



8-2006

Democracy, Hegemony, and Consent: A Critical Ideological Analysis of Mass Mediated Language

Michael Alan Glassco
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Mass Communication Commons

Recommended Citation

Glassco, Michael Alan, "Democracy, Hegemony, and Consent: A Critical Ideological Analysis of Mass Mediated Language" (2006). *Masters Theses*. 4187.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4187

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



DEMOCRACY, HEGEMONY, AND CONSENT: A CRITICAL IDEOLOGICAL
ANALYSIS OF MASS MEDIATED LANGUAGE

by

Michael Alan Glassco

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
School of Communication

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 2006

© 2006 Michael Alan Glassco

DEMOCRACY, HEGEMONY, AND CONSENT: A CRITICAL IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF MASS MEDIATED LANGUAGE

Michael Alan Glassco, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 2006

Accepting and incorporating mediated political discourse into our everyday lives without conscious attention to the language used perpetuates the underlying ideological assumptions of power guiding such discourse. The consequences of such overreaching power are manifest in the public sphere as a hegemonic system in which free market capitalism is portrayed as democratic and necessary to serve the needs of the public. This thesis focuses specifically on two versions of the Society of Professional Journalist Codes of Ethics 1987 and 1996, thought to influence the output of news organizations. This analysis exposes the problems inherent in the news media's focus of objectivity—an implicit patriarchal capitalist ideology—through Jon Lye's (1997) methods of critical ideological analysis. It is also significantly informed by research in the areas of Political Economy, and Critical and Cultural studies. A historical and sociological review of the Society of Professional Journalist Codes of Ethics reveals the complexities of objectivity, unitary rationality and use of official sources which legitimize the news and the illusion of democracy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE.....	1
	Introduction.....	1
	Rationale.....	8
	Organization of Chapters.....	10
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
	Introduction to Critical Theory.....	15
	Ideology and Capitalism.....	21
	Language and Ideology.....	27
	Hegemony.....	30
	Knowledge and Symbolic Power.....	33
	Truth and Hegemony.....	38
	The Veil of Objectivity.....	48
	Code or Dogma?.....	54
	Democracy and the Public Sphere.....	72
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	81
	Critical Theory as Method.....	82
	Critical Political Economy.....	85
	Critical Semiotics and Textual/Ideological Analysis.....	88

Table of Contents-Continued

CHAPTER

IV.	CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION I.....	93
	The Fairness Doctrine and the Elimination Thereof: Contextualizing the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics – 1987.....	93
	Critical Semiotic Analysis of the 1987 Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics.....	105
V.	CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION II.....	117
	The Implications of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Contextualizing the Society of Professional Journalists Codes of Ethics – 1996.....	117
	Critical Semiotic Analysis of the 1996 Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics.....	125
VI.	CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	146
	Conclusion.....	146
	Future Research.....	148
	APPENDICES.....	152
	A. Lye’s Method of Ideological Analysis.....	152
	B. The Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics-1987.....	153
	C. The Ownership and Shareholdings of News Corp. Ltd.....	155
	D. The Ownership and Shareholdings of Time Warner Inc.....	157
	E. The Ownership and Shareholdings of Viacom.....	160
	F. The Ownership and Shareholdings of Disney.....	164

Table of Contents-Continued

APPENDICES

G. The Ownership and Shareholdings of GE.....167

H. The Ownership and Shareholdings of Advance Publications.....168

I. The Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics-1996.....170

REFERENCES.....174

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Introduction

While the current age has been described as the ‘information age’, the ‘global era’ and the ‘digital age’, the U.S. has recently arrived at an era where a technologically advanced market driven capitalist society operates through the corporate lens of autocratic interests perpetuated through the illusion of democratic ideals. The mainstream information media established to support citizen consciousness and thus, democratic participation in the public sphere, has lost their purpose amidst the current “regime of truth”.

The inadequacy of the news continues daily, for our news agencies are run by advertising revenue, boards of trustees and corporate shareholders whose pursuit of profit strangle competing meanings out of an informed citizenry. Such public information systems initially instilled to facilitate democratic participation, deriving from notions of objectivity and Enlightenment rationality, are suppressed under a hegemonic order that perpetuates illusions of professionalized neutrality.

A corporate and lobbyist guided autocratic government perpetuates the dominant ideology of free market capitalism through neo-liberalism rather than operating through richly diverse democratic practices. This is accomplished through projecting a perception of objective, neutral news. The media’s veil of objectivity is necessary to enable the public to derive an all-encompassing world view so as to make decisions within the often imperceptible elite corporate structure. Within this economically monopolized and institutionalized vision of reality journalist codes of ethics perpetuate rigid categorical

distinctions, gross oversimplification and highly abstract generalizations. This research will address these particular practices. However it should be noted that the significance of other discursive practices such as the creation of mythic character and competition researched by Alterman (2003) and Lule (2002), are beyond the scope of this particular study.

These ideologically obscured discursive practices are the mechanisms by which the news educates the public and perpetuates the notion of objectivity. Such mechanisms further substantiate not only the claims in the news but the method in which news information is acquired and disseminated, thereby perpetuating the dominant epistemological framework of unitary rationality and over generalized dichotomized discourse.

Additionally, the dominant ideology of corporate owned, commercially driven and sensationalized media perpetuates the illusion of democracy through the pervasive discourse of binary oppositions. This dualistic thinking limits possibility and the creative discourse necessary for a rich and vibrant public sphere. Moreover, the downward spiral of oversimplification in news media controls the epistemic framework in which knowledge of reality is fostered. Notions of dualism and binary oppositions in language are explicated in the literature review under the subsections, *Language and ideology*, *Hegemony and The Veil of Objectivity*.

The thesis asserts that objectivity and codes of ethics used by professional journalists are the myths utilized to maintain the belief that news language is not political or economic language. Insofar as journalists are complicit in such practices they further authorize these myths and promote their legitimacy. Once accepted, the myth of

objectivity allows corporate media to classify their output as objective and neutral (Shaver, 1995).

McChesney and Foster (2003) for example, argue that the mechanisms of professional journalism within televised news function to support the elite power structure. Such “professionalism,” legitimizes journalism and assures the audience that the news will not be influenced by corporate, advertiser, or journalistic bias (Herman, 2003). However, rather than questioning the sources of information, an over reliance is placed on “official” reporting. This heavy and undue reliance on such professional sources means it is more difficult to gain access to the news media (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001). Such professionalized authoritative pronouncements perpetuated through press releases, public relations campaigns, breaking news broadcasts, official reports and news gathering techniques are legitimized through the procedural guidelines of “truth.” Of great concern in the media scholarship from 2002 onward, is the pursuit of a universality of media ethics which authorizes and legitimizes the methods and means of perpetuating “objective” news as a superior news gathering and disseminating method.

The current U.S. corporate superstructure of monopolistic media control enables the five news divisions of Disney, Viacom, AOL Time Warner, Advance Publications, General Electric, and News Corp Ltd., to substantiate their dominance through illusions of objectivity. Recognizable networks owned by these particular conglomerates include GE’s NBC, News Corp Ltd.’s Fox News, Disney’s ABC, Viacom’s CBS and CNN owned by Time Warner Inc.. Ultimately, the mediated output is not that of a diverse democratic opinion rather, the capitalist network of information creation and distribution operates through a discourse that blinds the public to their subjective interests in favor of

dominant 'corporate' interests. From a critical theoretical framework, if these corporations run news and information media from profit-centered perspectives, how can objective neutrality exist? Furthermore, if notions of objectivity benefit the elite demographic, how can the news be neutral? The thesis discusses such social concerns through a critical political economy framework.

If the news operates under a premise of objectivity then journalistic discourse should remain free of elite interests and ideological positions. Moreover, if the ideal of democracy requires independence, diversity and neutrality then one must look at the degree to which the structure of the industry and the language of the foundational journalist codes of ethics foster political knowledge, participation and democratic ideals. Consequently, to analyze the media according to the procedural guidelines substantiating and continually perpetuating truth and power, and the illusions which they foster, is to examine the media according to the proclaimed objectivity and the economic production of free market ideology. Therefore, this thesis explores the embedded economic and ideological structure of news media, to determine if journalist codes of ethics perpetuate the dominant elite perspective of capitalist patriarchal ideology.

The thesis study also seeks to illustrate the elite interests that prevail throughout capitalist modes of mass mediated discourse. Although the primary purpose of this study is ideological in nature it aims to expand Critical Theory through an exploration of Political Economy and Semiotics. Ultimately, media law, policy, and journalist practices are explored through contemporary writings on epistemology, language, truth, hegemony and ideology.

Democracy, Hegemony and Consent: A Critical Ideological Analysis of Mass Mediated Language is rooted in Critical Theory with an aim to expand theory by bridging Semiotics with Political Economy. Critical Theory's leading members, include Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer and Herbert Marcuse, asserted that the 'culture industries' guided by capitalist modes of production were corroding political consciousness and altering notions of value. Critical research in communication is concerned with the possible implications the mass media has in threatening cultural values. An emphasis is placed on discovering the media's role in social, political, ideological, and the cultural spheres so as to foster change toward emancipation and freedom. Critical research aims to bring forth how the media function in reproducing the dominant ideology through multiple and complex forms of power.

Critical Theory encompasses a spectrum of social theories, more recently influencing postmodern, cultural and feminist thought which illustrates and informs scholarship within and against notions of progress and universal truth. Accordingly, Critical Theory places an emphasis within a broad array of epistemological and economic assumptions emphasizing neo-Marxist materialism and the socio-political economic structure of the media. As such, an emphasis is placed on emancipating publics from the current reign of truth and knowledge creation so as to dismantle the ideological state apparatuses, which perpetuate the dominant and prevailing creation of truth.

Critical Theory and Political Economy explore and analyze the apparatus of capitalist industries and the social conditions in which they are manifest so as to reveal the ways in which the dominant ideology continually reinforces domination over the public sphere. McChesney (2000) asserts that the importance of studying the dominance

of the market, capitalist social relations and the primacy of profit cannot be undermined for it impacts every facet of academia and the public sphere.

Ultimately, it is through Political Economy that one is able to analyze taken-for-granted and untested assumptions about capitalism and the status quo so as to support democracy. Insofar as Critical Theory's concern is the public, preexisting notions must be challenged so as to foster that which is aimed toward the betterment of society. "We need to immerse the field in the broad and important issues concerning media, capitalism, and democracy that political economy is determined to pursue" (McChesney, 2000, p. 44).

Semiotics is a theoretical and methodological framework, which utilizes theories of language, power, objectivity and contemporary sociology. As a form of deconstruction, Semiotics serves to explicate and reveal the arbitrary nature of symbols so as to expose the deceit of natural and inherent meaning in that which is signified. Through deconstructive insights one is able to examine the placement of value through a word's binary opposition to bring forth an ideal or historical order of value (Desilet, 1991). Uniting these theoretical and methodological means of inquiry, Critical Theory and Political Economy with Semiotics, provide a useful framework for understanding the relationship between journalist news ethics and discursive power.

The aim of the thesis is to utilize the significant political, economic, sociological and historical factors as the semiotic lens through which interpretations of journalist codes are analyzed. This thesis asserts that there is an undeniable relationship between capitalism and journalist codes of ethics. Its aim therefore is to bring forth the necessity to continually expose the complex web of myths perpetuating free market capitalism and

objectivity. Accordingly, an examination that focuses on the current economic structure of mainstream media and government policies, which give rise to media ownership configurations that influence media content will also be presented and discussed. An analysis of the structural factors such as ownership is pivotal in revealing how the ideology of the elite is manufactured, controlled and disseminated to the public. As Murdock (1990) suggests, “A close study of the interplay between the structural and action components of control within media industries helps considerably in illuminating the core issues at stake in current debates about the nature of power” (p. 144).

The specific critical textual analysis will utilize John Lye’s (1997) method of ideological analysis as a starting point for exploration, integrated within a Critical Political Economy framework. This multiperspectival method utilizes concepts within semiotic, poststructuralist and postmodern research to uncover power relations, embedded meaning, ideology and hegemony. Analysis of the Society of Professional Journalism standards of ethical principles versions 1987 and 1996 is the primary focus. The meta-analysis unravels knowledges within specific aspects of the Fairness Doctrine 1949, the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and the properties of six multinational media outlets. The significance of the Radio and Television News Directors Association code of ethics as it pertains to broadcasting is also an important area of scholarly pursuit, however the Society of Professional Journalism Code of Ethics is analyzed specifically in this study due to its long standing presence within the news print industry and the assumption that few journalists - electronic, print or otherwise - are unfamiliar with the code. Ultimately, this analysis provides a cross methodological study of the industry through broadcast regulations and journalist ethical standards.

Rationale

Corporate democracy is the dominant ideology and measure in which power perpetuates a 'regime of truth' thereby concealing the hegemonic order under the guise of active democratic and participatory citizenship. If we are approaching an age that incorporates and surpasses the deconstructive insights within postmodern and feminist concrete subjectivity our very notions of an objective media is a substantial threat to democratic input that is designed to serve as a mechanism of an informed public (Bourdieu, 1988; Smith, 1988). Insofar as the mass communication industries perpetually guide the perceptions of the populace through manufactured illusions so as to continually sustain capitalist domination we must reanalyze the power of subjective assumptions. For projection of Enlightenment epistemic assumptions of objectivity and modern rationality serve as mechanisms of enablement and constraint within the market place of ideas. The structure of the market place of ideas, "is not to be equated with constraint but is always both constraining and enabling"(Giddens, 1984, p. 25).

It is the premise of this thesis that objectively established universal claims of abstract truths, legitimized through journalist codes of ethics, sustain the world view of the dominant elite capitalist order. This naturalized worldview proliferates throughout the communication industry as 'ideological state apparatuses' and within, and through, the actions of consuming-citizens. Louis Althusser, in *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, reminds us that "all Ideological State Apparatuses, whatever they are, contribute to the same result: the reproduction of the relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation" (1969, p. 1494).

Objective power continually shapes the messages within the prevailing discourse of truth thereby insuring the acceptance of elite discourse. The acceptance of this discourse intertwined with the economic structure of the industry limits full social participation and the diversity of information necessary in a democratic society. Therefore, it is argued that insofar as the media operate through the modern methods of deriving and verifying truth, i.e., objective-neutrality found within journalist codes of ethics, the media continually privilege and substantiate the position of elite and corporate owners and subjugate personal and individual subjective experience necessary for self-governance.

The study bridges Semiotics with Political Economy analysis; for a critical theoretical interpretation requires an analysis of the historical, political and economic atmosphere in which texts exist. Following the rationale of Critical Theory, Critical Political Economy and Semiotics, the thesis creates a space in which the good of the public is fostered outside of economic interests. It works to reveal the invisible processes of power and domination through revealing not only what is visible but what is missing from journalist codes of ethics. Through this process one works "to expose the bias of the allegedly neutral concepts" thereby revealing the embedded domination which they serve (Hekman, 1999, p. 87). Thus, this process illuminates that which was previously excluded from the dominant epistemological discourse. Consequently, this process enables researchers and theoreticians to alter the structure of societal operations, relations, concepts and visible reality. The aim is to obtain knowledge of the oppressive capitalist structures, which perpetuate and reinforce their ideology thereby reinforcing their power, so as to enter the public sphere with the knowledge necessary to foster

freedom. Ultimately, media theory is expanded toward a new location in communication scholarship, situated as an interdisciplinary meta-theory.

To a not-so-surprising degree, little if any, research of journalistic ethical guidelines has focused through a hybrid of Critical Political Economy and Semiotic analysis. Insofar as democracy and a participatory public sphere require an informed citizenry, the media must continually be analyzed. To the degree that language shapes perception and action, through a legitimizing function of objective and professionalized standards, it is necessary to examine the procedural guidelines in which news is legitimized.

Organization of Chapters

The thesis is organized into six chapters and includes extensive appendices material. Chapter One introduces the study and provides justification for the proposed analysis. Chapter Two is a review of foundational literature emphasizing a depth of theoretical discussion rather than a breadth of scholarship. The style of the literature review, influenced by postmodern and poststructuralist insight within a critical theoretical paradigm. It attempts to provide critical assessments while reviewing foundational scholarship. The literature is presented in seven sections: (1) Introduction to Critical Theory, (2) Ideology and Capitalism, (3) Knowledge and Symbolic Power, (4) Truth and Hegemony, (5) The Veil of Objectivity (6) Code or Dogma? and (7) Democracy and the Public Sphere. Section one; *Introduction to Critical Theory* introduces the significance of particular aspects of ideology, capitalism and democracy within the foundational scholarship of Critical Theory.

In section two, *Ideology and Capitalism* the significant and relevant literature of Marx and Althusser are presented. Their contributions situate theories of ideology within the economic structure of capitalist modes of production. Within this section, the subsections *Hegemony* and *Language and ideology* review particular theorists who have focused through Marxist insights with a primary emphasis on hegemony, language and ideology.

The third section, *Knowledge and Symbolic Power* builds on the previously mentioned scholarship and reviews the foundational works of Bourdieu. His analysis of power and how it relates to conceptions of consciousness, ideology and the reproduction thereof is essential to understanding the authorizing function in which acceptance of language fosters. Concurrently, *Knowledge and Symbolic Power* reviews the legitimization of truth and the procedural guidelines of knowledge as that which authorizes capitalist ideology.

Section four, *Truth and Hegemony* introduces foundational scholarship of hegemony as it relates to power, truth, ideology and knowledge. Explanations and the functions of hegemony are established so as to explicate the significance of competing meanings, illusion and consent in relation to the prevailing myths of the media industry. Accordingly, much of the literature is re-introduced and re-viewed so as to continually build the conceptual and theoretical framework necessary for a Political Economy and Semiotic Analysis.

The Veil of Objectivity builds on the previous review and re-introduces ideology in the context of post-structural, feminist and contemporary sociological theory. This section provides historical, sociological and economic conceptions of ideology and

discourse. Feminist Standpoint Theory provides a review of epistemology, knowledge, objectivity and neutrality so as to illustrate the significance of patriarchal capitalism. In addition, a brief review of the role of objectivity and universal applications of journalist codes of ethics is provided.

The sixth section of the literature review entitled *Code or Dogma?* reviews journalist codes of ethics in greater detail. Accordingly, the history and development of journalist codes of ethics is reviewed. Subsequently, models of media and the role of journalism within the United States are provided. A brief review of the complexities surrounding journalist application of objectivity, official sources and professional conduct implicated in the code are analyzed.

The seventh and final section *Democracy and the Public Sphere* illustrates the historical context of public forums and the importance of such organization to democratic practices. In this section I review literature that elaborates on the role and requirements of media in a democracy in light of the literature presented in *Code or Dogma*. The theoretical and conceptual insights of contemporary communication scholars are reviewed so as to illustrate the historical and sociological function of the news media. Through an explanation of the control and impact news fosters in the public, the importance of facilitating a democratic media is set forth.

Chapter III-Methodology follows the literature review and is divided into three sections; (1) Critical Theory as Method, (2) Critical Political Economy, and (3) Critical Semiotic, Textual Ideological. This chapter reviews the historical significance of Critical Media Theory and Political Economy research. It asserts that Critical Theory is also methodological, because argument makes social issues visible, and actively works for

social change by any method than can serve such interests. Critical Theory seeks to produce knowledge that will effect positive social change rather than reproduce the status quo, i.e. the dominant ideology of those in power. Subsequently, a discussion of Semiotics and Political Economy as the methods of analysis is provided.

Chapter IV entitled Critical Analysis and Discussion follows the chapter on methodology. Within this chapter the first part of the analysis is provided. Organized through a historical and chronological development of Federal Communication Commission policies, the *Fairness Doctrine* and its subsequent demise is provided so as to extra-textualize the journalist codes of ethics. This doctrine provides the context in which the analysis of the *Society of Professional Journalism Code of Ethics* and the changing media industry is understood.

Chapter V Critical Analysis and Discussion, incorporating the previous analysis, reveals the changes made within the industry since 1987. Following the logical trajectory of historical organization and meta-textualization the implications of the *Telecommunications Act of 1996* are revealed. For the purpose of this study the *Telecommunications Act of 1996* will be referred to as the Telecom Act. The specific focus is not the doctrine itself as much as its consequences to democratic practices. Within this analysis the conglomerate structure of the industry resulting from the deregulatory environment created by the Telecom Act is provided in the collection of six major media conglomerate shareholdings (Appendices D through I). The analysis of the economic structure of the industry guided by the underpinnings of free market capitalist ideology provides the context in which the 1996 version of the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics is analyzed.

Subsequently, Chapter VI Conclusion and Future Research addresses the significant issues facing critical analysis of the media industry, its forms, language and text. Future research should remain focused on critical political economic and semiotic analysis for such methods reveal power relations, policy decisions and the hegemonic system of free market capitalist ideology. It is indicated that research should also re-
kindle propaganda scholarship for the discursive practices identified in this thesis are the characteristics outlined in propaganda scholarship. Furthermore, insofar as democracy remains important in establishing forums in which a diverse array of truths is promoted, research should continually study the implications of the media.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Critical Theory

The following literature review is organized through the assumptions of Critical Theory so as to illustrate the role of the media in a democratic society. Insofar as capitalist industries threaten democratic practices it is vital to illustrate the leading conceptions of democracy within academic research. Although, scholars across disciplines will illustrate the requirements of democratic societies, few in communication research have addressed the significance of combining democratic theory, the role of the media, capitalism *and* journalist codes of ethics. Ben Bagdikian (2000), Noam Chomsky (1988), Croteau and Hoynes (2001), Edward Herman, (2003), Herman and Chomsky (1988, 2002), David Kellner (2004), Robert McChesney (1999, 2000, 2003, 2004) and Vincent Mosco (1992) are the leading interdisciplinary scholars addressing the importance of democracy and the media.

Tensions exist between that which is a return to Enlightenment conceptions of democratic practices and the rejection of the epistemological foundation which gave rise to it. Thus, postmodern and poststructuralist insights both problematize democracy as that which amplifies silenced voices as well as returning to that which suppresses alternative accounts of reality. The very notion itself represents a tension that occurs throughout the entire thesis. Although a participatory democracy perhaps signifies the possibility of an ideal society and was influenced significantly by universal moral values and defended admittedly by Enlightenment rationality, it nevertheless exhibits the potential for furthering diverse knowledges and amplifying silenced voices. This

dialectical tension by no means will be resolved herein, rather its acknowledgement will facilitate the importance of democracy as instilled in the foundation of the U.S. as well as postmodern insights. Such insights reveal the necessity to voice the silenced and oppressed, engage in debate and participate as active agents in a democratic society.

Therefore, democracy and democratic practices are to be understood as that which are consistent with a participatory democracy as outlined in the works of Chomsky (1989), Herman and Chomsky (2002), and McChesney (1999, 2003). Accordingly, this thesis is written from within the confines of a representative democratic system, but argues toward principles of participatory democratic practices, noting that participation is vital to establishing a successful representative democracy. Thus, representative democracies hinge on the degree to which active and diverse participation is furthered. Therefore, a democracy and democratic practices are defined herein as *that which promotes and legitimates a diverse array of voices, worldviews and the places necessary for participation to occur so as to foster knowledges that are fully representative.*

It is within this framework that the term 'publics' is understood as that which represents a diverse array of citizens with competing voices, values and assumptions, all equally valid accordingly to their epistemological, axiological and ontological frameworks. Furthermore, democracy, that being representative or participatory illustrates the necessity for the media to promote an active citizenship for publics to participate and voice that will facilitate, at the very least, representative democratic practices. Such practices are further identified as the representation of multiple voices and multiple truths. Accordingly, democracy and publics are here to be understood as that which fosters the multiplicity of voices so as to facilitate competing truths.

It shall be noted that by no means is this an attempt to categorize publics as passive or ignorant as the very early magic bullet theory or all pervasive media effects model would suggest. Rather, the aim is to illustrate the responsibility of the news media in a democratic state; as well as the difficulty of successfully inserting competing counter hegemonic claims in the public sphere. Accordingly, as the review of the literature indicates, the assumption is not that publics are passive but rather inasmuch as their attempts are inconsistent with the dominant procedural guidelines of truth, greater difficulty of inserting diverse meanings will arise. Thus, this thesis asserts that in general the dominant paradigm privileges elite interests.

The work of Sproule (1987, 1989, 2001) guides the theoretical assumptions in this area. Sproule (1989) illustrates that in the early 20th century propaganda was viewed as a technique used to infect an entire audience through a single message. Consequently, the metaphors of magic bullet and hypodermic injection were labels used to describe the perceived effects of such manipulation. This hypodermic injection was viewed as a powerful message directly influencing a captive, cognitively uniform, population. Ultimately, the view of a magic bullet became a leading fear in the public and found predominant attention in communication research.

According to these claims, the public was depicted as gullible, easily influenced and manipulated by forces beyond their control (Black, 2001). However, Sproule (1989) advocates that the concern of the critical propaganda scholar was one of establishing and maintaining a view of participatory democracy. As such, attempts were aimed toward educating the public so as to foster participation. These attempts saw fruition in the works of Clyde Miller and the scholars at the Institute of Propaganda Analysis. During a

time of concern of machine politics and the connection between the national government and big business, the propaganda analysts investigated social control and democracy by analyzing the strategic use of distorted messages. Accordingly, seven common techniques were identified and disseminated to safe guard and educate the public to the misuse and power of language (Sproule, 1987, 1989, 2001).

Ultimately, Sproule (1989) contests that the propaganda analysts did not study content as second rate effects; rather, their aim was to identify the power structure of the senders. The purpose was to investigate whose interests the message will serve, for what purpose and to what extent ethical implications followed. Their interests were in the function of institutions and how they were able to covertly send ideologies through the news, government and educational systems.

Thus, much like the propaganda analysts, this thesis does not suggest or emphasize that publics are an irrational, passive, or alienated audience. Rather, the assumption is that the media has a greater ability to continuously perpetuate particular ideologies, for their constant and overwhelming presence enables them to employ a continuous barrage of messages. Ultimately, the aim of the analysts is reflected in the very institute they attempted to establish. Similarly, by fully acknowledging the potentialities of the publics the very purpose of this thesis is revealed as well. Thus, if it was a belief that the publics were a homogeneous mass of passive and ignorant citizens, the purpose of this thesis would be undermined, for this thesis is about expanding knowledges.

For the purposes of this thesis the word “media” refers to the mainstream news agencies of Viacom, Time Warner, Disney, General Electric, Advance Publications,

Bertelsmann and News Corp Ltd. Therefore the examples provided within this text represent the mainstream news, fully noting that some mainstream journalists and alternative and grass roots news organizations do provide counter hegemonic news. This thesis acknowledges the paradox that is often represented in either/or terms, however this work and the examples outlined should not be understood in purely either/or terms, rather such terms signify a hegemonic tension between that which is presented in general and occurrences that are both contrary and within the confines of the news. Thus, news individuals and organizations are both working for, within, and against that which is constraining. Subsequently, the struggle of journalists who promote public service but are dependent on economic security and professional advancement is also acknowledged.

Dialectic of Enlightenment is one of the most significant texts concerning critical social theory and mass production and distribution (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1947). The work still provides significant insights into how capitalist ideology functions in perpetuating the ideals of the dominant class and suppressing notions of humanity, freedom and democratic principles.

In *The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception*, (1947) Horkheimer and Adorno argue that technology fosters mass production, utilized by the corporate monopolies, to spread entertainment as a means of control. For, “the basis on which technology acquires power over society is the power of those whose economic hold over society is greatest” (p. 1224). Consequently, “all broadcasts are the same” due to the underlying interests to sustain monopolistic control. Ultimately, such conditions eliminate the diversity of opinion necessary for an informative medium in a democratic society. Accordingly, through the constant repetition of acceptable perception, “the

culture industry tends to make itself the embodiment of authoritative pronouncements, and thus the irrefutable prophet of the prevailing order” (p. 1234).

Horkheimer and Adorno’s (1947) work provides a vision of the dangers of mass production perpetuated through a system of capitalist interests. These scholars also provide an insightful and prophetic look into the current condition of our media.

Ultimately, to the extent that one desires manufactured needs, the populace is not an informed citizenry; but rather are amused expendable commodities, consuming the world while continually striving toward created value, and the mass degradation of their subjective interests. Consequently, the underlying concern of capitalist economy, corporate monopolies, uncritical acceptance of ideology, the refraction of perception and consciousness continue to be of great concern.

This chapter attempts to review the foundational literature applicable to the thesis area of focus in great detail while summarizing scholarship in existence that is addressed in detail elsewhere. An emphasis is placed on ideology in the contexts of the current economic structure, mass mediated messages, manufactured illusions, power, and hegemony. Consequently, the function of such mechanisms in creating and maintaining particular patterns of thought under the veil of objectivity are also given substantial attention. However, to uncover the extent to which ideological mechanisms operate in the media it is necessary to first understand conceptions of ideology. Therefore the review of literature begins with conceptions of democracy, then proceeds through a post-structuralist account of power, truth, and hegemony and concludes in a related area of scholarship that synthesizes power, hegemony, ideology, and truth within democracy, the media and journalist codes of ethics.

Ideology and Capitalism

The prevalence of scholarship pertaining to ideology is overwhelming throughout Critical Theory. Insofar as the news media ought to operate free of ideological bias it is important to review significant contributions to theories on ideology. Insofar as a democratic media is possible the visibility of ideological factors is foundational to this thesis. Therefore the aim of the following section is to review significant and foundational theories relating to the production of ideology. Accordingly, scholarship is reviewed in such a way as to reintroduce and weave together conceptualizations so as to further an understanding of the complexity of ideology, language, power and capitalist economic structures.

Sholle (1988) argues that according to classical conceptions of ideology, signs and images are produced by the dominant class to mask the dominant elite interests in order for the public to accept them as reality. The lower class continually buys into the ideology of the dominant elite thereby perpetuating their status and class divisions. Ultimately, ideology produces a shared consciousness in order to reinforce and reproduce a particular perspective. This perspective benefits the elite interests and the producers of such messages. According to Marxist approaches, ideology will ultimately distort one's view of their current social position. Ultimately, ideology produces motivation to accept erroneous beliefs. In the classical approach ideology exists and is sustained by a false consciousness, maintained through the dominant economic system (Porter, 1998; Schiller, 1973; Sholle, 1988).

