DOSSIER

A MOUTHPIECE FOR TRUTH:

Foreign Aid for Media Development and the making of journalism in the Global South[1]

JAIRO LUGO-OCANDO
University of Leeds, Leeds – Yorkshire, United Kingdom
ORCID: 0000-0002-9533-2088

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25200/BJR.v14n2.2018.1101

ABSTRACT - This piece explores the role of Foreign Aid in developing the current framework in which journalism operates in the Global South. It looks at how international development efforts have been crucial in fostering particular models of journalism while arguing that this explains the current international convergence around journalistic values, normative claims and news cultures. In so doing, the piece suggests that raise of professional journalism should not be interpreted necessarily as a historical 'occurrence' but rather be also considered as part of a larger enterprise to construct a sense of nationhood. In opening these questions, it invites the reader to understand news values such as objectivity, balance and fairness within national historical efforts seeking hegemonic status in an increasingly globalised world. It suggests that international aid efforts to foster media development are key in explaining the spread of particular models of journalism education and practice.
Keywords: Journalism. Foreign Aid. Media Development. Democracy. Objectivity.

UM MEGAFONE PARA A VERDADE:
Programas de Cooperação e Assistência para o desenvolvimento da mídia e a produção de jornalismo no Sul Global

RESUMO - Este artigo explora o papel dos programas de Assistência Internacional e Cooperação para o desenvolvimento e a construção conceitual em que opera o jornalismo moderno. O artigo analisa como os esforços internacionais de assistência ao desenvolvimento têm sido cruciais para promover modelos particulares de jornalismo e argumenta que isso explica a atual convergência internacional em torno dos valores fundamentais para as práticas jornalísticas, suas aspirações profissionais, normativas e de de uma cultura da notícia. Ao fazê-lo, o artigo sugere que o jornalismo não deve necessariamente ser interpretado como um "evento" histórico, mas também deve ser considerado como parte de um empreendimento maior na construção da ideologia de uma nação. O artigo trabalha para o entendimento dos valores no jornalismo - como objetividade, equilíbrio e imparcialidade na produção de notícias – no contexto de esforços históricos nacionais que contribuiram para estabelecer o status hegemônico do Ocidente em um mundo cada vez mais globalizado. O artigo sugere que os esforços dos programas de Assistência Internacional e Cooperação

  doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

para incentivar o desenvolvimento da mídia são fundamentais para explicar a difusão de modelos específicos de ensino e de prática do jornalismo. ‘
Palavras-chaves: Jornalismo. Programas de Cooperação e Assistência Internacional. Desenvolvimento da mídia. Democracia. Objetividade.

UN MEGÁFONO PARA LA VERDAD:
Programas de Cooperación y Asistencia Internacional para el desarrollo de los medios de comunicación y el periodismo en el Sur Global

RESUMEN - Este artículo analiza el papel que tienen los Programas de Asistencia y Cooperación Internacional en el desarrollo y formación del marco conceptual del periodismo actual y sus prácticas en el Sur Global. En particular, este analiza cómo los esfuerzos internacionales de asistencia para el desarrollo han sido cruciales en el fomento de determinados modelos de periodismo, al tiempo que argumenta que estas acciones explican la actual convergencia internacional en torno a los valores fundamentales de las prácticas periodísticas, sus aspiraciones profesionales normativas y las culturas noticiosas. Al plantear esta disyuntiva, se sugiere que el periodismo no debe interpretarse necesariamente como un “acontecimiento” histórico, sino que debe considerarse como parte de un largo proceso dirigido a la construcción de un ideario de nación. De este modo, se invita al lector a examinar determinados valores noticiosos –tales como la objetividad y el equilibrio en la noticia- como parte de las estrategias históricas nacionales dirigidas a establecer y mantener el estatus hegemónico de Occidente en un mundo cada vez más globalizado. El artículo señala que los esfuerzos de ayuda internacional para fomentar el desarrollo de los medios de comunicación son claves a la hora de explicar la difusión de modelos específicos de educación y práctica periodística.
Palabras clave: Periodismo. Programas de Cooperación y Asistencia Internacional. Desarrollo de los medios de comunicación. Democracia. Objetividad.

Introduction

One of the most remarkable findings from the *Worlds of Journalism Study* research project (WJS, 2016) is the overall convergence in normative claims and deontological aspirations around news values and journalistic ethics among journalists from all over the world. Although there are important caveats to highlight about these claims of universality of news values and deontology of journalism practice, the survey suggests important overlaps regarding ethical aspirations and stances. The cornerstone of these convergent views is the ideal of professional autonomy (Deuze, 2005; Hanitzsch et al., 2010; Singer, 2007). One that seems closely connected to the notion of objectivity, which despite criticism, continues to be paramount in the conceptualisation of journalism as a professional and independent field (Maras, 2013; McNair, 2000; Ward, 2015). Indeed, as some of the findings of the WJS project underline, the idea

of 'professional autonomy' is strongly associated with detachment and non-involvement, which are considered essential journalistic functions. The journalists surveyed in this project equally valued notions such as impartiality, the reliability and factualness of information, as well as adherence to universal ethical principles (Hanitzsch et al., 2011), despite important cross-national and cross-cultural differences.

