

GLOBALISATION AND INTERNATIONAL JOURNALISM

Globalisation and the internet have created a space for news and political discourse that overrides geography and increases opportunities for non-mainstream, citizen based news sources ... the deterritorialised and globalised online zones for news and political discussion have led to important new questions about the future of traditional news media and the shape of political discourse. (Reese et al., 2007)

This chapter examines the different approaches to understanding the impact of global change on the nature of international journalism. To assess the impact we must be clear about what we are discussing. Both 'globalisation' and 'international journalism' are simple but elusive concepts. Traditionally, international journalism is equated with foreign correspondence. Many assumptions are made about the nature of 'foreign correspondence' which ignore the porous borders that have always existed between domestic *and* foreign news. Foreign news comes in different shapes and forms and the gathering, reporting and dissemination of international news has been undertaken by a variety of actors in a range of organisational contexts serving numerous objectives and interests. Understanding what is meant by 'globalisation' is not easy (McGillivray, 2006). There is 'no single coherent theory of globalisation' and the empirical data generated to assess the impact of global change is limited and contradictory (Held et al., 1999: 436). The media are full of references to 'globalisation', with newspapers, magazines, television news and other media forms carrying stories, comment and analysis of how globalisation is responsible for a plethora of events and occurrences. It seems that, every day, politicians around the world call forth 'globalisation' to justify support for this policy or to extol us to take that form of action. Everything from the problems of the collapse of the banking system to the decline of English football is attributed to what former British Prime Minister Tony Blair described as the 'inevitable and irresistible' process of globalisation. Despite having 'invaded our consciousness' (Tae Kim and Weaver, 2003) uncertainties cloud the meaning of the concept of globalisation.

As well as defining the terms that are central to our discussion of the way in which the world is reported, the chapter outlines three different approaches to understanding international journalism in an 'age of globalisation'. The first approach is to focus on the *homogenisation* of foreign news and reporting brought about by the standardisation of journalism around the world. According to Mark Deuze (2005: 444) 'the twentieth century history of ... journalism can be typified by the consolidation of a consensual occupational ideology among journalists in different parts of the world'. Globalisation is seen as encouraging the development of a universal set of values around the practice and output of the contemporary international journalism. The way in which international journalism has been universalised is a matter of debate. It is most commonly argued that the Anglo-American model has become the universal yardstick by which the profession should be practised. However, the export of Anglo-American journalism is not uniformly regarded as a positive development.

The second approach postulates the emergence of a radically new form of journalism described as *global journalism*. It is seen as a response to the new realities of a globalised international society that is more 'transnational' or 'cosmopolitan' in composition. Globalisation has 'weakened the connection between journalism and its traditional nation-state base ...' (Reese, 2008: 240). For Peter Berglez (2008: 847) 'global journalism is endowed with particular epistemology, defined as the global outlook', which produces interpretations of the world that are different from the national outlooks within which journalism has traditionally framed social reality. Globalisation and technology are also seen as undermining the professional and industrial foundations that have traditionally supported international reporting, removing the need for specialised foreign correspondents. The rise of 'do-it-yourself' foreign reporting facilitated by the internet has, some would argue, increased the number of 'foreign correspondents' who, 'equipped with camcorders and computers will send out and receive more foreign dispatches' (Utley, 1997: 9). The third approach asserts, or perhaps we should say reasserts, the role of the nation-state in determining the theory and practice of journalism in the global era (see de Burgh, 2005). It seeks to emphasise that foreign correspondence remains *heterogeneous* in its practices, performance and values. National cultures, politics and societies shape the practice and performance of foreign reporting throughout the world. This can be seen in a number of different ways: the 'domestication' of foreign news, the desire of news audiences around the world for local interpretations and analysis of events, the rise of new regional and local news actors, and the advent of new media organisations that are non-western in outlook.

Foreign correspondence

Foreign correspondence – or international journalism¹ – usually describes news media coverage of what is happening outside the home state and the processes by which it is obtained. What constitutes ‘foreign’ news is delineated from ‘domestic’ news with the presumption that there are clear differences between the peoples of different nations. It is what happens to ‘them’, and the implication is that what happens to ‘them’ has nothing to do with ‘us’ (Vargas and Paulin, 2007: 20). The word ‘foreign’ implies that what is reported is alien, strange and unfamiliar. This clear delineation of ‘domestic’ and ‘foreign’ news is the product of the development of nation-states and national media systems. Print and broadcast journalism has grown within the framework of the nation-state: newspapers, radio and television have been organised on a national basis serving the informational needs of the state, commerce and civil society.

The close connection between modern national identities and the media is emphasised by Benedict Anderson (1983) who theorises that individuals were able to imagine themselves as members of the modern nation through their consumption of the newspaper and print media. The growth of print culture enabled people who never met one another to feel, for the first time, that they were part of the same ‘imagined community’ – the nation. Broadcasting in most parts of the world has been committed to ‘serving the nation’; the motto of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) that ‘nation should speak truth unto nation’ illustrates the national remit of public service broadcasting. Most countries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries established national news agencies to communicate national news to the world. These agencies played a crucial role in the consolidation of the modern nation-state, participating in the national rivalries that characterised international relations in this era.

The centrality of national interests, needs and considerations to the emergence of the media ensured that international news would be defined as news about and between nations. National news agencies were closely associated with government, usually financed and funded by them and highly dependent on official sources of information. Many had started as commercial ventures to provide foreign news to their national and provincial newspapers, but most of them came under the aegis of state control and/or patronage. While legally and politically committed to independence from political influence, national news agencies closely identified with the nation-state perspective of events and issues.

The agencies were vital components in the armoury of the nation state: then as now, the agencies were among the range of institutions which new nation states came to feel they had to establish in order to be seen as credible as nations and in order to project or control the dissemination of the ‘national image’ on global markets. (Boyd-Barrett and Rantanen, 1998: 5)

This close identification not only shaped the practices of the national agencies and national media but also influenced the values used to select foreign news.

The notion that foreign news is about events that happen outside national borders is deemed inadequate by many scholars and practitioners in capturing what appears – and has appeared – in print and on screen. International news comes in different packages: foreign news abroad, home news abroad and foreign news at home (Hahn and Lonnendonker, 2009: 6). What we take as the customary form of international news is that which covers stories about countries and peoples abroad which have no impact, effect or relevance to home audiences. However, most news media focus more on the latter two categories; according to Kai Hafez (2007: 39) ‘most of the time, international reporting in media systems around the world is produced for domestic audiences, not for the regions in question themselves’. Adapting international stories to domestic concerns and interests is a means of ensuring that foreign news relates to the viewers, readers and listeners at home (Golding and Elliott, 1979: 156). *Home news abroad* concentrates on events which are directly linked or of direct interest to domestic audiences. What happens to fellow citizens abroad or the foreign travels of domestic leaders or celebrities are examples of such stories. *Foreign news at home* is the other side of this coin; such stories include visits by foreign heads of state or dignitaries, international conferences on home soil or domestic reactions to major international issues. Foreign correspondence often involves making a ‘link between foreign news coverage and domestic coverage’ and ‘transporting domestic references or concerns to foreign news abroad’ (Hahn and Lonnendonker, 2009: 6).

