

The Discontents with global television news: where is the Other? (2)

Introduction

The idea of this paper came about after delivering a lecture on ‘the discontents with globalization’. I realised that I was one of the ‘discontented’ when looking at my own experience in this ‘global’ world in which we are all supposed to be living. I believe I am what post-colonial theorists label as the colonized ‘Other’, a Brazilian living in England.

The reasons for my migration are not important, but rather the condition of my ‘otherness’, and the process of negotiation of the conflicts of ‘belongingness’ and ‘strangeness’ triggered, among other things, by the representations of the ‘Other’ on everyday television news. As an academic and journalist I am very aware of the process of news production and the ideological process of representation occurring in our living rooms every night through television. My earlier days as a university student, influenced by Marxist reading, gave me the feeling that the world was not a fair and just place, and I so much wanted to do something about it. No point in boring you with my attempts of trying to make the world a better place. The point is that although I had all these feelings of inequalities embedded in my intellectual upbringing I hadn’t experienced the feeling of being the ‘Other’, except perhaps as a woman, but as a ‘foreigner’ that elusive category one is immediately given when immigrating to another country.

Being abroad somehow increases one’s need to keep a grasp on what goes on in the world or rather at ‘home’, be it by calling the family, reading online newspapers or watching television. I would expect that, in times of high information and communication technologies such as the internet, global television, and so forth, one is not supposed to be hungry for information since those with access should be able to easily satisfy their (information) needs by pressing a button and instantaneously having the world in front of them. While living abroad, watching television news becomes a rather ‘intellectual’ practice in the sense that my feelings of ‘not being part of the world’ or ‘from a part of the world not worthy of any news’ was acutely reinforced. This also supported a feeling that the ‘world out there’ seems to be, inexorably, portrayed by the Western through a Eurocentric frame. The sense of

‘invisibility’ started to grow and I have decided to investigate how this process happens.

Thus, the order of my experience, which inspired this paper, could be translated into three points: cultural globalization, the ‘Other’¹, and the praxis of global television journalism. This a work in progress and I believe there is scope to develop an interesting argument based on the notion of ‘invisibility’ rather than on actual representation of the ‘other’ in global television news, through a post-colonial theoretical framework.

The argument constructed here is based on a thesis suggested by Ziauddin Sardar.² His argument explores the condition of postmodernity not so much as a critic of ‘imperialistic’ narratives but a reinforcement of them through ideas of celebration of diversity. From there I would argue that invisibility of the ‘other’ in the global media would be, paradoxically, the result of the ‘embrace’ of diversity by Western cultures, which rather than celebrating other cultures, would alienate and make them invisible in the global public arena.

The second concern of this paper relates to the framework of news values that defines what events become news³. My point is that these unwritten criteria are all tainted to some extent by an ethnocentric or Eurocentric frame.

The relation of those two concerns is constructed on the idea that international journalism has not fully embraced the Other, but has kept political and cultural diversity invisible or portrayed through a Eurocentric view even when claiming to work in a global culture to a global audience. This seems at odds with the pressing awareness of cultural globalism, which has brought with it a necessary consciousness of the differences of the local in relation to the global - i.e. the need to think the local

¹ The category of the ‘Other’ embraces all others, cultures from the East, Africa, South America and so forth, therefore runs the risk of homogenizing different cultures/people. Here it is related to its use in the binary opposition of the Us versus the Other, the West and ‘the rest’.

² In his book *Postmodernism and the Other*, Sardar argues that postmodernism far from being a new theory of liberation, particularly from the perspective of the Other, is simply a new form of imperialism.

³ Used in the sense of news as culture, and journalism as a cultural practice, i.e. it not only transmitting information, but constructing ‘realities’ through narratives of ‘common sense’.

and the global as aspects of the same reality which helps reposition each of them in more nuanced ways. Now, it seems very difficult to construct international news about the western and other cultures as separate cultural regimes unless journalism is reinforcing an ideology of new colonialism.

The first argument delineated earlier on follows a critique of the assumption of postmodern⁴ thought; that we are living in a new era of liberation, diversity and ‘synthesis’ of cultures and traditions.

