

POLITIKON

The IAPSS Journal of Political Science



Volume 13 Number 2
October 2007

ISSN 1583-3984

Politikon: The IAPSS Journal of Political Science

Editors in Chief

Iana Stantieru
IAPSS Chairperson

Klavdija Pojbic
IAPSS Vice-Chairperson

Editorial Board

Andrea Amici
*University of Rome
III*

Adrien Jahier
*University of Toulouse
I*

Dylan Kissane
*University of South
Australia*

Anders Kusk
Aarhus University

Marco Magini
University of Rome III

Zoe Onutu
University of Babes-Bolyai

Mehmet Ozkan
University of Linköping

Board of Reviewers

Ioana Ban
*Central European
University*

Maja Bucar
*University of
Ljubljana*

Georgiana Ciceo
*University of Babes-
Bolyai*

Radu Comanescu
*University of Babes-
Bolyai*

Dion Curry
*Central European
University*

Cristina Dogot
*University of Babes-
Bolyai*

Darragh Farrell
*National University of
Ireland*

Urik Gad
*Københavns
Universitet*

Dessislava Gavrilova
*Central European
University*

Sergiu Gherghina
*Central European
University*

Irakil Gvaramadze
*Central European
University*

Laura Herta
*University of Babes-
Bolyai*

Anna Horvath
*Central European
University*

Dylan Kissane
*University of South
Australia*

Damian Lataan
*Flinders University of
South Australia*

Igor Luksic
*University of
Ljubljana*

Ovidiu Pecican
*University of Babes-
Bolyai*

Katharine Vadura
*University of South
Australia*

Ronald Pohoryles
*ICCR
Austria*

Vivien Schmidt
Boston University

Suncica Macura
*University of
Ljubljana*

Karin Pedersen
Aarhus Universitet

Feyzullah Yilmaz
Linköping University

Politikon is the academic journal of the International Association for Political Science Students (IAPSS). It is recognized as one of the leading academic journals publishing the work of students from across the fields of political science and international relations. Founded in 2001, the journal is published twice yearly and distributed in hard copy and online to more than 10,000 IAPSS members in more than 40 countries on every continent, as well as outside the IAPSS network. *Politikon* publishes the best in undergraduate and graduate student scholarship from around the world. The peer-review and refereeing process involves full Professors, leading academics and experts from across the world and abstracts from *Politikon* are included in the International Political Science Association's (IPSA) Annual International Political Science Abstracts.

Politikon: The IAPSS Journal of Political Science



Volume 13 Number 2 - October 2007

Contents

Foreword: Reaching out to new horizons KLAVDIJA POJBIC	5
The outcomes of inadequate assimilation of Roma in socialist Romania SILVIA URSU	7
Which theory of Democracy? TOMMASO VISIONE	18
Comparing portraits: US media and foreign policy DERRICK I GOODRICH	33
Does pragmatism always work? Political objectives of the Australian government in North East Asia RACHEL WEST	51

Reaching out to new horizons

Klavdija Pojbic

Editor in Chief, *Politikon: The IAPSS Journal of Political Science*

klavdija.pojbic@gmail.com

We are happy to present you the new edition of *Politikon*, which can be considered as the result of teamwork of two consecutive editorial boards. The bigger share was done by the previous editorial board, which collected the articles and submitted them to revision. The new editorial board had to finalize the issue, and we did it with great pleasure.

It is an honor for me to have gotten the task to write this introductory article, and I will use this opportunity to introduce you to your the new editorial board. It is composed of four members. The role of the editor in chief was entrusted to me. My name is Klavdija Pojbic and I come from Slovenia. I am a fourth year undergraduate student of International Relations on the Faculty for Social Sciences in Ljubljana, Slovenia. My special interests are diplomacy, rhetoric and negotiations techniques. This is also why I feel that I am competent to improve the *Politikon's* position in its social environment.

Adrien Jahier comes from France. He has been elected as a member of the *Politikon* editorial board for a financial funds enhancement project, for the development of the distribution strategy for hard copies and web format and the creation of a scientific board. He has completed a Bachelor's degree and Master I in Political science (with distinction). He also has a diploma from the Development and International studies' institute. After completing his Master II, he would like to write a Phd in International Relations.

Andrea Amici comes from Italy and is a master candidate in International Relations at the University of Rome III. He joined IAPSS because it gives students the opportunity to contribute to the world's development, no matter where they come from. *Politikon* is especially important to him, because it gathers voices from the world youth, the best youth, to give them a platform to be heard. His values are ambition, pride and enthusiasm, this is the way he hopes to live this experience and convey a part of this positive spirit to you all.

Mehmet Ozkan is from Turkey, currently located in Seville (Spain), and is studying for a Master's degree in International and European Relations at Linköpings University, Sweden. Prior to this, he studied International Relations in Turkey and South Africa for BA and MA respectively. His main interests are Southern African politics, Turkey and the Middle Eastern issues along with his ongoing research on Pivotal Middle Powers and re-making of the global order. He wants to use his international educational and publication experiences for *Politikon* to make it globally well-known as a credible journal; that is why he believes in publishing quality works of young political science students in

Politikon. He aims, as a member of the editorial board, to establish an advisory board consisting of professors and academics from different parts of the world. By doing so, he firstly believes that *Politikon* will automatically become well-known in academic circles and secondly, it would be regarded as a credible journal due to fact that it has a significant advisory board. Online distribution and availability of *Politikon* in university databases is another concern that Mehmet takes very seriously. In his opinion it is also the IAPSS members' organizational responsibility to make sure that the journals will be available in their university databases. Therefore, he kindly asks you to help the editorial board in this crucial point. Together we will reach out to new horizons.

* * * *

But enough about us. This journal is from and for you. The present issue is comprised of five very good but also very different articles. We could identify only one common point, which, however, is no less important - the democratic values.

Silvia Ursu's *The outcomes of inadequate assimilation of Roma in socialist Romania* analyzes the effect of the 'assimilation' policies promoted by the socialist regime towards the Roma in Romania. It is an indication of the democratic deficit, which condemns the Roma to the everlasting cycle of poverty and degradation.

Tommaso Visone's *Which Theory of Democracy?* introduces us to different theoretical approaches that try to explain and incorporate the term democracy into their framework. He explains the contemporary theory on democracy and also offers some criticism on the current mainstream interpretations.

Derrick I. Goodrich's *Comparing Portraits: U.S. Media and Foreign Policy* focuses on the importance of the free press for the formation of public opinion. He is aware of the fact that free press is essential for a functioning democratic society because it exercises the role of a watchman over the government. With his paper he aims to recount the historic role the U.S. media has played in the unfolding of the international events.

Rachael West's *Does Pragmatism Always Work? : Political Objectives of the Australian Government in Northeast Asia* discusses the impact of the Australian foreign policy on its standing in the named region. She claims that national values create legitimate differences in the objectives pursued in Australian foreign policy, and explores these differences through Australia's position as a Western, liberal democracy located in the Asia-Pacific area.

Hopefully, reading this issue will contribute to your bigger understanding of the important political matters. Together we can reach out to new horizons and make a difference in a World which talks a lot about democracy, but does much less for it.

The outcomes of inadequate assimilation of Roma in socialist Romania

Silvia Ursu

s_ursu@yahoo.com

The paper analyzes the effect of the ‘assimilation’ policies (housing, education, employment, pronatalist) promoted by Ceaușescu’s socialist regime toward the Roma on the extreme degradation of their social and economic status in the transition period which followed. The failure of these policies increased their discrimination and deteriorated the community social ties, locking the Roma in a vicious inter-generational cycle of poverty and exclusion. To support this argument further, an intra-group comparison between a deprived Roma community, Brazilia, which was heavily influenced by the communist ‘assimilation’ policies and a better-off Roma community, Boghiș, which stayed isolated and preserved its ethnic identity was carried out.

Introduction

Transition to the market economy marked a period of rapid decline in the quality of life and impoverishment of the general population in the former socialist Romania. However, the most affected by the socio-economic changes brought by transition were the Roma.

