High. Educ.*, 2014, doi: 10.1515/njawhe-2014-0009.

- [5] C. Mahieux and A. Oudalov, “Balancing act,” *ABB Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.5951/tcm.17.4.0230.
- [6] B. W. Bardoel, E. F. Kenny, G. Sollberger, and A. Zychlinsky, “The balancing act of neutrophils,” *Cell Host and Microbe*. 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2014.04.011.
- [7] T. Peterson, “The Social Responsibility Theory Of The Press,” in *Four Theories of the Press*, 2018. doi: 10.5406/j.ctv1nhr0v.6.
- [8] J. L. Wolf, “Balancing act: Using drama to even the exchange of information in the classroom,” in *Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy Through the Communicative and Visual Arts*, 2004. doi: 10.4324/9781410611161-18.
- [9] R. Nishi, “Balancing act: To be, or not to be ubiquitylated,” *Mutation Research - Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis*. 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2017.07.006.
- [10] T. O’Neill and K. Seelig, “The balancing act,” *Printed Circuit Design and Fab/Circuits Assembly*. 2015. doi: 10.19164/ijmhcl.v1i13.181.

CHAPTER 8

DEFAMATION DILEMMAS: PRESS, PRIVILEGES AND LIBEL LAWS

Shailee Sharma, Assistant Professor

Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email Id- shailee.sharma@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The book *Defamation Dilemmas Press, Privileges, and Libel Laws* explores the complex and sometimes thorny terrain where the ideals of press freedom, journalistic ethics, and legal restraints converge. The expanded summary summarizes the many issues and factors discussed in this conversation, highlighting the defamation's complex and dynamic character and the serious consequences it has for democracies. The idea of defamation, which is ingrained in legal systems all around the world, centers on defending a person's reputation against untrue and hurtful claims. Fundamentally, defending one's image while safeguarding press freedom, a cornerstone of democratic government, is what defamation implies. Laws against defamation are created to achieve a compromise between preserving reputation and defending freedom of speech. These statutes often ask for a false statement, publishing, reputational loss, and, sometimes, carelessness or malicious intent. A basic democratic right, freedom of the press enables journalists to serve as watchdogs, hold authorities responsible, and educate the people. The idea of public interest, which directs journalists in deciding which stories are worth investigating, is intrinsically related to this freedom.

KEYWORDS:

Defamation, Government, Libel Laws, Press, Public Figure.

INTRODUCTION

Any incorrect information that damages the reputation of a person, company, or organization is considered defamation. Libel and slander are both forms of defamation. Slander relates to spoken defamatory comments, while libel typically refers to defamatory words that are written or broadcast (more permanent). While defamation claims are a frequent source of legal issues for media companies, journalists and documentary makers may lessen the risk of a lawsuit by adhering to moral standards like the PBS Editorial Standards, which emphasize the value of honesty and fairness. To find out more, read the questions below [1].

Defamation is defined differently by each state's laws. A plaintiff who brings a lawsuit alleging that a comment you made is defamatory generally has to demonstrate that you released the statement, which means that at least one person other than the plaintiff read or saw it. Internet- or television-published stories would be acceptable. revealed who the plaintiff was. The plaintiff may be identified by name or by displaying the plaintiff's likeness in a photograph or painting. Identification may also take place when the plaintiff is described using identifiable descriptive traits. injured the reputation of the plaintiff. A remark may be "per se" defamatory, which refers to the words being false on their own without any supporting details or context (examples include claims of criminal activity, workplace ineptitude, or sexual promiscuity). When taken in a broader perspective, a remark that may first seem benign might sometimes turn out to be defamatory (for instance, saying that John is dating Jane could be offensive if Jane is already legally wed). committed a factual misstatement. Statements that cannot be verified as accurate or incorrect, sometimes referred to as "pure opinion," are not considered defamatory (for example, "Jane is a terrible boss. It is likewise not defamatory to use rhetorical exaggeration or to make claims that cannot be taken to be true. In order to assess whether a remark may be proved accurate or untrue, courts carefully consider the context of the statement.

It's important to note that remarks that combine verifiable facts with personal views might be considered defamatory (for example, "I think Jane is a terrible boss because she steals money from her employees. had flaws, at least some of them. In general, a plaintiff who is a private citizen must establish that you behaved carelessly, a lesser degree of guilt, whereas a plaintiff who is a public official or public figure must prove that you published the comment with "actual malice," a greater level of culpability [2].

A public official is someone who holds a position of authority in the government, such as the president, a member of Congress, or a state governor, as well as someone who does not hold elected office but nonetheless has, or appears to have, substantial responsibility for or control over the conduct of governmental affairs. There is no clear-cut definition of what constitutes a public official, however. The U.S. Supreme Court has acknowledged that plaintiffs who are public officials must demonstrate that the defendant acted maliciously (the greatest degree of guilt) in disseminating the false statement. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964); *New York Times v. Sullivan*.

Who is a public figure, exactly?

A public figure is a person with authority and influence in society while not being a member of the government. All-purpose and limited-purpose public figures are the two different categories of public personalities. Public figures who serve all purposes are those who "occupy positions of such pervasive power and influence that they are deemed public figures for all purposes. Usually, they are people who are well-known, such celebrities and professional sports. Plaintiffs identified as all-purpose public figures, such public officials, must demonstrate that the defendant acted with genuine malice when making the defamatory comment. Public personalities with specific agendas "have pushed themselves to the fore of particular public controversies in an effort to influence the resolution of the issues involved." *Welch v. Gertz*. Typically, these are people who have become well-known in a certain industry or because of a specific topic. Limited-purpose public figures who sue must only show genuine malice for utterances that pertain to topics in which they are deemed public figures. Public personalities may include companies as well. Courts consider things such whether the company is well-known to the general public in the region where the defamatory comment was spread, if the company is governed by the government, and whether the company has been subject to intensive media scrutiny [3].

Who is regarded as being private?

Any people who do not meet the aforementioned criteria for public authorities or public personalities are considered to be private persons. Since negligence is a lesser level of culpability than real malice, the Supreme Court has ruled that plaintiffs who are public people must at least demonstrate that the defendant acted carelessly in disseminating the defamatory comment. *Welch*, In contrast, some jurisdictions demand more evidence than simple carelessness from private parties when it comes to issues of public concern. It is suggested that stations speak with their local legal advice regarding any relevant local defamation laws.

How can a public person or authority establish that behaved maliciously?

According to the actual malice standard, the plaintiff must demonstrate that you either knew the defamatory statement was false or behaved carelessly with respect to the truth, or, in other words, that you had a reasonable basis to believe that the statement was false. Courts consider factors such as whether the person had time to investigate the story or needed to publish it immediately as well as whether the source of the information appeared to be reliable and trustworthy when determining whether someone acted with reckless disregard for the truth [4].

How can a private individual demonstrate careless?

According to the negligence standard, the plaintiff must show that you did not use reasonable care. Whether a reasonable person in a comparable circumstance would have responded in the same manner is a crucial factor for the courts to take into account. By using sound journalistic procedures while gathering information, writing, recording, and fact-checking a report, you may significantly lower the chance that you'll be accused of negligence. Can I still be sued for defamation if I describe a group of individuals rather than a specific person? Maybe. A group may sometimes be small enough for individual members to demonstrate their identity, but courts haven't explicitly established what constitutes a small enough group. Generally speaking, a sizable number of bankers could not prevail in a defamation lawsuit based on the claim that "all bankers are thieves." However, you should use caution when making such claims, especially if the town that you are writing about has a small number of bankers. Such a remark may be interpreted by a sympathetic jury to identify particular individuals within that group [5].

Will the defamation suit end if I write/broadcast a retraction?

If your station gets a request for a statement, you published or aired to be retracted, this may be a warning that a lawsuit is imminent, and you should speak with local counsel before assuming responsibility. The station's responsibility for defamation may be reduced (but not entirely eliminated) if you find after careful study that you made a factual mistake and the remark has to be withdrawn. The possibility exists that the individual who was threatening to sue will be appeased by the retraction. Before launching a lawsuit, a plaintiff may be required by certain state statutes to provide the media outlet a chance to withdraw the allegedly defamatory comment. Generally speaking, the retraction must be as obvious as the initial assertion. These statutes lessen the damages that the plaintiff may receive even while they do not make it impossible for the plaintiff to launch a case. In California, for instance, the plaintiff is only entitled to "special damages," as opposed to punitive damages and/or general damages for injuries that are difficult to put a dollar amount on, like pain and suffering. Special damages are those damages related to specific financial harm caused by the defamatory statement [6].

What if I bring up a possibly libelous comment made by someone else?

In general, even when the material was provided by a third party, you are still accountable for whatever you post. Therefore, even if you provide credit to the original source of a defamatory comment, you might still be held accountable. However, courts have ruled that media companies are not responsible for remarks made by visitors to their websites, so long as the companies did not actively promote the remarks or take a major role in their formation. (Removing inflammatory language from comments after they have been reviewed and gently edited does not take away this immunity.) These rulings have been supported by Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which states that "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider." look at 47 U.S.C. 230.

What happens if I bring up a possibly libelous comment that was made in court or during a formal government proceeding?

Reporting on defamatory remarks made in an official government process or in a document issued by an official government would often qualify as privileged information and shield you from accountability. This privilege (commonly referred to as the "fair report privilege") also extends to reporting that is fair and truthful about comments made during legal procedures, such as witness testimony at trial and declarations made in court by judges and lawyers. This

privilege is intended to promote public interest reporting without the worry of legal repercussions. The scope of this privilege varies by state, so stations should speak with local counsel if they have any concerns about whether it applies in a given situation [7].

DISCUSSION

Defamation Dilemmas: Press, Privileges, and Libel Laws delves into the intricate and often contentious intersection of media freedom, journalistic responsibilities, and the legal framework surrounding defamation. This discussion explores the complex dynamics, challenges, and implications inherent in striking a balance between protecting an individual's reputation and safeguarding the essential role of the press within democratic societies.

Freedom of the Press and Public Interest:

A fundamental pillar of democracy, press freedom empowers journalists to serve as watchdogs, uncovering issues of public interest, and holding powerful entities accountable. However, this freedom is not unfettered. Responsible journalism requires balancing the public's right to know with the duty to avoid harm, especially in cases where reporting could damage an individual's reputation. Fundamental Right Freedom of the press is a cornerstone of democratic governance, recognized as a fundamental human right in many constitutions and international agreements. It empowers journalists and media organizations to investigate, report, and critique government actions without censorship or fear of retribution.

Watchdog Role The press acts as a vital check on government authority and a guardian of democratic principles. Journalists play a crucial role in uncovering issues of public interest, exposing corruption, and holding those in power accountable [8].

1. The Concept of Public Interest:

Broad and Evolving Public interest is a fluid and evolving concept that encompasses matters relevant to the well-being, safety, and informed decision-making of the public. It can include issues such as government transparency, social justice, human rights, environmental concerns, and more. Balancing Act Determining what constitutes public interest in reporting is a complex and subjective task. Journalists must balance the imperative to inform the public with ethical considerations, respecting individuals' privacy and avoiding harm.

