CONSTRUCTING A COSMOPOLITAN PUBLIC THROUGH DELIBERATIVE JOURNALISM. THE CASE OF ROMANIAN MEDIA CIVIC CAMPAIGNS

Mălina CIOCEA, Faculty of Communication and Public Relations,
NSPSPA, Bucharest, Romania.

Abstract: *This paper* [*] *will discuss the role of the media in constructing a cosmopolitan public. We will analyze a recent mobilizing campaign of a Romanian newspaper (Jurnalul Naţional's Resistance Movement) in order to show how the Romanian media build a potential cosmopolitan space by involving the public's imagination into a project of value redefinition. The research hypothesis I start from is that the journalists' thematic cut-up and the choice of medium mobilize the cosmopolitan sensibilities of the public. Endowed with deliberative instruments in a participative environment and presented with a controversial topic, the public gains a new identity as a reflexive producer of culture. Such militant campaigns initiated by the media integrate the public in a cosmopolitan civic perspective.*

Key words: cosmopolitan public, deliberative journalism, public sphere, media civic campaigns, media morality

1. INTRODUCTION

My analysis draws on recent developments in cultural theory regarding the role of the media in constructing and promoting a global civil society. By discussing the efficiency of several civic campaigns initiated in the media whose declared finality is value reconstruction, I will appraise media's role in the formation of a cosmopolitan community.

The perspective assumed in this paper is fed by discourses on globalization as the driving force behind (yet another) dramatic change in the social landscape.

Among the very dense haze of globalization studies, one track is of utmost interest here: the study of the rise of a global public sphere giving a voice to various self-reflexive publics. If to this idea we add the contention that the media are instrumental in the creation of this global public sphere, we have a very rich conceptual background that deserves some discussion before proceeding in our analysis of the new identities of the journalists and the public. The first part of the paper will then follow the complex changes in the nature of the public sphere (encouraging multiplicity of perspectives) and its actors (growingly aware of the deliberative instruments available to them) and discuss media's role in shaping cosmopolitan sensibilities.

2. TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE

While analysts' questions as to the locus of an emerging global society are still waiting for a new methodology exempt from the bonds of national space and limitations, the age-old concept of public sphere might well serve as provisional site.

That the term "public sphere" should be allowed to signify public spheres where a variety of self-reflexive publics are at work, is quite self-understood ever since Habermas refined the idea of the public sphere as a network permitting exchange of viewpoints. The reflexivity of publics is further emphasized by Appadurai's understanding of "mediascapes" and "ideoscapes" as constructs molded by actors' various backgrounds. While mediascapes are rather centered on images and based on reality narratives, and ideoscapes belong to the political realm of ideologies, both are enabling for actors, since they offer pooled resources for building new contexts (be they semiotic or political).

Back in the XVIIIth century "the public sphere as a functional element in the political realm was given the normative status of an organ for the self-articulation of civil society with a state authority corresponding to its needs" (Habermas, 1989, 74). Now the political public sphere is subject to the influence of two competing processes: "the communicative generation of legitimate power" (which communication processes, while interlinked and inclusive, are legitimated by weak institutions) and "the manipulative deployment of media power to procure mass loyalty, consumer demand, and <compliance> with systemic imperatives" (which is more of an interference in the public sphere, based on alternative referential frames – Habermas, 1992, 452). If power is now exercised by various actors following competing agendas, it is to be expected that they will attempt to identify and create their own publics, consequently multiplying perspectives and encouraging eccentric (if not individual) choices. In these circumstances, the principle of rationality makes room for impulsive/emotional reaction ("rational-critical debate gave way to the consumption of culture" - Calhoun, 1992, 21).

The pessimistic view of a degraded public sphere not serving its purpose may find a counterpart in a stance where the multiplication of publics and public spaces would allow various identities to express themselves. In this postmodern view, trivialization (the invasion of private matters into the public space) would stretch the field of choice for identities, commercialization (producing on demand) would make ideas accessible by forging them on the framework of working-class culture, spectacle (replacing rational debate with spectacular communication) would

accentuate the appeal to emotions, fragmentation (into distinct, overlapping public spheres) would allow public debate from different perspectives, and deplored apathy towards public matters would be in fact a new way of doing politics and being politically involved (McKee, 2005). We may recognize in this analysis the tokens of global culture: global reach, diversity, polyphony, empowerment. It is not insignificant that Habermas himself acknowledges the critical potential of the public, become pluralistic (Habermas, 1992, 438).

3. THE COSMOPOLITAN ACTORS AND THEIR POWER

Despite contrasting visions of a global community, the concept of a global society bringing together people from different cultures, sharing the same ideals, is very much the talk of the day. The view (often dismissed as a highly utopian empty concept) comes as a continuation of the more comfortable idea of globalization as an instance of modernization, which has come to signify an emancipation from the strains of national topography (community included). Whether "globalization is, *au fond*, a continuation, albeit in an intensified and accelerated form, of the perduring challenge of modernization" (Berger, 2002, 16), or a postmodern stance involving the loss of national perspectives, it follows that all concepts pertaining to modernity should be at least revised, if not re-defined, to answer the challenges of the process. Defenders of globalization as a distinct historical epoch call for the necessity of an ideology that would govern, organize and imbue this state.

