

Trends In Sedition Laws: Implications For The Practice of Journalism in Developing Societies

Tonnie O Iredia PhD

Department of Mass Communication, Nasarawa State University, Keffi
tonnie.iredia@yahoo.com

Abstract: Political intolerance is a common observable fact in several societies especially developing countries where democracy is yet to be institutionalized. One of the fall-outs of the phenomenon is undue sensitivity to media criticisms which is the core issue this paper addresses. With an interdisciplinary research approach which aggregates a law and society perspective, the paper undertakes a review of relevant literature and pertinent judicial decisions on the subject and finds that across cultures, there are varying degrees of anti-democratic practices among which is the unending use of Sedition laws as a tool to dissuade free speech and repress political opposition. A combination of segments of the 'Theories of the Press' upon which the study is anchored amply illuminates the dictatorial rationale for the arrest and harassment of opposition activists and media professionals on charges of sedition in different countries. It also throws light on the world-wide struggle for free speech and self regulation by the media. Having established that Sedition laws evolved in the early stages of societal development when feudalism and oligarchies which have largely become obsolete were in vogue, the paper calls for urgent repeal of such laws wherever they still exist to comply with the dictates of democracy and modern civilization where free speech is generally guaranteed by national constitutions.

Keywords: Developing societies, Implications, Journalism, Sedition laws, Trends

Date of Submission: 03-12-2017

Date of acceptance: 11-01-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

Democracy as a system of government is currently hailed across the globe as the best system of government. The problem with the posture is not only that there are scholars such as Scruton (2013) who see the system as overrated, the real issue is that generally, the term, 'democracy' has no settled meaning (Campbell, 2008). This probably explains why even despots can occasionally claim to be democratic in certain actions. The world recently witnessed an uncommon dimension of the system when the military in Zimbabwe ousted a democratically elected President Robert Mugabe supposedly in the public interest. Thus, democracy as a concept has varied meanings and a unique nature. However, what disputants of the definitions of democracy are not likely to successfully controvert is that the term is not a matter for claims, rather it is a set of ideals and principles with a set of practices and procedures designed to institutionalize freedom. It is also not difficult to identify the features of democracy which can simply be itemized as the protection of a) Sovereignty of the people, b) Rule of Law, c) Free and fair elections d) Majority rule and e) Minority rights. From these features, three issues are discernible namely:

- i. The identification of people as the most important element in a democracy because it is on their behalf that government runs the state.
- ii. The recognition that the legitimacy of government is premised on free and elections in which the victorious candidates/political parties secure majority of the votes cast.
- iii. The acceptance that governance ought to have an in-built system to protect the rights of minorities.

These features have probably been in the sub-consciousness of the media in Africa since the colonial era hence they have continued to display zero tolerance for undemocratic authorities and tendencies. This was in fact the rationale for the alignment of the media with the great leaders of the nationalist movements and other political activists of the colonial period to oust colonialism. As argued by Zaghلامي (2016), militant journalists and nationalistic media in North Africa emerged in the 20th century as an alternative to defy and challenge the repressive rule of colonialism. In Morocco for instance, two papers – Al Alam (The World) and l'Opinion (Errai), were at the forefront of anti-colonial journalism in 1944. The situation was the same across Africa. As for military dictatorship, the media played similar heroic roles in the struggle to end the aberration in the continent. Even elected governments that should be regarded as democratic had and are still having battles with

media professionals for patronizing undemocratic practices. For example, the leaders of the nationalist movements who formed governments after colonialism, faced the wrath of the media when it became obvious that the leaders were only in search of power with little or no real interest in democracy. Once in power, they were found to discourage opposition so as to perpetuate themselves in office arguing as Tanzania's Julius Nyerere did that only one political party could foster unity of purpose to confront the massive problems of under-development in African countries. But it was obvious to the media that the self-serving argument was an open invitation to the emergence of an unsophisticated political culture that would only lead to what Claude Ake cited in Iredia (2015, p30) described as the "criminalization of political dissent and the inexorable march to political monolithism." Therefore, if colonial rule brought little or no development to Africa, the media appropriately perceived that the situation was compounded by leaders of indigenous governments who at independence merely stepped into the shoes of the white men leaving the people to remain mere objects of development. For this reason, the media in developing societies have had a major task of making successive governments accountable to the people. The degree of their success so far, particularly the legal obstacle posed by the subsistence of oppressive laws such as those on sedition is worth examining.

