
Article:
Conboy, M. (2017) Journalism and the Democratic Market Society: Decline and fall? Journalism Studies, 18 (10). pp. 1263-1276. ISSN 1461-670X

https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1336935

JOURNALISM AND THE DEMOCRATIC-MARKET SOCIETY
Decline and Fall?

This paper will assert the continuing relevance of Schudson's historical approach to journalism. It will probe links with Schudson's insistence on the centrality of the cultural contexts of journalism's reception which will allow us to appreciate the ways in which his work has prompted historicizations of journalism to move from mere chronology into areas rich for interdisciplinary investigation such as the economic underpinnings of news and the relationship of journalism to democracy, assessments of the sedimentation of journalistic styles and even discursive analysis. Such studies are increasingly important in their capacity to assess the performance of journalism from the perspective of textual evidence and thus challenge many outdated or unrepresentative idealizations that may lie at the heart of journalism's contemporary plight.

KEYWORDS Schudson, democratic market society, journalism history

Introduction

The paperback cover of *Discovering the News* has Joseph Cotton, Orson Welles and Everett Sloane gazing out of the window of the New York *Daily Inquirer* in the most famous and most successful film about the newspaper industry ever made: Citizen Kane. Such a choice of image may be serendipitous for our purposes. What are they looking out on? Why are they so seemingly pleased? In terms of its narrative, the film would have us believe that this is a particular high point of achievement for these masters of journalism. They are looking out on the success of their newspaper enterprise. It is a commercial triumph in a particular American city at a particular time, having keyed into the tastes and opinions of a particularly styled readership. The film is a highly fictionalized narrative of the life of a news media magnate with passing similarities to Randolph Hearst. Of further significance, the era the film is set in, at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, was one of the peaks of commercial success for popular newspapers. The characters in the still from the film are regarding a success in journalism. But what does this

mean? The rise of a form of popular journalism – yellow journalism as pioneered by Randolph Hearst in real life – that some consider the beginning of the end for principled, ethical journalism; the start of the long decline towards tabloidization? It may be that successful journalism is as elusive and as ambiguous as definitions of journalism itself. Whichever we want to explore – historical context is a good place to start.

Schudson presents journalism as a product - historically and sociologically contingent. To paraphrase his original intention a little, he explores in his first book, the history of an idea and the sociology of the values of journalism (1978: 10). Across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the book's analysis moves from the incorporation of journalism into a Western tradition of the democratic market society to eventually beg questions concerning the state of contemporary journalism. This paper will focus on how his more recent work and that of other critics provide an analytical arc that continues to probe discussions of journalism with questions that return to the original basis of his work from 1978.

I will endeavour to make links with Schudson's insistence on the centrality of the cultural contexts of journalism's reception. This will allow us to appreciate the ways in which his work has prompted historicizations of journalism to move from mere chronology into areas rich for interdisciplinary investigation such as the economic underpinnings of news and the relationship of journalism to democracy, assessments of the sedimentation of journalistic styles and even discursive analysis. Such studies are increasingly important in their capacity to assess the performance of journalism from the perspective of textual evidence and thus challenge many outdated or unrepresentative idealizations that may lie at the heart of journalism's contemporary plight.

In the US, as well as the UK, histories that dealt with journalism tended until quite recently to focus predominantly on narratives of newspapers (anthropomorphic) and biographies of the wealthy and powerful owners and editors (eulogistic). These sorts of approach generated an understandable

disdain from the historical establishment for an area of study that looked so myopically at its own practice and often uncritically at its own heroes.

It would not be true to say that there were no histories of journalism before Schudson's but his was like no previous book-length study. In the UK, Andrews provided the first historical overview of journalism's development in 1847 and Bourne continued this high Whiggish tradition in 1887. Both were accounts of the emergence of journalism as part of a political enlightenment, the emancipation of the politically liberal bourgeoisie. Herd's *March of Journalism* from 1953 displayed a continuation of these trends from its title through to its final pages, showing how little had changed over a century of historiography in the dominance of this idealized version (Conboy, 2016, 28-29).

