



MEDIA@LSE
Department of Media and Communications

MEDIA@LSE Electronic MSc Dissertation Series

Compiled by Dr. Bart Cammaerts and Dr. Nick Anstead

Mediated Cosmopolitanism?

The Other's Mediated Dialogical Space on BBC World's
Hardtalk

Andrew Rogers,
MSc in Global Media and Communication

Other dissertations of the series are available online here:
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse/mediaWorkingPapers/>

Dissertation submitted to the Department of Media and Communications, London School of Economics and Political Science, August 2010, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the MSc in Global Media and Communication. Supervised by Dr. Shani Orgad.

Published by Media@LSE, London School of Economics and Political Science ("LSE"), Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE. The LSE is a School of the University of London. It is a Charity and is incorporated in England as a company limited by guarantee under the Companies Act (Reg number 70527).

Copyright in editorial matter, LSE © 2011

Copyright, Andrew Rogers © 2011.
The authors have asserted their moral rights.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published. In the interests of providing a free flow of debate, views expressed in this dissertation are not necessarily those of the compilers or the LSE.

Mediated Cosmopolitanism?

The Other's Mediated Dialogical Space on BBC World's *Hardtalk*

Andrew Rogers

ABSTRACT

With the continued integration of the world through the compression of time, space and place, people once distant from one another are now coming into contact at a greater rate. As events around the globe begin to affect people across borders, the use of communication technology to redefine imagined communities needs to be examined. The advancement of communication technology has allowed for unprecedented connections between people, places and events and with these once distant people and cultures coming into view, is the notion of universalism becoming displaced by the emphasis on, and acceptance of, diverse particularism? Cosmopolitanism is a lens through which to analyze the spread of global commodities and the move toward global political integration. While cosmopolitanism is focused on the celebration of diversity and the acceptance of difference, Orientalism is its opposite, using the exacerbation of difference and the celebration of self that create barriers to a global community. While the study of global consumer brands by Szerszynski and Urry has noticed a 'banal globalism' that is spreading throughout the world, it fails to engage with the more complex notion of the increased social interaction of diverse peoples as a result of globalization. With the spread of global television, the chance to meet the 'other' and to be introduced to the diverse particularisms around the world increases. Using BBC World's news interview show *Hardtalk*, this paper attempts to discover whether the dialogical space of the other on global television encourages a cosmopolitan mentality or uses Orientalist methods to reinforce national or cultural collective identity. Using a basic content and discourse analysis of six selected shows, this investigation found an overwhelming tendency to delimit and reinforce national and cultural imagined communities. By using visibility, hospitality, and estrangement as indicators of a cosmopolitan space, this paper found that despite its global claims, BBC World's *Hardtalk* appears to merely reinforce Western cultural and political hegemony at the cost of attempting to cultivate a global cosmopolitan audience.

INTRODUCTION

As the physical size of the world remains the same, the globe is invariably getting smaller. There are many factors that are linking the once distant corners of the earth together rendering the fixed notion of time and space nearly irrelevant. The interpenetration of political, economic and environmental problems is disrupting the taken for granted notion of the nation-state calling into question the organization of government and citizenship. The increased flow of human and material capital has created numerous opportunities for cross-cultural communication and dual citizenship. Perhaps the most pertinent factor in global connectivity, however, is the rise in communication technologies. The proliferation of global media has allowed the reach of programming to extend beyond the traditional borders of the nation-state thus bringing people, places and events once invisible into the fold of daily observation.

With problems transcending the boundaries of the nation-state there becomes a need to reassess the role of both states and individuals within global society. The recent financial crisis, global warming and the rise in terrorism are all maladies that are creating the perception of a smaller, more interconnected world. Because all of the aforementioned problems are arguably affecting humanity as whole, Beck (2002) describes the current state of the world as a 'world risk society.' As the globe is affected by events that involve an increasing number of actors, there is a need to view the world as one society. With increased flows of money and people and the rise of communal problems, both nation-states and individuals should move beyond viewing the world as fragmented territories and begin to see the inevitable interconnectivity of the 'global village' (McLuhan, 1964). It is from Beck's notion of a world society unified by shared risks that it becomes more evident that there must be a conscious effort to reassess the nature of the nation-state and global citizenship.

The idea of cosmopolitanism goes back as far as the ancient Greeks (Holton, 2007). Coming from the words 'cosmos' and 'polis,' cosmopolitanism encompasses the whole of humanity as citizens of the world (Guibernau, 2007). Reinvigorated by Kant during the enlightenment, cosmopolitanism has enjoyed a renewed focus over the last few decades (Holton, 2009). With the ramifications of political, economic and environmental events being experienced across borders, it becomes necessary to reevaluate the character of citizenship in a globalizing world. While cosmopolitanism has its roots in natural law and political theory, many academic fields have attempted to interpret it through the lens of their particular discipline. Whether focused on cultural, philosophical or political ends of cosmopolitanism, most authors agree that an integral starting point of the cosmopolitan ideal is the recognition and

acceptance of difference in a culturally diverse world. It is from this specific notion that the field of media and communications can play a significant role in reconciling the goal of a universal ethical or political order, with the diverse particular aspects of the other as a culture and individual.

In Anderson's (1983) discussion of 'imagined communities,' he points out the important role the printing press played in forging the nation-state. Moving from localized communities to a larger, more centralized state was assisted by the media's ability to utilize shared language and symbols. It is from this same idea that a new cosmopolitan consciousness must be formed. The media and its increasing reach across the world have the potential to respond to Beck's 'world risk society' by attempting to reform the design of citizenship not based on the rigid demarcation of the national borders, but rather on the recognition of shared rights as individuals, shared risks as humans and the shared diversity of the human race. If the recognition and acceptance of difference is arguably the most important start to forming a cosmopolitan consciousness, the spread of global media, and particularly satellite television can be an immensely useful tool in the process.

The representation of the other on global television can help enlighten viewers to differences between cultures and shed light on the current state of cosmopolitanism. While there has been some focus on the 'banal globalism' of global brands in the world media (Szerszynski and Urry, 2006), there needs to be research into the mediated dialogical space of the other. By providing a space in which the other can speak and be heard, the opportunity for the world to evolve into a cooperative society may increase. In order to achieve a cosmopolitan consciousness, there must be an active attempt on the part of the media to give a voice to the particularisms of distant people and cultures. Without access to the other, citizens of nation-states will almost certainly be stuck viewing the potential of a universal society through an ethnocentric, particularist lens. This paper will attempt to examine the structure and discourse of BBC World News' interview show *Hardtalk* in order to discover how the representation of the political other on a global television station is an opportunity to expand the cosmopolitan consciousness of the audience or simply reinforce global ideals seen through a national or particularist prism.

Literature Review

Since the advent of the telegraph, communication technologies have changed the perception of time, space and place. According to Giddens (1990), the pre-modern concepts of time and space were intimately connected to a person's local environment. Whereas once people were only capable of knowing their immediate surroundings, the extension of the senses by technology (McLuhan, 1964) has allowed for the awareness of distant people and events (Giddens, 1990). With the organization of time via calendars and mechanical clocks, and the creation of international communication networks, time, space and place have all been transformed (Rantanen: 2005). Communication technologies 'created a new concept of time that hastened space of life by constantly reminding people that something was happening-if not here, then somewhere else' (Rantanen, 2005: 50). The 'de-territorialization' (Tomlinson, 1999) of experience through technology has enhanced the ability for distant people to achieve an acute awareness of events affecting the world. Consequently, social relationships can be seen to have intensified as a result of increased visibility (Rantanen, 2005). The ideas of local and global have become blurred as the 'situational geography' of social life has continued to change (Meyrowitz, 1985: 6). The continued evolution in the sophistication of communication technology has evoked even more questions about time, space, place, and the future of human social and political life.