No study of global projects can be attempted without the "critical investigation of the ideological project … called <globalism>." (Steger, 2007, 380) The general feeling among globalist academia is that global flows of objects, images and discourses of universal appeal somehow have the edge over national imagination. Still, such competitive advantage loses its force in the absence of a global community that would manage the flows for the benefit of the world. In creating this new loyalty, emancipation is a significant process – emancipation not only from space (as in Scholte's concept of deterritorialized experience), but also from time and 'collective memory' (Beck, 2002, 27). Consequently we should not understand that the "geocultural and geolinguistic locations of modernity" (a term coined by Mignolo, 1998, 38, to discuss civilization processes) belong to the non-space of globality, but that they are rather reinterpretations of "natural" allegiances.

The ideological deconstruction of modern national perspectives should be followed by a new critical theory which might well be cosmopolitanism. A cosmopolitan social and political perspective would need to build a moral authority (which some researchers believe to be "grounded in the *language of universal individual rights and needs*" – Hunter and Yates, 2002, 338), but also open up "*negotiation spaces and strategies which the national viewpoint precludes*", such as relations of power in the global arena or the power of actors in new political networks (Beck, 2007, 175). Changes in the geography of global cultural interactions (Held *et al.,* 2004, 387, Scholte, 2000, 59, Scholte, 2003, 85, Smith, 2003, 279), the spreading of modern cultural institutions (Tomlinson, 2003, 270), the plurality of cultures (following the earlier fragmentation of societies - Connor, 2000, 376), increasing reflexivity impacting the structure of social relations (Giddens, 2005, 63), are all signs of a shift in the symbolic structure of the world

(Thompson, 2003, 246), where culture is power (see Castells, 1999). The global civil sphere would harbor the production and negotiation of meaning (Schirato and Webb, 2003, 137, discussing Hardt's and Negri's proposition in "Empire").

Cosmopolitans do not share a common past, but project a paradigm of communitarian bonding in the future. 'The moral epistemology' that feeds cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2004), irrespective of its vagueness in present, would have the double advantage of imagining a new cultural order and of projecting it in the future. The cosmopolitan agreement on values and their weight would not lead to harmony without the necessary companion of pluralism, which Appiah (2006) calls "fallibilism" (admitting that our share of knowledge is imperfect).

Part of the problem in trying to seize the loyalties of citizens towards a cosmopolitan ideal lies in the disjuncture between imagined and real communities. One solution would be to allow imagination to play its part in designing new patterns of collective life (Appadurai, 1996) that would help communities not only imagine better worlds, but construct them. Within this frame research of social build-ups would play the part of imagination going practical (Appadurai, 2000).

Before Beck, cosmopolitanism was seen as departing from the 'natural' order of local attachment and entering the fuzzy, abstract order of non-attachment. Beck claims that 'cosmopolitanization means *internal* globalization, globalization *from within* the national societies' (Beck, 2002, 17). 'Banal' cosmopolitanism (Ong, 2008) or 'grassroots globalization' (Appadurai) characterizes those individuals who behave as cosmopolitans because of globalization awareness (Axford and Huggins). Although lacking in some respects the visible side of performance, this form of low globalization could shape the cosmopolitan society to whom it feeds a narration which, in time, could create loyalty, very much like loyalty to localism. Cosmopolitanism is, basically, an alternative to modernization as put forward by the given cultural paradigm. By questioning the value attached to 'inherited' principles, the cosmopolitan creates culturally significant practices that form that system of meanings which, in Goodman's vision, is necessary for validating cosmopolitanism as an ideology ("An analysis of global culture … requires the identification of a set of practices that constitute a cultural field" – Goodman 2007, 335).

Global culture does not demand absolute loyalty from individuals *("all sectors of the emerging global culture enhance the independence of the individual over against tradition and collectivity"* – Berger, 9). The significant influence of global culture is evident in the reconstruction of identity: the individual acts as an autonomous producer of culture, taking a critical attitude towards community culture. The individual can construct her own hybrid cultural paradigm, putting together values from diverse cultures which resonate with her principles, values which might be more or less harmonized, but dramatically influence the cultural behavior of the individual, who feels freed from the pressure of the "official" culture. It is this process of individualization that spills into a new ethic of "personal cultural programming." (Lull, 2000) While culture is still a staple space for identity construction, "the locus of much cultural activity today is shifting from structure and tradition … to individual persons and their chosen networks that are composed of varying degrees of proximity and mediation." (Lull, 2006, 45)

Global culture comes with its own set of values, already simplified, tagged and self-explanatory, and with their own interpretation grid which attaches *significance* to values. The individual accepts the convention of this grid, since this

form of culture does not bring about the obligation of final attachment (Multiple allegiances and identities are often quoted among the liberating features of a global community.) The alleged freedom of the individual (individuals are *"autonomous, rational, resourceful, and acquisitive",* "pragmatic ... self-directed agents" - Hunter and Yates, 339 - 340) is, however, quite limited in the very relativity offered to her.