Central to my argument is postmodernism’s claim that the binary opposition of the Centre/periphery is deconstructed, marginality takes central stage as western cultures discovers Otherness, and thus a ‘new ethics of marginality’ has emerged centred on plurality and freedom.⁵ Hence, postmodern debate has been concerned to assert the importance of difference and otherness, so there is a connection between a postmodern critique of universalistic categories and the process of indigenisation. That is, “both indigenisation and postmodernism have a fascination for the textuality of knowledge; its local, embedded, contextual quality and the problems of universalising or generalizing about ‘human nature’”. (Turner, 1994:9).

However, what could be seen instead is that by embracing the other, postmodern relativism makes alterity far more than just the representation of all non-western cultures and societies, it avoids the politics of non-western marginalization through discovering and celebrating otherness everywhere. As suggested by Sardar, the celebration of the Other in postmodernism becomes an irony, i.e. instead of listening to the voice to the marginalised, “it uses the category to prove how unimportant, and ultimately meaningless, is any real identity it could contain” (Sardar, 1998:13)

Thus, has international journalism entered its postmodern phase by celebrating the Other through invisibility, since facts and people of different cultures would neither

⁴ The general ‘principles’ of Postmodernism are: primacy to difference, to heterogeneity, invalidity of meta-narratives, scepticism of knowledge, denial of reality i.e. what we have is a simulacrum of reality, death of meaning, deconstruction as a methodology of discursive analysis, and irony and parody as rhetorical strategies. Postmodernity is the postmodern social condition which is an effect of globalization, information and communication technologies, hyper-consumerism, deregulation of financial markets, and anachronistic nation-state.

⁵ See Yudice, 1988:214

be represented by any binary opposition such as Us versus Them nor represented as part of the heterogeneity of global cultures? Alternatively, would it be the case that international journalism is still viewing the world through the old Western-coloniser eyes?

Cultural globalization

The new communication landscape with a new era of global communication seems the adequate place to contextualize the global television and claims of invisibility of the other.

The 1990s have been marked by the collapse of political systems, the growing power of transnational corporations, the weakness of nation-states, the emergence of global problems such as AIDS and environmental destruction, and by global consumption of material and symbolic products which have helped to create the 'globalization' of the world.

That globalization is not a new process is well documented in the literature (Robertson, 1990; Hall, 1995). However, over the years the world has increasingly 'shrunk' in a time-space compression that brings the majority of the world's population together in a single society, or to "the concrete structuration of the world as a whole" (Robertson, 1990:50). This 'global society' then forms the structure for individuals and nation-states to operate under the logic of capitalism.

Whether globalization has been recognized or not as a feature of a postmodern world is not an issue here, but the outcomes of cultural globalization as a homogeneous or heterogeneous experience is what interests us. Without entering on a debate which has been discussed elsewhere (Wallerstein, 1990; Giddens, 1990; Hall, 1992; Featherstone, 1995; Hirst and Thompson, 1996; Waters, 1995), it is important to stress that the current accelerated phase of globalization does not refer to the success of any 'metanarrative' but rather to their dissipation. Thus, a globalized culture is chaotic rather than orderly – it is integrated and connected so that the meanings of its components are 'relativized' to one another but it is not unified or centralized. The relativism of globalization implies a 'pattern' of cultural diversity. A globalized culture, as described by Waters, "admits a continuous flows of ideas, information, commitments, values and tastes mediated through mobile individuals, symbolic tokens and electronic simulations" (Waters:1995).

Globalization is thus a dialectical process that both homogenises and diversifies cultures. The first process sees globalization as ‘cultural imperialism or ‘Americanisation’ brought about by the consumption of the same cultural and material products. The context is of a power geometry of globalization in which there is an imbalance of power between the west and the so called ‘third world’ countries, with winners and losers, which reminds us of the dynamics of historical colonialism and perhaps raises the suspicion of a new pattern of neo-colonialism.

The latter process focuses on the development of a diversity of cultures. In this approach, globalization has mainly resulted in a new level of multiculturalism that has redefined not only the traditional dominant cultures of nation-state, but has had an effect on the expansion of political consciousness into global concerns, and on the patterns of global communication. Consequently, instead of losing one’s sense of place because of increasing global influences, globalization has highlighted the importance of local cultures in a negotiating process of cultural hybridisation. In this context then, global journalism could be seen as a space for different cultures to meet and clash, blurring the distinctions between the domestic and the foreign, the local and the global, the us versus them. As Featherstone (1995) proposes, globalization is a “stage for global differences”, pointing out to a fragmented and de-centred globalization of cultures which suggests cultural exchanges and complexities (Wang and Servaes, 2000:4).