The invention and proliferation of the television saw the forging of the visual with the auditory. Bringing the distant near, McLuhan (1964) envisioned the beginning of a new world. People, places and events once invisible were now brought into the daily fold of observation. It is through this 'new visibility' (Thompson, 1995) of the 'distant other' that McLuhan believed the 'global village' would emerge. Trials and tribulations of those outside society could now be witnessed and potentially invite action from distant outsiders. Even in its infancy, McLuhan saw the possibility for television to overcome the boundaries of space and time and forge a new unified world order. While the new technology provided an extension of the senses beyond the immediate (McLuhan, 1964), McLuhan failed to recognize the immense difficulty of reconciling the goal of a global community with the particularist diversity of peoples and cultures.

With increased flow of human and material capital across the borders of nation-states, globalization has become a highly discussed topic. The term 'globalization' refers to both 'the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole' (Robertson, 1992: 8). The term globalization is often discussed in the context of contemporary global economics, with focus on free trade, foreign direct investment, and

global economic deregulation (Beck, 2006; Holton, 2009), but as Baker (1997) points out, 'globalization is also concerned with issues of cultural meaning, including issues of texts, representations and identity' (18). There are many side effects of a world increasingly connected through macro institutions and communication technologies but many globalization researchers tend to focus on the changing structure of integrating macro institutions (Holton, 2009). Within globalization research there is an inherent tension in the universal and/or particular experience of globalizing processes (Robertson, 1992). While some authors view the effects of integrating processes as a universal experience, others find themselves arguing on behalf of particularisms experienced by various peoples around the world. One perceived consequence of globalization is cosmopolitanism, which 'touches on many arenas of globalization, but above all that of individual attitudes and reactions to globalization' (Rantanen, 2005: 120). In order to begin uncovering the multifaceted universal and particular experiences of globalization, cosmopolitanism delves into the implications of political and cultural interactions.

If globalization research is more focused on the general processes and effects of global interaction, cosmopolitanism can be seen as a lens through which to take a focused look at the apparent and potential social and political consequences of those effects. As a theoretical and increasingly empirical concept, cosmopolitanism attempts to use a balance of universalism and particularism to investigate the cultural, philosophical, and political implications of globalization processes. Dating back to the ancient Greeks, cosmopolitanism comes from the words 'cosmos' (universe) and 'polis' (state), and is equated with being a citizen of the world community whose allegiance supersedes that of the local or national (Kendall et al, 2009). During the enlightenment, Kant revisited the idea of cosmopolitanism in his discussion on natural law and the creation of a world civic society (Fine, 2007). On an individual level, Kant recognizes the need for people to be considered the 'possessor of rights whose moral personality is nothing but the freedom of a rational being under moral laws' (quoted in Fine, 2007: 23). At the macro level, Kant believes nation-states need to have accountability to an international order established on the principle of universal morality. Kant's belief in the universalism of human experience prompts him to suggest that the establishment of macro laws should be formed out of micro moral axioms. Instead of focusing solely on the legal determinism of macro structures, Kant focuses on the determination of individual rationality to dictate global action. While still overly inconsiderate of human particularism, Kant's 'utopian treatise of universal citizenship' is considered a cornerstone of modern cosmopolitan research (Ong, 2009: 452).

Today the term cosmopolitanism is one that is highly contested. As Pollack et al (2000) point out, 'Cosmopolitanism may be a project whose conceptual content and pragmatic character escape positive and definitive specification, precisely because specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitively is an uncosmopolitan thing to do' (quoted in Holton, 2009: 17). While there are many avenues of study within cosmopolitanism, there are three often repeating sites of inquiry namely in the cultural, philosophical, and political realms (Guibernau, 2007). The cultural aspect of cosmopolitanism has to do with the flows of people and goods across the increasingly porous borders of the nation-state. As Beck (2006) says, 'consumer society is the really existing world society' (40). The globalizing marketplace provides an excellent opportunity for cultural cosmopolitanism as global commodities can be consumed in a local context. Stevenson (2007) points out, nearly half the world's population lives in urban centers, which as Georgiou (2008) notes, puts distant others and cultures into the fold of daily life, directly challenging the homogeneity of the national imaginary. The increasing cultural diversity of urban spaces begins to alter the notion of citizenship by providing migrants with dual loyalties and providing locals with the chance to interact with the distant other. The human diversity of the city and the availability of cultural goods such as food, music, dress or tourist experiences lend themselves to an 'unreflexive' form of cosmopolitanism (Kendall et al, 2009). In an empirical inquiry into the spread of 'banal globalism,' Szerszynski and Urry (2006) investigate the proliferation of global brands and symbols. In the conducted interviews, participants were found to increasingly blend the availability of universal discourses with their own particular experience. In this case, the media helped facilitate global narratives through the use of global corporate brands and images of a blue earth from space. While the visibility of these narratives is an important aspect of cosmopolitanism, its unreflexive nature creates a taken for granted conclusion that the world is becoming a more open and unified space. The lack of focus on attitudes toward the other overshadows the immensely difficult task of overcoming local allegiance in favor of a global affiliation.

The philosophical and political aspects of cosmopolitanism tend to have an intimate interrelation. As Kant was attempting to formulate a legal framework that drew on natural law innate to all individuals, so too are philosophical and political cosmopolitan researchers attempting to find a universality amongst the worlds diverse particularisms. Philosophical cosmopolitanism seeks to define principles and values that can be applied to the whole of humanity. A typical example of an attempt at this can be seen through the U.N.'s human rights charter (Guibernau, 2007). Nevertheless, if maxims could be established by some group claiming to represent the whole of humanity, how could these rules be enforced? Political cosmopolitanism is concerned with the macro institutions that could supersede the

roles and laws of the nation-state in order to provide the codification and enforcement of philosophical principles. For authors such as Beck (2006) and Chouliaraki (2006), groups like the U.N., I.M.F. and other I.G.O.s and N.G.O.s provide an example of taken for granted manifestations of political cosmopolitanism. Nonetheless, other authors recognize the Western-centric nature of the concept of cosmopolitanism and question the legitimacy of the aforementioned groups as truly 'cosmopolitan' (Fine, 2007; Guibernau, 2007; Holton, 2007). Are groups with such inherent biases politically (the U.N. Security Council) and financially (I.M.F.'s conditions of loan reception) simply a mask for a new form of cultural, political or economic imperialism? Both Kant and Fine were aware of the dangers of the agenda of cosmopolitanism and the potential anti-cosmopolitan nature of a world government. As Fine says, 'The shadow of totalitarianism hangs over every effort to develop cosmopolitan social theory' (2007: XIII).

One main question surrounding cosmopolitanism is the goal: is it an end point of human society or a continuing struggle to achieve global awareness and justice (Fine, 2007)? While many authors disagree about the ultimate ends of cosmopolitanism, most see it as a project for humanity. In the past, many academics perceived cosmopolitanism as a project for the individual and not the mass (Rantanen, 2005). At the individual level, the idea of cosmopolitanism has often been associated with identity politics. The ability for the wealthy of society to move, consume, and forge an identity beyond the boundaries of the local gave the term cosmopolitanism an individual and thus elitist implication (Kendal et al, 2009). Being a citizen of the world, or cosmopolitan, was equated with expensive travel, consumption and interaction with people from afar. Nevertheless, in a world that is experiencing the compression of time, space and place through globalization and communication technology, the project of cosmopolitanism is being reconsidered through the lens of the mass (Rantanen, 2005). With the increased migration of the distant other, availability of foreign products and the 'visual mobility' provided by communication technologies, specifically television, people at large are now afforded the opportunity to interact, consume and travel globally in the comfortable and familiar space of the local (Szerszynski and Urry, 2006). It is through the individual capabilities of post-modern societies that allow for a mass movement. As Kendal et al (2009) say, 'The cosmopolitan, then, becomes the micro-unit, or the agent of change, in a move to a new form of global government' (20).