The prevalent interpretation for the way these values have become widely spread around the world is that the current news cultures and practices that characterised professional journalism somehow emerged 'naturally' from the process of industrialisation and commercialisation of the press and that it then became adopted as a universal notion by other societies from around the globe. As leading journalism historian Michel Schudson himself suggests,

> Journalism is not something that floated platonically above the world and that each country copied down, shaping it to its own national grammar. It is something that -as we know it today- Americans had a major hand in inventing (Schudson, 2008, p. 188).

This proposed interpretation of how journalistic values 'from the West' became the moral threshold for the rest of the globe, derives from the assumption that the notions of journalism and liberal democracy are not only historically intertwined in both the public imagination and professional practice but also that they are underpinned –although more subtlety- by the emergence of commercial and market economy in the aftermath of the Enlightenment (Lugo-Ocando, 2008; Nerone, 2013; Schiller, 1981). Indeed, according again to Michael Schudson (1976), the idea of 'objectivity' –for example- prevailed as a dominant discourse among journalists since the appearance of modern newspapers in the Jacksonian Era of the 1830s in the backdrop of the democratization of politics, the expansion of a market economy, and the growing authority of an entrepreneurial, urban middle class.

In fact, many historians have agreed upon an explanation that sees the process of commercialisation as the key driver force for the emergence of this particular model of the press and its consolidation as the archetypical type in modern society (Conboy, 2004; 2006). In this context, one of the key notions in journalism theory and practice, that of journalistic objectivity, has been interpreted to be a by-product of commercialisation, political changes and technological advances that somehow emerged in the Anglo-Saxon world as a guiding principle between the 1890s and 1930s and which was closely associated with the rise of the mass audiences for newspapers (Muhlmann, 2008, p. 2).

doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

Accordingly, journalistic objectivity is seen as a universal and core value in the mainstream newsrooms that somehow 'happened' as a derivate phenomenon from particular events and circumstances. This view has been adopted as the most important explanatory theoretical framework within debates around professionalization (Waisbord, 2013; Ward, 2015) and Freedom of Expression (Ryan, 2001; Steel, 2013) as to why it became the dominant form of journalism around the world. Accordingly, one of the reasons as to why there seems to be such a remarkable convergence of values and professional aspirations across practitioners from so many journalists operating in different societies is, according to many, because these were values developed as historical formations and underpinned by the political economy of the press (Banning, 1998; Conboy, 2004; Muhlmann, 2008; Schudson, 1976).

However, contrary to this view, I ask in this piece why do we have to interpret the emergence of 'professional journalism' as a natural derivation of the marketization of the press rather than as an orchestrated political reaction to the rise of the mass society and of [revolutionary] forces that threaten the economic and political order at that time? And, who says that the spreading of the normative values that today characterises journalism practice happened without agency or even intentionality? Moreover, why shouldn't we think also of journalism as a national enterprise that aimed at building the 'collective imaginary' proposed by Bendeitct Anderson (2006 [1983])?[2] Following this line of inquiry, I suggest that journalism should not be interpreted necessarily as a historical 'occurrence' but rather be also considered as part of a larger enterprise to construct a sense of nationhood, as suggested recently by Professor Barbie Zelizer (2017). In opening these questions, we are then invited to understand news values such as objectivity, balance and fairness within national efforts seeking hegemonic status in an increasingly globalised world.

At the centre of these national hegemonic efforts towards spreading a particular model of journalism in the Global South is that of public diplomacy; one that is directed at influencing the public abroad. Over the years this meant fostering media systems in the mirror image of the dominant power of each time and translated in efforts to promote media outlets and journalistic practices that somehow replicated those operating in free-market and pro-liberal democracies in the United States and Western Europe (or, during the Cold War, replicating the media systems experiences in the Soviet Union in places such as Angola, China and Cuba). Consequently, during the 20th Century we saw an influx of Foreign Aid destined to achieve these goals by supporting media

'modernization' – a terms that was broadly interpreted by both sides in the Cold War – and that led not only to support media infrastructure (Schramm, 1964, 1971) but also, and somehow more importantly, to foster particular news values and journalistic approaches that emulated those in the North (Golding, 1977; Mujica, 1982[1967]). This Foreign Aid for Media Development took the form of investment in media industries, training of journalists, educational programmes and subsidies to create or sustain particular news media outlets.

However, Foreign Aid for media development cannot be constrained to the Cold War period as it not only preceded it but also has continue to play an important role in shaping journalistic cultures in the Global South long after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Moreover. To be sure, far from 'dead' as Dambisa Moyo (2009) would want us to believe, Foreign Aid continues to be influential and effective in shaping organisations and public institutions around the globe (Bräutigam & Knack, 2004; Jenkins, 2001).

If well Foreign Aid in general has been corporatized and securitized in ways that would have been unimaginable only a few years ago, it has now nevertheless larger tentacles and is far more influential than it ever was. Today, government expenditure on Foreign Aid has surpassed initiatives such as the Marshall Plan after the Second World War in ways that many planners of the past would pale (Lomøy, 2011). However, what it is distinctive is that it has become rather invisible.