2. Challenges and Ethical Dilemmas:

Fact vs. Sensationalism: Reporting in the public interest requires a commitment to fact-checking, accuracy, and responsible sourcing. However, sensationalism or the temptation to prioritize sensational stories can sometimes conflict with these principles. **Invasion of Privacy** Journalists often face ethical dilemmas when reporting on individuals' private lives, particularly public figures. Balancing the right to privacy with the public's right to know can be contentious. **Minimizing Harm:** Responsible journalism seeks to minimize harm to individuals, especially in cases where sensitive information could negatively impact their lives, mental health, or reputation.

Accountability and Government Transparency:

Preserving Democracy: The press plays a pivotal role in preserving the transparency and accountability of government institutions. Reporting on government actions, policies, and potential wrongdoings serves the public interest by enabling citizens to make informed decisions. **Checks and Balances:**

An independent and critical press is an essential part of the system of checks and balances within democratic societies. It helps prevent abuses of power and ensures that those in authority are held accountable for their actions.

Defamation and Legal Frameworks:

Defamation laws exist to protect an individual's reputation from false and damaging statements. Yet, these laws must strike a balance between safeguarding reputation and ensuring the media's ability to engage in robust reporting. The discussion highlights the challenges in defining defamation within a rapidly changing media landscape, where social media and online platforms complicate the issue of jurisdiction and responsibility. Defamation's basic components

False remark: In order to qualify as defamation, a remark about a person or thing must normally be untrue.

The statement may be spoken (slander) or written (libel). Publication The fraudulent statement must be made public, not only kept between two people. **Damage to Reputation** The false statement must cause damage to the person or organization's reputation. **Negligence or Malice** Depending on the legal requirements in the jurisdiction, plaintiffs may need to demonstrate that the statement was made either carelessly or maliciously in specific circumstances. **Juggling the Right to Free Expression** Legal frameworks must find a compromise between defending press freedom and preserving people's right to an untarnished reputation.

In democracies, maintaining this equilibrium is essential. Comparing **Public and Private Figures** Laws often make distinctions between public personalities and private people. Public persons, such as politicians or celebrities, sometimes have a greater burden of proof for establishing defamation since they voluntarily joined the public eye and must put up with scrutiny.

The Internet and the Law The problem of jurisdiction in defamation proceedings has become more complex with the growth of the internet and social media. It might be difficult to decide which legal framework applies since online media can reach audiences throughout the world. **Counterarguments to Defamation** Legal systems frequently offer defenses to defamation claims, such as truth (if the statement is factually accurate), opinion (if the statement is genuinely held), fair comment (if the statement is a fair and honest expression of opinion), and qualified privilege (if the statement is made in a specific protected context, such as a court proceeding).

Self-Censorship and the Chilling Effect Investigative journalism and free expression may be stifled by strict defamation laws. To reduce the possibility of defamation lawsuits, journalists may self-censor or refrain from covering contentious issues. **A Changing Media Environment** User-generated material, anonymous online comments, and the quick spread of knowledge are all issues brought on by the digital age. Legal systems must change to accommodate these modern communication methods.

Disparagement and the Public Interest: In defamation lawsuits, the idea of public interest often comes into play. It's possible that reporting on topics of public interest will have more legal protection [9], [10].

Ethical Journalism and Verification:

The responsible exercise of press freedom demands ethical journalism practices, including rigorous fact-checking, sourcing, and a commitment to fairness and accuracy. Ensuring that media outlets adhere to these principles is a key aspect of maintaining public trust and avoiding defamation-related dilemmas.

Challenges of the Digital Age:

The advent of the internet and social media has transformed the media landscape, leading to a surge in user-generated content and challenges related to the spread of false information. In this context, determining liability and addressing defamation in online spaces present complex dilemmas for legal frameworks.

Impact on Public Figures:

Defamation issues often involve public figures who occupy positions of influence. Balancing their right to protect their reputation with the public's right to be informed about those in power can be particularly challenging.

International Perspectives:

The discussion acknowledges that defamation laws and their interpretation vary widely across countries, highlighting the importance of understanding the global context when discussing these dilemmas.

Solutions and Mitigations:

Potential solutions to defamation dilemmas include promoting responsible journalism, encouraging the use of retractions or corrections, and refining legal frameworks to address the evolving media landscape.

Implications for Democracy:

Ultimately, this discussion recognizes that the manner in which defamation dilemmas are addressed has significant implications for democratic societies. It underscores that striking the right balance between protecting reputation and preserving press freedom is essential for upholding democratic values.

CONCLUSION

The author of "Defamation Dilemmas: Press, Privileges, and Libel Laws" has traversed the intricate and nuanced terrain where the values of press freedom, journalistic obligations, and legal frameworks converge. The complexity and difficulties of defamation are highlighted in this conversation, which emphasizes the necessity for a thoughtful and impartial strategy to safeguard both people's reputations and the independence of the press in democracies. A crucial component of democratic countries is press freedom, which enables the media to serve as a watchdog, educate the people, and hold the powerful responsible. "Defamation Dilemmas" serves as a moving reminder that the problems surrounding defamation are everything but intangible; they have significant ramifications for people, the media, and society at large. The fight to protect the principles of free speech while preserving the integrity of people's reputations is an ongoing and delicate task that requires flexible legal frameworks, ethical journalistic standards, and an unshakable dedication to democratic ideals. We reaffirm our commitment to promoting democratic societies where rights and obligations coexist peacefully in the ever-changing media environment as we work through these conundrums.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Koningisor, "The de facto reporter's privilege," *Yale Law J.*, 2018.
- [2] R. J. Bies and T. M. Tripp, "Employee-initiated defamation lawsuits: Organizational responses and dilemmas," *Empl. Responsib. Rights J.*, 1993, doi: 10.1007/BF01385020.

- [3] K. H. Youm, "Freedom of the Press," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.95054-
- [4] T. Gleason, "If we are all journalists, can journalistic privilege survive?," *Javnost*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/13183222.2015.1091625.
- [5] C. Y. Liu, "'Freedom of the press' in the digital age: A study on reporters privilege," *Mass Commun. Res.*, 2009.
- [6] E. Fisher, "The rise of transnational environmental law and the expertise of environmental lawyers," *Transnatl. Environ. Law*, 2012, doi: 10.1017/S2047102511000021.
- [7] D. S. Jones, "Combatting corruption in Brunei Darussalam," *Asian Educ. Dev. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1108/AEDS-01-2016-0007.
- [8] B. Girvin, "Religion, Law and the Irish State: The Constitutional Framework in Context," *Irish Polit. Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/07907184.2013.751757.
- [9] A. Charlesworth, R. Murray, P. Bartlett, N. Tsagourias, and N. Tsagourias, "Book Review: The Law of Defamation and the Internet, the Judicial Application of Human Rights Law. National, Regional and International Jurisprudence, from Nuremberg to the Hague. The Future of International Criminal Justice, International Law from Below. Development, Social Movements and Third World Resistance, Reading Humanitarian Intervention. Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law, Humanitarian Intervention. Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas, Decisions and Dilemmas: Working with Mental Health Law, Democratic Accountability and the Use of Force in International Law, United States Hegemony and the Foundations of International Law," *Common Law World Rev.*, 2004, doi: 10.1350/clwr.33.4.368.55941.
- [10] Freedom House, "Freedom of the Press 2014," 2014.

CHAPTER 9

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOWS: TRANSPARENCY VS. NATIONAL SECURITY

Mohit Sushil Kelkar, Associate Director
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id-mohit.kelkar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

For democratic nations, striking a fine balance between openness and national security has always been difficult. This research examines the intricate relationship between the need for transparency in government and the necessity of preserving a country's security interests. The conflict between these two imperatives has become worse in a society that is becoming more linked and susceptible to new dangers. On the one hand, voters' confidence in their governments and democratic accountability depend on openness. It permits supervision, promotes moral conduct, and permits reasoned decision-making. Government transparency may reduce corruption and increase public trust. These values, too, can run afoul with the demands of national security. On the other side, maintaining national security often calls for discretion and secrecy. The security of a country depends critically on the protection of sensitive information, intelligence sources, and military tactics. The safety of people as well as national security may be at risk if this material is disclosed. Finding the ideal balance between security and openness is a difficult issue, especially in the age of digital information sharing when it is simple to leak sensitive information.

KEYWORDS:

Balance, Government, Information, National Security, Transparency.

INTRODUCTION

The successful involvement of parliaments and civil society in the political process depends on transparency in government expenditures. The fact that governments often lack transparency when it comes to military spending has significant negative effects on democracy and security. In reality, achieving the right balance between openness and national security considerations may help lessen the root causes of unrest and violence.

Governments agree that openness is necessary

Military forces are important tools in any state's security strategy and are sometimes shrouded in secrecy. However, openness in military affairs, such as defense plans, budget, and capacity, is often seen as a crucial component for fostering trust and confidence between governments. Transparency may also aid in reducing the amount of money wasted on the security forces. Transparency also supports a number of goals related to democratic supervision, accountability, and resource allocation. While such openness may be present in many or even most government sectors in many nations, it is often lacking in the security and defense sectors. There is broad formal consensus among governments that sharing information on military capabilities may aid in preventing exaggerated threats, incorrect interpretations of intentions or actions, military errors, and excessive or destabilizing weapons builds up.

The United Nations Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures was founded in 1980 as a consequence of widespread support for these transparency principles. The UN then created its Register of Conventional Arms in 1991. These efforts, through which the UN asks member states to give certain standard statistics on military expenditures and on the imports and exports of armaments, were approved by almost all UN members. However, despite overwhelming

initial support, both systems are optional, and the level of participation is shamefully low: in 2012, only one-third of the 193 UN member states provided any information on their import and export of weaponry, and even fewer governments provided information on their military spending [1].

Reporting to national parliaments is becoming more transparent.

There are a number of transparency-related mechanisms that have been developed as a result of transparency between states, and while the idea of transparency is generally supported, there are no internationally endorsed regulations or even best practices regarding domestic transparency in terms of defense policies, military budgets, or the purchase and sale of arms. Budgets for the armed forces and details of the purchases and sales of weapons are often regarded as very sensitive topics. Governments contend that disclosing information about them would aid hostile parties' strategic planning. As a result, they limit the public's access to information and even protect it from legislative review. In reality, there is a broad range of openness in military affairs. Many governments regularly release information on their defense policies, either through specialized reports like defense white papers or annual budgets, or through public statements that outline the goals of military planning as well as the military organizations and tools needed to achieve those goals. However, military concerns are shrouded in secrecy in the majority of governments, making informed public or legislative discussions, examination, and input highly difficult or even impossible. Despite this, advancements have been made. In recent years, the thoroughness of information on military spending and the purchase of weapons has significantly increased in Latin America, and large projects are often chosen only after extensive public debate. For instance, Brazil opted to buy submarines (including a nuclear submarine) in 2009 and combat planes in 2013 after years of open negotiations.

Africa, Asia, and the Middle East have also seen some modest advancements. In Ghana, for instance, the specifics of expenditures and procurement are often discussed in the legislature, but in Indonesia, the legislature is becoming more educated and vocal about military budgets and procurement [2].

