JOURNALISM TODAY

A THEMED HISTORY

JANE L. CHAPMAN AND NICK NUTTALL

WILEY-BLACKWELL

Journalism Today

Journalism Today

A Themed History

By

Jane L. Chapman and Nick Nuttall

WILEY-BLACKWELL

A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

This edition first published 2011

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing program has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, United Kingdom

Editorial Offices
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data is available for this book.

ISBN hbk: 9781405179539
ISBN pbk: 9781405179522

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

This book is published in the following electronic formats: ePDFs [9781444395358]; Wiley Online Library [9781444395372]; ePub [9781444395365]

Set in 10.5/13pt Minion by SPi Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

01 2011

Contents

Preface

How To Use the Book and Summary of Sections

The Approach

The idea for this book first evolved from an attempt to identify the major themes facing journalism today, and then to trace their historical roots. We wanted the approach to history to center on these themes and thus, by definition, to be selective. So our starting point has been *to identify current and longer term issues for journalism and society*. We have then elaborated the arguments and presented empirical historical evidence to back them up. All of the FactFiles and Résumés, for instance, predate the twenty-first century.

We selected four themes, and to each we devote a section of the book:

- Journalism and democracy
- Technology, work, and business
- Ethics
- Audience and its impact on journalism.

In the process of historical exploration, we found that we had identified a further four themes that define *modern journalism*, as both significantly different from its forebears and at the same time having a clear familial connection with those antecedents:

- Personalization
- Globalization
- Localization
- Pauperization.

Using the Book

This has been a voyage of discovery to connect past with present as it relates to journalism. We hope that readers will want to share the journey by reading this book cover to cover. It promises to be a fascinating and entertaining journey! Alternatively, the book is also designed to be consulted in sections, or indeed, in chapters and parts of chapters. You can dip in and out, picking names or episodes that seem to stand out from the page, or serve any other purpose that you may have.

Class usage

Class usage is likely to be more systematic than individual usage, so here are some suggestions.

1 This book can be used for *discussion purposes* – students, for instance, can read a section or chapter on a selected theme before attending a class on that theme, or an allied subject.
2 Chapters can also be used for *follow-up work*: the book is clearly divided up so that it will provide background for essays and project work. The "*résumés*," and *case studies* for instance, are intended to be an "aide-memoire" or prompt for further research on the life of the person selected, or the issues involved. In a relatively short book like this it is not possible to provide a complete history of journalism as a chronological transition from A to Z. Rather we have selected case studies that are indicative of those issues still relevant today, and those that also hold the potential for further discrete research as subjects in their own right, using this book as a springboard. The people who have been selected are neither definitive nor unique. Our choice is not exclusive: it is pragmatic to the extent that it is guided by the existence of a body of work (speeches, diaries, books, films, and other reflections) or scholarship – not necessarily on the people themselves and their lives but rather relating to their outstanding contribution to the overall context, enabling readers to investigate in more depth where they wish.
3 The contents of this book do not pretend to be definitive. We realize that other topics and different personalities can offer comparable insights into major events in the world of journalism as much as in the wider world itself.

An Introduction to the Themes

The main themes covered in this book – widening of participation in the public sphere, "nonprofessional" reporting and reporters, globalization of news and news organizations, concentration of ownerships, technological transformations, audience responses to the complexity of multiplatform delivery – are all historical phenomena dating back at least to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, often in countries outside the United States and Great Britain. This book traces some of these influences, not as an all-embracing chronological history (for these exist elsewhere), but more as a thematic "potpourri," highlighting in particular those journalistic functions that relate to and interact with wider society. In doing so, we take a long view, stressing continuities as well as change.

The four main sections each attempt a thematic approach that of necessity foregrounds the press and print journalism to a greater extent than its broadcast equivalent. This reflects the much longer history of the printed word itself. Similarly, the examples used throughout attempt to be representative or emblematic of the issues under discussion and there has been no attempt to be all-embracing of either journalism history or ideology.

The Introduction: Uses and abuses of history

The Introduction explains the rationale for our approach and acts as a discursive springboard for the rest of the book.