The work of Karl Marx provides significant insight to critical scholarship and ideology. Although scholarship throughout Critical Theory elaborates upon and

disagrees with Marxist assumptions, the emphasis on the role of capitalism and ideology continually provides the theoretical distinctions necessary to the expansion of Critical Theory. The most prevalent aspects in Marx's writings address the objectification of reality and subjective experience. In, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (1932), *The German Ideology* (1969), *The Communist Manifesto* (1932), *Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), and *Capital* (1867) Marx contends that a society of mass productions serves to alienate and alter the consciousness of the society. This existential shift negates subjectivity insofar as the object produced shifts the perception of the individual to that of the object. Thus,

The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power of its own confronting him; it means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien (1932, p. 765).

Accordingly, the producer creates a condition in which the more one works the less able one is to have power over the conditions of existence. Consequently, the alienation of the worker exists due to the upheaval of his own subjectivity being transferred to a dependent relation with the object created. Thus, the very act of reporting the news according to standards of objectivity is a creation of something different, alien and other than that which is viewed and perceived from subjective experience.

Marxist assumptions are guided through elements of Hegel's dialectical tension between being-for-itself and being-for-others. For, it is in the presence of the other that one is, and is precisely not the other. It is through the presence of the other that existence is both created and determined, such that existence becomes the negativity that brings forth the flux of subjectivity while annihilating the independent subject. Furthermore, if

creating the material object fosters a relation in which the product itself negates the subject of experience, and is not perceived by the creator, then such creation induces a being for submission. Marxist principles have reached beyond historical materialism however and into Feminist and Critical Race scholarship. Scholars, for example, who have taken dialectical materialism arguments further and have expanded upon them include Anzaldua (1987), Bordo (1993), Butler (1990), Christian (1988), Cixous (1976), Gates (1988), Haraway (1985), Hekman (1999), hooks (1990), Said (1978), and Smith (1987).

Marx writes of the shift of value inherent in capitalist modes of production. He proposes a diminished perception of quality and the misconstrued relation between utility and value. Ultimately, capitalist economies determine modes of production such that the object is not valued according to its utility but rather gains value and is produced, according to its ability to be exchanged. This change in value according to quantity and exchange value is also seen in Benjamin's (1936) *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Thus, from the moment film is created and mass-produced, it is not the value of unique subjective expression that is valued; rather, the extent to which one can reproduce expression determines perception of value. Accordingly, it may be said that from the moment news is reported it is not subjectivity, depth, and quality that are valued but rather the fact that it is reported and reproduced quickly across multiple media channels is what determines its value. Furthermore, Benjamin states that technological changes in production alter social transformation and aesthetic perception. The alteration of aesthetic perception and truth in relation to electric epistemology has gained substantial attention in the works of Chesebro (1984), Gozzi and Haynes (1992),

Krugman (1970), Jamieson (1992), McLuhan (1964), Postman (1984, 1992, 1999) and Scheuer (1999) as well.

To the degree that one buys objects apart from utility, knowledge of the production efforts, or consequences required for manufacture, one supports that very system of production and submission. Ultimately, insofar as a citizen buys into commodities, value, behavior, language and perception associated with such products, they continually reproduce the ideology of the system itself. Such notions are also identified as a part of hegemony and symbolic power.

Ultimately, the following characteristics of ideology can be found within the work of Marx. In the beginning, the language of the dominant elite refracts pre-existing representations of reality so as to foster knowledge necessary to the reproduction of their interests. Knowledge is a fragmented and partial representation of reality selected by the dominant group who deems such presentations as acceptable. Accordingly, any representation other than that which supports the dominant ideology is suppressed.

Ideological representations distort reality due to the historical process in which they arrive. Such ideological representations reside in abstract, fictitious and unreal representations. As such, the pursuit of those who are dominant is toward an encompassing universality in which an ethnocentric worldview is furthered. Through this process ideologies bring together an interweaving discourse of subjective and objective interests. Ideologies are general, speculative and abstract as well as limited to determinate special interests. Insofar as ideologies attempt to answer all problems through universality they give rise to a “comprehensive” picture of the world. This picture emphasizes particular habits, thoughts, behaviors and attitudes that support the

ideology. Ideology masks the true intentions of the groups involved through a process of universalizing the particular and taking the part as the whole. The pervasive force of the dominant particular values, beliefs and behavior percolate into all mediated forms.

Louis Althusser (1969) in particular provides the necessary theoretical and conceptual distinctions to critical ideological theory. Althusser argues that it is the function of a capitalist society that the ruling class will ensure their economic position so as to create the necessary conditions to their existence. It logically follows then that in order to exist “every social formation must reproduce the conditions of its production at the same time as it produces, and in order to be able to produce. It must therefore reproduce: 1. the productive forces, 2. the existing relations of production (p. 1484).

For the public to willingly embrace and reproduce the interests of the ruling class, ideology must infiltrate and conceal its presence within cultural and socio-political discourse. Ideology is the mechanism by which agents continually reproduce both repressive and non-repressive social institutions. To the extent that one actively engages in the social institutions of knowledge, such as the media, church or school, one actively pursues and acquires the knowledge and skills required to reproduce the dominant interests of the ruling class. Consequently, through the process of developing and incorporating the proclaimed potentialities that such institutions advocate, one embraces “the ruling ideology” of time, place, authority, proper conduct and submission.

To ensure the existence of the ruling class interests, the state must be unified in its effort to sustain the dominant ideology. Consequently, epistemological, spiritual and moral paradigms passed on to the citizenry by and through educational, religious and communication media show us how the ideological state apparatus infiltrates and verifies

each institution, thereby providing the means and relations of production, and the continued existence of the repressive state. As Althusser (1969) states, “all ideological state apparatuses, whatever they are, contribute to the same result: the reproduction of the relation of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation” (p. 1494).

This is seen when the Federal Communications Commission serves to keep the corporate structure and its ideological foundation of market driven capitalism intact rather than fostering public debate.

The triumph of capitalism and the increasing power of those with an interest in privatization and market rule have strengthened the grip of market ideology, at least among the elite, so that regardless of evidence, markets are assumed to be benevolent and even democratic...(Herman & Chomsky, 2002, p. xviii).

Politicians, media owners and potential political campaign contributors provide the barrier between the interests of the public and the economic status of profitability. As a result, the public has been eliminated from the process of debating policy from encouraged corruption of the U.S. political system (McChesney, 2004).

The lack of democratic debate concerning the structure of the media system is defended through neo-liberal ideology, which claims market forces ‘give the people what they want’ and thus the system is natural and inevitable to the “American” system. In addition, professionalism protects the public from nefarious influences, communication technologies are innate to democratic theory and the First Amendment authorizes corporations and advertisers sanction without public interference (McChesney, 1999). “Neoliberal ideology has provided the intellectual rationale for policies that have opened up the ownership of broadcasting stations and cable and satellite systems to private transnational investors” (Herman & Chomsky, 2002, p. xiv). Neoliberalism refers to

policies that minimize the role of non-market institutions while maximizing profit-making so as to establish a society in which the government interference with business interests is virtually absent (McChesney).

Embedded in the social institutions of a capitalist society the media is the ideological servant of the ruling class, providing the self sustaining mechanism of elite interests. Thus, through acquiring and utilizing the dominant discourse and paradigms of knowledge and truth such as official reports, objectivity, binary oppositions, and gross oversimplifications, ideology conceals its presence and manipulates from within, thereby ensuring its continued existence. One way this is sustained in the media is to explore long standing self regulation. Journalist codes of ethics therefore become an integral indicator of embedded ideology and are the subject of this study's textual analysis.

Language and Ideology

Althusser (1969) argues that ideology "represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (p. 1498). Ideology is the lens through which reality is transformed into that which supports the ruling class. It is not *their* interests, even if perceived as such, but rather the interests of the ruling class that exploit them. Thus, ideology is effective to the extent that it creates a false reality thereby sustaining the interests of the elite. Consequently, one does not understand the real conditions of existence from ideology; but rather, is convinced that reality is the ideology that sustains their conditions of existence. Such notions are expanded upon within social philosophy and media scholarship in the works of Baudrillard (1981), Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, and Sasson (1992), Parenti (1992), and Postman (1984).

Ultimately, ideology functions through a proliferation of the dominant discourse embedded in institutions, thereby convincing its subjects that it is reality while simultaneously concealing its presence as something other than truth. Ultimately, Althusser (1969) states:

The reproduction of labor power requires...a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order, i.e....the ruling ideology...and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class 'in words.'" (p. 1485)

Any attempt to produce the conditions necessary for the reproduction of such interests requires that the media continually reproduces and substantiates the patriarchal capitalist ideology of those in power. Accordingly, the news media have been organized into a concentrated number of owners such that, monopolies in film, radio, music recording, publishing, and television entertainment are established so as to perpetuate an interweaving network of discourse consistent with corporate interests.

In a similar commentary on ideology Postman (1984, 1992, 1999) has devoted his works to critical media theory in such a way as to reveal the necessity of analyzing the discourse of the media. Postman (1992) contends that ideology refers to a system of ideas, assumptions and beliefs, which are often associated with doctrines, canon or an inflexible set of rules. Such rules are often tied to political and moral consciousness perpetuated by the dominant or ruling class. Postman asserts that language is ideology, in that it instructs the user to see the world through naming and dividing the world in a particular way. He argues that,

If we define ideology as a set of assumptions of which we are barely conscious of but which none the less directs our efforts to give shape and coherence to the world, then our most powerful ideological instrument is the technology of

language itself. Language is pure ideology. It instructs us not only in the names of things but, more important, in what things can be named. It divides the world into subjects and objects (p. 123).

Language instills distinctions in the world such that notions of subjects and objects, which are only the characteristics of language itself, are perceived as extensional boundaries and objective divisions. Thus, reality is experienced through a system of biased codes creating a predetermined perception of the world. Such codes act as a barrier between what is perceived and what truly lies beyond the linguistic structures of our mind (Postman, 1999). Here, the work of Benjamin Whorf (1997) reminds us, “We are inclined to think of language simply as a technique of expression, and not to realize that language first of all is a classification and arrangement of the stream of sensory experience, which results in a certain world-order” (p. 55)

Gottdiener (1985) contends that consciousness is controlled through the acceptance of the dominant world order. Once used and legitimized those in power are employing the ideology of sedimentation (Sholle, 1988). Sedimentation is an embedded ideology that serves a limiting function—such that—if accepted one is only able to talk about events in a particular way (Sholle). Thus the structure of sedimentation reveals limits to understanding possible narratives and possible solutions (Corcoran, 1984). As such, interpretation is limited and freedom, although perceived to flow through each choice made, is but an illusion (Whorf, 1997).

However, Stuart Hall (1981) provides a distinction between ideology, language and discourse. Hall argues that language and ideology are not the same since particular words can be employed within and throughout different ideological discourse. However, language is the dominant medium in which different ideological discourses are

elaborated. Hall further contends “ideologies do not consist of isolated and separate concepts, but in the articulation of different elements into a distinctive set or chain of meanings” (p. 271). Hall (1985) states that ideologies themselves do not operate through singular ideas; rather, the functioning ideology works through semantic fields and discursive chains. Similarly, picking out one idea triggers an entire chain of connotative associations.

This is seen in the media’s predominant use of binary oppositions of democracy and terrorism and its associative connotations of good and evil. Accordingly, reporting one idea of democracy is to report on that which has been associated with freedom, patriotism and the common good, while reporting on terrorism is inextricably intertwined with an entire chain of connotative associations such as evil regimes, Hitlerian and anti-democratic ideals. Herman and Chomsky (2002) indicate that this system has focused on victims of terrorism so as to continually reestablish enemy evil, which elevates concern and action toward intervention, subversion, supporting terrorist states, and military conflict, all of which are now under the rubric of a noble cause. Such mediated and ideologically embedded discursive practices raise the necessity of specifically defined patriotic activities and demonstrate the humanity of “freedom.”

Hegemony

The following review of significant literature utilizes Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) notion of hegemony in the *Prison Notebooks*, which provides a foundation from which to understand the complex conceptualizations of ideology, power and discourse that his work has furthered. Gramsci illustrates, much like Foucault, that the production of

ideology and notions of false consciousness are much more complex than the typical scholar of Marxism would allow. The Gramscian notion of hegemony refers to the idea that power, values and ideology operate so as to convince the public, on their own accord, that their interests are those of the dominant elite. Hegemony is the manufactured consent of beliefs won peacefully through ideology and has been a central point of media critique by countless media scholars such as Chomsky (1989), Fiske (1987), Hall (1973, 1981, 1985), Gottdiener (1985), McChesney (2004), and Mosco (1996).

Hegemony is politically constituted and is,

The ongoing formation of both image and information to produce a map of common sense sufficiently persuasive to most people that it proves the social and cultural coordinates that define the 'natural' attitude of social life (Mosco, 1996 p. 242)

John Fiske (1987) and Stuart Hall (1973, 1981) illustrate that the ruling elite and apparatuses of power shape the representations, narratives and meaning of culture and society. To the extent that one acquires such conceptual schemes and utilizes the language of the prevailing truth, one perpetuates the dominant code of a particular interest. These codes "refer signs to the 'maps of meaning' into which any culture is classified; and those 'maps of social reality' have the whole range of social meanings, practices, and usages, power and interest 'written in' to them" (Hall, 1973, p. 57). Thus, as the public believes the dominant representations they may condemn their own interests as that which is inferior thereby perpetuating a false consciousness and the hegemonic order. Thus, that which is perpetuated potentially affects the ways in which the population perceives the familiar thereby reinforcing notions that familiarity is normality.

The prevailing language is the means by which power and ideology are made to signify dominant meanings within particular discourses. However, in actuality no natural connection of meaning exists, for all symbols are arbitrary. The misunderstanding that the symbols of power are actually the signs of the natural order of things perpetuates the hegemonic structure in which power is manifest. Thus, insofar as that which is perceived by the public is *normal* and the dominant class perpetuates the ideological images of such familiarity that which is *other* is deemed as inferior, incoherent and deviant. Diversity of thought reduced in the public sphere by instilling institutionally created limited and fixed meaning. Hegemony is the active engagement of individuals, in which they accept and cooperate in a mechanism, submitting to their own domination. Consent is the means in which hegemony functions for such interests.

The works of Corcoran (1984), Gottdiener (1985), Lewis (1999) and Shaver (1985) illustrate that hegemony is the mechanism in which the dominant interests maintain power. According to hegemony theory, the capitalist class dominates the production of culture and belief systems and thus, the system of language used will support the system itself. Corcoran advocates that the most prominent form of hegemony is the establishment of a political system dominated by corporate interests. Moreover, Herman (2003) adds,

The mainstream media, as elite institutions, commonly frame news and allow debate only within the parameters of elite perspectives; and when the elite is really concerned and unified, and/or when ordinary citizens are not aware of their own state in an issue or are immobilized by effective propaganda, the media will serve elite interests uncompromisingly (p.4).

The following section reviews, in greater detail, the hegemonic system of language, the structure it advances and the result to consciousness and knowledge. Furthermore, it reviews how power and truth are naturalized, legitimized and authorized.

Knowledge and Symbolic Power

This section of the literature review examines Pierre Bourdieu's (1993) emphasis on language and social mobility. Bourdieu's study of language from a sociological perspective illustrates the necessity to continually study the language of the media and the producers and authorizers, such as the news, of such symbolic systems. Bourdieu illustrates not only what is lacking in communication scholarship but the necessity to utilize contemporary sociological theory within any analysis of ideology, language, power and the media. Consequently, the concepts of constraint, agency, power and truth are reviewed within the context of an individual's and institutional use of language. In addition, issues of knowledge and reality are examined in relation to the dominant discourse of the elite. Ultimately, Bourdieu argues that one's social mobility is constrained to the degree that the dominant discourse of the elite is inconsistent with the way in which an individual acquires, utilizes or has access to the language of the elite (1993).

Bourdieu (1993) argues that language is an instrument of power, which continually reproduces the relations of social classification, binary divisions, and domination within its structure. The system of knowledge and truth that such language produces inevitably sustains the foundation of its structure thereby perpetuating the dominant paradigm. Consequently, the ontological, axiological and epistemological

paradigms of elite interests are sustained through a limiting authoritative network of intellectual language, which creates the status and power of such discourse.

The dominant prevailing discourse of elite interests continually recreates the binary oppositions, class divisions and social hierarchy necessary to substantiate their existence. The mechanisms of power required to sustain such authority requires that the elite establish the official and proper norms, rules, and pragmatics of language and behavior. Consequently, power remains in the hands of the elite and sustains its distinguished position only insofar as the public believes in the truth of discourse and the methods of truth. Thus, through 'ideological state apparatuses' the "state language becomes the theoretical norm against which all linguistic practices are objectively measured." (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 45). As a result, the official dominant language becomes the necessary measure and mechanism in which reality and authority are classified. This is seen for example in the media with the use of such phrases as the 'war on terror' the 'axis of evil,' protecting, 'our way of life' and of course 'patriotism,' 'liberty,' 'freedom' and 'democracy,' which are eventually naturalized into mainstream consciousness and language.

Ultimately, according to Chomsky (1989) the most effective device of discursive power is to allow debate to exist within the limits established by the media. Accordingly, the corporate and governmental lobbies will effectively control the parameters on the legitimate range of discussion (McChesney, 1999). Ellul (1973), McChesney (1999) and Parenti (1992) argue that when the media have established the limited framework in which debate will amount, one will not see the issues underlying such a framework. Issues such as political doctrines and economics will remain hidden until the media

disseminate such matters to the public. Thus, by focusing debate on particular issues, the media serve to prevent debate of wealth, power and policy. Ultimately, discussions concerning the laws and regulations of such issues are restricted to the business pages or the trade press. But even then, they are regarded as issues of importance to investors rather than public issues important to an informed citizenry.

For example, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 passed without any significant media attention on public criticism and with little coverage of the consequences to a democratic society (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001; McChesney, 2004). The coverage that received most attention was framed as a business story rather than stimulating a broad public conversation as to how to regulate the consolidating media industry. Consequently the public was shielded from the political and cultural significance of this restructuring of media policy (Croteau & Hoynes). However, a rare example of the ownership and potential revenue of Bertelsmann found its presence on the front page of the New York Times during the summer months of 2006. This story was couched within a particular story angle relating to the release of the movie *The Da Vinci Code*. Bertelsmann's potential revenue from its publishing and movie sales illustrates the synergistic integration that is often hidden from the front pages of the press.

McChesney (1999) illustrates that what is conveniently and continually missing from the mainstream news are messages that illustrate the role, function and purpose of the media. Accordingly, the very notion that the U. S. media system is manufactured, and a direct result of explicit governmental laws, regulations and subsidies, is far from the dominant discourse. Furthermore, what is kept at the wayside is that this system is not the result of a free market nor is it a natural law; rather, the economic paradigm is

enforced and has created media giants without the public's informed consent. The lack of media attention to ownership and control reveals the economic, political and ideological power of the media corporations and the elite interests they serve. The absence of informed debate continues to perpetuate the presupposition that a commercially driven, profit seeking media system is fundamentally flawless. Accordingly, the presupposition that any problem that emerges will be resolved through less interference or regulation is continually instilled.

Ultimately, to the extent that one is unable to perceive or utilize the language of the ruling class, one is unable to enter the discourse or socio-economic position of the elite. Thus, the divisions of power embedded in language perpetuate the stratum of socio-economic, cultural, gender, and ethnic class positions which recreate the very conditions of exclusion, domination and mechanisms of power. Bourdieu's contribution to the literature therefore turns our attention to the symbolic means by which agents actively partake in authorizing the language of the elite.

Power, authority, submission and eventual domination are embedded in language use and acquisition, which perpetually reproduce the structure of power. Therefore, if, "all linguistic practices are measured against the legitimate practices, i.e. the practices of those who are dominant," then to take part in such practices, measurements, classifications and language of the proper and accurate language of the elite, is to take part in subjugation (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 53). Bourdieu argues that such linguistic practices sustain and legitimate authority as the primary means of acceptable discourse through its use by members in dominant and dominated positions. Thus, power becomes manifest through a self-perpetuated chain of recreation, instilled within the structure of

language itself and subsequent institutions of knowledge. Accordingly, the elite interests not only subject others to the mechanisms that reproduce their power but recreate their authority through utilizing the discourse in which they are trained. Thus, through the exclusionary function of language and the process of legitimization, the system of power recreates the language of domination. The works of Foucault (1972, 1984), Giddens (1993), and Mosco (1988) also provide insight into the structure, power, agency and ideology debate.

Insofar as journalist codes of ethics utilize the official paradigm and subsequent categorization and normalization which the exclusionary nature of such language creates, journalists produce the divisions necessary for the elite to subdue any deviation or threat to this system of power. Thus, the dominant language as perpetuated by journalists is the language of the economic elite. The elite perpetuate their authority through a refined verification process of objective classification, while that which deviates is classified as low in quality and value.

Nevertheless, the dominated reinforce the rights of authority by attempting to enter or adapt to the language of the elite. Journalism schools teach courses in ethics, reporting, writing style and the proper use of language. Thus, students learn to name, classify or categorize according to the way in which the dominant system has instilled, which sustains and reproduces the authority of such divisions. In the education of media professionals educators imitate and recreate the power of the ruling class. Domination occurs through the participation in authorizing and legitimizing the dominant discourse of binary divisive language and a closed classification system. Subsequently, the correct

means to classify reality and behavior is legitimized through embracing the discursive practices of authoritative power.

Bourdieu (1993) argues that language is an instrument of power, which continually reproduces knowledge and the relations of social classification through symbolic means so as to reproduce class relations and the positions of those in power. Ultimately, “knowledge of the social world and, more precisely, the categories which make it possible” is “a struggle...over the power of preserving or transforming the social world by preserving or transforming the categories of perception of that world” (p. 236). The notion of objectivity and the epistemological foundation in which it resides is the means by which knowledge and perception are preserved according to dominant patriarchal ideology.

Truth and Hegemony

Much like Bourdieu's concepts of language illustrates how social institutions create and maintain hegemonic relations, Foucault's conception of power are relevant to this study because unlike contemporary media scholarship Foucault provides a more complex vision of power than what is often studied in the media. As Scholle (1988) indicates, we must embrace ideology and move beyond its simplicity and toward the concepts of power and knowledge. Furthermore, Foucault provides arguments as to the means by which power and discourse shape reality. Consequently, issues pertaining to normalization, classification, objectification, and subjugation are reviewed herein. Furthermore, conceptions of truth are analyzed as a means to bring forth the vehicle of thought, knowledge and action toward the needs of institutional power and at the

foundation of journalism. Ultimately, power functions through the rationale of journalism embedded in the conglomerate structure of media industries so as to bring forth the very purpose and rationale that enables its existence.

Foucault argues that the framework in which truth and power function derive from, and through, the prevailing discourse and social network of institutional practices. Consequently, truth and power function as mutually reinforcing variables set up and interwoven within each other, so as to give rise to the potential of a prevailing system of truth. Subsequently, the prevailing truth serves to continually reestablish its presence through infiltrating an individual's epistemological and ontological framework. This is seen in the media's vascilatory hyper and hypo coverage of Osama Bin Laden or weapons of mass destruction, which are dependent on official reports from the nation's press secretary.

The truth created within the dominant paradigm derives power from discursive practices enabled through institutional authority, thereby subjugating an individual toward particular systems of thought, knowledge and perceptual frameworks. Once power develops the lens in which reality is filtered, objects become blurred or cleared according to macroscopic or microscopic necessity. Subsequently, truth is magnified or censored accordingly to the prevailing perceptual schemata. Thus, the regime and politics of truth are established through,

types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1984, p. 73).

Thus, the reign of truth is that which coincides with the reign of power. In a system in which the prevailing discourse fosters power relations enabling public discourse defined according to the prevailing interests, knowledge becomes that which supports the 'true'. Thus, the truth is verified according to the rules, procedures, organization, classification and system of power that exerts and pervades truth.

Truth is a manufactured illusion continually instilled by a governing body or institutional system, which sustains its authority through, at least in part, claims of universal values. In this regime of manufactured illusions, the subject becomes objectified and classified according to acceptable discourse, while subsequently subverting the 'inessential' unique qualities of alternative perceptions. Thus, to the extent that one acquires such conceptual schemes, one perpetuates a particular interest through the language of truth. Ultimately, all that is classified, verified and objectified according to this particular system limits discourse, knowledge and participation to that which the system has organized and deemed as true and acceptable.

Chomsky (1989), Croteau and Hoynes (2001) and Ellul (1973) argue that discourse dependent upon this truth spectrum undoubtedly reflects the interests of powerful elites, for consensus is formed by only allowing debate to exist within the desired parameters. Thus, debate about government policy itself will rarely be found in the media unless it is within the framework determined by state and corporate power. If one has similar views, no attempt will be made to disrupt the flow of such issues. Ultimately, such censored information only allows debate to occur within the realm of desired discourse. "As a result, the views that dominate in corporate media tend to be those that are compatible with a corporate worldview (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 171).

If for example, commercial activities are provided protection under the First Amendment, political debate and government regulation are absent from the mainstream public sphere. Consequently, public debate over media policy and the communications industries have been effectively eliminated by the corporate media (McChesney, 1999, 2003). Chomsky (1989) contends that debate is limited through framing and reporting in a way that supports state and corporate power. "Corporate entities pursue profits for their shareholders because that is what they are expected to do. Those who manage such institutions tend to interpret events in the outside world in terms of whether they aid or hinder the company's pursuit of profits" (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 170). The power of this system, according to Herman (2003), provides the appearance of democratic consent under the veil of the elite interests. Consequently, the elite institutions frame news stories in such a way as to only allow debate within the constraints of elite perspectives.

As a result, we find policy debates that focus on marginal and tangential issues; for core structures and policies are off limits to criticism. Such issues gravitate toward the elite level while public participation disappears (McChesney, 2004). The erosion of the public sphere reflects the choices of the public as consumers rather than citizens. The owners and managers of the media decide what will be offered and the public chooses among the options provided. What is watched or viewed is done so on the basis of what is intensively promoted or readily available.

Ultimately then, truth is constraint if it is "understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements" and "is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and

sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it”; for, one is constrained to the truth that benefits the particular order of power (Foucault, p. 74). Consequently, to the extent that one believes the truth of prevailing discourse, one subjects oneself to a particular line of thinking, which serves to continually reinstate the constraint and domination of the individual. This particular line of thinking, in which all is evaluated against, objectifies the individual according to the elite interests of classification, thereby creating fixed categories of normalization.

Thus, that which is, is constructed and measured in relation to a manufactured illusion of reality so as to reinforce the truth of the prevailing discourses. This construction enables the objectification and subjugation of an individual’s reality. Consequently, institutions which implement such procedural guidelines recreate the governing apparatus of truth and the technology in which power operates. This study asserts that journalistic objectivity among other ‘procedural’ and ‘ethical’ practices enables power to both conceal and censor that which will give rise to potential battles for the status of truth. As a result, entire fields of knowledge and arsenals of thought are produced to support and perpetuate the circular feedback of truth into power into the world. Consequently, Foucault (1984) states, power creates discourses that are “interlocking, hierarchized, and all highly articulated around a cluster of power relations” (p. 312). And, power “produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production” (p. 205).

Power is the apparatus in which truth circulates into the prevailing epistemological and ontological fabric of individuals, so as to authenticate the social

network of power. Thus, through a continual feedback loop of truth and knowledge, into thought and action, power becomes an ordering, and thus ‘other’ producing apparatus. “In this sense, thought is understood as the very form of action—as action insofar as it implies the play of true and false, the acceptance or refusal of rules, the relation to oneself and others” (Foucault, 1984, p. 335). Truth, then, becomes that which enables and constrains the very system which composes it. For example, that which is legitimized as true in the media, (universal notions of truth and progress) and within journalistic practices (objectively defined knowledge), become the measure and method by which other truths and knowledge are produced and constrained. Thus, the system of classification and normalization brings forth a truth serving particular interests, which enables an entire body of knowledge, politics, and order of the self within social relations.

Accordingly, the mechanisms of truth, the classification of knowledge, the systems of rules and procedures, the objectification of individuals, the normalization of behavior, and political and ethical order become prescriptive potentialities. Thus, truth gives rise to and enables the purpose for power insofar as power acts to provide the framework in which knowledge and thought are inextricably bound to the prevailing discourse. For example, in the Society of Professional Journalist Codes of Ethics, first borrowed in 1926 from the American Society of Newspaper Editors objectivity is ranked as a primary goal. Therefore, these ‘watch dogs’ of political/economic/cultural institutions partake in perpetuating Foucault’s assertion of power institutions.

The following section of the literature review builds on Foucault’s assertions of truth and incorporates Susan Hekman’s (1999) conceptions of and directions toward a

redeveloped feminist epistemological framework and method of truth. Consequently, aspects of universal truth, generalized experience and subjectivity will be analyzed because these are (or were) the central tenets of journalist codes of ethics and are identified as predominant forms of mass mediated discourse. Furthermore, conceptions of the dominant hegemonic discourse pervading current epistemology are examined to provide further insight into how the media and ethics can perpetuate a particular path to truth while subjugating multiple, equally valid truths.

Hekman (1999) argues that the current objective paradigms of truth perpetuate the inability to identify subjective existence within the conceptual framework of elite dominated discourse. Consequently, the conceptual schemes substantiating such methods have developed a framework in which that which is other is subjected to a classification of inferior. Strategies based primarily within modernist epistemology are subject to the analytical framework which supports such paradigms. Hekman (1999) illustrates that,

The hegemonic discourse of Western epistemology is unitary: Truth is defined as singular and universal; it can be attained by only one path. As a consequence, this epistemology defines difference as inferiority. Any deviation from the one Truth, the one path to knowledge, is necessarily inferior simply because it is a difference, a deviation (p. 91).

Thus, if truth is obtained through the analysis of prepositional phrases and such phrases are bound to a unitary logic, then that which is non-unitary, concrete and subjective is rejected from the realm of truth and is therefore irrational. Consequently, rational logic based within universal truth excludes any deviation thereof, mainly subjective concrete experience. Implicit in rationality is a framework of domination instilled through rational logic (Hekman, 1999).

Hekman (1999) advocates that in the end “we experience truth outside the realm of logic”, outside the dominant unitary path of truth which rational logic has defined (p. 104). Ultimately, the exclusion of feminist reality understood as multiple paths of truth and difference is due to this inconsistency within the structure of unitary rational logic. This has been the complexity that Butler, (1990) Cixous, (1976) and Haraway (1985) have battled within their work as well.

If a unitary rationality supports the dominant hegemonic discourse, and such discourse must of necessity derive truth, then any contradictory, multiple or alternate path deviating from the accepted means of establishing and verifying claims of truth are subject to unintelligibility. Thus, strategies emphasizing unique experiences and differences are denied access and visibility within the discourse of truth, for they are *other* than the unitary rational means of identifying truth. Furthermore, if the dominant prevailing paradigm of established truths is inconsistent with subjective conceptions of reality, then such claims remain hidden and consequently are perceived as nonexistent (Hekman, 1999).