By being privatised and then channelled through a complex web that avoids the type of check and balances that it had in the past, taxpayers in the North continue to pay for media development but in a far less accountable manners. Indeed, while Senator Frank Church (1924-1984) was able relatively easily and quickly to determined responsibilities of those medalling and wanting to overthrow democratically elected governments (Barnes, 1981; Bernstein, 1977), today's network of Foreign Aid for media development presents a far greater challenge; this not only because it is channelled with far more opacity but also because intentions and outputs are far less clear.

In today's world we find, for example, journalistic enterprises carrying out investigative reporting that have expose the interests and wrongdoings of precisely those who have funded directly or indirectly these same news-enterprises, as it was the case of many of the independent journalistic organisations that as part of an international consortium of journalists exposed the Panama Papers (Hudson, 2017; Obermayer & Obermaier, 2017). So rather than

doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

concentrating in specific cases, often highlighted as examples of Foreign Aid towards media development, I rather focus on the type of models and values that these set of efforts and policy tend to foster.

Pivotal question

So, in this order of inquiry, one question remains urgent: how were these key ideas, values, practices and notions about journalism disseminated across the globe and what allowed Western values to become such as standardised and almost axiomatic set of principles among journalists? In asking these questions, this piece does not seek to invalidate current historical interpretations and accounts around historical 'occurrence' in the North – which might still be valid there- but rather open alternatives interpretations of journalism histories in the Global South, where existing interpretation seem inadequate given the fact that the also rich histories of journalism in the Southern part of the globe have yet to be incorporated more thoroughly in the wider narratives about how journalism became to be what it is today. I believe that this exercise could help us advance a new understanding of how journalism became a source for power struggles rather than a true force for social accountability and justice.

My thesis is that far from being a 'historical occurrence', notions such as objectivity, fairness and balance – now central in our understanding of professional journalism in the Global South – were fostered, at least partially, through orchestrated efforts disguised as what we call today foreign aid for 'media development'[3]. In so doing, international donors had the intention of promoting particular models of journalism that reflected the type of liberal values set in their own societies This was part of a set of ideological, geo-political and strategic efforts to replicate similar models of liberal democracy around the world while, in the specific case of the USA and Western Europe in contemporary terms, helping to contain the spread of communism.

Is worth mentioning that some of the most important efforts to replicate liberal democratic institutions – that is exporting the USA model or the cultural 'Americanization' of world society (Appy, 2000; Mattelart, 2002) – can be traced to Woodrow Wilson's quest for a new international world order (Ambrosius, 2002; Knock, 1992) and his struggles with the Soviet Union. Indeed, during the First and later on during Second Red Scare – and particularly during the initial stages of the Cold War – , this meant the use of journalistic objectivity as a virulent attack against

communism. This became even more so during McCarthyism in which journalism objectivity became a virulent anti-communist exercise in defence of freedom (Maras, 2013, p. 130) setting the tone for how world politics was reported in the Great Press in the North as well as in many newsrooms in developing countries that aimed at emulating them (Alvear & Lugo-Ocando, 2016; Diaz-Rangel, 1976; Mujica, 1982 [1967]).

I suggest, consequently, that international aid efforts to foster media development are key in explaining the spread of particular models of journalism education and practice. Moreover, they are crucial for the understanding of this models became hegemonic as part of the increasing expansion and globalisation of Western media systems throughout the 20th century. By exporting their model or absorbing local outlets, they enabled the Western news media to play broadly the same role at an international level as it already played at a national one in particular developed countries. Furthermore, as some authors have suggested, the international media systems became one of the key mechanism by which developing countries were brought within the common cultural hegemony of Western capitalism (Elliott & Golding, 1974, p. 229) which at times was challenged by the then Soviet Union (Stevenson, 1988; Thussu, 2006).

In more recent times, these models were foster thanks to aid programmes that created or shaped curriculums in journalism schools, funded leading scholars, journalists and editors in the Global South to study abroad, was used to set up training programmes and even support particular journalistic projects. These efforts also included supporting journalism practice itself in the wider context of foreign intervention and public diplomacy. From the money that the Central Intelligence Agency channelled towards *El Mercurio* newspaper to help overthrow Salvador Allende in Chile back in the 1970s (Alvear & Lugo-Ocando, 2016; Corvalán, 2003) to the more recent support of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation and the Open Society of George Soros to foster independent journalism NGOs in the Global South (Cook, 2016; Requejo-Alemán & Lugo-Ocando, 2014), passing by the programmes to train broadcast journalists in Africa, Latin America and Asia by leading European broadcasters such as Radio Netherlands and Deutsche Welle. They all need to be contextualised within the larger framework of 'public diplomacy' (Cull, 2008; Nye Jr, 2008).

In fact, my argument is that in order to understand how convergent news values and normative claims become endowed into journalism around the world, we need to examine more carefully and critically the relationship between Foreign Aid and media development. I am not attempting to present a comprehensive history of Foreign Aid and media development,

doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

although historical accounts are central to the analysis. Instead, it is an effort to understand the present and perhaps act towards the future in ways that are more critical and meaningful for the way journalism has been constructed in the Global South; an exercise that has certainly been initiated already by several scholars (Park & Curran, 2000; Wasserman, 2017). This analysis, however, cannot only be performed in terms of North-South relationship nor be narrowed to the US foreign aid programmes towards particular regions, but needs to be widely open to include historical and present efforts as well as other geo-political initiatives.