In order to create the 'global village' McLuhan foresaw there must be an active attempt to conceive the world and all its inhabitants as one community. Prior to the establishment of the nation-state, communal citizenship was divided into much smaller territories. As

Benedict Anderson (1983) points out, the printing press played an integral role in banding together smaller territories of diverse tribes of people under the auspices of the larger nation-state. 'Imagined communities,' according to Anderson are 'imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members...yet in the minds of each lives an image of their communion' (1983: 6). Imagined communities of the nation-state were realized utilizing the creation of common languages and symbols disseminated by the media, and the once foreign idea of a nation-state has now become quite taken for granted. Guibernau (2007) lays out five main points of constructing a collective national identity: 'The construction and dissemination of a certain image of the nation..., the creation and spread of symbols and rituals charged with...reinforcing the sense of community among its citizens..., the advancement of citizenship, involving a well-defined set of civil and legal rights..., the creation of common enemies,' and the use of media systems as key instruments to reinforce and spread all the aforementioned (Guibernau, 2007: 25). It is the use of 'national' symbols that create what Anderson refers to as the 'image of their communion' that leads to what Billig (1995) calls 'banal nationalism.' From flags and anthems to the reproduction of key historical moments, national sentiment can be reinforced by calling upon images and shared memories that subvert diversity and conjure shared symbols of community within a territory (Billig, 1995).

As the time and space of the post-modern world continues to compress, there is a need to reconsider the rigid demarcation of the nation-state boundaries. In the view of Beck (2006), the 'cosmopolitan outlook' is an already existing reality. The increased flow of people and goods across the limits of nation-states and the increasing cross-border interdependence of social actors makes Beck reconsider the changing nature of global society. As he says, 'the cosmopolitan outlooks means that, in a world of global crises and dangers produced by civilization, the old differentiations between internal and external, national and international, us and them, lose their validity and a new cosmopolitan realism becomes essential to survive' (2006: 14). In order to achieve a cosmopolitan consciousness, the emphasis on the local and national must move to the global. The compression of the world must not be seen as something taking place at a distance but rather it should be perceived as a change happening here and now. In the view of authors such as Hannerz (1990), cosmopolitanism is a mindset or attitude, and thus there is an imperative need to cultivate this consciousness utilizing the available forms of communication technology. The 'visual mobility' (Szerszynski and Urry, 2006) and 'new visibility' (Thompson, 1995) can help potentially form a cosmopolitan consciousness that can begin to transcend the antiquated view of the nation-state as the highest order of organization in favor of a global community, unified by shared risks and tolerant of human diversity.

If the goal of cosmopolitanism is to reconcile the particularisms of cultural diversity with the universalism of a global political society, Orientalism can be viewed as its opposite. Much like cosmopolitanism is a lens through which to analyze and view the world, Orientalism acts in a similar way. According to Said (1978), 'Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident"' (2). Before the 'new visibility' of Thompson, or the 'visual mobility' of Szerszynski and Urry, the distant other was represented through the literary work of travelers and academics. It is within these representations that the Orientalist tradition began. While many scholars may argue about the true intention of the Orientalist approach, Said suggests that the work produced by Orientalist authors was less about the Orient and more about the Occident. To Said, the study of the distant other in the Orient was an attempt to reify the superiority of Western or Occidental society. As Pickering (2003) argues, the exacerbation and perversion of difference then leads to 'otherness.' It is then this perceived otherness that continues to not only reinforce the 'us' over 'them' but also potentially creates the imperative to bring to 'them' 'our' way of life, 'our' particularism. Instead of a view of the world that praises difference and educates about the world's diverse particularisms, Orientalism is a reflection and celebration of self, an inescapable avenue toward cultural hegemony and ethnocentrism. By using the Orient to reflect on itself, the Occident sought to reassert the superiority of its particularism and reassert the boundaries of its imagined community. As the world moves towards greater interconnectivity, analyzing the dialogical space of the other can help shed light on the increasing focus on cosmopolitan ethics or demonstrate the still existing specter of Orientalism in reproducing nationalist sentiments or universalist judgments from a particularist perspective.

In the work of Roger Silverstone (2007), the media play an integral role in the post-modern world. As the process of mediation is seemingly inescapable with the proliferation of communication technologies, Silverstone argues that there should be a careful consideration as to the ethical and moral role of media in the world. Silverstone says, 'for global interdependence, both conflictual and conciliatory, involves increasing awareness of, and interaction with, the stranger' (2007: 13). While in the past the exposure to the other may have been less accessible, global television has further dissolved the boundaries of nation, place, space, and time. With the rise of global transnational television networks, programs once exclusively produced and distributed at a national level are now being displaced by the availability of television content from around the world (Albizu, 2007). While this content does not guarantee exposure, it does in fact increase the possibility for cross-cultural interaction (Baker, 1997). The spread of television programming produced outside the nation

has provided an opportunity for audiences to not only meet the stranger abroad, but also the stranger within (Silverstone, 2007). As Baker (1997) points out, the increasing interest in global television stems from its ability to undermine the traditional role of national programming. As Anderson (1983) mentions, the media is integral in the formation of the nation-state, and as global television access spreads across the world, the ability for the nation to dictate and reinforce collective identity diminishes. With more and more programs produced for a global audience, the question of intentions becomes more poignant. Are global television programs promoting the recognition of the other and cultural diversity in a cosmopolitan vein, or rather are global television programs produced in an attempt to export and reify cultural dominance and superiority?

In their discussion on methodological cosmopolitanism, Beck and Sznaider (2006) call on researchers to refocus their efforts from the symbols and collectivity of a nationalist perspective to those of a cosmopolitanism ethic. For them, 'the farther cosmopolitan rituals and symbols spread, the more chance there will be of someday achieving a cosmopolitan political order' (8). Similar to Kendal et al (2009), Beck and Sznaider recognize the individual effort required to potentially establish a global society. Achieving the lofty goal of a global political order then necessitates the cooperation of diverse peoples around the world. Silverstone (2007) sums it up well when he says:

The cosmopolitan individual embodies, in his or her person, a doubling of identity and identification; the cosmopolitan as an ethic, embodies a commitment, indeed and obligation, to recognize not just the stranger as other, but the other in oneself. Cosmopolitanism implies and requires, therefore, both reflexivity and toleration (14).

To cultivate individuals that possess what Silverstone claims is the essence of the cosmopolitan, there needs to be a platform through which the stranger can be seen and heard. Global television, then, can provide this platform, giving audiences around the world exposure to not only the particularisms of distant people, but also narratives that reinforce the universal nature of human experience. Unlike the 'banal globalism' of Szerszynski and Urry, the creation of cosmopolitan individuals requires a very reflexive attitude. Orientalism provided an opportunity to become acquainted with the other, but its lacking reflexivity lent itself to a reinforcement of cultural or national maxims. Cosmopolitanism, however, requires much more awareness and dedication to overcoming the seemingly insurmountable notion of difference.