Part I: Journalism and democracy

Here we explore aspects of the historic relationship between journalism and democracy, first in terms of philosophical milestones such as Magna Carta, John Milton's *Areopagitica*, the writings of Tom Paine and of Jürgen Habermas; then in terms of legal and political struggles for freedom of expression such as the trial of John Peter Zenger, the Haswell case, and the story of Edward Smith Hall, an Australian free speech pioneer. The role of the press in the American Revolution, the First Amendment to the Constitution and other aspects of journalism and democracy (or the lack of it – such as censorship and oppressive laws), as well as challenges from investigative reporting and renegade proprietors, are all discussed. Examples of active political cultures, public debate, the impact of commercialism, and the growth in influence of public relations provide historical illustrations

of journalism's good and less auspicious influences on democracy. Critiques of journalism such as the Hutchins Report highlight weaknesses in political coverage and lead on to debates about how journalism can facilitate a new sense of community in the future.

Part II: Technology, work, and business

By tracing historical themes and examples relevant to the evolving relationship between technology and commerce and their impact on the business of journalism, this section explores some of the reasons for the way the news business presently operates. The main trend mapped out here is the continuous march of a business and commercial ethos and the way it has influenced journalism over time. An underlying thread during the late nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century is the gradual "corporatization" of journalism, that many believe has come to threaten the concept of a "free press."

Part III: Ethics

Journalists have a history of clashing with authority. This can be because they expose the rich and powerful, they antagonize governments or vested interests, or they "get it wrong" for one reason or another and end up in court. The law is one form of constraint but from the late nineteenth century journalists themselves devised various codes of ethics that they hoped all practitioners would adhere to, and in so doing both legitimize the profession and earn the public's trust. This section examines these various ethical codes, from those devised by labor unions and journalists' organizations to those promulgated by proprietors, editors, and individual journalists themselves.

We also draw attention to the ways in which a journalist has to constantly reconcile a variety of ethical standards while doing the job on a day-to-day basis. For it should be remembered that "one very important function is the idea that it [journalism] is seen to bridge a gap between events and audiences, and therefore to mediate experience."[1] It is in the process of mediation that ethical factors become significant, and how they are "played" determines to a large extent how journalists are perceived. Are they trusted? Do they command respect? Answers to these questions are suggested within a historical context that traces the development of ethical codes primarily in Great Britain and America. Major issues studied include privacy and celebrity, the press and royalty, and how fakery, both within the media

and from external sources, has at times threatened to undermine public confidence in print and broadcast journalism alike.

Part IV: Audience

Attitudes towards audience have changed considerably over the years – in essence early audiences were self-selective and early newspapers focused on a narrow constituency of readers: "The eighteenth century in England had no 'mass' audience in the modern sense; that was to come only in the next century. But the eighteenth century was modern in the sense that, from that time on, a writer could support himself from the sale of his works to the public."[2] The eighteenth century ushered in the first major development in audience building: the "shift from private endowment (usually in the form of patronage by the aristocracy) and a limited audience to public endowment and a potentially unlimited audience."[3] It is the pursuit of that unlimited audience that has in many respects driven the journalism engine ever since.

Audiences can be serviced, represented, misrepresented, or unrepresented; they can be involved in the process of news production or remain discrete and uninvolved. But there has seldom if ever been an even balance between the producers of news and its consumers, for media tend to be either controlled by hegemonic power, or else act as an expression of counterhegemonic forces that are largely defined by their audiences. This section therefore addresses the argument that journalism has gradually become more democratic and empowering of a better informed and responsive public. But at the same time it rebuts the idea that there has been a continuous trajectory of progress throughout the past toward a glorious present, exemplified by the democratic potential of the internet.

By highlighting some historical examples of different sorts of audience awareness and involvement from the early days of newspapers to the present, it can be shown that a blurring of the boundaries between consumers and producers is a constant *leitmotiv* of journalistic development. The contribution of celebrity, tabloidization, "dumbing down," and increasing personalization of news agendas is also assessed.

Part V: Conclusion

We have allocated the Conclusion a discrete section all by itself. This is because the chapter can be read as a separate exercise in its own right – as the summing-up session for the end of a particular module, program, or

series of classes. This chapter contains the ideas to walk away with for the future: we cannot predict accurately – nobody can – but we can provide food for thought. In that respect, we hope we have supplied a satisfying, and also a gourmet experience!

Notes

1 David Berry (ed.), *Ethics and Media Culture: Practices and Representations* (Oxford: Focal Press, 2000), p. 28.
2 Leo Lowenthal, *Literature, Popular Culture, and Society* (Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1961), p. 55.
3 Ibid.