Inspired by the North American literature on urban deprivation and exclusion, a number of social scientists preoccupied with the study of the Roma ‘problem’ in Central and Eastern Europe, categorized the Roma as the ‘underclass’ of post-socialism (Emigh et al., 2001; Ladányi, 2001; Magyari et al., 2001). They are characterized by persistent poverty, they have limited or no access to opportunity structures, low quality social capital and social networks, so that “those in the underclass have almost no chance of finding roles in the new division of labour or of having ‘normal’ jobs, income, housing, social security, or access to better education for their children” (Ladányi et al., 2000 in Stewart, 2001a, p.2). As in the case of the American urban underclass formation, Emigh et al. (2001) identified discrimination, structural economic transformations (Wilson, 1987, pp.20-62) and segregation (Massey and Denton, 1993, pp.3-9) as the main factors leading to the formation of Roma ‘underclass’ in Eastern Europe. They argue that the deindustrialization following the collapse of the planned economy led to a decline in well paid low-skill work which was usually performed by the lower segments of the socialist working class, and left most of the Roma unemployed and unemployable.

There is much resemblance, indeed, between the experiences of deprivation of African-Americans in the inner-cities and the Roma in Central and Eastern

European countries; therefore, it is difficult to contest the authors' borrowing of North American theoretical concepts referring to urban poverty in describing the evolution of socio-economic situation of the Roma. However, transition was a much more complex process than the economic transformations in the U.S. in the 1970s, affecting not only members of the minority groups, but also a large segment of the majority. Nevertheless, the Roma suffered most from these changes. After 10 years of transition an improvement in the socio-economic situation of all ethnic groups in Romania, but the Roma, is noticed. The improvement in the case of Roma is minimal or even lacking. In this context, I hypothesize that the inefficient assimilation policies promoted by most Communist regime in Romania between 1950s and 1980s, determined the marginalization of Roma by leaving them without skills, means and opportunities to fight the hardships brought by the transition to a market system. The failure of these assimilation policies increased their discrimination and deteriorated the community social ties, locking the Roma in a vicious inter-generational cycle of poverty and exclusion.

The assimilation policies promoted by the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) accelerated the shift from their identification as a distinct ethnic group with distinct traditions and lifestyle, which were discriminated against but generally accepted by the non-Roma, to their categorization as a socially inferior group, a categorization which is more salient in terms of social stigma and discrimination than the previous. In the absence of these policies, the group would most likely still have experienced increasing poverty and degradation of quality of life, for these were the experiences of the general population in post-Socialist Romania, however, they would have been better prepared to cope with the challenges of transition, thus, avoid being marginalized and deprived of life chances to the extent of an 'underclass'.

The aim of this short paper is to elucidate the content of the Roma assimilation policies promoted by the RCP during the Socialist period and their negative outcomes for the transition. In order to make my argument stronger, I will undertake a case study: an intra-group comparison between a deprived Roma community which was heavily influenced by the communist 'assimilation' policies and a better-off Roma community which stayed isolated and preserved its ethnic identity.

The effects of the Communist policies on Roma marginalization and deprivation

The main policies promoted by RCP that aimed at assimilating Roma in the Romanian society during Socialism were: compulsory education, sedentarization and housing 'systematization', 'integration to work', and Ceausescu's active pronatalist policy.

The dual relationship between the Roma and the majority of the population [on one hand being needed for their skills and craftsmanship, on the other, being stigmatized] found a reflection in the Romanian Communist Party's (RCP) approach toward the Roma. Until 1970s the party's approach was characterized

by lack of policies altogether, which permitted prejudice and the emergence of “Gypsies” as a problematic social group, followed by active Gypsy “problem” solving policies in reply to the previous lack of approach (Beck, 1984). The failure of these policies lied in the fact that they aimed at reaching short-term quantitative results such as high school enrolment ratio or high socialist labour participation without treating the roots of the social problems that Roma were confronted with.

The character of socialist Roma policies depended on the RCP’s vision of minority culture in general, and the Roma in particular, and of economic progress. The RCP was exploiting the arguments of the Marxist-Leninist theory of ethnicity, which operated in terms of class and not of ethnic minority belonging, for its nationalistic purposes. The Romanian culture was seen superior to the culture of any other minority group and the party was aiming for a gradual elimination of national differences through the assimilation of ethnic groups. Nevertheless, because of better mobilization and active intelligentsia enrolled in the Romanian Communist Party, the Hungarian, German, and Serbian minorities obtained their cultural rights and education in their native language. The officials felt that the Gypsies, unlike other minorities, had neither a “protective state”, nor a “history”, nor a “culture and civilization” through written languages to justify their claims for minority rights (Crowe, 1991, p.69). Thus, they were never considered a national minority during the Communist rule. Giving up their ethnic identity and lifestyle was the price of admission in the ‘normal’ Romanian society.

Secondly, modernization and advanced forms of production became central to Romanian values during socialism and the ‘backward’ and ‘uneducated’ Roma had to embrace those values before given any minority rights. Michael Stewart (Stewart, 2001b, p.83) incorporated the policy of the Hungarian Communist Party’s policies toward Roma in the following formula:

*(Gypsy) * (socialist wage-labour + housing + education) = (Hungarian worker) * (Gypsy folklore)*

A similar situation is characteristic for Romania, except the folklore. Ceaușescu limited the number of Gypsies in folk ensembles to 60% of the fear that this could spoil the ‘superior’ Romanian culture (Pons, 1999, p.32). The cultural deprivation distorted the identity, coherence and sense of solidarity of the Roma minority.

There were two aspects to the housing policy for the Roma. The 1950s forced sedentarization which involved the confiscation of their horses and carriages (Pons, 1999). The second was Ceaușescu’s “systematization” programme in 1980s which involved the destruction and removal of unhygienic Roma settlements and houses with an end-goal of dispersing the large groups of Roma among the Romanian population for an efficient integration. They received housing in apartment buildings in urban areas or were placed in nationalized houses, which were confiscated from German emigrants (Helsinki Watch, 1991).

Although these policies aimed at improving housing conditions, they failed in major part due to their perverted implementation. After “systematization” the Roma were concentrated in flats in urban areas which formed urban ghettos. The quality of housing was low and their dwellings degraded rapidly. They were moved in small apartments, insufficiently spacious for the large Roma families. The Romanian sociologist Nicolae Gheorghe, who worked for the RCP Commission on Demography from 1976-1989 (Helsinki Watch, 1991, p.23), testified that he was shocked by the misery of those blocks: “So many people concentrated in such a small amount of space. The blocks of flats were built in bad condition. Water is not running. Some Romanians live in these conditions as well, but mostly Gypsies. The result is a deterioration of social life.”

The Roma who were moved in confiscated houses from German emigrants faced strong resentment from the non-Roma neighbours and in many cases did not receive property papers for those houses being left at the risk of evacuation during the transition when nationalized property was returned to owners.

During transition, the results of the housing policies were residential segregation, overcrowding and bad housing conditions. Many of the Roma, who received apartments among the non-Roma, sold them in order to avoid the prejudice, spent the money, and moved back to huts and tents in their previous settlements. In some cases, the restitution of land to previous owners led to the spatial isolation of Roma houses from social institutions such as the school, the town hall, the bakery as it happened in the Romanian village Fize (Pons 1999, p.76). Segregation left the Roma out of the electrification programme and connection to the water system. ICCV (2002, p.32) found that the Roma experienced worse housing conditions compared to the majority population and that the average number of people per room for Roma was almost twice that of the general population. In 25.6% of the Roma households the number of people per room was 3.01, compared to the corresponding percentage for the entire population - 1.7%.

The housing policy was accompanied by the socialist employment policy which strived to achieve full-employment, even if that meant to artificially create unnecessary jobs for people. The Roma, who until then were ‘idle’ or were performing ‘backward’ jobs, needed to be integrated into the socialist working system. This was done by employing them in the lowest niches of the Romanian socialist economy mainly as collective farm workers and as unskilled manual workers. According to the 1956 and 1966 censuses there was an increase in the number of workers and collective farmers of 6.92% and 23.65% respectively (Gilberg, 1974, p.460). The collective farmers were the most poor of all the socialist workers (Pons, 1999). Moreover, the Gypsies continued to have a low mobilization in the functionaries/intellectuals category and even experienced a decline in 1966.