In order to investigate the current state of cosmopolitanism on a global television network, indicators need to be established to more narrowly define the attributes of a cosmopolitan

space. There are three key themes that emerge in the literature that can be used to critically appraise the cosmopolitan nature of a global television program. First, the visibility of the other is imperative in establishing a functional relationship. As both Thompson (1995) and Szerszynski and Urry (2006) point out, the media and specifically television can provide a dialogical space with the other. As Baker (1997) notes, the visibility of diverse and distant cultures adds to the potential for cosmopolitanism to become an active part of everyday existence. The next significant indicator of a cosmopolitan space is hospitality. According to Silverstone (2007) hospitality is 'a primary ethic in a cosmopolitan world' that is 'welcoming the other in one's space, with or without expectations of reciprocity' (139). Hospitality is not just the visibility of the other, but also the availability of the other's voice. Silverstone argues for the necessity to not just see the other, but also hear them and points out that, 'It is only when someone enters our lives, and is welcomed, without having been invited, that we can truly accept the otherness of the other; his or her implacable difference from us, and his or her immeasurable sameness to us' (140). It is through hospitality then, that the universality of humanity is coupled with the particularisms of human diversity in order to cultivate awareness and compassion on behalf of the audience toward the distant other. By creating what Silverstone calls 'proper distance,' estrangement, the third indicator of cosmopolitan space can be better understood. Both Gilroy (2004) and Silverstone (2007) acknowledge the estrangement from self and culture as a significant part of a cosmopolitan world. As Silverstone points out, recognizing the stranger in oneself is an imperative in creating the cosmopolitan. Proper distance helps establish the balance between the universality of human experience and the particular experiences of diverse cultures, thus providing audiences with the opportunity to reflect on themselves as the other. It is through 'the self-knowledge that can be acquired through the proximity to strangers' that can bring to light the otherness near and the otherness afar (Gilroy, 2004: 75).

While there has been research focus on the spread of banal global images on global television, there has yet to be a focus on the global dialogical space of the other. By using 'global' television networks to study this space, the notion of imagined community can be reevaluated. Is global television about forming a cosmopolitan mentality, accented by the visibility and hospitality of the other, thus creating the opportunity to estrange the global audience from the taken for granted-ness of the particularisms of everyday existence? Or is global television simply a way to mask the reinforcement of cultural boundaries, defined by national borders? Is it an emancipation from Said's Orientalization or a new form of cultural imperialism, highlighted by the continuing emphasis on irreconcilable difference and cultural superiority? By thinking about global television as a potential key to cultivating the cosmopolitan individual, it becomes necessary to study the dialogical space of the other in a

discursive manner in order to unpack themes of an emerging cosmopolitan ethic or a new medium of Orientalism

This paper will attempt to uncover some of the underlying themes within a global television space. If the world will ever reach the cosmopolitan pinnacle of a global community it must start by treating individuals, near and far, with the 'proper distance.' To establish the 'global village' McLuhan foretold, the media, and specifically the space where the distant other dwells, must be a space free from bias and intolerance, and open to the differences that comprise the human race. Nevertheless, as the media has been used in the past to create cultural and national solidarity it would seem that even media deemed as 'global' would still have a latent motivation to create a boundary between 'us' and 'them.' Based on visibility, hospitality and estrangement how cosmopolitan is the studied dialogical space? How are the national and global discursively constructed, thus reinforcing or redefining the notion of an imagined community? In what ways does the space encourage or discourage a mediated cosmopolitanism? By examining the dialogical space of the other, this paper will attempt to point out the still existing hindrances to not only cultivating the cosmopolitan individual, but also cultivating the global community, political or otherwise. It is from these discoveries that this paper hopes to provide some critical thoughts on how the 'global' media should reconceive its purpose and thus actively attempt to create a cosmopolitan space in the future.

Methodology

To begin the investigation of mediated cosmopolitanism, two important aspects of the research site must be determined. First, of the available ‘global’ television networks, one must be chosen that not only offers a diversity of programming but also has a wide reach across the world. Additionally, the chosen network must possess a show in which the distant other is invited into a dialogical space. With BBC World’s availability in over 200 countries it is arguably the biggest production company in the world (Barker, 1997). With a global reach and a stated global agenda, BBC World’s claim to deliver “impartial, in-depth analysis of breaking news, as well as looking at stories behind the news-not just what is happening, but why” makes it a good site to begin investigating its content (BBC World, n.d.). After researching the available programming of BBC World, the news interview show *Hardtalk* emerged as an evident candidate for this case study. As a one on one interview show, *Hardtalk* claims to ask “the difficult questions” and get “behind the stories that make the news-from international political leaders to entertainers” (News.BBC, 2009). With international political leaders invited into *Hardtalk*’s dialogical space, the other has the potential to be seen and heard, and thus *Hardtalk* becomes a case study in which to investigate the current state of mediated cosmopolitanism.

After determining that BBC World’s *Hardtalk* would be the site of study, the question of a corpus and its accessibility must be answered. As *Hardtalk* has been on air for nearly 13 years, there are over 800 episodes that are neither televised nor available. Nevertheless, the BBC iPlayer at BBC.com makes available over 170 episodes from the past year. In order to take a sample from the provided corpus of shows, there was a need to more narrowly define what type of interview and interviewee would help shed light on the nature of mediated cosmopolitanism. As this paper is interested in the dialogue with the distant other, the notion of ‘distant other’ must first be defined. The idea of non-European Union and non-North American interviewees seemed to be the best way to define the other, but after reviewing the available episodes, the distant other seemed to be better defined by stipulating that interviewees be from non-English speaking countries (as a first language). For example while Hungary may be a member of the EU, its status as a non-English speaking country (first language) puts Hungarian interviewees in the category of ‘distant other.’ As both Anderson (1983) and Guibernau (2007) pointed out, language is a major factor in solidifying national identity and imagined community.

The second determining criterion in choosing the shows to be analyzed is the topical focus of the interview. After reviewing the available shows, politics seemed to provide the best topic

to find interviews with the distant other. Finding interviews with the other that had similar thematic elements and interview foci could potentially provide more generalizability in the analysis. It would seem that political interviews can potentially yield contentious discussion and thus provide discursive support to either a cosmopolitan or Orientalist slant within the dialogical sphere. The third and final question of sampling was that of textual quantity. As this paper is focused mainly on the elements of production and discursive trends, a more in depth analysis of a few texts was chosen over a less in depth analysis of many texts. With 171 shows available, less than half were interviews with the distant other. Of the 59 shows that interviewed the distant other, the majority were political in nature. As a result, this study chose to look at six interviews conducted with various political authorities in Iran, Pakistan, Iraq, Afghanistan, Sudan and Zimbabwe. Because this study is attempting to comment on the perceived consequences of production and discourse from the perspective of an audience member (the researcher), there were two distinct ways in which the six shows were analyzed. The first three were fully transcribed and studied for their discursive contribution to supporting or undermining a cosmopolitan disposition (see Appendix B). The second three were only watched with minimal notes in order to not only act more like an audience member, but also to discover production cues and some dialogical trends that help inform the analysis. All episodes were viewed three times to ensure the accuracy of transcription and the emergence of previously overlooked visual, production, or discursive themes. With visibility, hospitality and estrangement as indicators of either a cosmopolitan or Orientalist disposition, a combination of simple content and discourse analysis are necessary to analyze the indicators.