In the US, Hudson's *Journalism in the United States* dated from1873 while Mott provided what many considered the definitive twentieth century chronology in 1951. Distinct from this tradition, Schudson's book rather followed on from Park's account of the role of the newspaper in the symbolic construction of space in urban America from 1926. Highly specific in its temporal range and interpreting journalism as the commercial construction of communities of readers and consumers, it would be therefore inaccurate to restrict the scope of his first book to that of journalism history alone as it is broader in both ambition and achievement. Peters (2008) has reminded us more recently that all history is ultimately communication history and Schudson's is the most important early attempt to provide a sustained analysis of the conditions of formation of journalism as a modern, capitalized communication form; to rescue journalism history from the disdain of the historical establishment. In this spirit, journalism history becomes an absolutely key component in understanding how society has structured its information flows. He may lay claim to have been the first to seriously begin to probe the social and definitional contexts of journalism in a sustained manner and thereby open up intellectual engagements which continue to prosper.

Transcending Embarrassment

If there were no long-form, critical-historical accounts of journalism in the US before Schudson's first book, at least the mood was changing. Not only was *Journalism History* launched in 1974 as a serious academic journal but its opening article mercilessly berated the field and captured this tone in its title "The Problem of Journalism History" as well as in its opening lines: "The study of journalism history remains something of an embarrassment" (Carey, 1974: 3). Carey claimed that the main intellectual culprit was the Whig tradition of history and of course journalists and journalism had been only too predisposed to buy into such a triumphant narrative at journalism's moment of "high-modernism" (Hallin, 1992), around the time of the Watergate scandal in 1972/3. Beyond merely cataloguing journalism's self-proclaimed achievements, Carey proposed a much more ambitious project in declaring that journalism history at its best could allow us to access the ways people grasped reality in the past in all its radical difference from the present.

In emphasizing journalism as a modern institution that has taken on all the markings and contours of a fully capitalized economic activity Schudson indicated how his approach was distinct from a chronology or a celebration of some sort of teleological triumph since it emphasized the commercial, organizational and above all mass nature of newspapers. In stark contrast to Mott's or Herd's chronology he aimed to provide, an "account of the conditions that brought into being the newspaper as we know it" (1978, 45).

Instead of restricting my appraisal to an account of the contribution his more established texts have made to historiography alone, I extend this review to encourage an appreciation of how his insights have both structured other researchers' work and also how his intellectual agility has continued to gestate through other publications right up until the present; how the first stirrings of his historical approach contribute to the dynamism of his contemporary work; how he engages with the echoes of his previous work that has been out there for critical review for so long. I'll attempt to make links with scholarly work on popular newspapers as well as research into the vitality and variety of journalism.

Continuing to explore his text from 1978, he presented us with an account of journalism as an ideal – not even necessarily a practice - rooted in social and economic history, as part of the process of democratization of the 1830s and 1840s specifically in America – from the gentrified social strata of the early century to the mass democratic (middle class) society of the mid-century. Beyond this he opened up an approach that has afforded later scholars, including this one, the opportunity of exploring the idealization of journalism under the microscope of a socially-inflected history of a particular communication form. Ideals and idealization are thus combined in this articulation of the role and functions of journalism. My own twist on this would be to extend this ambition to exploring the *idea* of journalism, a seminal exposition for which was produced by my colleague from Sheffield, John Steel, (Steel, 2009) and which informs much of our recently completed research project with Groningen (Peters and Broersma, 2013, 2017; Conboy, 2015; Steel and Broersma, 2017).

Despite the high-flown idealism about journalism, as expressed in fictional form in Welles' film, the late nineteenth century, Schudson wrote, was nevertheless characterized by a naïve empiricism about facts. According to his account, this lasted until the twin assault of propaganda and PR eroded faith in this crude empiricism in the early twentieth century. Yet the dissonance between idealization and the pragmatic engagement with the commercial world of reader expectation and professional claims to exclusivity is one that persists in what Hearns-Branaman (2013) has characterized, after Žižek, as a "fetishistic disavowal". Its contemporary articulation can be seen in the cultural lag between the professed ideals of journalism and the daily compromises of journalists who struggle to make it pay. According to such accounts, objectivity, as one such idealization, becomes a sort of compensatory credo for the ejection of journalism from its own imagined Eden. For Schudson, objectivity was and remains the conduit for reflections on the shifting relationship between the communicative form of journalism and the society that is informed by it. He probes objectivity as an entry point into deeper concerns about the public role of journalism; not exclusively considering "public" as a narrowly political term but in the light of all

its popular and commercial dynamism.

It is the intellectual promise of his asking questions "not only unanswered but unasked" (Schudson, 1978: 10) which urges us to reconsider the fundamentals of a communicative form that has claimed such cultural and political significance in our daily lives. He might have asked the questions of particular formative periods in modern journalism's history but the assumptions he disrupted in posing the questions continue to require consideration in the present. In fact, historical reconsideration of the founding moments of modern journalism remind us how much of these older established discourses we have inherited as commonsense assumptions and indicate the epistemological necessity of reconceptualizing journalism's relevance for the modern era.