During the 1970s the “integration to work” policy intensified. However, it did not integrate but forced the Gypsies to work through the Decree 153/1970, which persecuted the unemployed and threw them in jail for six months

(Helsinki Watch, 1991). Although there was an alternative Decree 25/1969 related to parasitism, which made the government take responsibility to find a job for the unemployed, the Decree 153 was predominantly used in relation to unemployed Roma. In an interview with Helsinki Watch (1991, p.28) Nicolae Gheorghe stated that Decree 153 targeted principally the Roma.

The 1983 Report compiled by the Propaganda Section of the Central Committee informed that the RCP's attempts to integrate the Roma to work did not produce the expected results. In 1977 many of the Roma had temporary work and out of 65,000 only 900 were qualified. In 1977, 32.7% of the Roma fit for work and 48% of Roma women were unemployed. In 1983, the situation worsened (Romanian Communist Party, 1983, p.109).

The goal of employment policies to integrate the Roma was a short-term one and led to the expulsion of this minority from the labour market during transition which perpetuated their poverty and marginalization. The restructuring of the large state enterprises after 1989 prompted the loss of jobs of unskilled worker, most of whom were Roma. In the context of discrimination outburst after the collapse, they were more likely than Romanians to lose their jobs. The Communist Party's support of full-employment motivated the creation of artificial unskilled jobs such as street-sweeping, which became unnecessary and unsustainable in transition.

Due to the fact that industrialization and nationalization decreased the demand for the products of the Roma traditional trades and forcefully transformed them into seasonal collective farmers, they lost their skills for these crafts. In the beginning of transition they were left out of the land privatization reform, and having lost their traditional skills, they were excluded from the labour market with no opportunities and means to enter it again. The dependency on the Communist production system and the disappearance of their competencies, which maintained the functionality of the relationship with the non-Roma, made them vulnerable when the system collapsed.

Furthermore, the Roma assimilation was to be realized by introducing compulsory education for them. Before socialism the level of education of the Roma was much more inferior compared to that of the non-Roma, due to their nomadic lifestyle and poverty. In 1956, the illiteracy rate among Roma over 8 years was high - 37.7%, compared to the 10.9 % of Romanians from the same age category (Gilberg, 1974, p.447). Out of the few Gypsies who were participating in education, the bulk was enrolled in primary school (18.17%), while there were virtually none enrolled in secondary and higher education. At seven-year level, less than 500 could be found (Gilberg, 1974, p.455). According to the national census, by 1966 almost all Roma were enrolled in primary schools - 96.61%, circa an 80% increase in one decade (Gilberg, 1974, p.463). However, their representation in vocational and technical schools and lyceums remained symbolic. In higher education Roma registered no gain at all.

The 1983 Report on Integration of Gypsies (Romanian Communist Party, 1983) revealed that many adult Gypsies were semi-literate or illiterate. Not understanding the necessity of schooling they were not motivating their children to attend school. Thus, the Roma sedentarization did not increase the school enrolment because understanding the importance of education lacked. The Report also noted that one of the reasons for low school attendance among Roma was poverty - a proof that the Party did not achieve the improvement of the Gypsies' economic position.

Despite the accomplishments which were registered on primary level, the reality of education conditions for Roma during the regime was different. The Roma were not allowed to have schools with teaching in their own language and were enrolled in Romanian or Hungarian schools, where they faced discrimination from teachers and peers. Many of the Roma children did not speak another language but Romanes which was an obstacle to school integration and achieving good results. As a result, many of them were 'diagnosed' with learning disabilities and sent to the so-called 'special' schools for mentally disabled. This put obstacles for their later social integration (Mihok, 2003).

During the transition the situation did not change. In 1998 Roma school participation was 15-25% lower compared to the general population at primary level, 30% at gymnasium level, and almost 40% at the high school level (ICCV 2002, p.23). Moreover, the few Roma who did gain higher levels of education during Communism gave up their ethnic identity to avoid prejudice and have access to the opportunities for social mobility. This left the marginalized Roma without social networks and support for upward mobility.

Thus, the results of Communist education policies for Roma were superficial. During socialism the enrolment rate registered an increase but only at primary level. Due to lower returns to education for Roma, lack of education among the adult population and discrimination faced in schools, the truancy and drop-out rates among Roma children increased in transition.

Finally, the 1966 Ceaușescu's active pronatalist policies and the generous monthly state allowance for every new born encouraged high birth rates and the creation of large Roma families in the next two decades. As previously discussed the large family size is a direct determinant of high poverty level. The high fertility favoured high numbers of school dropouts among Roma women and created difficulties for them to enter the labour market (Pons, 1999). This increased the dependency of Roma women on the state which was unable to fulfil its previous socialist commitments during the transition.

Other results of Ceaușescu's pronatalist and childcare policies in the 1970s and the lack of social and educational programmes in the 1980s were that they encouraged the Roma to abandon their children or place them in state institutions such as orphanages or healthcare centres for disabled children (Pons, 1999). This condemned the new generation of Roma to marginalization

once out of the institutions because these institutions usually failed to develop their skills for social integration.

The Communist assimilation policies increased the vulnerability of the Roma to socio-economic transformations in transition by destroying the family and community social networks. This shattered the opportunities for social mobility and made it difficult to exit deprivation. The following intra-group comparison of two Roma communities aims to illustrate the importance of social capital and networks for a Roma community's economic advancement in transition and how the Communist policies destroyed these networks in one of the communities condemning it to extreme poverty, marginalization and discrimination by the non-Roma.

Case studies: The Roma of Brazilia and Boghiş

The case studies are taken from an ethnographic research conducted by Gabriel Troc (2002) in two Roma communities in Transylvania: Brazilia in Nusfalau village and Boghiş. The first one experienced rapid impoverishment, extreme deprivation and discrimination during the transition, while an opposite situation is characteristic for the second community. Some of the Roma in Boghiş are even more affluent than the average rural inhabitant (Troc, 2002, p.50).

I selected the two case studies controlling for variables such as ethnic composition, residential segregation and poverty during the socialist regime. Both of these settlements are homogeneously populated by Roma, physically segregated from the non-Roma and were poor during the Communist rule.

The central differences between these two communities lie in their ethnic and social rapport with the non-Roma and the degree to which they were influenced by the Communist policies. I argue thus that it was these differences that made the Roma of Brazilia more vulnerable during the transition and augmented their poverty and social exclusion compared to the Roma of Boghiş.

Regarding the established relation with the non-Roma, the Roma of Brazilia occupied the lowest ethnic and social position since their first presence in Nusfalau village. Until 1850s, they were serfs of the local aristocrat working as brick-makers or agricultural labourers. After their emancipation, they were employed on and off by Hungarian or Romanian peasants as cheap labour force. To avoid discrimination they tried to adopt the non-Roma 'ways', giving up their dressing style, some of the social norms and traditions. However, their mobility outside their ethnic group stayed limited.

Unlike the 'Brazilians', the Roma of Boghiş were brought to the village in 1950s by the Communists for two reasons by the author's assumptions: to change the ethnic balance of an increasingly all Hungarian village and to divide the larger group of the Roma from Huseni (Troc, 2002, p.66). Their 'wilder' look and lifestyle kept the non-Roma peasants at a distance and generated a 'certain' respect for their customs and occupations.

The 'Brazilian' Roma were heavily influenced by the Communist assimilation and 'integration to work' policies, while the Roma of Boghiş were permitted to preserve their mobility, traditional lifestyles and occupations.

The Communist influence on the 'Brazilian' Roma can be divided into two periods, which, as in the case of the general Roma population, are characterized by a duality of approaches - ambivalence and forced 'integration to work'. During the ambivalence period, the Roma were moved to the district Brazilia, a residentially segregated housing area which was developed after WWI in the Eastern part of the village. Despite their 'hygienic' and 'civilizing' intentions, the Communists did not provide any conditions such as sewerage, wells, electrification in those houses.