Hayakawa (1964) provides similar insights upon analyzing the system of Aristotelian logic. For, two-valued orientation based primarily in two-valued logic creates a singular path toward truth, composed primarily of artificial dualisms not inherent in reality. Accordingly, ‘Truth’ is evaluated according to a logic that does not refer to reality or particular referents; but rather, to a system that excludes differences and creates binary oppositions. While this thesis is not a feminist analysis per se, discussion of this theoretical area provides additional support in understanding how the discourse within the media is perpetuated, legitimized and perceived.

The implications of binary oppositions are found within the works of media scholars such as Bagdikian (2000), Herman and Chomsky (1988, 2002), Scheuer (1999) and Shaver (1995). Herman and Chomsky argue that political propaganda relies on systematic and highly dichotomized political discourse. Scheuer (1999) argues that dichotomized language favors particular political ideas and disfavors others. Television works as a lens through which complex ideas are filtered and transformed into emotional and narrow, moralized political messages. Consequently, anything contrary or complicated, which advocates alternative account of realities, definitions and meaning will not be used as political or cultural knowledge for it is perceived as extreme, too complicated or incomprehensible.

It is important to note the guiding descriptive statements lying at that which is chosen in the media. For, an issue or event is defined by those who control the world of communication. Furthermore, an issue is not an issue until the media describe it as such Jamieson (1992) and Parenti (1992). These practices fall within the rubric of agenda setting and frame theory. Chomsky (1989) argues that once such interpretations are accepted governments such as the United States are unable to commit terrorist acts. For the actions employed are in the name of democracy or human rights. As such, actions toward peace are justified as peace, as long as such actions serve the governmental purpose. For example, the U.S. fires missiles in the Middle East to instill peace, while North Korea fires missiles to show power. Accordingly, explanations that serve to influence such action are based within terms of truth, what is right or what is moral.

Furthermore, the media will attempt to guide the acceptance of certain policies through labeling an enemy as a threat, intent to destroy them. Consequently, signifying

labels such as “terrorists” will be employed to refer to those who are seen as weak but simultaneously able to threaten the general population (Chomsky, 1989). Chomsky contests that if by chance, an issue develops outside of the control of the system it will be pushed outside of the debate and be regarded as unintelligible. Such challenges to patriotic assumptions are easily dismissed as anti American sentiment and are therefore pushed outside of accepted discourse.

However, Herman and Chomsky, Scheuer (1999) and Shaver (1995) argue that the dichotomy is not limited to language use; rather, it is reflected in the choices of story and in quality of coverage as well. In addition, it is not merely the oversimplification of language; it is the use of audio and visual rhetorical devices. Scheuer (1999) asserts that the television medium itself favors simple messages and simplicity opposed to longer or complex messages.

The strategic reliance and overuse of the simplex view of dichotomization maintains and predisposes one to see the world through rigid and simple dichotomies (Haraway, 1985; Scheuer, 1999). Subsequently, once such perceptual schemes are developed “the correspondence between objective divisions and classificatory schemes, between objective structures and mental structure, underlies a kind of regional adherence to the established order” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 127). As such, a division is placed within the public sphere and one is further distracted away from complex events lying beyond such discourse (Chomsky).

If a challenge to the existing condition emerges it is seen and portrayed as extreme, radical, Marxist and even anarchist. This is necessary to enable the public to derive an all-encompassing Anglo-centered world-view so as to make decisions within

the corporate elite, economic monopoly, and institutionalized vision of reality. In the end, issues contrary to accepted discourse become unintelligible (Bagdikian, 2000).

If the world portrayed is attached to abstract language of polar opposites, and such opposites build a conceptual framework in which the world is evaluated, which perpetuates a perceptual framework adhering to the interests of the dominant elite, then we must take seriously the ability of the media to perpetuate ideology. Accordingly, the means by which reality is produced, controlled, manipulated, perceived and divided should be analyzed. For, all that is classified, verified and objectified according to this particular system limits discourse, knowledge and participation to that which the system has organized and deemed as true and acceptable. The mechanisms of journalism, as indicated by the thesis are guilty of such collusions in power.

The Veil of Objectivity

Although principally, scholars have debated whether objectivity is even possible, journalists nevertheless argue that it is a worthwhile pursuit (Fink, 1988; Schudson, 2001; Ward, 2005). Notions of objectivity, ethical responsibility and universal essence derive from the moral principles outlined in ancient Greece by the philosophical discourses of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. The contradictions between them have perhaps helped guide our current understanding of ethics. Nevertheless it was in this era that the principles of universal truths and common morality in relation to epistemology and moral actions began to take shape. The philosophical arguments of whether reality is known a posteriori, from experience, or a priori, from pure rational thought, and how such knowledge facilitates the acquisition of truth and propels action guided debates even in

modern times. Accordingly, the works of Descartes, Hume, Milton, Newton and Kant significantly altered conceptions of such knowledge processes and the justification and legitimizing function of how truth is defined and arrived at (Fink, 1988).

Contrary to these paradigmatic frameworks an epistemological shift took place through the works of Nietzsche and subsequent existential rivals. The landmark of non-Aristotelian modes of thought derives from Nietzsche's anti-Platonic rejection of essence, origin, truth and universal nature. Nietzsche contends that in order to derive the truth of being, one must reject the basic assumptions of objectivity and the concepts of an all-encompassing universal nature. For, one cannot derive truth from glossing over the unique qualities of particular existences, but rather from the full appreciation thereof. Consequently, insofar as one has knowledge of essence or form, one acquires knowledge of a concept and is subsequently misled into a false knowledge of reality.

Nietzsche (1894) contends that the concept and the object create a relationship in which that which is known is never that which exists. Consequently, upon naming and utilizing concepts, one denies the unique qualities of its existence. "Like form, a concept is produced by overlooking what is individual and real, whereas nature knows neither forms nor concepts and hence no species but only an 'X' which is inaccessible to us and indefinable by us" (p. 878). Consequently, to speak or write of nature is to eliminate the subjectivity of experience and convert that which is perceived to a realm of manufactured equivalent conditions. Yet, we continually deceive ourselves employing a familiarity in which concepts impose, such that, we contribute to the pillars of knowledge built on the threads of hollow discourse. We peer through the veil of illusion forgetting that a concept is always other than the object to which it refers.

Such operations perpetuate a perception of non-difference between the symbol and that which it refers, and to the particular object and all other reoccurrences of similar objects. Such systems are useful but inevitably harmful to the degree that they refer to that which is other than itself, enabling one to communicate through illusions of consent. If one were to attempt to move beyond the limits of concepts one finds a condition in which reality becomes a continuously indiscernible constant flux of sensuous impressions. Thus, as Whorf (1997) contends,

the categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds-and this means largely by the linguist systems in our minds (p. 213).

Nietzsche revealed through a genealogy of morals that truth is the illusion that has propelled a systematic categorization of constraint and order. For as Nietzsche contends,

something becomes possible in the realm of these schemata which could never be achieved in the realm of those sensuous first impressions, namely the construction of a pyramidal order based on castes and degrees, the creation of a new world of laws, privileges, subordinations, definitions of borders, which now confronts the other, sensuously perceived world as something firmer, more general, more familiar, more human and hence as something regulatory and imperative (p. 878)

However, insofar as a concept is a symbol that stands in place of the unique qualities of the object and such symbols are governed by a system of rules, one objectifies subjective impressions of existence according to a prevailing dominant structure. Thus, to speak of truth is to impose a falsehood on that which is neither true nor false. To test truth is to subject experience to an arbitrary system of rules or logic. Truth has no inherent existence in nature, for that which is perceived is neither true nor false, but gains such status through objectified or measurable arbitrary codes of domination and submission.

Thus, “truths are illusions of which we have forgotten that they are illusions, metaphors which have become worn by frequent use and have lost all sensuous vigour” (Nietzsche p. 878).

The employed universal concept functions to establish order and domination over all that follow. The illusions of truth create the production of control through modes of regulation. Accordingly, insofar as one incorporates this system into knowledge, one participates in domination. The subject of this thesis is an analysis of these discursive practices within the journalist codes of ethics, those which enable such hegemonic consent. For the insights which Nietzsche advances have not been utilized as that which promotes a consciousness of such insight, but rather are used as that which promotes the existence of elite borders, definitions and boundaries.

The following section addresses Dorothy Smith’s (1987) standpoint approach to Feminist theory. Smith’s work is significant to this project because of her research on the discourse of objectivity, ideology, its relationship to the works of Nietzsche and its potential implications within the media. Accordingly, the following will review issues of objectivity, agency, and structure for her insights are necessary to any study analyzing the media, ideology and language. Consequently, the epistemological, ontological and methodological assumptions implicit in paradigms of objectivity are examined. Ultimately, Smith(1987) argues for a perspective in which sociology examines the subjective experiences of individuals derived from the concrete reality in which they are embedded. Smith contends that,

The concept of ideology brings into focus the conscious production of the forms of thought by a ruling class or that section of a ruling class known as the intelligentsia, which serves to organize and order the expression of the local,

particular, and directly known into forms concordant with its interests, aims, and perspectives (p. 56).

Through the infiltration and “production of images, ideas, symbols, concepts, vocabularies,” the dominant ideology continually frames thoughts and perceptions within their structure, thereby reproducing a false consciousness necessary to the foundation of their existence (Smith, 1987, p. 54). Smith argues that objectively pronounced neutral positions, within the theoretical discourse of sociology, imposes barriers and manifest distinctions onto that which they claim to analyze. Such concepts have operated through an inherently biased paradigm dominated by the authoritative positions of masculine conceptual distinctions. Such abstract distinctions give way to a discourse in which terms of domination are perpetually concealed under the veil of objectivity. Consequently, “scientific” methods of inquiry function through and determine social realities from a perspective in which masculinist discourse excludes the voice of contrary subjective experience. Additionally, the work of Judith Butler (1990) provides significant insight into the construction of gendered lives. Objectively identified methods of binary oppositions conceal an institutionalized bias of masculine concepts and the reality in it constructs.

The prevailing structure of “objectivity” perpetuates a hierarchical structure of male conceptual distinctions, control and patriarchal order. Thus, upon categorization, the prevailing objectively defined *neutral* categories de-privilege the unique concrete experience of individuality, thereby substantiating the hierarchy of dominant classifications. Thus, that which is valued, represented and known, is a manufactured illusion of an objective reality created by the concepts, methods and discourse of the

dominant elite. Accordingly, the positions of authority perpetuate the illusory status quo through specialized institutions of political, educational and communication apparatuses. Such institutions train participants in the skills necessary to legitimize and authorize the ideological hegemonic discourse of the prevailing order. Ultimately, within the socio-political, cultural, and conceptual schemes of analysis, the other is that which is outside of, or in opposition to, the prevailing, dominant structure. The journalism schools and newsrooms that hang codes of ethics above their doors and in their offices are among the institutions which perpetuate this hegemonic structure of objectivity.

Ultimately, structuring of dominant ideology continually recreates and substantiates the structure of domination through descriptions of a world in which objectivity is valued as neutral while subjectivity is evaluated as value-laden, inferior, and other. Furthermore, insofar as a non-expert or subjective place is that of otherness 'it' loses its unique individualized subjective expression, thereby creating the space in which objectivity operates as a device of manipulative socialization. Thus, subjectivity becomes other, an object, where actions and thought are subjugated and contrived to fit within the elite discourse of domination.

Insofar as the ideology of the elite has infiltrated the forms of epistemological and methodological paradigms within the media and a part of journalistic ethics, that which follows is a continual renewal of the established mechanisms of objective, 'neutral' domination and subjective exclusion. Subsequently, the established means of professionalism within news organizations, i.e. relying on 'objective' criteria in which the authoritative pronouncements from business and government experts evaluate the world,

creates the necessary hierarchy in which classes are divided, classified and organized into a structure of capitalist patriarchy.

Power, ideology and hegemony are successful insofar as that which is perceived, is perceived as natural and inevitable thereby reproducing consent. Ultimately, the system of knowledge and truth derived from the dominant language, rules and established means to gather and verify truth sustains the epistemological foundation of truth, knowledge and meaning, thereby perpetuating the dominant paradigm of elite institutions and class relations (Bourdieu, 1984; Foucault, 1982, 1984; Hekman, 1999; Smith, 1988). Of significant interest to this study is the extent to which journalist codes of ethics operate as procedural guidelines of truth, thereby perpetuating the hegemonic system of objectivity.

Code or Dogma?

The following section provides a review of related literature on journalism ethics. Subsequently, concepts of objectivity, universal essence, and moral virtues are addressed. Within this framework the professionalization and codification of journalism ethics is provided. Ultimately, by providing a review that addresses the historical significance and development of journalist codes of ethics, a brief history of journalism theory is provided as the necessary bridge between post-structural and feminist insight to that of the role of the press in a democratic society.

As of late, research on media and journalism ethics has placed a primacy on a universality of ethical principles. Perkins (2002) has claimed that journalism ought to operate through the universal ethical principles of truth telling, independence and freedom with responsibility. Herrscher (2002) also advocates for a universal code of

ethics. Accordingly, eight principles are identified as that which would serve human rights. Pursuing the truth through fact gathering, with an overall completeness, without conflicting interests, thereby eliciting freedom, independence and self esteem, while promoting honesty, privacy and honor, so as to treat people as equals and reveal the importance and relevance to news stories. Herrscher argues that the code should be adopted fully noting that the universal principles would eliminate cultural relativism.

The push for a universal code of media ethics continues in the work of Stenz (2002). Stenz argues that a universal standard should apply across cultures however, fully noting the generality of such principles. Stenz advocates for four principles: use restraint, know thyself, respect others, and be accountable. However, the work of Christians (1997) reveals that notions of universal moral order needs to be reexamined to see if notions instilled through Enlightenment rationality are still conceivable and intellectually defensible.

Christians (1997) advocates a more complex route identifying that humans strive for the universal principles of truth telling, non-maleficence and human dignity. This claim resides in the notion that normative ethics grounded ontologically is pluralistic. Unlike the Enlightenment version of universals and their ontological dependence on dualism, a dialogic Trinitarian worldview is suggested as that which advances a commonality of being. Christians proposes that the final question is the degree to which values affirm the human good. Ultimately, open debate espoused by competing belief systems is that which fosters transformative intent, strategic action, social change and a universal dialogic worldview.

Fink (1988) illustrates the rationality behind how truth is defined at the inception of the U.S. Constitution. This which would subsequently influence journalist codes of ethics is revealed in the work of Immanuel Kant. Kant's 18th century influence propelled rationality and the epistemological foundations in the age of Enlightenment. Kant advocated that morality and codes of conduct must be arrived at through reason. Accordingly, reason and the proper rationale should be universally applicable. The Enlightenment conception of human reason embraced and advocated for a common morality, unitary epistemological and axiological foundations, universal truth, linear rationality, and science and politics derived from rational consent.

Siebert, Peterson & Schramm (1956) illustrate that within this framework, libertarian philosophy would guide notions of the press, truth and ethical responsibility in the West. Fink (1988) illustrates that John Milton, credited with the concept of an "open market place of ideas," influenced the founding fathers of the U.S. and subsequent U.S. Supreme Court justices. The market place of ideas derives from a theoretical notion that truth would survive if positioned against false or unsound ideas. It implies therefore that truth depends upon competing and diverse opinion. Unlike Soviet-Totalitarian or Authoritarian rationales for the media, Libertarian rationality would require that the chief purpose of the mass media would be to inform, entertain and sell with its primary objective of discovering the truth and playing an adversarial role. Ownership would be private and controlled by a self-righting process of truth as indicated in the writings of Milton (Siebert, Peterson & Schramm, 1956).

In the 20th century the United States press developed a model which focused on social responsibility and the tension between mirroring reality and economic pressures

(McManus, 1997). Ideally, journalism's primary focus would be to inform, entertain and sell much like the libertarian model however its primary objective would be to raise conflict and instill rational debate. Therefore, the media's responsibility is to promote atmospheres in which truth can arise, i.e. a competition amongst a diverse array of voices. Ultimately, social responsibility is that which is consistent with the requirements of a democratic society. Accordingly, anyone who has something to say would have a right to use the media and it would be subsequently controlled by community opinion, consumer action and professional ethics. Ultimately, the media would be controlled privately unless it failed to ensure public service. Subsequently, insofar as the media fails to promote the outlined services, they are subject to public accountability (Seibert et. al., 1956).

Schudson (2001) illustrates that a change in journalism took place between the 1870's and the First World War. Although the exact moment is difficult to pin down, the explicit recognition of journalism as a profession transpired in the 1920s. In part the professionalization of the industry was instilled through the works of Joseph Pulitzer and the American Society of Newspaper Editors who developed the *Canons of Journalism* in 1922. The American Society of Newspaper Editors embraced objectivity as the natural result of perceiving science as God and efficiency as a necessity. Professionalism would promote and legitimize the notion that journalists operate through a scientific method thereby facilitating a perception of credibility (Lippmann, 1922).

The 1920s was the beginning of the explicit codification of objectivity as a moral code, an occupational ideal of detachment. The codes of ethics were developed to accredit journalism as a scientific profession. Journalists embraced the code outlining

objectivity so as to establish journalism as a distinguished profession apart from the prevalence of propagandists and the public relations industry. As a result, journalists would strive to aspire to the ideals of objectivity as a means to deflect criticism (Schudson, 2001).

Gans (1979) illustrates that journalists working toward the detachment of conscious values will embrace objectivity, disregard implications and reject subjective ideology. Schudson (2001) outlines the role of objectivity as the norm on which U.S. journalism has placed a heavy significance. Objectivity in journalism is that which exists as a moral ideal exhibited through news writing, reporting and editorial practices and thus is the 'normalized' practice or ideal. Journalists legitimize and authorize this norm in conferences, codes of ethics, textbooks, debates in professional journals, and scientific surveys of journalist opinions. Furthermore, this norm is observed by ethnographer's occupational routines. Furthermore, the hegemonic value of objectivity was utilized to deflect criticism (Schudson, 2001).

Tuchman (1972) outlines that form, content and interorganizational relationships contribute to the perpetuation of objectively defined news. In his analysis Tuchman argues that objectivity is strategically implemented by newsmen who advocate the formalized procedures and attributes of the news organization or news story.¹ The formal attributes of a news story are defined as the four strategic procedures which enable news journalists to claim objectivity.

¹ Newsmen is a term used by Tuchman and thus suggests that even in the 1970's industry studies were conducted by those utilizing patriarchal discourse. For the purpose of this thesis news journalists will refer to both men and women and replace the sexist language of newsmen.

Presentation of conflicting possibilities is a procedure in which claims may be unverifiable and therefore fact is determined by establishing that the quote itself is a fact, rather than verifying the claim. This leads to calling upon official sources to verify if such claims were made. The second procedure is identified as presentation of supporting evidence. Here the news journalist will acquire evidence commonly accepted as truth. Thirdly, the judicious use of quotation marks illustrates that opinion is used as supporting evidence. The fourth procedure, structuring information in the appropriate sequence, illustrates that insofar as journalists employ an inverse pyramidal order they are inserting their value judgments. One example of utilizing professional news judgment occurred two decades later—when news sources during the WTO proceedings in Seattle identified the so-called anti globalization violent riots. Emphasizing the particular violent acts of a minority of protestors, the reporter determined the importance of the event in light of violence rather than the peaceful protests associated with international trade.

In general, a news journalist has one working day to gather information and write a story. The process involves a hierarchical chain of editors and the economic implications of failing to meet the deadline. For such implications are felt by the journalist as well as the parent firm, for speed has determined a news agency's value. Thus, the strain of reprimands and deadlines serve as predominant factors in writing news stories. News journalists work to alleviate the aforementioned pressures by emphasizing "objectivity," here defined as the strategies utilized to minimize risks. Thus, detached, unbiased, impersonal guidelines promote the notion that libel suits and reprimands can be avoided and deadlines can be met. Ultimately, Tuchman (1972) argues that objectivity is the means by which newspapers and news journalists protect themselves from the risks

associated with their trade. Such risks include reprimands by superiors, libel suits and deadlines. So as to operate free from reckless disregard for the truth i.e., malice, a news journalist will call upon “objectivity” to protect his/herself. Ultimately, this strategic ritual is effective due to the hegemonic notion of objectivity.

Within this framework Graber (1980) identifies four models of news making. The mirror model derives from a conception that news is and should reflect reality. Here journalists observe the world and report what they see as accurately and objectively as possible. Subsequently, the function of the news is that of a conduit in which information is passed on to others. However, Graber also indicates a professional model for journalism, which suggests that news is the endeavor of highly skilled professionals seeking to please audiences by placing an interesting collage of events selected for importance, audiences, and economic reasons.

The organizational model, on the other hand, entails that decisions and news selection emerge from the pressures inherent in organizational processes and goals. Alterman (2003) suggests, ultimately, the reporter, the editor, the producer and the executive producer understand that job security hinges on keeping the corporate parents happy. Thus, people at higher levels are internalizing the constraints imposed by proprietary, market and governmental centers of power (Herman & Chomsky, 2002). Within this model it is rare that censorship should be thought of as prior restraint from government actions or that a story is censored from the corporate level downward. Rather, censorship is also self-censorship by reporters and commentators who adjust to source and media organizational requirements (Alterman)..

Lastly, the political model derives from the assumption that news is an ideological product of news people in relation to the pressures of the political and economic environments in which the news operates (Graber, 1980). Herman (2003) has provided evidence maintaining that the media have relied heavily on ideological premises in which an uncritical examination of elite sources remains, so much so that organizations continue to rely on, and participate in, propaganda campaigns reinforcing elite interests. Such organization, selection, emphasis and exclusion lead the news to define political discourse according to the defined boundaries of the news (Ryan, Carragee, & Meinhofer, 2001). Consequently, the media operate within the framework of corporate and political elite definitions, narrowing the spectrum of opinion through journalistic reports reflecting elite interests (Champlin & Knoedler, 2002; Ryan, Carragee, & Meinhofer, 2001).

Insofar as the mirror, professional, organizational or ideological models or that of libertarianism is utilized, sources are chosen who will reflect the interests of the system itself. For example, Croteau and Hoynes (2001) and McChesney (1999) contest that professional journalism relies on official sources who give those in positions of power, as well as the public relations industry, the ability to influence what is covered in the news.

This heavy and undue reliance on such professional sources means it is not only more difficult to gain access to the news media, if you are outside the corridors of corporate interests, but that that news organizations are less likely to pursue costly investigative journalism. For such reporting requires a greater investment of time and resources. (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001)

For example, WOOD TV, the Grand Rapids, Michigan-based news affiliate of NBC, recently identified via telephone conversation, that video news releases, or VNRs, are utilized without a careful fact checking procedure for new medical breakthroughs. Thus, public relations campaigns are promoted as news from the pharmaceutical companies and perpetuated as legitimate news. VNRs are not verified against fact checking procedures, for official sources are identified as that which promotes truth. As a result, journalists perpetuate the hegemonic system in which truth is identified as that which is consistent with the aims of those in power.

McChesney and Foster (2003) and Ryan, Carragee, and Meinhofer (2001) indicate a similar trend in news journalism geared toward the support of big business such that journalists routinely favor official sources and those of higher institutional power. Croteau and Hoynes (2001) illustrate that the logic of the system is quite clear, thus

Commercial news organizations would like to produce credible news coverage at the lowest possible cost. This leads to practices in which journalists rely on outside sources to feed them stories. Routine news material from government and the private sector efficiently helps news organizations fill their broadcasts and newspapers (p. 163)

This is seen in the Bush administration's White House Photobooks. The photobooks consist of a pre-packaged array of press materials. Accordingly, all photos taken in and around the White House are approved before reaching the news agencies and the public. As a result, no unofficial White House photographers are allowed to show photos that may contradict the message that the White House wishes to send. Furthermore, insofar as news agencies utilize such photos the message that is sent is that which verifies the truth of those in power.

Herman and Chomsky (2002) illustrate that the apparent bias results from the pre-selection of right-thinking people, the adaptation of personnel to the constraints of ownership, organization, market and political power furthers the internalization of preconceptions. As a result, "The responsibility of journalism to report fully and fairly on events of the day has the potential to clash with the interests of corporate parents to promote their business and minimize any negative news about their operations" (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 177).

Cirino (1971) advocates that the idea that news can be presented objectively or free of any bias is a myth set up so that owners are able to establish that objectivity is possible they are able to covertly determine news output. This output is biased according to the source, selection, omission and art of interviewing. Furthermore, placement, headlines, and words reveal an embedded bias. Moreover, images, photo selection, captions and editorials determine the structure of the news. Ultimately, to the extent that objectivity is impossible people require different viewpoints and a fair chance to express their concerns. McChesney and Foster (2003) contest that such bias has altered objective journalistic criteria and consequently finds political and commercial allegiance with the owners of the media. As a result, this process maintains a skewed standard reflecting the interests of the business elites.

Insofar as journalist codes of ethics fail to address such constraints the codes are incomplete, morally suspect but enable corporate deflection of criticism. McManus (1997) outlines eight variables that must be considered when evaluating journalism ethics. The eight influences upon journalism ethics include: Shareholders and owners, advertisers, sources, consumers, government, parent corporations, media firms, and

pressure groups. Ultimately, McManus illustrates that the four codes most predominant within the industry include those of the Society of Professional Journalists, the Associated Press Managing Editors, the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the Radio-Television News Directors Association. Each code signifies that journalists are free of business related constraints but in fact fail to consider the eight aforementioned characteristics.

McManus (1997) illustrates that journalists in a market model operate through three universal principles. The journalist first and foremost will work to maximize audiences, minimize cost and avoid embarrassing advertisers or the owner's interests. Upon doing so journalists work to sell a product rather than inform. Accordingly, the simple and visual, emotional and shallow reports are the ones perpetuated rather than the complex, significant or underlying issues. Ultimately, Croteau and Hoynes (2001) illustrate that,

The pursuit of profits is not a value-neutral exercise. Regardless of the rationale, the pursuit of profits can have the effect—intended or not—of constraining the range of ideas and voices routinely found in the media. In conducting their business, corporations do not want to promote information or views that contradict their goals. (p. 170-1)

Ordinarily journalism and propaganda are perceived as vastly different however, the propaganda model summarizes and illuminates the current review. Chomsky (1989) illustrates that when the primary revenue is received by the product labels of corporate advertising giants, the news media will not air information that is contrary to the interests of their economic revenue. Doing so would lead to a loss of revenue, power, control, and manipulative capacity (Chomsky, 1989; Herman and Chomsky, 2002).

An example of corporate domination of the news is seen in the years preceeding Tommy Sandefur's address to Congress testifying that nicotine was not addictive. In response to this address Jeffery Wigand, a former vice president of Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation, attempted to voice a counter-claim on CBS's *60 Minutes*. As a result, Wigand suffered through a smear campaign in which he was vilified as a liar by multiple news agencies. The source of much of this information was a 500 page dossier Wigand compiled and disseminated by Brown & Williamson. Ultimately, the smear campaign and threat of a law suit issued forth by Brown and Williamson led CBS to pull the interview and suppress the truth.

Accordingly, themes and facts that have been carefully researched and well-documented that are incompatible with the institutionalized theme are suppressed or ignored (Herman & Chomsky, 2002). Instead, same sex marriage, and celebrity births and baby names are used to provide inexpensive, graphic and socially trivial filler without any social context or public policy concerns. As a result, Tom Cruise and Katie Holmes and Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie's new baby names are promoted as that which is worthy of public attention. If anything, these practices serve to enhance sensationalism or paranoia. Accordingly, professional commercial journalism will stray away from hard investigative journalism of corporate malfeasance so as to keep the parent firms happy, while subsequently controlling exposure to sensational, easily covered or simplified, context free stories (McChesney).

The propaganda model focuses on the interests and choices of the mass media which perpetuate the inequality of wealth and power. The model traces the routes by which money and power perpetually filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent,

and allow the dominant private interests and government to enforce their message to the public. Such choices and consequences are reflected in the output of the media system in which information must meet the criteria of five filters established by the subjective interests of elite decision making before being disseminated to the public. The material that reaches the news must pass through successive filters, thereby ensuring that discourse, interpretation, and definitions of what is newsworthy continually re-substantiate the motives and initiatives of the elite. The constraints are fundamental to the system so much so that any alternative to what has been deemed acceptable is hardly imaginable (Herman & Chomsky, 2002).

The first filter focuses on the economic structure of the mass media. This includes the size, wealth, profit orientation and the concentration of ownership. The second filter refers to the commercial based revenue of the media; this being advertising as the primary source of income for the media. The corporate advertisers on television avoid sponsoring programs that engage in serious criticism of corporate activities. Thus the problems of environmental degradation or the military-industrial complex will receive little to no coverage. As the price of advertising spots and market pressure for financial performance increase and regulation decreases, a commodity-based system will increase while subsequently marginalizing or eliminating programming that has significant public affairs content. Public affairs content refers to issues relevant to policy and regulatory decisions. To promote their interest advertisers will avoid programs with serious complexities that interfere with consumer behavior. Accordingly, the media will privilege programs that are consistent with disseminating a selling message (Herman & Chomsky (2002).

The first filter which illustrates the impact of concentration of ownership and the lack of media coverage concerning this structure is seen in the lack of coverage of the COPE Bill. For example, on June 8, 2006 The House of Representatives passed the Communications Opportunity, Promotion and Enhancement Act also known as the COPE Bill. This act received little media coverage as it pertains to the consequences of the public interest and freedom of speech. This new legislation permits phone and cable companies to operate both internet and digital communications services as private networks. These private networks are free from policy safeguards and governmental oversight. Consequently, "net-neutrality," the concept that everyone should have free, universal and non-discriminatory access to the internet, is no longer upheld. Accordingly, the notion that the Internet is the haven for First Amendment principles is subject to reconsideration. Moreover, this bill released cable TV companies from many of their public service and financial obligations to devote channels to public access. Furthermore, this act would allow national franchises to replace local cable franchises. What is seen and promoted as news on MSNBC is a Judge's decision to allow R. Kelly's sex tape in court rather than public policy issues concerning the COPE Bill and the public's First Amendment Rights.

The third filter involves the source of information, such that, the dominant media will rely on and remain in the hands of government and business experts. Consequently such agents of power are the primary sources of information thereby legitimizing the authority of their positions and the truths they perpetuate. The media's strategic reliance on editorial decisions, professionalism, source selection and objectivity foster knowledge that is conducive to the interests of corporate elite owners.