Turner suggests that the discussion of the binary opposition of West and the rest becomes redundant in a global multicultural world (Turner, 1994:183). For him ‘globalization brings about increasing diversification and complexities of cultures by interposing a variety of traditions within a given community. Cultural globalization, therefore, requires a new cultural reflexivity” (idem:184).

Global journalism ?

This, I suggest, gives a new role to intellectuals and, in this case, to journalists, as passing a judgement on the nature of national versus foreign cultures, as producers and distributors of symbolic messages for a global market, setting agendas around a specific definition of topic, characters, and political crisis, therefore creating

worldwide news. As also pointed by Volkmer, globalization of news replaces in-depth knowledge by the pace of the demand of ‘fast’ information on various levels. “ These fragments and particles, these keywords and stereotypes, make up a common sphere, and through it take a dominant part in the global ‘togetherness’ of symbolic communities” (Volkmer, 1999:92).

This new global position for journalists challenges the established frames of reference of journalism – the national and the local level and the binary relations. The development of journalism as a professional field has been framed in the context of modernity⁶ and the rise of the nation-state. Globalization has increased a tendency for internationalism and globality which has replaced the ‘foreignness’ of events which happen beyond national borders. While news framed in the modern paradigm used to consist in the distribution of national affairs within the borders of a defined nation-state, globalization has led to a more complex counter development – disappearance of national state interests within a global ‘news’ community – while at the same time increasing the perspectives of domestic news (Volkmer, 1999:93).

Thus, as rightly pointed out by Fursich, “the destabilized location beyond the national setting has the potential for a more complex framing of the Other”. (Fursich, 2002:60) The question for her is “how is the Other constructed if the ‘We’ becomes a redundant category?” and I would argue that the question is also about how to go beyond the ‘dichotomy model’ of representation of the other?

This unstable relationship between local and global and the deconstruction of binary relations have so far entailed the relativization of the other therefore their invisibility rather than a new model of representation based on sameness rather than difference.

The traditional storytelling of journalism in representing the other has been based on the West’s versions of reality imposed on the rest of the world. International journalism is based on the major values of journalism: objectivity, independence and public relevance which, in many ways, seem to ignore a new reality brought about by globalization, post-modernism and post-colonialism. Journalism seems to bring with it a certain world-view which in turn conditions its view of the world. The world-view of journalism is heavily mediated and the ‘reality’ presented to us in everyday life is mediated in a particular way. However, As argued by Ginneken, the problem with

⁶ As suggested by Hartley, “journalism may be taken as the textual system of modernity. It shares the salient features of modernity and modernism. The most important of these are: the people (society); science (knowledge) progress (politics) and comfort (capitalist-culture)” (Hartley, 1996:14).

Eurocentrism in journalism is not what the correct way of seeing things is, but rather admitting that there are many legitimate ways of seeing things in the first place. What is of concern here is the continuous process of ‘selective articulation’ (Ginneken, 1998:16) by which the media literally ‘make sense’ out of the world which surrounds us.

This ‘selective articulation’ is mainly defined by ‘news values’ that mark an event as newsworthy. The list of factors analysed by Galtung and Ruge about the ‘structure of foreign news’ ranges from frequency of an event to its negativity.⁷ One of the first findings was that the majority of ‘spot news’ items originated from a limited number of international news agencies. Apart from identifying these various factors, they suggested that these mechanisms led to a grave unbalance in foreign news reporting. Without, by any means, dismissing the findings of this seminal work, the point is only to show how the other is defined in the news by the major news-gathering organizations of the West who define what is news, what is normal/ordinary/expected in opposition to what is abnormal/extraordinary/unexpected. As suggested by Ginneken, the quasi consensual ideology of the major Western countries is responsible for the pre-selection and pre-interpretation of global news. “In this perspective, news production and news consumption can also be seen as a twenty-four-hour ideological repair shop for our world order and our world views. Possible anomalies are identified, checked and ‘normalised’, so that the ideological machine keeps running smoothly” (Ginneken, 1998:32).