II. THE PROBLEM

More than five decades after many colonies attained independence, undemocratic behaviour is still perceptible in many of them. Indeed, many are still under the yoke of oppressive laws enacted during the colonial period to distort the struggle for independence. Painfully, such obnoxious laws have remained in the law books of the countries many years after independence. One of the most prominent of such laws is the one on sedition whose original goal was to virtually decapitate critics of those in authority. In fact, several journalists working to strengthen democracy in many developing countries were feared to have been assassinated, with the authorities failing to investigate the cases. This was confirmed by an independent commission in Burkina Faso in 1998, which found that a frontline newspaper journalist, Norbert Zongo was assassinated purely for political reasons, because his practice of investigative journalism exposed dishonesty, bad governance and impunity in official quarters. Many others were jailed on charges of the colonial law of sedition. Interestingly, the colonialists who originated such laws have since abrogated them from their own legal system. Considering that Sedition laws evolved when feudalism and oligarchies which have largely become obsolete were in vogue, the continued use of such laws to repress the press along with a number of factors which have worked against the eventual repeal of such laws have remained a puzzle. The goal of this study therefore is to advocate an end to Sedition laws in line with the dictates of democracy and modern civilization where free speech is constitutionally guaranteed. To aid the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Are there aspects of Sedition laws that can meet the ends of justice and public interest?
2. Why has it been so difficult to repeal what many regard as obnoxious laws of sedition in developing societies?

III. Laws of Sedition: Origin, growth and development

Unlike defamation which refers to attacks on individual reputation, sedition deals with attacks on authorities and institutions as well as incitement of segments of societies against one another. Based on the belief that if such attacks were not outlawed, they could destabilize the government of the day and create disharmony among different communities in society, laws to check sedition were enacted by those in government at different stages of societal development. Britain was probably the first to do so with its Sedition Act of 1661. As history reveals, the law was enacted ostensibly to protect the British monarchy whose authority rested on a concept known as the 'Divine Rights of Kings'- a scheme designed essentially to discourage any revolution against the British royalty. The Act can be broken into two. These are; the protection of government and all its organs and then ensuring public peace by discouraging feelings of ill-will and hostility between different people in a society.

In the United States of America, a law of sedition came into being during the tenure of President John Adams (1797-1801), which enacted the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798 making it illegal for the government of the country to be criticized. This was influenced by the fear at the time that internal dissent could adversely affect the then on-going war between the country and France. It was under the law that Thomas Cooper, a Pennsylvanian lawyer and newspaper editor was indicted, prosecuted, and convicted for his sharp criticism of President Adams (Hoffer, 2011). In many other countries, especially former British colonies, those in power at one time or the other, adopted one form of Sedition law or another for self-preservation.

In India, the law was introduced when the country was still a British colony. The main objective was to suppress an Islamic revivalist movement; led by Syed Ahmed Barelvi which organized a jihad against British rule concerning policies which the revolutionaries believed could adulterate Islam. After suppressing the movement, the British introduced the term "sedition" into the Indian Penal Code in 1870 to outlaw any speech that was capable of exciting disaffection towards the government established by law in India. According to

Section 124-A of the Indian Penal Code: “whoever, by words, either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation, or otherwise, brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt, or excites or attempts to excite disaffection towards the Government established by law in India” is deemed to have committed the offence. During the colonial era, leaders of nationalist movements were the real targets - a development which has since been extended to the media. The first known use of Sedition law against the media was recorded in India, when Jogendra Chandra Bose, editor of “Bangobasi” was charged in 1891 for his criticism of the “Age of Consent Bill” which he described as disastrous imposition of religion on Indians. Reports in the media over the years confirm the attempts by the nation’s successive governments to use the draconian law of sedition to stifle dissent. According to a BBC News reporter, “In India, you can be charged with sedition for liking a Facebook post, criticising a yoga guru, cheering a rival cricket team, drawing cartoons, asking a provocative question in a university exam, or not standing up in a cinema when the national anthem is being played” (Biswas, 2016).