4. MEDIA'S ROLE IN CREATING THE GLOBAL PUBLIC SPHERE

The media have long been pinpointed as instrumental in negotiating and reflecting the meanings and ideological allegiances of individuals and communities. So long, that the complex relations of power between the media and its public have been clichéd (Curran, 2006, 139). Understanding the complex exchanges between media and the publics, the power relations governing them, the configuration of the knowledge circulated among them, the fields of action opened up to the publics thus empowered and the ethical implications of this interchange is, undoubtedly, one of the most fertile grounds to explore in future years (in the encouraging words of Couldry, "a new map of media studies" should include "two crucial landmarks (knowledge, agency) that, assuming media research still wants a critical edge, imply a third (ethics)" – Couldry, 2006, 187). We find here much to encourage our analysis on how the media shape the public matters by involving an active public.

In the age of increasing reflexivity, the media appropriate the reflective instruments needed to turn spectators (long thought of as passive and weak) into an active, conscientious public. If, along this reality, one goes a step further towards the ideal of an ethical public space, then the media should be seen as a moral force enabling and creating such representations. The permanent negotiation of meaning and opinion (the contrapuntal seen by Silverstone, 2007, as the mediating logic governing the mediapolis) allows the creation of a moral public life ("our media provide the most pervasive and persuasive perceptual frameworks, in an increasingly global society, for the way in which meanings, representations and relationships to the other are offered and defined" – Silverstone, 101). If we employ Jeffrey Alexander's definition of the civil society as containing not only symbolic categories but also structures of feeling (among which, the idea of the public 'as it has inserted itself into social subjectivity' – Alexander, 2006, 72), we must allow for the media (as a communicative institution) to provide interpretations and define representations of the public.

Although there is still no theory of the relationship between media and cosmopolitan identity development ("media and morality … currently lacks a sophisticated and rounded *theorization* and *examination* of the relationship between the media and the development of a moral *identity* – an identity that has come to be described as *cosmopolitan*" - Ong, 5), it is not far-fetched to claim that the media are able to build empathy between local and distant communities and nurture attachment to cosmopolitan identity. By encouraging reflexivity, media take a stand on inducing social change. One of their instruments is mediation, defined by Silverstone as the "dialectical process in which institutionalized media of communication are involved in the general circulation of symbols in social life" (Silverstone, 109). It is shaped towards the ideal foundation of the mediapolis by the proper distance (which might be seen as the kind approach of difference), trust (in the view the media take),

complicity and collusion (in accepting the mediation of the media) and responsibility (for such shaping). A step further is to see mediation as a political process insofar as its potential to define public response and cosmopolitan traits in spectators (Chouliaraki, 2006, 18).

The dilemma is how to negotiate between the consequence of such mediation (namely, the creation of a cosmopolitan public) and public action. The ethical role of the media derives not only from responsibility to educate the public (if not yet global, through the work of transnational flows, then at least cosmopolitan, through the build up of its moral sphere by means of universal values), but from the infinitely more difficult task of inviting public action in the name of the cosmopolitan sensibility it has thus created. The moral issues involved by mediation derive from two transformations it brings about: immediacy and deterritorialization, both of which raise the issue of "rendering various moral horizons adequate" (Tomlinson, 2002, 252). In line with Tomlinson (who asks for taming moral issues from distant spaces, rather than require people to cover the "moral distance"), Chouliaraki tackles "the problematic of governmentality" associated with mediation, given its potential to influence the conduct of the public (Chouliaraki, 71). For instance, the "position of reflexive identification" of ecstatic news allows spectators to feel for and with distant sufferers (*ibid.*, 187), which amounts to cosmopolitan disposition (by breaking with the moral horizon of the locality, only to accede to "universal" morality). The long-standing issue of media power is thus refined by the trickier problem of media responsibility.

5. THE CASE OF ROMANIAN MEDIA CIVIC CAMPAIGNS
5.1 Hypothesis
It is now time to see how these changes in the public sphere and in the positions assumed by journalists and the public (and the subsequent transformations in the media role) work in the Romanian media landscape. The research hypothesis I start from in this analysis is that the journalists' thematic cut-up and the choice of medium mobilize the cosmopolitan sensibilities of the public. Endowed with deliberative instruments in a participative environment and presented with a controversial topic, the public gains a new identity as a reflexive producer of culture. Such militant campaigns initiated by the media integrate the public in a cosmopolitan civic perspective.

From among the initiatives that have lately been launched in the Romanian media landscape (the news channel Realitatea TV, *We demand respect!*, the internet - websites, blogs and Facebook), campaigns brought together by protest aimed at deficient public communication, politicians' irreverent attitude towards citizens, lack of vision in Romanian politics and pervasive media ignorance of true values, I have chosen the ongoing campaign of Jurnalul Naţional, *Resistance Movement*. Following the troublesome political campaigns of 2009, some newspapers and TV channels took an unprecedented stand against what they denounced as utter immorality of Romanian public sphere, and their campaigns have echoed in the public, rallying support from a whole range of public figures and anonymous citizens.