Critique and Commentary

Schudson triggered an interest in the social and cultural importance of journalism at the same time as setting the clock ticking on productive and critical responses to his initial exposition. His early writing acted as a focal point for critical engagements with a range of topics that expanded the discussion of journalism history: theory, democracy, commercial imperatives. Most notable was the dialogue created by the journal *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* in 1987 with its four respondents to Nerone's flagship piece. Nerone is perhaps among the least persuaded by the direction of Schudson's analysis. On a point central to Schudson's argument, he took issue with the conceptualizing of the democratic market society:

> ….the word "democratic" means a great deal more. In its root, it means rule by the people, and this is something quite different from equality in the marketplace. The mythology of the penny press, however, substitutes the marketplace for the broader meaning of democracy …..It thereby gives the impression that, without a specifically commercial structure, newspapers cannot enable rule by the people (Nerone, 1987: 399).

In response to Nerone - and he has responded many times to Nerone - Schudson asserted (Schudson, 1987: 405-408) that he recounted the rise of a bourgeois democracy based on the lubricating properties of journalism. In corroboration, he claimed to have highlighted the commercial imperative underpinning the democratic system and the associated idealizations that informed American political developments throughout the early nineteenth century and which, it must be noted, continued to provide such a powerfully persuasive normative model of journalism to the rest of the world in the twentieth century.

Perhaps wanting neither to eat the cake nor to keep it, Nerone comes in a later work to the conclusion that "there is no such thing as journalism history" (Nerone, 1991). This is one interpretation of the type of social history espoused by Schudson, in its aversion to event-centred narratives and rejection of great-men driven accounts and in its incorporation of broad thematic approaches coupled with the inclusion of the ordinary citizen. Others would agree with Schudson that a fuller contextualization of journalism history should not necessarily lead to its disappearance (Hampton and Conboy, 2014). Nerone seemed torn between outright rejection of the lure of the grand narrative and its opposite dynamic, the dispersal of a field into a thousand fragmentary explorations. In his concluding comments to Nerone, he implied that journalism history must strive for a model integrated with theoretical approaches to culture, power and social science. More sophisticated in his analysis than Nerone gave him credit, Schudson is anti-Whig to the extent that he sees the developments in the 1830s as rupture not triumph of a democratic ideal; more a compromise between historical forces and certainly one that would change over time and within which were embedded tensions that could only be resolved by moving on from some of the more contentious idealizations of journalism then and now.

Another fierce critic of Schudson's approach, Mitchell Stephens (1988), objected to the interpretation that the 1830s had "invented" news. Schudson did not shy away from the implications of this point, concluding:

> The penny press was novel, not only in economic organization and political stands, but in its content. The character of this originality is simply put: the penny press invented the modern concept of "news" (1978, 22).

While Stephens derided the idea that "news" was an early nineteenth century invention since it had been an integral part of human communicative experience for centuries, many commentators have concluded that the scope and address of journalism from the 1830s in the US was different from what preceded it (Chalaby, 1998) and even in the British context scholars such as Hampton (2004) have identified a significant shift, gradual and complex in its contours, but nevertheless a shift, after the lifting of the final taxes on newspapers in the 1850s. For all that authors have identified the longer trajectory of written information flows in Western Europe (Frank, 1961; Baron and Dooley, 2001; Raymond, 2013), a distinct rupture from what went before is evident in reading early and mid century nineteenth century newspapers across both the US and the UK, meaning that a distinctly modern permutation emerged within the commercialization of the penny press (Chalaby, 1998; Conboy, 2002, 2004; Chapman, 2007) which did much to set our expectations of journalism.

Schudson has provided an economic view of journalism's evolution within social history while stressing the formative forces of capitalism as the frame for what emerged as traditional journalism; the material conditions of communication we might say. This perspective is informed by the relationship of journalism and its markets to power relations within both polity and economy.

The Value of Popular Journalism

One thing that emerges from his work as a subsidiary theme is the implicit complexity of the nexus of popular culture out of which modern journalism is formed. This complexity has been articulated in Williams's *Keywords* and it is something that I have been keen to emphasize in my own writing on the press and popular culture (Conboy, 2002; 2006. Bingham, 2004; 2009). Pauly (1987: 418) suggests that Nerone has identified a lack of match

between “popular” and “mass commercial” and claims to be drawing upon Williams (1976: 198-199) in this observations yet Williams had already provided a sophisticated tripartite analysis of the “popular” which accepts that “mass appeal” is one of its complex attributes.