My argument is that this model was developed in a different media landscape, where the dichotomy of the world ‘centre versus periphery’ and the nation-state had a much stronger role in defining the Other than in the current global landscape. Reinforcing this argument is the work developed by Hoskins who emphasis the anachronism of the model to deal with “media contexts – the setting of a new story in a given medium – (which) have transformed beyond all recognition.” (Hoskins, 2002:3)

Moreover, the media has implemented a world-view of exclusion in which different cultures and societies are defined as ‘foreign’. As pointed out by Volkmer, “the modern world view gave order to world communication and its effectiveness by

⁷ The ‘structure of foreign news’ was a study done by Johan Galtung and Mari Holmboe Ruge. They were interested in how major crises (of the Third World periphery) were reported in Norway (First world periphery). In order to find out they developed a content analysis of how the Congo (Zaire), Cuba and Cyprus crises of the early sixties has been reported in the Norwegian capital. List of news values: frequency, threshold, meaningfulness, consonance, unexpectedness, continuity, composition, reference to elite nations, elite people, reference to persons, and reference to something negative. (1965: 64-91)

employing terms like ‘First World’ or ‘Third World’ in designating communication structures” (Volkmer, 1999:104). This world order originated from an imperialistic perspective of the world as a settled and global hegemonic power based on the model of ‘core-periphery’. This model has been criticised as ‘an abstract expression of an idealized imperial system’ (Canclini, 1992:40) that does not recognise the complexity of cultural globalization as a decentred process, suggesting that the world cannot be understood in the rather monolithic terms that the core-periphery dualism suggests.

The literature on media representation of race, for example, shows that ethnic groups still tend to be represented in a stereotypical form. Stereotyping constitutes a representational practice which ‘reduces people to a few, simple, essential characteristics’ which are deemed to be unchanging (Hall, 1997:257). To claim that stereotypes of ethnic groups is the norm in the media implies therefore that complex differences are ignored and are thereby defined as the Others. Just to illustrate the point, let’s look at the concluding remarks made by Cottle in relation to race/ethnicity and the media: “the collective findings of this research effort generally make for depressing reading. Under-representation and stereotypical characterisation within entertainment genres and negative portrayal within factuality and news forms, and a tendency to ignore structural inequalities and lived racism experienced by ethnic minorities in both, are recurring research findings” (Cottle, 2000:7-8).

Although less attention has been paid to television news, most studies show the same pattern of stereotypical representation found in the press. (Hartman and Husband, 1974; Gordon and Rosenberg, 1983; Van Dijk, 1991). For example, the Glasgow Media Group conducted research to examine the language and visuals of a sample of news reports on migration and race in February, 1995, and the results showed that “news was sometimes xenophobic in tone, which reinforced our identity and their exclusion and, perhaps more importantly, provided a rationale for the apparent need for exclusion”. (Glasgow Media Group, 1997:46)

As it is often argued, the result of this constant process of ‘othering’ in television news is “to promote and consolidate a racist ‘commonsense’ which serves to justify and help maintain racial inequalities” (Gordon and Rosenberg, 1989:38). Although this does not imply that audience accepts this kind of representation as a preferred reading, there is enough support to claim that dominant representations play a significant role in influencing people’s perceptions of minority groups and that

dominant news frameworks in particular help to structure perception of the key issues in race relations (Pilkington, 2003: 185).

The explanation for the ways most of the international journalists recreate a 'modern' discourse of the other may be found in the discussion of post-colonial debates which shows that the discourse of the colonizer with its insistence of difference from the colonized establishes a notion of the savage as other, the reverse of civilized value. The residual aspects of this colonial discourse seem to have survived beyond the classic colonial era and continue to colour perceptions of the non-western world.

The construction of a distorted image of the other has been a concern in the writings of Said (1978) who has shown the degree to which Western systems of knowledge and representation have been involved in the long history of the West's material and political subordination of the non-Western world. He is preoccupied with the relationship between the West and the East and the particular discourse which mediated that relationship which he calls Orientalism. For Said, what is at issue is not so much the question of the West's identification with Eastern culture, but the fact that he sees all Western discourse about the East as of domination of Oriental cultures, therefore working in a duality which reaffirms Western identity as a superior civilization. As a consequence, Said's Orientalism works in the service of the West's hegemony over the East primarily by producing a discourse of the East as the West's inferior 'other'. This is achieved by a dichotomising system of representations embodied in the regime of stereotype, with the aim of making rigid sense of the difference between Europe and the 'rest. Thus, the other is produced in Orientalist discourse as – variously voiceless, sensual, female, despotic, irrational, exotic, barbarian, uncivilized. By contrast, the West is represented as masculine, democratic, rational, moral, dynamic and progressive. Such patterns of description – and the power relations they inscribe – are illustrated with reference to an enormous diversity of Western representations (Said, 1978). Although the work of Said has received criticism, his interventions cannot be dismissed, and are still useful to rethink the representation of the other in journalism.