In Nigeria, the law may not have had the same omnibus status, but it was similarly introduced by Britain in 1909 to deal with a critical group of leaders of nationalist movements and the media in the colony. Evidence that the colonial government was disturbed by the growth of adversarial journalism in the territory first emerged when it enacted the Newspaper Ordinance of 1903. The repressive provisions of the Ordinance notwithstanding, the colonial government faced increased media criticism which was heightened by the activities of a group of leaders of nationalist movements who were agitating for self-government (Gadzama, 2014). In reaction; Britain looked back into her records and produced the Seditious Offences Ordinance of 1909 in line with its own Sedition Act.

In recent times, some countries have reviewed and repealed the laws. A few examples would do. Britain repealed the law in 2010 beginning from the observation by a 1977 Law Commission that the offence of sedition was redundant and should be abolished in England and Wales. The proposal was however not implemented until section 73 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 abolished it with effect from January 12, 2010. In Scotland, section 51 of the Criminal Justice and Licensing Act 2010 abolished the common law offences of sedition with effect from 28 March 2011. But in many other countries, particularly in the developing world, provisions of the oppressive law still apply in different forms. In India, the Sedition law is still being actively used against social activists, political opponents and the media as evidenced by the arrest in 2012 of cartoonist Aseem Trivedi who was charged with sedition because his banners and cartoons allegedly mocked constitution, parliament and India’s national flag (Burke, 2012). Earlier in 2010, writer Arundhati Roy and SAR Gilani were arrested for allegedly making anti-Indian speech in New Delhi. In September 2014, authorities in Malaysia on suspicion of sedition arrested Susan Loone, assistant editor at Malaysiakini, an online newspaper, critical of the government. Her offence was the inclusion in her article, statements by Phee Boone Poh, a Penang State executive councilor and notable opposition activist. The recent arrest of political cartoonist Zulkiflee Anwar Ul-Haque, popularly known as Zunar, who has been charged multiple times under the Sedition Act, seems to confirm that silencing critics and suppressing opposition voices is high on the priorities of the authorities (Razaq, 2016).

In Nigeria, the situation has been the same. In June 2006, two journalists, Gbenga Aruleba and Rotimi Durojaiye were arrested by the State Security Services SSS following the transmission of a television interview in which former Senator Joseph Waku accused President Olusegun Obasanjo's government of wrongdoing. They were later jointly charged with "sedition" for writing about the presidential jet and denied bail, for about a month. At state level, another media professional, Lere Olayinka was arrested by policemen from the Ekiti State Government House in October 2012 and arraigned on a four count charge; namely, sponsoring a seditious publication against the state governor; engaging in conducts likely to cause a breach of the peace; promoting feelings of ill will and hostility between teachers and government of Ekiti and unlawfully exciting teachers against Teachers Development Needs Assessment. He was discharged and acquitted a year later. In May 2017, an online publisher, Austin Okai was charged with sedition and defamation against Governor, Yahaya Bello of Kogi State which seems to confirm that in Nigeria, state governments are probably more active in using Sedition laws to halt free speech.

In Botswana, Newspaper editor, Outsa Mokone, who managed the Sunday Standard, one of Botswana’s few independent newspapers, was arrested for sedition on account of his report on a late-night car accident involving President Ian Khama. His co-accused, Edgar Tsimane, a senior reporter allegedly fled into exile. In Bangladesh, Agence France Presse, AFP reported the arrest of veteran magazine editor, Shafik Rehman for sedition in 2016. Police claimed to have found evidence connecting him to a conspiracy to abduct and murder the premier’s son. In Liberia, a young activist, Vandalark Patrick was arrested in 2016 on charges of sedition instructively adding President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf-led government among the nation’s list of despots.

The arrests enumerated above establish beyond reasonable doubt, the commonality of interests of political leaders which is undue sensitivity to media criticisms. Such leaders however tend to forget that it is practically impossible to run a government without the media whose role is to serve as a veritable link between the government and the public. Indeed, without the media, the task of public enlightenment which can facilitate the civic responsibility of a people would be in jeopardy. This was the kernel of oral arguments by the Federation of African Journalists (FAJ) and four individual Gambian journalists living in exile in a case against the Gambia before the ECOWAS Community Court of Justice in October 2016. The Court was presented with accounts given by journalists who had been arrested, held in secret detention and tortured in the Gambia under draconian press laws providing for sedition, criminal libel and false news.

IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The main purpose of a Sedition law where it has existed or still functions has been to disallow free speech and preserve the privileged position of the ruling class. To maintain statusquo, different models and colorations of draconian laws had been introduced by those in authority, but certain segments of society especially the media have continued to challenge despotism and all forms of anti-democratic practices. Against this backdrop, this study is appropriately anchored on a combination of Theories of the Press which makes it easy to better narrate the story of the evolution of society from authoritarianism to development. It is indeed only an amalgam of the theories that explicitly explains the stages of societal development. Perhaps F. S. Siebert, T. E. Peterson and W. Schramm had sedition and its variants in mind when they propounded the ‘Authoritarian Media Theory’ and the ‘Soviet Communist Media Theory’ in 1956 and 1963 respectively. Both theories illuminate the roles of dictators and non-democrats in society who have always sought to criminalize dissent. Thereafter, the same theorists reviewed their earlier works to reflect new perspectives by propounding the ‘Libertarian or Free Press Theory’ and the ‘Social Responsibility Theory’ which combine to throw light on resistance to tyranny by the media and social activists in different countries. The latter have not been able to overturn dictatorship as represented by anti-people laws like that of sedition partly because freedom can never be absolute; it must go along with responsibility.

Dennis McQuail had imagined that the elitist nature of the media could be expanded to include individuals and small groups hence he put forward the ‘Democratic –Participant media Theory’ in 1987. Unfortunately, private media entities have been too commercially oriented while the public media have been too bureaucratic to bring meaningful social change to society. This forced McQuail to modify his position and propound the ‘Development Media Theory’ which hopefully would stretch beyond individual and group interest to over-all development of respective communities. But then, all the different segments of development; that is dictatorship and undue sensitivity to criticism, the struggle by the media for freedom and self regulation and the fears by people that the media must not be let loose, still cohabit in society, culminating in varying degrees of freedom or the lack of it across the globe. Whereas, an overview of extant case law would reveal a high degree of consensus that Sedition laws are archaic and despised, they are still in use in many countries which underscore the perception in the Theories of the Press that democratic norms and ethos are yet to be institutionalized world-wide. The implication of this for humanity is that although Sedition laws neither meet the ends of justice nor public interest, there has been no consensus on their repeal especially in developing societies.

V. A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

Developments in research have since successfully challenged the conformist idea that conventional legal research and social science methodologies are mutually exclusive. They can be interwoven. For this reason, this study adopts an interdisciplinary research approach which aggregates a law and society perspective because the crux of the study is the impact of a legal instrument on non-lawyers, especially political activists and media professionals. The study employs a lucid and chronological historical narrative of the origin, growth and development of the law of sedition in different countries so as to facilitate an x-ray of the adverse conditions of the past as a guide to current developments. This was followed by a comparative study of the gravity of Sedition laws in different jurisdictions thereby throwing light on global occurrences on the subject. In addition, selected pertinent judicial decisions in Law Reports and Journals were reviewed to find the influence of case law on the subject. Among them were the leading cases of Nigeria’s Arthur Nwankwo V The State (1985) 6NCLR 228 and India’s Kedar Nath V Union of India 1962 SC 955 which tended to have set binding precedents on Sedition cases in the two countries and beyond. Bearing in mind that a critical part of the study deals with current issues, problems and questions concerning sedition and society, free speech and journalism, the study also relied on non-legal sources to throw light on how society can benefit from law reforms on the subject. Put differently, the approach adopted in this study views law not in its technicalities but in its proper social context making it easy to evaluate the extent to which Sedition laws in particular are being adhered to in different

societies as well as how effective the law in question is, as a piece of legislation, in achieving certain societal goals

VI. DISCUSSIONS OF THEMATIC ISSUES

The unending nature of cases of sedition in some countries especially in developing societies which often follows the same pattern raises fundamental issues such as the goals of Sedition laws and the pertinent context of their reforms with special reference to their implications for journalism practice in society. These issues are probably best discussed against the backdrop of research questions formulated for this study.

Research question 1: Do Sedition laws meet the ends of justice and public interest?