The ethos of mobilizing campaigns in Romanian media is quite rich: Generaţia aşteptată, Generaţia expirată [Waited-for Generation, Expired Generation] initiated by Cotidianul in 2006, and meant to identify agents of change and their

counterparts, 10 pentru Romania [10 for Romania], initiated by Realitatea TV, searching for influential personalities, Martor Ocular [Eye Witness], inviting Realitatea TV's watchers to post videos on the site denouncing shortcomings in the system. Jurnalul's campaign is illustrative for the symbolic mechanisms employed in the press for constructing a new social imagery and public culture, involving new social practices of the public. It is also relevant for a certain complicity between a public that trusts media enough to join the deliberative game it lays forth, and the media that incorporates the public into a setting of participative journalism. This complicity serves an educational finality. For the public, participation in the campaign is a way of appropriating and cultivating cosmopolitan disposition, while for the media it is a way of developing and polishing the deliberative discourse, and learning the techniques for building a public matter with the help of an active public.

Jurnalul Naţional is one of the few quality papers in Romania which managed to survive in print (with a readership of around 67.000 copies), partly due to its accompanying 'Library for all' books (reviving a much loved collection of good Romanian literature), and its supplements and Sunday papers on health and lifestyle. Jurnalul changed its identity several times from its launch in 1993, from tabloid to The Guardian-like format. The target audience is educated people between 20 and 40, with an above average income. Editorials signed by personalities in the press, in economics and politics are accompanied by investigations and feature articles on less known events in the Communist times. Part of a powerful media holding under the influence of opposition groups, Jurnalul has hosted a series of debates on Romanians' identity and values. Its editor, Marius Tucă, gained a reputation as an objective journalist, following his TV show in the mid-nineties, and is now at the forefront of Jurnalul's campaigns, many of them focusing on denouncing faults in the system and attempting a redress.

5.2 Elements of methodology

Given the scope of the paper, one should perhaps wonder about the most appropriate instruments to employ in the analysis. Any attempt at analyzing media role in promoting cosmopolitan values is in danger of falling down on several important points, the most prominent of which is probably that concerning the incongruity between instruments and scope. 'Global' or 'cosmopolitan' seem abstractions in the absence of the more salient 'national' perspective. Before tackling the issue of cosmopolitan perspectives within nationally delimited campaigns, however, we will follow the thematic construction and the involvement devices employed in the campaigns, in an attempt to demonstrate that the choice of medium and themes is instrumental in the construction of cosmopolitanism. Integrating in such an approach the three ensembles (semio-discursive, socio-communicative and of interpretation) which, in Charaudeau's view (1997), should govern the study of social discourses, seems a reasonable approach. Since the media have a role in constructing allegiances of the individual, the themes and instruments it chooses to put forward are relevant for the complex shifts of the public's perspective. So are the fields of action opened up as a result of debating both the issues and the ethical choices laid out to the public. Consequently, we have introduced in the methodological grid the followign elements: the position of journalists towards the issues launched and towards the contributing public, the symbolic distance created as a result of the complex interactions between the

journalists, the personalities and the anonymous readers, the types of participation and alliances proposed by the online forum, and the types of actors that are valued (the identities that are legitimized, the conventions and values of such actors). With such instruments we will attempt to outline how journalists construct public matters starting from general interest themes opened up to a public endowed with instruments of deliberative discussion.

5.3 The thematic orientation

The thematization space is relevant since it helps construct an axiological imaginary. The campaign approaches themes that are under subdued circulation among the public: national values are ignored, value appreciation follows arbitrary criteria, the political sphere perverts values, loyalty towards true values is at an all-time low.

The finality condition proclaimed by Jurnalul is to engage the public in developing an inventory of 'true' values and act based on them. 'The vocation of permanent beginnings' has been bewailed by many analysts as one of the prominent (and disturbing) features of Romanian culture. The constant attempt of cultural personalities to lay the foundations of their work on the ruins of former orientations and schools of thought, and the accompanying effort of defining Romanians' representative values, are the underlying enterprise of centuries of cultural creation. In this respect, the theme of the campaign launched by Jurnalul is not a new discovery. TV station Realitatea's campaign, launched on its site (We demand respect!) at about the same time with Jurnalul's, is strikingly similar, as we will see below. Nor is a novelty the treatment of value rejuvenation in the media and not in more traditional 'cultural' settings. Jurnalul's campaign, started in the print and online edition, moves towards a platform where petitions can be posted and signed by users (petitieonline.ro), Realitatea's campaign, launched on the site of the TV channel, invites comments on Voxpublica, its platform of comments, blogs and opinions, only to be picked up on socializing networks.