In the 1950s, the brick factory was nationalized and modernized, thus, many Roma were left without jobs in the community. In this way they lead a semi-nomadic lifestyle between 1950-1980 searching for demand for their bricks and services. This lifestyle condemned them to low level of education and poor housing. According to the author's findings they were not trained in modern professions and many of them lacked identification papers (Troc, 2002, p.61).

During 1980-1989, the Romanian Communist regime became very restrictive and many Roma were forced to work on collective farms as temporary workers. The Communist policies from this period had two important negative effects on the Roma of Brazilia. By maintaining their status as temporary inhabitants (more than half of the year was spent on large socialist farms) they allowed for the local authorities' indifference toward their living conditions and level of education. Secondly, by engaging them mainly in temporary work, these policies made them ineligible for pensions and other social benefits.

Due to their strong traditional lifestyle the Communists considered the Roma of Boghiş too wild for a short-term assimilation policy, thus, they were allowed to maintain their occupations and habits in a legal form. They received a state license which permitted them to collect scrap metals and glass and sell them to special state recycle centres. These licenses also allowed them to keep their highly mobile lifestyle. Although, during socialism, they were much poorer and marginalized than the rest of the population and there were no state programmes to address their problems, they were never forced to employment in agriculture and industry. They travelled around the regional fairs and markets with their horse carts engaging in various commercial and exchange activities. At the same time, unlike the 'Brazilians' they stayed less off-house and they did not have a "second residence" on socialist farms (Troc, 2002, p. 66). This made them more concerned with their homes and housing conditions. The most important characteristic of the Boghiş Roma, which favoured their economic advancement in transition, was the fact that the community remained integrated and preserved its social ties and networks.

The outcome of Communist policies for the 'Brazilians' was dramatic during the transition. Although they worked on collective farms, the 'Brazilian' Roma were

left out of the land privatization reform. They did not receive the property rights even to the land that their houses were built on. Moreover, in the first three years after the regime collapsed most of them found themselves unemployed. The Roma who worked in the extractive industry were first dismissed. The ones who worked for the collective farms and the brick factory lost their jobs after the privatization. Beginning with 1993, the economic situation of the 'Brazilians' worsened progressively (Troc, 2002, p.67).

In the case of the Boghiş Roma, their independence and high mobility, knowledge of the market, as well as their strong social ties, allowed the entire Roma community to take advantage of the new opportunities of the informal economy during the transition. The first opportunity was the "walnuts affair", which involved exchanging industrial-made vessels, which were provided by a Roma employer to the Boghiş Roma, for walnuts from the non-Roma peasants. The employed Roma cracked the walnuts and gave the kernels to the employer, who sold them in Arad to an entrepreneur, who processed them for export in Germany and Austria. The second opportunity was commerce - horse dealing and vegetables commerce with the non-Roma peasants (Troc 2002, p.71). The commercial relations with the peasants created a kind of 'business-partner equality' between the Roma and the non-Roma.

Thus, the Communist policies coupled with an inferior ethnic and social status destroyed the social networks and the traditional skills possessed by the Roma of Brazilia making it difficult for them to stay and enter the market during the transition and exit poverty, as the Boghiş Roma succeeded. Furthermore, the author found ethnographic evidence that the inferior economic position of the 'Brazilians' perpetuated their social marginalization and discrimination by the non-Roma, while the higher economic position of the Boghiş Roma fuelled a functional relationship of exchange with the non-Roma and ensured a certain degree of equality, for example, in education and housing conditions (Troc, 2002).

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to show how the inadequate assimilation policies promoted by RCP made the Roma more vulnerable to the economic transformations during the transition compared to the general Romanian population that they became the post-socialist 'underclass', characterized by extreme deprivation and social exclusion. The intra-group comparison between a Roma community which was heavily influenced by the Communist policies and another Roma community which was less victimized by the regime further supported my argument that the failure of these assimilation policies increased their discrimination and deteriorated the community social ties, locking the Roma in a vicious inter-generational cycle of poverty and exclusion. Most of the poor Roma underwent similar conditions as the Roma of Brazilia, thus, it is possible to infer that the Communist policies negatively influenced the majority of the Roma which constitute 'underclass' of transition.

Thus, in order for the Roma to be able to exit their inferior socio-economic position, they need social capital. This can be achieved mainly through increased access to quality education, which will develop their social capital. Social capital will, subsequently, provide valuable networks to access jobs and higher educational opportunities. Nevertheless, the Romanian government must seek to achieve this goal not through targeted programmes, but through programmes which pursue the accomplishment of equality of life chances. The targeted programmes provide opportunities to individuals who are already better off and fail to assist the entire socially excluded group (Wilson, 1987). Moreover, the targeted programmes by benefiting only certain groups do not generate and sustain public support (Wilson, 1987). Moreover, in the case of Romania, where the transition negatively affected not only the socio-economic situation of the Roma, but also that of many non-Roma, these programmes will intensify the existing prejudice and ethnic conflict.

Wilson (1987) proposed for the American society the introduction of universal programmes that would benefit all the segments of the population. In this way the groups that have experienced the most severe economic dislocations, including the ghetto underclass, would be helped most. However, the size of the U.S. economy and the type of its welfare state are very different than those of Romania. At the moment, in conditions of continuing economic stabilization and development, it might be financially difficult, if not impossible, for the Romanian government to introduce universal economic and social assistance programmes.

Therefore, the government's principal solution to the Roma 'problem' is investing in their education by providing them with opportunities to study in their own language or integrating them efficiently in Romanian or Hungarian schools with support for learning Romanian or Hungarian languages. The first solution - separate schools or classes with teaching in Romanes - may fail since it already has precedent which did not yield the expected results (see Pons, 1999), as well as, in conditions of discrimination and exclusion it may perpetuate the existing situation. At the same time, due to the fact that many Roma are partially assimilated and do not speak Romanes as their native language, but Romanian or Hungarian, separate schools or classes in Romanes may create a divide inside the Roma group itself, making more difficult the integration of the Roma students, who attended these schools or classes, in higher education or labour market that operate in Romanian or Hungarian.

The second option of creating special preparatory classes to assist the Roma students in learning Hungarian or Romanian, and then integrating them in non-Roma schools and classrooms, seems to be a better solution to the problem. Achieving equality in education status starting with primary level will provide the Roma students with means to compete for scholarships in secondary and higher education. The contact in joint classrooms may reduce the level of prejudice and would prevent the resentment from the non-Roma students that is generated in the case of targeted affirmative action programmes.

References

- Beck, S. (1984) 'Ethnicity, Class and Public Policy: Tiganii/Gypsies in Socialist Romania' in Shangriladze, K. K. and Townsend, E.W. (eds.) *Papers for the V. Congress of Southeast European Studies*, Belgrade: Slavica Publishers, pp. 19-37.
- Crowe, D. (1991) 'The Gypsy Historical Experience in Romania' in Kolsti, J. and Crowe, D. (eds.) *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*, New York: M.E.Sharpe, Inc., pp. 61-80.
- Emigh, R. J. and Szelenyi, I. (2001) *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe during the Market Transition*, Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Emigh, R. J., Fodor, E. and Szelenyi, I. (2001) 'The Racialization and Feminization of Poverty?' in Emigh R. J. and Szelenyi, I. (eds.) *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe during the Market Transition*, Westport: Praeger Publishers, pp.1-32.
- Gilberg, T. (1974) 'Ethnic minorities in Romania under Socialism', *Eastern European Quarterly*, 7:4, pp. 435-463.
- Helsinki Watch (1991) *The Persecution of Gypsies in Romania. Destroying Ethnic Identity*, New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Institutul pentru Cercetarea Calitatii Vietii (2002) *Romii in Romania*, Bucuresti Editura Expert.
- Ladanyi, J. (2001) "The Hungarian Neoliberal State, Ethnic Classification, and the Creation of a Roma Underclass", in Emigh, R.J. and Szelenyi, I. (eds.) *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe during the Market Transition*, Westport: Praeger Publishers, pp. 67-82.
- Magyari, N., Magyari-Vincze, E., Popescu, L. and Rotariu, T. (2001) 'The Social Construction of Romanian Poverty: The Impact of Ethnic and Gender Distinctions' in Emigh, R. J. and Szelenyi, I. (eds.) *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe during the Market Transition*, Westport: Praeger Publishers, pp. 123-156.
- Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1993) *American Apartheid: segregation and the making of the underclass*, Cambridge, Mass; London: Harvard University Press.
- Mihok, B. (2003) 'Raport de țară Romania' in Graf, I. (ed.) *Rromii in Europa de Sud Est - Raporturi de țara despre condițiile cadru, sociale și juridice*, București: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung,
- Pons, E. (1999) *Țiganii din România - o minoritate în tranziție*, București: Compania "altFEL".
- Romanian Communist Party (1983) 'Report on Integration of Gypsies of the Propaganda Section of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party' in Helsinki Watch (ed.) *The 1991 Helsinki Watch Report on the Persecution of Gypsies in Romania*, New York: Human Rights Watch, pp. 108-116.
- Stewart, M. (2001a) 'Deprivation, the Roma and the "underclass"' in Chris Hann (ed.) *Postsocialism: Ideas, Ideologies and Practices in Europe and Asia*, Routledge.