Acknowledgments

With thanks to Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, where Jane Chapman is an honorary associate of the Centre for Media History and a Visiting Professor. With thanks also to editor Elizabeth Swayze and her assistants for their continuing vision and sound judgment throughout the long project of book writing, and to all the production team at Wiley-Blackwell for their professionalism and efficiency. We are also grateful to our colleagues in the Lincoln School of Journalism for all their encouragement and to Kate Allison for her help with picture/website research.

Introduction

The Uses and Abuses of History: Why Bother With It?

A study of the modern newspaper is meaningless, in the very exact sense of the word, if it is not aware of the historical framework …
(*Leo Lowenthal*, ***Historical Perspectives on Popular Culture***)

When truth is replaced by silence, the silence is a lie.
(*Yevgeni Yevtushenko*, ***Soviet dissident***)

Professional journalism is undergoing a reshaping in terms of occupational roles and legitimacy. It is causing a lot of people a lot of pain. Indeed, some commentators believe journalism's very existence is threatened by the potential of internet-based technologies: a potential not only to democratize participation in the public sphere, but also to provide a platform for user-generated content. Against this backdrop of ongoing restructuring of the global news industry and increasing concentration of ownership among transnational corporations, it would appear timely to scrutinize the problems that journalism faces and how our understanding of them might benefit from an examination of the historical dimension.

If we are to understand contemporary and future journalistic forms and allied occupational issues, then we need to appreciate how its various roles and social position have emerged and developed over time. Similarly, we need to have a clear idea of the relationship between the media in a democratic society and that democratic society itself. Robert McChesney and John Nichols visualize the ideal: "Imagine the kind of media that a democratic society deserves; media that bring us a wealth of diverse opinions and entertainment options; media that are held responsible for providing

Jane Chapman and Nick Nuttall, *Journalism Today: A Themed History*

us with the information we need to function as informed citizens; media where ideas flow in both directions, and where ordinary people routinely have a chance to voice their concerns."[1] As a checklist of aspirations, such values have existed in one form or another throughout the medium's history; but if we want to reimagine or re-emphasize such values then, once again, we have to understand the past.

A historical perspective should be capable of revealing underlying trends, causes, and conditions that might otherwise be neglected. Social histories of the press have shown how institutional and technological factors have shaped news over the last 200 years, reinforcing the doctrine that news is, more than anything else, a culturally constructed category.[2]

Too Much Information!

Today's society suffers from an abundance of information, but this does not necessarily mean that the public can make sense of it. Too much information, if you like, often obscures rather than reveals the truth: "There are times when the historian of the media feels that the best metaphor to use in relation to the recent past is that of 'the thicket'. The technology changes so fast and becomes so obtrusive that broader history is forgotten, and in examining that, not everything converges."[3]

Sophisticated technology and a legally free news media therefore do not necessarily lead to an informed citizenry. And without some historical understanding or perspective, current issues can be misunderstood or deracinated such that their "ancestry" is obscured. This lack of a "communicative competence" enables powerful and vested interests to set the parameters of public debate. In the United States, for example, the way public opinion is formed depends on two factors – firstly, how governments and corporate power choose and define the debate and secondly, the way they influence that debate by setting its frames of reference.[4]

Internet enthusiasts and those optimists who place their faith in the democratizing opportunities offered by blogging and podcasts argue that this traditional power nexus is now being undermined. Certainly there is ample supporting evidence. Some of the most powerful images of the London 7/7 terrorist attacks of 2005 were provided by commuters with their camera phones. Details of the uprising in Burma during 2007 came from bloggers who bypassed reporting restrictions while images of the fighting and demonstrations were captured on mobile phones. Such was

the threat that the military leaders imposed an internet blackout to block informational leaks about the violent crackdown. Yet the very ability of the Burmese regime to "pull the plug" should perhaps be considered a powerful corrective to the unbridled optimism of internet enthusiasts.