The choice of themes already announces the complicity between the journalists and the public, revolving around a mutual understanding of what is good for society. The manifesto of Jurnalul's campaign, written by Marius Tucă and posted on the campaign page (hosted by the site of the newspaper), identifies the most stringent issues of society, from Everybody's perspective, and vilifies the political class as corrupt, lacking vision, will and character. The threat to Romania's value system is denounced as immediate, inevitable and tragic in its consequences. Jurnalul posts different articles motivating the initiative ('Because we receive EU funds but aren't able to spend them, we have started the Resistance Movement!' 'Because we have been singing <Wake up, Romanians!> for 20 years and are still sleeping, we have started the Resistance Movement!'). Most reasons are gathered from the area of value/non-value, but the cut-up is unequal in terms of relevance or prominence (from fallacies in reason to failings to recognize true literary figures, for instance), probably in order to allow readers' identification with an array of social perspectives. Taking a stand against lack of civic action or ignorance of communitarian values is at the forefront of the discourses.

While this first stage is militant in tone and intention, the second stage introduces a more pronounced deliberative tone. The editorial of this new stage, 'Were we born in the right place? Why would you stay in Romania? Why would

you leave Romania?', gives a description of the desolate Romanian landscape and lists some areas of discontent, among which politics (and a particular understanding of democracy). 'Dreaming of running away from Romania' becomes habitual, as it was during Ceausescu's time. Despite all this, people return home because of 'inner nonsense'. Reasons for leaving are 'bizarre mentalities', indifferent and corrupt politicians; the counter-arguments are more emotionally laden: 'the color of Christmas and love' and 'sweet language'. The journalists' posts are imbued with cultural imagery and idioms, while personalities' interventions are emotional and defensive. In the words of a journalist, 'Talking about your relationship with Romania is like talking about your relationship with religion, with church. Much too intimate.'

The strategies of assembling information and delivering it from a perspective result in giving pre-interpreted information to the readers (ever since Goffman, frames serve not only for defining the situation, but also for interpreting it.) The retrospective construction of the event, for instance, derives legitimacy from previous states. The manifesto of Jurnalul campaign relies heavily on images of a distant, untainted past of fully-fledged values which, in time, have degenerated into negative reflections. The problem identified is approached in the name of collective actors.

The insufficient symbolic capital (sparse criteria for selecting values or establishing their representativity) is not the only argument that can be brought against the campaign. Critics emphasize various constraints (such as the difficulty of transfering a list of desirable values and behaviours into real life) and the ethical dimensions of the campaign. If the campaign is just a media concept based on spectacular devices, is it moral to invite confessions of the public on very sensitive themes? The question can be answered if the journalists are entrusted with a second finality (besides that of legitimizing their own discourse by the use of anonymous voices): attempting a change in the public's behaviour. We will tackle this issue below.

5.4 Mechanisms for involving the public

What is relatively new in such campaigns is the treatment of the theme (value definition) in a new medium (the online forum involving direct participation) by new actors (the reading public). The mere access granted to the public to new forms of representation is not a great breakthrough. What is groundbreaking is that the journalists make use of a new medium to select a public and endow this public with two instruments: *the deliberative mode* (forcing the public to acquire some competence not only in the topic, but also in building arguments to qualify their assertions) and the *rhetoric of emotions* generating discursive effects.

In order to identify the types of actors aimed at, selected and given visibility by the journalists, we will take a look at the types of participation open to the public and at the networking between the different participants. While any public involves rituals of participation and sociability, the unstable nature of an online public invited to debate a sensitive issue with some level of competence requires mediation from journalists that first offered the instrument of online deliberation. Besides legitimizing a theme (and the accompanying arguments developing it), by means of deliberative campaigns the journalists legitimize a citizen-public (and its accompanying emotions).

The campaign parades a manifesto, an anthem (sung by known figures of Romanian music) and the odd personality (actors, professionals, writers) supporting the initiative. The public are invited to join the movement (a list of Movement members is provided on the website) and to post reasons why they would or would not leave Romania. In terms of availability, the Movement is quite visible (a banner sends to the site from the main page of the online edition), and the public can choose whether to pass as generic identity ('a reader') or 'in person' (with full name) when writing on the forum. The second stage of the campaign allows even more freedom to the individuals, since many of their 'for or against' posts reach the front page, along with journalists' and personalities' posts (although previously selected by journalists from an array of pooled comments, probably on criteria of representativeness or relevance and to observe discretion). The selection of anonymous voices clearly follows that of types delineated in personalities' posts: professionals are given equal stage as private people telling their life story, for and against discourses are as visible as emotional renditions of the theme. Many of the public's roles are present here: they are information sources but also reflexive instances, anonymous actors/witnesses, but also civic actors.

However, it is the journalists' and personalities' discourse and arguments that set the tone of deliberation, and the readers' comments, while not arising to the aesthetic quality of professional writers/thinkers, reiterate some arguments, in defensive, poetic or cultural language, adding up to a line of thinking. Readers are free to comment on journalists' posts, but journalists preserve a position of 'objectivity' by not intervening in readers' discourse (although, as we have seen, some censorship takes place).