Visibility of the distant other is arguably the first requirement in a cosmopolitan world. Is the distant other available on this global news show and if so, how often are they invited into dialogue? In analyzing the visibility of the distant other on *Hardtalk*, a simple content analysis was used to determine how often the other is invited into dialogue. That is, of the backlog of *Hardtalk* episodes available on BBC iPlayer, how many interviews are conducted with guests who fit the aforementioned definition of the 'distant other?' By using the show description provided by BBC iPlayer, five characteristics of each interview were put into a Microsoft excel spreadsheet (see Appendix A). The show's date of air, the interviewee's country and continent of origin, topic discussed (i.e. politics, entertainment, etc.) and whether or not the interviewee fits the pre-defined criteria of the other were all used to analyze the concept of visibility. The content analysis was conducted with the intent only to use the statistical outcome of each category to determine the overall diversity of the interviewees and how often the other is invited into *Hardtalk's* dialogical space. There is little weight in the analysis section given to the results and consequently there was no second

coder trained. The use of the spreadsheet was merely to understand at a perfunctory level how cosmopolitan (i.e. diverse) the show appears, and thus it did not require a second coder to compare notes. Nevertheless, if this study were to be repeated it would be helpful to have a second coder in order to ensure that the sometimes nebulous notion of 'distant other' is not lost on the reader, nor poorly defined by the researcher.

The notion of hospitality is contingent not only on the study of transcription but also on the elements of production. As Scannell (1991) points out, the television studio is an institutional discursive arena, a 'public space in which and from which institutional authority is maintained and displayed' (2). Hospitality is contingent on the openness to the particularisms of the other, thus the elements of the show that either provide or hinder the ability for the audience to not just listen but actually hear the other must be analyzed. For example, how the show is structured, who gets the first word, where is the interviewee in relation to the host, and finally how does the host invite or discourage identification with the interviewee. The audience, according to Corner (1991), identifies the television studio as a public space with seemingly private ramifications. The host is the impresario who conducts an investigation for the benefit of the audience (Corner, 1991), and who 'plays a central role as the hero that undertakes to solve the problem affecting the kingdom' (Livingstone and Lunt, 1994, 60). While Livingstone and Lunt are focused on talk show hosts, the host of the news interview is similarly motivated. The social encounter of the interview conducted by the host on behalf of the audience can be a means to either inform the viewer of diversity through hospitable proper distance (cosmopolitanism) or reinforce hegemonic identity through emphasis on difference (Orientalism). It is the presence of the host that Munson (1993) says, 'inscribes the producer of the news within the product itself (110). Both the structural and discursive elements of *Hardtalk* inform the analysis of hospitality as an indicator of mediated cosmopolitanism.

In conjunction with hospitality, estrangement is the final indicator used to analyze the show. Unlike hospitality, the notion of estrangement can be viewed almost exclusively through the discursive trends uncovered in the analysis of the transcripts. The way in which the interview is dialogically constructed can help inform the nature of mediated cosmopolitanism. According to both Silverstone (2007) and Gilroy (2004), estrangement of the self is necessary to fully accomplish a cosmopolitan awareness. In the case of the interview, contextualization provides an excellent example of estrangement. Historical and social contextualization are necessary in order to better inform the audience of the distant other's situation and thus make evident the universalism of human experience and the particularism of a diverse world. The way in which both the interviewer and interviewee attempt to either elevate similarity or

emphasize difference can all be uncovered by studying the language itself. As Fairclough (1995) points out, language used in any text is always 'constitutive of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief' (Fairclough, 1995: 55). How is the national, international and global viewed? Is the audience invited to identify with the interviewee and challenge taken for granted knowledge and belief? The ability to reflect on the self as other can be considered an important aspect of a global show attempting to inform a global audience. By analyzing the language of the interview with a focus on estrangement, the 'imagined social reality' (Baker, 1997: 147) constructed through the media can help inform researchers of available discourses. As Baker (1997) points out, "though audiences are active, their activity will be resistant only when alternative discourses are available and drawn upon (147). It is only when estrangement is allowed to take place in the mediated sphere that a greater opportunity for cosmopolitan awareness can help audiences overcome the reinforcement of nationalism, social hegemony and the otherness of difference.

Results and Analysis

After deciding on BBC World's *Hardtalk* as the site for study, the most obvious question that came to mind was, 'how visible is the other?' Although *Hardtalk* has over 800 episodes over its 13 year history, only 171 were available online for actual viewing and analysis. With that, it became apparent that the question of visibility should be limited to the available online corpus. Clearly this is one of the biggest shortcomings because analyzing less than 25% of the history provides only a small, biased sample of visibility. Nevertheless, it would seem that with the continued increase in global interdependence the most recent year's corpus would provide a rich and semi-accurate assessment of the show's historical and continued visibility of the other, and thus its underlying cosmopolitan or Orientalist themes.

Using a basic Microsoft Excel spreadsheet provided some clear insights into continuing trends of *Hardtalk*. As this paper is focused on the availability of the other as indicative of either a cosmopolitan or Orientalist disposition, the most important element of the show became the actual number of times the other was invited into the dialogical space of *Hardtalk*. Based on the aforementioned criteria to define the other, it was found that only 34% of the 171 episodes actually invited the other to speak. For a show that is considered 'global' it would seem that a greater number of interviews would contain people who more easily fit into the category of the other. With the apparent failure of its global claims, *Hardtalk's* overwhelming tendency to favor guests from a non-other background helps reinforce the Western imaginary by putting greater significance on Western issues. One of the biggest problems, however, with not having a second coder even for a basic content analysis is defining the parameters of the other. While this paper has attempted to make it as clear as possible, it could be argued that some of the interviewees could belong to either category. A future project that would mirror this investigation should most definitely include a larger corpus and a second coder to ensure continuity in defining the other. Nevertheless, it would seem based on the criteria laid out that from the standpoint of the other's availability, *Hardtalk* errs on the side of a Western audience and thus lends itself to a Western collective identity.

While the parameters for defining the other may provide some ambiguous results, the 'continent' statistic brought to light a very specific short coming of *Hardtalk*. Nearly 50% of all the people invited into the dialogical space of *Hardtalk* are from a European origin. While the BBC is housed in a European city, the global context in which BBC World, and specifically *Hardtalk* produces its shows creates the imperative need to invite a variety of people from diverse places into the dialogical space provided by global television. The over abundance of

European figures to occupy the space on *Hardtalk* lends itself to a reinforcement of national and even continental imagined community and thus an overwhelming suspicion of European cultural imperialism. Despite this assumption, nearly 20% of guests are from the Asian continent. While this does not counterbalance the disproportionate amount of European guests, it does narrowly trump the North American guest total by 2%. At the very least, while Western interviews (Europe, North America and Australia) total nearly 70% of the available corpus, Asia and Africa combine for nearly 30% of all interviews. Once again the global claims made seem to fail as a result of an over abundance of Western interviews. The biggest area of concern regarding *Hardtalk* as a global space is the lack of South American interviewees. With a global approach to news production and dissemination, the lackluster 1% of South American guests makes this dialogical space seem rather perfunctory. Without the inclusion of the millions of voices that comprise South America, the global ambition of *Hardtalk* fails to encompass the full reach of the world and thus neglects a significant portion of particularist experience necessary to fully actualize the dialogical space as cosmopolitan.