More recently in 2009 new media allowed the world to connect with the Tehran rebels who supported Mir Hossein Mousavi in the disputed presidential elections in Iran that returned President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to power. One Iranian graduate, Neda Agha-Soltan, became a "heroine" as well as a martyr, her death from a gunshot wound captured on camera phone and video and beamed around the world. This was one of the first conflicts where Twitter, the social networking website that allows a maximum of 140 characters per "tweet" or message, was also highly influential. As one Twitter message read: "One person = one broadcaster."[5] The Iranian regime's response was to slow down internet speeds to a crawl so "brevity and simplicity were essential." As recorded by journalist Andrew Sullivan: "To communicate they tweeted. Within hours of the farcical election result, I tracked down a bunch of live Twitter feeds and started to edit and re-broadcast them as a stream of human consciousness on the verge of revolution."[6]

These unauthorized broadcasts are symptomatic of the new digital technology flexing its muscles. And already we are seeing the beginnings of a power struggle between those who crusade for total freedom and those who wish to exercise control, whether governments or traditional media conglomerates. Google, for example, is a business that has disturbed the equilibrium of both these power elites. English journalist Henry Porter in an article for the *Observer* described Google as a WWM – a worldwide monopoly – and wrote in April 2009: "Google presents a far greater threat [than other WWMs] to the livelihood of individuals and the future of commercial institutions important to the community." His argument went on to assert that "newspapers are the only means of holding local hospitals, schools, councils and the police to account, and on a national level they are absolutely essential for the good functioning of democracy."[7]

Porter seemed to share his point of view with Rupert Murdoch, although possibly for quite different reasons. From May 2009 Murdoch indicated that he expected to start charging for access to News Corporation's newspaper websites. In August Britain's *Guardian* suggested that he had "dangled a possible lifeline to the struggling newspaper industry by declaring that his titles will start charging for online content."[8] By November 2009, Murdoch had refined his attack by mentioning Google by name: "Rupert Murdoch

has underlined his determination to make the internet pay by promising to remove his newspapers' stories from Google."[9] By March 2010, it was confirmed that the UK national newspapers *The Times* and the *Sunday Times* were to start charging for content online in June 2009: "Users will be charged £1 for a day's access and £2 for a week's subscription for access to both papers' websites." News International chief executive Rebekah Brooks "implied in a statement that its other titles, the Sun and the News of the World, would follow."[10]

At the same time, we should not underestimate the desire of governments of whatever stripe – whether the United States after the 9/11 Al Qaeda attacks, Russia after the second Chechen war, the United Kingdom during the IRA bombing campaigns – to exercise some control over news media.[11] The Chinese authorities, for example, have for some time been in conflict with Google over freedom of access to the internet via Google's search engine. Google said it was no longer prepared to comply with demands that it filter web content such as prodemocracy sites behind what has been dubbed the "great firewall of China." Google's stock price fell on the news that it had allowed its internet content provider license to expire. Whether China's attempts to regulate digital technology will survive its own population's desire to circumvent such controls, however, is difficult to determine.

Yet in all the media coverage of the battle between new media forms and entrenched vested interests, as well as the democratizing process inherent in their development and use, few if any observers have made reference to the long history of "citizen journalism" dating back to the eighteenth century, when newspapers often depended on members of the public to act as news gatherers. These early "citizen journalists" were often in the vanguard of new developments in the media, whether the radical press in Great Britain in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, or at an international level acting as foreign correspondents by dispatching accounts of important events in the absence of paid professionals. Such pioneers would surely understand and appreciate the skill and courage with which their descendants communicate the horrors of tyrannical regimes the world over in the twenty-first century.

Egalitarianism doesn't just depend on earth-shattering events to manifest itself, however. *OhmyNews*, for example, is a South Korean online agency which regularly scoops large media operations, employing as it does between 25,000 and 40,000 citizen journalists worldwide (numbers vary) and paying them about $15 a story. Despite allowing anyone to contribute, it attempts to moderate its output by applying some "traditional" journalistic

standards to submitted copy. Clearly then, established journalistic criteria are being applied here, but it is the scale and the delivery platform that have changed rather than the concept. One of the themes we examine in this book is how that change has come about and why.

These concerns, still evident in any discussion of online news and other emerging news platforms such as podcasts, blogs, and Twitter, have in fact been the subject of a broad and far-reaching discourse throughout journalism's various checkered and contested histories: news gathering and relations with sources and readers; the political economy of news production and its institutions; definitions of journalism; its values, ethics, and professional identity. In other words, there are certain constants and ongoing themes. The point of these historical analogies is thus not to minimize the importance of current issues in journalism, but rather to remind us of the continuities in media heritage at a time when analysts seem predisposed to inflate the importance – and uniqueness – of current events. We can learn from the past in order to navigate the future.