Moreover, in writing about Claude Levi-Strauss's studies of Brazilian Indians, Jacques Derrida has identified what he calls the anthropological war –“the essential confrontation that opens communication between peoples and cultures, even when that communication is not practiced under the banner of colonial or military oppression” (1976:107). Derrida argues that the writing produced by this

confrontation always involves a “violence of the letter” imposed by one culture upon another, a violence, in other words, of “difference, of classification, and of the system of appellations”. The very process by which one culture subordinates another begins in the act of naming and leaving unnamed, of marking on an unknown territory the lines of division and uniformity, of boundary and continuity. We can expand this notion of anthropological war to include the entire system by which one culture comes to interpret, to represent, and finally to dominate another. In other words, it includes the discourses of colonialism as produced in a diversity of fictional and non-fictional forms, including journalism. (Spurr, 1994:4)

Therefore, one could argue that the media representation of the other as ‘periphery’ has resulted in the construction of a particular image of the other. Journalism tends to represent the other through difference, as if there were for example, a cultural authenticity and purity which differentiate the West from the ‘rest’. Tomlinson rightly asks, “how the discourse of cultural imperialism works for the diasporic cultures – and the answer is probably not very well” because it is difficult to grasp how this rhetoric of ‘cultural authenticity’ can embrace the experience of cultural hybridity. (Tomlinson, 1997:184).

A further point in relation to the representation of the other in postmodern times is made by Sardar who argues that there is no hope for the non-western cultures to reclaim the ‘truth’ of the construction of their image since “there is nothing but representations, all interpretation is misrepresentation” (Sardar, 1998:38). Thus, the status quo of a ‘racialised regime of representation’ (Hall) is perpetuated by framing of the other in stereotypical images.

The arguments about the media’s ideological representation of the other through a discourse of ‘modernism’, colonialism and imperialism are vast. However, the point here is to emphasise that the current position of international journalism of representing the other in a dichotomised frame is extremely problematic. The question is, if possible, how to change the dominant practice of an ethnocentric regime of representation in journalism in the light of the political and social changes brought about by globalization and multiculturalism. To find new journalistic strategies for reporting the other is of new importance in this emerging postmodern and media-saturated era in which the other has become increasingly invisible or misrepresented.

Possible Conclusion

In sum, I have presented my case of discontentment with global television news where I, as part of the category of the other, feel under-represented. I have focused my argument on the dialectical nature of the decentred process of globalization; on the pluralism of cultures and the constant negotiation of the global and the local, as a context to situate the international journalism 'landscape' where invisibility and/or misinformed representation of the Other is a constant practice.

The post-colonial perspective that I have drawn into this discussion has shown the origins of the current 'modernism' framework of journalistic discourse. Therefore, pointing out how, in the light of the political, social and intellectual changes, the paradigm of journalism centred on the notion of nation-state and on binary oppositions of us versus them needs to be critically re-evaluated.

In addition, journalists and media theorists should review the news values framework, as it does not seem to reflect the reality of a diversified and 'global' culture. 'New values' related to who has a voice in the news and who becomes news are especially important if a balance of voices is to be achieved. It is time to challenge the self-absorption and parochialism of much of Western journalistic theory.

To the central problem of the current regime of representation, one is faced with the challenge posed by post-colonialism. It asks whether it is possible to represent cultural difference without, on the one hand, resorting to essentialist models of identity or, on the other, reducing different cultures to the status of exchangeable terms in a system that is more or less arbitrary. To that, we could add Bhabha's suggestion, in a very preliminary way, that stereotyping is a complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation. This ambivalence is manifested because, in spite of the discursive 'stereotypical images' of non-Westerns in colonial systems, which are *sine qua non* to its exercise of power, colonial discourse produces the colonized as a social reality which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible. For him, "it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; and informs its strategies of individualism and marginalization". Without wanting to expand on such a preliminary argument, the alternative to the ambivalence of the representation of otherness would be perhaps a discourse of sameness that would emphasise the continuities between various cultures rather than their antagonisms (Turner, 1994). That is not an absorption of the particular in the general, for the very

way of articulating cultural differences calls us “into question fully as much as it acknowledge the Other...neither reducing the Third World to some homogeneous Other of the West, nor... vacuously celebrating the astonishing pluralism of human cultures” (Jameson, 1989: foreword xi-xii).