Stewart, M. (2001b) 'Communist Roma policy 1945-1989 as seen through the Hungarian case' in Guy, W. (ed) *Between Past and Future: the Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*, Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, pp. 71-92.

Troc, G. (2002) 'A state of despair: Roma (Gypsy) population during transition - Transylvanian case studies' *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Studia Europaea*, XLVII, 1-2, pp. 49-89.

Wilson, W.J. (1987) *The truly disadvantaged: the inner city, the underclass, and public policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Which theory of Democracy?

Tommaso Visone

Università degli Studi Roma Tre

tommaso.visone@gmail.com

Democracy. Nowadays, this term is used quite freely but by going beyond its literal meaning (demos = power) we can find a lot of other possible interpretations that generate the political need to ponder over the historical meaning of the word. In the article the two main and different theories of Democracy, contemporary and ancient shall be explained and confronted in order to fully understand what can be intended as current Democracy. The objective is also, as indicated in the title, to answer the question that set up a contrast between the two main theories (which theory of Democracy? The Ancient or the contemporary one?) showing that contemporary Democracy was influenced by the Ancient theory proving that the answer is to be found in the ever different relationship existing due to the specific historical moment in which such confrontation was made and not between to opposing and contrasting worlds.

This short essay will try to explore the universe of Democracy's theory via a critical approach and an historical feeling to the praxis and values related to the problem of democracy with the hope to better define the current meaning of the word. This essay is divided into five parts:

- *In the first part, the meaning of the political theory and the methodological choice adopted into the work is analysed.*
- *In the second part, the problems linked to the theory of classic democracy are dealt with.*
- *In the third, the contemporary theory on Democracy is explained.*
- *In the fourth part, some criticism on the current mainstream interpretations of the theory of Democracy is argued.*
- *In the fifth part conclusions and hypothesis are formulated*

Because of the short length of the paper and of the complexity of the issue, all the possible interpretations and problems linked to it cannot be fully addressed in the way that a longer work would. However, the issues and interpretations that are deemed essential in order to better understand and clarify the theory of democracy have been selected.

Theory is a word that can be used with a lot of meanings. According to A.Marradi “theory” has plenty of possible definitions, that can be included in a vast typology (Marradi 1984: 157-171). In this essay, the definitions of theory specifically needed is the one that can later define the meaning of Democracy. The problem of political theory stems from a debate on the roles and the relationship existing between political science and political philosophy that has been an important issue of study of the methodological and “geographical” redefinition (Sartori1979; Zolo 1985; Bobbio 1986; Bobbio 1990) since the early '80s. Beyond the differences among the personal views, the many different possible solutions that came up from the debate, a common opinion was that political studies need a common “theory”, that analyses the “fundamental political concepts”(Bovero 1999: XX), constituting a platform to increase political knowledge. Sartori gives a plausible and effective approach to define this common “new” tool: “I understand it (the theory) as a third kind, a level of intermediate subject of discussions between philosophy on the one hand, and science on the other. Philosophy can be all ideas and no facts, science (empirical) all facts and no ideas. The theory here shown lies in the middle: ideas hold on to facts and vice versa, facts incorporate into ideas” (Sartori 1995: 8). The same statement is found among the observations by Bobbio that address a second standpoint on political philosophy concerning the “facts” specifically when political philosophy is involved in the conceptual analysis “continuously interlaced with factual analysis...to be performed with the consolidated methodology of empirical science.”(Bobbio 1990:39). These considerations by Bobbio are close to Sartori’s ideas; the difference lies in the name because Bobbio calls this second standpoint on political philosophy corresponding to Sartori’s political theory “general theory of politics”.

Even though the short definition for “Political Theory” is a consideration about the meanings of political language that initially keeps the two different points of view on research (on *to be* meaning and on the *should be* meaning) separated , it actually tries to find a link between the descriptive and prescriptive meanings of the analysed word.

Theory of classic Democracy

Democracy is known to be born in ancient Greece around the VI century B.C. This notion may be criticized (Sen 2004; Erodoto 1990: 297) or not (Sartori 2006: 54) but, for the purpose of this article, ancient Greek Democracy must be mentioned to spot the possible links to “contemporary” Democracy that was surely born in Western countries, culturally inspired by the Greek model (Canfora 2004: 52-79). The term *Demokratía* was found for the first time (Canfora 2004: 31; Musti 1997: 3) in Erodoto's *Istoriai* (V century B.C.) when he spoke about the debate that took place in 522/521 B.C among Persian notables on the best possible form of government. Most likely, the first empirical case of Democracy came out in Chio around the middle of the VI century B.C. (Held 1997: 29) and the apex of this experience was reached in Athens around the V century B.C. The Athenian system was marked by three important reforms: Solon's reforms (594/593 B.C.) that prohibited slavery as punishment for debt introduced a monetary reform and created a first form of *isonomia* (D'Addio

1984: 14); Clistene's reforms (508/507 B.C) that created the Athenian Democracy through the institution of ten new tribes based on residence, the transformation of the political role of the *demi*, the creation of *bulé* and *prytaneía* (Musti 2003: 91-92); Efiacte's reform (461 B.C) that concentrated all the democratic powers into the *ecclesia* through the abolishment of Aereopago's powers (Musti 2003: 113). This type of Democracy was characterized by: direct participation of citizens to legislative and judicial functions; sovereign power of the assembly of citizens; sovereignty of the assembly on all public affairs; several methods of selection of public candidates (election, rotation, draw); short duration of the offices; economical compensation for the public office officials (Held 1997: 56; Bobbio 1987: 3-17; Finley 1973: 19).

Furthermore, this type of Democracy relied on a limited citizenship and on strong slavery (Canfora 2004: 52-79). The above mentioned characteristics are the descriptive ones.

Issues on the prescriptive meaning of the classic Democracy controversial interpretations can be found in authors, as Musti (Musti 1997) and Canfora (Canfora 2004). The debate is focused on the possible links between Democracy and freedom in the famous Pericle's speech contained into the Tucidide's *Istorie*. Canfora asserts that, to Tucidide's *Pericle*, Democracy was in contrast with freedom and Musti asserts the opposite of Canfora. This debate is important because Pericle's speech is considered an exposition of the classic Democracy's model and at the same time it is hard to find an important Greek democratic theorist who helps research on this subject (Held 1997: 33). Consequently, the prescriptive meaning of classic Democracy has to be found through a different point of view, based on the principles that most experts believe to be fundamental in classic Democracy context. These values are *isegoria* and *isonomia* among citizens and the "civic virtue" among the same citizens (Held 1997: 32-35; Finley 1973: 16-19; Sartori 2000: 154-155; Canfora 2004: 31-51; Musti 1997: 3-62; Bobbio 1987: 3-16). In the end, it is possible to say on the classic democracy's prescriptive meaning that it is linked to the above mentioned values, and that a possible definition of ancient Democracy, in the complex relationship between descriptive and prescriptive meanings, is delineable as the direct government of the *polites* on the *polis* that is inspired by the political and juridical equality of the citizens and by the belief that the "civic virtue" of the same citizens is the only possible way to *eunomia* (on this point look Zeus' answer into Protagora by Platone). The classic theory was described in such view by Enlightenment thinkers who newly proposed the word "Democracy" into their papers, after a long silence over this old concept and their ponderings would have a strong political impact (Cofrancesco 2003: XVII-XIX). Montesquieu, according to Polibio's typology and inspired to classic Democracy, (Musti 1997: 314), said that the principle of Democracy is "virtue" of the people (Montesquieu 2005: 84) and its nature is to be a Republic where all the people detain the supreme power (Montesquieu 2005: 66); Rousseau's work, characterized by a deep knowledge of classical political experiences (Carnevali 2002: 259-260) was interpreted by French revolutionaries who,

sometimes by changing this original thought (like Saint-Just in *Sur la constitution de la France*, Musti 1997: 323) linked Rousseau's ideas on Democracy to the French Revolution. At the same time, American constituents called "Republic" the new American State having likely been influenced by Montesquieu's thoughts (Dalh 2003: 114-115). In the whole, the XVIII century saw the rebirth of study on classic politics and Democracy that marked the political future of the world creating the concept that is currently attributed to classic Democracy.