This has implications for understanding what foreign correspondents do and what foreign correspondence is. Definitions of the ‘foreign correspondent’ are few and far between. Scholars have bombarded foreign correspondents – mainly those working for western organisations or in major news centres such as Washington and London – with mailed questionnaires since the mid 1950s (for example, Lambert, 1956; Mowlana, 1975; Ghorpade, 1984; Morrison and Tumber, 1985; Hess, 1996; Wilnat and Weaver, 2003; Wu and Hamilton, 2004). While generating considerable information about their background and working practices, no-one has provided a detailed definition of foreign correspondence and foreign reporting. One standard way of defining a foreign correspondent is ‘a journalist who works in a state different from one in which his [sic] information-medium is located’ (Hahn and Lonnendonker, 2009: 3). Traditionally, the largest employers of foreign correspondents have been the international news agencies – a select number of national news agencies that morphed in the nineteenth century into international news providers (see Chapter 2). Their allegiance to the ‘nation’ has been a matter of conjecture as a result of their commercial objective of providing news for outlets in a variety of countries. Many national news organisations have for most of their history maintained their own correspondents in key locations abroad.

Most of those we characterise as 'great foreign correspondents' worked for distinguished national titles. These are usually believed to be nationals of the country in which the news organisation is located – history indicates that this assumption is problematic. The gatherers of foreign news have traditionally come in many shapes and sizes, and from numerous national backgrounds. Long stay correspondents, the men and women assigned to cover a country, region or beat – the bureau correspondents – are seen as typifying the foreign news reporter. But from the very early days the roving reporter sent to cover 'hot spots' or major news stories in remote parts of the world – what we label parachute journalism today – have figured prominently in the foreign news gathering business. Long before air transportation enhanced the ability of reporters to drop into breaking news stories across the world, reporters jumped off trains, boats, horses and carriages or whatever form of transport was available to cover stories (Erickson and Hamilton, 2007). The distinction between the long stay reporter and the parachute journalist has been a feature of foreign correspondence since its earliest days. The struggles between the two types of reporters and their different *modi vivendi* have always had a bearing on the nature of international news.

Much foreign news is not gathered in the field but by other kinds of correspondents based in the home country. Tensions between the 'field' and 'home office' figure prominently in the history of international news gathering. This is not only a product of the way in which those in the home office edit copy, crop pictures and splice film to fit their understanding of the story but also the result of the flow of information from diplomatic, political and other home-based correspondents. The reporting of one of the 'big stories' of the twentieth century – the Vietnam War – is often characterised as a battle between two press corps, the Washington-based reporters and the Saigon correspondents, which fed the media two different and mutually exclusive pictures of events. Several Saigon-based reporters spoke of their editors ignoring what they were telling them in favour of the Washington version (Knightley, 1975: 376). Struggles inside media organisations are a feature of all kinds of news reporting but are keenly felt in the case of foreign news stories: a large newspaper such as Japan's *Yomiuri Shimbun* would have – on an average news day – two pages of foreign news, which means its large network of 60 foreign correspondents based in around 30 countries faces acute competition for space (Hannerz, 2004: 67).

Another important distinction in the world of foreign correspondence is between full time and freelance reporters. Mark Pedelty (1995), in his examination of the press corps covering the bitter civil war in the El Salvador in the early 1980s, differentiates between A Team and B Team correspondents. The A Team are usually staff correspondents who work for major news outlets, have regular access to official sources of information, a regular salary, reside in the best hotels and usually appear when the story enters its crisis phase. The B Team are part timers who are hired for their local knowledge. They can be local nationals or

foreign nationals who are resident in the country. 'Stringers' and 'fixers' are often local journalists who supplement what is in many parts of the world a meagre income to supply news for larger and usually foreign news organisations. The 'staff' and 'stringers' distinction is a feature of the reporting of many major foreign news stories. Pedelty (1995) describes the tensions and interdependency of the two groups, drawing attention to the different type of foreign news reporting produced by each. The staff reporter is perceived as trapped within 'disciplinary apparatuses' (1995: 5) that favour particular forms of knowledge and privilege certain discourses. He or she is subject to the 'editorial discipline' of the news organisation (1995: 76). While stringers are not 'under the editor's constant eye' they are subject to the commercial pressure to sell their expertise and stories to different media outlets. They are also perceived as less detached from local conditions – stringers are seeking to sell their familiarity which, in the words of one staff correspondent who covered the war in El Salvador, 'can lead to pretty strong emotions towards the story' (1995: 75). Hannerz (2004: 74) makes a distinction between 'freelancers' and 'stringers'; the latter have 'a bit longer term relationship with media organisations'. Many stringers seek to advance to a staff position. Freelancers on the other hand struggle to maintain their independence from editorial control. Writing for a variety of publications is part of this struggle but the commercial need to 'sell' stories means they are enthralled to the news organisations as much if not more than staff reporters.

The 'team' aspect of foreign news reporting must be emphasised – while the audience is accustomed to seeing star reporters on their screens (such as CNN's Christine Amanpour and BBC's John Simpson) or reading them in print (such as John Pilger), most foreign news gatherers work relatively anonymously and as part of a team. Covering a story for television has for most of the post-war period involved a sizable entourage, including a sound recordist and camera worker. Many print reporters are accompanied on their travels by photographers. The relationship between reporter and support staff has often been characterised as difficult, with camera workers and photographers portrayed as taking greater risks to get the story (Behr, 1978; Marinovich and Silva, 2001). Getting the pictures, particularly in relation to television, is as important as the words and the outcome of an often uneasy collaboration. The notion of the lone correspondent perpetuated by news organisations and practised by a few mavericks such as Ryszard Kapuściński (see Chapter 4) belies the fact that for most of the post-war period foreign reporting in the field has been done by a team of media workers. This is changing with the advent of new technology but traditionally foreign correspondents are involved in a process of conflict and collaboration which determines the kind of news we receive.