In order to do so, however, an understanding of context is required. A professional life tends to be lived "in the moment" with little time for reflection or examination of contexts, historical or otherwise. Journalists are aware of being vulnerable to accusations of partisanship when making a controversial value judgment during the process of contextualizing a story. So the temptation to play safe by delivering an arsenal of facts – often making the story less interesting, reducing its political potency, and confusing potential audiences – is often overwhelming. On the other hand, a more partisan writer may well put stories into a context that tries "to find a common thread between them"[12] and in the process alienate "impartial" members of the audience.

The "common thread" provided by history, however, is not a panacea. "It is not always appropriate to learn the lessons of the past," warns media academic Natalie Fenton, "if this is done indiscriminately without taking account of the precise configurations of the present."[13] This is precisely the reason why this study is selective, organized around themes rather than a comprehensive and complete history of journalism. Within these themes, we aim to present as impartially as possible a range of interpretations. But there are gaps. Our history is aimed almost exclusively at perceived contemporary problems in the Western world.

One such problem is the perception that recent media developments, rather than advancing ideas of "community," are reinforcing a pack mentality, whether it's the paparazzi in pursuit of a celebrity or the constant

reiteration of the same news stories across radio and television news channels. The lone, intrepid investigative reporter who became an individual hero is largely a thing of the past. The corollary of this is spelt out by British PR magnate Max Clifford who argues that when he began his career, public relations was about promotion. Now the majority of his work is about protection of both celebrities and organizations against the media pack, or the "feral beast," to use a phrase coined by Tony Blair when he was Prime Minister. Clifford considers that today people are "very slow to praise and very anxious to destroy," while Tony Blair argued that in media reporting of politics, attacking the motives of politicians has become more potent than attacking their judgment.[14]

The danger of entrenched viewpoints, from whatever perspective, is their tendency to obscure the wider arguments of history. In fact, there are two contrary ways of construing journalism history that need to be avoided: "gloom and doom" scenarios on the one hand, and the inevitable "march of progress" represented by both emerging press freedoms and new communications technologies on the other. British historians refer to the latter as the "Whig interpretation of press history."[15] Yet these have often emerged as two sides of the same coin. Some industry observers believe that journalism's modern structure has encouraged a dangerous conservatism that, in the case of the United States with its protective First Amendment, was never intended. Noted American journalist Dan Gillmor says, "I don't believe the First Amendment, which gives journalists valuable leeway to inquire and publish, was designed with corporate profits in mind. While we haven't become a wholly cynical business yet, the trend is scary. Consolidation makes it even more worrisome."[16] In Britain the commercial broadcast media have long chafed under what they consider to be the intensely conservative and restrictive "public service broadcasting" doctrine exemplified for so long by the BBC.

There is no question, however, that today's rapid technological changes can be seen as a continuation of socioeconomic trends dating back to the seventeenth century despite differences of scale, character, and emphasis. Scholars have noted how previous communications technologies – the railways, telegraph, telephone, radio, television – changed perceptions of global boundaries and distance, time, and space. The internet and the world wide web, as the latest of these communications technologies, may arguably be the most significant. This prompts two significant questions. Firstly, how does the internet change people's perceptions as media consumers,[17] and secondly, what are the implications for journalists as both users and consumers?

The answers to such questions, we suggest, can be found, in part at least, through an informed appreciation of the cultural, economic, and political functions of the press that emerged during previous technological ages, even if they appear now to be threatened. McChesney and Nichols in their critique of the American media's role in destroying democracy, spinning elections, and selling wars (a paraphrase of their title) point out that some of the endemic problems for political journalism are due to commercial control and the professional code that emerged about one hundred years ago. Therefore, "a rigorous accounting with history offers necessary insights and perspectives on our current situation and points the way out."[18] History, it seems, can go some way toward helping us focus on solutions as well as issues.