For example, the Fox News Network's over emphasis on John Gibson and Brit Hume as special reports consultants illustrates an emphasis on homogeneity and the economic structure it promotes. This emphasis illustrates a symbiotic relationship with powerful sources of information through a reciprocity of interests and economic necessity. Economics dictate that resources are concentrated where significant news often occurs. Accordingly, the news derives from regular press conferences held at the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department. Official sources allow the mass media to claim objectivity so as to protect themselves of bias or the threats of libel suits. Thus, taking information from official credible sources reduces investigative expense, whereas information deriving from sources outside the bounds of official, expert or professional sources that elicits criticism or threats requires careful and costly research and is therefore carefully avoided (Herman & Chomsky, 2002).

The fourth filter is based on flak. Flak refers to negative commentary in the news media used by institutions, both government and corporate, to discipline that which is acceptable discourse. The powerful may communicate to stockholders about the media and generate institutional advertising and right-wing monitoring or think-tank operations designed to attack the media. Political campaigns may derive from flak thereby positioning conservative politicians who will serve the interest of private power and curb any deviation there of. Such is the function of Accuracy In the Media, to harass the media and pressure them to follow the corporate agenda and a right-wing foreign policy (Herman & Chomsky, 2002). The a non-profit organization of AIM critiques the news. Its mission is to set the record straight on stories that receive slanted coverage. Although it claims to promote grassroots citizen orientated watchdog activities, the website reveals

a far different story. For one does not have to scroll far down the webpage to see who the alliances are.

For example, Ann Coulter's new book *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* is not only promoted but is available at a discounted rate. In addition, the only link available on the AIM website is that of townhall.com. Townhall is a news organization that provides a special section entitled "conservative thought and philosophy."

The fifth filter refers to the name-calling and labeling device of communism. The term communism is used as a means to facilitate thought control so as to continually reinsert the naturalness and inevitability of the market. Today, the word "terrorist" connotes similar meanings and is employed to facilitate a similar outcome. Communism has always been the ultimate evil; for, it is a threat to property owners as it threatens their class position and superior status. This ideology will mobilize the populace against an enemy who advocates policies that threaten their property interests or support communist states and their radicalism. The fifth filter fragments the left and labor movements thereby serving the corporate interests as a political-control mechanism (Herman & Chomsky, 2002).

McChesney and Foster (2003) have offered additional perspectives on the critique of flak associated with left-wing biased news. They claim that the news promotes a left orientated approach to journalism for the majority of journalists identify themselves as liberals. Accordingly flak issued by conservative authorities claim that journalists abuse their power by broadcasting their subjective political views in hopes to sway the public. Thus, liberal attitudes are not consistent with the professional code of journalism. The

argument therefore implies that conservative perspectives are consistent with objective journalist criteria.

Ultimately each filter represents a pro-corporate elite barrier in which information must pass before being disseminated to the public. The five filters concentrate the range of news and limit what can become big news. The natural result of the propaganda filters is a dichotomization of the public sphere into binaries such as left/right, gay/straight, good/evil, patriot/terrorist, Democrat/Republican, or conservative/liberal to name a few.

Bagdikian (2000) has argued that concentrated ownership results in a limited range of information output and has grave consequences to democracy. In turn, the larger the corporation, the better it is able to promote its interests. The propaganda model reveals applied theoretical insights of the ideological model. Thus, political economy reveals the examples necessary to illustrate the function of the ideological model.

Bagdikian (2000), Croteau and Hoynes (2001), and Herman and Chomsky (1988, 2002) have established that it is well understood that the media are to operate independently from elite interests. Leaders in the media industry have contested that the news operates from unbiased and objective criteria. Accordingly, the news media have established a role in which claims of objectivity, neutrality and naturalness have been established. Consequently, the media are often perceived to report the facts with no attempt to persuade (Parenti, 1992). As Schiller (1973) advocates,

For manipulation to be effective, evidence of its presence should be nonexistent. When the manipulated believe things are the way they are naturally and inevitably, manipulation is successful. In short, manipulation requires false reality that is a continuous denial of its existence. (p.11)

The acceptance of discourse relies on the publics' sustained belief that the media and government do not have conflicting interests. Accordingly, the news must maintain the image of serving publics beyond any political, corporate, or propagandist infiltration.

Ultimately, we arrive at a complexity of understanding the role and function of journalism according to journalism ethics and the mirror, economic, political, ideological, professional and organizational notions within the media industry. However, it is argued that such conflicting notions reveal a tension between the acceptance, authorization and legitimization of journalist codes of ethics and the models in which they operate. The codes themselves indicate a bias toward the assumptions underlying their development. Consequently, that which is known is not knowledge of external reality; rather, knowledge is composed of an objectively identified discourse removed from experience.

The complex hegemonic system of truth and method across cultures indicates the problematic notions of universalizing journalist codes of ethics that the economic system of the industry promotes. Accordingly, it is no surprise that such principles are promoted and advanced within the industry and found across cultures, insofar as the industry's aim is to increase profit. Insofar as journalist's codes of ethics are applied throughout the world the principles may legitimize the free market concentration of the media thereby suppressing the diverse and substantive information necessary for democratic practices. For such problematic assumptions guided by the preceding principles may deprive the legitimacy of unique subjectivity and therefore find its presence within this thesis.

Journalist codes of ethics and the pursuit of objectivity are the primary methods by which the news classifies its output as neutral and the public is thereby welcomed to

sustain this belief. The pervasive assumption that the news is free of ideological content allows news agencies to promote their interests in the name of the public's interest.

Democracy and the Public Sphere

Democracy and the Public Sphere reviews the contemporary literature and theoretical and conceptual insights that addresses the function, role and requirements of the news media in a democratic society. In light of the literature presented in *Code or Dogma?* the historical and sociological function of the news media is reviewed. Many of the assumptions within this literature reside within the assumption that the function of the media in a participatory democracy is to promote a vibrant public sphere. Accordingly, this section illustrates the historical context of public forums and the importance of such organization to democratic practices. Ultimately, an explanation of the importance of facilitating a democratic media is set forth.

Sholle (1988) has argued that if the media exists as a democratic institution then it is a necessary function of the media to produce knowledge for society. The media are to provide thorough and unbiased information necessary to the functioning of democracy (Champlin & Knoedler, 2002). McChesney and Foster (2003) argue that in democratic societies the press and independent media have a complicated role. Rather than a propaganda machine utilized by those in power, the media, especially the news media, are expected if not required to reflect the range of creative visions and diverse ideas that constitute a society's vibrant culture.

McChesney (1999) asserts that the media play a central role in providing the basis for an informed and participating citizenry. Insofar as the media is set up to serve the

public interest it must by necessity become diverse, innovative, independent and provide substantive news coverage (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001). As Croteau and Hoynes and McChesney (2004) further indicate, a healthy democratic media system will provide substantive news, which addresses the issues most prevalent, or at least significant, facing society. However, such issues are presented in a way as to not merely inform the publics but rather promote active civic participation. Furthermore, the media must provide its publics with views that are independent of concentrated power (Croteau & Hoynes; McChesney, 2004).

Drale (2004) and McChesney (2004) assert that the degree to which a society engages in widespread informed debate is the means by which we can determine its democratic role. Accordingly, insofar as decisions are made by powerful self-interested parties with little to no popular participation, a society is less democratic. In an ideal liberal democracy participants directly engage in rational debate. Such debate and reasoned conclusions are drawn from criteria in which equal participation is necessary.

Rucinski (1991) illustrates that democracy, although potentially a universal ideal can be achieved in matters of degree. Insofar as individual citizens possess a degree of political knowledge, defined as the degree to which knowledge facilitates social interaction, a society and its members are demonstrating the degree to which they are engaging in democratic practices. Reciprocity is a necessary requirement for democracy. Reciprocity is defined as, “the shared knowledge of the perspectives of others and the interests underlying those perspectives” (p. 187). To the degree that reciprocity is full, all members know and understand the perspectives and underlying interests in the social

system. However if members are constrained from understanding these perspective, reciprocity is partial. Ultimately, democracy requires the knowledge of such interests.

Similarly, Buckingham (1997), Chomsky (1988) Croteau & Hoynes (2001) Drale (2004), McChesney (1999, 2004) and Rucinski (1991) illustrate that the fundamental principle underlying democratic practices is that active responsible citizens require information pertaining to issues and events occurring in their world. This type of social political knowledge is either derived from knowledge of the interests underlying perspectives or knowledge of the perspectives themselves. Political knowledge does not merely entail that one can recite the interests of those in power. Rather, knowing the interests may further establish active political engagement. Consequently, for full participation and reciprocity to occur the public must be able to compete freely in the information environment with full acknowledgement of the interests guiding such discourse (Buckingham, 1997; Drale, 2004; Rucinski, 1991).

Surveys have provided data suggesting that the U.S. public is misinformed rather than uninformed (Lewis, 1999). Despite living in the "Information Age" young people are less interested in political news compared to earlier decades (Buckingham, 1997). There have been multiple methods of assessing political knowledge, however they are misleading. For example, the ability to identify a political leader is not an adequate measure of political understanding and therefore should not be the measure of an informed citizen. Rather, political knowledge requires that an informed citizen is able to provide an account of differences between social actors and why those differences exist (Rucinski, 1991).

The lack of well-informed political awareness potentially leads to a “blind faith” in the political leaders and institutions of government (Buckingham, 1997). According to Buckingham, the *Times Mirror Report* data suggests that young people are vulnerable to political persuasion and are consequently uncritical of big business and government.

This society inundated with mass media of all sorts also has extremely low voter turnout, limited knowledge of public affairs, and general disengagement from civic activity. Although it is certainly not the only cause, the media’s inattention to its public interest role has contributed to generalized cynicism and alienation (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 203).

Buckingham (1997) contests, that the lack of political action and participation has provided evidence suggesting the public is nearly irrational, maintaining a depoliticized state of mind. The shift from informed consent to mere consent erodes the functioning of democracy (Bagdikian, 2000). The public’s interest derives from notions found within theoretical models addressing the historical requirements of an informed citizenry and the places in which citizens can acquire such information. The public sphere was a notion first formulated by Habermas (1973) to address issues most pertinent to the public interest and a democratic society. Habermas states, “By ‘public sphere’ we mean first of all a domain of our social life in which such a thing as public opinion can be formed. Access to the public sphere is open in principle to all citizens” (p. 92).

Habermas is a critical scholar who has focused his attention on democratic principles and the notion of emancipation. His emphasis derived from the preceding works of those at the Frankfurt School with a particular emphasis on democracy. Other scholars such as Buckingham (1997), Dralle (2004), Kellner (2004), Rucinski (1991) and Sholle (1988) also provide significant insight into the role of the media in a democratic

society. Therefore, their contributions as they pertain to the public sphere and democracy are reviewed in the following section.

During the era of Enlightenment public spheres emerged, fostering public debate on a wide array of issues concerning the public's role as active and informed citizens (Kellner, 2004). Historically, the public sphere was comprised of predominantly literate citizens. It was the array of places and forums in which issues pertinent to a democracy are debated and information necessary for intelligent citizen participation was disseminated (Herman & Chomsky, 2002).

The classical liberal public sphere were places in which citizens could articulate dissident views of the state and society. Ultimately, the ideal of fostering a diverse public sphere is the foundation which news practices and democratic theory ought to aspire (Kellner, 2004). While such forums may exist in the environments of coffee houses and progressive classrooms, rarely do they exist in mediated form. However, exceptions such as Comedy Central's *The Daily Show*, HBO's *Real Time with Bill Maher*, *Democracy Now*, National Public Radio's *On the Media*, the Canadian magazine and website *Ad Busters*, and the U.S. magazine and website *The Nation* have become forums in which citizens and politically astute celebrities articulate dissident views of the state and society.

In the U.S., the press was founded to provide information equally throughout society so that less advantaged individual could have the resources necessary to be active and effective citizens (Buckingham, 1997; Chomsky, 1988; Croteau & Hoynes, 2001; Drale, 2004; McChesney, 1999, 2004; Rucinski, 1991). According to the public sphere model indicated in the works of Croteau and Hoynes (2001) and Kellner (2004), the news

media educates citizens so as to relay the importance and necessity of public issues that face society. Accordingly, the news sends messages that perpetuate citizen consciousness and their role as active agents capable of change.

Bagdikian (2000) and Herman and Chomsky (2002) assert that the news media in a democratic society should not merely further democratic practices but rather, a democratic society requires that the media are independent and are committed to reporting and discovering the truth. Thus, the goal of journalism in a democratic society is to provide the information necessary so that the public is able to engage in effective self-governance (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2001; Slattery, Doremus, & Marcus, 2001). Accordingly, the role of the news is that of a facilitator, a mediator that promotes the education and role of active and responsible citizens (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001).

Croteau and Hoynes (2001) illustrate that the educational role of the news media is fundamental and is explicitly protected by the First Amendment. "Because its public service responsibility is so intertwined with the health of democracy itself, the press is the only business explicitly protected by the Constitution" (p. 202). Murdock (1990) argues that the freedom of the press is the logical extension of free speech and is synonymous with the freedom from prior-restraint as well as the freedom to operate in the market place. The underlying notion is that a market place of ideas unrestrained through government censorship or regulation should generate a stimulating democratic political culture (McChesney, 1999). "Ideally, the media are watchdogs of our freedoms, informing citizens about current events and debates, and alerting us to potential abuses of power" (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 6). Ultimately, the press is the means by which the

public's interest is served (Bagdikian, 2000; Chomsky, 1988; McChesney, 1999, 2000, 2004).

The public interest is the cornerstone to which the Federal Communications Commission has implemented policy decisions. Historically, radio and TV have always received less protection due to the limited amount of spectrum space available. Accordingly, the decisions that were executed were guided by the public's interest, convenience and necessity. This interest has been redefined since the early policy decisions of 1927 and is the subject of this thesis's meta-textual analysis.

Croteau & Hoynes (2001) state that in a democratic society, "The mass media serve the public interest to the extent that they portray the diversity of experiences and ideas in a given society" (p. 32). Consequently, the public requires a wide range of perspectives so as to make informed decisions. It is only through this type of exposure that citizens can truly understand their society. Furthermore, these authors assert,

The media...must serve the public interest by also regularly including ideas that are outside the boundaries of the established consensus. In this way, the mass media become a place where old ideas can be scrutinized and where new ideas can emerge and be debated. With a focus on diversity that welcomes disagreement and dissent, mass media can make a significant contribution to democratic public life (p. 32).

McChesney (2003) provides a systematic theoretical and practical application in which journalism is supposed to operate to foster active self-governance. Accordingly, journalism ought to operate through the lens of nine principles in which the publics are justly informed. Journalism's first obligation is (1) to the truth both in respect for and the transmission to the public. Thus, (2) its loyalty is toward a diverse public and the public sphere. (3) To do so requires a discipline of verification in which practitioners are (4)

independent from those they cover. This detached independence serves as the mechanisms by which (5) power is monitored. Accordingly, a (6) forum is established in which the public is informed and enabled to form criticism and social compromises. Subsequently, especially in our information saturated and entertainment riddled era, it (7) must make the significant interesting and relevant as well as (8) comprehensive and proportional. Finally, (9) journalists must be able to exercise their personal conscience. "To maintain their credibility with citizens and their integrity as professionals, journalists must remain independent of advertisers' wishes or the strictly business concerns of their employers" (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 164).

Bagdikian (2000), Buckingham (1997), Herman (2003) and Rucinski (1991) illustrate that insofar as citizens function as though the information received through the media is the entire objective picture, free of elite or ideological interests, one may support the underlying interests unknowingly. Ultimately, a controlled communication environment serves the elite perspective. Where a diversity of ideas is required for adequate solutions, the homogenization of information serves that of a particular uniform interest. Ultimately, for democratic practices to exist, a change in the political structure and media systems must occur. However, political change cannot and will not occur without an informed public derived from informed political discussion and debate.

What is of great concern in this thesis is the push for a set of universal principles that fail to consider economic pressures and policy decisions as well as an emphasis on individual responsibility rather than collective responsibility. Currently, scholarship pertaining to journalism ethics has insufficiently addressed the specific economic structure of the media industry, the policy decisions which made it possible and the

necessity to incorporate critical and cultural studies as a theoretical framework for fostering democratic principles.

It is argued therefore, that ideological consent is established through perceptions of objective reporting. Consequently the capitalist patriarchal ideology operates when the public is convinced that the media serves their interest. All of these are relying on market ideology authorized and legitimized through broadcast law and policy as well as journalist codes of ethics.

From this review of literature the following questions are posed:

How and what specific (a) principles, (b) standards, (c) assumptions and (d) discursive practices, (i.e., professionalization, official sources, unitary rationality, binary oppositions, etc.), of media ethics are used to perpetuate the doctrine of objectivity?

Furthermore, insofar as the principles and codes of ethics are claimed to be free of ideological positions it is worth inquiring into whether or not the codes of ethics are independent from the economic, professional or organizational structure of elite interests.

Subsequently, are the principles and codes of media ethics consistent with establishing an informed public and a vibrant public sphere from diverse perspectives?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

If the news operates under a premise of objectivity then journalistic ethics should remain free of elite interests and ideological positions. Insofar as the media operates through a social responsibility and democratic model it is imperative that these power institutions instill the means in which truth can arise. Subsequently, the media in a democratic free state must foster the forums in which a diverse array of competing meanings and debate can exist. However, the pursuit of a detached, value-free and objective media, reliant on professionalism, official sources and journalist codes of ethics poses a substantial threat to a system requiring competing voices. Insofar as objectivity is praised it must be asked: What specific (a) principles, (b) standards, (c) assumptions and (d) discursive practices, (i.e., professionalization, official sources, unitary rationality, binary oppositions, etc.), of media ethics are used to perpetuate the doctrine of objectivity, and how?

Furthermore, insofar as the principles and codes of ethics are free of ideological positions it is worth inquiring into the extent to which journalist codes of ethics are independent and free from corporate media influence, concentration of ownership, advertisers, sources, government and the level of synergistic integration. Moreover, the economic, professional and organizational models are questioned insofar as such models perpetuate the simple, shallow, and emotionally driven, reports so as to maximize audience and minimize cost. Ultimately the last research question asks, are the principles and codes of media ethics consistent with establishing an informed public and a vibrant public sphere of diverse perspectives? The following presentation of multi-perspectival

methodology illustrates how these research questions will be answered. Critical Theory is an effective and appropriate theoretical and methodological framework to answer the aforementioned questions.

The methodological approach outlined is strategic in that it aims to enhance the potentialities of fostering a diverse array of knowledges rather than narrowing them. This approach is informed by the deconstructive insights of Derrida (1997) and the semiotic distinctions of Hall (1973, 1981, 1985). Derrida illustrates that a deconstructive analysis necessitates the absence of a precise method. A precise and specific method entails a limited framework in which the knowledge that is brought forth is limited to the specific framework outlined at the start. The absence of a precise method facilitates greater unbound knowledges by an unfolding process in which multiple and complex knowledges are brought forth.

Derrida (1997) and Hall (1973, 1981, 1985) illustrate that this approach facilitates counter hegemonic truths in which the knowledges brought out are neither true nor false but rather alternative. As such, a deconstructive semiotic ideological analysis is, ceaseless for the unraveling of the ways in which language deconstructs its own assertions is endless. This analysis, informed by the aforementioned theoretical frameworks, facilitates the unraveling process in which the relationship between power and ideology are analyzed within the historical and economic environment.

Critical Theory as Method

Critical research privileges theory over method and is often defined as a method in itself. Accordingly, critical theory rejects the primacy of one method over another.

Critical research questions the epistemological assumptions of objectivity, acknowledges that objectivity based on empiricism is a problematic paradigm and is more concerned with social critique than producing objective knowledge. Accordingly, such scholarship embraces the role that values and embedded assumptions play in producing knowledge (McChesney, 2000). Subsequently, theory guides research so as to produce knowledge that will question social structures of power and effect positive social change rather than that which supports, legitimizes and perpetuates the dominant ideology of those in power (Hamilton, 2002).

From its very inception, critical theory was influenced by the economic conditions of post-war Germany and the devastation of its culture, values and freedom. Consequently scholars began to examine the tragic consequences of blind faith often associated with the capitalist industries and those in power. As a means to give coherence to the utter incomprehensibility of the destruction before them, the scholars of the Frankfurt School re-introduced the significance of values associated with culture, subjectivity and human voice. Influenced by the writings of Marx, Freud, Lacan, and the idealist tradition of German philosophy, critical theorists turned their attention to a form of theoretical scholarship that was both a means to identify power and a method of emancipation. The methodological act itself was an emancipator activity in that it freed practitioners from the confines of power. Ultimately, the argumentation and discussion that was brought forth drew attention to social issues and counter hegemonic claims of the social world thereby facilitating a freeing process.

The works from the Frankfurt School varied in their complexity, pursuit and analysis. Horkheimer and Adorno in particular focused on the industrial complex,

freedom and capitalism. Their studies often consisted of empirical studies, however, their findings were placed within dialectical social theory, which analyzed individual phenomena as a part of a much broader, socio-historical context. Horkheimer saw humanist philosophy, social value and deep-rooted philosophical orientation as integral components of intellectual work. Ultimately, his work turned to modern capitalist society and its industrialized production of culture. Accordingly, the very act of Critical Theory was both a theoretical and methodological framework. It is for this reason that critical theory plays such a substantial role in this analysis.

The review of foundational literature was presented and organized according to the depth of theory rather than overall breadth of related works in the discipline. The review offered insights of ideology through hegemony and the functions of economic control, creating a social order in which illusions are produced and consent is manufactured. The following serves to explicate through a historical, sociological and ideological inquiry the critical political economy of mass mediated messages as perpetuated through journalist codes of ethics.

The interpretive textual analysis will contextualize specific aspects of the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics (versions 1987 and 1996) within the economic structure of the industry, and will be informed by specific aspects of the Fairness Doctrine (1949) and the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Accordingly, two two-part areas of discussion are proposed within the critical semiotic, textual ideological analysis: (1a) political economy analysis of historic government policies that gave rise to media configurations (1b) critical textual analysis of a journalistic code of ethics, (2a) political economy analysis of historic government policies that gave rise to media configurations

which also introduces the current economic structure of media, and (2b) critical textual analysis of a journalistic code of ethics. The main analysis is a critical textual semiotic analysis of the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics 1987 and 1996, within the above-framed critical theoretical perspective and uses the textual indicators described below in sections *Critical Political Economy* and *Critical Semiotics and Textual Ideological Analysis*.

Critical Political Economy

Insofar as the media is supported through corporate interests and perpetuates the ideology of the dominant class thereby perpetuating hegemony, critical political economy is concerned with capitalism, ideology and the ownership of the media (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, 2002; McChesney, 1999, 2000, 20004; Mosco, 1988). Critical political economy of communication is the study of power relations that mutually constitute the consumption, distribution and production of communication resources. These resources include, but are not limited to newspapers, books, videos, films and audiences. Political economy focuses on a specific set of social and organizational relations organized around power and control (Mosco, 1998).

According to McChesney (2000) critical political economy of communication entails two main dimensions. First, it addresses the nature of the relationship between media and communication systems on the one hand and the broader social structure of society on the other. Critical political economy also examines how media and communication systems and content reinforce, challenge, or influence existing class and

social relations. It does this with particular interest in how economic factors influence politics and social relations.

Second, Political Economy of communication looks specifically at how ownership, support mechanisms (e.g. advertising), and government policies establish media systems and communication technologies and (directly and indirectly) influence media behavior and content. This line of inquiry emphasizes structural factors and the labor process in the production, distribution, and consumption of communication. The thesis will not present specific communication technologies or content necessarily; rather it presents the procedural guidelines by which content is guided and technology has played a part. Historical documents such as the Fairness Doctrine (1949) and the Telecommunications Act of 1996 provide the necessary ideological artifacts for analyzing the significance of public interest, convenience and necessity as they relate to democracy, capitalist ideology and the public sphere. Subsequently, an analysis of media ownership properties will be presented with the analysis of the 1996 version of the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics. The economic structure is reviewed to illustrate how a media corporation is able to sustain the dominant elite perspective. The current shareholdings of the major media conglomerates are presented to illustrate, through a visual format, the capitalist synergism of the industry. This industry organizational presentation, in combination with FCC documents, will illustrate how deregulation has altered the public sphere, its citizens and their interests. Both sections provide the socio-historical background necessary for a critical semiotic analysis of the Society of Professional Journalism Code of Ethics versions 1987 and 1996. Furthermore

an analysis of structural factors such as ownership is pivotal in revealing how the ideology of the elite is manufactured, controlled and disseminated to the public.

The critical analysis of the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics (versions 1987 and 1996) examines the goals of Accuracy and Objectivity as the internal regulations instilled to facilitate how the mainstream media constructs news according to its own recommendations. The codes offer statements of proclaimed objectivity, specialized sources, and coverage. These long standing codes of ethics are the procedural guidelines substantiating and continually perpetuating truth and power, and the illusions they foster. The analysis/discussion of journalist codes of ethics (as outlined below) in partnership with ownership and policy studies, will serve to unravel the latent ideological structure of underlying interests under which the news operates.

As stated earlier, the importance of studying the dominance of the market and capitalist social relations cannot be ignored, for they impact every facet of academia and the public sphere. Accordingly, the thesis utilizes a critical textual-semiotic analysis to answer if the 'procedural guidelines of truth' as enacted by two predominant versions of codes of ethics perpetuate "objectively established universal claims of abstract truths" and, if such standards reinforce the economic structure of elite interests. Ultimately, the analysis inquires into the extent to which the codes perpetuate the world view of the dominant elite capitalist order rather than promote an informed public and a vibrant and diverse public sphere.

Critical Semiotics and Textual/Ideological Analysis

Lewis and Jhally (1998) contend that critical research, and textual analysis more specifically, are necessary to any part of media study. Textual criticism uncovers both latent and overt meaning manifest in content and form. This study explores the language of journalist codes of ethics (form) and their potential meaning(s) (content) from critical political economic and ideological perspectives.

An ideologically focused textual analysis of power studies the encoded textual structure that the mass media perpetuates. An analysis that goes beyond the surface of the text is able to uncover the concealed dominant ideology and the suppression it furthers (Corcoran, 1984). Fink (1988) illustrates that journalism codes of ethics identify objectivity as a pursuit worth striving for. Recently however, such studies have moved beyond any further discussion of the hegemonic system such codes may perpetuate and have argued instead to adopt and incorporate a universal code of ethics (Herrscher, 2002; Perkins, 2002). Such authors fully acknowledge the limited views this new code will foster claiming that a universal code is that which serves the rights of humans. This thesis by no means claims that meaningful scholarship does not exist but rather argues that the prevalence of ethical scholarship does not go deep enough into hegemonic structural analysis. Nor does existing scholarship incorporate the economy and policy decisions that continue to perpetuate the organization and structure of the industry. This invisibility is central to my analysis and research questions.

Hall (1985), Lye (1987), McChesney (2000) and Sholle (1988) have established the extent and utility to which an ideological analysis will reveal ideological structures. Consequently, due to messages having multi-layered dimensions of meaning one cannot

take texts at face value (Gamson et al., 1992). Thus, an ideological analysis reveals the embedded meaning of symbols in the placement of text (Hall, 1985; Lye, 1997; Sholle, 1988). It is here that one is able to deconstruct the terminology, the standards, principles and ethics used thereby, understanding the selection of material so that we may derive their ideological implications (Kieran, 1997).

Semiotics seeks to explicate the ways in which signs are positioned and inevitably perpetuate hegemonic themes and values of the dominant culture. Semiotics is the study of the social production of meaning within sign systems. As such semiotics functions as both a theory and a method in which conceptual and methodological assumptions inform the ways in which signs and meanings are studied and deconstructed within particular contexts (Desilet, 1991; Orbe, 1998; Orbe & Strother, 1996).

The following analysis identifies the dominant reading to expose the myths that the signs of Enlightenment rationality are consistent with notions of an informed democratic media. Thus, the following reading explicates the signification processes so as to illustrate the ways in which meaning is created, thereby exposing the lie that free market capitalism is naturally occurring or inevitably associated within signifying structures of a democratic media. In addition, the critical textual analysis seeks to expose the myth that signs of objectivity are naturally and inevitably fixed to democracy so as to reveal the ways in which such signs are situated within, against and among signs of free market capitalist patriarchal ideology. Furthermore, this analysis reveals that meaning exists only in relation to and against the larger sign system perpetuated by the dominant elite.

The specific analysis will utilize Lye's (1997) methods of ideological analysis as a starting point for further exploration. An ideological framework examines the range of allowed debate and the access of the public to participate in that which is produced and represented in the media. A focus is placed on the connections of ideological formations within political, economic, and social structures (Hall, 1973, 1981, 1985; Makus, 1990). However, it should be noted that such an analysis will not only focus on the language used in the text but will examine what is absent from the text as well, for such absence may bring forth that which the media aims to suppress (Desilet, 1991; Lewis & Jhally, 1998). With such insights in mind, six questions have been identified as a starting point for opening a critical semiotic ideological analysis in which meaning is continuously unraveled.

- 1) How does the style of presentation contribute to the meaning of the text?
- 2) What 'utopic kernel', that is, vision of human possibility, appears to lie at the heart of the understanding of the ideology?
- 3) What are the assumptions about what is natural, just and right?
- 4) What (and who) do these assumptions distort or obscure?
- 5) What are the power relations?
- 6) What people, classes, areas of life, experiences, are 'left out', silenced? (See Appendix A for the complete list of Lye's analytical questions).

Hall (1981, 1985) illustrates that ideological critique is a method in which critical analysis brings forth ideological structures. Makus (1990) advises that the critic of ideology will investigate the use of signs to uncover ideology, power, conflict and articulation. Articulation is, "a connection among signifiers and among codes that have

no necessary relationship among themselves or the events they represent” (p. 503). Lye’s questions #1, #3 and #4 all serve in locating articulations of meaning. Makus also advises that the critic of ideology will investigate the use of signs to uncover ideology, power, conflict and articulation. Lye’s suggestion to observe power relations (#5) and representative subjectivity (#6) are suggested here.

As noted earlier, these points of interpretive analysis are only a start for that which will provide a freer reading. As such, a method that utilizes fewer questions is better able to unravel multiple and complex meanings. Therefore, exact categories of analysis will not be provided but rather, insights brought forth from the literature review and research questions will serve to inform the deconstructive, semiotic ideological textual analysis. For example, the insights significant to Cirino’s (1971) work on objectivity, Graber’s (1980) four models, Herman and Chomsky’s (2002) propaganda model, McChesney’s (1999, 2003) and McManus’s (1997) economic contributions, and Schudson’s (2001) professionalized media will serve as the foundation for my theoretical insights.