This because in the same way US and Western European foreign aid has had an effect in shaping journalism cultures and organisational practices in certain countries, other streams of foreign aid were also instrumental in modelling journalistic practices in places such as Cuba and Eastern Europe under the Soviet influence; this, as well as more recent attempts of China and Japan in gaining a foothold for its public diplomatic efforts in places such as Africa and India, to give an example. By making this multidimensional analysis one can also ask why certain aid efforts where more effective than others in the Global South even before the fall of the Berlin Wall and why the Western set of values and aspirational journalistic deontology became so prevalent despite important competing alternatives in each period of time.

Key understanding

Let us start by pointing that foreign aid for media development is not a new phenomenon in the Global South (Bushnell, 1950). On the contrary and to cite an example we can find that the Spanish empire promoted and funded a great number of publicly managed and privately owned pro-colony newspapers in Latin America as early as the 17th century. These international aid efforts where followed years later by the new Black Republic of Haiti, which supplied Simon Bolívar in 1815 of a print and resources to establish in Venezuela a pro-independence and pro-abolitionist newspaper (Blackburn, 2006; Fischer, 2013) and subsequent financial and logistic support from Great Britain to also foster new media outlets in that country. In fact, as it is widely documented, the geo-political struggles of the old European empires were key in the development of the international media systems and particularly in relation to news agencies (Boyd-Barrett, 1980; Boyd-Barrett & Rantanen, 1998; Frère, 2015; Paterson & Sreberny, 2004) as it continues to be

expose today in the case during the recent diplomatic standoff between Saudi Arabia and Qatar in relation to Al-Jazeera (Aldroubi, 2017). In this sense, Marie-Soleil Frère (2012, 2015) has argued that the interventions of the great powers of the time shaped deeply the media systems in their then African colonies, which explains partially the Francophone and Anglophone media systems' distinctiveness of today.

In more recent times, the notion of 'free-flow of information' (which provided an international justificatory framework for 'objectivity') was used to counter international demands for a new information order and greater state involvement in the McBride Report (2003 [1980]). The debates around the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) reflected the ideological struggles that tried to challenge, in the shadow of the Cold War, the dominating status of Western media representations and journalistic cultures (Lugo-Ocando & Nguyen, 2017; Mujica, 2006 [1982]; Sparks, 2007). Therefore, it is important to remind ourselves that the whole system of beliefs behind the idea of journalistic objectivity and other news values, which are now so widespread in the South, are a by-product of geo-political struggles that intended, at least partly, to replicate political cultures by mimicking news media models.

Contesting concepts

Some scholars who have already explained the formation of journalistic practices in the Global South from a hegemonic perspective (Beltrán, 2006; Golding, 1977; Mujica, 1982 [1967]), particularly in relation to how these practices where 'transferred'. I think the analysis continues to be adequate as an explanatory framework, mostly because it suggests – although does not always mentioned explicitly – a multiplicity of elements that have enabled the prevalence of a particular journalism paradigm within the global imaginary. No less, for example, the role of news agencies and international broadcasters in setting the standards for the rest of the news actors at a national and supra-national levels (Arasa, 2015; Silberstein-Loeb, 2014). Accordingly, we should not treat the process that led to the prevalence of the Western paradigm only as a 'historical occurrence' or 'convergent process' but should also debate it in terms of 'standardisation by imposition and contestation'. That is, a process in which the values and practices associated to the news media in the centres of power are transferred to subordinated actors in the South by creating aspirational thresholds. These last then

doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

tend to be replicated even when being contesting; as the quest for 'truth' in news reporting is by then widely embraced as a matter of rational enlightenment (Martinisi & Lugo-Ocando, 2015, p. 440).

Perhaps at the forefront of these notions is that of the concept of journalistic objectivity, which has been a fundamental tool for the articulation of a particular worldview where ideologies around social progress are rolled back in favour of a particular type of factual analysis (Lugo-Ocando, 2014, p. 174). Indeed, the concept of journalistic objectivity was historically employed in the newsroom as a way of detaching news coverage from wider structural social and economic issues. Consequently, when news coverage is often performed by the news media, it stops from making reference to structural issues such as inequality in relation to class struggle; an approach that is still considered to be 'too ideological' in most newsrooms. Thanks to these practices, all explicit references to ideologies in the newsroom in the Global South have been rendered invisible while 'market economy', the true and only ideology explicitly articulated, is presented as factual analysis (Lugo-Ocando & Nguyen, 2017; Steel, 2013). In relation to specific news beats, such as poverty, to put an example, this has led to a predominantly individualistic account of poverty and social exclusion that is constructed through the voices of elite sources and that nevertheless reflect market ideology while claiming objectivity and factual analysis (Harkins & Lugo-Ocando, 2018; Lugo-Ocando, 2014).