The most obvious consistency on *Hardtalk* was found in the area of topic. Almost 60% of the available corpus was based around political conversation. 'Arts/entertainment,' 'business,' and 'education/other' all shared a similar amount of time at just over 10%. Similar to the concept of the other, some of the categories of topic were some what nebulous and could benefit from the coding of a second person. Nonetheless, while politics may provide ample opportunity to invite the distant others from around the world into dialogue, the over emphasis on political themes fail to fully encompass the other as a creative or innovative individual. Politics can be seen as one of the most contentious and disagreeable subjects around the world, and thus the other's availability primarily in political context fails to invite the audience to identify with the other as creators or innovators in arts, science, business and beyond. The cultural and historical variations that help shape the nature of political thought in any given country create very distinct practices and world views that may be irreconcilable with global audiences and in turn, may fail to encourage the audience to identify with the universal human experiences of the other. Of course the opportunity to be introduced to political nuances around the world may provide the audience with insight, but it may also allow producers to reinforce Western particularist experience thus taking an Orientalist approach when interviewing the other.

One clear textual example that exhibits the lacking continuity of political understanding can be seen in the interview with Zimbabwean Deputy Prime Minister Arthur Mutambara. As Zimbabwean president Robert Mugabe has been the focus of political criticism from around

the Western world, this portion of the interview was focused on the new coalition government formed by Mr. Mutambara's political party and President Mugabe's party.

- Guest: 103 ...And if Zimbabweans have
104 decided to work with Mugabe, why shouldn't people in the West, in America
105 in Britain understand that?
- Host: 113 ...It just seems to me there's
114 something Alice in Wonderland about your belief this political process is
115 working and can work.
- Guest: 123 ...And you cannot call our views 'Alice in Wonderland' we are very
124 clever people, cleverer than you uhh, the British. We know what we want. I
125 know better than Brown and Obama what is good for Zimbabwe.

This exchange between guest and host demonstrates the inherent tension in a particularist political discussion and a Western-centric 'universalist' perspective adopted by the host. As this show is set in a Western production studio, it becomes clearer that there are certain underlying assumptions being made about the perspectives of viewers. As Mr. Mutambara attempts to explain the circumstances of his political situation, he is met only with derisive criticism from the 'Western' host. The new coalition government formed in an attempt to rectify the long standing turmoil in Zimbabwe is cast off as 'Alice in Wonderland' while the coalition governments of countries such as Great Britain escape the criticism of being fantastical. The overwhelming criticism of President Mugabe leads the host to conclude on behalf of the audience that the only successful government in Zimbabwe will be one devoid of Mr. Mugabe. Despite Mutambara's attempt to explain their particular circumstance, he is met with the assumption that the 'all or none attitude' of Western political criticism of Mugabe is the only 'realistic' conclusion. These underlying assumptions then lend themselves to an Orientalist perspective, exalting the Western universalist perspective over the acceptance of a cosmopolitan particularist understanding.

An additional problem with the exchange between guest and host is the obvious reinforcement of national and cultural identity. While the research focus tends to be on the host's role as facilitator of the discussion, and thus their role as a unifying or divisive entity, the guest can be seen to draw distinct lines between 'us' as Zimbabweans, and 'them' as the Western powers of America and Britain. Although Mr. Mutambara makes a compelling point about political autonomy and the particularist nature of his experience, his derogatory and all encompassing insult of the British as less 'clever' further removes his particular situation from universal human experience. By ostracizing the assumed British viewers, and

potentially Western audiences as a whole, Mutambara reemphasizes irreconcilable difference and thus destroys much of the opportunity to draw a sympathetic audience toward his cause. In turn, this exchange can be seen to support an Orientalist perspective, casting Zimbabwe off as a struggling nation, and leaving Britain and the West as a witness to the apparent hostility of the political turmoil. In this case, the focus on politics can be seen as a way to bring the other into focus, only to have either the host or the guest reinforce difference and thus allow the Western audience to reflect on themselves in a vain similar to Said's discussion on Orientalism. While there may be some visibility of the other, the framing of the discussion and elements of production can be seen to further hinder the hospitality and estrangement necessary to cultivate a cosmopolitan space and thus a cosmopolitan viewer.

After analyzing *Hardtalk* from the perspective of both discursive researcher and active audience member, it became apparent that hospitality and estrangement can be seen as interconnected. When watching *Hardtalk* simply as an audience member, certain elements of production created an inhospitable environment for the other. From the opening introduction of *Hardtalk* the audience is invited to identify with the host, who not only broadcasts from a Western studio, but also possesses a Western dialect and thus a Western disposition. It is through the opening that the reason for the interview is constructed around conflict and the need for the host to inquire about perceived troubles of the interviewee. It is from this lack of hospitality that, from a discursive perspective, many of the openings shine light on to the Orientalist approach of the show. In an interview with Iran's Envoy to the International Atomic Agency Ali Asghar Soltanieh, both a lack of hospitality and estrangement are made evident.

Host: 1 Is Iran ready to bow to the will of the international community and reign in its
2 nuclear ambition?
6 ...Full cooperation or deeper international isolation? Which way
7 will Iran go?

From the outset of the introduction, the audience is aligned with the host as the investigator while the guest is the person to be investigated. Acting on behalf of the 'international community,' the host assumes the role of world's spokesperson charged with the responsibility of obtaining answers from the guest who is only invited into the dialogical space in order to answer to the inquiry. The very premise of the episode is predicated on the answering of these pertinent questions thus undermining the simple notion of hospitality as the motive. The other is not invited to speak to inform the audience or to create a cosmopolitan understanding of their nations particular situation, rather they are invited to

submit to the inquisition that puts the host and by proxy the audience in the position of 'world' authority. As world authority then, the underlying assumption is that the particular nation, in this case Iran, must answer to this body in order to avoid 'deeper international isolation.' Because the opening of *Hardtalk* immediately puts the audience in a position to identify only with the host, the prospects for the audience to experience estrangement are undermined. While there should be some impudence for the interview itself, the way in which the opening frames those motives should not latently or blatantly place the audience and host on one side and the guest on the other. As an active audience member one can overcome this immediate identification by both listening to the guest and questioning the host. Nevertheless, the creation of a conflictual and potentially hostile environment through the introduction not only cultivates an inhospitable space, it also reduces the chances for the audience to align or empathize with the guest and experience moments of the self as the other. If 'we' as the audience are representing the world, 'they' as the guest are outside of the world, needing to answer to the authority of the host in order to ever be considered legitimate.

One very clear question that arises out of this introduction and many of the other analyzed interviews is: who is meant by the phrase 'international community?' Within all the analyzed interviews, the terms 'international community' and 'world community' constantly reemerged with a troubling undercurrent of meaning. In the same interview with the Iranian Ambassador to the IAEA, the 'will of the international community' seems defined by quite a narrow range of countries.

Guest: 210 First of all, do you appreciate this positive gesture by Iran?

Host: 212 Frankly ambassador it matters here nor there whether I
213 appreciate it. The question is does the United States, the permanent five
214 do they appreciate it?

With the discussion framed around Iran's need to 'bow to the will of the international community,' it becomes apparent that the 'international community' is not inclusive of the many nations around the world but rather the few nations with the political and economic power in the world. To be welcomed into the 'international community' which inherently Iran is not considered a part of in this discussion, the nation must concede to the will of the U.S. and the permanent five of the U.N. The international community then is simply a mask for the will of the political and economic elite which puts the host and viewer in the position of 'world authority' leaving Iran outside and thus making them the other. Once again the imagined community of the audience is reinforced though the assumed authority the host

wields. With a Western-centric universalism, the opinions and values of Western political structures take an Orientalist approach, posing the guest as an outsider needing to conform to the assumed mores of the host and audience.

In another section of the interview it is once again emphasized that only a few can speak for the whole.

Host: 285 its Moscow, the permanent five at the U.N., everybody now is talking about
286 serious sanctions by the end of the year unless you {Iran} pass this upcoming
287 examination.