The campaign revives "certain media practices already active in the Romanian public space", "the journalist as a skeptical representative of collectivity" (Beciu, 2009, 61). Yet, while journalists regard themselves as representatives of collective identity in the frequent use of 'us' versus 'them' and the appeal to mutual responsibility against a degraded reality, the fact that the debate is apparently 'set free' after the initial input introduces some symbolic distance from the public. Even if such distancing produces its effects, it is undoubted that an active public (let aside its limited activism) will change the construction of public matters (since 'the media settings dedicated to the *active public* institute a certain imagery on the culture of public engagement' – Beciu, 2010, 10).

5.5 Strategies for legitimizing the movement

There are many elements in this campaign confirming the marketing logic governing similar past campaigns. The title of the campaign, the editorials, the mobilizing language used, the strategies for public visibility, all lead to a 'double discursive effect' (Beciu, 2009, 59): legitimizing the media initiative as a campaign of the newspaper and as a necessity for the public. The use of 'us' versus 'them', the diary of campaign (who else joined the movement, what other events were hosted under the slogan), the involvement of personalities, all lead to the idea of significant impact on the public. Since change is iminent, participation is a civic duty. The use of rhetoric strategies defining the issues that respond to citizens' needs has the potential not only to shape the journalist as a mediator, but also to facilitate the access of actors to the public sphere. Yet, apart from some instruments open to individuals (posting comments on the forum, joining the movement, posting life

stories), not many channels of direct intervention are available, leaving open the question of the relevance of such campaigns in 'real' life.

Here we must stop and inquire into the power of these campaigns to rally support from the public they claim to represent. Given the channels used for spreading Jurnalul's Resistance Movement: the web page of the newspaper, YouTube, the petition page, and their potentially cascading effects, the number of people openly joining the Movement is quite low (3500 for the website, 200 for the petition in June 2010). In contrast, a movement on Facebook, "Wake up! This is not your Romania!", begun by a private person, gathered 11.000 "friends". Part of the explanation is in the medium – the emotional involvement is lower on a socializing website, while another, perhaps more pungent, explanation resides in the fact that on Facebook no personalities were rallied, giving the members a feeling of belonging to a community of equals, rather than an exclusive club of "illuminated" citizens (A secondary thread of analysis might elaborate on the topic from Bourdieu's perspective of symbolic capital).

Before giving a final sentence on the comparative irrelevance of such movements, one should ponder on the various constraints governing them. The finality condition and the thematization space of the campaign have both been questioned as heavily indebted to the interests of the media trust, preoccupied with recovering from the potentially dangerous blows of face loss during the presidential campaigns (see Cătălin Sturza in *Observatorul Cultural*, 'Values Crisis and Death of Culture as Marketing Tools'). The commercial logic might have been forgiven, had the target not been missed: since the scope of issues was too broad and vague to allow precise identification of threats and enemies worth fighting against, rallying sizeable public figures to talk about the movement seems morally unacceptable, the disparity between the festive means (use of an anthem, among others) and the poor outcome being quite similar to putting on a fabulous upmarket carnival costume for a backstreet jig.

It is not to be inferred that *faire ressentir* is any more blamable than *faire savoir*. Staging objectivity is, by and large, the privilege of the media, and successfully negotiating spectacular devices to generate credibility shouldn't necessarily lead to chastising media morality against pre-established norms of deliberative communication. Rather, we should see "whether that particular format contributes – by means of specific scenic formulas, irrespective of their atypical dress – to the build-up of a public issue" (Beciu, 2009, 107). In this logic, the thematic construction, the staging of events and the deliberative mode are the tools of the journalist who is highly involved in the topic and who not only comments on events, but provokes them (Charaudeau, 140-143). And one cannot deny the relative novelty of all of the above tools in the Romanian public space. The cut-up and hierarchy of themes (the otherwise subdued interest in value construction and recognition amounts to general interest topic), the choice of deliberative discourse (in a media space seemingly dominated by narratives) and the scenes chosen for mediation between publics (from the print newspaper to the online edition, from a TV station's website to opinion platforms, from socializing networks to blogs) create a movement (to use the very name) whose potential for changing perspectives is not to be denied.

The eclectic devices used in the campaign (militant vocabulary, use of mobilizing language to enphasize civic motivations and iminence of action,

marketing logic – through the promotion of hierarchies, dichotomies, cumulative effect of multiple channel use and employment of deliberative practices) tie in with the various facets of journalists' involvement: as ideologists (at the forefront of fight against 'spoilers' of true values), as civic actors (mobilizing the public), as authorities (on representative values), as average citizens (sharing the same experiences with the public), as teachers (of desirable behaviours). Journalists that assume all these roles have a certain vision of the public space and of the public. Mediation between various viewpoints is appropriated as a deliberative instrument (all the while, in media studies, '<interpretative> would not equal the journalist's unfounded subjectivity; deliberative [journalism], meaning interpretation constructed on the principles of mediation among several viewpoints and providing knowledge for the citizen-public' – Beciu, 2007, 8).