The illusion of military affairs' secrecy

Many nations use the argument that such information shouldn't be given to possibly hostile forces as justification for keeping military finances secret. However, it is nearly difficult to keep military expenditures and significant military acquisition initiatives secret. For instance, SIPRI has 45 years of expertise gathering data on global weapons transfers and military spending. SIPRI receives a plethora of information regarding the acquisition of large armaments from open sources, whether they are official or not. National intelligence agencies in potentially hostile countries can clearly accomplish much more if organizations like SIPRI, with limited resources and relying solely on open sources, can calculate military spending and map global arms transfers with a high degree of thoroughness and accuracy. Governments may thus only accomplish partial secrecy rather than total concealment, which can actually lead to muddled discussions about national defense, the proper distribution of national resources, and the right military equipment for upholding national security.

A more open approach would help build confidence and prevent misinterpretations and miscalculations of state intentions that can result in the waste of resources, corruption, and interstate tensions instead of letting half-truths direct discussions and policymaking at home or in neighboring nations. Secrecy is an illusion, according to a growing number of major weapons-supplying nations, in part because data on the arms trade is publicly available. As a consequence, they have started giving their parliaments and the wider public formal

information on weaponry shipments. Such information sharing does not put national security interests at risk; on the contrary, it is required to guarantee that civil society is aware of and may contribute to responsible weapons export policies that do not instigate or worsen conflict.

overcoming a wasteful culture

Military budget and procurement secrecy also has the potential to squander money. It promotes corruption and ambiguous pricing for military hardware, results in pointless purchases and less accountability, and all of these things are bad. Secrecy might ultimately lead to expensive and risky arms competitions and military buildups. Transparency is essential because it makes people more accountable. No parliament can do its duties if it is not informed about military spending and acquisition. Particularly in many emerging nations, governments must make difficult decisions when dividing scant resources between development and security. This issue is made worse by a lack of accountability and openness. Hopefully, the recently ratified and soon-to-be-effective new weapons Trade Treaty will spur more openness in the weapons trade. Transparency, however, is not a goal in and of itself. Instead, it serves as a tool to encourage conversations on important national and worldwide problems. Transparency in military affairs is also essentially a fruitless exercise in public relations in the absence of a setting where a variety of stakeholders are involved and informed choices on defense policy, budgets, and procurement can be made by all stakeholders [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

In democracies, people' rights are fundamentally dependent on the openness of their governments. Fundamental human rights including freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom to engage in public life are protected by a variety of national and international legal instruments. The exercise of these rights and, therefore, the health of a democracy are hampered by a lack of openness. Without transparency, it is difficult to hold the government accountable, there is a chance of misuse and corruption, and the public's faith in the government declines. On the other side, transparency has wide-ranging societal effects that may have an influence on the economy, education, and even health. In addition, new worries regarding openness and its effects on the operations of the national security community have surfaced in light of the outbreak. At the conclusion of this study, we touch on them briefly. This declaration should demonstrate the department's or agency's commitment to transparency by outlining what it means, why it is significant, and how it will be monitored and executed. The pledge should be precise and serve as a basis for future reporting and responsibility.

Departments and agencies may build this pledge on the government's National Security Transparency pledge while tailoring it to their own needs. Public disclosure of departmental transparency statements is a good idea. They should be made readily available and hosted, particularly on already-existing departmental transparency websites (where they might be combined with particular programs and supporting materials such mandate letters, departmental reports, and proactive disclosure). By making this statement widely known, these organizations may define the requirements for performance reporting and raise public awareness of their commitment to openness. Additionally, we urge businesses to make a commitment to regularly reviewing and, if required, revising their definition of transparency as they gain experience. Transparency has many different meanings.

It is possible to describe it as "official business conducted in such a way that substantive and procedural information is available to, and broadly understandable by, people and groups in society, subject to reasonable limits protecting security and privacy," at its most basic level [5].

Beyond this broad concept, however, transparency comes in a variety of forms. It might be construed broadly, for instance, or it can put more of an emphasis on the kinds of data to be disclosed or the procedures regulating these disclosures. It is challenging to promote openness in the national security sector, which has traditionally been plagued by a culture of secrecy. Despite recent advances, the Canadian national security community still has a poor track record of upholding the strictest norms of openness, as we observed in our first report. Citizens' trust in national security institutions is negatively impacted by this. We held lengthy and significant virtual sessions to gather input for this report. According to what we've heard, numerous industries are affected by the lack of openness in national security. The difficulty of providing trustworthy information on national security was noticed by journalists. Many people lack confidence in national security organizations, which prevents them from fully exercising their democratic rights. The national security community's efforts are hampered by its inability to interact with civilians in a productive manner.

A worsened flow of competing ideas always has a negative impact on the health of democracy. A worldwide advocacy movement has centered on openness, transparency, and civic involvement. The Open Governance Partnership, an effort started in 2011 to promote accountability, openness, and participatory governance, has expanded from eight member nations to 78, as well as an increasing number of local governments. Canada is a participant of this project. Even longer, non-governmental groups like Transparency International have been writing about transparency. Publish What You Pay, the Open Contracting Partnership, and the International Budget Partnership are just a few of the several groups that today seek to promote transparency in a variety of industries.

Understanding the fundamentals of not just why transparency matters but also the structural and cultural drivers of systemic changes that might increase institutional accountability and performance is necessary for defining, assessing, and institutionalizing transparency. Regarding the definition of transparency, it's critical to recognize the several ways the idea has been expressed both generally and in more concrete situations related to agency mandates. While we believe it is important to express a broad set of ideas for the national security community, it is also crucial to translate these concepts into precise, quantifiable results for the community as a whole in ways that are pertinent to both particular agencies and the government as a whole [6].

Measurement is equally important because, as both study and experience have shown, it is important to know what to assess when making choices and monitoring their effects. Furthermore, current government changes associated with open government and results-based management highlight the need of delivering crystal-clear performance target indicators. It is crucial that reporting include both quantitative and qualitative standards in a field as complicated as national security, in addition to routine stakeholder and public discussions.

Measurement must be seen as a tool for learning, adaptation, and continuous progress rather than as a single linear task. As a result, measuring is a crucial component of shared responsibility and public participation because it grounds discourse in indications of success and failure, enabling greater evaluation of previous performance as well as planning for new and more complex difficulties.

To institutionalize openness in meaningful ways, there must be a strong focus on consultation and involvement. This calls for structural and cultural changes to the way that national security is governed. It takes time and effort to transform a huge organization's culture, and this is particularly true in the case of national security, where leadership and individual action have traditionally been characterized by secrecy. The primary objective is to assist in the

development of a common understanding for organizational culture change as well as particular policy and governance changes that may direct the process of institutionalizing transparency in the interest of improved accountability and increased creativity [7].

"Sunlight and Shadows: Transparency vs. National Security" delves into the complex and delicate balance between the imperative of government transparency and the critical need to safeguard national security interests.

This discussion navigates the intricate terrain where the principles of open governance, accountability, and the protection of state secrets converge. It explores the challenges, controversies, and ethical dilemmas inherent in striking this balance, acknowledging that both transparency and national security are essential facets of democratic societies [8].

Government Transparency

Democratic Pillar Transparency in government is a fundamental tenet of democracy, allowing citizens to hold their leaders accountable, participate in decision-making, and ensure the rule of law. Access to Information Access to government information promotes trust, helps prevent abuses of power, and fosters a well-informed citizenry [9].

1. Access to Information:

At the core of government transparency is the principle that citizens have the right to access information about government activities, policies, and decisions. Freedom of information laws, often known as "right to know" laws, are established to facilitate this access.

2. Accountability:

Transparency serves as a powerful tool for holding government officials and institutions accountable for their actions. When government activities are open to scrutiny, citizens, civil society organizations, and the media can identify and address corruption, inefficiency, or abuses of power.

3. Rule of Law:

Transparency helps ensure that government actions are consistent with the rule of law. When decisions are made openly and transparently, it reduces the likelihood of arbitrary or unlawful conduct by public officials.

4. Public Participation:

Transparent government processes facilitate public participation in decision-making. Citizens can provide input, express concerns, and contribute to the development of policies and regulations that affect their lives.

5. Anti-Corruption Efforts:

Transparency is a vital tool in combating corruption. When government activities are visible and accountable, it becomes more difficult for corrupt practices to go unnoticed and unchecked.

6. Budget Transparency:

Openness in budgetary processes allows citizens to understand how public funds are collected, allocated, and spent. This transparency promotes responsible fiscal management and ensures that resources are used for the public good.

7. Data and Information Accessibility:

Governments are increasingly sharing data and information online in accessible formats, enabling citizens, researchers, and organizations to analyze and utilize this information for various purposes, from research to decision-making.

8. International Standards:

International organizations, such as the United Nations and the Open Government Partnership, promote transparency as a global norm and encourage governments to adopt open government practices.

9. Challenges:

Achieving government transparency is not without challenges. These can include bureaucratic resistance to openness, concerns about national security, and the need to balance transparency with privacy and confidentiality.

10. Citizen Engagement:

Encouraging citizens to actively engage with government information and processes remains a challenge. Public awareness and education are essential to maximize the benefits of transparency.

11. Technological Advancements:

The use of technology, including open data platforms and e-government initiatives, has the potential to enhance government transparency by providing accessible and real-time information to the public.

12. Continuous Improvement:

Transparency is an ongoing process that requires continuous efforts to improve access to information, accountability mechanisms, and the responsiveness of government institutions to citizens' needs and concerns.

National Security Imperatives

Protection of the State National security is paramount in safeguarding a nation's sovereignty, citizens, and critical infrastructure from threats, both domestic and foreign. Secrecy for Security Certain information, such as intelligence sources, military strategies, and classified data, must be kept confidential to ensure effective national defense.

Challenges and Dilemmas

Ethical Dilemmas Balancing transparency with national security often involves ethical dilemmas, such as the tension between protecting civil liberties and preventing terrorism. **Classification and Declassification** Deciding what information should be classified, for how long, and when it can be declassified presents ongoing challenges.

Controversies and Disputes

Whistleblowing Whistleblowers often play a crucial role in revealing government wrongdoing or excesses, but their actions may also compromise national security. **Media Reporting** Media outlets sometimes publish sensitive information, sparking debates about responsible journalism and potential harm to national interests.

Legal Frameworks and Oversight

Freedom of Information Acts Many countries have enacted legislation to promote government transparency, allowing citizens to request information from public authorities. **Oversight Bodies** Independent oversight bodies, such as parliamentary committees and courts, help ensure that government agencies adhere to legal and ethical standards. **International Relations** Diplomatic Sensitivities Balancing transparency and national security has implications for international relations, as disclosures can strain diplomatic ties. **Global Cooperation** In certain areas, such as counterterrorism and intelligence sharing, international cooperation is essential for addressing global threats [10].

Implications for Democracy

Checks and Balances Striking the right balance between transparency and national security contributes to the system of checks and balances within democratic societies. **Public Trust** Both transparency and security are integral to fostering public trust in government institutions.

CONCLUSION

For democratic nations everywhere, balancing national security and openness continues to be difficult. The fine line that must be drawn between these two requirements is not a static equilibrium; rather, it is a dynamic equilibrium that must be continually reevaluated and modified in response to shifting threats, developing technology, and shifting social norms. Democracies embrace the values of open government, accountability, and the right of people to information access in their quest of transparency. Transparency supports responsible governance, builds confidence in institutions, and works as a potent deterrent to corruption. It is a fundamental tenet of democracy, guaranteeing that governments continue to be answerable to the people they are meant to serve. On the other hand, maintaining national security calls for secrecy, the use of secret information, and sometimes, the exclusion of certain information from the general public. This is necessary to safeguard a country's interests, its population, and the stability of the global system. Although secrecy is often required for national security reasons, it should only be used sparingly and in accordance with checks and balances.