This passage not only highlights the very limited scope of the word ‘international’ but it also points to yet another linguistic short coming of this dialogical space. In this case, the word everybody is summed up by Russia and the permanent five (which Russia is already apart of). The constant neglect of non-U.N. nations and the over emphasis on the power and will of the Security Council makes this space inhospitable. In order for the particularism of Iran to be accepted, it must ‘pass this upcoming examination’ put forth not by the will of a universally sanctioned body, but rather by a particularist body imposing itself as a universalist entity. Additionally, the guest is charged with the responsibility of representing the whole of Iran. In many instances the word ‘you’ and ‘Iran’ become interchangeable, and the guest is then seen to represent the whole of a nation. This not only continues to distance the audience from the guest by oversimplifying difference but it also over essentializes the very complex nature of Iran and its people. The interchangeability of guest and nation makes clear that the selective nature of *Hardtalk* lends itself to an Orientalist slant, ostracizing the guest to oversell difference and undersell the acceptability of diversity and commonality of human experience.

In a similar way, the interview with Arthur Mutambara continues to reinforce the narrow definition of the ‘world.’

Host: 342 ...Do
343 you want the Western sanctions lifted, yes or no?
Guest: 344 Yes, yes, yes...we want the world to give us a
345 fighting chance. We want the West remove whatever measures, whatever
346 sanctions they’ve imposed...

Once again, the ‘world’ can be interchanged with the West. Similar to the discussion with the Iranian official, the Western world plays an integral role in determining the validity of the experience of other nations. The overall tone of skepticism adopted by the host on behalf of

the Western world makes the guest ask the 'world' (the West, the audience) for a 'fighting chance.' These passages demonstrate the very narrow scope of focus on *Hardtalk* and show how the particularist perspective of Western hegemony is inherently written into the discussion of 'international' or 'world' affairs. While it is important to have some frame of reference it is crucial to have an less narrowly defined view of the world in order to create a hospitable dialogical space which in turn can provide the audience the opportunity to achieve a proper distance, recognizing the not only the validity of the other's particular experience, but also the estrangement of the self.

Another structural component of *Hardtalk* that potentially undermines audience identification with guest is the use of satellite feed interviews. As Scannell (1991) points out, the studio is the vicarious home of the audience where the guest is invited into dialogue in a public space that has private ramifications. In five of the six analyzed interviews, the guests were not in the studio but rather in an even more distant location being interviewed from the studio. If the studio itself is already a space being inhabited from afar, the addition of a television within the television reemphasizes the distance between host, audience and guest. During a normal in studio interview there are not titles available on the screen to remind the audience of the distance between viewer and the conversation. Nonetheless, with the added distance of satellite interviews there are titles superimposed under the shot of the guest, continually reminding host and audience alike that the guest is distant, reinforcing the otherness, and thus not available to inhabit the common public space of the studio. While many audience members may be able to overcome the constant reminder of distance, the lacking proximity and failure to inhabit the common space of the studio can be construed as inhospitable and can potentially create difficulty in estrangement. By not having an in-person interview the guest is not within one's public home of the studio and in turn is not provided a hospitable space for discussion. Likewise, the visual reminder of distance through the titles on the screen will always tend to reinforce the literal and cultural distance between audience and guest thus maintaining the relationship of audience and other and resulting in the creation of a potential barrier in estrangement by constantly reminding the audience of their irreconcilable difference, nationally or culturally. With these potential barriers to cultivating a cosmopolitan audience, the Western-centric imagined community prevails and consequently supports an Orientalist objective; the other is invited into 'our' space of the studio in order not to enlighten, but rather answer to 'us,' the perceived world authority.

A significant part of establishing a hospitable dialogical space capable of proper distance and in turn audience estrangement is the notion of context. Because *Hardtalk* is inviting the particularisms of distant others into view, it is necessary to provide both social and historical

contexts to the audience in order to foster a cosmopolitan disposition. In an ideal cosmopolitan space, the universalism of human experience will be discovered by learning and accepting diverse particularisms. To fully integrate the many others into one's collective identity, there must be contextualization to not only better understand the other, but also better reflect on and understand one's self. In the realm of *Hardtalk*, historical and social context was often either neglected or interpreted through the lens of Western experience. In an interview with Pakistan's foreign minister Shah Mahmood Qureshi, there is a clear example of contextual neglect and reinterpretation.

Host: 168 So you've got the bigger problem with terrorists than any other country in the
169 world? I mean, that's what this White House policy review said earlier this
170 year

Guest: 171 Well terrorism is not a Pakistan specific issue...

Host: 172 No I didn't say it was, I'm saying you've got more than your fair share than
173 any other country.

Guest: 174 Well the world has contributed to that uhh...

Host: 175 How?

Guest: 176 How? Because uhh you had trained Mujahideen. You had used religion
177 as as a doctrine to fight the Soviets out of Afghanistan.

Host: 178 Oh you're going back to history there then?

Guest: 179 But that's a fact, you have to, you cannot ignore history

Host: 180 (Sigh) Well, uhh, but you're going far too back. Let me tell you what
181 Barak Obama said in March this year. He said since September 11th
182 so that's much more recent. Al-Qaeda and its extremist allies have move
183 across the border into remote areas of Pakistan including Osama Bin Laden
184 and Ayman Al-Zawahiri, the leaders of Al-Qaeda.

Guest: 185 Well...

Host: 191 Ok, but I just wanted you to clarify, because you said to me a moment ago
192 this goes back to when the Mujahideen were being trained against the Soviets
193 but I'm saying to you this is in the last eight years...

In an attempt to contextualize the current situation in Pakistan, the guest tries to put into historical perspective the oversimplified assessment by the host that Pakistan has a '...bigger problem with terrorists than any other country...' By pointing back to the relics of the Cold War, the guest is attempting to call on the past as a more elaborate explanation for the present day situation in his country. Instead of allowing the blame for terrorist individuals to fall entirely on to Pakistan, and by proxy himself, Mr. Qureshi asserts that '...the world has contributed to that...' Once again in this case, the word 'world' is primarily referring to the Western actors during the Cold War and it delimits a very narrow view of the globe. In so

doing, this passage supports a more Orientalist perspective, putting the host and audience against the guest and reinforcing the Western imagined community. Also, the passage demonstrates that not only the host but also the guest can contribute to the reinforcement of a Western-centric view of the world. Additionally, his statement could be construed by some viewers as an excuse for the apparent over abundance of terrorists in Pakistan. Nevertheless, by trying to put into perspective his particularist view of the current state of Pakistan, Mr. Qureshi is inviting the audience, and more specifically Western viewers, to understand how history can be seen to contribute to the current situation. In this respect, a sense of estrangement may be achieved on behalf of the Western audience because of Mr. Qureshi's ability to historically contextualize their possible role in the problem being discussed. Despite his best attempts however, Mr. Qureshi's historical explanation is subjugated and subsequently socially re-contextualized to better serve a Western perspective.

While in this passage there is an apparent element of hospitality and estrangement that could contribute to a cosmopolitan mentality, the host is quick to realign the perspective of the viewers thus potentially undermining its cosmopolitan position. In this portion of the interview, the historical contextualization of terrorism places some responsibility on Western powers. With the 'War on Terror' a continuing major effort in the Western world, the host attempts to deflect the potential historical condemnation by placing terrorism in the frame of current Western social context. Instead of encouraging a hospitable space by inviting Mr. Qureshi to elaborate on his historical narrative, the host calls on President Obama and the more current memory of September 11th to once again shift the source of blame away from the West. By calling upon the more recent atrocity of terrorism in the West, the host can be seen to suggest to the audience and guest alike that terrorism was not an issue until 9/11. The emphasis on the authority of Barak Obama as the narrator of history overwhelms the seemingly flimsy and almost forgotten history of Afghanistan and the Cold War. Pushing the Western audience away from actually hearing and understanding Mr. Qureshi by calling upon 'familiar' and 'trustworthy' sources and experiences undermines the potential for hospitality and estrangement. While audience members can still potentially understand the problem of terrorism more fully from the guest's brief historical explanation, both the words and body language of the host send signals of absurdity regarding the historical contributions to terrorism by the West.