5.6 The construction of the cosmopolitan public

While the work of such instruments in the practice of participative journalism in Romania is highly illustrative of the transformation of media discourse towards a more deliberative stance, one other change is important as well: the media construction of the public. Valuing the public as a gathering of cases and experiences, as a participative self-reflexive partner, works well with the idea of a cosmopolitan public sphere relying on self-conscious individuals.

The choice of themes and the deliberative practices employed signal a preoccupation with individuals' empowerment as creators of culture. Since the campaign is imbued with the issue of value recognition and revival which would lead to a better Romania, one might wonder whether this campaign does not display, at the most, the very opposite of cosmopolitan value formation. Can a campaign aimed at cultivating communitarian values be an instrument for universalist reflexivity? And what qualifies the term 'cosmopolitan' by which we choose to define the new identity of the public? Going back to the hypothesis of this analysis, do deliberative practices work up the cosmopolitan sensibilities of the active public?

Irrespective of the low turnout of the public in Jurnalul's campaign, the use of an interactive medium (the online forum) creates the stage for dialogue and empowerment. Although not all readers' posts make the front page, their proximity with journalists' and personalities' arguments not only 'democratizes' this virtual agora, but also multiplies perspectives on the issues under debate. By laying open the question of values representativeness, the media offer the public the possibility to acquire moral authority as producers of meaning. The volitional act of joining a movement and posting comments takes the readers to a higher level of autonomy. One might claim that this autonomy is quite limited, given the journalists' intervention in selecting front-page posts. However, the possibilities offered to the public at large (of reading both front and back page posts together with more 'qualified' opinions) amount to the creation of an environment where production of meaning is accompanied by *negotiation* of meaning. In this respect, the public comes to acquire cosmopolitan traits. Emancipation from 'traditional' perspectives on values is what results from debating their representativeness, be such perspective only an enrichment or confirmation of traditional thought. Awareness of the axiological imbuement of actions, on the one hand, and of the universal validity of local values, on the other, means internalizing a global perspective.

The short answer to the above questions would be that all reflection on value revival may be a first step towards such 'high education.' This attempt at giving a higher meaning to realities, at putting aside the degraded national environment and immediate political concerns for an alternative agenda of cultivating universalist values is in tune with what is required of cosmopolitans. A local context does not revoke universalist propensity; nor can universalist sensibilities be devoid of local meaning. A critical appraisal of current affairs, given the chance of deliberative devices lending it a voice (and potential public action) might well serve the purpose. In defense of this view we might summon Chouliaraki's elegant solution of a similar dilemma: since Western public life offers a "narrow repertoire of participatory positions …for the ordinary citizen" (a fact made clear before by Boltanski), it is hard to account for the way in which "transnational flows of visibility actually cultivate a 'beyond the nation' cultural resonance among Western audiences". The way out is to relieve the public from its local bonds and see it "as a symbolic act of cultural identity" (Chouliaraki, 12). If we add the cosmopolitan potential of mediation, we have a double-fold contingency that rings true.

6. CONCLUSIONS

It is high time to draw a conclusion on the media role in the construction of a cosmopolitan community through deliberation and value redefinition.

The study of the rise of a global public sphere allowing self-reflexive publics to define their identity is a fruitful track to follow in globalization studies. The publics agreeing on shared narrative frameworks and meanings become agents of cosmopolitanization. Globalization from below could shape a cosmopolitan society by creating a set of culturally significant practices, along with the legitimation of moral authority and definition of relations of power between actors. The development of global communication flows and the individual's access to means of self-expression encourage new forms of political and cultural engagement.

Employing reflexive instruments in the mediation between communities and their narratives, the media can well be the scene needed for the build-up of a global public sphere. The mediating logic governing the mediapolis might lead to the creation of a moral public life. The dilemma laid before the media is how to negotiate between the consequences of mediation (among which, the cosmopolitan identity) and public action.

An analysis of the staging of an event as a public issue should reflect on the instruments employed by the media (the themes and experiences brought forth), the symbolic sphere (values, opinions, stereotypes, emotions), the mediation practices between the social identities, the imaginary communities built on the basis of shared narratives and cultural standing. The construction of a cosmopolitan perspective invites comment on the ethical choices opened to the public by the media. The mediation between the political and cultural allegiances of the public is one of the instances encouraging the idea of media as the frame of choice for forging a cosmopolitan perspective. In reflecting upon the power potential of networked actors and the reconstruction of the political and ethical space through the media we

13

answer the imperative of emancipation from the national viewpoint towards a new critical theory, as proposed by Beck.