Supply-side explanations of foreign correspondence must also focus on the role of home editors in determining what foreign news is. News organisations are hierarchical and editors exercise considerable control over the news agenda. The contours of the foreign news coverage, it is argued, reflect

the ways in which editors deploy their correspondents. Some parts of the world 'generate more foreign news because they have more foreign journalists' (Van Ginnekin, 1998: 143). Economic and organisational factors are crucial in determining what is reported. Surveys have also shown that home editors perceive their audiences are relatively uninterested in foreign news. This perception shapes their coverage of events overseas. It leads us to ask what readers, listeners and viewers actually want. The audiences for foreign news have not figured prominently in the discussion of foreign news reporting (Berger, 2009). The limited attention paid to what people want produces a range of contradictory data: more people appear to be interested in foreign news than editors believe and they appear to want different kinds of stories than they often receive. It is also possible to say that audiences in certain parts of the world have historically been more open to news from abroad.

There are two final points about the nature of foreign correspondence. The first relates to the variety of forms of knowledge by which correspondents and their organisations serve up accounts of what is happening in the world. Scholarly literature tends to focus on the 'news' – this is the primary way by which what foreign reporters see, hear and are told reaches the majority of the public. The restrictions that news as a form of knowledge places on what is reported have been thoroughly dissected. However, there are other outlets that foreign correspondents – as with other specialist reporters – use to tell us what is happening. Backgrounders, features and more analytical pieces, columns and special documentaries – recently joined by blogs – are some of the means by which foreign reporters escape the straight jacket imposed by news on what they can communicate. The BBC's John Simpson used a column in the *Sunday Telegraph* to express his opinions about world and other events – something his employers eventually believed impaired the commitment to objectivity they demanded. Over the years reporters have resorted to books to convey their truth of the events they have witnessed. In fact, reporters such as Kapuściński, who spent most of his working life as a reporter for the Polish National News Agency (PAP), have acquired their reputation as foreign correspondents based on their 'literary' not their news output.

The second point is intrinsic to the word 'foreign': foreign correspondents continually have to make the unfamiliar familiar to their audiences. Crossing cultural barriers and interpreting cultural difference is central to activity of foreign correspondence. A critical aspect of this is the process of 'translation'. Bielsa and Bassett (2009: 2) relate how international journalism conceives of translation as more than an inter-lingual activity; it is a process by which information is 'reshaped, edited, synthesized and transformed for the consumption of a new set of readers'. INAs produce news texts for the different markets they serve; linguistic and cultural knowledge combine to produce information that conforms to the journalistic norms of the regions and satisfies the demands of their audiences. The dominance of languages such as English – one in three

internet users is an English speaker and more than 50 per cent of the content of the medium is English – means many stories are ‘translated’ into English before being re-translated into other languages. The translation of global news therefore has implications for how readers, viewers and listeners around the world understand what is happening and the meaning of events. There are ‘serious questions about the extent to which we can ever know what was and what was not said in another cultural context’ (2009: 132).

What is globalisation?

We can all accept that the world is undergoing considerable change. More problematic is how we make sense of the change and its impact on our lives. Globalisation is a catch-all concept used to explain the effects of the growing interaction of the international economy, the rise of supranational entities that limit or bind the actions of nation-states, the increasing intermingling of cultures across the world and the rising awareness peoples in all parts of the world have of what is happening elsewhere. Robertson (1992: 8) describes globalisation as ‘the compression of the world’, emphasising the increased interactions and interconnectedness between peoples, groups and organisations across national borders and boundaries. Interaction and interconnectedness is enabling the emergence of a transnational or global culture or society. While travel, tourism and migration fuel connectivity, there can be ‘no globalisation without media and communications’ (Rantanen, 2002: 1). The growth of the global media and cultural industries is perhaps the most significant of all the transformations that are supposedly bringing us all closer together. These industries have increased the speed and volume of information, images and entertainment that the individual receives on a daily, hourly or minute by minute basis. They are making people more aware of the commonality of the problems the world faces as well as enhancing consciousness of other places, other peoples and other lifestyles. New media technologies are singled out as central to the weaving of a web of interconnectivity between people, cultures and countries, breaking down the limitations of geography and nation, of time and place.

The globalisation debate is characterised by a ‘wide array of claims and counterclaims’ (Scholte, 2005: 2). Sceptics believe globalisation is neither inevitable nor widespread and some dismiss the concept as a ‘myth’ (Hafez, 2007; Ferguson, 1992). For Hafez (2007: 159), increased cross border exchange is not necessarily leading to greater connectivity, or changing the political, social and cultural systems of the nations involved or acting as the midwife to the emergence of a global public sphere or civil society or culture. He argues that globalisation is developing to ‘a far more modest degree and at a far slower pace than is generally assumed’. For sceptics nation-states, which are supposedly withering away in the face of greater

global interconnectedness, retain their hold over political, economic and cultural life and activity. They see globalisation as a 'flawed conceptual tool' which has significant limitations in helping us to understand contemporary international relations (Hirst and Thompson, 1996; Sparks, 1998, 2008). It is important to emphasise that 'globalisation' is a contested term; it is also the case that there are different kinds of proponents of globalisation.

Among those who embrace the view that globalisation is 'real and tangible', there is a distinction between *positive* and *pessimistic globalisers*. The former focus on the capacity of globalisation 'to improve the quality of life, raise living standards and bring people together, which, in turn, promotes the sharing of cultures and understanding among nations around the world' (Held, 2000: 22). The transfer of values, resources, goods, aid, technology, ideas and media and communication systems across the world is beneficial; it helps these nations to grow economically, develop politically and socially and ultimately contributes to the eradication of poverty and backwardness. *Pessimistic globalisers* believe that the world is becoming 'less diverse and more homogeneous' with the dominant world powers able to 'impose their own agenda on the world' with 'a diminution of national identities and sovereignty' (Held et al., 1999: 22). They deem the interaction to be harmful, imposing alien values which undermine the cultural identities of most of the peoples of the world and removing their cultural autonomy. Both concur that greater interconnectivity is breaking down national boundaries, diminishing differences between nations and peoples and promoting the development of new global structures (Held, 2000: chapter 2). Globalisation assumes some degree of homogeneity resulting from the exchange of goods, values, ideas and beliefs. It is the consequences theorists disagree over. Simon Cottle (2009: 28) draws a distinction between these two approaches on the basis of power, pitting the 'global public sphere' against the 'global dominance' paradigm. Positive globalisers embrace the notion that people are coming together to create a 'world cosmopolitan citizenship' (2009: 28). People are described as having a disposition that not only takes them beyond the concerns of their immediate locality but also makes them more open to inter-cultural knowledge (Hannerz, 1992, 1996; Holton, 2009). They have a sense of global belonging and an international outlook – they are 'citizens of the world' (Norris, 1999). Globalisation is seen as a process of 'hybridisation', which focuses on different cultures travelling across borders to influence one another and create out of their interaction a new culture that respects and embraces difference. Pessimistic globalisers, on the other hand, stress the inequality of global interaction, focusing on the extension of capitalism, corporate power and American or western influence. Interconnectedness is determined by the few rather than the

many – and in particular by the US which, in spite of the vast changes that are taking place, is ‘still in charge’ (Schiller, 1998: 17).