Theory of contemporary Democracy

Nowadays, the world of political systems is dominated by concepts of Democracy. According to Bobbio it is possible to say that this is *L'ère des démocraties* (Bobbio 1995a: XIII). In fact, since the end of XX century, Democracy can claim victory over other political systems based on legitimacy due to the widespread belief that the only power to which free obedience is due, is power obtained through people's choice, that is elected following a system that recognizes the choices of a wide base of electors who determine their own representatives (Sartori 2000: 268-269). Such victory doesn't mean that Democracy has won into a global geographic area; (nowadays, the number of the independent states is about two hundred and the number of democracies is eighty six), even though in the last twelve years of the XX century the number of democracies doubled from forty (1960-1970) to eighty or so (Morlino 2003: 12 and specifically for period 1981-1985 Dalh 1989: 241). Consequently, it becomes important to fully understand the new meaning of the word Democracy, and how it has become so.

To answer this question, it is better to quickly delineate the historical contest and the historical reasons that lead in approximately two centuries (1789-1989) to the triumph of such concept and to the development of the contemporary empirical Democracy. Leaving out the Medieval experience such as the Viking *Ting* (Dahl 2002: 20) and Medieval ponderings on the theoretical sovereignty of the people (Bobbio, Pasquino & Matteucci 2004: 236-237) it is possible to say that before the XVIII century, as stated above, the Democratic (by "Democratic" it is intended the ideas that at that time would be known through the study of Classic Democracy) ideas were marginal into the political thought and marginalized into the political praxis of the time.

In this instance, it is best to delineate the specific context of the XVIII century where it is possible to delineate a new feeling about Democracy and with its political praxis and values. Such context was the French Revolution. Differently from the American war of Independence, it meant a radical rupture with its cultural and social roots (Sartori 2000: 39) and in this sense it is possible to speak about "Revolution" (Sobul 1997: 45-49). The Revolution led to the moral and political need of universal values and normative models to use to substitute old and stratified social models that were destroyed the Revolution itself. These models were found into the ideological interpretation of the experience lived by Greek and Roman history in the classic city that, as ancient republics,

gave to revolutionaries a model of virtue which convinced them that equality and freedom could coexist (Canfora 2004: 71-73). Between 1792 and 1793 Sans-culottes went towards the praxis of direct government and towards the establishment of a People's Democracy (Soboul 1997: 240). the political activities of the Sans-Culottes "sections" were reformed by the same Jacobins (9 September of 1793) but their experience, united with the Constitution of 1793 that gave social equality a strong position in the revolutionary values, marking the strong attempt (as Marx understood in Holy Family when he spoke about the contradiction of Jacobins; Marx & Engels 1972: 159) to propose (in an ideological and distorted way) classic Democracy mixed with the universal new values of the French Revolution.

The American approach to Democracy was different and came shortly after. Its birth came from the debate and the development of Christian values after the War of Independence. It was successful first as a praxis and then after as a theory (Urbinati 1997: 6-77). The American constituents were in favour of the Republican system but they were against Democracy because, differently from the French Montagnards politicians, they were afraid of direct (so Classic) Democracy (Bobbio 1995b: 141). James Madison wrote that democracies have always been violent and in contrast with all possible forms of guarantee for people or things (Hamilton , Jay & Madison 1788: 61). So, in spite of work of intellectuals as T. Paine who spoke about Athens like an America in miniature (Paine 1995: 233), the concept of Democracy had to wait to become popular. But in the same period, the fusion of the new egalitarian Christian thoughts and values sprung from the war against the Brits (the same war springs from a reinterpretation of English values; Urbinati 1997: 79), paved the way to that "democratic individualism" that created the social Democracy, marked by equality, that Tocqueville saw in 1831 (Sartori 2000: 13). In fact, Tocqueville wrote as a central point to all his observation in its famous introduction at *Démocratie en Amérique* that the thing that had upset him the most was the equality of conditions because it was the generative force from which everything he had experienced during his journey in the States seemed to derive (Tocqueville 1968: 15). Tocqueville's observations would have likely been different if a whole lot of economical and political changes hadn't taken place between the end of the 20s and the early 30s of the IXX century (Testi 2003:145). In these years the premiership of A. Jackson and the economic situation lead to big social mobility and to the success of the self-made man that united with the new Christian thought (Unitarian church, etc.) founded a new "Democratic" society (this is the reason why it is possible to claim a slightly later success of Democracy in the US., because the 20s and 30s marked the end of a cultural process, after the different but also democratic French experience), that reflected a different society compared to the one of Washington and Jefferson. It was intelligently described by Tocqueville who, starting from Plato's typology, understands the new "democratic" contents of this particular society.

Summarizing of the relationship with Democracy, it is possible to say that the French way was different from the American one. In France it was the result of

a great social, political and cultural rupture; whereas in America it was the result of a social and cultural evolution. On these different approaches it is possible to say again that French historical typology of democracy was basically rationalist and American historical typology was basically empiricist (Sartori 2000: 39). Clarifying this two different historical products that strongly marked the evolutions of contemporary Democracy, it is possible to assert that after the birth of these two prototypes the majority of European representative states (the way of birth of European representative states would need an other separate paper) experienced a process of democratization along two different lines: from widening the right to vote to universal suffrage and from political associations to mass parties (Bobbio 1995b: 144). These two lines are linked with the fights of national independence that characterize all the contemporary age and with the success of the national state. In fact, between the eighteenth and the nineteenth century, the new idea of national identity became current and strong, deep-rooted in the romantic experience (Chabod 1974: 23). This idea, connected with the universal values of equality and freedom (a typical example is Mazzini and his connected ideas of nation and humanity, Chabod 1974: 80), created big excitement to reform and revolt against the coincident pre-democratic and pre-national political system (the best example is the Asburgic Empire after Wien's Congress). In general after the end of Wien's congress (1814-1815) there was an increase in political and social unrest, where the request could be National, Liberal, Socialist or Democratic or a mix of the three. This fact, in the history of political thought, can create some problem, and it can create some problems also to who wants to rebuild the Democratic experience. In fact in Europe, from the French Revolution of 1789 to European risings of 1848, the term "Democratic" marked a crowd of different political positions that were united by the hate towards the census suffrage (Canfora 2004: 102). The same Communist Manifesto wrote by Marx in 1847 contained the claim that the first step for the Communist to take would be the conquest of Democracy (Marx & Engels 1999: 35), evidently through the conquest of universal suffrage. After 1848 the different ways of progressive liberals, democratic and socialist became more delineable. Leaving out the socialist ideas - to better understand after the specific relationship between liberalism and Democracy- that here need to be reduced (but they were more complex and rich) to the Marxist point of view on instrumental Democracy directed to the conquest of the power by proletariat, it is possible to try to build a differentiation, according to Cofrancesco, between liberalism and Democracy. To simplify, Cofrancesco uses three containers: the first one is Anthropology and History; the second one is civil society, the third one is State and Politics.