REFERENCES

1.   Alexander, J. (2006). *The Civil Sphere*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
3. Appadurai, A. (2000). "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination", *Public Culture*, 12 (1), pp. 1-19, Duke University Press.
4. Appiah, K.A. (2004). *The Ethics of Identity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
5. Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a World of Strangers*, New York, London: Norton.
6. Axford B., Huggins, R. *Globalization and the Prospects for Cosmopolitan World Society,* http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/vol/cosmopolis/papers/axford.html.
7. Beciu, C. (2010). "*New media* şi reconfigurarea sferei televizuale. Construcţia mediatică a *publicului activ"* [*New Media* and the Reconfiguration of the TV Sphere. The Media Construction of the *Active Public*], *Revista Română de Sociologie* [Romanian Review of Sociology], 5-6 (in press).
8. Beciu, C. (2009). *Comunicare şi discurs mediatic. O lectură sociologică* [Communication and Media Discourse. A Sociological Reading], Bucureşti: Comunicare.ro.
9. Beciu, C. (2007). "Forme mediatice de dezbatere a normelor europene. Redefinirea 'misiunii' jurnalistului – elemente analitice (I)" [Media Forms of Debating European Norms. Redefining the Journalist's 'Mission' – Analytic Elements (I)], *Revista Română de Sociologie* [Romanian Review of Sociology], 3-4, year XVIII.
10. Beck, U. (2002). "The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 1-2, (19), pp. 17-44.
11. Beck, U. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: A Critical Theory for the Twenty-first Century*, in George Ritzer (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
12. Berger, P. (2002). *Introduction. The Cultural Dynamics of Globalization*, in Peter L. Berger, Samuel P. Huntington (eds.), *Many Globalizations. Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press.
13. Calhoun, C. (1992). *Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere*, in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
14. Castells, M. (1999). *L'ère de l'information. Le pouvoir de l'identité* (tome II), Paris : Éditions Fayard.
15. Charaudeau, P. (1997). *Le discours d'information médiatique. La construction du miroir social*, Nathan.
16. Chouliaraki, L. (2006). *The Spectatorship of Suffering*, London : Sage.

17. Connor, S. (1996/2000). *Cultural Sociology and Cultural Sciences*, in Bryan S. Turner (ed.). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Theory,* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

18. Couldry, N. (2006). *Transvaluing Media Studies: or, beyond the Myth of the Mediated Centre*, in James Curran and David Morley (eds.), *Media and Cultural Theory*, London: Routledge.

19. Curran, J. (2006). *Media and Cultural Theory in the Age of Market Liberalism*, in James Curran and David Morley (eds.), *Media and Cultural Theory*, London: Routledge.

20. Giddens, A. (1990/2005). *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

21. Goodman, D. (2007). *Globalization and Consumer Culture*, in George Ritzer (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

22. Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translation by Thomas Burger, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

23. Habermas, J. (1992). *Further Reflections on the Public Sphere*, in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

24. Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., Perraton, J. (2004). *Transformări globale. Politică, economie şi cultură* [Global Transformations. Politics, Economics and Culture], Iaşi: Polirom.

25. Hunter, J.D., Yates, J. (2002). *In the Vanguard of Globalization. The World of American Globalizers*, in Peter L. Berger, Samuel P. Huntington (eds.), *Many Globalizations. Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press.

26. Lull, J. (1995/2000). *Media, Communication, Culture. A Global Approach*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

27. Lull, J. (2006). *The Push and Pull of Global Culture*, in James Curran and David Morley (eds.), *Media and Cultural Theory*, London: Routledge.

28. McKee, A. (2005). *The Public Sphere: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

29. Mignolo, W.D. (1998). *Globalization, Civilization Processes, and the Relocation of Languages and Cultures*, in Fredric Jameson, Masao Miyoshi (eds.), *The Cultures of Globalization*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

30. Ong, J. (2008). *The Cosmopolitan Continuum. Locating Cosmopolitanism in Media and Cultural Studies*, http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse/Conference/Conference_Papers_Keep_them_here/CosmoContinuumCorpusOng.pdf

31. Schirato, T., Webb, J. (2003). *Understanding Globalization,* London: Sage Publications.

32. Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization. A Critical Introduction*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

33. Scholte, J. A. (2000/2003). *What is Global about Globalization*, in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

34. Silverstone, R. (2007). *Media and Morality. On the Rise of the Mediapolis*, London: Polity.
35. Smith, A. (2000/2003) *Towards a Global Culture?,* in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate,* Cambridge: Polity Press.
36. Steger, M.B. (2007). *Globalization and Ideology*, in George Ritzer (ed.). *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
37. Sturza, C. "Criza Valorilor şi moartea Culturii ca instrumente de marketing" [Values Crisis and Death of Culture as Marketing Tools], *Observatorul Cultural*, http://www.observatorcultural.ro/Criza-Valorilor-si-moartea-Culturii-ca-instrumente-de-marketing*articleID_23182-articles_details.html
38. Thompson, J. (2000/2003). *The Globalization of Communication*, in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate,* Cambridge: Polity Press.
39. Tomlinson, J. (2000/2003). *Globalization and Cultural Identity*, in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate,* Cambridge: Polity Press.
40. Tomlinson, J. (2002). *Globalizare şi cultură* [Globalization and culture], Timişoara: Amarcord.

Websites
www.jurnalul.ro
www.miscareaderezistenta.jurnalul.ro
www.petitieonline.ro
www.realitatea.net
www.voxpublica.realitatea.net