The global village

Positive globalisation is often associated with the Canadian philosopher Marshall McLuhan, who coined the notion of the ‘global village’ in the 1960s. McLuhan emphasised the role of new media technology in shaping international relations. He believed in an equality of exchange between those involved in interactions across national borders and asserted that increased international interaction results in better understanding between peoples, cultures and countries. He concluded that the expansion of television and satellite technology would bring about a world in which we could all live alongside one another as neighbours in a global village. He wrote that ‘after more than a century of electronic technology we have extended our central nervous system in a global embrace, abolishing both time and space as far as our planet is concerned’ (McLuhan, 1964: 3). Suffused with an overly romantic view of village life, McLuhan was positive about the impact of technology on social relations. McLuhan’s small world was characterised by greater understanding, better cooperation and a more fully developed sense of community. Peace and harmony, watchwords of the 1960s when his work was published, were the outcome of greater understanding and cooperation. The universalising of values such as democracy and greater access to ideas, values and even material goods were the foundations of life in the global village. For McLuhan the explosion of communication, information and interconnectivity was a liberating force.

McLuhan’s conceptualisation of globalisation as a positive, unifying force was not new. Usage of the term ‘globalisation’ may be relatively recent but the developments it refers to have long antecedents. Attention has been drawn to the ‘ahistorical manner’ in which contemporary discussion of globalisation often takes place (Morley, 2006). Armand Mattelart (1996) has traced the discourse of ‘globalisation’ and its attendant hype back to the end of the eighteenth century. He reminds us that every technological innovation in media communication that has speeded up international interaction has been accompanied by the propagation of ‘the grand narratives of general concord and social reconciliation’ (1996: 19). The remarks of the novelist and journalist Victor Hugo, in his opening address at the International Congress of Peace, 1849, remind us that the connection between the shrinkage of time-space by the extension of international communication networks *and* the expansion of peace and understanding between nations and peoples is a recurrent theme in the history of new media forms (Hugo, quoted in Mattelart, 1996: 20).

How peoples touch each other! How distances are growing shorter! And growing closer is the beginning of fraternity ... in a short time man will be able to travel the Earth just as the gods of Homer travelled the sky, in three steps. Just a few more years and the electric wire of concord will embrace the whole world.

Philip Taylor (1997: 7–9) highlights how Hugo's sentiments have echoed down the years. There is the belief that new means of communicating between peoples help to 'transcend ... race, creed, culture, class and country'. Every media technology has been seen as the internet is today, as a means of promoting international understanding.

Putting aside the crude assumption that the more we know about and interact with one another, the better we get along, the concept of the 'global village' was problematic in the eyes of many, particularly those who lived in villages in the developing world. Not all villagers had access to the benefits of the new media technologies. A variety of critics have drawn attention to the disparities between the nations, peoples and individuals in this world of ever expanding media hardware and software. Cees Hamelink (1983) challenges the basic assumptions on which McLuhan's concept of the 'global village' is constructed. For him the world is not a place where everyone talks to everyone else, where people know a great deal about each other and where everyone has social and cultural experiences in common. On the contrary it is a community in which only a few voices are heard, opinions expressed and images viewed (Traber and Nordenstreng, 1992). Distinction is made between the *information rich* and *information poor* in the global village. Many parts of the world are deprived of access to the benefits of the global information and communication revolution. Considerable disparities exist between developed and developing countries. Nation is not speaking unto nation in a world dominated by an unequal distribution of information and information technology.

Emphasising such disparities is regarded by some commentators as out of date, associated with old technologies whose usefulness to the world of international communication is fading away. Today's new digital technology is bridging the information imbalance, turning a monologue into a conversation between many. The internet, mobile phones and other forms of digital technology offer new opportunities, enabling those previously lacking access to information the chance to join in the global chatter. Mobile phone usage has increased considerably everywhere, even in Sub-Saharan Africa, one of the world's most information poor regions (James and Versteeg, 2007; Tenhunen, 2008). The rate of acceptance of the internet in Africa is described as 'the most remarkable in the world' (Sonaike, 2004: 46). However, the facts and figures show that Africa, like the rest of the Third World, is on the wrong side of the digital divide. With one user per 190 people, Africa compares unfavourably with the world average of one user for every 15 people.

Many people do not have access to the new media technology, in the same way as they were deprived of the old media. Similar complaints are levelled at the new technologies; the language of the internet is primarily English and the costs of accessing mobile telephony and the internet are prohibitive for most of the people who live in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Golding (1998: 79) points out that the 'arrival of new communication and information technologies has offered the promise of a more egalitarian, participatory and progressive structure', but 'in practice, the reality has been of their rapid incorporation into familiar structures of inequity and commercial exploitation'. He prefers to describe international interaction as 'cultural pillage', placing his analysis firmly in the camp of pessimistic globalisers.

The global village is also imbalanced in terms of values, ideas and lifestyles. What villagers are talking about, the products they are buying and things they are doing are seen as overwhelmingly shaped by 'western values'. The huge global audiences attracted by television programmes such as *Dallas*, *Bonanza* and *Hawaii 5-0* in the 1970s and 1980s are cited as evidence of the dissemination of western values and lifestyle around the world. The success of western products such as Levi jeans, Ford cars and Nike shoes is seen as an example of the disproportionate emphasis attached to western lifestyles. The growing similarity of downtown city centres on all continents with their Holiday Inns, McDonalds and shopping malls attest to the increasing replication of western urban structures. The emergence of English as a global lingua franca reinforces the notion that western ways of doing things are more valued. These are all examples of how local, authentic cultures around the world are, in Jeremy Tunstall's graphic description, being 'battered out of existence' by the flow of images, ideas and products from the West or, more specifically, from the United States (Tunstall, 1977). The predominance of western products, lifestyle and values around the world is evidence that undermines McLuhan's view of an exchange of equals. Technological change and the global marketplace of ideas and experience might bring the world closer together, drawing in even the most remote areas of the world. But for McLuhan's critics this is happening on the terms of the few; the global village is steeped in western values, beliefs and lifestyles.