In this respect, perhaps a subtle change is on its way. Although most analyses of the representation of the other suggest a racialised regime of representation remains dominant, much of the literature relates to the 1970s and early 1980s, and most surveys have relied on either very small timescales or on unsystematic data-collection (Daniels, 1998:135). While there is some recognition of improvements in image of black and Asian images in popular film and television during the 1980s (Ross, 1996) and some recognition of improvement in terms of less negative news headlines (Van Dijk, 1991), such admissions of change, however, downplay the growth in both the volume and range of representation of minority ethnic groups.

In Britain, for example, the public service ideal of BBC and Channel 4 has allowed black programming to develop, and news casting to have a range of racial representation, (Daniels, 1996) due to recognition of the challenges posed by multicultural Britain, where BBC programmes should have values which in some ways speak to the whole society. Thus, programmes such as the black sit-con “Desmond’s”, and the Asian “Goodness Gracious Me” and “The Kumars at Number 10” are examples of a new policy concerned with the political and cultural representation of multiculturalism.⁸

This is an important move for an institution such as the BBC which has always been white, male and middle class. However, Programmes and People (BBC report) admits that in many ways it has failed to represent multiculturalism. “Either you get badly represented or you don’t get represented at all” was one comment (BBC, 1995:163-68). Part of the problem is the way that mainstream cultural institutions lump together non-western people of entirely different cultures. For example, British Asians and Afro-Caribbeans have often been arbitrarily yoked together in ‘ethnic minority’ programmes in attempts to satisfy both. In fact, neither party’s very different cultural interests or tastes were met.

While we can see some progress on representational practices in programming and news, Law reminds us that an old framework is still in place to portray minorities as a

⁸ See Dines and Humez, 1995 for a discussion on the media and multiculturalism

social problem. He suggests that the display of an “anti –racist show” masks the dominance of a discourse where whiteness is the norm against which others are seen, the marginal role of members of minority ethnic groups within news organizations, and a “collective failure to provide appropriate quality news services for black and minority ethnic communities and consumers” (Law, 2002: 76,159).

Thus, the literature on media representation shows that a racialised regime of representation can still be identified but it is no longer hegemonic but coexists with representations which dispute old stereotypes. The result is that representations of the other are frequently ambivalent and ambiguous. Such ambiguities are the site of ‘cultural struggles’ over meaning rather than the fixing of definitive meanings for the audience’ (Barker, 1999:169).

My argument on the invisibility of the other reinforced by postmodern claims of the contradictory ‘embracing of the other’ could be re-appropriated by what Hall proposes as a strategy to contest the complexities and ambivalence of representations itself by working ‘it from within...in an on going struggle over meaning and representation” (Hall, 1997:274). However, how to develop this strategy in terms of journalism when the other does not have power to break into the space of mainstream media production is quite unclear. The alternative of ‘ethnic communities’ to produce their own broadcasting services outside the mainstream media might be a way of voicing their otherness, but, it runs the risk of promoting ghettoisation and greater invisibility in the mainstream media.

In that way, postmodernist celebration of the other may be a useful theoretical category to give a voice to the non-westerns in television global news. However, I am still quite sceptical about how to use a discourse that may co-opt and assimilate the other whose experience it addresses.

Finally, the challenges posed by multicultural societies to global television highlights my discontent with global news in the sense that if television has helped to offer a ‘place’ where cultures meet and clash, the feeling of strangeness is still there, and I believe this situation is extremely variable. As globalisation further blurs the distinction between the local and the global it might not have yet reached the ‘reality’ of all the others out there, people who are more and more living in two worlds. Consequently, they (we) will not only have to be bilingual but also bi-cultural. In that

sense then, we will live and relate to culture as a ‘strategy of survival’⁹, culture “between spaces” which provides the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood, negotiation and contestation, (Bhabha, 1994) and, perhaps accomplish ‘visibility’ and anti-essentialist representations in the public arena of television global news.