This continual conflict is not a zero-sum game; rather, it is a balancing act that calls for a careful and careful strategy. It is not necessary to prioritize one over the other in order to strike the correct balance between openness and national security; rather, a framework that takes into account both requirements must be created. It involves creating strong institutional and legal frameworks that support responsible disclosure while safeguarding crucial security interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Chawki, "WikiLeaks: Transparency vs. national security," *Int. J. Intellect. Prop. Manag.*, 2012, doi: 10.1504/IJIPM.2012.045860.
- [2] M. Rao and K. R. Sridhara Murthi, "Keeping up with remote sensing and GI advances- Policy and legal perspectives," *Space Policy*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.spacepol.2006.09.001.
- [3] C. Ray, "Extreme Risk Management: Revolutionary Approaches to Evaluating and Measuring Risk," *KR misc*, 2010.
- [4] L. B. Moses and L. De Koker, "Open secrets: Balancing operational secrecy and transparency in the collection and use of data by national security and law enforcement agencies," *Melbourne University Law Review*. 2017.

- [5] N. Melatyugra, "Refugee Detention Centre: Humanity Vs National Security," *Refleks. Huk. J. Ilmu Huk.*, 2014, doi: 10.24246/jrh.2014.v8.i2.p207-220.
- [6] S. Derigan, "Power, national security and transparency: Judicial decision making and social architecture in the federal courts," *Commun. Law Policy*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/10811681003666703.
- [7] J. R. Reidenberg, "The Transparent Citizen," *Loyola Univ. Chicago Law J.*, 2015.
- [8] A. Brough and L. John, "The Ironic Impact of Privacy Policies on Perceived Security and Purchase Intent.," *AMA Marketing & Public Policy Academic Conference Proceedings*. 2017.
- [9] E. Lieblich, "Show Us the Films: Transparency, National Security and Disclosure of Information Collected by Advanced Weapon Systems under International Law," *Isr. Law Rev.*, 2012, doi: 10.1017/S0021223712000155.
- [10] A. Roberts, "National Security and Open Government," *Georg. Public Policy Rev.*, 2004.

CHAPTER 10

ETHICS IN JOURNALISM: NAVIGATING THE MAZE OF MEDIA INTEGRITY

Shefalika Narain, Professor
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
 Email Id-shefalika.narain@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The ethics of journalism serve as a lynchpin in maintaining the integrity of the media landscape at a time where information flows nonstop and journalism's influence on public opinion has never been stronger. This research explores the complex web of ethical issues that journalists face as they work to report on truth, justice, and accountability. The "Fourth Estate," often referred to as journalism, is essential to maintaining democracy's fundamental principles of openness, accountability, and the access to information for the populace. Accuracy, fairness, impartiality, and responsibility are fundamental tenets of ethical journalism. The road to ethical reporting is anything from simple, however. A new era of journalistic issues has emerged with the advent of the digital age. Accuracy and fact-checking may sometimes be compromised in the drive for speed and readership. The emergence of new social media platforms has opened up unexplored ground where false information may spread rapidly, challenging journalists' ability to negotiate this minefield of dubious sources.

KEYWORDS:

Ethics, Information, Journalism, Media, Privacy.

INTRODUCTION

While adding layers of complexity to some aspects of our lives, the digital revolution also simplified many others. Originally used to describe current events in written form, journalism is the practice of gathering, preparing, and disseminating news and associated information. Up to the invention of radio and television, journalism was confined to newspapers, periodicals, and books. The complexity of journalism in the digital age is rising. Almost anybody can produce and disseminate "news" online because to the widespread availability of podcasts, social media, e-mail, blogs, and video-based applications. Journalism ethics now more than ever need to be prioritized. According to studies, social media serves as the main news source for half of Generation Z in the US every day. In order to keep updated, they also use podcasts and online-only news sources. Given that the younger generation mostly depends on online news sources, it is crucial to create and abide by a set of digital journalism ethics to advance accuracy, truth, and transparency [1].

Why Are Ethics in Digital Journalism Important?

In the United States, fake news gained prominence during the 2016 presidential election. The dissemination of false information, often through digital platforms, is referred to as fake news. For instance, during the epidemic, almost 80% of Americans who were questioned said they had come with false information regarding the pandemic. Only 26% of Americans feel highly confident in their ability to spot bogus news. 67% of Americans who had previously trusted bogus news were very confused. 10% of Americans admitted to intentionally spreading false information. In comparison, unreliable news websites gained greater momentum and saw much more interaction on social media.

People disseminate false information and misleading headlines when controls aren't in place. Why is this important? Fake news may have an impact on anything from election outcomes to

climate change measures by changing how people perceive reality. By reporting the truth and ethically, journalists may assist the public in navigating the complicated and always evolving news scene.

How can we promote ethical journalism?

The pursuit of the truth and public dissemination of it are crucial tasks for journalists. Journalism is more democratic, participatory, and immediate than ever before as we go through a media revolution in the age of digital-first news. Anyone with an internet connection can access Twitter and post anything that other people could take to be true.

To guarantee that the public has access to trustworthy information online, professional journalists have an even greater obligation to defend the truth, expose false news, and fact-check popular narratives. How does one go about recognizing and putting journalistic ethics into practice? The Society of Professional Journalists' (SPJ) Code of Ethics states that journalists have four main obligations: to find the truth and report it, to limit damage, to act independently, and to be responsible and open about their actions [2].

1. Identify and report the truth

The duty of journalists to confirm the veracity of their reporting and convey the truth is one of their most important duties. To prevent distorting information, journalists must provide the truth in all formats and offer context. For instance, moral journalists should refrain from writing click-bait headlines that distort or oversimplify the reality. Journalists should constantly validate their sources and assess their dependability and objectivity in addition to offering clarification.

2. Reduce injury.

The ethics of journalism are based on the notion that all people are entitled to respect and the truth. Journalists must show empathy and refrain from unwarranted intrusion. They must also get legal access to information and respect a person's right to withhold information and consent. When it comes to reporting delicate subjects that include children, crime victims, or working with inexperienced or vulnerable communities, journalists have an even greater need to limit damage.

3. Exercise independence

The goal of journalism is to serve the general public. Journalists who uphold ethical standards must be impartial and steer clear of conflicts of interest. Dr. Mortiz examined how conflicts of interest might jeopardize a journalist's objectivity and integrity in the case study on sports gambling. Journalists must decline gifts, payments, preferential treatment, and political activities that can influence their reporting.

4. Be trustworthy and responsible

After publishing their work, journalists have a continuing obligation to respond to the public and as soon as they discover any errors. Additionally, journalists need to be willing to address the public's queries and provide clarification and follow-up information. The work of a journalist does not end with the publication of their work; it continues while the audience consumes and evaluates the work.

Become A Member of The Future Of Journalism Ethics In The Digital Age.

In the digital era, journalists share vital stories across digital media and expand crucial, globally relevant dialogues based on truth and openness. You may prepare to fill this demand by

pursuing an online Master of Arts in Digital Journalism or online Master of Arts in Sports Journalism at St. Bonaventure University (SBU). Our journalism graduate programs, which are available at the ACEJMC of Communication, enable you to master the craft of digital media in addition to more conventional journalistic skills like writing, reporting, and editing. Utilize photography, video, design, and audio to engage viewers across a variety of channels. Our master's degree programs in journalism provide an unmatched education that blends conventional journalism with technological innovation, all while being molded within a moral and ethical framework that reflects our Franciscan principles. You will gain from a long history of journalistic achievement and a curriculum that complies with the highest industry standards, especially in areas like diversity, inclusion, and ethics, whether you are an experienced journalist wishing to upgrade your skills or completely new to the sector [3], [4].

DISCUSSION

By supplying the public with the knowledge required for informed decision-making and holding the powerful responsible, journalism acts as a crucial pillar of democracy. Nevertheless, sustaining this trust depends in large part on ethical issues. The essential values of journalistic ethics, such as honesty, fairness, impartiality, and accountability, are examined in this research. It digs into case studies and examples to highlight the fine line that journalists must walk while adhering to these values, especially when under pressure from factors like sensationalism, corporate interests, or political prejudices.

The development of social media and citizen journalism has made the ethical environment even more difficult. In the digital era, journalists must contend with concerns of verification, false information, and the quick dissemination of unconfirmed news. In addressing these issues, this research focuses on the need of fact-checking, ethical sourcing, and the obligation to fix mistakes as soon as they are discovered. It also looks at the moral ramifications of investigative journalism, including the use of secret sources, covert reporting, and possible privacy infringement.

Journalists often toe a delicate line between upholding people's rights to privacy and safety while upholding the public's right to information. The importance of media ownership and its effects on the independence of journalists are also examined. Political ties, corporate interests, and money from advertising may all have a subtle influence on editorial choices, raising concerns about the independence of newsrooms and their capacity to report objectively. The summary ends by highlighting how crucial it is for journalists and media companies to preserve ethical standards and publicly demonstrate this commitment.

It examines how independent monitoring agencies, ombudsmen, and codes of ethics may promote media integrity and preserve public confidence. Journalism ethics are essential for maintaining the media's credibility and reliability in a world where the lines between reality and fiction are becoming more and more hazy. This research urges journalists and media organizations to traverse the minefield of media integrity with steadfast devotion to truth, fairness, and responsibility. It asks for a renewed commitment to ethical journalism as a crucial component of a healthy and functional democracy [5], [6].

The Core Principles of Journalism Ethics: The fundamental principles of accuracy, fairness, impartiality, and accountability are the bedrock of journalism ethics. These principles guide reporters in providing truthful, balanced, and accountable reporting. However, balancing these principles in practice can be challenging, especially when dealing with complex, polarizing, or emotionally charged issues [7].

The Digital Age Challenge: The emergence of social media and the democratization of information have presented journalists with unprecedented challenges. Speed often takes precedence over accuracy, and the viral nature of misinformation can damage reputations and contribute to societal discord. This environment requires journalists to be more vigilant than ever in verifying facts and sources.

Sensationalism and Clickbait: The pursuit of higher ratings, web traffic, and revenue can tempt media organizations to sensationalize stories or engage in clickbait practices. This can compromise the ethical principles of accuracy and fairness. The pressure to attract and retain an audience in a highly competitive media landscape can test journalistic integrity.

Privacy vs. Public's Right to Know: Investigative journalism plays a crucial role in exposing corruption and abuse of power. However, it often involves the use of confidential sources and the potential invasion of privacy. Journalists must grapple with ethical dilemmas, balancing the public's right to know with respecting individuals' rights to privacy and safety.

Media Ownership and Independence: The ownership of media outlets can influence editorial decisions and coverage. Corporate interests, political affiliations, and advertising revenue can subtly shape the narrative and compromise journalistic independence. Ensuring that media organizations maintain editorial autonomy is an ongoing challenge.

The Role of Codes of Ethics and Oversight Bodies: Journalistic organizations often have codes of ethics that guide their members' behavior. Additionally, some media outlets have ombudsmen or independent oversight bodies to address ethical concerns and maintain transparency. The effectiveness of these mechanisms in upholding ethical standards varies and merits ongoing evaluation.