Local and/or global

One major assumption of positive and pessimistic globalisers is that expanding interconnectedness threatens the ability of nation-states to exercise control over their territories and citizens, making state governance increasingly unviable. Globalisation is leading to the 'withering away' of the nation-state. Nation-states in the form of territorial, bureaucratic and centralised entities which govern virtually every aspect of social relations within their borders

have 'reigned supreme over the vast majority of humanity' for the last 350 or more years (Scholte, 2005: 188). National sovereignty – that is – the exclusive right of the state to exercise power within its own territory, was established by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The quantity and speed of contemporary global information flows impedes the efforts of the state to exercise surveillance over its borders. Citizens are every day making more and more connections with one another outside the control of the nation-state, and in the process forming new identities and weakening their allegiance to the nation. In addition, supranational bodies of one form or another reduce the legal, economic and political powers of the nation-state.

Supranational actors come in a variety of forms – positive globalisers tend to emphasise the rise of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), people power and global political actors such as the EU, while pessimists concentrate more on multinational or transnational corporations (TNCs). Positive globalisers focus on transborder links between organisations ranging from sporting bodies such as FIFA to NGOs like Greenpeace and Amnesty International, from the proliferation of regional, multilateral agreements and organisations to the expansion of international political bodies such as OPEC, NATO and the OECD. They tend to foresee this expansion of global political activity as leading to the emergence of global governance, usually based on the extension of democracy and human rights. The most optimistic globalisers believe technology offers the possibility of global democracy by liberating individuals everywhere to communicate their views and opinions. Pessimistic globalisers stress the negative impact of global economic interaction, especially the rise of the global firm. Global media firms such as Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation have become key players in determining the nature of global communication and act as the main gatekeepers of the flow of information around the world. They have been described as the 'lords of the global village' and the 'new rulers of the world' (Pilger, 2002). They are represented as 'operating unchecked in national, regional and global settings, creating their own rules, acting at will, constantly expanding and having limitless power to grow larger than ever' (Picard, 1996: 24). This may exaggerate the power of TNCs which are subject to vagaries of competition (see Compaine, 2002). It is also challenged by free marketers who ascribe to the benefits of the extension of capitalism. But the growing concentration of economic and cultural power in the hands of a smaller number of international corporations is seen as a threat to democracy, cultural diversity and the capacity and ability of governments to make economic, cultural and political decisions. TNCs are seen as the 'missionaries' of capitalism and consumerist values (Herman and McChesney, 1997).

The media are undergoing a fundamental transformation in the era of globalisation. Previously bound within the parameters of the nation-state, national in their scope and output, the media have played a key role in helping to forge national identities (Anderson, 1983; Gellner, 1983;

Billig, 1995). By contrast, the global media are producing material that is 'increasingly detached from the specific tastes of national audiences'. Now the media facilitate the emergence of a transnational culture, drawing on symbols, products and images that come from anywhere in the world. The relationship between the 'local' and the 'global' is posited in theoretical terms primarily as either/or, as mutually exclusive categories, and the rise of the global is portrayed as happening at the expense of the local or national. This binary approach is problematic. The interaction between the local and global is characterised by a variety of forms: the emergence of cultures which combine global and local elements, the adoption of the values of another, alien culture and the revitalisation of traditional sub-national local cultures. Hafez (2007: 5) draws attention to the 'complex processes of indigenization and local adaptation which play a role both in the import of media and the construction of world views within international reporting'. The complexity is acknowledged in the term 'glocalisation' (Robertson, 1994).

Globalisation is not simply a clash between the 'global' and the 'national', a collision of opposing trends juxtaposing homogenisation *and* heterogenisation or assimilation *and* resistance. The presentation of the global and national as antagonistic ignores the fact that as a result of the new media technology we can be in two places at once; the global and local are part of the same process. Global change may be transforming national culture, media and identity but the nature of this transformation is unclear, often exaggerated and it is something that has been taking place for much longer than many proponents of globalisation believe. Things national are not disappearing, they are merely adapting as they have always done. Interconnectivity has its roots deep in history; whether you identify different stages or phases of globalisation or whether you describe globalisation prior to present times as 'incipient', making international connections in a sustained and organised way started way back in history. The growth of 'empire', which saw European societies make connections with all parts of the known world, is associated with the rise of the nation-state and modern society from the late fifteenth century onwards (see Darwin, 2007; Brook, 2008).

The theoretical differences between positive and pessimistic globalisers resonate in the debates within UNESCO in the late 1970s and early 1980s over calls to restructure the international information order. In this debate positive globalisers were associated with 'modernisation theory' while pessimists with the concept of 'cultural imperialism'. These different theoretical outlooks laid down much of the thinking that has shaped the contrary interpretations of globalisation discussed above. If modernisation looked forward to the possible benefits and opportunities posed by technological progress and commercial change, cultural imperialism looked back to the political certainties of colonialism, which had been the primary defining experience

for most peoples, nations, communities and individuals in encountering each other at the global level. This theoretical disagreement has shaped not only our understanding of globalisation but also the nature of foreign correspondence.

Both theoretical approaches accept that there is a transfer of resources, values and practices from the West to the rest. Modernisation theory believed that the transfer was an integral part of the efforts to promote development in Africa, Asia and Latin America during the 1950s and 1960s. As part of the efforts to bring about social and economic change, attempts were made to create a 'professional class of communicator'. Golding (1977) describes how western forms, practices and norms were imitated by professionals in the Third World. Most of the models for selecting, gathering and processing news inside the Third World are based on US, British or European newsroom structures and norms. American structures were often – and still are – transferred as part of 'tied aid' packages with finance made available to replicate US practices and news values. Training and education programmes supported by the UN and western government and non-government programmes inculcated western skills, values and attitudes. Journalism schools were set up with funds from the United States across many parts of the Third World (Schiller, 1976: 11). Based on programmes patterned on those in the United States and Western Europe, trainees absorbed Anglo-American notions of journalism and the role of journalism in society. The commitment to objectivity, the basis for selecting news and the autonomy of the professional, as well as the verbal and visual techniques required to present the news, were implanted into the emerging professional in the Third World. Media scholarship was also dominated by Anglo-American thinking and provided a readily accessible theoretical model – the 'Four Theories of the Press' – which pushed aside other ways of conceptualising journalism and media systems (1976: 257).