Over the history, there has been overt efforts to 'standardise' journalism as a corporate practice (as opposed to a less homogenous social practice; i.e. citizen journalism). From the creation of journalism schools, to the setting of Manual of Styles – the Associated Press one been perhaps the most prominent – to, as I have suggested in this paper, Foreign Aid for media development. These efforts, at least in relation to North-South relations, need also to be understood in the larger context of public diplomacy, geo-politics and ideological struggles. In other words, as a set of efforts to project soft power; that is the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment. In this sense, public diplomacy has a long history as a means of promoting a country's soft power and was essential in winning the cold war (Nye Jr, 2008, p. 94). This translates into investing in a media ecology that, under the premises of liberal democracy, is capable of affecting and mobilizing civil society in the countries of the South in the same way that the Armed Forces in those same countries served for years precisely to demobilize that civil society (all of which responds to the model of coercion and hegemony outlined by Antonio Gramsci).

Indeed, far from the current meaning of civil society, which suggests an 'associational' view of the common, we need to place these efforts rather in Gramscian terms; that is by seeing the capitalist state as being made up of two overlapping spheres, a 'political society' – which rules through force- and a 'civil society' – which rules through consent –. It is in pursue of this consent that efforts at 'modernising' journalism took place in the Global South. Indeed, Foreign Aid for media development was at the centre of these efforts to shape civil society in those countries; this by spreading values such as journalism objectivity that subsequently underpin in the public imagination the notion of 'common sense' as a core value to make sense of the world while constructing social reality.

Conclusion

To be sure, efforts towards media development in the context of journalism and democracy has had the effect – intentionally or not- of consolidating the language of common sense in the public debate and in so doing it has brought about a paradigm that still defines the way citizens see and debate about the world around them. Indeed, one of the most enduring influences of the 'modernisation' of journalism in the societies in the Global South has been to help establish the language of 'common sense' as the hallmark for political discussion in the public sphere. Consequently, on the one hand, journalism as a corporate practice has played a key role in setting the parameters for political debate among the public in a way in which the public examination of society by individuals is considered only legitimate when is driven by 'factual' examination rather than by opinion or ideological analysis. However, on the other hand, corporate journalism – driven by sales and ratings – has meant appealing at the common sense of the masses as guarantor of truth. For journalists in the South this has meant focusing on the 'facts' provided by institutional authorities as legitimate sources of information while at the same time accepting almost axiomatically 'certain truths' that reflect somehow the 'vice of the people'.

Accordingly, this 'common sense' simplifies political debate to intuitive narratives that allows for superficial explanations of society's wrongs while displacing the blame for them to 'the other', 'individualising' key societal issues (that is displacing the faults to particular individuals rather than on the system) and de – structuralising – hence depoliticising – the analysis that is offered to the public (Harkins & Lugo-Ocando, 2016a). In so doing, journalism as a hegemonic institution in modern society

doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

has willingly or not helped set and protect the parameters of political engagement by linking them to the values of the Enlightenment as a political project while underpinning over time the discourses of power of the ruling elites (Harkins & Lugo-Ocando, 2016b, 2017) through broader appeals to the 'common sense'. Not surprising, for example, key calls made by Robert Malthus in his Essay on the Principle of Population (1798) still resonates today within media narratives despite broad evidence that is not the growth of population among those in poverty but the minorities among the wealthiest that are depleting our planet of its resources and putting in jeopardy the lives of present and future generations.

Thanks partially to embracing this very narrow understanding of objectivity, mainstream journalism was then able to push other forms of journalistic practices to the margins while presenting 'structural analysis' as too 'ideological', 'emotional' and/or 'irrational' to be taken seriously and therefore restricting it to the margins of the public debate.[4] To be sure, as a particular way of practicing journalism consolidated over the years in the Global South as a universal model and became accepted as legitimate, other forms of journalism practices around news production and dissemination became increasingly marginalised from the mainstream debates as they were considered propaganda and opinion; in the same manner as it had happened in the North (Janowitz, 1975; Schudson, 2001). Therefore, reducing other journalistic formats and practices to none-scientific expressions, which were too ideological or emotional as to be considered legitimate ways of achieving truth.

Because off this, notions such as 'journalistic objectivity' became historically intertwined in the public imagination – and among journalistic values- with freedom and democracy while 'structural analysis' and 'dialectical materialism' became associated with propaganda, ideology, totalitarianism and oppression. In this sense, it is claimed that journalism can only operate fully as a Watchdog in a system that gives them the freedom to present the 'facts' beyond and despite of any ideological consideration (Gauthier, 1993; McNair, 2000; Mindich, 2000). Hence, journalism needs to be objective and this can only happen, arguably, in the context of a liberal system in which individuals can make rational and free political choices (McNair, 2000; Overholser & Jamieson, 2005).

This is not to say that there was linearity in the adoption of these values or that these Western forms of journalism went uncontested in the Global South. On the contrary, there has been a distinctive gap between initial intentions and final outputs in the adoption and imposition of models around producing news (Chaparro Escudero, 2016; Ruiz &

Olmedo, 2011). If well, these aid efforts towards 'media development' colluded at times with dictatorships and authoritarian regimes in order to protect strategic interests in subservient markets and colonies in others, such as the newspapers set in India and African nations during the colonial time, they help to unleash the same forces that were aiming at subduing (Chatterjee, 1993; Parameswaran, 1997). Similarly, many of the attempts that were originally set up as hegemonic projects ended up becoming spaces for contestation in which journalism was only partially co-opted in relation to its ability to challenge discourses of power in those societies.