The Public's Role in Ethical Journalism: Journalists are accountable not only to their organizations but also to the public. Transparency, corrections, and engagement with audiences are vital in building and maintaining trust. Media literacy initiatives can empower the public to critically evaluate news sources and hold journalists accountable for ethical lapses.

Continuous Evolution of Ethics: The landscape of journalism ethics is not static. It evolves alongside technology, societal norms, and global events. Journalists must adapt to new challenges and ethical dilemmas, such as deepfakes, privacy concerns in an age of surveillance, and navigating international reporting standards.

Journalistic Ethics

Journalists are obligated by the Society of Professional Journalists' Code of Ethics to:

1. Find the truth and talk about it. This entails examining the facts, avoiding informational fabrication, citing sources, avoiding stereotyping, and encouraging the free interchange of ideas.
2. Limit damage. This entails showing consideration for the people who provide the information and the people who are the topic of the tales, as well as respecting their right to privacy. It's interesting that there is no bar against interfering with national security in the code.
3. Independently behave. Avoiding conflicts of interest, preventing corruption, and thwarting efforts by marketers and special interest organizations to influence the news are all part of this.
4. Be responsible. Correcting errors, welcoming criticism, and exposing unethical media practices are all examples of this.

5. Make an effort to uncover the truth and express it in our dispatches, programs, and newscasts in a way that is clear-cut and guarantees its authenticity and correctness.
6. To present a clear, factual, and accurate picture while taking into account the feelings of victims of crime, war, persecution, and disaster, their families, our viewers, as well as individual privacy and public decorum, we must treat our audiences with the respect they deserve and address every issue or story with the necessary attention.
7. In order to prevent acquiring a "scoop" from turning into a means in and of itself, welcome fair and honest media competition without enabling it to negatively impact our standards of performance.
8. Present many viewpoints and thoughts without prejudice or discrimination.
9. Recognize the variety of human civilizations, including all of their races, ethnicities, and religions, as well as their values and innate uniqueness, in order to portray them in a fair and accurate manner.
10. Recognize errors when they happen, fix them right away, and make sure they don't happen again.
11. Adhere to globally recognized standards on the rights of news sources while maintaining openness in your interactions with the media.
12. To escape the traps of conjecture and propaganda, distinguish between news, opinion, and analysis. Support your fellow professionals and be there for them when they need it, especially in light of the harassment and violent actions that journalists sometimes experience. Join forces to preserve press freedom with Arab and worldwide journalistic unions and groups.

Gandhian Journalism Ethics

"Service should be journalism's only goal. The newspaper has enormous power, but just as an unchecked flood submerges the whole countryside and destroys crops, so too does an unchecked pen only serve to damage. Mahatma Gandhi.

Idea of Social Responsibility

Mahatma Gandhi, a wonderful journalist and editor who also recognized the newspaper's power, was quite clear about the goals of journalism and the reasons it shouldn't be an unrestrained flood of information. He wasn't talking to restrictions placed by outside parties on the freedoms of the press and expression, which he has always defended and fought for. Instead, he was expressing the notion of journalism's social obligation. Simply expressed, this implies that journalism must uphold ethical standards and be socially responsible while serving the public with dedication, educating them, and avoiding sensationalism, factual distortion, and manipulation in news stories [8].

Journalism's importance

As the fourth estate of democracy and the "voice of the voiceless," The news media and the profession of journalism are essential for informing the public about influential sources of information, opinion, and discussion. government watchdog Without a vibrant, independent, and critical news media that not only reports on events of public interest but also serves as a watchdog over the operation of important government agencies and institutions, assesses the accomplishments of public officials, and holds them accountable, it is impossible to imagine a vibrant democracy. increases the vitality of democracy The long and rocky road of democracy has been made possible by an independent news media, which encompasses traditional media like newspapers, magazines, television, and radio as well as emerging media like online news portals and digital news platforms. It has changed through time along with democracy, notably in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. There, a strong media is seen as a critical component

of a democracy's success and is indeed one of the most important indicators of how healthy it is. Setting the agenda for public discourse, molding public perception, and having a significant effect on politics, the economy, culture, and government are all things that the news media and journalism hold a strong position in democratic societies. In light of this, Napoleon Bonaparte is credited as having once stated, "Four hostile newspapers are more to be feared than a thousand bayonets."

What Responsible Journalism Looks Like

Integrity and responsibility the news media earns and maintains its credibility and respect by upholding the ethical and moral standards of journalism, none of which are given to them for free or as a gift. Furthermore, the media must adhere to the standards of journalism, be open and responsible for its reporting, analysis, and general operation. Maintaining journalistic ethics: Just like other professions that interact with the public, journalism has developed a set of ethical principles, standards, and norms to help it fulfill its social responsibility and provide better services to the public by ensuring the highest professional standards in the gathering, processing, filtering, and distribution of news and opinions. Fundamentally, journalistic ethics are a collection of values, norms, rules, and codes of behavior created for professional journalists. It discusses a journalist's conduct, personality, and behavior as well as how she operates prior to, during, and after the process of obtaining and disseminating news [9].

Self-regulation

In general, news media organizations and their professional journalists are expected to not only adhere scrupulously to these principles and standards but also to self-regulate in line with them. However, since journalistic ethics are optional and non-mandatory, news media outlets and journalists often report violations. It is undeniable that a portion of news media outlets compromise on journalistic ethics, either voluntarily or inadvertently, in order to get more readers or viewers, for some personal advantage, or generally at the altar of commercial interests and to increase their bottom lines.

Problems with Indian Journalism

Journalistic ethics being compromised: There have been many more examples of ethical norm and principal violations in India, including paid news consumption, the dissemination of fake news, participating in sensationalism and inflating insignificant issues, making false headlines, invasion of privacy, and factual distortion. reporting that is biased: openly taking sides and biased reporting. In addition, several major news organizations and their journalists have been exposed for conducting biased media investigations, advocating for private interests, blackmailing, altering news articles, participating in harmful and defamatory reporting, and waging campaigns of propaganda and misinformation. Press freedom abuse: There is rising worry in the nation that many Indian news media outlets have shown little regard for journalistic ethics and conventions by often going over the line and developing a pattern of misconduct. In reality, many who oppose the news media's unethical behavior are calling for strict regulation in favor of the inefficient self-regulatory system, and their voices are becoming more and more audible every day. It should be mentioned that India, like many other liberal democracies, acknowledges the importance of press freedom and permits independent news media regulation [10].

CONCLUSION

In the modern digital era, when information flows quickly and widely, ethics in journalism is a crucial and challenging topic. A strong commitment to moral standards and awareness of the

difficulties presented by the changing media environment are necessary to successfully navigate the complex web of media integrity. Here are some important findings on the subject Ethical Foundations The ethical values of truth, accuracy, fairness, and impartiality should serve as the foundation for all journalism. Even when it's painful or embarrassing, journalists have a duty to look for and report the truth. Transparency: Integrity in the media is based on transparency. Journalists must be transparent about their sources, any conflicts of interest, and any prejudices that could influence their reporting. The audience develops trust as a result of this openness. Verification and fact-checking must be given priority by journalists in the age of "fake news" and disinformation.

Hasty publication of dubious facts may undermine public comprehension and media credibility. Journalists should make an effort to deliver fair and balanced reporting, giving several viewpoints on a particular subject. By doing this, you may prevent the appearance of prejudice and promote critical thinking among your audience.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. J. a Ward, "Global Journalism Ethics : Widening the Conceptual Base," *Glob. Media J. -- Can. Ed.*, 2008.
- [2] A. Phillips, "Transparency and the new ethics of journalism," *Journal. Pract.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/17512781003642972.
- [3] E. E. Hussein, "Journalism Ethics, Attitude on New Media Journalism and the New Media Readers," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i6/4256.
- [4] Q. Y. Nasidi, "Media and Ethics: Journalism Ethics in Nigerian News Media," *IOSR J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. (IOSR-JHSS)*, 2016, doi: 10.9790/0837-2112030106.
- [5] H. H. Martono, "Teaching journalism ethics: Constructing model for teaching journalism ethics on the basis of local wisdom to create peace journalism," *Cogent Arts Humanit.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/23311983.2017.1334982.
- [6] K. Hafez, "Journalism ethics revisited: A comparison of ethics codes in Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, and Muslim Asia," *Political Communication*. 2002. doi: 10.1080/10584600252907461.
- [7] C. Beasley and L. Walker, "Research ethics and journalism in the academy: Identifying and resolving a conflict of culture," *Res. Ethics*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/1747016114531981.
- [8] A. Braithwaite, "It's About Ethics in Games Journalism? Gamergaters and Geek Masculinity," *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/2056305116672484.
- [9] R. E. D. McBride, "The Ethics of Data Journalism," *Prof. Proj. from Coll. Journal. MassCommunications.*, 2016.
- [10] P. L. Plaisance, "Journalism ethics," in *Journalism*, 2018. doi: 10.1515/9781501500084-005.

CHAPTER 11

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATIONS: COURTS' ROLE IN DEFINING BOUNDARIES

Utsav Shroff, Assistant Professor
 Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
 Email Id-utsav.shroff@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

This research examines how crucial it is for courts to interpret the law in order to define legal limits. The judiciary is an essential check and balance on the authority of the administrative and legislative departments in democratic societies, ensuring that the rule of law is upheld. Courts set precedents, defend individual rights, and interpret and clarify statutory and constitutional provisions as well as adjust the law to changing society norms and values. The process of judicial interpretation is intricate and requires a careful balancing act between tradition and change, taking the public's view into account, and a dedication to maintaining the ideals of justice and fairness. This research emphasizes the importance of courts in establishing the rule of law, promoting it, and defending people's rights and liberties in a dynamic environment.

KEYWORDS:

Courts, Judicial, Judges, Law, Protection.

INTRODUCTION

The examples and viewpoints in this article are mostly American-focused and do not reflect a global perspective on the issue. As necessary, you may make changes to this article, speak about the problem. When to delete this template message and how. The way the court interprets the law, notably the constitution, laws, and commonly used terms, is known as judicial interpretation. This is a significant problem in several common law countries, such as the United States, Australia, and Canada, where the supreme courts have the power to judicially examine and reject legislation passed by their legislatures. The desegregation in the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, and abortion rights in the *Roe v. Wade* decision are just a few examples of subjects the US Supreme Court has ruled on. As a consequence, there is a political component to the way judges read the constitution and how they approach this responsibility. A term's meaning might change depending on what is being attempted to be "conserved" when discussing different sorts of judicial interpretation. There are several perspectives along the continuum that runs from judicial restraint to judicial activism when examining judicial interpretation [1].

Judges balance matters by weighing one set of rights or interests against another, generally to reach decisions in First Amendment disputes. For instance, in issues concerning freedom of speech, judges may need to distinguish between speech that is legally allowed and speech that may be prohibited or limited for, say, reasons of safety. The judge's role then is to strike a balance between these opposing claims. Felix Frankfurter, a judge of the Supreme Court, opposed the balancing strategy, claiming that the Constitution contains no instructions on how to assess or compare conflicting interests. According to Finn, doctrinarism examines how specific provisions of the Constitution have been "shaped by the Court's own jurisprudence.