Ignoring the question of whether these values actually capture how the media perform in western societies, the Anglo-American model of journalism was seen by the cultural imperialism thesis as not appropriate to conditions in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The failure of UN efforts to bring about development in the Third World meant that the gap between rich and poor actually widened as the take-off predicted by modernisation theory failed to materialise. This led to a reassessment of the impact of western products, values and ways of doing things on Third World societies. Westernisation came to be seen as detrimental to development. Western countries, and in particular the world's dominant power, the United States – according to cultural imperialism theorists – exploited the countries of the Third World to serve their own economic and political interests. Scholars such as Dallas Smythe (1981), Armand Mattelart (1979), Cees Hamelink (1983) and, above all, Herb Schiller (1969, 1976), described how the importation of western products and values maintained the 'structural under-development' of the Third

World. Michael Traber (1985) was one of many who called for the development of a form of journalism more conducive to Third World societies. He called for alternative news values which emphasised non-prominent people, 'good' news, a new way of writing about events and an emphasis on stories which stressed social processes rather than events. Traber's questioning of the appropriateness of the western model of journalism was part of a broader re-evaluation of the impact of western values and practices. This re-evaluation became highly politicised in the 1970s as pressures for change grew.

MacBride and a new order

The battle of ideas between 'modernisation' and 'cultural imperialism' was not simply a dispute between academics. Waged with some intensity during the 1970s, it often spilled over into real war as the struggle for national economic liberation inside the South was subsumed into the rivalry of the Cold War. More often it was fought out within the UN system with calls for a NWICO as a necessary step toward the restructuring of the world's economic system. Many Third World governments and their supporters in the West were critical of the way in which calls for economic reform and justice were either ignored or misinterpreted by the international media. The MacBride Report,² published after nearly four years of discussion, debate and disagreement (Alstchull, 1995: chapter 17) defined communication as a human right and criticised the international coverage of the western media, blaming misrepresentation of the Third World on the market and commercial considerations which dictated the work of the news agencies and international broadcasters. To rectify the imbalance in the international communication flows and structures MacBride made a number of recommendations. As with all UN Reports they were expressed in broad and sometimes vague terms in order to attain as much agreement as possible. Besides calling for more resources and technical aid, MacBride put forward a number of recommendations to make media systems around the world more responsive to their own particular needs as well as redress the imbalances and distortions seen as endemic to international news. Encouraging national news agencies, preferencing public service media, promoting radio over television, limiting the concentration of media ownership and providing a right of reply to misreporting were among the proposals made.

The report said a lot about journalistic standards and the news values that underpinned the reporting of international news. Standards could be improved by more appropriate training for journalists in the Third World, the introduction of a code of ethics and the improvement of accountability to the public through the establishment of press or media councils. However, it was the

means to improve international reporting that took up much of the discussion of journalism standards. All countries were urged to make greater efforts to admit foreign correspondents and facilitate their reporting. Better education in the languages, politics and cultures of the nations to which correspondent were assigned was advocated. The report recommended that editors in developed countries – the international news ‘gatekeepers’ – become ‘more familiar with the cultures and conditions in developing countries’. More protection for journalists to do their job everywhere was proposed. The Commission also wanted a thorough reassessment of conventional news values, which it believed were at the heart of the poor reporting of the Third World.

Conventional standards of news selection and reporting, and many accepted news values, need to be re-assessed if readers and listeners around the world are to receive a more faithful and comprehensive account of events, movements and trends in both developing and developed worlds. The inescapable need to interpret unfamiliar situations in terms that will be understood by a distant audience should not blind reporters or editors to the hazards of narrow ethnocentric thinking ... (quoted in Richstad and Anderson, 1981: 391)

This call was made in the context of a critique of the negative influence of market pressures in shaping the nature of national and international news and the dominance of global corporations over international communication and media structures.

The failure of the MacBride Commission to criticise government involvement in the media and the restrictions placed by some Third World governments on the flow of information at the same time they condemned the market was the basis of its rejection by many western organisations and journalists. MacBride was charged with seeking to impose state control over the media. The system he proposed would, according to one Fleet Street editor, ‘impose a State version of truth: a monotonous official lie’ (O’Brien, 1980: 7). Western editors found support from some of their colleagues in the Third World who saw UNESCO as strengthening the power of governments at the expense of an ‘independent press’. As one East African editor put it: ‘People forget that government held all the power before independence. It still holds all of the power. My fight for intellectual freedom is more important to me than the fight against Americanisation’ (quoted in Smith, 1980: 40). While the debate about a new information order was conducted in the corridors of the UN by national governments, journalists all over the Third World struggled to establish independent centres of opinion against the increasingly authoritarian stance their governments took to media freedom. UNESCO’s efforts to implement a NWICO were ultimately stymied by Britain and America’s withdrawal from the organisation in the mid 1980s (see Atwood and Murphy, 1982; Roach, 1987, 1997). They were eventually swept away with the fall of Communism and the vast and rapid technological changes that spread through the international media and communication industries. The ideological

struggle around a NWICO prevented a full and informed discussion of the nature and the impact of western values, attitudes and practices on developing societies.

Westernisation or what?

The debate over McLuhan's concept of the 'global village' highlights two different and diametrically opposed views of interaction between the 'West' and the rest of the world. Whether detrimental or beneficial, the impact of the West and western values is central to the debate about global change and international journalism. Identifying what is meant by 'western values' is problematic, as is any assessment of the impact of these values on other societies. Many scholars have questioned the notion of westernisation (Latouche, 1996). Jonathan Hardy (2008: 1) notes the term 'western' has 'various dimensions and patterns of inclusion and exclusion' that are 'complex, deeply contested, dynamic and changing'. Several scholars have described how the concept came to be constructed historically and used to classify societies into different categories to serve ideological and political purposes, emphasising the qualities of some societies – the West – in contrast to the failings of other societies – the rest (see Said, 1978). Unpacking the components of what constitutes 'the West', it is apparent that each of these is a contested area within western history, society and culture. Some scholars have fallen back on a narrower definition of cultural transfer by emphasising the notion of 'Americanisation' or the transfer of the 'American way of life'. It was not just the peoples of the Third World that expressed concern about the 'Americanisation' of their ways of life. Europeans have a long tradition of complaint about the influence of the relentless flow of US popular culture into their continent during the twentieth century.