One of the most significant of those issues in the current media climate is the plight of traditional newspapers, at both local and national level. They face challenges from expansive local and national radio, 24-hour TV news channels, free newspapers (that encourage readers to think of newspapers as a cost-free product), news delivery via online editions, billboards, and mobile telephony. Revenue streams, meanwhile, are in flux as advertisers migrate to internet competitors such as eBay and craigslist. The print industry has retaliated by attempting to woo readers with free gifts and DVDs. One British national daily has gone so far as to claim that, "The age of podcasts, war-zone bloggers, and countless other online information sources presents newspapers with arguably their biggest challenge ever."[19]

Is this just another example of the traditional doom-mongering that often accompanies dramatic changes in the media landscape? Or is the current turmoil, the digital disturbance of a once peaceful analogue "pond," of a different order from all previous technological upheavals? History suggests that media platforms have regularly reinvented their purpose and user base as new formats and technologies emerge. But what makes the emergence of the online platform such an intriguing challenge is its position as both a rival medium and at the same time a medium for the continuation of the press in a new form.

Newspapers are in the process of reinventing themselves in order to extend their appeal to a generation reared on information delivered electronically. Yet the newspaper crisis should not be exaggerated. In 2006, according to Gavin O'Reilly, President of the World Association of Newspapers, 439 million people still purchased a newspaper every day – an increase of 6 percent over a five-year period. Newspapers remained the world's second largest advertising medium with a 30.2 percent market

share.[20] By the following year, the same organization – one that admittedly has a vested interest in selling its image and is clearly benefiting from the burgeoning markets in China and India – was able to report that paid-for titles surpassed 11,000 for the first time in history and that free daily newspaper circulation had more than doubled over five years to 40.8 million copies per day.[21]

Such encouraging statistics, however, cannot hide the fact that transitions can be painful, for new information technologies very often decentralize power, or at least shift the center of gravity, and this fact is not easily conceded by those who are adversely affected. For instance, during the late 1920s and early1930s, print editors saw as one of their roles the provision of news for the new medium of radio. In the USA, they bought into radio stations, and also started their own, but those who did not choose this controlling route depicted the advent of radio news reporting as a threat to democracy and the American Way of Life. In Britain, agreements were made with the fledgling BBC that news would not be transmitted before 6 p.m., thus preserving the press's hegemony over the daily news agenda. In both countries this allowed members of the press to depict themselves as the true, reliable defenders of the public interest.

History as News, News as History

Good journalistic coverage has often provided the first draft of history by enabling the public to understand the meaning of events as they unfold: "It is journalism that ten, twenty, fifty years after the fact still holds up a true and intelligent mirror to events."[22] Award-winning journalist John Pilger quotes T. D. Allman on this point in order to remind us that if journalism discards its role as history's first draft, it promotes "directly and by default, an imperialism whose true intentions are rarely expressed. Instead, noble words and concepts like 'democracy' and 'freedom' and 'liberation' are emptied of their true meaning and pressed into the service of conquest."[23] Thus, according to Pilger, in the 1970s the media by its silence allowed the US to arm the Indonesian dictatorship as it massacred the East Timorese, and to begin secret support for the mujahideen in Afghanistan, out of which came the Taliban and al-Qaida.[24] By the time 9/11 erupted, new publishing tools available on the internet meant that the first draft was being written, in part, by the former audience.

This is just one of the ways that journalism is in the process of being transformed from its former characterization as a twentieth-century mass

media structure. The one-way communication model – news as lecture with audience participation confined to the letters pages of newspapers and largely ignored by radio and television – is losing out to a more inclusive discourse that at first just acknowledged the existence of the audience but now actively seeks out that audience and often responds to it. People from the grassroots who may previously have been disempowered are now being listened to. Major players, once again, are forced to adapt, and that process – in which some of the more persistent and important news bloggers such as Glenn Reynolds's *Instapundit* and news aggregation sites such as Matt Drudge's *Drudge Report* actually accumulate considerable influence – needs to be understood.

As the battalions of citizen foot soldiers join journalism's ranks, such questions become more urgent. According to Brian McNair, "The qualities which have been associated with 'good' journalism for centuries – objectivity, analytical skill, interpretative authority, integrity in investigation and reportage, courage in the face of elite pressure – all will increase in value as the number of writers expands into the billions."[25] Yet the intrinsic irony of such predictions is not lost on John Pilger who, with characteristic melancholy, has noted that "as media technology advances almost beyond our imagination, it is not just the traditional means of journalism that are becoming obsolete, but its honourable traditions."[26]