Judges attempt to ascertain the Founders' Intent while attempting to interpret a legislation or a constitution. Judges may encounter issues when attempting to choose which Founders or Framers to consult and when attempting to interpret their intentions from sometimes scant and deficient material. Judges who practice originalism attempt to apply the "original"

interpretations of certain constitutional clauses. A constitutional provision is read in its original context, or the historical, literary, and political setting of the founders, in order to ascertain its original meaning. The fundamental concept is then deduced from that interpretation and applied to the current circumstance.

According to former Supreme Court judge Antonin Scalia, the constitution's wording should still be understood to mean what it did when it was first written. According to an article in *The Washington Post*, originalism is the "view that the Constitution should be interpreted in accordance with its original meaning that is, the meaning it had at the time of its enactment. The ethos of the law" or moral reasoning contends that "certain moral concepts or ideals underlie some terms in the text of the Constitution" and that the Court should take these underlying principles into consideration while interpreting a case. Prudentialism instructs courts to take a restricted role and forbids judges from establishing wide standards for perhaps future instances.

According to the legal concept of *stare decisis*, judges decide a case by referring to the outcome of a prior, related case and using that decision to inform their conclusion in the present case. According to strict constructionism, which advocates that judges should avoid drawing conclusions from earlier statutes or the constitution and instead concentrate on exactly what was written, judges should only interpret the text as it was written; once a clear meaning has been established, further analysis is not necessary. For instance, Justice Hugo Black contended that the First Amendment's phrase "Congress shall make no law" with relation to certain civil rights should imply just that: no legislation, no exceptions. Structuralism is a strategy used by judges to determine the meaning of a specific constitutional principle by "reading it against the larger constitutional document or context, as Finn puts it. Judges work to comprehend how a given decision fits within the overall framework of the constitution.

Textualism bases its legal interpretation largely on the plain language of the relevant legal text. In the case of *Bostock v. Clayton County*, both the majority judgment and the dissenting opinions followed a textualist approach; the main area of disagreement was "what flavor of textualism the Supreme Court should employ. Justice Neil Gorsuch's majority opinion adopts a highly limited and literal textualist view, which is crucial to the decision in *Bostock* and the precedent it established. The dissenters (Justices Brett Kavanaugh, Samuel Alito, and Clarence Thomas) contend that ordinary meaning, not the literal reading utilized by the majority ruling, is the proper textualist interpretation to use. This is an illustration of the flaws in the argument that one judge's subjective interpretation would somehow result in a more objective judicial analysis than procedure, according to legal realists and other skeptics [2], [3].

According to Justice, distinctly American in concept and function," is how Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes described the Supreme Court. Few other courts in the world have the same constitutional interpretation power, and none have used it as extensively or for as long. The French political analyst notices of the Supreme Court's special place in jurisprudential and national history in 1835. He said, "The representative form of government has been adopted in various nations of Europe, but I am ignorant that any country in the world has to yet organized a judicial authority in the same fashion as the Americans.... A more imposing judicial power was never established by any people. The strong adherence of the American people to the Rule of Law and to constitutional governance is a major contributor to the Supreme Court's unique position. The American "experiment in democracy" now has the oldest written Constitution that is still in effect because to the United States' unparalleled commitment to preserving and protecting its written Constitution. The United States Constitution is a finely balanced text. It is intended to provide for a national government that is both powerful and adaptable enough to satisfy the demands of the republic and restricted and just enough to uphold the people'

fundamental rights. This allows for a balance between society's need for order and each person's right to freedom. The Constitution's Framers established three separate and equal departments of government in order to guarantee these goals. The greatness of the American form of governance is shown by the fact that this Constitution has maintained democratic democracy during the cyclical pressures of more than two centuries [4].

The Supreme Court's ability to nullify laws or presidential orders that, in its well-researched opinion, violate the Constitution gives it a complicated function in this system. The Court now has a key role in protecting individual rights and preserving a "living Constitution" whose wide provisions are constantly applied to challenging new circumstances. This power of "judicial review" has given the Court this duty. Although it is not expressly stated in the Constitution, judicial review serves a purpose that was expected prior to its ratification. State courts have previously invalidated laws that went against state constitutions before 1789.

A lot of the Founding Fathers also anticipated that the Supreme Court would play this function in interpreting the Constitution; James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, for instance, had emphasized the value of judicial review in the *Federalist Papers*, which pushed for the passage of the Constitution. According to Hamilton, the Court ensures that the will of the whole people, as represented in their Constitution, will take precedence over the will of a legislature, whose legislation may only temporarily embody the desire of portion of the people.

Madison further said that rather than being subject to the turmoil and dispute of the political process, constitutional interpretation must be left to the reasoned opinion of impartial judges. Madison claimed that the Constitution would be converted to a battlefield of opposing factions, political fervor, and partisan spirit if every constitutional dispute were to be resolved via public political negotiation [5]. Despite this history, Chief Justice use of the Court's judicial review jurisdiction in 1803 was the first time it had been recognized. The Chief Justice argued in this ruling that the Supreme Court's need to strike down unconstitutional laws was a natural byproduct of its oath-bound duties to preserve the Constitution.

There was no alternative way to carry out that pledge. He said, "It is categorically the province of the judicial branch to define what the law is. In hindsight, it is clear that the Constitution's very existence necessitated the need for constitutional interpretation and implementation. The Founders had sensibly written the text in very generic language, leaving it open to future development to take into account shifting circumstances.

A constitution that attempted to specify every aspect of its own application, as Chief Justice Marshall noted in 1819, "would partake of the prolixity of a legal code, and could scarcely be embraced by the human mind. Its nature, therefore, requires that only its great outlines should be marked, its important objects should be designated, and the minor ingredients which compose those objects be deduced from the nature of the objects themselves. The Court is only permitted by the Constitution to address Cases and "Controversies. Early in the history of the Court, John Jay, the first Chief Justice, made this constraint clear by refusing to counsel President George Washington on the legal ramifications of a potential foreign policy move. The Court's role is restricted to adjudicating particular matters; it does not provide advisory views [6].

DISCUSSION

The role of courts in defining legal boundaries through judicial interpretations is a multifaceted and essential aspect of any legal system. This discussion will delve deeper into the significance of this role and its implications for the rule of law, society, and the functioning of democratic governments [7].

Clarity and Precision in the Law: One of the primary functions of judicial interpretations is to provide clarity and precision to the law. Laws enacted by legislatures are often written in broad terms to accommodate a variety of situations. Courts, through their interpretations, narrow down these broad provisions, making them applicable to specific cases. This clarity ensures that citizens and legal professionals can understand and apply the law effectively.

Checks and Balances: The concept of separation of powers is a fundamental principle of democratic governance. Courts act as a crucial check on the powers of the executive and legislative branches of government. By interpreting the law and determining the constitutionality of government actions, courts ensure that the other branches do not overstep their boundaries and violate the rights of citizens.

Protection of Individual Rights

Courts play a vital role in protecting individual rights and liberties. They often serve as a last line of defense against government actions that may infringe upon these rights. Judicial interpretations of constitutional provisions establish the boundaries beyond which government cannot encroach, safeguarding the freedoms of citizens. The protection of individual rights is a fundamental aspect of any just and democratic society. It ensures that individuals are safeguarded from government overreach, discrimination, and other forms of abuse of power. Here are some key points to consider when discussing the protection of individual rights

1. **Constitutional Guarantees:** Many democratic countries have a constitution that enshrines specific rights and freedoms. These constitutional guarantees serve as a foundation for the protection of individual rights. Common examples include freedom of speech, freedom of religion, the right to privacy, and the right to a fair trial.
2. **Bill of Rights:** Some countries have a separate Bill of Rights or similar legal instruments that explicitly outline and protect individual rights. These documents often serve as a reference point for legal challenges and judicial decisions.
3. **Rule of Law:** The rule of law is a fundamental principle that ensures that laws are applied consistently and fairly to all individuals, regardless of their status or background. It also implies that no one is above the law, including government officials.
4. **Separation of Powers:** The separation of powers in a democratic system helps protect individual rights. By dividing government functions into legislative, executive, and judicial branches, it limits the potential for any one branch to infringe upon individual rights unchecked.
5. **Judicial Review:** Courts, particularly independent and impartial judiciaries, have the authority to review government actions and laws to determine their constitutionality. This process, known as judicial review, provides a crucial check on the government's power and ensures that individual rights are upheld.
6. **Checks and Balances:** Beyond the judiciary, other branches of government, such as the legislature and executive, also play a role in protecting individual rights. They can create, amend, or repeal laws to better align with changing societal values and expectations.
7. **Civil Liberties Organizations:** Civil liberties organizations and advocacy groups often play a vital role in protecting individual rights. They use legal action, public awareness campaigns, and lobbying efforts to advocate for the rights of individuals and marginalized communities.
8. **International Human Rights Instruments:** Many countries are signatories to international human rights treaties and conventions, which set global standards for the protection of individual rights. These agreements can influence domestic policies and legal decisions.

9. **Challenges to Individual Rights:** In some cases, individual rights may come into conflict with other societal interests, such as national security or public health. Balancing these interests while still protecting individual rights can be challenging and may require careful legal analysis.
10. **Ongoing Vigilance:** Protecting individual rights is an ongoing process. It requires vigilance from both citizens and government institutions to ensure that rights are not eroded over time.
11. **Public Awareness and Education:** Educating the public about their rights is essential for their protection. An informed citizenry is better equipped to advocate for their rights and hold government accountable.

Adaptation to Changing Societal Norms

Societal norms and values evolve over time. Courts have the flexibility to adapt legal interpretations to reflect these changes. This adaptability allows the law to remain relevant and just, addressing new challenges and issues that emerge in society. Legal Evolution Social norms, values, and attitudes are not constant throughout time; they evolve as a result of changes in culture, society, economy, and technology. The legal system must adapt in tandem with these developments in order to continue to be effective and fair. Legislative Action Taking legislative action is one method the legal system adjusts to shifting standards. To reflect modern ideas and solve new challenges, elected officials adopt new laws or change current ones. Legislative revisions, for instance, often result from changes in family patterns or the acceptance of new rights (such as LGBTQ+ rights). Courts are crucial in interpreting and implementing the law to particular situations, according to judicial interpretation. By taking changing societal norms into account, they may modify legal concepts to fit modern standards. Advancements in civil rights, gender equality, and other cultural reforms have been made in large part because to landmark court rulings. Public Opinion and Advocacy [8].

The public's viewpoint and advocacy activities have a significant impact on how laws are changed. Changes in cultural norms may be sparked by grassroots movements, demonstrations, and public discussion, which in turn can persuade legislators and courts to take appropriate action. Constitutional Interpretation Constitutional interpretation is especially important in nations with written constitutions. In order to conform with contemporary notions of rights and freedoms, courts may reinterpret constitutional clauses. New constitutional rights may be recognized as a result of this procedure, or existing rights may get broader protections. Globalization and international agreements may also have an impact on how laws are adjusted. Nations may change their laws to comply with international standards and commitments, such as environmental accords or human rights conventions. Technology in the Digital Age New legal issues, such as digital privacy and cybercrime, have emerged as a result of rapid technical breakthroughs.