Any view of journalism as a discursive practice which enables factual knowledge to chime with our everyday experience of communal life surely enables us to elevate the insistent power of popular culture, not in any straightforward, positivist way, but in ways which nevertheless allow journalists to own up to the enormous power they wield, way beyond that of simplistically mirroring reality. This insight allows us to appreciate anew the breadth of the popular as a concept and encourages us to interpret journalism as an increasingly important part of popular culture with all the complexity of its contemporary commercial stratifications. Although Schudson’s work is most certainly not restricted to the emergence of popular journalism, there is nevertheless a strand of his writing which is extremely illuminating in the cross-overs between popular culture and the newspaper. This is in evidence in a later piece drawing on his original research into journalism in 1830s America when he writes of the influence of popular media forms.

> If popular media, oral and written, framed public understanding and public understanding influenced how individuals thought and acted, and individuals acted on one another in ways that change the course of history then the popular media changed the course of history (2008, 182-3).

Despite this up-beat assessment, popular culture has always had a problematic relationship with journalism. On the one hand, it has always been there, amplifying public/popular discourses that are as necessary as they are profitable while, on the other hand, it has always been marginalized from the idealized, political functions of journalism. Nevertheless, it is indisputable that as news became a marketable commodity, it established the importance of representing everyday life and elevated the interests and commercial appeal of

ordinary people. In the UK it was the Sunday press which in different circumstances and for different readers developed a more democratic discourse for their products (Brake, Kaul, Turner, 2016). The flow in the UK was from the Sunday to the daily and was not fully achieved until the daily tabloid newspapers – again under the influence of the American popular press – reached maturity in the 1930s.

The Textualization of Democracy

In *Discovering the News*, Schudson coined the resonant phrase "democratic market society", not in a Whiggish fashion but more as an indication of a shift that operated in a similar fashion to Habermas's conceptualization of the public sphere in the eighteenth century (1992), in so far as it acted as much as a disruption as an innovation, disturbing older forms of communicative order at the same time as introducing new modes and ideals of information sharing. Though too modest to claim any direct impact on discursive approaches to the study of journalism his insistence on the importance of its structure and democratic appeal could certainly be seen as encouraging explorations of the substance of journalism. One of the ways in which history has enabled a better understanding of the potential of news as a medium rather than a mere repository of facts has been in paying closer attention to the textuality of newspapers. This opens up two possible avenues to explore. First, it indicates the importance of the actual language, layout and content of newspapers; second, beyond this literalism, it stresses the interconnection of the text of the newspaper with other texts as a barometer of the power relations of the day - a stylistic encoding of cultural and political expectations. Schudson's willingness to engage to an extent with the texts of journalism in his study of the evolution of the summary lead (1981) is relevant as riposte to certain critics who have used his work more reductively. In this piece, Schudson extends the correlation between the informational ideal and the story ideal and their middle and working class target readers respectively. In addition to the structure of news, the register and the style of language targeted at a particular audience and what Matthew (1996: 3) has called the "unity of tone" are all subtle markers of editorial consensus building. Van Leeuwen has claimed that newspapers use

structure to divide presentation between *stories* for those who, because of their social status and education, are denied the power of exposition and *exposition* for those who have been given the right to participate in the debates that may change society (Van Leeuwen, 1987: 199).

In later work, Schudson expresses appreciation for this sort of analytical approach, building on his own early insights and is quick to draw attention to the work of Høyer and Pöttker (2003) and Broersma (2007). Further work on the textual levels of journalism has added to our understanding of journalism's appeal (Conboy, 2006; 2010) while Nerone and Barnhurst's work on the shape and content of news (2001) has likewise disrupted some common assumptions about the evolution of journalism's incorporation of technology through longitudinal assessments that disrupt or even discard journalism history's own self-generated genealogies.

Historicizing Technology

When considering the issues of shifting technology across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Schudson asked why objectivity survives and even amplifies after the early era of the wire services that are credited with its emergence. He writes:

> As in the Jacksonian era, so in the 1890s, changes in the ideals of journalism did not translate technological changes into occupational norms so much as make newspaper ideals and practices consonant with the culture of dominant social classes (1978, 5).