Ways and Means

In a relatively short book such as this we have had to reject the seminal "single year" approach exemplified by W. Joseph Campbell's exclusively American study, *The Year that Defined American Journalism: 1897 and the Clash of Paradigms*. Campbell examines an exceptional 12 months in the history of journalism and argues that there was a clash of "paradigms" between William Randolph Hearst's "journalism of action," the fact-based journalism practiced by Adolph Ochs, and experiments in literary journalism by Lincoln Steffens. While this detailed approach has much to commend it we have opted for a broader overview that is not constrained by dates or by country, while taking periodization and context into account. Besides, for American journalism history there are other candidate years: 1798 with the Alien and Sedition Acts, 1833 and the emergence of the penny press, 1972 and exposure by the *Washington Post* of the Watergate scandal. All of these events appear in the pages that follow, but are approached from

the angle of their significance to journalism and society in the present, rather than their importance within a particular chronological year. We have drawn heavily on American, British, and in some cases French history, drawing comparisons between episodes and experiences as a means of enhancing historical insights.

The emergent synthesis of primary and secondary sources adds up to a novel methodological approach. The comparative methodology also makes it eclectic. Readers may find that there are sins of omission, but if this book serves to provide a better understanding and appreciation of the current and historical relationship between journalism and society, then it will have served its purpose.

Notes

1 Robert W. McChesney and John Nichols, *Our Media, Not Theirs: The Democratic Struggle Against Corporate Media* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002), p. 11.
2 Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News: A Social History of the American Newspaper* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); Menahem Blondheim, *News Over the Wires: The Telegraph and the Flow of Public Information in America, 1844–1897* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).
3 Asa Briggs and Peter Burke, *A Social History of the Media* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2002), p. 319.
4 Kevin Howley, *Community Media: People, Places, and Communication Technologies* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 20.
5 Andrew Sullivan, "Twitter Ripped the Veil off 'The Other' – And we Saw Ourselves," *Sunday Times*, June 21, 2009, p. 22.
6 Ibid.
7 Henry Porter, "Google is Just an Amoral Menace," *Observer*, April 5, 2009, p. 27.
8 James Harkin, "All The News Fit to Pay For," *Guardian*, August 8, 2009, p. 31.
9 Chris Tryhorn and Bobbie Johnson, "Murdoch Plans to Strip Google of News," *Guardian*, November 10, 2009, p. 25.
10 Mercedes Bunz, "Times and Sunday Times Websites to Start Charging From June," *Guardian*, March 26, 2010. Available online at http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2010/mar/26/ times-website-paywall, accessed on April 1, 2010.
11 Charles Arthur, "Google Fails to Renew Licence in China," *Guardian*, April 1, 2010. Available online at http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2010/apr/01/google-china-licence-expires, accessed on April 1, 2010.
12 McChesney and Nichols, *Our Media, Not Theirs*, p. 19.

13 Natalie Fenton, *New Media, Old News: Journalism and Democracy in the Digital Age* (London: Sage, 2007), p. 12.
14 Andrew Grice, "Blair's Attack Provokes Anger Among Newspaper Editors and Broadcasters," *Independent*, June 13, 2007, p. 5.
15 James Curran and Jean Seaton, *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting in Britain*, 5th edn (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 10–21.
16 Dan Gillmor, *We the Media: Grassroots Journalism by the People, for the People* (Cambridge, MA: O'Reilly, 2004), p. xv.
17 Hazel Dicken-Garcia, "The Internet and Continuing Historical Discourse," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 1, 75 (1998), 19–27 (p. 23).
18 Robert W. McChesney and John Nichols, *Tragedy and Farce: How the American Media Sell Wars, Spin Elections, and Destroy Democracy* (New York: New Press, 2005), p. xi.
19 Steve Auckland, "The Future of Newspapers", *Independent*, *Media Weekly* special report, November 13, 2006, p. 4.
20 Ibid., p. 6.
21 World Association of Newspapers, 2007. Available online at http://www.wan-ifra.org/, accessed on April 1, 2010.
22 John Pilger (ed.), *Tell Me No Lies: Investigative Journalism and its Triumphs* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2004), p. xiii.
23 Ibid., p. xxvii.
24 Ibid., p. xxv.
25 Brian McNair, "The British Press, 1992–2007," unpublished paper presented at the *Future of Journalism Conference*, Cardiff, September 7–9, 2007, p. 11.
26 Pilger, *Tell Me No Lies*, p. xviii.

Part I

Journalism and Democracy

A Sibling Rivalry?

But such is the irresistible nature of truth, that all it asks, and all it wants, is the liberty of appearing.

(*Thomas Paine,* ***Rights of Man***)