The preponderance of sources in this study no doubt suggests that Sedition laws are unconstitutional. In countries such as Nigeria where the law still operates, it is clear that Sections 50 and 51 of the country's Criminal code on sedition are an affront on free speech provided for in Section 39 of the Constitution of the Federal republic 1999 and Article 9 of the African Charter on Human and People's Rights Act. The situation in India is no different as Section 124-A of the Indian Penal Code is at variance with freedom of speech and expression guaranteed by Article 19 of the Constitution. What this implies is that Sedition laws are not in the public interest. Indeed, it is germane that a statute which is inconsistent with a constitutional provision is null and void to the extent of its inconsistency. It is therefore difficult to imagine that Sedition laws could be capable of meeting the ends of justice. Hence, Ghana, a leading African liberal democracy, anxious not to be counted among conservative democrats has since repealed its variant of the law through the passage by the nation's legislature of a Bill seeking the repeal of the Criminal Libel and Seditious Laws in 2001.

Ghana's credible disposition on the subject had been amplified by case law as the judiciary in many places have shown not to be keen supporters of Sedition laws. In 2007, Indonesia's Constitutional Court had declared the Indonesian version of sedition to be unconstitutional. In 2010, a High Court in Malawi similarly acted when it declared that the country's Sedition laws were illegal because they contravened the Constitution. The posture of the judiciary to sedition is perhaps best demonstrated in Nigeria where in the classical case of *Nwankwo V. The State* (1985) 6NCLR 228, the defendant was convicted of sedition on account of an article he wrote criticising Jim Nwobodo former governor of old Anambra state. The conviction was later set aside by the Court of Appeal with a persuasive dictum that "we are no longer the illiterates or the mob society our colonial masters had in mind when the law was promulgated...Let us not diminish from the freedom gained from our colonial masters by resorting to laws enacted by them to suit their purpose." The main thrust of the above quote in the ruling by Olatawura JCA according to Falana (2017) was that Section. 51 of the Criminal Code upon which the conviction was based in the court below, was inconsistent with the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of expression just as it could be a deadly weapon that could be subjected to indiscriminate use by a corrupt government or a tyrant. Therefore, considering that Sedition laws do not meet the ends of justice, it is hard to support their continued retention. The argument that the use of such laws can stop provocative reportage of events would enjoy little logic when it is realized that many other less controversial laws exist to sustain societal stability. While reports which incite people into crime can be punished without resorting to charges of sedition, those which adversely affect the administration of justice can be redressed through contempt of court laws just as the law of defamation is available to check the practice of publishing damaging reports which attack the reputation of people. It is thus not irrational to conclude that Seditions laws are unnecessary.

Research question 2: Why has it been so difficult to repeal what many regard as obnoxious laws of sedition in developing societies?

As already established in this study, the law of sedition is an obsolete piece of legislation originated by despots in the days of the divine rights of kings to compel the loyalty and subservience of people to authorities. In the developing world, where many nation-states were colonised, such laws were found suitable for exploiting the colonies. But as societies developed, such repressive laws were repealed in many countries including colonies when they later regained independence. Surprisingly, oppressive laws such as those on sedition are still retained in the law books of many of the former colonies which are now independent countries notwithstanding that their hitherto colonial masters who originated the laws had done away with many if not all the obnoxious provisions of the laws. In addition, those, whose constitutions and judicial pronouncements have illegalised the laws; still operate them in different forms. Thus, Sedition laws have become a species which subsist amidst public outcry everywhere. This is a puzzle yet to be unravelled more so as convictions on charges of sedition are too few to validate the frequency of their use. According to the Media Legal Defence Initiative (MLDI), there are a large number of trials but very few convictions meaning that the purpose is pure harassment of journalists which defeats the essence of law (Noorlander, 2013).

The handling of charges of sedition virtually takes the same pattern of legal inhibitions in many jurisdictions. First, not everyone can institute a case on sedition as the law requires it to be done with the

consent of the Attorney General and Chief Law Officer of a nation. Second, it must be dealt within 6 months from when it first occurred. Third, for successful prosecution, each case of sedition requires more than the testimony of one witness for the purposes of corroboration. Besides, a defendant would be left off the hook if he can prove that his alleged offensive article was intended to show that a president or governor as the case may be, was misled to make certain decisions being attacked in the publication. If these factors make sedition an unattractive charge, why then is it still popularly in use? One school of thought believes in the argument of Noorlander (2013) that the attraction of the law of sedition is due to the ease with which it serves as a tool for harassing political opponents and critics. In other words, those in authority are more interested in the ability of the law to put their critics in discomfort than to secure conviction and serve as an instrument of peace and order in society.