As stated, the lens of this analysis is critical political economy. So as to uncover the embedded structures of meaning within the text of journalist codes of ethics in relation to broadcast policy and the economic structure of the industry. These combined methods for analyzing the codes of ethics are informed by critical, cultural and political economic analysis and are used because they appear to be the most effective tool in bridging theory and method. The analysis centralizes the complex web of social institutions and forces, rather than investigating a single occurrence of a single text without historical or cultural content. Contextualizing the codes of ethics within larger

economic and social systems expands the body of theory about journalism, its social role, self regulation and the construction of objectivity within society.

CHAPTER IV

CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION I

The Fairness Doctrine and the Elimination Thereof: Contextualizing the Society of Professional Journalism Code of Ethics - 1987

Democratic theory has been written about since the age of Aristotle. Notions of a society run by and for its people was a utopian ideal for citizens subjected to the iron cusp of unjust monarchies and dictatorships. In the United States democracy was no longer a distant dream but a reality to be fostered. The writers of the U.S. Constitution and subsequent Bill of Rights knew very well the importance of a free media un-infringed by the power of the government and free from ideological bias. From its very inception the press in the United States was established to play an adversarial role, to protect its citizens and property holders from its government.

McChesney (1999) asserts that beyond prior restraint historically, professional journalism was established on the premise that its content would not be shaped by the interests of owners, nor would it be influenced by advertisers or the biases of reporters or editors. To ensure a free marketplace of ideas media regulations were instilled in the mid 20th Century, to facilitate a vibrant public sphere. The broadcast industry was regulated to ensure that the media would first and foremost serve the public interest (McChesney, 1999). The following reviews significant aspects of major regulations instilled to further the interests of the publics within a democratic society.

Kahn (1985) illustrates that the Radio Act of 1927 was established, in part, to address network distributed and advertising supported media. The 1927 Act sought to cure the insufficiencies of the Radio Act of 1912 by implementing a discretionary

licensing standard. This standard required broadcasters to hold licenses insofar as such broadcasts were conducive to the *public interest, convenience, or necessity*. The Radio Act of 1927 established that the airwaves belonged to the public and that broadcasters were public trustees using a scarce public resource. According to such standards the 1927 Act stated that it would not tolerate propaganda stations or illegal monopolization of the industry.

Despite its particular concern with advertising supported media the act itself is vague about, if not lacking any definition of public interest, convenience or necessity. The unfortunate vagueness or lack of a precise definition of the public interest, led to a commission report in 1928. Since no new licenses would be renewed without serving the public interest the new commission report sought to determine the procedures necessary to facilitate this objective. Due to the number of competing broadcast stations vying for assigned electromagnetic spectrum space, the quality of reception diminished. The commission reported that the public interest would be served insofar as the public received clear broadcasts. Thus, stations that brought about the best possible broadcasting conditions, i.e., those with greater financial capital, were identified as the stations which served the public interest, convenience or necessity. Ultimately, the commission sought to advocate for fewer broadcasters so that the public would not suffer from undue interference. This report indicated that any benefit derived from advertisers must be secondary and entirely incidental to serving the interests of the public.

The Communications Act of 1934 is a pivotal document that would shape the communication industry, influence future policy decisions and re-write the necessary requirements for a democratic media serving the public interest. The purpose of the

Communication Act of 1934 was to establish, in part, a federal regulatory agency of interstate commerce.² The Communications Act of 1934 developed from the technological advancement that occurred following the implementation of the Radio Act of 1927. This act created the Federal Communications Commission and was implemented to regulate broadcasting. At its inception it stated that it would be an independent commission, free from partisan politics. However, it should be noted that the commission would consist of five members, the chair appointed by the president.

Throughout the Act the Commission states that broadcasters and broadcasting should serve the public interest, convenience, or necessity and should not be a government operation, a private monopoly, or based primarily on free enterprise with unlimited competition. In particular the 1934 Act illustrates the importance of balancing the power of the government with the First Amendment rights of individuals and broadcasters.³

² See Communications Act of 1934 SEC. 1. [47 U.S.C. 151] PURPOSES OF ACT, CREATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.

For the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in communication by wire and radio so as to make available, so far as possible, to all the people of the United States, without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, a rapid, efficient, Nationwide, and world-wide wire and radio communication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges, for the purpose of the national defense, for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication, and for the purpose of securing a more effective execution of this policy by centralizing authority heretofore granted by law to several agencies and by granting additional authority with respect to interstate and foreign commerce in wire and radio communication, there is hereby created a commission to be known as the "Federal Communications Commission," which shall be constituted as hereinafter provided, and which shall execute and enforce the provisions of this Act.

³ See Communications Act of 1934 SEC. 326. [47 U.S.C. 326] CENSORSHIP; INDECENT LANGUAGE.

Nothing in this Act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station,

On September 5, 1947, a hearing was held by the Federal Communications Commission to re-assess the obligations of broadcasters in the arena of broadcast news, commentary and opinion (Kahn, 1985). The commission believed that due to the amount of confusion and disagreement concerning the language of its previous statements an open forum was required to reexamine such issues. The hearings established the requirement for a broadcast license, applicants were obliged "to cover vitally important controversial issues of interest in their communities," and second, "to provide a reasonable opportunity for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints." Accordingly, the public interest, which had guided preceding policy decisions, was fulfilled insofar as the requirements of broadcasters furthered the democratic principles of an informed public.

In 1949 the FCC imposed a Fairness Doctrine upon broadcasters to promote issues of public importance and to provide a wide array of viewpoints on controversial issues. The Doctrine promoted the notions that a democratic society necessitates an informed public from a diverse and balanced range of issues. Thus, the Act states, the undeniable relationship between a healthy democratic media systems and a vibrant public sphere. News agencies and a democracy require that citizens possess news and ideas pertaining to the vital public issues. Accordingly, the media was required to promote democratic practices by informing the public. Ultimately, the Fairness Doctrine sought to define the public interest according to such practices. Subsequently, the public interest, convenience and necessity are facilitated herein as that which promotes democratic practices, i.e., informing the public of vital issues. As section six states,

and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication.

It is axiomatic that one of the most vital questions of mass communication in a democracy is the development of an informed public opinion through the public dissemination of news and ideas concerning the vital public issues of the day...Unquestionably, then, the standard of public interest, convenience and necessity as applied to radio broadcasting must be in the light of this basic purpose.

Furthermore the Act outlines the premise that free societies require its publics to be informed so each individual can either reject or accept a diverse array of attitudes and viewpoints. Accordingly, each viewpoint is to be understood as that which facilitates competing meanings. The Act further states that it is,

The paramount right of the public in a free society to be informed and to have presented to it for acceptance or rejection the different attitudes and viewpoints concerning these vital and often controversial issues which are held by the various groups which make up the community.

Ultimately, section six outlines the public's right to be informed through the propagation of diverse viewpoints. The media is thus defined as the means by which democratic practices are perpetuated. Insofar as they fail to meet this obligation they are not operating in the public interest. This Act defined the public's right to a diverse array of viewpoints as that which is synonymous with democratic theories. This right supersedes any right of the government, broadcasters or individuals working to promote their subjective interests. This Act therefore, explicitly signifies that the news first and foremost must serve democratic practices before monetary, political or ideological gain. As section six states,

It is this right of the public to be informed, rather than any right on the part of the Government, any broadcast licensee or any individual member of the public to broadcast his own particular views on any matter, which is the foundation stone of the American system of broadcasting.

At this time the public interest and civic responsibility of the media was interpreted as that which promotes the interests of the public and furthers a diverse range of issues necessary to the market place of ideas. The Act was issued so as to assure that the news would facilitate the public interest by broadcasting contrasting vital news and ideas of most concern to society above any rights of free press. So as to facilitate this interest the Fairness Doctrine imposed a two-fold obligation upon broadcasters. Each licensee of a radio or television broadcast station was required to “(1) to provide coverage of vitally important controversial issues of interest in the community served by the licensee, and (2) to afford a reasonable opportunity for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints on any controversial issue of public importance covered by the licensee.”

Ultimately, the Doctrine placed heavy responsibility on both the Federal Communications Commission as a regulatory agent, as well as broadcasters, to promote the intellectual interest of a well-informed public from a diverse range of opinions. Thus, the Doctrine sought to reinforce the responsibilities of broadcasting and their importance in facilitating an informed public. “Failure to abide by these requirements could subject a licensee to sanctions ranging from an order requiring the licensee to remedy its programming deficiencies to an order denying renewal of its license” (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989). In 1937 section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 was amended to further the public interest however in 1959, Congress once again amended Section 315 in accordance with the statutory authority of the Fairness Doctrine. Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 states,

Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed as relieving broadcasters, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events, from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest and to afford

reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

In 1969 the United States Supreme court ruled on the constitutionality of the Fairness Doctrine in *Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC*, 395 U.S. 367 1969. The Supreme Court concluded that the Doctrine would enhance speech rather than abridge the goals of the First Amendment. In this case a clear division between the rights of the press and that of broadcasters was made. It was argued that broadcasters are unique in that they require a license to broadcast. Subsequently, it was argued that due to the limited amount of spectrum space available it is essential that broadcasters promote a diverse market place of ideas. The case of *Red Lion* substantiates earlier documentation that the rights of the public supersede the First Amendment rights of broadcasters or private parties (*Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC* 395 U.S. 367 1969). Supreme Court Justice White wrote,

Where there are substantially more individuals who want to broadcast than there are frequencies to allocate, it is idle to posit an unabridgeable First Amendment right to broadcast comparable to the right of every individual to speak, write, or publish... A license permits broadcasting, but the licensee has no constitutional right to be the one who holds the license or to monopolize a radio frequency to the exclusion of his fellow citizens. It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount.

However, the court also stated that it recognized the arguments set forth by *Red Lion*. The understanding that the Doctrine required broadcasters to spend more time and money which potentially discouraged them from covering controversial issues led the court to say that, if experience found that “the net effect is reducing rather than enhancing coverage there will be time enough to reconsider the constitutional implications.” Thus,

insofar as the Doctrine is found to reduce the volume and quality of coverage rather than enhance it, the Doctrine would be subject to reinterpretation.

In 1974 the Federal Communications Commission issued a Fairness Report addressing the issues set forth in *Red Lion*. At this time the Commission concluded that the Fairness Doctrine did not reduce the volume or quality of coverage. Rather the commission called the Fairness Doctrine the means for serving the public interest. At this time the FCC utilized its findings to establish the license renewal process. A decade later in 1984, during the Regan Administration, the FCC started to investigate the public policy, constitutionality and implications of the Fairness Doctrine in part from congressional concerns and the case of the *FCC v. League of Women Voters of California* 468 U.S. 364 1984. In 1985 the Federal Communications Commission compiled an exhaustive report entitled the "Fairness Report" declaring the Fairness Doctrine obsolete and "no longer [in] ... the public interest"(Fairness Report, 102 F.C.C.2d 142, 246 1985).

The case of *Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC* illustrates the events that transpired to eliminate the Fairness Doctrine. In 1982 television station WTVH aired a series of program advertisements that elicited serious questions pertaining to fairness activities. WTVH was a subsidiary of Meredith Corporation located in Syracuse, New York. The programs that aired dealt primarily with a controversial topic vital to the public interest. The program argued that "The Nine Mile II nuclear power plant was a 'sound investment for New York'" (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989). Ultimately, the argument that aired provided information only in support of the nuclear power plant. Syracuse Peace Council filed a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission

claiming that Meredith Corporation violated the Fairness Doctrine. Specifically, Syracuse argued that the program failed to give viewers conflicting perspectives on the plant and its impact and therefore failed to comply with the Fairness Doctrine requirements of offering contrasting opinions as well as providing the adequate time necessary for contrasting opinions to be voiced after the broadcast (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989).

Before the commission ruled on the petition set forth by Meredith, the commission completed its Fairness Report. The report questioned the constitutionality of the Fairness Doctrine and the public interest and sought to reinterpret such interests due to technological advancement. After issuing the Fairness Report they considered the petition for reconsideration in light of their findings. The commission reported that the Fairness Doctrine dissuades broadcasters from airing controversial issues. The commission referred back to more than 60 instances in which the Doctrine inhibited coverage of controversial issues. Such issues were not limited to individual programs but crossed over into policies whereby stations refused to present editorials, national coverage and political advertisements. The commission found that the Doctrine produced

[a] chilling effect by placing burdens on stations which chose to air numerous programs on controversial issues—including the fear of denial of license renewal...the cost of defending fairness doctrine attacks and of providing free air time to opposing views if a fairness violation is found, and the reputational harm resulting from even a frivolous fairness challenge (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989).

The commission continued to reaffirm its findings that those incidents were representative samples of what was occurring throughout the industry. The report argued that the prevalence of new media technologies would ensure the dissemination of a

diverse range of viewpoints necessary to the public interest. Thus, the commission argued that,

The growth in the number of broadcast outlets reduced any need for the doctrine, that the doctrine often worked to dissuade broadcasters from presenting any treatment of controversial viewpoints, that it put the government in the doubtful position of evaluating program content, and that it created an opportunity for incumbents to abuse it for partisan purposes (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989).

Furthermore, the commission contended that the very proceedings that were taking place threatened broadcasters. Ultimately, the commission claimed that federal regulation existing in the form of the Fairness Doctrine hindered free speech rather than fostered it (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989)

The commission continued to reiterate the necessity that the Doctrine further First Amendment principles and insofar as the doctrine fails to stay within the parameters established by the Constitution, it follows that the doctrine does not achieve the specific purpose for which it was intended and should be eliminated (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989). The commission noted that the result is an overly broad restriction. Ultimately, the commission determined that the editorial decision of WTVH was an action protected by the First Amendment and should remain free from government interference.

In sum, the Fairness Doctrine in operation disserves both the public's right to diverse sources of information and the broadcaster's interest in free expression. Its chilling effect thwarts its intended purpose, and it results in excessive and unnecessary government intervention into the editorial processes of broadcast journalists. We hold, therefore, that under the constitutional standard established by *Red Lion* and its progeny the fairness doctrine contravenes the First Amendment and its enforcement is no longer in the public interest (*Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC*, 867 F.2d 654 1989).

Legally, the absence of the Doctrine allows media conglomerate controlled news free reign without governmental interference. Theoretically, the most controversial issues will find their presence in the market place. Accordingly, the absence of the Doctrine would ensure that such ideas are no longer chilled but are promoted and positioned against other 'truths.' Subsequently, truth will win out and serve the public interest of a democratic society and the First Amendment rights of the press. This case is a pivotal moment where the First Amendment rights of the public outweigh government interference in the market place.

The public interest and democratic obligations were rewritten to coincide with broadcast license holder's financial concerns and editorial decisions. Legally, broadcasters were no longer required by law to provide a balanced range of controversial issues of public importance, an element required for an informed public in a free society. Accordingly, the very requirements of an informed public from a diverse range of issues had been rewritten to further the rights of broadcasters rather than that of the public. This notion contradicts section six of the Fairness Doctrine, which stated that the public's right to be informed superseded any right of the broadcaster.

The elimination of the Fairness Doctrine illustrates that the income of broadcasters surpasses the rights of an informed public in a free society. As Justice White illustrated, insofar as the Doctrine inhibited the free flow of ideas there would be time to consider the constitutional implications. However, as the commission noted, economic revenue and the cost of furthering an informed public was the factor which decreased coverage rather than the doctrine itself. The economic concerns within the broadcast industry re-wrote the necessary requirements of the public interest and the

ethical responsibility of broadcasters operating in a democratic society. Ultimately, market ideology was legitimized through a First Amendment interpretation while the public's interest was not protected.

The result places heavy ethical responsibility on news stations for, the breadth and depth of their programs would not be enforced by government regulations. As is indicated in the demise of the Fairness Doctrine, depth and breadth of programs would be evaluated against economic loss. Accordingly, as stated in the Syracuse case, breadth and depth were not in the financial interests of broadcast license holders. Thus, the elimination of the Doctrine supports that which will foster greater monetary gain, i.e., narrow and shallow and cheap and inexpensive reporting; resulting most likely in an ill-informed public.

A substantial amount of public trust has been placed in the news. Insofar as the public willingly embraces the civic and ethical responsibility of the news as a fair, balanced and objective source on controversial issues of public importance, and journalists continue to legitimize news as objective, the public was led to believe that the assumptions of the Fairness Doctrine still exist. Accordingly, the information believed to be objectively identified, balanced and true may only support one side. Insofar as journalists verify such reports as objective they are perpetuating that which serves the elite.

The underlying foundation of the Fairness Doctrine signifies competing meanings, values and ideologies. Fairness is an element required in a democracy insofar as there is a competition among interests, meaning and truth. Thus, the elimination of the Doctrine signifies agreement and the homogenization of interests, the lack of competition

and diverse disagreement. Furthermore, the absence of the doctrine signifies that monetary interests had thwarted the doctrine's intent. To suggest that the spectrum will amount to diversity due to the explosion of media outlets fails to consider the implications of the Cable Act of 1984 and the economic industry in which a few companies pursue profit and control the vast majority of spectrum space. Accordingly, the assumption that diversity is obtained through quantity supersedes assumptions that diversity is derived qualitatively.

Of significant interest is the fact that in that same year that deregulation occurred in the broadcast industry, which has always received less protection, the print industry was also changing its standards as they pertained to the ethical conduct of news journalists. The following analysis contextualizes the changes made in the Society of Professional Journalists Codes of Ethics within the Federal Communications Commission decision to eliminate fairness activities. It is also assumed that although this particular code is utilized predominantly by newspaper agencies, the broadcast industry has also used many of its premises in news broadcasting, for the code specifically addresses issues relevant to journalists utilizing digital broadcast technology.

Critical Semiotic Analysis of the 1987 Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics

The Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics was first adopted in 1926. One year later the Radio Act was implemented setting forth the requirements for license holders as well as establishing the requirement to work as public trustees. The Society of Professional Journalists would revise the code of ethics during the changing broadcast industry in 1973 and subsequently, the FCC would compile a Fairness report of the

broadcast industry in 1974. In 1984, during the same year that the FCC began to investigate the Fairness Doctrine, implement the Cable Act of 1984 and begin to compile information in its fairness report. Three years later, the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics would revise its code once again. At this time the beginning of synchronous activities between broadcast law and print news ethics align themselves so as to promote the economic structure of which they are a part.

The 1987 code outlines six primary objectives: Responsibility, Freedom of the Press, Ethics, Accuracy and Objectivity, Fair Play and Mutual Trust. Under the section, Freedom of the Press, the code states,

Freedom of the press is to be guarded as an inalienable right of people in a free society. It carries with it the freedom and the responsibility to discuss, question, and challenge actions and utterances of our government and of our public and private institutions. Journalists uphold the right to speak unpopular opinions and the privilege to agree with the majority (See Appendix B for the entire code).

As outlined above, press freedom is to be equated with the inalienable rights of people in a free society. Theoretically, any person wishing to voice an opinion in print will not be subject to prior restraint. It makes explicit reference to government, public and private institutions.

The section Accuracy and Objectivity must be understood within and as a part of the preamble that states, "Journalists uphold the right to speak unpopular opinions and the privilege to agree with the majority." Thus, nothing in the Code compels journalists to dissent, or provide competing meanings insofar as agreement is privileged. Accordingly, insofar as journalists continually agree with the majority and such agreement is privileged, journalists perpetually authorize, legitimize, substantiate and enable elite meaning to exist as that which is natural, inevitable and true. Accordingly, by its explicit

nature, the Code authorizes itself as that which aspires toward ethical ideals and anyone following such guidelines is therefore working in the public interest. Its power and authority therefore legitimizes itself and the journalists who aspire to acquire it. This continual feedback loop of truth into power into the world re-substantiates its existence insofar as journalists utilize the Code thereby perpetually authorizing and enabling this particular model of truth and professional conduct.

Utilizing Lye's method as a starting point we are to believe that the style of presentation—print itself—signifies a foundational epistemological background represented in print form. Print culture, influenced by Guttenberg technology, illustrates that meaning is derived from context, linear thinking, unitary rationality, Euclidean geometry and propositional phrases, i.e. that which is either true or false. Accordingly, unlike the image that is neither true nor false and without textual signification, print requires a more demanding intellectual capacity thereby privileging itself in an elite position. Contrary to the televised medium, news print by its very nature authorizes that truth is to be understood by and from an emphasis of critical thought representative of Enlightenment epistemology in which Universal Truth is not only something to be strived for but is capable of being acquired.

Under this rubric notions of universal essence and that which perpetuates a masculine-dominated, Anglo-centered world view is privileged. The discourse that substantiates universal essence resides above extensional concrete subjectivity so as to further an abstract universality. Accordingly, print may ironically exist as a more trusted medium, for it calls upon the intellectual capacities of its readers; its meaning is that which is perpetually authorized as having the capacity of true-ness.

The preceding notions are verified in the six standards outlined in the Code.

However, this analysis will focus on objectivity. Within Accuracy and Objectivity as outlined in the Code, eight goals are listed. The first states, "Truth is our ultimate goal." The Code fails to signify how a journalist ought to obtain such truth. However, it does signify that either goals are fulfilled and therefore that which reaches print is truth or that which is not truth will not reach the news papers.

These interests as illustrated in the court hearings surrounding the Fairness Doctrine signify that the press serves the public rather than multiple publics. Within this aforementioned framework Universal Truth is to be understood as that which serves elite interest *and* majority opinion. Thus, truth is that which enables elite meanings of the majority. Insofar as this code operates within the economic structure of the media industry, truth is that which reaches the greatest audience.

For journalists, print or electronic, to embrace the ultimate universal Truth is to embrace a unitary rationality in which voices are suppressed. As stated in the works of Haraway (1985) and Hekman (1999), this type of truth resides in a binary logic in which dichotomized discourse finds its presence. As a result, the opportunities for a middle ground are suppressed. Truth becomes that which perpetually re-substantiates over generalized, dichotomized discourse. In the end this type of unitary logic perpetuates a hegemonic system in which ideological distinctions subjugate and suppress alternative accounts and logics as that which are inferior, incoherent or extreme. The second goal signified under this statement states,

2. Objectivity in reporting the news is another goal that serves as the mark of an experienced professional. It is a standard of performance toward which we strive. We honor those who achieve it.

The development of objectivity as that which defines truth and diverse representations is suspect. Insofar as objectivity is that which perpetuates dominant conceptual distinctions, objective criteria emphasize the importance of subjugating the concrete subjective experiences of that which is contrary. Accordingly, the Code explicitly states that professionalism depends on the use of objectivity which thereby authorizes and legitimizes “objective” discourse. The discourse of objectivity perpetuates a hierarchical structure of male conceptual distinctions, control and patriarchal order. Thus, upon categorization, the prevailing objectively defined *neutral* categories de-privilege the unique concrete experience of individuality thereby substantiating the hierarchy of dominant classifications.

This goal signifies that objectivity is possible and is even praised as that which serves a professional, a profession and a social responsibility toward democratic ends. This statement clearly enables journalists to aspire to that which limits subjective expression, for objectivity is honored for “those who achieve it.” This signifies that objectivity is a ‘higher’ order of truth, something not everyone is capable of. It also fails to clearly establish how objectivity ought to be acquired, nor does this goal explicitly take into account the pressures associated with sponsors, advertising revenue, editorial decisions and corporate governance.

Furthermore, insofar as professionalism is that which ought to be aspired, journalists continually standardize discourse and method within the industry. This type of standardized discourse limits diverse and alternative axiological, epistemological and methodological accounts thereby facilitating a normalizing behavior and the

homogenization of discourse. Furthermore, economic revenue would indicate that objectivity is that which is easily verified and cost effective.

This type of universal discourse is signified in the fourth standard which states, “Newspaper headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles they accompany. Photographs and telecasts should give an accurate picture of an event and not highlight an incident out of context.” To fully warrant is neither defined nor explained. Accordingly, the absence of a sign of epistemological justification is neither explicitly signified nor explained. How then and using what procedures should an editor verify knowledge as diverse and representative of the citizenry?

Epistemological justification derives from that which will fit to print, flash, sensationalize and appeal to the greatest audience base. Accordingly, the visual and dramatic is replayed and reprinted in headlines and running banners on the bottom of television screens. These techniques find their presence in published newspapers and electronic media. Ironically, these techniques are discouraged by the code.

We might find that such headlines are warranted insofar as they are consistent with the discourse of the article or appeal to a larger demographic. From the aforementioned characteristics outlined in the first and second objective, one must contend that the discourse of objectivity, unitary logic, spectacle and visual, and dichotomized discourse must be found within the article and represented as such in the headline. Accordingly, a headline or photo is warranted insofar as it contains such discursive practices. Subsequently, this suggests that the broader the headline, although potentially vague, the greater the implied warrant and the less the need to justify its use. For by its very nature, the more vague, simple or generalized the more encompassing is

the word. Subsequently, insofar as such discourse is used the less likely the report is untrue or lacks validity although highly unrepresented and potentially unclear.

Telegraphy was the initial start to such context-free information in which value was placed on information itself, despite not having any function for social or political life (Postman, 1999). Context-free information is consistent with the ideology of detachment of values and objectivity. However, de-contextualized facts need to be placed within a larger context significant to history, politics, sociology, and economics so as to facilitate knowledge and participation within the social order (Alterman, 2003). Furthermore, to place an image within context signifies the importance of the image. Jamieson (1992) contests that visual media aids to reconfigure reality so that the power of the visual image obtains a heightened appeal. As such, a visual and dramatic report will receive greater attention than that of pure reporting or commentary. Thus, when the visual and dramatic appeal to the audience, discourse follows accordingly (Jamieson). The image, utilized through repetition, targets the vast majority of the population. Accordingly, the headlines associated with such images signify an overly vague title so as to perpetuate majority values and facilitate a larger homogenous demographic. The journalist's career, as well as the economic stability of newspapers and cable news operators, requires a larger audience so as to foster greater income from advertisers.

The fifth standard states that,

5. Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free of opinion or bias and represent all sides of an issue.

This statement is significant for, the broadcast industry was deregulating the legal need to enforce a balanced perspective. This statement explicitly states that a sound practice will

provide the reader with a clear distinction between opinion and fact thereby reinforcing the mission and possibility of an objective journalist. Accordingly, objectivity and unitary truth are valued while subjective and alternative opinions are beneath the plane of visibility.

This statement also signifies that a news report should be free of the journalist's voices found in any issue. Accordingly, this perpetuates a categorization, normalization and subjugation of those interviewed. The pursuit to represent all sides of an issue is a worthy pursuit however as stated earlier, a unitary logic perpetuates the notion that only two sides exist to any problem. Therefore, this further substantiates the need to view the world in polar opposites, a deep rooted epistemological condition of our era which results in the suppression of middle ground and the limited spectrum of experiences.

This statement also signifies that journalists ought to operate in a detached and value-free manner. However, insofar as journalists fail to interject themselves in a personally subjective manner, quality and thoroughness may be lost. Thus, detachment is consistent with the lack of motivation and inferior benefits or rewards. This would all change with Fox News, celebrity news persons, and editorials which altered the news to that of commentary and opinion. Furthermore, if journalists are to report without consideration of democratic consequences, it follows that journalists are not guided by whether a story promotes the public interest, defined as informing the public through a depth and breadth of information so as to facilitate debate, a requirement of the media operating according to the codes overriding mission. Rather, the concern is whether the story will appeal to the status quo, meet the deadlines and appease editors and managers.

The sixth statement states that “Partisanship in editorial comment that knowingly departs from the truth violates the spirit of American journalism.” This statement re-substantiates that partisanship should be accepted, authorized and utilized insofar as a journalist views partisanship as the truth. Accordingly, suppression or investigation that is either other than that which is authorized and legitimized as truth i.e., highly dichotomized, objectively defined unitary logic, or is yet to be proved by such criteria – is not an ethical goal to aspire to. Thus, journalists are compelled to report on that which is easily proven or lacks substantial controversy. Controversies such as crime and sex stories are reported and therefore reinforce that which is consistent with the status quo. Accordingly, given that the previous statements reinforce the truth of polarization, the need to question, inquire, and investigate is pushed to the way side. This supports the economic environment in which shallow reporting exceeds that of depth and breadth. Accordingly, and indicated in the rationale to dismiss the Fairness Doctrine, costly investigative reporting will not be pursued a rationale guided by both the market and the Code of Ethics.

The seventh standard states,

7. Journalists recognize their responsibility for offering informed analysis, comment, and editorial opinion on public events and issues. They accept the obligation to present such material by individuals whose competence, experience, and judgment qualify them for it.

This standard is not so much a goal to strive for, rather it starts with a recognition that journalists offer informed analysis. Accordingly, insofar as journalists are ill-informed, this standard compels them to maintain relationships with those who are authorized as official sources. This heavy and undue reliance on such professional

sources means it is not only more difficult to gain access to the news media, if you are outside the corridors of corporate interests, but that that news organizations are less likely to pursue costly investigative journalism. For such reporting requires a greater investment of time and resources. The ideological imperative guiding such activities is seen years later when newsrooms turn to sister companies and parent firms for 'expert' advice and commentary. Thus, the economy will further dictate perceptions of expertise through a web of media properties with similar interests in mind.

The use of authorities thus alleviates journalists from producing the news according to news ethical guidelines for official sources are not compelled by the ethical principles of journalists. Rather, authorities with an economic interest at stake are outside the framework of the code. Accordingly, debate is controlled the moment the "authorities" set the parameters of classification and discussion. Insofar as the news agencies relay the information they are enabling, authorizing and legitimizing the language and the reality constructed by such sources. Insofar as such sources are government or economic, specialized discourse is defined according to such terms and the role of the citizen is de-privileged. Instead, the voices of citizens should define the boundaries of debate and acceptable discourse.

Furthermore, official, expert or governmental sources are likely to have a vested interest in that which their discourse addresses. This enables the capability for elite actions to go forward in the name of "official journalism" and signified in the values they promulgate. Accordingly, expert sources, the verifiers of the word and the world, are not representatives of the programs they promote in as much as their credentials as experts

are. In the end journalists are complacent with power enabling it to function, and authorizing the limited debate that follows such discursive practices.

The last standard states “8. Special articles or presentations devoted to advocacy or the writer's own conclusions and interpretations should be labeled as such.” This is perhaps the most significant aspect that all journalists should strive for. However, when citizens perceive the news as serving its citizenry first and foremost above any monetary gain the hegemonic system perpetuates the truth of the dominant elite. It is here that the news ought to label the reports as what they are, serving a particular subjective, ideological, political or governmental interest.