Therefore, we I must also argue that Foreign Aid for media development has played in addition a pivotal role in shaping journalism in the Global South but in different forms and by different means; many of which were originally not anticipated. This is something that can help explain the discrepancies, challenges and re-interpretations of the dominant journalism aspirational paradigm found by the Worlds of Journalism Study and others across the South (Mellado et. al., 2012; Skjerdal, 2012). This area of appropriation, contestation and subversion opens a wide alternative research agenda around the role Foreign Aid for media development in the Global South.

In this sense, far from a cause-effect view that assumes straightforward relations of dominance and dependence, I suggest that the relationship between Foreign Aid and media development in the Global South is a phenomenon that continues to be much more complicated and dynamic than the traditional critical analysis has led us to initially believe. Indeed, rather than being just an effort to develop a sort of 'Maquilas of Power' (Lugo-Ocando, 2008, p. 1) to reproduce hegemonic institutions in the South, Foreign Aid for media development has also provided a series of unintentional outputs that that has shaped journalism as a social practice in ways that were initially not intended, therefore becoming manifestations of subversion and contestation. This calls for a research agenda that we urgently need to explore.

NOTES

I would want to thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for its support through the grant 'Development Assistance and independent journalism in Africa and Latin America: A cross-national and multidisciplinary research network (Reference: AH/P00606X/1) that made possible the discussions that lead to this piece. Particularly to my colleagues Cosette Castro, Audrey Gadzekpo, Chris Paterson,

  doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

María Soledad Segura and Herman Wasserman, for their invaluable feedback and support as part of this network.

2 According to this last concept, a nation is a socially constructed community, imagined by the people who perceive themselves as part of that group (Anderson, 2006 [1983], pp. 6-7). For him, the media also creates imagined communities, through usually targeting a mass audience or generalising and addressing citizens as the public, while also creating imagined communities through the use of images to which the people can relate to.

3 I should point out that media development is not often used in academia. Many academics prefer to refer instead to media for development or media for social change. However, given the distinctive meaning in the context of this piece I have decided to use it, although I am well aware of the problematic dimension that brings into discussion by incorporating such label.

4 Let us not forget that these debates around scientific/rational approaches against irrational ideological did not only happen in the West. In the Soviet Union they were also motive of discussion as we will explore in a later chapter (Ings, 2017; Pollock, 2006).

REFERENCES

Aldroubi, M. (2017, Aug. 15). Bahrain says Qatar's media is making diplomatic crisis worse. *The National*. Retrieved from https://www.thenational.ae/world/gcc/bahrain-says-qatar-s-media-is-making-diplomatic-crisis-worse-1.620047

Alvear, F. J., & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2016). When Geopolitics becomes Moral Panic: El Mercurio and the use of international news as propaganda against Salvador Allende's Chile (1970–1973). *Media History*, 1-19. DOI: 10.1080/13688804.2016.1211929

Ambrosius, L. (2002). *Wilsonianism: Woodrow Wilson and his legacy in American foreign relations*. New York: Springer.

Anderson, B. (2006 [1983]). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Londres: Verso Books.

Appy, C. (2000). *Cold War Constructions: The Political Culture of United States Imperialism, 1945-66*. Amherst, Massachusetts: University Massachusetts Press.

Arasa, D. (2015). La Batalla de las Ondas enla Guerra Civil Española. Girona, España: Editorial Grega.

Banning, S. A. (1998). The professionalization of journalism: A nineteenth-century beginning. *Journalism History*, 24 (4), 157-163. Retrieved from https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-40717919/the-professionalization-of-journalism-a-nineteenth-century

Barnes, T. (1981). The secret cold war: the CIA and American foreign policy in Europe, 1946–1956. Part I. *The Historical Journal*, 24 (2), 399-415. DOI: doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X00005537

Beltrán, L. R. (2006). La comunicación para el desarrollo en Latinoamérica: un recuento de medio siglo. *Revista Anagramas - Rumbos y sentidos de la comunicación* 4 (8), 53-76 Retrieved from http://www.redalyc.org/html/4915/491549031003/

Bernstein, C. (1977). *The CIA and the Media*. Retrieved from http://lust-for-life.org/Lust-For-Life/_Textual/CarlBernstein_TheCIAAndTheMedia_20oct1977_35pp/CarlBernstein_TheCIAAndTheMedia_20oct1977_35pp.pdf

Blackburn, R. (2006). Haiti, slavery, and the age of the democratic revolution. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 63 (4), 643-674.

Boyd-Barrett, O. (1980). *The international news agencies* (Vol. 13). London: Constable Limited.

Boyd-Barrett, O. & Rantanen, T. (1998). *The globalization of news*. London: Sage.