Another major reason why the situation is not changing despite the consensus that sedition laws are bad is because many of the affected countries are heterogeneous societies which harbour numerous centrifugal forces. In such societies, the fabric of solidarity which binds society together can easily stretch to breaking point at the slightest provocation. Under such scenario, many people for fear of chaos and civil unrest tend to involuntarily support stringent laws that put critics and media professionals in check for seeming societal peace and stability. In other words, whereas many people think the law has since outlived its usefulness in a democracy which guarantees freedom of speech, they are ambivalent as to the expediency of doing away with every aspect of the law. This is because hate speeches are harmful to society and their authors ought to be made to face the aspect of the law of sedition which seeks to stop the raising of discontent among different people in a multi-ethnic country by promoting sectional and ethno-religious ill-feelings. The authorities in some countries may have bought this reasoning hence; leaders in Malaysia once claimed that the Sedition Act was needed to ensure that free speech was not used to incite violence or hatred between the different communities in the Muslim-majority nation. There are also individual members of society who are anti-media because they think media professionals are often mischievous. In Uganda, one writer vehemently opposed the decision of the country's Constitutional Court which on August 25, 2010 declared the offence of sedition as unconstitutional. Arguing that the decision of the court could encourage disrespect for the person of former President Yoweri Museveni who according to her was the father of the nation, she called for a reinstatement of the law (Jabo, 2010). With loyalists like Jabo, a government may be misled into considering itself popular and also believing that perhaps the use of Sedition law would encourage only 'constructive' criticism.

Another factor which seems to oil the wheels of charges of sedition is that although case law is largely against the frequent resort to the offence by government, the judiciary seems to have left some loopholes in the relevant judicial decisions. What is generally described as India's 'locus classicus' that is, the leading case of *Kedar Nath V Union of India AIR 1962 SC 955*. is a good example. In that case, the Supreme Court did not disapprove of the Sedition law, rather it merely warned against the arbitrary use of the law which it argued could violate the freedom of speech and expression guaranteed by the Constitution. The Court thus gave tacit support to the law especially against the backdrop of seditious speeches and expressions which may serve as 'incitement' to 'violence', or 'public disorder'. It can be argued that this may have given dictators ample room to keep the law alive for as long as they can.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A major high point in this paper is the world-wide consensus that Sedition laws are obsolete and oppressive legislations conceived before the emergence of democracy to command people's subservience to a despotic ruler. During the colonial era, it was applied to the administration of conquered territories but with developments, which witnessed the attainment of independence, many nations have repealed the laws – a trend that is yet to be institutionalized in developing societies. In the latter, critical segments of society such as activists, political opponents and media professionals face frivolous daily charges of sedition. Although the relevant laws have proven to be incapable of meeting the ends of justice, to repeal them has remained a herculean task. This has unfortunately impacted negatively on the practice of journalism in developing societies as media professionals who are under a duty to undertake public enlightenment are constrained as many of them get arrested whenever a report unfavourable to government is published. Considering that it is in developing countries, that the role of the media as the fourth estate of the realm to hold government accountable to the people is most needed, the several assaults on the media merely end up short-changing society. In the public interest therefore, this paper calls for a repeal of any law of sedition where it still exists. As canvassed earlier in the paper, there are enough laws to cover all valid offences. It is unnecessary to retain a law which events have shown is only being used to fight perceived enemies and political opponents. Based on this line of thought, this study favours the repealing of Sedition laws. Accordingly, the paper makes the following recommendations

- i. There is a need to undertake law reforms and remove from the statute books, Sedition laws and indeed all laws that are at variance with the Constitution