From this passage another continuing trend of *Hardtalk* can be seen. The use of 'Western' sources of knowledge, in this case both the White House policy review and Barak Obama, only seem to support an Orientalist slant on reporting. Whether through reports issued from the U.S., European Union, or various United Nations panels, producers of *Hardtalk* tend to

err on the side of a Western oriented audience and thus construct 'authentic' knowledge through a Western prism. As seen in the passage above, Mr. Qureshi's view of history is too far reaching to be considered legitimate for the host and so the audience is redirected to President Obama and the events of 9/11 to more 'accurately' frame the roots of terrorism in Pakistan. By reorienting the audience, history can be seen as malleable and short term and the social particularism of Pakistan is trumped by the universalism of Western experience. Of course it is not fair to suggest that *Hardtalk* exclusively uses Western sources of knowledge and authority because many of the sources of knowledge used by the host come from the guest's country of origin. Nevertheless, the sources typically chosen are antithetical to the message of the guest, in the case of politicians it is typically members of the opposing party whose quotes and 'studies' fuel polemic debates placing the guest at the receiving end of a seemingly bias inquiry. As these quotes and studies are taken by the host as authoritative, the audience is then invited to question the authenticity and reputability of the guest. Using sources of knowledge that continually undermine and call into question the expertise of the guest create neither a hospitable dialogical environment nor provide many opportunities for the audience to experience estrangement.

Conclusion

After considering the findings, it would seem that the dialogical space of *Hardtalk* rarely attempts to cultivate a cosmopolitan consciousness. Despite its global claims, the framing of issues through a Western-centric lens on *Hardtalk* lends itself to the perpetuation of an Orientalist disposition. The boundaries of the imagined community seem to always be drawn around nation and culture, with an emphasis on the Western 'world.' The limited visibility of the other in the global dialogical space supports the notion that the 'world' is more narrowly defined by the Western perspective of Western producers. The dialogical space of *Hardtalk* provides moments of hospitality, but the rare and perfunctory nature of those opportunities are constantly undermined by the host's control over the topic and breadth of discussion. The invitation extended to the other to speak in the space of *Hardtalk* should not be based on answering to the inquisition of Western universalism, but rather on the desire to see, hear, and listen to the diverse particularisms of the other.

The opportunities for estrangement may be present in various moments of *Hardtalk* but the continual neglect and reinterpretation of social and historical context can be seen to limit the effectiveness of those moments. To better cultivate cosmopolitanism in a mediated space, producers need to more thoroughly consider the aims of their program. With 'global' claims

of 'impartiality,' global networks and producers need to more reflexively evaluate whether the dialogical spaces of the other encourage the proper distance Silverstone discussed. If these spaces for interaction with the distant other continue to be marred by Western universalism they will fail to recognize and accept the particularisms of the other. In turn, these failures will continue to perpetuate an Orientalist perspective, characterized by rigid demarcation of imagined communities and thus the failure to cultivate a global community and mediated cosmopolitanism.

This paper is not suggesting that all of global television or in fact every *Hardtalk* episode is aimed at cultural imperialism or Orientalizing the other. The very narrow nature of this research makes any kind of strong or generalizable conclusion too ambitious for its scope. Nevertheless, acting as both discursive researcher and critical audience viewer provided insight into the short comings of *Hardtalk* as a place for cultivating a cosmopolitan audience. To better investigate the questions of mediated cosmopolitanism, future research conducted in a similar vain should not only sample and compare similar shows on global television networks, but it should also increase the size of the sample.

By only analyzing 10% of one year of a show that has been airing for over 13 years, there is a lacking sample size and clear short sightedness. Nonetheless, as the goal of this research was to uncover continuing trends counterproductive in the search for a cosmopolitan space, it hopefully provided some thoughts on what elements create an Orientalist slant, and how future programs can potentially make conscious choices to overcome some of these short comings in order to better create a space for mediated cosmopolitanism.

REFERENCES

- Albizu, J. (2007) Geolinguistic Regions and Diasporas in the Age of Satellite Television, *The International Communication Gazette* 69(3): 239-261.
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.
- Anonymous, (2009) *About Hartalk*, URL: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/hardtalk/about_hardtalk/default.stm [Last Consulted 1 August 2010].
- Anonymous, (n.d.) *BBC World News*, URL: <http://www.bbcworldnews.com/Pages/About.aspx> [Last Consulted 1 August 2010].
- Baker, C. (1997) *Global Television: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Beck, U. (2006) *Cosmopolitan Vision*, London: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. and Sznaider, N. (2006) Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda, *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 1-23.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2006) *Spectatorship of Suffering*, London: Sage.
- Corner, J. (1991) The Interview as Social Encounter, in P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*, (pp. 32-46). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*, London: Arnold.
- Fine, R. (2007) *Cosmopolitanism*, London: Routledge.
- Georgiou, M. (2008). Urban Encounters: Juxtapositions of Difference and the Communicative Interface of Global Cities, *The International Communication Gazette* 70(3-4): 223-235.
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Gilroy, P. (2004) *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture*, London: Routledge.
- Guibernau, M. (2007) *The Identity of Nations*, London: Polity Press.
- Hannerz, U. (1990) Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture, in M. Featherstone (ed.) *Global culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, (pp. 237-252). London: Sage.
- Holton, R. (2009) *Cosmopolitanisms: New Thinking and New Directions*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kendall, G., Woodward, I., and Skrbis, Z. (2009) *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism: Globalization, Identity, Culture and Government*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Livingstone, S. and Lunt, P. (1994) *Talk on Television: Audience Participation and Public Debate*, London: Routledge.
- McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meyrowitz, M. (1985) *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behaviour*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Munson, W. (1993) *All talk: The talk Show in Media Culture*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ong, J. (2009) The Cosmopolitan Continuum: Locating Cosmopolitanism in Media and Cultural Studies, *Media, Culture, & Society* 31(3): 449-466.
- Pickering, M. (2001) *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rantanen, T. (2005) *The Media and Globalization*, London: Sage.
- Said, E.W. (1978) *Orientalism*, London: Routledge.
- Scannell, P. (1991) Introduction: The Relevance of Talk, in P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*, (pp. 1-12). London: Sage.

Silverstone, R. (2007) *Media and Morality: On the Rise of the Mediapolis*, London: Polity Press.

Stevenson, N. (2003) Cosmopolitan and Multicultural Citizenship: World, Nation, City and Self, in N. Stevenson (Ed.), *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions*, (pp. 35- 67). Berkshire: Open University Press.

Szerszynski, B. and Urry, J. (2006) Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World From Afar, *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 113-131.

Thompson, J.B. (1995) *The Media and Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.

Tomlinson, J. (1999) *Globalization and Culture*, London: Sage.

Electronic MSc Dissertation Series

Media@lse Electronic MSc Dissertations will:

Present high quality MSc Dissertations which received a mark of Distinction (72% and above).
Selected dissertations will be published electronically as pdf files, subject to review and approval by the Editors.

Authors retain copyright, and publication here does not preclude the subsequent development of the paper for publication elsewhere.