In a provocative inversion of common-sense assumptions with as much relevance for today's configurations as for those of the nineteenth century he dismissed both technological (steam press, wood pulp paper, transportation) and literacy arguments as well as argument based on the natural evolution of societies, claiming instead that rising literacy rates were as likely a result of rather than a cause of increased printing:

> Indeed, it may be more accurate to say that the penny press introduced steam power to American journalism than to say that steam brought forth the penny press (1978, 33).

He stressed the importance of looking beyond the technological to the underlying structures and culture of journalism practice and the distinctive content of the press at this formative moment. It is a view that we would do well to consider into our own era of technological shifts where we are too often confronted with assertions of the primacy of the technological over the realities of the lived experience of class and power dynamics and their combined ability to exclude as well as include within the folds of the information flow. In the contemporary world, Schudson focuses on what he considers journalism's historical continuities: "commitment … to independent truth-seeking, to verification, and to holding governments to account" (2013, 195) and is reluctant to see in current developments any need to have recourse to a new techno-teleology dismissing the notion that, "the global news exchange sphere .. has superseded the traditional media system" (Heinrich, 2013: 94).

However, as his work developed he has become increasingly aware of the constant generic combinations within journalistic forms arguing that the "news paradigm … has not held the field by itself" (2013, 199). Among the voices drawn into the journalism field from outside the mainstream of news we can see precursors of the hybrids and opinion-brokering so characteristic of the modern mediasphere. This has meant that most, if not all, of journalism's genres have survived in some shape or form throughout its changing structures and representational styles: cultural commentary, satire, astrology, agony aunts, obituaries, commercial news, letters, illustration, celebrity news. (Franklin, 2008) Such an appreciation necessitates both an understanding of chronology and an awareness of the complexity of genre in understanding journalism and its potential futures. Schudson's innovative insights have drawn our attention to the social and economic histories of news and the varied formats and styles that this has engendered.

The digital context

Widespread access to the digitized versions of newspapers of the past allow us to read them against the intentions of their authors and often against the requirements of their readers. Reading newspapers against the grain or even against the intentionality of their creation is a complex challenge but not one that has been unexplored by more traditional historians, searching through their own archival spaces.

This sort of textual exploration is hugely enhanced and often problematized by the wider availability of source material in digital form providing new ways of reading journalism, against other sources and certainly often against the original intentions of the publishers who imagined that their work would be consumed and discarded in a matter of days. Nicholson (2013) and Mussell (2012) on the nineteenth century British press have demonstrated the power of longitudinal searches.

The shifting sands of democratic deficit

Schudson encourages us in his more recent work to consider the inherent instability of journalism as textual practice and as cultural form. "Would journalism please hold still" (Peters and Broersma, 2013) is therefore a deliberately ironic plea to appreciate a subject that cannot be stilled. Historians will surely appreciate this rejection of idealization or reification of the subject of study and it is in fact largely in this nimble approach to the changing shapes and claims of journalism that Schudson's continuing relevance as a historian of journalism resides. At the same time Schudson demonstrates (2013) his optimism in the regenerative powers of journalism he also admits his skepticism that the journalistic 'paradigm' is either long-lasting or stable. A historical view of the journalism is essential to the development of a proper sense of perspective on contemporary challenges and changes to combat naïve 'presentism' (Pickering, 2015).

When Schudson laid out the underlying ambition of his first book it included the examination of the sociology of the values of journalism and prominent among these, as already sketched, was that of journalism's often self-conscious contribution to democracy. Of course, the particular brand of democracy, as acknowledged by Schudson himself, excluded in the 1830s at the same time as it has become celebrated by its practitioners and by historians into the present day. Most established historical accounts of journalism demonstrate the lack of match with the complexities of its contexts which witnessed the rise of journalism as a liberal, enlightenment project parallel to the existence of slavery, colonialism and Empire. A major risk for historians of journalism is to exclude the potential contradictions in considering journalism as a core component of democracy. As illustration, we might ask if journalism has always been a central part of democratic culture why was it so easily adopted by regimes that oppressed and persecuted millions? Yet this neglect permeates contemporary discussions of its centrality to democracy. For example the *American Journalism Reader* opens with this celebratory statement:

> The writing of American journalism history constitutes an exercise in tracing, describing, and reinforcing ideas about the press as a pivotal force in society, indispensable for producing social cohesion, asserting cultural identity, and upholding the principles of democracy……Throughout the centuries, journalism historians have reinforced the importance of the press as a vital institution in the life of a democratic society…. (Brennan and Hardt, 2011:1-2)

Indeed such a direct and unproblematized linkage persists as a significant weakness in the continuing discourses of Schudson's defence of journalism. He too insists upon this essential connection in a sort of trans-historical idealization: "news as a human activity linked to democracy and the quality of public life" (2008: 188); "Should newspapers pass from the scene (rather than from passing from ink on paper to pixels on screens), democracy would be in grave danger"

(Schudson, 2009, 111.) Such views are core to much of his recent work e.g. *Why Democracies Need an Unlovable Press*; *The Reconstruction of American Journalism*.