The 1987 Society of Professional Journalist Codes of Ethics above all positions itself as that which is the protector of truth, human rights and representative of the public. What is missing from this Code are the pressures on journalists from editors, shareholders and owners, the parent firm, dependence on economic revenue from advertising, the public construed as consumers, government regulations, and the predetermined layout of the news.

The utopic kernel is that of progress and a universal unchanging Truth, where objectivity is the means by which journalists should strive to operate. The Code signifies that Truth is singular, unchanging and obtainable. Of significant importance to this study is the 1987 Code of Ethic's goal of Accuracy and Objectivity stated as the fourth primary objective, for such criteria are the measures in which the procedural guidelines of truth operate. Accordingly, the beliefs in Universal Truth, objectivity and unitary logic reinforce the assumptions that what is reported is operating through an epistemological framework of that which is natural, just and right.

Insofar as journalists operated under the assumptions that the code facilitated the natural and inevitable guidelines in which truth operates, subjective truth, detailed analysis, and multi-valued expression is suppressed or marginalized. Accordingly, the assumption that what is objectively acquired and reported represents the truth is naturalized and normalized within the public sphere. The embedded power relations observed throughout the code reveal that insofar as “objectivity” benefits a particular group it is neither objective nor neutral. Accordingly, power operates for those who benefit from the Code of Ethics at the expense of those whose voices are not authorized as true. As a result, the subjective experiences of those who live below the plane of power are silenced as that which are incoherent or extreme.

Thus, the absence of the Fairness Doctrine within the industry as well as the insights pulled from the Society of Professional Journalism Code of Ethics reveal that journalistic accountability is enforced to the degree that it furthers the economic interests of the broadcaster or newspaper. Rather than informing the public, an element axiomatic to a free and democratic society, journalism operates through that which promotes the linguistic interest of hegemony. Without regulations instilled upon either the print or electronic media, we must question the extent to which free-market patriarchal capitalist ideological practices are promoted under the veil of operating within the public interest. Moreover, technology has changed and with it, policies to regulate its new forms. It is vital therefore to examine the implications of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and its relationship with the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics version 1996.

CHAPTER V

CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION II

The Implications of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Contextualizing the Society of Professional Journalists Codes of Ethics - 1996

The importance of the deregulatory environment within which broadcast news is no longer required to broadcast a diverse and contrasting opinion, in combination with the synchronous activities within the print industry, illustrate the homogenization of the industry. Whether instilled by law or professional conduct the perpetuation of economic ideology is what perpetuates the status quo. Enlightenment values were signified in the 1987 Society of Professional Journalist Codes of Ethics and the elimination of the Fairness Doctrine. Both actions signify that free-market capitalist ideology is privileged over the public interest. Thus, our economy as a power structure redefines historic democratic conceptualizations. This chapter examines how policy decisions and a revised code of ethics will alter a well informed public, or serve democratic practices.

1994 was the year in which the Cable Act enabled cable operators to adjust service and rates more flexibly in response to market conditions. Although the Act outlined a number of provisions, the most significant are mentioned here. This Act allowed consistency in the franchise renewal process, provided cities with 3-5% of the revenue as allocated by franchise fees, and home satellite dishes were legalized, The Act also allowed cable companies to raise the rates and permitted cross ownership by newspapers.

As a result of the Act cable rates were raised and cities embraced this new form of revenue. From 1986 to 1992 the cable industry had virtually no competitors and

consumers had no alternatives. In 1992 Congress reacted to the de-facto monopolies created by the Cable Act of 1984 by implementing the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992. The 1992 Act sought to cure the monopoly status of cable by implementing provisions toward the expression of diversity, which monopolies suppress. However, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 would irreparably change and alleviate the burdens of broadcasters and the cable industry in the name of the public interest, convenience or necessity.

Since the deregulatory push starting in 1984 with the Cable Act as well as the beginnings of the Fairness Report, media giants privatized the broadcast sector of the public sphere. The government regulations initially instilled to foster democratic participation have dissolved into a deregulated environment supporting free market competition. The Fairness Doctrine was abolished in 1987 under the Reagan Administration. Such interests were furthered when the Telecommunications Act of 1996, passed during the Clinton Administration and issued forth by the Federal Communications Commission, eliminated the cap that a single radio station could own nationally.

The Telecom Act modified broadcast ownership rules, relaxed the regulatory treatment for Bell Operating Companies, eliminated broadcast comparative license renewal procedures, and deregulated cross ownership and conglomerate status of the industry. The relaxed restrictions on media ownership have led to larger media companies with a greater concentration of ownership.

Before the Telecom Act a national television corporation could own up to 12 stations nationwide or could own enough stations to reach a maximum of 25% of U.S.

television households. Upon implementation of the Act, the limit on the number of stations was eliminated insofar as the station reach did not exceed 35%. In 2006, station reach has increased to 39% after a compromise in which media conglomerates attempted to initiate a 45% reach of U.S. television households.

The Act altered local television provisions from owning a single station in a particular market to a review of that standard. As of 1999, the Federal Communications Commission allowed multiple station ownership within single markets in particular situations. Thus, the Telecom Act retained the television duopoly rule unless compelling circumstances arrived. The waiver provision applies to the top 50 markets. Ultimately, companies are allowed to own two stations insofar as other competitors exist. The provision also stipulates that both stations cannot be in the top four in the market. The barrier restrictions associated with this are compelling to say the least.

The Telecommunications Act alleviated restrictions on national radio as well. Thus, where 20 FM and 20 AM stations were permitted prior to 1996, after the implementation of the Act there was no limit. The consequences to local radio are far reaching. In markets exceeding 45 stations, an entity could own up to eight stations total and five stations in either AM or FM service. Prior to the Act, a company could not own, operate or control more than two AM and two FM stations in the market. Consequently, the audience share of co-owned stations could not exceed 25% of the market.

The relaxed rules have significantly funneled competition to that of seven major corporations. These companies include Viacom, AOL/Time Warner, Disney, News Corp Ltd., General Electric, Bertelsmann and Advance Publications. The Act has propelled the ability of these larger conglomerates to heavily advertise and cross-promote their

products. As such, mergers and acquisitions have increased resulting in integration and globalization of these major firms. The result is an increased ability of media conglomerates to combine their market share in almost every medium and across international borders (Alterman, 2003; Croteau & Hoynes, 2001). (See appendices D through I for an abridged guide of the shareholding of six major media firms as of June 2006).

As a result of the Act each of the major firms has developed a particular configuration of television networks, TV show production, television stations, cable channels, music companies, cable TV systems, magazines, newspapers, book publishing and distribution networks. Through this process they are further enabled to continually exploit synergy across their vertically integrated market structure (Bagdikian, 2000; Croteau & Hoynes, 2001; McChesney, 2004, 1999). Vertical integration “involves owning assets involved in the production, distribution, exhibition, and sale of a single type of media product,” which guarantees places for firms to market and display their products (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001, p. 94).

McChesney (1999) illustrates that horizontal integration applies to a firm attempting to control the greatest amount of output in its particular field. As horizontal integration increases a firm will have a greater share of the market, which permits it to have lower overhead and more bargaining power with suppliers as well as gaining greater control over prices. As Croteau & Hoynes (2001) and McChesney (1999) indicate, if a media conglomerate develops a successful motion picture it perpetually increases profit insofar as it utilizes its broadcast properties to promote it, television to create programs, soundtracks through its music holdings, books through its publishing houses,

advertisements in its magazine and newspapers and commercials both through television and the web.

Gomery (1989) illustrated in his analysis that the structure of the media industry is a system in which ownership is dominated by a few large corporations. As the current economic holdings indicate, each of the major media firms are either customers for each other's products or have direct interconnected links to other Fortune 1000 firms. For example, GE has seventeen direct links, or two people who serve on boards of directors of nine other media giants, while Time Warner has seven direct links (McChesney, 1999).

Herman and Chomsky (2002) reveal that as of 2002, four of the nine major media firms produce books, movies, magazines, newspapers, TV programs, music, toys, videos, and theme parks. Disney, AOL Time Warner, Viacom, and News Corp Ltd., have extensive distribution facilities through broadcasting and cable ownership, retail stores and movie-theater chains. Despite the potential of the growing number of newspaper outlets, the number of media owners is declining, resulting in each owner gaining greater communication power. Consequently, the higher the degree of concentrated ownership the more power the producer maintains.

Greenwald (2004) argues that as of early March 2004, the Fox Television Network gained operating capacity, enabling their signal to reach as many as 280 million people. In addition, its cable capacity has obtained the ability to reach as many as 300 million homes. Ultimately, the combined power of the U.S. Fox Cable Network with the Fox Asian Satellite Network has developed the capacity to reach an audience base of over 4.7 billion people or roughly three-fourths of the world's population (Greenwald, 2004).

McChesney (1999) and Herman and Chomsky (2002) argue that as a result of the conglomerate structure of the media the Telecommunications Act of 1996 fostered, smaller firms are unable to pursue the strategies necessary to compete, for they are unable to access the capital necessary for expensive investigative projects. Smaller firms have reduced financial, employment and technological resources, which has made them more dependent on the mainstream news. Insofar as smaller firms lack the ability to cross promote or cross sell their products through the absence of vertically or horizontally integrated structures they are unable to compete with the media giants, which effectively establish synergistic enterprises. As a result diversity of opinion is not the direct consequence of FCC regulations, rather a lack of competing voices is the necessary result of deregulation.

Ultimately, deregulation has provided support for private self-interested powerful parties fostering further support for powerful interests to block the path of democratic practice i.e., that of competition and diverse opinion. Since the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act the trend of media concentration continues to accelerate. The restructuring of the media industry has not merely allowed media conglomerates to actively pursue their own interests but has enforced a market model under the veil of the public interest (Croteau & Hoyne, 2001).

Structural factors that influence media content include the pursuit of profit, the amount of direct or indirect competition, the nature of such competition, the degree of horizontal or vertical integration, the role of advertising, and the specific interests of owners, managers and media employees (McChesney, 1999). Accordingly, the system

perpetuates the convenience and manufactured necessity toward a series of strategies directed at maximizing profits, reducing cost, and minimizing risk.

The government issued Telecommunications Act of 1996 insured that capitalist interests would override that of the necessary conditions of a democratic society thereby reproducing the conditions of their existence. This neo-liberal act ensured that the prevailing owners of the media could not only own the current rights to their channels, but upon digital infrastructure, could create the divisions necessary to expand their broadcast capacity to operate at the level of complete and exclusive control of the digital spectrum (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001). Ultimately, the potential devastation to a democratic society and the public sphere was developed from corporate and government action. In this transformation, public opinion and knowledge are no longer fostered through debate and consensus but are manufactured and disseminated to the public from political and media elites. Consequently, an informed citizenry is replaced by a consumer culture in which knowledge is derived from entertainment or political spectacle (Kellner, 2004).

This Act ensured a non-competitive structure thereby suppressing diverse opinion so that product labels, magazine outposts, publishing houses, and media outlets would eliminate diversity in the market place of ideas (McChesney, 1999; McChesney & Foster, 2003). McChesney asserts that a commercially driven market place of ideas may induce the greatest potential for maximum returns for investors however such interests will not ensure a high caliber of political exchange for citizens.

The government-sanctioned corporate consolidation did not in fact foster competition on a grand scale, but rather allowed a corporate elite structure in which all

news, opinion, and the supporting commercial products of the media collapsed into a monopoly of conglomerate control (McChesney, 1999; McChesney & Foster, 2003). Rather than competition, the Telecom Act produced a tidal wave of mergers and acquisitions in the media and telecommunication industries. The Telecom Act strengthens the major media companies in such a way as to cement the oligopolistic structure of the industry (Croteau & Hoynes, 2001; McChesney, 1999, 2004).

When concentration accentuates the tendencies of a profit-driven, advertising-supported media system the result is a perpetuation of hyper-commercialism and a degeneration of journalism and public service (McChesney, 1999). Consequently, a corporate-guided media serves as an elite economic filter in which American politics are pushed to the right. The result is a concentration of media ownership, the decline of mainstream journalism, the hyper-commercialization of culture, the globalization of the corporate media through neo-liberal economy, the collapse of public broadcasting, and a First Amendment serving as a tool to protect corporate privilege (McChesney, 1999).

Insofar as the broadcast industry has redefined the public interest, according to technological advancement and the interests of owners of media outlets, it is necessary to establish the extent to which journalists code of ethics operate throughout the industry. The Telecommunications Act has altered the media industry in every form. The result of the elimination of the Fairness Doctrine, in which controversial topics and diverse opinion was mandated by law, and the Telecommunications Act, which further suppressed diverse opinion, as well as the changing Code of Ethics requires our attention insofar as the media serve the public interest beyond any monetary ideological motive. Moreover, the significance of this Act, the absence of the Fairness Doctrine and the

changing environment in which power is manifest require re-evaluation of the Society of Professional Journalist Codes of Ethics, for it too changed its standards in 1996.

Critical Semiotic Analysis of the 1996 Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics

The Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics was revised in 1996. The Code includes a preamble and four objectives. The preamble states that public enlightenment is “the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy.” The duty therefore of journalists is to seek truth and provide a fair, honest and comprehensive account of events and issues. The preamble instructs journalists of their responsibility in upholding the U.S. principles of freedom of the press and the public’s right to be informed. The statements following the preamble instruct journalists on how they are to achieve such ends.

Of significant importance to this critical textual analysis are the four main objectives stated within the Code. The objectives include: (1) Seek Truth and Report it, (2) Minimize Harm, (3) Act Independently, and (4) Be Accountable. Unlike the preceding code which identified objectivity as a primary goal “Seek truth and report it” has taken its place. The absence of the pursuit of objectivity as a methodological imperative signifies that journalists no longer view professionalism as that which attempts to *explicitly* promote objective news. Rather the code signifies that journalists should be “honest, fair and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information.”

Eliminating objectivity as a primary goal signifies that the assumptions associated with the paradigmatic worldview of objective methodological approaches; that which is

value-free, removed and detached, and neutral is contested. Therefore, utilizing unitary logic and provable facts, surveys, and questionnaires to acquire and reproduce truth, is muted. Deconstruction assists in unraveling the ideological implications of the absence of objectivity in relation to the historical significance of the preceeding code of 1987 as well as the elimination of the Fairness Doctrine, which promoted balance. Utilizing a deconstructive analysis, the absence of objectivity signifies a privileging of subjectivity. However, the absence of explicitly pursuing either objectivity or subjectivity reveals that journalists are free to utilize either world-view or a combination of the two. The following explicates the extent to which the Code directs journalists to utilize either paradigm.

Following the expanded “Seek Truth” directive the Code outlines 17 prescriptive behaviors. The first recommends that journalist should “test the accuracy of information from all sources...” Due to its numerical position the statement signifies that accuracy becomes the primary component when evaluating news sources. Accordingly, this signifies the underlying assumption that a source is legitimate according to the underlying framework of how accuracy, i.e., truth, is construed. Insofar as journalists construe truth as that which is universal, unitary, and a priori, sources and the information conveyed are accurate. Thus, that which is subjective, non-linear and a posteriori is not validated as truth and therefore is not legitimized as authentic and subsequently will not be found within the news. If however, truth is construed as multiple, complex and subjective, that which reaches the news is that which supports subjectivity. Accuracy becomes the means by which sources and information are tested before reaching the public. However, the code neither signifies that accuracy is that which is consistent with the prevailing

dominant ideology of truth or that which promotes counter hegemonic claims toward the multiplicity of truths. Thus, without a precise direction journalists are subject to a tension between conflicting approaches of determining accuracy.

Of significant importance to this ideological analysis is the ability of journalists to have a precise methodological approach in which replication is possible. Thus, if subjectivity is utilized the news is not that which promotes the homogeneity of discursive practices and knowledges. Insofar as journalists are unable to reproduce and replicate the news, the ability for journalists to defend themselves against malice, i.e. the reckless disregard for truth—insofar as the dominant ideology is that which supports a singular truth—is weakened. This directive implies that insofar as journalists value their job, utilizing that which is a counter hegemonic discourse may be detrimental to their career.

The second statement, “Diligently seek out subjects of news stories to give them the opportunity to respond to allegations of wrongdoing” is perhaps the guideline in which multiple webs of truths are promulgated. Accordingly, rather than official sources all subjects should be valued to respond to allegations. However, if one looks closely enough the statement implies that the subject under which allegations stand are already only capable of providing a response to their presumed guilt. This statement reveals that trial by media is not only acceptable but should be advanced, insofar as the presumed guilty are given a chance to respond to allegations. This statement contradicts later directives which state, “Be judicious about naming criminal suspects before the formal filing of charges” and “Balance a criminal suspect’s fair trial rights with the public’s right to be informed.” For a trial has already begun insofar as coverage begins and a presumption is made about the guilt or innocence of those covered.

These statements reveal that multiple webs of truths should be promulgated, and thus there should be a fair and balanced approach toward informing the public. Within these statements is the assumption that there is a right and a wrong point of view. Accordingly, a dichotomization of discourse follows from those who seek out a claim and thus the response to such allegations. However, nothing thus far suggests that journalists go beyond the response of the presumed guilty to illustrate the significance of such wrongs to greater societal issues, nor are journalists instructed to discover and promote the relationship between the events covered and larger societal implications.

However, the web of truths and counter hegemonic claims are sought after only in terms of allegations of wrong doing. Thus, if a news story advances a particular interest, journalists are not required to strive for competing counter hegemonic claims as to the negative impact of such interests. Moreover if journalists are faced with deadlines and inter-organizational pressures from editors, corporate management and the parent firm, the probability of pursuing that which requires less time and resources is greater. As a result, the news that is fostered may be that which advances a particular interest rather than a multiplicity of truths. Of course, exceptions to this arise insofar as an attack and reply will presumably attract a greater audience, i.e. the potential for greater revenue. This code has not yet signified that journalists will be able to succeed in the accusations of wrong doing by those in high positions of authority, both corporate and government alike. It is likely that those in government and corporate positions will be given the opportunity to respond to allegations of wrongdoing however the likelihood that they will be tried in the first place is confined to the economic structure in which the news media operates.

These statements reveal the tension between seeking out truth and reporting it, as the Libertarian Model would indicate; thus providing a diverse account of multiple truths in which the public can debate, a characteristic of the Social Responsibility Model.

Insofar as journalists strive toward reporting and reproducing a singular truth, the absence of multiple truths may arise. However, insofar as journalists report so as to instill debate, multiple truths are promoted rather than single claims dependent upon unitary rationality.

The third statement within the directive of Seek Truth states, "Identify sources wherever feasible. The public is entitled to as much information as possible on sources' reliability." This directive signifies that a source's reliability is determined to the degree that he/she is credible, and thus the public has the right to receive this information.

Insofar as those who exhibit the competence and character required to establish such reliability, sources are the ones who have a stake in the matter at hand. Or, for example, when North Korea attempts missile launches its success is defined by government experts from the State Department.

The ideological implication of this directive signifies that the amount, quality and time expended to establish a source's reliability is privileged beyond the information that the source conveys. This statement signifies that establishing reliability is perhaps more significant than the information itself. The ideological implication of privileging reliability signifies not only the value placed upon Enlightenment conceptions of objective assumptions, but also an unchanging and fixed view rather than that which promotes heterogeneous non-unitary expression. Thus, a focus on reliability, a particular kind of truth guided by epistemological assumptions consistent with objectivity and Enlightenment rationality, de-privileges inter-subjective truths which represent publics.

Reliability provides the rationale for which official sources may be continually utilized as sources and definers of discourse for they are more likely to be consistent in their claims and provide a consistency in their truth. Ultimately, the assumption that sources remain reliably consistent further authorizes the professional standardization of journalist discourse and the use of official sources.

These directives are interesting in light of another directive which states, "Avoid stereotyping by race, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, geography, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance or social status." The ideological implication of this directive reveals that insofar as journalists operate through the assumptions of neutrality, the categorizations that follow by necessity form generalized categories that suppress subjective qualities. The code itself is riddled with the presence of the "voiceless" which perpetuates that the voiceless remain a categorical distinction as those incapable of advancing their own position.

To direct journalists to avoid stereotypes advances an ideological position that journalists should be conscientious of the implications of their stories and adjust them accordingly. This is a quality often associated with subjective and attached journalism. Furthermore, as Lippmann (1922) illustrates, to avoid stereotypes is to provide that which is indefinite, inconsistent, disorderly, and turbulent; characteristics that contradict preceding directives of detached and neutral methods of reliability, reproducibility and accuracy.

However, insofar as stereotypes simplify rather than complicate, the economic structure and the directives aimed toward the distribution of truth may dictate that stereotypes are used rather than the complex, disorderly, and non-unitary accounts of

peoples within the public. One only has to look to the “Freedom loving people of Iraq” to determine if the news perpetuates stereotypes rather than avoiding them. Furthermore, insofar as reliability is praised, to avoid stereotypes is to contradict that which promotes consistent sources. Furthermore, avoiding stereotyping, the very means by which the economic revenue of the system is fostered, would collapse a system dependent on this type of economic revenue. Such is not possible insofar as economic revenue dictates advertising expenditures.

The Code directs journalists to “Examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing those values on others.” This directive signifies that journalists ought to evaluate their own subjective values and therefore remove such world-views from their reports. However, this directive fails to consider that values are inevitably tied to the method used to acquire and disseminate information. This directive assumes that an objective, detached and neutral methodological approach eliminates the possibility of imposing values. However, by embracing a detached and neutral reporting style a journalist becomes an advocate for objectivity and thus promotes the world view of the dominant elite. A tension arises when journalists view objectivity as that which is free of value assumptions or particular epistemological and ontological frameworks. As such, when operating in a detached and neutral framework journalists may not feel the need to “Distinguish between advocacy and news reporting,” for the objective report is not perceived as advocacy. However, Bourdieu (1991) and Foucault (1984) remind us that the very use of such reporting methods is a technique which serves an authorizing and legitimizing function.

The first and third statements signify that the accuracy of information ought to be verified against the proper and official means of testing truth. The proper and official means of testing truth is that which perpetuates a detached value free objective framework. According to the critical political economic models put forth by Bagdikian (2000), Herman and Chomsky (2002), and McChesney (1999, 2003) as well as Graber's (1980) professional and political models, media experts and professionals are used to verify truth. Thus, the verification of truth may show its allegiance with official sources so as to eliminate the expenses of time and money necessary to verify the claims of unofficial sources. As a result, the perpetuation of the singular truth, which official sources are used to verify, eliminates the diversity of opinion necessary to compete against the prevailing conception of truth.

However, a contradiction arises with the 14th directive which states, "Give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid." This statement gives rise to the notion that the non-unitary can be equally validated. However, it does not clearly signify that the voiceless, oppressed and silenced are in fact as equally valid as official sources. But rather, that they *may* be valid.

Later in the Code a directive is put forth, "Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects." This statement reveals the ideology within professional journalists code of ethics. Providing an ethical directive in which children and inexperienced sources are linked together categorizes and normalizes the commonalities between the two. Thus, the unofficial source should be treated like a vulnerable child. This directive reveals that the inexperienced source is a less credible or reliable source rather than promoting the notion that inexperienced sources are as equally

valid as official, reliable and experienced sources. Eye witnesses, for example are directly affected by the events before them and thus have an interest in the matter under investigation and are therefore, experts.

Thus, the code signifies the contradictions between the possibility of competing meanings and a neutral and objective truth. However, insofar as journalists are forced to operate within a market structure in which advertising revenue, parent firms, time, resources and monetary concerns determine output. Furthermore, as the demise of the Fairness Doctrine and implementation of the Telecom Act would suggest, that which appeals to the largest demographic is that which is used. Thus, there is reliance on sources that are consistent with the status quo is authorized and legitimized.

In Graber's (1980) ideological model, unofficial sources are said to be used in reports dealing with a dichotomization and polarization of discourse. Thus, views that are inconsistent with the mediated industrial complex will be voiced through unofficial sources while official sources will be used to promote it. Thus, the news will magnify the credibility of sources that legitimize the truth that serves elite economic interests. As Herman and Chomsky (2002) suggest, in this system we can expect that official sources are used heavily and uncritically in connections with U.S. abuse while dissident sources will be used in dealing with the voiceless.

The practice by journalists of a heavy and undue reliance on professional sources signifies that news organizations are less likely to pursue costly investigative journalism. It is easier to attend an official press conference than an investigative report which requires a greater investment of time and resources. Accordingly, professional commercial journalism will stray away from hard investigative journalism of corporate

malfeasance so as to keep the parent firms happy, while subsequently controlling exposure to sensational easily covered or simplified, context free stories. An example of this was indicated in the story of Jeffery Wigand and Brown and Williamson Tobacco.

We must view these directives in light of the economic and nation-state environment of which they are a part. Alterman (2003), Champlin and Knoedler (2002), Herman (2003) and McManus (1997) comment, that news conglomeration which is the result of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 leads to the necessity of producing profitable networks. As such, news aimed toward such ends will focus on the demographic groups that foster profit. The demand for profit places pressure on media outlets to appeal to the lives of the wealthiest to lower income audiences i.e., celebrity news portrayed as 'real' news. As a result, in general the poor and oppressed are not part of investigative entrepreneurship. Of course, exceptions exist. The mainstream news coverage of Hurricane Katrina reveal that when the public is up in arms the news cannot avoid covering such issues, especially when the coverage could facilitate greater economic revenue. As a profit seeking business the media depends on an information environment conducive to and supportive of such interests.

The aforementioned characteristics within the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics version 1996 signify that journalists attempting to follow through with such goals may be blocked due to the structure of which the codes are a part. However, under the section Act Independently, it states, "Journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know." Although a worthy pursuit, a tension exists between the type of knowledge that is accepted and that which is promoted as

truth. Thus, it must be asked, what type of knowledge does the public have a right to know about?

Insofar as journalists may attempt to remain detached with little consideration as to the consequences of news stories, journalists will do little to nothing in promoting civic engagement or avoiding conflicts with parent firms. Consequently, the news media perpetuates the alienation and disengagement of the broader public from public life insofar as they remain detached from even democratic practices, for that would entail a conflict of interest. For the Code directs journalists to “Avoid conflicts of interest, real or perceived,” an assumption required of subjective consideration. Ultimately, the news media addresses the public as consumers and spectators of a bi-polarization of discourse rather than active citizens capable of change or reform.

The codes indicate that journalists should, “Clarify and explain news coverage and invite dialogue with the public over journalistic conduct” and “Encourage the public to voice grievances against the news media.” These statements signify the tension between a professional organization whose pursuit is to inform the public of the truth and the public’s right to dissent. The codes themselves indicate a procedural safe guard coined ethics, which thereby provides greater value as a standard and methodological approach toward the acquisition and distribution of truth than the counter hegemonic claims of those who may dissent. Insofar as the dominant conception of truth is that which is acquired through objective means, citizens who dissent utilizing “inferior” means will have difficulty successfully implementing and advancing their claims of truth. Accordingly, as a means to argue against the reckless disregard for the truth, the public

who dissents may find it difficult to prove that journalists are guilty of wrong doing, for the code signifies procedural guidelines of truth.

The following addresses the significance of visual images in mainstream news journalism. The code directs journalists to,

Make certain that headlines, news teases and promotional material, photos, video, audio, graphics, sound bites and quotations do not misrepresent. They should not oversimplify or highlight incidents out of context.

The implications of this directive are revealed in the work of Scheuer (1999). Scheuer argues that sound bites favor particular political ideas and disfavor others. Thus the medium itself works as a lens through which complex ideas are filtered and transformed into emotional and narrow, moralized political messages. The spectrum of the simple and complex defines political discourse in which the soundbite supports one ideology rather than another. Consequently, anything contrary or complicated, which advocates an alternative account of reality will not be used as political or cultural knowledge for it is perceived as extreme, too complicated or incomprehensible.

Journalists attempting to eliminate the use of soundbites are thus advancing a more complex array of knowledge, a characteristic often identified within non-unitary epistemology. However, how can a headline or picture avoid oversimplification? Thus, abstract language may be used to ensure that the story fits within the framework of the headline. However, what is missing from this directive is pressure to promote eye catching headlines that further the pursuit of revenue. Thus, headlines used to attract attention and still avoid oversimplification reveals insufficient and unpractical guidelines within the code of ethics.

In relation to this directive the code states, “Avoid misleading re-enactments or staged news events. If re-enactment is necessary to tell a story, label it.” The image being neither true nor false illustrates that an overemphasis of images relinquishes the time and money necessary involved in the fact checking process. However, within these image directives is what Boorstin (1978) identifies as the pseudo-event. A pseudo-event and subsequent image is not that which is captured or spontaneous but is rather planned, planted or incited. The event is created for the immediate purpose of reproduction and usually acquires the status of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Thus, that which is not spontaneous or captured but is planned or incited is a staged news event. We see the presence of pseudo-events or staged news events in press conferences specifically, or events that involve a podium, American flag, State Seal, audiences, and audio-visual amplifying techniques. The pooling of journalists and the more recent Bush administration confined press rooms have naturalized the pseudo event.

Boorstin (1978) outlines eight characteristics of staged events, which the codes of ethics direct its journalist to avoid and/or reveal: (1) The pseudo-event will focus on the dramatic and by its purpose of reproduction is both (2) easier to disseminate and focus on vividness. Due to the staged character of the event itself (3) it is more capable of repetition and reinforcement. Moreover, insofar as those staging the event invest the expenses necessary to create it (4) the interest of disseminating, advertising, magnifying, and extolling them is revealed as that which is worth watching or believing. The ideological implications reveal that the event itself is an advertisement for values. Pseudo-events are planned for intelligibility and are thus (5) more intelligible and reassuring. A staged event is (6) more sociable, conversable and thus strategically

implemented for the audience. Furthermore, (7) the what, how and who of reporting pseudo-events become the test of being informed and consequently perpetuate common discourse. Ultimately, (8) pseudo-events perpetuate, legitimize and enforce the authority and progression of other pseudo-events.

The ideological implication of avoiding these events reveals that professional journalists value captured events and spontaneous reporting. However, insofar as journalists are complicit in such pseudo-events the news perpetuates that which is a false reality and thus furthers a false consciousness. The pseudo-events manufactured by government and official sources perpetuate this type of manufactured reality as a means to disseminate a particular message. Accordingly, the actions by the White House and the press packets disseminated to reporters or the classic “mission accomplished” aircraft carrier event reveals State control over information and thus the government’s suppression of First Amendment Rights and the Professional Ethics of Journalism. These events have found their presence in the evening news and front pages nationally. However, insofar as journalists are complicit in such practices they too, perpetuate governmental censorship rather than the public’s right to participate in a diverse market place of ideas in which truth can arise.