Bibliography

- Altheide, D. L. and Snow, R. P. (1991) *Media Worlds in the Postjournalism Era*. New York, Aldine de Gruyter.
- Appadurai, A. Disjunction and Difference in the Cultural Economy. In: Featherstone, M. (ed). *Global Culture: nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London, Sage.
- Barker, C. (1997) *Global Television*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- ____ (1999) *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Barker, F. et al (eds.) *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. Manchester University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1992) *Intimations of Postmodernity*. Cambridge, Polity.
- BBC. (1995) *People and Programmes*. London, BBC Publications.
- Berkowitz, D. (1997) *Social Meanings of News*. London, sage.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London, Routledge.
- Bignell, J. (2000) *Postmodern Media Culture*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Briggs, A. (1960-1995) *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom*. 5 vols. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Canclini, G. N. (1992) Cultural Conversion. In: Yudice, G. et al (eds.) *On Edge: the crisis of contemporary Latin American Culture*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Collins, R. (1990) *Television: policy and culture*. London, Unwin Hyman.
- Cottle, S. (2000) Media Research and Ethnic Minorities: mapping the field. In: _____ (ed) *Ethnic Minorities and the Media*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Curran, J. and Seaton, J. (1991) *Power Without Responsibility*. London, Routledge.
- Dahlgreen, P and Sparks, C. (eds.) (1992) *Journalism and Popular Culture*. London, Sage.
- Daniels, T. (1998) Television Studies and Race. In: Geraghty, C and Lusted, D. (eds.) *The Television Studies Book*. London, Arnold.
- Delano, A. and Henningham, J. (1995) *The News Breed; British journalists in the 1990s*. London Institute.
- Dines, G. and Humez, J. (1995) *Gender, race and Class*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- ____ (1978) *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Spivak, G. Baltimore, John Hopkins

⁹ Bhabha calls culture a ‘strategy of survival’, “where a resistant subject is a hybrid of the postcolonial legacy of Western forms of subjectivity and cultural identity, together with the otherness from the Western which the colonial experienced has mapped onto that subject. A ‘strategy of survival’ which is both ‘transnational and translational’. It is transnational in slavery, the imposition of colonial cultures on those they civilise, in immigration to the West and in refugee movements inside and outside the Third world. Culture is translational because such spatial histories of displacement make the question of how cultures signifies, or what is signified by culture a rather complex issue. The hybrid resistant subject can be described as postmodern because of his/her ‘translated’ culture and identity, internally different as well as representing difference for the West”. (Bhabha, 1994: 172)

- University Press.
- Fabian, J (1983) *Time and the Other*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Fanon, F.(1967) *A Dying Colonialism*. Trans. Chevalier, Haakon. New York, Grove Press.
- _____(1966) *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Farrington, C. New York, Grove Press.
- Fenton, S (1999) *Ethnicity, Racism, Class and Culture*. London, Macmillan.
- Ferguson, R. (1998) *Representing Race*. London, Arnold.
- Flournoy, D and Stewart, R. (1997) *CNN; making news in the global market*. University Luton Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972) The Discourse of Language. In: *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse of Language*. New York, Pantheon Books.
- Fursich, E. (2002) How Can Global Journalists Represent the Other? *Journalism*.3(1):57-84. London, Sage.
- Gand, L. (1998) *Postcolonial Theory*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Gans, H. (1991) *Deciding What is News*. New York, Pantheon.
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Ginneken, J. (1998) *Understanding Global News*. London, Sage.
- Glasgow Media Group. (1997) *Race, Migration and Media*. Glasgow, GMG.
- Hall, S. (1991) Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities. In: King, A. (ed.) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*. London, Macmillan.
- _____(1992) The Question of Cultural Identity. In: Hall, S. at al (eds.) *Modernity and its Future*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- _____(1992b) The West and Rest: discourse and power. In: Hall, S. and Gieben, B. (eds.) *Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge, Polity.
- _____(1995) News Culture for Old. In: Massey, D. and Jess, P (eds.) *A Place in the World?* Milton Keyne, Open University Press.
- _____(1995b) The White of Their Eyes In: Dines, G. and Humez, J. (eds.) *Gender, Race and Class in the Media*. London, Sage.
- _____(1997) The Spectacle of the Other In: Hall, S. (ed.) *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London, Sage.
- _____(2000) The Multi-cultural Question In: Hesse, B. (ed.) *Un/settled Multiculturalism*. London, Zed.
- Harrison, J. (2000) *Terrestrial TV News in Britain*. Manchester University Press.
- Hartley, J. (1996) *Popular Reality, Journalism, Modernity, Popular Culture*. London, Arnold.
- Harvey, S. (1994) Channel 4 Television: from Annan to Grade. In: Hood, S. (ed.) *Behind the Screens: structures of British television in the 90s*. London, Lawrence and Wishart.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (1988) *Broadcasting in the 90s: competition, choice and quality*. London, HMSO.
- Hoskins, A. *Goodbye New Values: new (s) times in media studies*. Paper presented at the 4th annual MeCCSA Conference. Reading, December, 2002.
- Jameson, F. (1991) *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*.
- _____(1989) foreword to Retamar, R. *Caliban and Other Essays*. Trans. Baker,E. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press. Pp. vii-xii.
- Kung-Shankleman, L. (2000) *Inside the BBC and CNN; managing media organizations*. London, Routledge.
- Langhorne, R. (2000) *The Coming of Globalization*. London, Palgrave. London, Verso.
- Law, I. (2000) *Race in the News*. Basingstoke, Palgrave.