A variety of terms including McDonaldisation, Coca-colarization, Disneyfication, CNNization and even the 'Levi's generation' – have been used to describe the process by which American values are disseminated (Campbell et al., 2004). Putting aside the problem of identifying what values constitute the 'American way of life', it is not clearly articulated how media products such as Hollywood films, American TV drama serials and international news reports represent and convey American values. The problem of defining a 'culture' is not confined to trying to identify the values of the dominant culture. There is some confusion over what constitutes the local, authentic cultures of the Third World that are being eradicated by western values and media. In one of the most rigorous interrogations of the concept, John Tomlinson (1991: 17) draws attention to the emphasis on 'national cultures' in the discourse of 'cultural imperialism'. Differences within the countries of the Third World – either in economic or cultural terms – are rarely

acknowledged. Tomlinson (1991) sees this as a product of the deployment of the theory within the UN system, which is dominated by nation-states and national governments. Equating cultural identity with national cultures reflected the pressing concern of many Third World nations to ensure the political stability of the highly fragmented and fragile entities they inherited following decolonisation. The disposition of national governments and political elites towards traditional cultures inside their own countries was never that favourable; they often shared the view of proponents of modernisation that rural and minority language cultures were inimical to national development. The state-centric bias of the discussion led to a re-evaluation of the nature and process of the impact of western media and products on the Third World.

Seeing international information as a struggle between nation-states or national governments *or* the First and Third Worlds *or* the West and the Global South *or* America and the rest neglects the information imbalances within regions and societies. The growth of media strength in the non-western world has led to charges of 'little cultural/media imperialism' (Sonwalkar, 2001: 505). Within southern Asia, for example, concern has been expressed among India's neighbours about the impact of Indian satellite television on their cultures (2001: 507). Gross inequalities in access to information and communication hardware and software also exist within nations. Global change cannot simply be seen in terms of the transfer of western values from one nation to another, in which the culture of one nation is made subservient to another. Leslie Sklair (1991, 2001) attempts to understand global society and international relations in non-'state centric' terms, applying the Marxist notion of dominant-subordinate classes to international society. Rather than divide the world between states, he distinguishes the emergence of a class of people throughout the nations of the world who benefit from the economic, cultural, technological and political changes that are associated with globalisation. These elite people are found in Asia, Africa and Latin America as well as the nations of the West. They enjoy the benefits of global citizenship: travelling the world, consuming the world's media and purchasing the products that can be obtained in the downtown shopping centres that are replicated throughout the planet. Sklair's global elite – or what he prefers to call the 'transnational capitalist class' – is based on the expansion of the global reach of multinational corporations. Global citizens tend to work for these corporations or for the businesses and service industries that supply them or the state enterprises that support them. They reproduce a culture of capitalism throughout the world, promoting consumerism, advocating liberalisation of trade and emphasising the profit motive. According to Sklair they are responsible for the widening gap between rich and poor, between the transnational elite and the masses, as well as the ecological crisis which is the by-product of the workings of the present international economy.

Sklair's class analysis is criticised for presenting a negative interpretation of global interaction. A more positive analysis is found in the notion of 'cosmopolitanism' – the emergence of what is essentially a group of 'citizens of the world' who have a broad internationalist perspective and outlook (see Holton, 2009). This perspective is critical of Sklair's analysis in two respects: it extends 'global citizenship' beyond the confines of business and economic elites *and* perceives it as something which emerges from below rather than driven by the needs of multinational capitalism. Ulf Hannerz (1996: 105) describes cosmopolitans as those who seek 'to immerse themselves in other cultures'. These are not 'global tourists' who travel the world as a 'spectator sport' but the community of diplomats, bureaucrats, educationalists, aid workers, military personnel and businessmen and women and their sons, daughters, families and friends who have eschewed their local and national attachments to become 'world citizens'. Academic guru Ulrich Beck (2006: 3), in more prosaic prose, describes the cosmopolitan outlook as comprising 'global sense, a sense of boundarylessness ... awareness of ambivalence in a milieu of blurring differentiations and cultural contradictions ... the possibility of shaping one's life under conditions of cultural mixture'. There are people who have been able to throw off their national shackles to be able to imagine belonging to a worldwide community. The 'intellectual and aesthetic stance of "openness" to peoples, places and experiences from different cultures' is deemed a crucial characteristic of these people (Holton, 2009: 19). What they imagine appears similar to the vision McLuhan had of his global villagers. These elites make a contribution to the cultivation of an enhanced sense of 'global civic responsibility'. Cosmopolitanism is a positive development as it favours more 'inclusive arrangements of compassion, human rights, risk management, solidarity and peacefulness' (Hannerz, 2007: 301).

Foreign correspondents can be identified as part of the 'world making cultural apparatus' by the role they play in the 'management of meaning across spatial and cultural distances' (Hannerz, 1996: 113). While foreign correspondents may be accustomed to crossing borders, comfortably living and working in different places, they are not necessarily cosmopolitan in their outlook. Hallin and Mancini (2004: 258–9) note that international journalists are heavy consumers of Anglo-American media. Journalists in many parts of the world regularly tune into the BBC and CNN as well as read global business publications such as *The Economist*, *Wall Street Journal* and *Financial Times* and news magazines such as *Time* and *Newsweek*. A study of Greek international news gatekeepers identified the influence of US news magazines as well as CNN International in shaping their organisations' concept of newsworthiness (Roberts and Bantimaroudis, 1997). While the study found that 'European influences are not negligible', with *Le Monde* and the French TV channel TV5 figuring prominently, American media played a central role in shaping professional judgements on foreign news. Most international news gatherers are employed by international news agencies, which can be seen as primarily US and UK companies. They serve as vehicles to

bring Anglo-American news values and news practices into newsrooms around the world (Tunstall, 1977: 45–6). They are also part of a highly competitive business that with the arrival of the internet and 24-hour news channels, has become even more cut-throat, thereby militating against the ‘electronic empathy’ that Hannerz (1996: 121) describes the international media as being able to promote.

Globalisation and international journalism

It is commonly held that globalisation has changed the ways in which foreign correspondents work and the nature of international news. With globalisation generating greater interconnectedness between peoples and nations it is often assumed that there should be a growth in the demand for foreign news. Similarly, international news should promote a growing awareness of what is happening elsewhere in the world. Outside these commonsense assertions the exact nature of the changes is a matter of debate. There are adherents of modernisation, cultural imperialism and globalisation who in their different ways believe that journalism is becoming increasingly standardised in its practice and values and that international news in the world’s media systems is more and more similar. Both positive and pessimistic globalisers argue that standardisation is based on the expansion of the Anglo-American model of journalism. British and American news organisations, news agencies and newspapers dominate the flow of news around the world (Tunstall and Machin, 1999: chapter 8) and journalists as insatiable consumers of global news increasingly look to these organisations and publications to provide them with the model of how they should understand their role in society and how they should do their job. The INAs are conceived as playing a crucial role in having ‘successfully spread worldwide the narrative forms and values of western journalism’ (Bielsa, 2008: 364). The hegemony of the Anglo-American model – also described as the ‘professional’ or ‘liberal’ model – is sustained by the role of English as a world language, the concentration of academic and textbook publishing in Britain and America and the long tradition of journalism training and research in the US (Joesphi, 2005). What constitutes international journalism is determined by Anglo-American news values and practices.