Bräutigam, D. A & Knack, S. (2004). Foreign aid, institutions, and governance in sub-Saharan Africa. *Economic development and cultural change*, 52(2), 255-285. DOI: 10.1086/380592

Bushnell, D. (1950). The development of the press in Great Colombia. *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, 30 (4), 432-452. DOI: 10.2307/2509284

Chaparro Escudero, M. (2016). Del pensamiento de Luis Ramiro Beltrán a las Epistemologías de la liberación y la alteridad. *Revista Internacional de Comunicación y Desarrollo (RICD)* 1.3, 143-153. DOI: 10304/ricd.1.3.3062

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments: Colonial and postcolonial histories* (Vol. 11). New Jersey, NJ: Princeton University.

Conboy, M. (2004). *Journalism: a critical history*. London: Sage.

Conboy, M. (2006). *Tabloid Britain: Constructing a community through language*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis.

Cook, C. (2016). Money under fire: The ethics of revenue generation for oppositional news outlets. Ethical Space. *The International*

  doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

Journal of Communication Ethics, 2(3), 66-80. Retrieved from http://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/6359/1/v13n2-3.pdf

Corvalán, L. (2003). *El gobierno de Salvador Allende*. Santiago de Chile: LOM ediciones.

Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 616(1), 31-54. DOI: 10.1177/0002716207311952

Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. *Journalism*, 6 (4), 442-464. DOI: 10.1177%2F1464884905056815

Diaz-Rangel, E. (1976). *Pueblos sub-informados*. Caracas: Monte Ávila Editores.

Elliott, P. & Golding, P. (1974). Mass communication and social change: The imagery of development and the development of imagery. In E. De Kadt & G. Williams (Eds.), *Sociology and development* (pp. 229-254). Londres: Tavistock Publications.

Fischer, S. (2013). Bolívar in Haiti: Republicanism in the Revolutionary Atlantic. *Haiti and the Americas*, 25-53.

Frère, M. S. (2012). Perspectives on the media in 'another Africa'. Ecquid Novi: African *Journalism Studies*, 33 (3), 1-12. DOI: 10.1080/02560054.2012.732218

Frère, M. S. (2015). Francophone Africa: The rise of 'pluralist authoritarian'media systems? *African Journalism Studies*, 36 (1), 103-112. DOI: 10.1080/23743670.2015.1008176

Gauthier, G. (1993). In defence of a supposedly outdated notion: The range of application of journalistic objectivity. *Canadian Journal of communication*, 18 (4), 497.

Golding, P. (1977). Media professionalism in the Third World: The transfer of an ideology. In J. Curran; M. Gurevitch and J. Woollacott. *Mass communication and society* (pp. 291-308). London: Edward Arnold.

Hanitzsch, T. (2016). The WJS 2012-2016 Study. Retrieved from http://www.worldsofjournalism.org/

Hanitzsch, T., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I., Coman, M., Hamada, B., . . . Moreira, S. V. (2010). Modeling perceived influences on journalism: Evidence from a cross-national survey of journalists. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 87 (1), 5-22. DOI: 10.1177%2F107769901008700101

Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Mellado, C., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I., Karadjov, C. D. (2011). Mapping journalism cultures across

nations: A comparative study of 18 countries. *Journalism Studies*, 12 (3), 273-293. 10.1080/1461670X.2010.512502

Harkins, S., & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2016a). All People Are Equal, but Some People Are More Equal Than Others. En J. Servaes & T. Oyedemi (Eds.), *The Praxis of Social Inequality in Media: A Global Perspective* (pp. 3-20). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Harkins, S., & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2016b). How Malthusian ideology crept into the newsroom: British tabloids and the coverage of the 'underclass'. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 13(1), 78-93. DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2015.1074594

Harkins, S. & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2018). *Poor News: Media Discourses of Poverty in Times of Austerity*. Londres: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Hudson, M. (2017, Apr. 07). Panama Papers win the Pulitzer Prize. *International Consortium of Investigative Journalists*. Retrieved from https://www.icij.org/blog/2017/04/panama-papers-wins-pulitzer-prize

Ings, S. (2017). *Stalin and the Scientists: A History of Triumph and Tragedy, 1905-1953*. London: Faber & Faber.

Janowitz, M. (1975). Professional models in journalism: The gatekeeper and the advocate. *Journalism Quarterly*, 52 (4), 618-626.

Jenkins, R. (2001). Mistaking 'Governance' for 'Politics': Foreign Aid, Democracy and the Construction of Civil Society. In S. Kaviraj, & S. Khilnani, (Eds.) *Civil Society: History and Possibilities* (pp. 250-268). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Knock, T. (1992). *To end all wars: Woodrow Wilson and the quest for a new world order*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lomøy, J. (2011). *Measuring Aid: 50 Years of DAC Statistics 1961-2011* (D. A. C. (DAC), Trans.) (2 ed., Vol. 1, pp. 18). Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Lugo-Ocando, J. (2008). *The Media in Latin America*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Lugo-Ocando, J. (2014). *Blaming the victim: How global journalism fails those in poverty*. London: Pluto Press.

Lugo-Ocando, J. & Nguyen, A. (2017). *Developing News: Global Journalism and the Coverage of "Third World" Development*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis.