Yet we may ponder, given concerns about journalism's actual performative functions within democratic structures in the contemporary globalized, digitized era what aspects of citizenship does a fully capitalized, profit-driven journalism occlude?

The Economic Context

John and Silberstein-Loeb in their longitudinal exposition of the rupture of journalism's sponsorship models have undermined another great myth of journalism; its rugged financial independence. They have historicized journalism's existential imperative for subsidy and sponsorship that has been exposed by recent shifts in journalism's economic model. Moreover, as journalism has become more compromised economically it has unsurprisingly perhaps become challenged in its claims to independence (Lewis, Williams and Franklin, 2008; Jackson and Moloney, 2016). Both the democratic and the commercial/economic stands have unraveled and we are witnessing the spectacular consequences of both of these trends in the present. Together they throw down a severe challenge not to the underlying assumptions of Schudson's historiographic trajectory but to its maintenance into the future or even its relevance to the present.

There is a fundamental problem in the present day with any assumption that journalism is bound up with a society that enables the development of individual and collective economic progress. This sort of progress, intrinsic to the evolution of American popular capitalism from the era of the penny press has not only come to an end but is in reverse. All long-term indicators demonstrate that one of the underlying dissatisfactions of the ordinary working classes of North America and much of Western Europe revolve around the stagnation and even decline of the economic standing of large swathes of the working population. Beyond this, the plight of their children whose incomes are set to shrink in comparison with their parents' holds potential for inter-generational

tensions. The "democratic market society" no longer works on behalf of the consumers of news; news that was structured and made profits out of a readership that bought wholly into the underlying philosophy of popular capitalism. Journalism in the Jacksonian era in the US had accompanied the rise of individual entrepreneurialism and many of the most successful newspapers were evidence of such success on a large scale. Small ads in the penny press became a kind of shorthand for the American Dream. Aspects of this dream were exported to other countries, including Britain, along with the Americanized features such as headlines and the interview. Today it is apparent to more and more people that the compact of an ever-improving economic standing at the heart of expectations of the market society has been broken and journalism has played its part as it has shifted its allegiance to support of the status quo, the plutocracy. Lasch (1996) saw this as the end of the "democratization of abundance" in which the rising economic egalitarianism driven by the industrial working classes has been replaced by rising inequality and the demise of the aspirations to do better generation by generation. The rich and the cultural/political elites that have profited from these centrifugal consequences include the professional and creative elite of media workers. In the UK one of the more subtle consequences of this shift of journalism towards the power-bloc is the lack of realistic coverage of those left behind by neo-liberal economics and the increasing bourgeoisification of the journalistic cadre (Sutton Trust, 2006; Society of Editors, 2004).

In the US Sarah Smarsh can observe the consequences of this process within journalism:

> ….. one-dimensional stereotypes fester where journalism fails to tread. Few people born to deprivation end up working in newsrooms, or publishing books.
>
> …..A journalism that embodies the plutocracy it is supposed to critique has lost the respect of people like my grandmother who call bullshit when they see it (2016, 41).

The most vivid consequence of this is the lack of scrutiny of the excesses of neo-liberal capitalism which left all major economies wrecked in 2008 (Jensen, 2014; Starkman. 2014)). Even financial journalists who should have been the first to expose the dangerous and reckless practices of casino capitalism were imposing a regime of silence upon themselves as they had become and remain too close to comment critically for the simple reason that they have become incorporated into an undemocratic power elite.

Conclusion

Tucher highlights a point that is worth bearing in mind given increased access to digital news archives when she writes:

> I want to see more scholars from all sorts of disciplines stay for a while in our yard rather than just raiding our orchards as many do and cherry-picking the evidence for facts they need to advance their own arguments…. (2007, 3).