In the first one, for liberalism the subject's dignity is linked with being in the world, with his human nature, and according to this point of view, political rights for all people aren't so important to obtain happiness and liberty, because the vote is considered as a function entrusted with the capability to do it well and not as a right. Moral universalism exists to Democracy as well but dignity isn't linked with his being in the world because it is linked with the capability to become worthy of citizenship doing something for the homeland.

These distinctions lead to two different ideas of freedom, the liberal idea where freedom stays for “freedom from” whereas freedom in democratic idea stays for “freedom to”. At the same time, the difference on History lied on a particular form of Historicism (that isn't the Popper's historicism) who stays for awareness of complexity of human vicissitudes for liberal thought whereas the democratic point of view on History is a type of secularized providence that is similar to a strong historical philosophy. In the second container liberalism see society as a society where the social relationship is a “limited performance”, where the individual isn't linked strongly with society and live in a regulate conflict that allows to the bests to emerge whereas to democratic society is an organic union of partners where exist the value “one to everybody and everybody to one” and the aspiration is towards harmony with the tendency to limit conflict. Consequently there is a different conception of people: to liberalism it has value only as public opinion wise and competent that is composed by some whereas to Democratic the people is composed by the entire citizen, everybody is equal in the same country. In the third container liberalism has fear of sovereignty because it think that the individual right comes before the political union whereas to democratic thought the people has right to detain and use to itself the sovereignty that, consequently is seen as a good thing. Such points of view on sovereignty are due to a different vision of legitimacy. This one isn't so important for liberalism because it is interested in how the government governs and not, as the Democracy, in who governs. To Democracy there isn't legitimacy if the people isn't sovereign (Cofrancesco 2003: 57-64). At the end of this model is useful to observe that the epistemology linked with these two thoughts shows the same difference who presents the revolutionary French and American types of New Democracy. In fact, democratic thought is, epistemologically, rationalist as the French type and the liberalism is, epistemologically, empirical, as the American type. It is, told this, strange to see that this two different thoughts (and linked political praxis), often so distant, combined together have created our idea and experience of Democracy. But it is so.

And the reasons of this strange marriage are to find into two specific experiences, the French of third republic and the England of universal suffrage that united to the particular American system (that remains the same, or so, of the type described above) after the two word wars resulted, with different events, winners with the communist system. The alliance between liberalism and Democracy gushed out in these two countries as an outcome of the rupture of the dualism between political revolution and industrial revolution (1789-1848). After 1848 the industrial revolution became the first. The unexpected expansion, vast and boundless, of the capitalistic world economy opened into the advanced country political alternatives. The rulers of the more advanced European country started to admit, with reluctance, that a parliamentary constitution with wide suffrage was inevitable and, at the same time, it was likely politically innocuous (Hobsbawm 1979: 4-5). They begin to extend the suffrage towards a democratic point of view.

But at the same time liberalism was, and remained, in power (in England) and took the power (in France) because it represented the only possible economical

policy that was considered reasonable for development. So, progressively the political mix between universal suffrage and liberal system came into being with the name of “liberal Democracy” where because of the insertion of people's vote into a bureaucratic vertical system (in other words, the modern State, Sartori 2000: 141) and because of the mix with liberal representative institutions there was the creation of representative Democracy that, differently to Classic Democracy, gives the people only the power to elect its representatives. It is also possible to say that the mix between Democracy and liberalism was based on a common rejection of socialism and communism due to the fact that the democratic thought was always (Robespierre included) in favour of private property, even if its aim was its distribution to all citizen, (Cofrancesco 2003: 62) whereas the central aim of communist and socialist ideas had always been the end of private property (Fenske 2004: 67-82). In the French case, there was a break in 1871 when, after the defeat against the Germans, there was a Civil war (according to Marx 1948) between the socialist Commune of Paris and the provisional government of A. Thiers. Communards had begun a socialist revolt (they also repurposed a form of direct democracy) and the central government, expression of a capitalist bourgeois force, isolated them, with the indifference of the other nations, and killed them all with the assent of the German occupants. This was the act of birth of the third republic in France (Canfora 2004: 176), that marked the momentary defeat of communist and socialist forces and also the substantial elimination of direct Democracy from Europe. The third republic represents, initially, (since the constitution of 1875) the classic example of a mix between democratic universal suffrage (only male in the nineteenth century) and a liberal balance of power, creating a republican model of parliamentarism that would influence the future empirical model of Democracy. The other model that can be useful to delineate a map of the mix between liberalism and Democracy is the English model of continuous evolution.

In fact, differently from France, the English model to arrive at liberal democracy was characterized by progressive reform and social stability. The Liberals and the Conservatives (lead by Gladstone and Disraeli) in the course of time gradually extended the suffrage (e.g.1867, 1884) creating a political praxis of useful reformism, even though there was a strong Trade Unions movement (Matthew 2002: 395-444). The arrival to the definitive model of liberal democracy was, for this graded reformism, slower than other countries (in England the universal suffrage was adopted in 1928) but the type of liberal Democracy that was created in the U.K was to be adopted by a lot of future democracies, in fact A.Lijphard calls it, in a famous study on contemporary Democracies, “Westminster” model (Lijphard 2001: 27).

Once we have individuated the prototype of the mix between liberalism and democracy, it is important to say that during the XX century, this model suffered a strong crisis in the period between the two World Wars when due to a severe economical crisis it nearly disappeared, defeated by the Fascist governments that between 1921 and 1939 replaced it in almost every country of Europe. Only the ambiguous alliance with Communism (that since 1917

governed Russia) and the consequent victory during the World War II saved and re-proposed a liberal Democracy that came into its “golden age” (Hobsbawm 2004: 18) by extending itself to women voters, containing social rights and elements of welfare state. Its subsequent confrontation with the Communist system ended on 9 November 1989 when, with the fall of the Berlin wall, real socialism came down as well. So it is possible to say that liberal Democracy remained alone among the great political systems (Fukuyama speaks even about “the end of history”, Fukuyama 1992) and is, in terms of legitimacy, today the strongest political system of the world.

After having shortly clarified the historical evolutions of Democracy in the last two hundred years, it is necessary to adjust the descriptive and the prescriptive definitions of the term according to the current meaning of the term.

It is possible to have three types of empirical definitions: procedural, minimal and “condensed”. The Procedural one looks at the procedural rules that characterize contemporary Democracies as a whole, or rather it looks at the method of the democratic praxis. Schumpeter wrote about the above in 1942, stating that the democratic method is the institutional shrewdness needed to arrive at political decisions, in which somebody acquires the power to decide through a competitive struggle for votes (Schumpeter 1942: 269). Kelsen wrote about the same issue that Democracy is a form as method and procedure, because a social system that transforms itself is to be considered formal in order to be distinguished from the contents of the system itself. (Kelsen 1981: 191). It is possible to say that the forms allow and guarantee the possibility that some substantial decisions are made following the ways that the same forms provide for it (Morlino 2003: 23).

The Minimal definition concerns the essential aspects (empirically checkable) that allow to decide a threshold beyond which a regime isn't considered as democratic. Bobbio wrote that in order for Democracy to be such, three characteristics need to be present: the right of a high number of citizens to participate directly or indirectly to public decisions; the existence of procedural rules like the majoritarian rule; the possibility for the voters and the governing authorities to choose amongst real alternatives (Bobbio 1995a: 6). It is important to stress (and here there is the usefulness of the Minimal definition) that if these characteristics aren't part of the system, it will be impossible to have any sort of Democracy.

The “Condensed” definition concerns the general empirical traits that are observable in all the contemporary democracies and it constitute an attempt to summarize the ideas included in the other two definitions with the aim to obtain a definition useful to the confrontation with the prescriptive definition. Following this aim it is important to quote Dahl and Sartori to try to obtain this “condensed” and final empirical definition. Debating with the theorists of *élite*, Dalh wrote that the contemporary political system is a “Polyarchy”(Dahl 1971), or rather a political system that is characterized by the government of several relatively autonomous *élites* and by several minority oppositions where

the government has a continuous capability of answering to the preferences of its citizens, considered politically equal (Sola 2004: 649). This “Polyarchy”, with its characteristics, represents once more a type of minimal definition of Democracy that, however, can become a “condensed” definition with the integration of the procedural definition’s hub: the mechanism. About the above it is useful to utilize Sartori’s descriptive definition that says that Democracy is a mechanism (and here the reference is to Schumpeter’s definition, as Sartori wrote the same) that creates an open polyarchy from which a competition comes out of the electoral market that gives people power and, specifically, imposes the “responsiveness” of elected members towards the voters (Sartori 2000: 108). This definition can be accepted as a good descriptive, “condensed” and firm, definition of contemporary Liberal Democracy.