The liberalisation and deregulation of media systems around the world in the 1990s is seen by some scholars as increasingly leading to the global media system becoming consolidated as a single commercial entity dominated by western TNCs. This development is resulting in a further homogenisation of international news which ever more reflects the agenda of western nations and governments and the negative imagery associated with this agenda. Several studies since the 1970s have indicated that there is considerable similarity in what is reported as foreign news in media systems throughout the world (see Chapter 6). The consolidation of the power of

'communication cartels' such as Murdoch's News Corporation and Disney has reinforced the hold of the West – and in particular America's dominance – over people's understanding of international relations (Thussu, 2006).

The commercialisation of national media systems and the deployment of 'soft power' by successive US administrations are crucial factors in this respect. Reference is made to the 'Murdochisation' of journalism and the media in non-western countries due to the dramatic rise in entertainment-oriented news, sensational style journalism and the commodification of news (Sonwalkar, 2002; Rao, 2009). The shift in the balance between public service and commercial media and journalism highlights a contradiction at the heart of what is understood as the western or Anglo-American approach. Daya Thussu (2002) emphasises the extension of commercial media in the context of the increasing importance attached to the exercise of 'soft power' in the post-Cold War era. The US government and the Pentagon in particular have become more skilful in using the international media and information system to persuade the world of American views of events and issues. He notes that the extension of US military power in the form of interventions in many of the world's hot spots since the 1990s have 'dominated the foreign reporting agenda' and they have been 'invariably presented in the context of how they fitted into the American view of the world, with most reports based on information ... provided by US sources' (Thussu, 2002: 206).

Veteran television and newspaper correspondent Philip Seib articulates the notion of the 'global journalist', arguing that global change requires of the correspondent that 'much new information must be mastered, which involves learning the substance of new issues and acquiring new sources'. Global reporting 'seeks to understand and explain how economic, political, social and ecological practices, processes and problems in different parts of the world affect each other, and are interlocked, or share commonalities' (Seib, 2002: 25). It is not grounded in Anglo-American or other national assumptions of how the world should be reported. Going online or producing a global news service is seen as changing the relationship between the news media and their audiences. The 'death of distance' means that national media can become 'global' in their reach and with readers, viewers and listeners across the world their product will be adapted to respond to the needs of a global audience. The instant interconnectedness of the online world in particular is changing the national orientation of news journalists around the world and undermining reporters who cover foreign news from one nation. There are a growing number of news workers who supply content to global corporations, produce news for a global audience and adopt a global outlook on world events. The huge packs of reporters – the same reporters – turning up time and again at the major news events can be seen as a physical manifestation of this phenomenon. The INAs in this scenario are increasingly decoupled from their

Anglo-American and European roots in order to embrace this global perspective. The emergence of a new form of journalism that is distinctly 'global' in practice, values, nature and dimension is underpinned by a positive approach to understanding the process of globalisation. It associates 'global journalism' with democracy and the potential of the internet to advance a 'more engaged and active citizenship' (Reese et al., 2007: 237).

There are, however, differences in understanding the way in which foreign correspondence is becoming more 'global'. Some commentators, such as Philip Seib (2002), locate the changes within the confines of the profession. They tend to see it as an extension or evolution of journalism: the net and other technological advances, the expansion of global agencies and organisations and the growth of an audience that has escaped from national frames of reference are identified as factors that transform the mediating role of the foreign correspondent. For other scholars the new environment is undermining the need for specialist foreign news gatherers. Global news can be produced from anywhere and by anyone. The internet means that a foreign news-gatherer does not need to travel to another country to report on events. Home based reporters can trawl the web for information and news about foreign locations. A 'news species of unintentional foreign correspondents' is emerging (Berger, 2009: 366). With foreign news media accessible online local reporters around the world have become sources of international news. Official and non-government websites also act as a source of foreign news for residents of other countries who can become 'do-it-yourself' journalists. Such transformations are also weakening the hold of INAs as the primary provider of foreign news; many of the traditional clients of Reuters, AP and AFP can now turn elsewhere for foreign news. The new landscape is threatening to make the foreign correspondent as a specialist news gatherer redundant.

Scholars such as James Curran and Myung-Jin Park (2000) highlight what they see as the limits of 'Anglo-Americanisation'. They are critical of the 'self absorption and parochialism' of much of the contemporary study of the mass media and journalism and the 'routine' way in which 'universalistic observations about the media' are 'advanced in English-language books on the basis of evidence from a tiny handful of countries'. John Downing (1996) talks of the conceptual impoverishment of extrapolating theoretically from such unrepresentative nations as Britain and the United States. By prescribing the Anglo-American model as the only valid way of practising the profession other journalism traditions have been ignored or neglected. Hugo de Burgh (2005: 2) asserts that the notion that 'all journalisms were at different stages on the route to an ideal model, probably Anglophone, is *passé*'. He and his fellow authors in *Making Journalists* describe different forms of journalism. They draw attention to the range of conventions, practice and values that differentiate between journalism in different cultures. They emphasise that 'how journalism operates ... is a product of culture' and that while globalisation

has shared more widely techniques, formats and professional attitudes, it has also 'brought about an intensified awareness of the power of culture' (2005: 17). Some of the basic tenets of Anglo-American journalism are simply not workable in different cultures and political systems. While that most precious of principles, 'objectivity', might be operationalised within a two-party political system, it is 'almost impossible within an intricate and fragmented panorama in which a greater number of political forces act and in which even the slightest shades of meaning in a story risk stepping on the positions of one of the forces in the political field' (2005: 9). The MacBride Report (1980) drew attention to the problems of performing objective journalism in a highly politicised society. It also emphasised that the wide dissemination of the US model made it difficult for any journalist to advocate practices that violate principles of autonomy and private ownership.

Notes

- 1 The terms 'foreign', 'international', 'global', 'transnational' and 'cross-cultural' are often used in the literature on international news and communication. There are differences in the way in which they are used but sometimes they are used interchangeably to refer to the gathering, production and dissemination of news about international issues and events. Berger (2009) provides an interesting discussion of the geo-spatial conceptualisation of news produced outside the boundaries of the nation and the challenges posed by technological change. In this book foreign correspondence and international journalism are used to mean the same thing, as the notion of 'foreign' has traditionally been central to our conceptualisation of international news gathering.
- 2 The MacBride report was produced by the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems chaired by former Irish Foreign Minister, Sean MacBride, and was composed of 15 members representing all parts of the world.