Moreover, the Code directs journalists to embrace a subjective account of reporting the news in photojournalism in the directive that states “Image enhancement for technical clarity is always permissible.” The Code also directs journalists to “Never distort the content of news photos or video.” With these directives one must ask what technical clarity and the distortion of content are defined as, for if technical clarity promotes an activity which zooms in on a particular eye catching feature within the photo

itself, the image that is advanced has been directly, purposely, and justifiably distorted to sell the story, for distortion is that which alters the original form. Thus the foreground may be eliminated for the technical purpose of clarity focuses on a particular aspect within the background rather than the context in which it is a part. This ideological directive reveals that a holistic approach toward journalism is suppressed when promoting a context free picture, and subsequent story. For journalists need only to make sure that images do not misrepresent.

A tension arises when the subjective interpretation of an image is justified as that which is not misrepresentative. Accordingly, insofar as the story relates to the subjectively altered image, the story is not misrepresented. However, journalists are directed against these activities when the Code states “They should not oversimplify or highlight incidents out of context.” Thus, the story provides a context for the image and the image for the story thereby facilitating that this directive is followed.

The Code also states that journalists should “Distinguish news from advertising and shun hybrids that blur the lines between the two.” The very presence of pseudo-events reveals the difficulty in avoiding hybrids that blur the lines. However, as the earlier discussion with ABC editors indicated, VNRs promoted by pharmaceutical companies are not checked and the procedures necessary to distinguish news from advertising or public relations campaigns are not shunned, but rather normatively advanced. Ultimately, news organizations may comply with the above code, but that which is selected or not covered is based on overriding corporate interests. Thus, a story’s presence reveals a subjective account of that which will foster greater economic revenue and still inform the public of manufactured remedies..

A tension arises, when for example, NBC covers a General Electric environmental issue or perhaps the lack of coverage concerning the connections between General Electric Air Craft Engines and the Military Industrial Complex. Corporate interests will affect news stories insofar as the issue is defined as an issue rather than a problem. Thus, stories are determined by the level of wrongdoing associated with each story. Accordingly, the presence of the story may indicate the lack of corporate interest involvement; however the way in which the story is defined is dependent upon ownership control. Furthermore, it could be argued that insofar as journalists cover a General Electric issue put forth by NBC, critics may advance the notion that NBC is promoting and advertising for G.E. Thus, due to the potential for ridicule a journalist may stray away from hard hitting investigative reports or disclose the conflict against the parent firms.

Finally, the Code states, "Support the open exchange of views, even the ones they find repugnant." This statement signifies that the views of dictators, rapists, murderers and those who commit massive genocide should be reported which reflects the ideology the market place of ideas. However, mainstream news organizations suppress the extreme and repugnant compared to the non-confined beheadings reported on the Aljazeera news network. In fact, the reports of the beheadings were ridiculed by the mainstream media. Ultimately, grass roots, independent and foreign news agencies are guided by this principle rather than the mainstream news organizations of the United States.

The economic industry signifies that the ability for journalists to operate according to the code of ethics is constrained to the potential profitability or economic

loss associated with news stories. Thus, the news that obtains the greatest ratings is that which will saturate the market and perpetuate the values conducive to the greatest audience base. Thus, news which is defined objectively is that which propels the industry, authorizes its validity and perpetuates the meaning of elite interests.

The Society of Professional Journalists Codes of Ethics signify that truth is a commodity rather than promoting an atmosphere in which truth can arise. Thus, the multiplicity of voices in the market place of ideas is suppressed through an economic rationality in which the discursive practices of an acquirable truth dictate the news. What is absent from the code is the goal to promote community action and debate. Accordingly, the journalist Codes of Ethics operate so as to instill a Libertarian model of the media in which truth is reported rather than fostering a forum in which rationale debate can arise.

The professionalization of media ethics relies on the assumptions which underlie a framework of truth that Nietzsche identified as problematic. There is an entire world of truth not spoken of within the codes, such as economic and inter-organizational pressures. As Nietzsche contends, truth can never be obtained from discourse but rather is always removed. Accordingly, journalists and the public who strive for truth without this knowledge are deceived. Moreover, within the Code of Ethics is an underlying framework which produces a hierarchical reality, “namely the construction of a pyramidal order based on castes and degrees, the creation of a new world of laws, privileges, subordinations, definitions of borders...”(Nietzsche p. 878).

The result is not a proliferation of diverse opinion or meaning deriving from the concrete experiences of the public or its citizens within the public sphere. Rather, the

result is a proliferation of a unified stance in which corporate interests and professionalized discourse define accurate reflections of meaning through the institutionalized political, economic, corporate and “accurate” filters. These filters are legitimized through the procedural guidelines of truth i.e., journalist codes of ethics.

Implicit within such discursive practices is the language of objective categorization, “accuracy,” and “reliability” and the prevailing universalized truth of binary order. “Seek Truth” serves the interests of those in power. Upon categorization, these prevailing objectively defined neutral categories de-privilege the unique concrete experience of individuality thereby substantiating the hierarchy of dominant classifications. The code signifies that journalists judge harm, thereby authorizing their position and discourse as superior to that of citizens. Thus, journalists are apart from the public rather than sharing the same civic duties. This activity authorizes journalist discourse as the proper and official means of language and truth which thus creates borders and boundaries between those utilizing its methods and those incapable of acquiring such information, an aspect of the professional model.

Foucault (1984) reminds us that the prevailing illusion of truth takes place on a battlefield of representations in which the language of objectivity inevitably supports the elite interest’s claims of categorization, classification, and control over subjectivity. To act as journalists do is to perceive and name according to the classifications proliferating throughout the media, thereby continually structuring power through language. Ultimately, language is the technological instrument of ideology, for it enables power to classify reality according to the dominant interests of expertise and trustworthiness. As

the Professional Journalists Codes of Ethics version 1996 preamble states, “Professional integrity is the cornerstone of a journalist's credibility.”

Ultimately, knowledge consists of hollow threads of truths; for, journalism or mediated news truth is not that of subjectivity; but rather, is an illusion of truth fostered through objectification and normalization embedded in their prevailing procedural guideline of truth. Truth is a manufactured illusion partially instilled through the Journalist Codes of Ethics and subsequent Federal Communications Commissions documentations which sustain illusion of the public interest under the veil of Enlightenment rationality.

These long standing Codes of Ethics and policy decisions are ideology. They deceive and manipulate perceptions, actions and knowledge of the world. They have done so within a series of recommendations and decisions that at first glance attempt to promote the public interest in a democratic society. The language used in the codes is ideological power continually rewoven into the economic structure of domination. Thus, the codes enable power and power structures; for, power is the prevailing truth within legitimate discourse. Such meaning and linguistic subjugation continually manufacture false consciousness insofar as the language and events which it procures are always other than the interests of those constrained.

The journalist Codes of Ethics exhibit high concentrations of control, truth, and power through a tension of arbitrary oppositions, which continually recreate the divisions of manufactured dualisms. This was seen in the use of reliable sources against the silenced and marginalized voiceless who may be equally as valid in this role. This

tension fosters hegemonic consent in which free-market capitalist ideology operate under the veil of democracy and the public interest.

Democracy has become the manufacture of consent instilled to covertly keep publics in line with subjective assumptions of capitalist interests. We are to understand, then, that

democracy is a system that rejects democratic forms so as to facilitate reduced consumption and super exploitation, with state control over the economy in coordination with domestic conglomerates and international corporations, a pattern closer to traditional fascism than to democracy. All makes sense, however, when we take the term “democracy” to mean domination of the economy and social and political life by domestic elements that are properly sensitive to the needs of corporations and the U.S. government (Chomsky, 1989, p. 108).

Insofar as the media operate according to the proclaimed professionalized standards of *Seek Truth and Report it* in which *accuracy* and *reliability* has redefined *objectivity*, the media perpetuate the means by which the accurate reflection of the world is evaluated. Consequently, insofar as the media is embedded in the structure of binary thinking, institutionalized discourse and free market corporate capitalism, the publics are enabled to constrain themselves to the structure of domination.

Insofar as the system advocates a consciousness in which reliability is praised, the voice of the suppressed, whether cultural, gender, and socio-economically are not heard, legitimized or authorized as credible. “The construction, of course, is always homogenizing and normalizing, erasing racial, class, and other differences and insisting that [we] all...aspire to a coercive, standardized idea” (Bordo, 1989, p. 2365). Thus, the regime of truth becomes the official paradigm perpetuated through the prevailing elite news media discourse.

The ideological unraveling within this analysis indicates that the value system of the professional journalist code of ethics is constructed from objective rationality. In the end the essentializing framework of universal notions in which hegemony operates perpetuates the silence and devaluation of that which is *other* or outside of the prevailing framework of objective neutrality and accurate reflection. This discursive process instills the myth that free market capitalism is natural, essential, inevitable and unquestionable to a democratic society.

When hegemonic forces proliferate through effective illusions of truth, consent is manufactured through legitimizing a picture of the world according to the dominant ideology. This sustains and reproduces the world view and institutionalized framework of those in power. Subsequently, the individual, the knowledge of one's environment, and relations of being are analyzed by the media according to the *accurate* nature of the procedural guidelines of the media. What remains is a socially shared perspective of a singular conception of truth and reality. Here truth is judged according to the subjective needs and values of capitalism and proclaimed objective interests thereby maintaining the hegemonic order of supporting objectivity.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Conclusion

The current analysis of the media illustrated the political, economic and cultural structures of power, truth, hegemony and ideology perpetuated through the assumptions of objective reporting and subjective interests. In doing so this analysis connected “the productive system rooted in private ownership to a political system that presupposes a citizenry whose full social participation depends in part on access to the maximum possible range of information and analysis and to open debate on contentious issues” (Murdock, 1990, p. 144). Accordingly, the thesis examined the function and economic base of the mass media and the culture industry.

This analysis reviewed the mainstream news industry in a democratic society, the structure of institutionalized discourse, and the requirements necessary to acquire and insert diverse knowledge so as to make accurate, critical and representative assessments of a market driven capitalist “free and democratic” state. Ultimately, the discourse of truth and the potential consequences of elite driven objectively proclaimed subjectively established corporate driven professional media remains a great concern.

The corporate domination of the industry perpetuates a hegemonic web through multiple and complex inter-connective myths surrounding the role of the public and the system itself. “The corporate domination of both the media system and the policy-making process that establishes and sustains it causes serious problems for a functioning democracy and a healthy culture” (McChesney, 2004, p. 7).

So as to expand theory, I incorporated the shareholdings of the industry, the documents which made conglomeration possible, and insofar as this is centered on the responsibility of journalists, the codes of ethics were analyzed in light of policy and media ownership issues. Thus, to analyze the codes in light of FCC documentation reveals not only what is allowed and suppressed in the media but how the dominant elite perpetuates and reinforces particular truths to benefit the interests of those in power.

Two versions of the Society of Professional Journalist Code of Ethics were used to illustrate that when legislation passes to alter the broadcast media, which has always received less protection due to spectrum scarcity, the industry also changes through implementing changes in print media codes of ethics. This is seen in the elimination of the Fairness Doctrine which required broadcasters to promote controversial issues of public importance and the subsequent changes within the Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics.

Subsequently, in 1996 legislation was passed once again which altered the economic industry and the requirements of media in a free society. The Telecom Act of 1996 deregulated the media thereby allowing further conglomeration of the industry. This structure has ensured the lack of competition, i.e. diverse opinion. At the same time the Society of Professional Journalists revised its code. Objectivity was to be a thing of the past, for it was reduced in significance as a primary objective.

What may matter most is the historical context of the media in which its foundation resides in playing an adversarial role, protecting the public from abuses of the concentration of power. Our eyes now turn to corporate power as legislated by the government. Thus, insofar as publics believe its news to be objective and serving the

public interest beyond any propaganda, political or corporate interests they perpetuate the hegemonic system. The FCC documents and the economic structure reveal that the news is a business that operates for monetary benefit beyond any democratic principles.

Future Research

Critical research should compare the characteristics of journalism ethics with propaganda. The works of Black (2001), Cunningham (2001), Schiller (1973) and Sproule (1987, 1989, 2001) would be of great utility. For example, Black (2001) has offered six characteristics common to all propaganda. First, propaganda relies on established authority. Second, rather than empirical reasoning to establish the truth, an emphasis is placed on beliefs, unverifiable abstract language and physical representations. Third, propagandistic language consists of static evaluation, over simplified generalizations, polarized language, and two-valued orientation. Fourth, such language reduces cause and effect relations to a simplistic view of society where causes are easily identifiable. Fifth, propaganda establishes an inconsistent view of time characterized by either an over emphasis or under emphasis of time as a disconnected series of events. And finally, propaganda supports an over reliance on conflict with little emphasis placed on cooperation among organizations within society (Black).

Cunningham (2001) builds on such political propaganda foundations; however, he defines propaganda messages in terms of ethical considerations. Cunningham states that propaganda generates ungrounded beliefs or tenacious convictions. It skews perceptions and systematically disregards truth. It acts to maintain beliefs and impressions, rather

than knowledge and understanding. It discourages reasoning to promote an utter indifference to the procedural safeguards of such epistemic values (Cunningham).

Sproule (1989) has identified these characteristics as those common with the techniques identified by the scholars of the Institute of Propaganda Analysis, while Schiller (1973) illustrates the hegemonic system in which propaganda depends. Thus Schiller advocates,

For manipulation to be effective, evidence of its presence should be nonexistent. When the manipulated believe things are the way they are naturally and inevitably, manipulation is successful. In short, manipulation requires false reality that is a continuous denial of its existence. (p.11)

Therefore, future research should reunite the connections between those who place an emphasis on critical theory, political economy, and propaganda scholarship.

It should be noted that focusing primarily on one professional organization's specific code of ethics may reveal the ideological bias of only one particular interest group. Therefore, future research should also investigate other codes of ethics within internet, advertising and public relations organizations. The following codes would be beneficial to analyze: Radio-Television News Directors Association, Associated Press Managing Editors, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Public Relations Society of America, and the National Press Photographers Association. An emphasis should be placed on the extent to which such codes perpetuate the discourse of elite interests. In addition, a cross-cultural analysis is suggested to analyze the United States codes existing within a commercial or advertising based media with that of Canadian public broadcasting systems. The Canadian Broadcast Standards Councils implementation of the Radio-Television News Directors Association of Canada would be a useful point of analysis.

Although, this analysis seeks to analyze the procedural guidelines of truth and power the analysis is limited to discovering a formula. While this formula guides the media output and can be used to understand and trace how discourse is perpetuated it lacks the specific analysis of the discourse it guides. Therefore, future research should continually use and expand this formula as a means to analyze the output of the media.

In addition, it should be noted that isolating an analysis of guidelines will not bring forth the audio or visual mechanisms employed during coverage. Such audio and visuals may serve to reinforce or contradict the ideological guidelines by which discourse is guided. Therefore, future research should not only analyze the narrative text of the broadcast, but the audio and visual representations, through a semiotic analysis, to determine the audio visual characteristics and the signification of the underlying messages as well. Furthermore, internet feedback and how it relates to the public sphere, should also be incorporated into future studies.

This analysis lacks a comprehensive understanding of the atmosphere of newsrooms and the tensions that exist between upper management, journalists, editors, and the codes themselves. Accordingly, future research should incorporate critical political economy and semiotics with potential organizational conflicts as a means to understand the organizational and professional pressures associated with ethics, power and autonomy. Accordingly, an emphasis should be placed within the notions of competing ideologies, power, articulation and conflict as identified by Makus (1990) and Hall (1973, 1981, 1985).

Further research should also focus on events of limited coverage as well. As Herman and Chomsky (1988) contest, the power of the U.S. media system lies in its

ability to control the information environment. As such, issues that are not covered are unable to receive such an analysis. Therefore, a strong recommendation is placed on reevaluating the propaganda model, for it illustrates how to utilize comparative examples. In addition, future research should continue to focus through the framework of rhetorical criticism to determine the extent to which ideology and bias are inherent mechanisms in any medium.

If such consequences are seen as threatening democracy through veiled perceptions and strategic manipulation, it follows that a need to reform the current economic structure of the commercialized monopolistic medium is established. Thus, research should continue to analyze the current media to uncover that which such systems suppress. So that the media as well as the public are informed of the prevailing illusions and mechanisms continually suppressing and manipulating beliefs in democratic society. It is from this research that knowledge will enter the public sphere so as to empower citizens to take action and inform future policy decisions. Accordingly, the public hearings required by the FCC will be filled with the diverse array of knowledges necessary for social emancipation and alter existing societal relations. Only at this point can the media further democratic practices.

Appendix A

Lye's Method of Ideological Analysis

Questions of the Text

1. What are the assumptions about what is natural, just and right?
2. What (and who) do these assumptions distort or obscure?
3. What are the power relations? How are they made to appear as if they are normal or good? What negative aspects are excluded? Look for binaries, oppositions (good/evil, natural/unnatural, tame/wild, young/old). Which term of the binary is privileged, what is repressed or devalued by this privileging of one term over the other?
4. What people, classes, areas of life, experiences, are 'left out', silenced?
5. What cultural assumptions and what 'myths' shape experience and evaluation?
6. What is mystified? (Myth as "second-order signification", An experience or event or thing is mystified when a broad cultural meaning obscures the particulars of that experience, event or thing; this obscuring usually covers up or 'disappears' contrary or inconvenient facts.
7. How does the style of presentation contribute to the meaning of the text?
8. What 'utopic kernel', that is, vision of human possibility, appears to lie at the heart of the understanding of the ideology?

Appendix B

Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics - 1987

SOCIETY of Professional Journalists, believes the duty of journalists is to serve the truth. We BELIEVE the agencies of mass communication are carriers of public discussion and information, acting on their Constitutional mandate and freedom to learn and report the facts.

We BELIEVE in public enlightenment as the forerunner of justice, and in our Constitutional role to seek the truth as part of the public's right to know the truth.

We BELIEVE those responsibilities carry obligations that require journalists to perform with intelligence, objectivity, accuracy, and fairness.

To these ends, we declare acceptance of the standards of practice here set forth:

I. RESPONSIBILITY:

The public's right to know of events of public importance and interest is the overriding mission of the mass media. The purpose of distributing news and enlightened opinion is to serve the general welfare. Journalists who use their professional status as representatives of the public for selfish or other unworthy motives violate a high trust.

II. FREEDOM OF THE PRESS:

Freedom of the press is to be guarded as an inalienable right of people in a free society. It carries with it the freedom and the responsibility to discuss, question, and challenge actions and utterances of our government and of our public and private institutions. Journalists uphold the right to speak unpopular opinions and the privilege to agree with the majority.

III. ETHICS:

Journalists must be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know the truth.

1. Gifts, favors, free travel, special treatment or privileges can compromise the integrity of journalists and their employers. Nothing of value should be accepted.
2. Secondary employment, political involvement, holding public office, and service in community organizations should be avoided if it compromises the integrity of journalists and their employers. Journalists and their employers should conduct their personal lives in a manner that protects them from conflict of interest, real or apparent. Their responsibilities to the public are paramount. That is the nature of their profession.
3. So-called news communications from private sources should not be published or broadcast without substantiation of their claims to news values.
4. Journalists will seek news that serves the public interest, despite the obstacles. They will make constant efforts to assure that the public's business is conducted in public and that public records are open to public inspection.
5. Journalists acknowledge the newsman's ethic of protecting confidential sources of information.
6. Plagiarism is dishonest and unacceptable.

IV. ACCURACY AND OBJECTIVITY:

Good faith with the public is the foundation of all worthy journalism.

1. Truth is our ultimate goal.
2. Objectivity in reporting the news is another goal that serves as the mark of an experienced professional. It is a standard of performance toward which we strive. We honor those who achieve it.
3. There is no excuse for inaccuracies or lack of thoroughness.
4. Newspaper headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles they accompany. Photographs and telecasts should give an accurate picture of an event and not highlight an incident out of context.
5. Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free of opinion or bias and represent all sides of an issue.
6. Partisanship in editorial comment that knowingly departs from the truth violates the spirit of American journalism.
7. Journalists recognize their responsibility for offering informed analysis, comment, and editorial opinion on public events and issues. They accept the obligation to present such material by individuals whose competence, experience, and judgment qualify them for it.
8. Special articles or presentations devoted to advocacy or the writer's own conclusions and interpretations should be labeled as such.

V. FAIR PLAY:

Journalists at all times will show respect for the dignity, privacy, rights, and well-being of people encountered in the course of gathering and presenting the news.

1. The news media should not communicate unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character without giving the accused a chance to reply.
2. The news media must guard against invading a person's right to privacy.
3. The media should not pander to morbid curiosity about details of vice and crime.
4. It is the duty of news media to make prompt and complete correction of their errors.
5. Journalists should be accountable to the public for their reports and the public should be encouraged to voice its grievances against the media. Open dialogue with our readers, viewers, and listeners should be fostered.

VI. MUTUAL TRUST:

Adherence to this code is intended to preserve and strengthen the bond of mutual trust and respect between American journalists and the American people.

The Society shall--by programs of education and other means-- encourage individual journalists to adhere to these tenets, and shall encourage journalistic publications and broadcasters to recognize their responsibility to frame codes of ethics in concert with their employees to serve as guidelines in furthering these goals.

CODE OF ETHICS

(Adopted 1926; revised 1973, 1984, 1987)

Appendix C

The Ownership and Shareholdings of News Corp. Ltd.

Fox Television Stations

WNYW - New York City
 WWOR - New York City
 KTTV - Los Angeles
 KCOP - Los Angeles
 WFLD - Chicago
 WPWR - Chicago
 KMSP - Minneapolis
 WFTC - Minneapolis
 WTXF - Philadelphia
 WFXT - Boston
 WTTG - Washington D.C.
 WDCA - Washington D.C.
 KDFW - Dallas
 KDFI - Dallas
 WJBK - Detroit
 KUTP - Phoenix
 KSAZ - Phoenix
 WUTB - Baltimore
 WRBW - Orlando
 WOFL - Orlando
 WOGX - Ocala
 WAGA - Atlanta
 KRIV - Houston
 KTXH - Houston
 WJW - Cleveland
 WTVT - Tampa
 KDVR - Denver
 KTVI - St. Louis
 WITI - Milwaukee
 WDAF - Kansas City
 KSTU - Salt Lake City
 WHBQ - Memphis
 WGHP - Greensboro
 WBRC - Birmingham
 KTBC - Austin

DBS & Cable

FOXTEL
 BSKyB

DirecTV

Sky Italia
 Fox News Channel
 Fox Movie Channel
 FX
 FUEL
 National Geographic Channel
 SPEED Channel
 Fox Sports Net
 FSN New England (50%)
 FSN Ohio
 FSN Florida
 National Advertising Partners
 Fox College Sports
 Fox Soccer Channel
 Stats, Inc.

Film

20th Century Fox
 Fox Searchlight Pictures
 Fox Television Studios
 Blue Sky Studios

Magazines

InsideOut
 donna hay
 SmartSource
 The Weekly Standard
 TV Guide (partial)

Newspapers**United States**

New York Post

United Kingdom

News International
 News of the World

The Sun

The Sunday Times
 The Times

Australia

Daily Telegraph
 Fiji Times
 Gold Coast Bulletin
 Herald Sun
 Newsphotos
 Newspix
 Newstext
 NT News
 Post-Courier
 Sunday Herald Sun
 Sunday Mail
 Sunday Tasmanian
 Sunday Territorian
 Sunday Times
 The Advertiser
 The Australian
 The Courier-Mail
 The Mercury
 The Sunday Telegraph
 Weekly Times

Books**HarperMorrow Publishers****HarperMorrow**

General Books Group
 Access
 Amistad
 Caedmon
 Avon
 Ecco
 Eos
 Fourth Estate
 HarperAudio

HarperBusiness	Broadsystem
HarperCollins	Classic FM
Harper Design International	Festival Records
HarperEntertainment	Fox Interactive
HarperLargePrint	IGN Entertainment
HarperResource	Mushroom Records
HarperSanFrancisco	MySpace.com
HarperTorch	National Rugby League
Perennial	NDS
PerfectBound	News Outdoor
Quill	Nursery World
Rayo	Scout Media
ReganBooks	
William Morrow	
William Morrow Cookbooks	
Children's Books Group	
Avon	
Greenwillow Books	
Joanna Cotler Books	
Eos	
Laura Geringer Books	
HarperAudio	
HarperCollins Children's Books	
HarperFestival	
HarperTempest	
Katherine Tegen Books	
Trophy	
Zondervan	
HarperCollins UK	
HarperCollins Canada	
HarperCollins Australia	

Other

Los Angeles Kings (NHL, 40%)
 Los Angeles Lakers (NBA, 9.8%)
 Staples Center (40% owned by Fox/Liberty)
 News Interactive
 Fox Sports Radio Network
 Sky Radio Denmark
 Sky Radio Germany

Appendix D

The Ownership and Shareholdings of Time Warner Inc.

Time Warner Inc. - Magazines

Time	Coastal Living
Time Asia	Weightwatchers
Time Atlantic	Real Simple
Time Canada	Asiaweek (Asian news weekly)
Time Latin America	President (Japanese business monthly)
Time South Pacific	Dancyu (Japanese cooking)
Time Money	Wallpaper (U.K.)
Time For Kids	Field & Stream
Fortune	Freeze
All You	Golf Magazine
Business 2.0	Outdoor Life
Life	Popular Science
Sports Illustrated	Salt Water Sportsman
Sports Illustrated International	Ski
SI for Kids	Skiing Magazine
Inside Stuff	Skiing Trade News
Money	SNAP
Your Company	Snowboard Life
Your Future	Ride BMX
People	Today's Homeowner
Who Weekly (Aus. edition)	TransWorld Skateboarding
People en Español	TransWorld Snowboarding
Teen People	Verge
Entertainment Weekly	Yachting Magazine
EW Metro	Warp
The Ticket	American Express Publishing Corp.
In Style	Travel & Leisure
Southern Living	Baby Talk
Progressive Farmer	Baby on the Way
Southern Accents	Departures
Cooking Light	SkyGuide
The Parent Group	Magazines/Warner Brothers label
Parenting	DC Comics
This Old House	Vertigo
Sunset	Paradox
Sunset Garden Guide	Milestone
The Health Publishing Group	Mad Magazine
Health	Time Warner - Online/Other Publishing
Hippocrates	Road Runner

Warner Publisher Service
Time Distribution Services

American Family Publishers (50%)
Pathfinder
Africana.com

Time Warner Book Group

Warner Books
The Mysterious Press
Warner Vision
Warner Business Books
Aspect
Warner Faith
Warner Treasures
TW Kids
Little, Brown and Company
Little, Brown Adult Trade
Little, Brown Books for Young Readers
Back Bay
Bulfinch Press
Food & Wine
Your Company
Time Inc.
Southern Progress Corporation
Sunset Books
Oxmoor House
Leisure Arts

Online Services

CompuServe Interactive Services
AOL Instant Messenger
AOL.com portal
Digital City
AOL Europe
ICQ
The Knot, Inc.
WinbladFunds18%)
MapQuest.com - pending approval
Spinner.com

Winamp
DrKoop.com (10 %)
Legend (49% - Internet service in
China)

Time Warner - Online/Other Publishing

Road Runner
Warner Publisher Services
Time Distribution Services
American Family Publishers (50%)
Pathfinder
Africana.com

Time Warner - Cable

HBO
CNN
CNN International
CNN en Espanol
CNN Headline News
CNN Airport Network
CNN fn
CNN Radio
CNN Interactive
Court TV (with Liberty Media)
Time Warner Cable
Road Runner
New York 1 News
Kablevision (53.75%)

Turner Entertainment

Entertainment Networks

TBS Superstation
Turner Network Television (TNT)
Turner South
Cartoon Network
Turner Classic Movies
Cartoon Network in Europe
Cartoon Network in Latin America

TNT & Cartoon Network in Asia/Pacific

Film Production

New Line Cinema
Fine Line Features
Turner Original Productions

Time Warner Inc.- Film & TV Production

Warner Bros.
Warner Bros. Studios
Warner Bros. Television (production)
The WB Television Network
Warner Bros. Television Animation
Hanna - Barbera Cartoons
Telepictures Production
Witt - Thomas Productions
Castle Rock Entertainment
Warner Home Video
Warner Bros. Domestic Pay - TV
Warner Bros. Domestic Television Distribution
Warner Bros. International Television Distribution
The Warner Channel
Warner Bros. International Theaters
(multiplex theaters in over 12 countries)

Other Operations

Turner Learning
CNN Newsroom (daily news program)
Turner Adventure Learning (electronic field trips)
Turner Home Satellite
Turner Network Sales

Other

Netscape Communications
Netscape Netcenter portal
AOL MovieFone
iAmaze
Amazon.com (partial)

Quack.com
Streemail (partial)
Warner Bros. Consumer Products

Time Warner - Merchandise/Retail

Time Warner Book Group UK
Time Warner Audio Books

Appendix E

The Ownership and Shareholdings of Viacom

*Infinity Broadcasting***Northeast**

Baltimore

WBGR - AM
WBMD - AM
WJFK - AM
WLIF - FM
WQSR - FM
WWMX - FM
WXYV - FM

Boston

WBCN - FM
WBMX - FM
WBZ - AM
WODS - FM
WZLX - FM

Buffalo

WBLK - FM
WBUF - FM
WECK - AM
WJYE - FM
WYRK - FM

Hartford

WRCH - FM
WTIC - AM/FM
WZMX - FM

New York

WCBS - AM/FM
WFAN - AM
WINS - AM
WNEW - FM
WXRK - FM

Philadelphia

KYW - AM
WIP - AM
WOGL - FM
WPHT - AM
WYSP - FM

Pittsburgh

KDKA - AM
WDSY - FM
WRKZ - FM
WZPT - FM

Rochester

WCMF - FM
WPXY - FM
WRMM - FM
WZNE - FM

Washington D.C.