Yet at the same time as digital archives have allowed a wider engagement with journalism's history, journalism itself is in crisis. The crisis stems from a double blow; the collapse of the democratic market society and the serious compromising of what had become understood as liberal democracy. We cannot accept the centrality of this formation to journalism's emergence without taking note of the serious implications for journalism of the collapse of its twin supporting discourses.

Michael's work is a starting point not a definitive and all-encompassing statement. Historical understanding, framing, theorizing are all central to understanding journalism and within this analytical arc of Michael's work they combine to demonstrate the recurrence as well as the revitalization of historical narratives in the present.

As mentioned above, Schudson's most influential intervention emerges at the apex of the high-modernism curve of twentieth century journalism: the press triumphant. Watergate was the ultimate consolidation of this view. He takes us back from this cultural moment of the late 1970s to explore how idealisms were founded within specific constellations of economic, political and social forces. The problem is that these explorations are by definition grounded in idealization not just in the study of the idea of journalism. The former problem of journalism history being an embarrassment is no longer the case and it is to a great extent due to the innovative approach of Schudson that we have escaped from this abject position. Yet the contemporary situation of journalism, its definitional parameters and its engagement with the twin pillars of democracy and the market-society, throws up new challenges for us as historians and researchers in journalism studies. Schudson's work prompts us to continue to explore the dissonances across time and has positioned the field to respond energetically to these developments.

As Schudson highlights, '"Journalism does not produce democracy where democracy does not exists"(Schudson, 2008 (b): 26) and following on from that cautionary note, we may conclude that democracies may need an unlovable press but journalism in its current form may no longer have the ability to contribute to the democratic project. Schudson's optimistic and enduring assertion of the linkage between journalism and a form of democratic market-society (2008 (b); 2009) are as confident as the figures from Citizen Kane, looking out onto a world that they grasp in all confidence. Just as the fundamentals of the Kane empire were deeply compromised in the fictional narrative, in a clearly unintended historical irony, the very democratic and commercial strengths that appeared to guarantee the triumph of journalism have been swept away for us to reconsider the relationships of journalism in the present; a process that must start in the past.

REFERENCES

Barnhurst, Kevin, and John Nerone. 2001. *The Form of News: A History*. New York: Guilford.

Bingham, Adrian. 2004. *Gender, Modernity and the Popular Press in Inter-War Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bingham, Adrian. 2009. *Family Newspapers? Sex, Private Life and the British Popular Press 1981*-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broersma, Marcel. ed. 2007. *Form and Style in Journalism: European Newspapers and the Representations of News, 1880-2005.* Leuven: Peeters.

Broersma, Marcel. 2013. "A Refractured Paradigm: Journalism, Hoaxes and the Challenge of Trust". In *Rethinking Journalism: Trust and Participation in a Transformed News Landscape*, edited by Chris Peters and Marcel Broersma, 28-44. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge

Carey, James. 1974. "The Problem of Journalism History" *Journalism History* 1 (1): 3-5.

Chalaby, Jean. 1998. *The Invention of Journalism* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Chapman, Jane. 2007. *Comparative Media History: An Introduction – 1789 to the Present*. London: Polity.

Conboy, Martin. 2002. *The Press and Popular Culture*. London: Sage.

Conboy, Martin. 2004. *Journalism: A Critical History*. London: Sage.

Conboy, Martin. 2006. *Tabloid Britain: Constructing a Community Through Language*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Conboy, Martin. 2007. *The Language of the News*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Conboy, Martin. 2010. *The Language of Newspapers: Socio-Historical Perspectives*. London: Continuum.

Conboy, Martin. ed. 2012. *How Journalism Uses History*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Conboy, Martin. 2015. "It Is Nobbut (only) an Oligarchy that Calls Itself a 'We'": Perceptions of Journalism and Journalists in Britain 1880-1900. *Journalism Studies* doi: 10.1080/1461670x.2015.1017409

Conboy, Martin. 2016. "Journalism Studies and 'The Crisis in Journalism.' " In *The State in Transition: Essays in Honour of John* Horgan, edited by Kevin Rafter and Mark O'Brien, 28-52. New Island Books: Dublin.

Dooley, Brendan and Sabrina Baron. eds. 2001. *The Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe*. London: Routledge.

Engel, Matthew. 1996. “Papering over the Cracks.” *Guardian*. Section 2. 3 October: 2-4.

Frank, Joseph. 1961. *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Franklin, Bob A. ed. 2008. *Pulling Newspapers Apart: Analysing Print Journalism*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1992. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hallin, Daniel. 1992. “The Passing of the ‘High Modernism’ of American Journalism”. *Journal of Communication* 42 (3): 14-25.