- Lee, P. Television and Global Culture In: Wanf, G. et al (eds.) *The New Communications Landscape*. London, Routledge.
- Loomba, A. (1998) *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London, Routledge.
- May, S. (1999) Critical Multiculturalism and Cultural Difference: avoiding Essentialism In: May, S. (ed.) *Critical Multiculturalism*. London, Falmer.
- McBride, S. and Wiseman, J. (eds.) (2000) *Globalization and Its Discontents*. London, Macmillan Press.
- McGrew, A (1992) A Global Society? In: Hall, S. (ed.) *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge, Polity.
- McNair, B. (1994) *News and Journalism in the UK*. London, Sage.
- Mercer, K. (1990) Welcome to the Jungle: identity and diversity in postmodern Politics In: Rutherford, J (ed.) *Identity: community, culture and difference*.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. (1997) *Postcolonial Theory*. London, Verso.
- Morley, D. (1996) EurAm, Modernity, Reason and Alterity: or Postmodernism, The Highest Stage of Cultural Imperialism. In: Morley, D and Chen, K. (eds) *Stuart Hall; critical dialogues in cultural studies*. London, Routledge.
- Pearson, K. A. et al (eds.) (1997) *Cultural Readings of Imperialism*. New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Pilkington, A. (2003) *Racial Disadvantage and Ethnic Diversity in Britain*. London, Palgrave.
- Robertson, R (1990) Mapping the Global Condition: globalization as the central Concept. In: Featherstone, M. (ed.) *Global Culture, nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London, sage.
- Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalization*. London, Sage.
- Ross, K (1996) *Black and White Media*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Said, E (1978) *Orientalism: Western concepts of the Orient*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- _____ (1981) *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York, Pantheon.
- _____ (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. London, Vintage.
- Sardar, Ziauddin (1998) *Postmodernism and the Other*. London, Pluto Press.
- _____ (1999) *Orientalism*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Sarup, M. (1996) *Identity, Culture, and the Postmodern World*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Scott, A. (1997) *The Limits of Globalization: cases and arguments*. London, Routledge.
- Scannell, P. Britain: Public Service Broadcasting, from National Culture to Multiculturalism. In: Raboy, M. (ed) *Public Broadcast for the 21st Century*. University of Luton Press.
- Solomos, J. (2003) *Race and Racism in Britain*. London, Palgrave/Macmillan. 3rd ed.
- Spurr, D. (1993) *The Rhetoric of Empire*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Sreberny-Mohammadi, A. The Many Cultural Faces of Imperialism. In: Golding, P And Harris, P. *Beyond Cultural Imperialism*. London, Sage.
- Staring, R. Flows of people: globalization, migration and transnational communities. In: Kalb, D. et al (eds.) *The Ends of Globalization*. London, Rowman.
- Stevenson, N. (2000) Globalization and Cultural Political Economy In: Germain, R. *Globalization and its Critics*. London, Macmillan.
- Taylor, P. (2001) Iizations of the World: Americanization, modernization and globalization. In: Hay, C. and Marsh, D. *Demystifying Globalization*. London, Palgrave.

- Tomlinson, J. (1997) *Cultural Globalization and Cultural Imperialism*. In: Mohammadi, A. *International Communication and Globalization*. London, Sage.
- Tracey, M. (1998) *The Decline and Fall of Public Service Broadcasting*. Oxford University Press.
- ____ (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge, Polity press.
- Turner, B. S. (1994) *Orientalism, Postmodernism & Globalism*. London, Routledge.
- Volkmer, I. (1999) *News in the Global Sphere: a study of CNN and its impact on Global Communication*. Bedfordshire, University of Luton Press.