- ii. During the period of electioneering, civil society organizations should combine to campaign against the re-election of all undemocratic leaders with a view to dissuading leaders from working against free speech, accountability and open government.
- iii. Societal expectations from the media should be put into consideration in all dealings with them as they have no option other than to publish all news reports in line with the industry's ethical values. They are also obliged to set the national agenda as well as to serve as watch dogs to mirror the society
- iv. In order to strengthen democracy, every country should endeavour to emulate countries which have constitutionally provided for press freedom as distinct from freedom of expression. This would serve as an impetus for them to help society develop copiously.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Baatweng, V. (2014). Botswana mounts crackdown on Sunday paper retrieved 16/11/2007 from <http://www.aljazeera.com/africa/2014/09/botswana-mounts-crackdown-sunday-paper-201491411223106412.html>
- [2]. [2] Biswas, S. (2106). Why India needs to get rid of its sedition law - BBC News retrieved from on December 07, 2017 <https://www.google.com.ng/search?q=Why+India+needs+to+get+rid+of+its+sedition+law+Soutcorrespondent&oq=Why+India+needs+get+rids+of+its+sedition+law+South+Biswas+India+correspondent&aqs=chrome..69i57.2283j08&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>
- [3]. google .com.ng /search?q =Why+India+needs +to+get+rid+ of+its+sedition+law +Soutcorrespondent &oq= Why India+ needs+get+rids+of+its+sedition+law+South+Biswas+India+correspondent&aqs=chrome..69i57.2283jo8 &sourceid =chrome&ie=UTF-8
- [4]. Burke, J. (2012). Indian cartoonist Aseem Trivedi jailed after arrest on sedition charges retrieved November 22, 2017 from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/sep/10/indian-cartoonist-jailed-sedition>
- [5]. Campbell, D. (2008). The Basic Concept for the Democracy Ranking of the Quality of Democracy. Vienna: Democracy Ranking Retrieved from http://www.democracyranking.org/downloads/basic_concept_democracy_ranking_2008_A4.pdf
- [6]. Express Tribune World (2016). Bangladesh police arrest elderly editor for sedition retrieved on November 22, 2017 from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1086008/bangladesh-police-arrest-elderly-editor-for-sedition/>
- [7]. Falana, F. (2017). Illegality of the offence of criminal libel available at: <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/01/illegality-offence-Criminal-libel/>
- [8]. Gadzama, J. (2014). Media, law and good governance: A paper at a Lawyers in the Media (LIM) of the Nigerian Bar Association (NBA) forum; retrieved on November 201, 2017 from <http://thenationonlineng.net/media-law-good-governance/>
- [9]. Hoffer, P. (2011). The Free Press Crisis of 1800: Thomas Cooper's Trial for Seditious Libel: University Press of Kansas.
- [10]. Iredia, T. (2015). The media and the law in Nigeria; IOSR Journal of Humanities and social sciences. Vol. 20 Issue: 12 (Version- IV) Pp 30-36
- [11]. Jabo, J. (2010). Reinstate the Offence of Sedition in Uganda's Law Books! <https://www.mediacentre.go.ug/opinion/reinstate-offence-Sedition-uganda%E2%80%99s-law-books>
- [12]. Razaq, I. (2016). Malaysian authorities using Sedition Act to stem criticism, opposition says; retrieved on December 10, 2017 from [http://www.abc.net.au/news/updated/2016-01-08/opposition-says-authorities-using-sedition-act-to-stem-criticism/6693210](http://www.abc.net.au/news/updated/2016-01-08/opposition-says-authorities-using-sedition-act-to-stem-criticism/)
- [13]. Noorlander, P. (2013). Explaining the Issues: Sedition; retrieved on December 10, 2017 from <http://www.media defence.org/news/explaining-issues-sedition>
- [14]. Zaghلامي, L. (2016). Colonial media and post independence experience in North Africa accessed on September 13, 2017 from [https://www.google.com.ng/search?q=Zaghلامي%2C+L\(2016\).+Colonial+media+and+post+independence+experience+in+North+Africa&oq=Zaghلامي%2C+L\(2016\)](https://www.google.com.ng/search?q=Zaghلامي%2C+L(2016).+Colonial+media+and+post+independence+experience+in+North+Africa&oq=Zaghلامي%2C+L(2016))
- [15]. experience+in+North+Africa&oq=Zaghلامي%2C+L(2016)

Tonnie O Iredia PhD. "Trends In Sedition Laws: Implications For The Practice of Journalism in Developing Societies." IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) , vol. 23, no. 1, 2018, pp. 44-50.