To successfully control and handle these concerns, the legal system must change. Legal institutions often struggle to resolve the conflict between tradition and progress. Some regulations could have a strong foundation in historical norms and values, which makes modification more difficult. A recurring problem for legal reform is striking a balance between upholding tradition and accepting progress. unforeseen repercussions Adapting the law to changing social norms may result in unforeseen repercussions or create new ethical and legal conundrums. To deal with these difficulties, careful thought and constant assessment are required. Education and Public Awareness It is crucial to educate the general public, legal experts, and legislators on shifting cultural norms and their legal ramifications. It promotes a greater comprehension of the justifications for the need for legislative modifications and promotes fruitful discussion [9].

Precedent and Consistency: The principle of stare decisis, or the use of precedent, helps ensure consistency in the application of the law. Courts' decisions in previous cases provide a framework for addressing similar legal issues in the future. This consistency promotes fairness and predictability in the legal system.

Limitations of Judicial Interpretation: While judicial interpretation is crucial, it is not without its limitations. Courts are bound by the language of the law and the constitution, and their interpretations must be grounded in legal principles. Sometimes, this can lead to outcomes that some may find unsatisfactory. However, this limitation is essential to maintain the rule of law and prevent arbitrary decision-making.

Public Trust and Accountability: The judiciary's role in defining boundaries also contributes to public trust in the legal system and government. When courts hold government actors accountable and ensure adherence to the law, it reinforces the idea that everyone, regardless of their position, is subject to the law.

Complexity and Controversy: Judicial interpretations can be complex and subject to controversy. Different judges may have varying perspectives, leading to dissenting opinions. These disagreements can be healthy, as they foster debate and discussion about the law's meaning and application [10].

CONCLUSION

Any democratic and fair legal system must include courts that play a key role in determining limits via judicial interpretations. Courts protect the rule of law by making sure that the rules are understandable, relevant, and consistent with changing society norms. Their rulings not only make laws and constitutional clauses clearer to understand, but they also establish precedents that will be followed in future legal cases. Additionally, courts serve as a crucial check on the authority of other departments of government, preventing abuse and defending individual rights and freedoms.

They may sustain the law's efficacy and relevance by adapting it to new social problems and advancements via their interpretations. This position is not without its complexity and difficulties, however. Courts must strike a careful balance between tradition and modernity, balancing changing social mores with long-standing legal precepts. They have to balance reacting to rapid social, cultural, and technical change with upholding the rule of law. In the end, maintaining the values of justice, accountability, and fairness within a democratic framework depends on the judiciary's role in setting limits. It emphasizes the ongoing importance of a fair and impartial judicial system in preserving individual liberties and rights as well as the consistency of the legal system as a whole.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ceci and A. Gangemi, "An OWL ontology library representing judicial interpretations," *Semant. Web*, 2016, doi: 10.3233/SW-140146.
- [2] A. V. Orlova, "'Public interest,' judicial reasoning and violence of the law: Constructing boundaries of the 'morally acceptable,'" *Contemp. Readings Law Soc. Justice*, 2017, doi: 10.22381/CRLSJ9220174.
- [3] U. Balasingam, "Judicial interpretation: The impact on individual and society in Malaysia," *Int. J. Eng. Technol.*, 2018, doi: 10.14419/ijet.v7i3.25.17596.
- [4] C. McCrudden, "Human dignity and judicial interpretation of human rights," *Eur. J. Int. Law*, 2008, doi: 10.1093/ejil/chn043.

- [5] F. Hoehn, "Privatization and the boundaries of judicial review," *Can. Public Adm.*, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1754-7121.2011.00161.x.
- [6] A. S. Tykyl-Ool, "The role of judicial interpretation in the 'Competition' of commercial courts in Russia," *J. Sib. Fed. Univ. - Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.17516/1997-1370-0290.
- [7] J. Pohl, "The judiciablity of social rights: Listening to the ecthr or making it say," *Rev. Chil. Derecho*, 2018, doi: 10.4067/s0718-34372018000300691.
- [8] S. Cao, "The legal status of decisions and judicial interpretations of the Supreme Court of China," *Front. Law China*, 2008, doi: 10.1007/s11463-008-0001-0.
- [9] P. Johnson, "Challenging the heteronormativity of marriage: The role of judicial interpretation and authority," *Soc. Leg. Stud.*, 2011, doi: 10.1177/0964663911406314.
- [10] A. Bamzai, "The origins of judicial deference to executive interpretation," *Yale Law J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2649445.

CHAPTER 12

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE PRIVILEGES AND PRESS FREEDOM

Dipika Bhatia, Director
Department of ISME, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India
Email Id-dipika.bhatia@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The complex interplay between press freedom and legislative privileges in various international settings is explored in this research. Press freedom guarantees that a free press can call the powerful to account, while legislative privileges provide politicians the immunity and privileges, they need to carry out their duties well. This comparative examination digs into the subtleties of how these two democratic pillars interact, looking at the reach and bounds of legislative rights as well as the struggles and triumphs of press freedom across the globe. This essay examines the difficult balance between parliamentarians' rights to free speech and the media's role in evaluating their activities, drawing on case studies from nations with diverse legal systems and cultural norms. It looks at how these rights are affected by constitutional safeguards, statutory provisions, and international agreements as well as the moral and legal difficulties brought on by matters like hate speech, national security, and the digital era.

KEYWORDS:

Immunity, Legislative Privileges, Protection, Press Freedom, Parliament.

INTRODUCTION

The privilege might be characterized as a unique entitlement and exemption. According to the Indian Constitution and in the context of Parliament, the terms "Privilege and Immunity" refer to certain unique and special privileges granted to the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha or to their individual members, which are widely acknowledged as necessary for carrying out constitutional duties. According to the Supreme Court, a "privilege" is a right or immunity granted to a particular individual. In a different sense, a person is now qualified to do a certain conduct while not generally being able to. For instance, as Attorney General, you have the authority to see any house session, but a regular citizen does not.

The established laws, practices, and use of Parliament make up privilege. As a result, the word "privilege" refers to the unique powers that members of parliament have to varying degrees and in a variety of formats. The phrase, however, refers to specific privileges held by both the combined chambers of the Parliament and each house's individual members. Any member of parliament has the privilege of being impervious to anything spoken on the floor of the house, and in the event of detention, whether civil or criminal, no member shall be held accountable and imprisoned 40 days before to and 40 days after the session of the house. However, there is a need to meet in order to use these rights. The privileges end when a person no longer serves as a member of parliament. Therefore, membership in either house of Parliament should be required in order to benefit from immunities [1].

Who Benefits from Privileges of Parliament

The term "Parliamentary Privilege" is defined by Sir Thomas Erskine as the totality of the particular rights enjoyed by each House of Parliament individually and collectively as a constituent part of Parliament, without which they could not carry out their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies and people. The President, despite being a member of Parliament, is not granted parliamentary privileges. Instead, the privileges are only

granted to members of Parliament and those who actively participate in committee work and other parliamentary activities. This also includes the Attorney General and union ministers.

Article 105

Privileges, powers, rights, and other things for each of the two houses of parliament, as well as for their members and committees Comes under the concern of the constitutional requirements, rules, regulations, and standing orders that dictate how Parliament must conduct itself, and it is essential that there be unrestricted freedom of expression in every chamber. If there are limitations, representatives will be reluctant to share their opinions, which is contrary to the democratic system of government's intent.

The publication of any report, vote, proceeding, or paper by a member of the Parliament or under any authority granted by either house of Parliament should not subject anyone to liability for any legal action brought against them in connection with anything said or voted by them or any committee acting on their behalf. In a different sense, the privileges, immunity, and authority of each of the two houses of Parliament, as well as their members and committees, shall be as may be defined from time to time and provided by the Parliament itself and through established procedure by law. Until such definitions shall be a matter of concern for those of that house, as well as its members and committees, immediately prior to the date of initiation of Section 15 of the Constitution by the The aforementioned constitutional provisions shall apply to anyone who, by virtue of their citizenship, has the right to free speech and who otherwise wishes to participate in the proceedings of the Parliament or any committee thereof [2].

Article 194

The laws of the constitution, rules, regulations, and standing orders that govern the State Legislature's process apply to this matter, and all state's legislators are guaranteed the right to free expression. No member of the state legislature may be forced to participate in any legal action brought against him or her based on statements made or votes cast by them in the state legislature or any committee thereof. Additionally, no one may be held legally liable for the publication of any paper, vote, report, or proceedings made by him or under any authority granted by a house of the state legislature. In a different sense, the privileges and immunities of the house of the state legislature, of its members, and of its committees shall be such as may be defined from time to time by the state legislature through established legal procedure, and, until so define, shall be the subject of those of that house, of its members, and of its committee thereof, immediately prior to the (forty-four amendment to section 26 of the constitution.

The aforementioned constitution shall apply to anyone who, under this constitution, has the right to free speech, as well as to anyone who has the right to participate in the deliberations of the house of the state legislature and any committees therein. Without the consent of the procedures officer of that specific house, no person whether a member or a visitor—may be detained on the grounds of the house of the Parliament, and no criminal or civil legal action may be taken against him. No court must be permitted to look into any committee's or house of the parliament's actions. If a subject of national significance or any other matter of public concern arises, the parliament may choose to hold a secret meeting or prohibit guests and visitors from the proceedings. For violating its privileges, Parliament has the authority to punish a member or an outsider.

Additionally, a member may be subject to expulsion and suspension for disrespect in addition to being subject to rebuke, admonishment, or incarceration. A member of Parliament or someone with these rights and immunities may choose not to appear in court or provide any

evidence while the legislature is in session. When the Parliament is in session, 40 days before to the start of the session, and 40 days after its conclusion, members cannot be detained. No member may be held responsible for anything said or voted during a session of the Parliament or any of its committees in any legal procedure [3], [4].

Speech Freedom

Honest, open, courageous conversations in the parliament's house of representatives are the foundation of the parliamentary system of democracy. Freedom of speech is crucial for an institution like parliament since it allows members of both chambers to voice their opinions without fear of repercussions or being punished for offenses like slander or innuendo, etc. In the seventeenth century, led to the establishment of the right to free expression in the legislature. According to the Rajya Sabha's report, a member of Parliament may be questioned in any court of law or outside of the legislature for disclosing information or displaying information because doing so would violate that member's right to free speech. The Lok Sabha has since said that bringing legal action against any member for remarks made on the floor of the house would constitute contempt of house or a violation of privilege. Once it is recognized that the parliament was in session and its business was being transacted, anything said during the clause of that transaction was completely immune from any proceeding in any court of law. The first sentence of Article 105 specifically safeguards the right to free expression in Parliament. It stipulates that everyone's right to free expression in Parliament.

No member of either house of the Parliament shall be held accountable in any legal process for anything spoken or for any vote cast by him or her in the legislature or any committee of the legislature. No legal or criminal action is taken against the member for the defamation offense or in relation to what was stated in the House of Representatives or one of its committees. The exemption applies to votes as well, since articles clearly states that every vote cast by him/her in parliament or a committee thereof is exempt from incarceration. Although it may be said that other actions that are done and have a connection to the procedures of each house, such as for notice of questions, motions, reports of committee, and resolutions, are also covered by the freedom of expression. The first sentence of Article 105 is subject to the requirements of the Constitution as well as the Standing Orders and Rules for the Regulation and Procedures of the Parliament, which is an essential point to keep in mind. should be interpreted to mean that it applies to both the constitution's provisions as well as the rules, standing orders, and circulations [5].