MacBride-Commission. (2003 [1980]). *Many voices, one world: Communication and society, today and tomorrow: The MacBride report*. Lanham, Maryland: Unesco/Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

  doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/bjr.v14n2.2018.1101

Malthus, R. (2008 [1798]). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maras, S. (2013). *Objectivity in journalism*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Martinisi, A. & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2015). Overcoming the objectivity of the senses: Enhancing journalism practice through Eastern philosophies. *International Communication Gazette*, 77 (5), 439-455. DOI: 10.1177%2F1748048515586944

Mattelart, A. (2002). *Geopolítica de la cultura*. Santiago de Chile: Lom Ediciones.

McNair, B. (2000). *Journalism and democracy*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Mellado, C., Moreira, S. V., Lagos, C. & Hernández, M. E. (2012). Comparing journalism cultures in Latin America: the case of Chile, Brazil and Mexico. *International Communication Gazette*, 74 (1), 60-77. DOI: 10.1177%2F1748048511426994

Mindich, D. (2000). *Just the facts: How "objectivity" came to define American journalism*. New York: New York University Press.

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa*. Basingstoke, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Muhlmann, G. (2008). *Political history of journalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mujica, H. (1982 [1967]). *El Imperio de la Noticia: Algunos Problemas de la Información en El Mundo Contemporáneo*. Caracas: Editorial de la Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Nerone, J. (2013). Why Journalism History Matters to Journalism Studies. American *Journalism,* 30 (1), 15-28. DOI: 10.1080/08821127.2013.767693

Nye Jr, J. S. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 616 (1), 94-109. DOI: 10.1177/0002716207311699

Obermayer, B. & Obermaier, F. (2017). *The Panama Papers*. London: Oneworld Publications.

Overholser, G. & Jamieson, K. H. (2005). *The institutions of American democracy: The press*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parameswaran, R. E. (1997). Colonial interventions and the postcolonial situation in India: the English language, mass media and the articulation of class. *Gazette*), 59 (1), 21-41. DOI: 10.1177/0016549297059001003

Park, MJ. & Curran, J. (2000). *De-Westernizing media studies*. London: Psychology Press.

Paterson, C. A. & Sreberny, A. (2004). *International news in the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Pollock, E. (2006). *Stalin and the Soviet science wars*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Requejo-Alemán, J.L. & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2014). Assessing the sustainability of Latin American investigative non-profit journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 15 (5), 522-532. DOI: 10.1080/1461670X.2014.885269

Ruiz, I. & Olmedo, S. (2011). Medios de comunicación, cooperación internacional y responsabilidad social: nuevos espacios en España. *Chasqui*, 113, 55-59. Retrieved from http://www.revistachasqui.org/index.php/chasqui/article/view/96

Ryan, M. (2001). Journalistic ethics, objectivity, existential journalism, standpoint epistemology, and public journalism. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 16 (1), 3-22. DOI: 10.1207/S15327728JMME1601_2

Schiller, D. (1981). *Objectivity and the news: The public and the rise of commercial journalism*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schramm, W. (1964). *Mass media and national development: The role of information in the developing countries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press Stanford, CA.

Schramm, W. (1971). *Notes on Case Studies of Instructional Media Projects*. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED092145

Schudson, M. (1976). *Origins of the ideal of objectivity in the professions: studies in the history of American journalism and American law, 1830-1940*: a thesis (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Schudson, M. (2001). The objectivity norm in American journalism. *Journalism*, 2 (2), 149-170. DOI: 10.1177%2F146488490100200201

Schudson, M. (2008). *Public spheres, imagined communities, and the underdeveloped historical understanding of journalism Explorations in Communication and History* (pp. 181-189). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Silberstein-Loeb, J. (2014). *The international distribution of news: the Associated Press, Press Association, and Reuters, 1848–1947.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Singer, J. B. (2007). Contested autonomy: Professional and popular claims on journalistic norms. *Journalism studies*, 8(1), 79-95. DOI:

  doi: https://doi.org/10.25200/BJR.v14n2.2018.1101

10.1080/14616700601056866

Skjerdal, T. S. (2012). The three alternative journalisms of Africa. *International Communication Gazette*, 74(7), 636-654. DOI: 10.1177%2F1748048512458559

Sparks, C. (2007). *Globalization, development and the mass media*. Londres: Sage.

Steel, J. (2013). *Journalism and free speech*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Stevenson, R. L. (1988). *Communication development and the Third World. The global politics of information*. New York: Longman.

Thussu, D. K. (2006). *Media on the move: Global flow and contra-flow*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Waisbord, S. (2013). *Reinventing professionalism: Journalism and news in global perspective*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Ward, S. JA. (2015). *The invention of journalism ethics: The path to objectivity and beyond* (Vol. 38). Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Wasserman, H. (2017). *Media, Geopolitics and Power: A View from the Global South.* Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Zelizer, B. (2017). 'Resetting Journalism in the Aftermath of Brexit and Trump'. *Paper presentado en* Media, Communication and Cultural Studies Association Annual Conference, Leeds, UK.

Jairo Lugo-Ocando is an Associate Professor of Journalism Studies at the University of Leeds in the UK, He is author of several books and over 40 journal articles and book chapters. Before becoming an academic, he worked as a journalist, correspondent and news editor for media outlets in South America and the United States.

RECEIVED ON: 03/02/2018 | APPROVED ON: 19/04/2018