WARW - FM
WHFS - FM
WJFK - FM
WPGC - AM/FM

South

Charlotte

WBAV - FM
WFNZ - AM
WGIV - AM
WNKS - FM
WPEG - FM
WSOC - FM
WSSS - FM

Houston

KIKK - AM/FM
KILT - AM/FM

Orlando

WJHM - FM
WOCL - FM
WOMX - FM

San Antonio

KTFM - FM
KTSA - AM

Tampa

WLLD - FM
WQYK - AM/FM
WRBQ - FM
WSJT - FM
WYUU - FM

West Palm Beach

WEAT - FM
WIRK - FM
WJBW - FM
WMBX - FM
WPBZ - FM

Austin

KAMX - FM
KJCE - AM
KKMJ - FM
KQBT - FM

Greensboro

WMFR - AM
WSJS - AM
WSML - AM

Dallas

KLUV - FM
KOAI - FM
KRBV - FM
KRLD - AM
KVIL - FM
KYNG - FM

Memphis

WMC - AM/FM
WMFS - FM

Atlanta

WAOK - AM
WVEE - FM
WZGC - FM

Midwest

Chicago

WBBM - AM/FM
WCKG - FM
WJMK - FM
WSCR - AM
WUSN - FM
WXRT - FM

Cincinnati

WAQZ - FM
WGRR - FM
WKRR - FM
WUBE - FM

Cleveland

WDOK - FM
WNCX - FM
WQAL - FM
WXTM - FM

Columbus

WAZU - FM
WHOK - FM
WLWQ - FM

Detroit

WKRK - FM
WOMC - FM
WVMV - FM
WWJ - AM
WXYT - AM
WYCD - FM

Kansas City

KBEQ - FM
KFKF - FM
KMXV - FM
KSRC - FM

Minneapolis

KDOW - AM
WCCO - AM
WLTE - FM
WXPT - FM

St. Louis

KEZK - FM
KMOX - AM
KYKY - FM

West**Denver**

KDJM - FM
KIMN - FM
KXKL - FM

Fresno

KMGV - FM
KMJ - AM
KOOR - AM
KOQO - FM
KRNC - FM
KSKS - FM
KVSF - FM

Las Vegas

KLUC - FM
KMXB - FM
KMZQ - FM
KSFN - AM
KXNT - AM
KXTE - FM

Los Angeles

KCBS - FM
KEZN - FM
KFWB - AM
KLSX - FM
KNX - AM
KROQ - FM
KRTH - FM
KTWV - FM

Phoenix

KMLE - FM
KOOL - FM
KZON - FM

Portland

KINK - FM
KLTH - FM
KUFO - FM
KUPL - AM/FM
KVMX - FM

Riverside

KFRG - FM
KVFG - FM
KVVQ - AM
KXFG - FM

Sacramento

KHTK - AM
KNCI - FM
KSFM - FM
KXOA - FM
KYMx - FM
KZZO - FM

San Diego

KPLN - FM
KYXY - FM

San Francisco

KCBS - AM
KFRC - FM
KFRC - AM
KITS - FM
KKWV - FM
KLLC - FM
KYCY - AM

San Jose

KBAY - FM
KEZR - FM

Seattle

KBKS - FM
KMPS - FM
KYCW - AM
KYPT - FM
KZOK - FM

CBS Stations:

KEYE-TV - Austin, TX
 KOVR-TV - Sacramento, CA
 WJZ-TV - Baltimore, MD
 WBZ-TV - Boston, MA
 WBBM-TV - Chicago, IL
 KTVT-TV - Dallas-Fort Worth, TX
 KCNC-TV - Denver, CO
 WWJ-TV - Detroit, MI
 WFRV-TV - Green Bay, WI
 WCBS-TV - New York, NY
 WFOR-TV - Miami-Ft. Lauderdale, FL
 WCCO-TV - Minneapolis, MN
 KYW-TV - Philadelphia, PA
 KDKA-TV - Pittsburgh, PA
 KUTV-TV - Salt Lake City, UT
 KPIX-TV - San Francisco, CA
 KCBS-TV - Los Angeles, CA

UPN Stations:

WUPA-TV - Atlanta
 WSBK-TV - Boston
 WWHO-TV - Columbus
 KTXA-TV - Dallas
 WKBD-TV - Detroit
 WNDY-TV - Indianapolis
 WBFS-TV - Miami
 WUPL-TV - New Orleans
 WGNT-TV - Norfolk
 KAUT-TV - Oklahoma City
 WPSG-TV - Philadelphia
 WNPA-TV - Pittsburgh
 WLWC-TV - Providence
 KMAX-TV - Sacramento
 KBHK-TV - San Francisco
 KSTW-TV - Seattle
 WTOG-TV - Tampa
 WTVX-TV - W. Palm Beach

Others:

KCCO - Alexandria, MN
 KCCW - Walker, MN
 WJMN - Escanaba, WI
 KUSG - Washington, UT
 KCAL - Los Angeles, CA

Cable

MTV
 MTV2
 Nickelodeon
 BET
 Nick at Nite
 TV Land
 NOGGIN
 VH1
 Spike TV
 CMT
 Comedy Central
 Showtime
 The Movie Channel
 Flix
 Sundance Channel

Television Production and Distribution

Spelling Television
 Big Ticket Television
 King World Productions

Film

Paramount Pictures
 Paramount Home Entertainment

Publishing***Simon & Schuster***

Simon & Schuster Adult Publishing Group

Atria Books

Kaplan

Pocket Books

Scribner

Simon & Schuster

The Free Press

The Touchstone

Fireside Group

Simon & Schuster Children's Publishing

Aladdin Paperbacks

Atheneum Books for Young Readers

Little Simon

Margaret K. McElderry Books

Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers

Simon Pulse

Simon Spotlight

Simon & Schuster New Media

Simon & Schuster Online

Simon & Schuster UK

Simon & Schuster Australia

MTV Books

Appendix F

The Ownership and Shareholdings of Disney

ABC Television Network

Owned and Operated Television Stations

WLS - Chicago
 WJRT - Flint
 KFSN - Fresno
 KTRK - Houston
 KABC - Los Angeles
 WABC - New York City
 WPVI - Philadelphia
 WTVD - Raleigh - Durham
 KGO - San Francisco
 WTVG - Toledo

ESPN INC. International Ventures
 Sportsvision of Australia (25%)
 ESPN Brazil (50%)
 ESPN STAR (50%)
 Net STAR (33%)

Television Production and Distribution

Buena Vista Television
 Touchstone Television
 Walt Disney Television
 Walt Disney Television Animation

Cable Television

ABC Family
 The Disney Channel
 Toon Disney
 SoapNet
 ESPN Inc. includes ESPN, ESPN2,
 ESPN News, ESPN Now, ESPN Extreme
 Classic Sports Network
 A&E Television (37.5%, with Hearst and GE)
 The History Channel (with Hearst and GE)
 Lifetime Television (50%, with Hearst)
 Lifetime Movie Network (50% with Hearst)
 E! Entertainment (with Comcast and Liberty Media)

Movie Production and Distribution

Walt Disney Pictures
 Touchstone Pictures
 Hollywood Pictures
 Caravan Pictures
 Miramax Films
 Buena Vista Home Video
 Buena Vista Home Entertainment
 Buena Vista International

Publishing

International Broadcast

The Disney Channel UK
 The Disney Channel Taiwan
 The Disney Channel Australia
 The Disney Channel Malaysia
 The Disney Channel France
 The Disney Channel Middle East
 The Disney Channel Italy
 The Disney Channel Spain

Book Publishing Imprints

Hyperion
 Miramax Books
 ESPN Books
 Theia
 ABC Daytime Press
 Hyperion Audiobooks
 Hyperion East

Disney Publishing Worldwide
 Cal Publishing Inc.
 CrossGen
 Hyperion Books for Children
 Jump at the Sun
 Volo
 Michael di Caupa Books
Disney Global Children's Books
 Disney Press
 Global Retail
 Global Continuity

Magazine titles include:

Automotive Industries
 Biography (with GE and Hearst)
 Discover
 Disney Adventures
 Disney Magazine
 ECN News
 ESPN Magazine (distributed by Hearst)
 Family Fun
 Institutional Investor
 JCK
 Kodin
 Top Famille - French family magazine
 US Weekly (50%)
 Video Business
 Quality

Radio Stations

WKHX – Atlanta
 WYAY – Atlanta
 WDWD – Atlanta
 WMVP – Chicago
 WLS – Chicago
 WZZN – Chicago

WRDZ – Chicago
 WBAP – Dallas
 KSCS – Dallas
 KMEO – Dallas
 KESN – Dallas
 KMKI – Dallas
 WDRQ – Detroit
 WJR – Detroit
 WDVD – Detroit
 KABC – Los Angeles
 KLOS – Los Angeles
 KDIS – Los Angeles
 KSPN – Los Angeles
 KQRS – Minneapolis - St. Paul
 KXXR – Minneapolis - St. Paul
 KDIZ – Minneapolis - St. Paul
 WGVX – Minneapolis - St. Paul
 WGVY – Minneapolis - St. Paul
 WGVZ – Minneapolis - St. Paul
 WABC – New York City
 WPLJ – New York City
 WQEW – New York City
 WEVD – New York City
 KGO – San Francisco
 KSFO – San Francisco
 KIID – Sacramento
 KMKY – Oakland
 WMAL – Washington DC
 WJZW – Washington DC
 WRQX – Washington DC
 KQAM – Wichita
 KKDZ – Seattle
 WSDZ – St. Louis
 WWMK – Cleveland
 KMIX – Phoenix
 KADZ – Denver
 KDDZ – Denver
 WWMI – Tampa
 KMIC – Houston
 WMYM – Miami

WWJZ – Philadelphia
 WMKI – Boston
 WDZK – Hartford
 WDDZ – Providence
 WDZY – Richmond
 WGFY – Charlotte
 WDYZ – Orlando
 WMNE – West Palm Beach
 WEAE – Pittsburgh
 WDRD – Louisville
 WPPY – Albany, NY
 KPHN – Kansas City
 WQUA – Mobile
 WBML – Jacksonville
 WFDF – Flint
 WFRO – Fremont, OH
 WDMV – Damascus, MD
 WHKT – Norfolk
 Radio Disney
 ESPN Radio (syndicated)

Walt Disney Internet Group

ABC Internet Group
 ABC.com
 ABCNEWS.com
 Oscar.com
 Mr. Showbiz
 Disney Online (web sites)
 Disney's Daily Blast
 Disney.Com
 Family.Com
 ESPN Internet Group
 ESPN.sportzone.com
 Soccernet.com (60%)
 NBA.com
 NASCAR.com
 Skillgames
 Wall of Sound
 Go Network

Disney Interactive

Music

Buena Vista Music Group
 Hollywood Records (popular music/soundtracks)
 Lyric Street Records (Nashville based music label)
 Mammoth Records (popular/alternative music label)
 Walt Disney Records

Theater and Sports

Theatrical Productions

Walt Disney Theatrical Productions

Professional Sports Franchises

Anaheim Sports, Inc.
 Mighty Ducks of Anaheim (National Hockey League)

Theme Parks & Resorts

Disneyland - Anaheim, CA
 Disney -MGM Studios
 Disneyland Paris
 Disney Regional Entertainment
 Disneyland Resort
 Disney Vacation Club
 Epcot
 Magic Kingdom
 Tokyo Disneyland (partial ownership)
 Walt Disney World - Orlando, FL
 Disney's Animal Kingdom
 Disney - MGM Studios
 Walt Disney World Sports Complex
 Disney Cruise Line
 The Disney Institute

Appendix G

The Ownership and Shareholdings of GE

NBC Stations:

WNBC - New York
 KNBC - Los Angeles
 WMAQ - Chicago
 WCAU - Philadelphia
 KNTV - San Jose/San Francisco
 KXAS - Dallas/Fort Worth
 WRC - Washington
 WTVJ - Miami
 KNSD - San Diego
 WVIT - Hartford
 WNCN - Raleigh
 WCMH - Columbus
 WVTM - Birmingham
 WJAR - Providence

Sci-Fi
 Trio
 USA

Film

Universal Pictures

Parks

Universal Parks & Resorts

Other

Paxson Communications (30%)

Telemundo Stations:

KVEA/KWHY - Los Angeles
 WNJU - New York
 WSCV - Miami
 KTMD - Houston
 WSNS - Chicago
 KXTX - Dallas/Fort Worth
 KVDA - San Antonio
 KSTS - San Jose/San Francisco
 KDRX - Phoenix
 KNSO - Fresno
 KMAS - Denver
 WNEU - Boston/Merrimack
 KHRR - Tucson
 WKAQ - Puerto Rico

Other General Electric Businesses

GE Aircraft Engines
 GE Commercial Finance
 GE Consumer Products
 GE Industrial Systems
 GE Insurance
 GE Medical Systems
 GE Plastics
 GE Power Systems
 GE Specialty Materials
 GE Transportation Systems

NBC Universal Television Studio
 NBC Universal Television Distribution

CNBC
 MSNBC
 Bravo
 Mun2TV

Appendix H

The Ownership and Shareholdings of Advance Publications

Cable Television

Cable Television Operations - with Time Warner
Discovery Channel (partial ownership)

Daily Newspapers

The Birmingham News (Alabama)
Harrisburg Patriot-News (Pennsylvania)
Express-Times (Easton, PA)
The Allentown Times (Pennsylvania)
The Huntsville Times (Alabama)
Mobile Register (Alabama)
The Jersey Journal (Jersey City, NJ)
The Star-Ledger (Newark, NJ)
The Gloucester County Times (NJ)
Today's Sunbeam in Salem (NJ)
Bridgeton Evening News (NJ)
The Trenton Times (NJ)
Mississippi Press (Pascagoula)
The Oregonian (Portland)
Hillsboro Argus (Oregon)
Plain Dealer (Cleveland)
Staten Island Advance (NY)
Syracuse Herald-Journal (NY)
The Herald-American (Sunday)
The Post-Standard (Syracuse, NY)
The Times-Picayune (New Orleans)
Union-News & Sunday Republican (MA)
Sun Newspapers - weekly newspapers in Ohio

Booth Newspapers of Michigan:

Ann Arbor News
Bay City Times
Flint Journal
Grand Rapids Press
Jackson Citizen Patriot
Kalamazoo Gazette
Muskegon Chronicle
Saginaw News

Business Journals and Periodicals

American City Business Journals

Magazines**Conde Nast Publications**

Allure
Architectural Digest
Bon Appetit
Conde Nast House & Garden
Conde Nast Traveler
Glamour
Gourmet
GQ
Lucky
The New Yorker
Parade Publications
Parade
React
Self
Tatler
Vanity Fair
Vogue
Wired
The World of Interiors

Fairchild

W
Jane
Women's Wear Daily
Daily News Record
Footwear News
Home Furnishings News
HighPoints
Executive Technology
Children's Business
Supermarket News
Brand Marketing
Salon News
Details

Elegant Bride
Bride's
Modern Bride

Other

Golf Digest
Golf for Women
Golf World
Golf World Business

Multimedia

CondeNet

Other

Religion News Service
Newhouse News Service

Appendix I

Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics - 1996

Code of Ethics

Preamble

Members of the Society of Professional Journalists believe that public enlightenment is the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty. Professional integrity is the cornerstone of a journalist's credibility. Members of the Society share a dedication to ethical behavior and adopt this code to declare the Society's principles and standards of practice.

Seek Truth and Report It

Journalists should be honest, fair and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information.

Journalists should:

Test the accuracy of information from all sources and exercise care to avoid inadvertent error. Deliberate distortion is never permissible.

Diligently seek out subjects of news stories to give them the opportunity to respond to allegations of wrongdoing.

Identify sources whenever feasible. The public is entitled to as much information as possible on sources' reliability.

Always question sources' motives before promising anonymity.

Clarify conditions attached to any promise made in exchange for information.

Keep promises.

Make certain that headlines, news teases and promotional material, photos, video, audio, graphics, sound bites and quotations do not misrepresent. They should not oversimplify or highlight incidents out of context.

Never distort the content of news photos or video.

Image enhancement for technical clarity is always permissible.
Label montages and photo illustrations.

Avoid misleading re-enactments or staged news events. If re-enactment is necessary to tell a story, label it.

Avoid undercover or other surreptitious methods of gathering information except when traditional open methods will not yield information vital to the public. Use of such methods should be explained as part of the story

Never plagiarize.

Tell the story of the diversity and magnitude of the human experience boldly, even when it is unpopular to do so.

Examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing those values on others.

Avoid stereotyping by race, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, geography, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance or social status.

Support the open exchange of views, even views they find repugnant.

Give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid.

Distinguish between advocacy and news reporting.

Analysis and commentary should be labeled and not misrepresent fact or context.

Distinguish news from advertising and shun hybrids that blur the lines between the two.

Recognize a special obligation to ensure that the public's business is conducted in the open and that government records are open to inspection.

Minimize Harm

Ethical journalists treat sources, subjects and colleagues as human beings deserving of respect.

Journalists should:

Show compassion for those who may be affected adversely by news coverage.
Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects.

Be sensitive when seeking or using interviews or photographs of those affected by tragedy or grief.

Recognize that gathering and reporting information may cause harm or discomfort.

Pursuit of the news is not a license for arrogance.

Recognize that private people have a greater right to control information about themselves than do public officials and others who seek power, influence or attention. Only an overriding public need can justify intrusion into anyone's privacy.

Show good taste. Avoid pandering to lurid curiosity.

Be cautious about identifying juvenile suspects or victims of sex crimes.

Be judicious about naming criminal suspects before the formal filing of charges.

Balance a criminal suspect's fair trial rights with the public's right to be informed.

Act Independently

Journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know.

Journalists should:

Avoid conflicts of interest, real or perceived.

Remain free of associations and activities that may compromise integrity or damage credibility.

Refuse gifts, favors, fees, free travel and special treatment, and shun secondary employment, political involvement, public office and service in community organizations if they compromise journalistic integrity.

Disclose unavoidable conflicts.

Be vigilant and courageous about holding those with power accountable.

Deny favored treatment to advertisers and special interests and resist their pressure to influence news coverage.

Be wary of sources offering information for favors or money; avoid bidding for news.

Be Accountable

Journalists are accountable to their readers, listeners, viewers and each other.

Journalists should:

Clarify and explain news coverage and invite dialogue with the public over journalistic conduct.

Encourage the public to voice grievances against the news media.

Admit mistakes and correct them promptly.

Expose unethical practices of journalists and the news media.

Abide by the same high standards to which they hold others.

The SPJ Code of Ethics is voluntarily embraced by thousands of writers, editors and other news professionals. The present version of the code was adopted by the 1996 SPJ National Convention, after months of study and debate among the Society's members.

Sigma Delta Chi's first Code of Ethics was borrowed from the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1926. In 1973, Sigma Delta Chi wrote its own code, which was revised in 1984, 1987 and 1996.

Copyright © 1996-2005 Society of Professional Journalists. All Rights Reserved.

Society of Professional Journalists
Eugene S. Pulliam National Journalism Center,
3909 N. Meridian St., Indianapolis, IN 46208
317/927-8000 Fax: 317/920-4789 contact us

REFERENCES

- Advance Publication's About us. (2006). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://www.advance.net>
- Alterman, E. (2003). *What liberal media? The truth about bias and the news*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Althusser, L (1969). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 1483-1509). New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Anzaldua, G. (1987). Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 2211-2223). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Bagdikian, B. H. (2000). *The media monopoly*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1981). The precession of simulacra. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 1732-1741). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Benoit, W. L., & Currie, H. (2001). Inaccuracies in media coverage of the 1996 and 2000 presidential debates [Electronic version]. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 38, 28.
- Berkowitz, D. (1991). Assessing forces in the selection of local television news. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 35, 245-251.
- Black, J. (2001). Semantics and ethics of propaganda. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*,

16, 121-137.

- Bordo, S. (1989). The body and the reproduction of femininity. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (pp. 2362-2376). New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1978). *The image: A guide to pseudo-events in America*. NY: Atheneum.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Language and symbolic power*. MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, J. A. C. (1963). *Techniques of persuasion: From propaganda to brainwashing*. Baltimore, MA: Penguin Books.
- Buckingham, D. (1997). News media, political socialization and popular citizenship towards a new agenda. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 14, 344-366.
- Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 2488-2501). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Champlin, D., & Knoedler, J. (2002). Operating in the public interest or in pursuit of private profits? News in the age of media consolidation [Electronic version]. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 36, 459.
- Chesebro, J. W. (1984). The media reality: Epistemological functions of media in cultural systems. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1, 111-130.
- Chesebro, J. W. (1992). Extensions of the Burkeian system. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 78, 356-368.
- Christian, B. (1988). The race for theory. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 2257-2266).

New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.

Christians, C. G. (1997). In Christians, C. G. & Traber, M. (Eds.). *Communication ethics and universal values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Chomsky, N. (1989). *Necessary illusions: Thought control in democratic societies*. Boston: South End Press.

Cirino, R. (1971). *Don't blame the people: How the news media use bias, distortion and censorship to manipulate public opinion*. Las Angeles, CA: Diversity Press.

Cixous, H. (1975). The laugh of the medusa. In V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (pp. 2039-2056). New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.

Columbia Journalism Review's who owns what? (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://www.cjr.org/tools/owners/>

Corcoran, F. (1984). Television as ideological apparatus: The power and the pleasure. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1, 131-145.

Croteau, D. & Hoynes, W. (2001). *The business of the media: Corporate media ant the public interest*. Thousand Oaks, California: Pine Forrest Press.

Cunningham, S. B. (2001). Responding to propaganda: An ethical enterprise. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 16, 137-147.

D'Alessio, D., & Allen, M. (2000). Media bias in presidential elections: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 50, 133-156.

Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore, MA: John Hopkins University Press.

- Desilet, G. (1991). Heidegger and Derrida: The conflict between hermeneutics and deconstruction in the context of rhetorical and communication theory. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 77, 152-177.
- Disney's corporate information. (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://disney.go.com>
- Drale, C. S. (2004). Communication media in a democratic society. *Communication Law & Policy*, 9, 213-235.
- Ellul, J. (1973). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Ellul, J. (1981). The ethics of propaganda: Propaganda, innocence, and amorality. *Communication*, 6, 159-175.
- Fairness Report, 48 F.C.C.2d 1 1974.
- Fairness Report, 102 F.C.C.2d 142, 246 1985.
- FCC Report on editorializing by broadcast licensees, 1949.
- Fink, C., C (1988). *Media ethics: In the newsroom and beyond*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Series In Mass Communication.
- Fiske, J. (1987). Television culture. In P. Marris & S. Thornham (Eds.), *Media Studies: A reader* (p. 220-230). Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984). In Rainbow, M. (ed.). *The Foucault reader*. NY: Pantheon Books.
- Free Press's Who owns the Media? (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from

<http://freepress.net/content/ownership>

- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373-393.
- Gans, H. J. (1979). *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gates, H. L. (1988). Talking black: Critical signs of the times. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 2424-2432). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- General Electric's Our company. (2006). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://www.ge.com/en/>
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Ca: University of California Press.
- Gomery, D. (1989). Media economics: Terms of analysis. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 6, 43-60.
- Gottdiener, M. (1985). Hegemony and mass culture: A semiotic approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 979-1001.
- Gozzi, L., & Haynes, W. L. (1992). Electric media and electric epistemology: Empathy at a distance. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 9, 217-228.
- Graber, D. A. (1980). *Mass media and American politics*. Washington D.C.:
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Habermas, J. (1973). The public sphere. In P. Marris & S. Thornham (Eds.), *Media studies: A reader* (pp. 92-97). Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.

- Hall, S. (1973). Encoding and decoding in the television discourse. In P. Marris & S. Thornham (Eds.), *Media Studies: A reader* (pp. 51-61). Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.
- Hall, S. (1981). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In P. Marris & S. Thornham (Eds.), *Media Studies: A reader* (p. 271-282). Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.
- Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2, 91-114.
- Haraway, D. (1985). A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (pp. 2269-2299). New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Hayakawa, S. I. (1964). *Language in thought and action*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of Spirit*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hekman, S. J. (1999). *The future of differences: Truth and method in feminist theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2002). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Herman, E. S. (2003). The propaganda model: A retrospective. *Against All Reason, 1*, 1-14.
- Herrscher, R. (2002). A universal code of journalism ethics: Problems, limitations, and proposals. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 17*, 277-289.
- hooks, b. (1990). Postmodern blackness. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 2478-2484). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Horkheimer, B. & Adorno, T. (1947). Dialectic of enlightenment. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 1223-1240). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992). *Dirty politics: Deception, distraction, and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Kahn, F. J. (Ed.) (1984). *Documents of American broadcasting*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Kellner, D. (2004). The media and the crisis of democracy in the age of Bush-2. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 1*, 29-58.
- Kieran, M. (1997). News reporting and the ideological presumption. *Journal of Communication, 47*, 79-97.
- Kovach, B. & Rosenstiel, T. (2001). *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Krugman, H. E., & Hartley, E. L. (1970). Passive learning from television. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 34*, 184-190.

Lewis, J., & Jhally, S. (1998). The struggle over media literacy [Electronic version].

Journal of Communication, 48, 116.

Lewis, J. (1999). Reproducing political hegemony in the United States. *Critical Studies*

in Mass Communication, 16, 251-267.

Lippmann, W. (1998). *Public Opinion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Lule, J. (2002). Myth and terror on the editorial page: The New York times responds to

September 11, 2001. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79, 275-

293.

Lye, J. (1997). Ideology: A brief guide. Retrieved September 18, 2004, from Brock

University, Department of English Language and Literature Web site:

<http://www.brocku.ca/english/jlye/ideology>

Makus, A. (1990). Stuart Hall's theory of ideology: A frame for rhetorical criticism.

Western Journal of Speech Communication, 54, 495-514.

Marx, K. (1859). A contribution to the critiques of political economy. In V. V. Leitch,

W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and*

criticism (p. 774-775). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.

Marx, K. (1867). Capital. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.).

The Norton anthology of theory and criticism (p. 776-787). New York, NY: W.

W. Norton Company.

Marx, K. (1932). Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844. In V. V. Leitch, W.

E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and*

criticism (p. 764-767). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.

Marx, K. (1932). The communist Manifesto. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B.

- Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 769-774).
New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1969). *The German ideology*. New York: International Publishers.
- McChesney, R. W. (2004). *The problem of the media: U.S. communication politics in the 21st century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- McChesney, R. W. (2003). Theses of media deregulation. *Media, Culture & Society*, 25, 125-133.
- McChesney, R. W., & Foster, J. B. (2003). The 'left-wing' media? [Electronic version]. *Monthly Review*, 55, 1-16.
- McChesney, R. W. (1999). Rich media poor democracy: Communication politics in dubious times. New York: The New York Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: Extensions of man*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- McManus, J. H. (1997). Who's responsible for journalism? *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 1, 5-17.
- Media Channel's media ownership chart. (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://mediachannel.org/ownership/chart/.shtml>
- Mosco, V. (1996). *The political economy of communication: Rethinking and renewal*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Murdock, G. (1990). Redrawing the map of the communications industries: Concentration and ownership in the era of privatization. In P. Marris & S.

- Thornham (Eds.), *Media Studies: A reader* (pp. 142-155). Washington Square, NY: New York University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1873). On truth and lie in a non-moral sense. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (p. 874-883). New York, NY: W. W. Norton Company.
- Orbe, M. P. & Strother, K. E. (1996). Signifying the tragic mulatto: A semiotic analysis of "Alex Haley's queen". *Howard Journal of Communication*, 7, 113-126.
- Orbe, M. P. (1998). Construction of reality on MTV's "the real world": An analysis of the restrictive coding of black masculinity. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 64, 32-48.
- Parenti, M. (1992). Political entertainment. *Make-believe media: The politics of entertainment*. New York: Saint Martin's Press, Inc.
- Parenti, M. (1993). *Inventing reality: The politics of news media*. New York: Saint Martin's Press, Inc.
- Perkins, M. (2002). International law and the search for universal principles in journalism ethics. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 17, 193-208.
- Porter, E. (1998a). *Epistemology and research*. Retrieved September 18, 2004, from Deakin University, Faculty of Arts Web site: <http://www.deakin.edu.au/arts/faculty/Documents/Research/TrainModules/RTMOD-1.pdf>
- Porter, E. (1998b). *Literary theory*. Retrieved September 18, 2004, from Deakin University, Faculty of Arts Web site: <http://www.deakin.edu.au/arts/faculty/Documents/Research/TrainModules/RTMOD-6.pdf>

- Postman, N. (1984). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. NY: Viking
- Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*. New York: Random House Inc.
- Postman, N. (1999). *Building a bridge to the 18th century*. New York: Random House Inc.
- Pratkanis, A., & Aronson, E. (1991). *The age of propaganda: The use and abuse of persuasion*. New York: Freeman.
- Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC, 395 U.S. 367. 1974
- Rucinski, D. (1991). The centrality of reciprocity to communication and democracy. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8, 184-194.
- Ryan, C., Carragee, K. M., & Meinhofer, W. (2001). Theory into practice: Framing, the news media, and collective action [Electronic version]. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45, 175.
- Said, E. (1978). Orientalism. In V. V. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. Fink & B. Johnson (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (pp. 1991-2012). New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Scheuer, J. (1999). *The sound bite society: Television and the American mind*. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows.
- Schiller, H. I. (1973). *The mind managers*. Boston: Beacon Press
- Schudson, M (2001). The objectivity norm in American journalism. *Journalism*, 2, 149-170.

- Shaver, P. M. (1995). Mass communication as political rhetoric: A critique of representation and commodity theories of mass media language. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 5.
- Sholle, D. (1988). Critical studies: From the theory of ideology to power/knowledge. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 5, 16-41.
- Siebert, F. S., Peterson, T., & Schramm, W. (1956). *Four theories of the press: The authoritarian, libertarian, social responsibility, and Soviet communist concepts of what the press should be and do*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Slattery, K., Doremus, M., & Marcus, L. (2001). Shifts in public affairs reporting on the network evening news: A move toward the sensational [Electronic version]. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45, 290.
- Smith, D. E. (1989). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist Sociology*. MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Society of professional journalist codes of ethics (1987)
- Society of professional journalist codes of ethics (1996)
- Sproule, M. J. (1987). Propaganda studies in American social science: The rise and fall of the critical paradigm. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 60-83.
- Sproule, M. J. (1989). Progressive propaganda critics and the magic bullet myth. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 6, 225-246.
- Sproule, M. J. (2001). Authorship and origins of the seven propaganda devices: A research note. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 4, 135-143.
- Stenz, H. (2002). Universal ethical standards? *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 17, 263-276.

Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC, 867 F.2d 654 1989

Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. NO. 104-104, 110 Stat. 53 (1996).

The Nation's The big ten. (2002). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from

<http://www.thenation.com/special/bigten.html>

Time Warner. (2006). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://www.timewarner.com/corp/>

Tuchman, G. (1972). Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's

notions of objectivity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77, 660-677.

Viacom. (2005). Retrieved April 1, 2006, from <http://www.viacom.com>

Ward, S.J.A. (2005). *The invention of journalism ethics: The path to objectivity and*

beyond. Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Whorf, B. L. (1997). *Language thought and reality*. Cambridge: Massachusetts

Institute of Technology Press.