DISCUSSION

Legislative privileges and press freedom are two fundamental pillars of democratic societies. Legislative privileges grant lawmakers' certain legal immunities and privileges to perform their duties effectively, while press freedom ensures that the media can operate independently, holding governments and institutions accountable. This comparative analysis explores the interaction between legislative privileges and press freedom in different global contexts [6].

Legislative Privileges

Scope and Variation: Legislative privileges vary significantly from one country to another. While some democracies grant broad immunities to lawmakers, others have more limited privileges. protection from Prosecution Lawmakers often have protection from legal action for words they make while participating in parliamentary sessions. This enables people to voice their opinions without worrying about legal repercussions. Legislators may also be shielded from arrest or incarceration while attending legislative sessions, allowing them to carry out their responsibilities without hindrance. **Speech and Debate Clause:** In certain nations, such as

the United States, legislative privileges are protected by constitutional clauses, such as the Speech and Debate Clause, which shields lawmakers from legal prosecution for performing their official responsibilities. Immunity Grant: The level of immunity given to lawmakers varies greatly. It may apply to all remarks and deeds pertaining to their legislative obligations in certain nations, while it may have more restrictive application in others. Comparing parliamentary and presidential systems, we can see that the nature of legislative privileges may vary. Wider privileges are often granted to politicians in parliamentary systems [7].

The existence or lack of a codified constitution may have an impact on the extent and interpretation of legislative privileges. There may be more definite safeguards in nations with written constitutions. Press freedom includes the larger freedom of speech, enabling journalists and media organizations to conduct investigations, file reports, and distribute information without excessive intervention. Access to Information This term refers to the freedom to get information held by public authorities, which promotes accountability and transparency. Protection of Sources In order to support informants and investigative reporting, press freedom may also require safeguarding journalists' sources. legislative Protections Press freedom is subject to a wide range of legislative safeguards. While some nations have strong legal systems protecting journalists, others have less stringent or poorly implemented laws. Government Control The government may have extensive influence over the media in certain countries, which restricts press freedom. In such settings, censorship and state-owned media may be common. Journalists' safety is subject to a wide range of risks. The capacity of journalists to practice press freedom is severely restricted in certain areas where they are subject to physical threats, violence, and even death for their reporting Interaction and Balance The breadth and diversity of these principles may have an impact on how legislative privileges and press freedom interact. A wide range of parliamentary privileges may sometimes interfere with press freedom when media organizations try to look into allegations of misbehavior by politicians. In democratic societies, it is crucial to strike a balance between these rights in order to guarantee accountability and openness [8].

Protection of Free Speech: Legislative privileges are designed to protect legislators' free speech, allowing them to debate, discuss, and represent their constituents without fear of legal consequences.

1. **Constitutional Protections** The right to free expression is protected by law or the constitution in many democratic nations. Usually, these safeguards are among the most essential liberties accorded to individuals. International Agreements The right to freedom of speech is recognized and supported on a worldwide level by international human rights agreements including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Free speech is protected, although there are often limitations and prohibitions. Incitement to violence, hate speech, defamation, and national security issues are a few examples of these restrictions. The precise limits vary depending on the nation and the legal system. Democracy and Accountability Free expression is essential to democratic systems' proper operation. It enables people to discuss politics, express their concerns, and criticize the government. Free speech supports openness and accountability in government in this manner. Protection of free expression is associated with society innovation and growth. It promotes free thought, which may result in scientific breakthroughs, technological growth, and cultural improvement. Freedom of speech gives people the ability to express their identities, convictions, and ideas. It stimulates personal development and self-expression while fostering variety of views.
2. **Challenges and Disputations**

Balancing Rights It may be difficult to strike a balance between the right to free expression and other rights and interests, such as those related to public safety or the suppression of hate speech. Courts often struggle to find this balance. **Hate Speech and Incitement** The moral and legal implications of hate speech and incitement to violence are complex. It is debatable where to draw the boundary between acceptable speech and offensive speech. **Emerging Technologies** The preservation of free expression faces additional difficulties in the digital era. Social media and online platforms create concerns about moderation, false information, and the dissemination of extremist material. **Press Freedom and Free Speech Related Rights** Press freedom and free speech go hand in hand. A free press acts as a platform for the communication of various viewpoints and information. Free speech is strengthened and expanded when press freedom is protected. **Civil Liberties groups:** In lobbying for the preservation of free expression, NGOs and civil liberties groups often play a crucial role. To make sure that the ideals of free speech are upheld, they could pursue legal action, spread awareness, and track government activities. **Public Education** It is essential to inform the general public about the value of free speech as well as its restrictions. A well-informed populace is more inclined to protect and defend this basic freedom [9].

Balancing Act: Balancing legislative privileges with other democratic principles, such as accountability and transparency, can be challenging. Overly broad privileges may lead to abuses of power.

Controversies: Legislative privileges have been controversial in some cases, as they can be seen as protecting lawmakers from legal scrutiny or accountability for unethical behavior.

Press Freedom

Critical Role: A free press is often referred to as the "fourth estate" in democracies, as it acts as a watchdog, exposing corruption, abuses of power, and violations of human rights.

Challenges to Press Freedom: Press freedom faces challenges worldwide, including censorship, restrictions, violence against journalists, and the concentration of media ownership.

Legal Protections: Many democracies have legal protections for press freedom, but their effectiveness can vary. Enforcing these protections can be difficult when governments or powerful entities seek to suppress critical reporting.

1. **Constitutional Protections** The right to free expression is guaranteed by the constitutions or bills of rights of many democratic nations. The greatest degree of legal protection for free expression is offered by these documents. **United States' First Amendment** A well-known example of robust constitutional protection for free expression is the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. It forbids Congress from passing legislation that restrict press or speech freedom.
2. **Legislative Protections** **Legislation:** In addition to constitutional protections, free speech is often covered by particular legislation in other nations. These laws could deal with things like censorship, defamation, and hate speech. **Freedom of Information Laws:** In certain nations, it is legal to obtain government data, increasing openness and allowing for well-informed views. **Agreements Made Abroad** The right to freedom of speech is acknowledged in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was ratified by the United Nations. Another UN treaty, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), has specific clauses that guarantee the freedom of speech, including the right to seek, receive, and disseminate information.

3. **Common Legal Defenses** Libel and defamation laws must balance free speech rights in order to prevent stifling genuine communication, even while they exist to protect people from false and destructive remarks. Hate Speech Laws While upholding the right to free speech, laws addressing hate speech seek to combat prejudice and violent provocation. The parameters of what qualifies as hate speech might differ greatly across nations. Jurisprudential Interpretation and Case Law Court rulings: In understanding and enforcing legislation pertaining to free expression, courts are essential. Their verdicts established legal precedents that influenced how free speech rights are understood and constrained. Courts often use balancing tests to compare the right to free speech to other conflicting interests, such as public safety or national security. Independent Regulatory Agencies Independent regulating organizations in certain nations monitor media and broadcasting to make sure that material complies with the law while upholding free expression.
4. **Protections for Whistleblowers:** Whistleblower laws: People who reveal misconduct inside organizations, especially government institutions, need legal safeguards for whistleblowers. These laws protect those who come forward with information that is in the public interest from being punished Acts relating to freedom of information Access to Government Information: Freedom of Information Acts provide the general public the right to seek and obtain government records, promoting accountability and openness. Online Speech and Digital Rights: Net neutrality rules prevent internet service providers from restricting or throttling access to certain material, which may assist safeguard free expression online. Legislation governing content moderation on internet platforms exists in several countries, with the goal of balancing the rights to free speech with responsible content management.

Social Media and Digital Era: The advent of social media and the digital era has both expanded press freedom and presented new challenges, including the spread of misinformation and disinformation [10].

Interaction Between Legislative Privileges and Press Freedom

Complementary Roles: Legislative privileges and press freedom should ideally complement each other. Lawmakers can use their privileges to speak out on important issues, and the press can report on their statements and actions.

Conflict and Tension: There can be instances of conflict and tension between lawmakers and the media, especially when the press investigates alleged wrongdoing by legislators. Striking a balance between protecting lawmakers' rights and ensuring transparency is essential.

Whistleblower Protection: Both legislative privileges and press freedom play a crucial role in protecting whistleblowers who expose corruption or unethical behavior within government institutions.

Case Studies

United States: The U.S. Constitution grants strong protections for both legislative privileges and press freedom. However, tensions often arise when the media investigates political figures, testing the boundaries of these rights.

United Kingdom: The UK has a long history of parliamentary privilege, which allows lawmakers to speak freely without the threat of legal action. The media also enjoys a high degree of freedom but is subject to defamation laws that can limit reporting.

Russia: Russia has faced significant criticism for curbing press freedom, with many independent media outlets facing restrictions. Legislative privileges have been used to shield lawmakers from investigations into corruption.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the comparative study of legislative rights and press freedom in many worldwide settings illustrates the complex interplay between these two crucial democratic tenets. This investigation highlights many important conclusions: There are regional differences in journalistic freedom and legislative privileges. They are influenced by the constitutional provisions, historical context, cultural standards, and legal traditions of each nation. The intricacy of their interaction is increased by these variances. It is a constant struggle to strike a balance between journalistic freedom and legislative privileges. While press freedom gives the media the authority to look into and report on government conduct, parliamentary privileges safeguard politicians' right to speak out without fear of retaliation. This balance is essential for promoting openness, responsibility, and democratic government. The comparative research highlights moral and legal conundrums connected to press freedom and parliamentary privileges. Media organizations must traverse the bounds of ethical journalism, particularly in the digital era, while lawmakers must employ their authorities appropriately to avoid possible abuses. The strength of these rights is significantly influenced by the existence of constitutional safeguards for both legislative privileges and press freedom. Constitutionally strong nations often provide more comprehensive protections for these democratic ideals.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Alam and S. Z. Ali Shah, "The Role of Press Freedom in Economic Development: A Global Perspective," *J. Media Econ.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/08997764.2012.755986.
- [2] S. A. Gunaratne, "Freedom of the press: A World System Perspective," *Gazette*, 2002, doi: 10.1177/174804850206400403.
- [3] G. Shani, "Human security as ontological security: A post-colonial approach," *Postcolonial Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13688790.2017.1378062.
- [4] L. Cowling, "Press Freedom in Africa: Comparative Perspectives," *J. South. Afr. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/03057070.2015.1026208.
- [5] M. A. Peterson, "Making global news: 'Freedom of speech' and 'Muslim rage' in U.S. journalism," *Contemp. Islam*, 2007, doi: 10.1007/s11562-007-0021-z.
- [6] C. Krishnamurti, S. Shams, and E. Velayutham, "Corporate social responsibility and corruption risk: A global perspective," *J. Contemp. Account. Econ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jcae.2018.02.002.
- [7] M. Bachvarova, "Non-domination's role in the theorizing of global justice," *Journal of Global Ethics*. 2013. doi: 10.1080/17449626.2013.818434.
- [8] B. I. Hamada, "Towards a global journalism ethics model: an Islamic perspective†," *J. Int. Commun.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13216597.2016.1205506.
- [9] H. Sadrettin, P. Bayram, and L. Emeagwali, "Media systems, politics and press freedom: Perspectives on contemporary Russia and Nigeria," *Int. Rev. Manag. Mark.*, 2016.
- [10] H. Hornmoen and K. S. Orgeret, "Defending democracy : Nordic and global diversities in media and journalism," *Spec. Issue, Nord.*, 2014.