Hampton, Mark. 2004. *Visions of the Press in Britain, 1850-1950. Urbana and Chicago, IL*: University of Illinois Press.

Hampton, Mark and Martin Conboy. 2014. “Journalism History: A Debate”. *Journalism Studies* 15 (2): 154-171.

Hearns-Branaman, Jesse. 2013. “Journalistic professionalism as indirect control and fetishistic disavowal”. *Journalism: Theory, Practice, Criticism* 15 (1): 21-36.

Høyer, Svennik, and Horst Pöttker. 2005. *The Diffusion of the News Paradigm 1850-2000.* Gothenburg: Nordicom.

Hudson, Frederick. 1873. *Journalism in the United States, from 1690 – 1872*. New York: Harper.

Jackson, Daniel and Kevin Maloney. 2016. “Inside Churnalism: PR, Journalism and Power Relationships in Flux.” *Journalism Studies* 17 (6): 763-780. Doi.10.1080/1561670X.2015.1017597.

Jensen, Robert. 2014. ”Journalism’s Search for Metaphor and Meaning”. *Counter Punch* Weekend Edition, March 28-30: 5-7.

Lasch, Christopher. 1996. *The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Lewis, Justin, Andy Williams, and Bob A Franklin. 2008. “Four Rumours and an Explanation: A Political Economic Account of Journalists’ Changing Newsgathering and Reporting Practices.” *Journalism Practice* 2 (1): 27-45. Doi 10.1080/17512780701768493.

Mott, Frank, L. 1961. *American Journalism*: *A History of Newspapers in the US through 250 Years, 1690-1960. Basingstoke*: Macmillan.

Mussell, James. 2012. *The Nineteenth Century Press in the Digital Age*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nerone, John (1987) "The Mythology of the Penny Press." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4: 376-404

Nerone, John. 1991. "The Problem of Teaching Journalism History." *Journalism Educator* 45 (3):16-24.

Nicholson, Bob. 2013. "The Digital Turn: Exploring the Methodological Possibilities of Digital Newspaper Archives." *Media History* 19 (1): 59-73.

Park, Robert, E. 1925. "The Natural History of the Newspaper." In *The City*, edited by Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie. 80-98. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Peters, John, D. 2008. "History as a Communication Problem." In *Explorations in Communication and History* edited by Barbie Zelizer, 19-34. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Peters, Chris and Broersma, Marcel. 2013. *Rethinking Journalism: Trust and Participation in a Transformed News Landscape*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Schiller, Dan. 1981. *Objectivity: The Public and the Rise of Commercial Journalism*. Philadelphia, PA. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schudson, Michael. 1978. *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Harper.

Schudson, Michael. 2008. "Public Spheres, Imagined Communities, and the Underdeveloped Historical Understanding of History." In *Explorations in Communication and History*. Edited by Barbie Zelizer, 181-189. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Schudson, Michael. 2008 (b). *Why Democracies Need an Unlovable Press.* Cambridge: Polity.

Schudson, Michael and Leonard Downie Jnr. 2009. *The Reconstruction of American Journalism* Columbia University Press.

Schudson, Michael. 2011. "Factual Knowledge in the Age of Truthiness." In *The Changing Faces of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology and Truthiness*, edited by Barbie Zelizer, 104-113. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Schudson, Michael. 2013. "Would Journalism Please Hold Still!" In *Rethinking Journalism: Trust and Participation in a Transformed News Landscape,* edited by Chris Peters and Marcel Broersma, 191-199.Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Smarsh, Sarah. 2016. “Working-class Americans were ignored for years. Now we’re blamed for Trump.” *Guardian* 15 October: 41.

Starkman, Dean. 2014. *The Watchdog That Didn’t Bite: The Financial Crisis and the Disappearance of Investigative Journalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Steel, John. 2009. “The Idea of Journalism.” In *21st Century* Communication, edited by William, F. Eadie, 583-591.Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Steel, John and Marcel Broersma. eds. 2017. *Redefining Journalism in the Era of the Mass Press, 1880-1920.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Stephens, Mitchell. 1988. *The History of News: From the Drum to the Satellite*.

Van Leeuwen, Theo.1987. “Generic Strategies in Press Journalism.” *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 10 (2): 199-220.

Williams, Raymond. 1976. *Keywords*: *A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana, Croom Helm.