For the prescriptive definition of contemporary Democracy there are many different positions among the experts. Morlino thinks that it can be defined simply as the regime that should create the best institutional opportunity to obtain liberty and equality, the two values he considers essential in contemporary Democracy (Morlino 2003: 27). Bobbio, as Canfora notices, stood between two definitions of Democracy: one is the minimal that is quoted above and the other, that is similar to a prescriptive definition, states that Democracy is that regime that, compared to the values, is inspired by the fundamental principle of formal and also substantial equality of all men (Canfora 2005). Sartori works on the prescriptive definition of vertical Democracy writing that good Democracy should be an elective meritocracy because he thinks that the only equality useful to the whole society is equality according to merit (Sartori 2000: 117). Held proposes an instrumental democratic principal of autonomy, formed by equal rights and equal obligations to determine conditions of the citizens' life, to try to determine a Democratic view to *eunomia* (Held 1997: 409-458). Zagrebelsky, in his book on democratic pedagogy, writes about a whole of “should be” linked with Democracy as relativism in the relationship with different identities, mistrust towards irreparable decisions, experimental attitude, conscience of majority and minority, altruistic attitude and care to words (Zagrebelsky 2005: 25-43).

Such different thoughts, respecting the approach of political theory, would lead to different and, likely, strongly conflicting theories of Democracy. So a possible answer to the question that springs out spontaneously “Which theory of Democracy?” can now be attempted.

Theory of Democracy, criticisms and proposals

The analysis performed up to now on contemporary Democracy brings to a number of different standings about the prescriptive definition of Contemporary Democracy that makes the drafting of a meaningful political theory on Democracy very problematic. To try to answer the question that names this paper, it is important to firstly resolve the problem with regards to the prescriptive definition in order to arrive to a complete definition of Democracy.

When the problem linked to prescriptive definition of contemporary democracy is tackled it is important to stress that this type of Democracy is a Liberal-Democracy, and that it isn't a pure Democracy (like the Classic type described above) and that, at the same time, if the term Democracy linked with the actual political system is to be used, it will include in its meaning an important role of Democracy in the contemporary hendiadys Liberal-Democracy. In fact, "defining Democracy is important because it establishes what we expect from Democracy" (Sartori 2000: 11) and, given that Democracy stays for something, it is fundamental, to obtain a prescriptive definition to understand what the current meaning of the concept is and what the "should be" meaning of it will be; then, this work will go on with the relationship (in prescriptive scope) between contemporary liberalism and contemporary Democracy.

In the Classic Democracy the central values were *isegoria* and *isonomia* and civic virtue. In the modern thought of Democratic thinkers (strangely Sartori in his work omits to include in the Democratic thought of nineteenth century some fundamental authors, as in Sartori, 2000: 110) the importance of this values appeared unaltered as in Michelet, Mazzini, Fröbel, Lowett (important for the chartist movement), Lamartine (Fenske 2004: 43-54). The difference lies on the universal significance that this values, united with the motto "equality, liberty and brotherhood", assumed after the French Revolution. The man of nineteenth century, differently of ancient Greeks, wanted to change the world and they were sure to live in revolutionary times that would permit them to modify the past structure. The providential vision of history and the faith in the natural equality of people (that is distant to ancient Greeks' strong use of slavery) created in the Democrats the aspirations towards a new society founded on the equality of the citizen. The contemporary democratic "should be", presents itself as a "idealized" model of the classic Democracy with the deification and the universalisation of the role of the people (when *for the people* stands for *the persons who live in the same political space*, and here the difference with classic citizenship is too big) that represents the foundation of sovereignty and the *telos* of the political activity. The transfigured link with classic democracy values allows to contemporary Democracy to continue to use the term, because a part of the classic prescriptive meaning continues to survive in the new formulation of the idea. Specifically, the part that survives and that is central to continue to use the term is the central role of the values of *isegoria* and *isonomia*, whereas the difference between the two lies in the extension of citizenship from the few of ancient Greek citizen to the whole of the people in the contemporary Democracy.

Leaving out the *isonomia* that is a political premise and result of Democracy, the problem that such ideas meet in the contemporary political systems, characterized by big national states in a contest of indirect rule by the people, is that to give possible *isegoria* (that is the equal capability of the citizens to take part in public politic) they don't have to realize only the condition for all the citizens to take a part in "active" electorate (that is reachable through political equality) but they also have to realize the condition for all the citizens to take a part in "passive" electorate (that is reachable through social

equality). For social equality the Democrats don't have the idea of arithmetic equality (for all the same) but they intend, for social equality, that condition asserting that “no citizen can be so rich to be able to buy another and no citizen can be so poor to be bought by others” (Rousseau 1970: 738).

So the prescriptive definitions of contemporary Democracy, that is deducible from the Democratic contemporary thought, is that form of government where there is the complete harmonic and virtuous sovereignty of the people, intended as a whole of equal persons that can equally decide and take a part in politic because their social, legal and political conditions are equal.

Such definition resolves only the first part of the problem. Contemporary democracy is a Liberal-Democracy and so this definition needs to be integrate with prescriptive liberal idea of government, where, going back to Cofrancesco typology, people, that are in legal competition one against the other, that have the best capability to govern lead the political system. The prescriptive definition of contemporary Democracy that tries to express the link between Liberalism and Democracy is Sartori's one, starting from the right observation that contemporary Democracy is a vertical Democracy. From such observation Sartori goes as far as defining prescriptive democracy as elective meritocracy (as written above). He emphasized, the liberal idea that only the best “should govern”. On the above Sartori thinks that meritocracy is linked with democratic equality of opportunity, that he considers as the equally open offer to climb the social vertical system according to the selection of the most meritorious. But he doesn't state that a democratic value (independently of the general judgment on meritocracy) but only a liberal value because the merit of meritocracy is given by a objective idea of merit that isn't the democratic idea of merit according to the one the choice on capabilities and merit stays in the will of the people. There is a strong relativistic attitude in the choice of good and wrong in Democracy (Zagrebelsky 2005: 25) where what is important is that all the people have the chance to chose according to their ideas (that is the true democratic equality of opportunity, or the opportunity to all the people to create and built a merit and not to be able to compete by “the merit”) and not that all the people have the possibility to go up following a standard merit. Summarizing, there is in Sartori a *scientist* idea of politics that, even though it may or may not be shareable, is surely Liberal and not Democratic, at least utilizing Cofrancesco's typology.

Such meritocratic definition is anyway useful to take too liberal prescriptive definition of contemporary democracy. Sartori's definition is too Liberal because, as stated above, the values of Democratic thought have to influence in a stronger way than liberal values the prescriptive meaning of the contemporary hendiadys Liberal-democracy does, if it wants to continue to be called only with the term “Democracy”, and this doesn't happen with Sartori's definition that proposes a Liberal idea of meritocracy as a prescriptive form of Democracy.

It is now possible to try to formulate a prescriptive definition of contemporary democracy that, considering liberal presence and its values, gives to democratic values an important role, guaranteeing with this method the link between the term “Democracy” and the historical meaning of the word. Such definition can be so: that political system where all the citizen are put in condition to compete (Liberal insertion) to carry out and create the public “will”, within the law (other liberal insertion).

Which theory of Democracy? A possible conclusion

From this prescriptive definition of contemporary democracy it is possible to try to delineate an answer to the starting question- which theory of Democracy?- through the possible comparison (according to political theory, as described above) between studies and empirical definition on to be of democracy (that are derived from political science, as examined above) and studies on the values of democracy over history (that are derived from the history of political thought, as shown above). Contemporary Democracy, following this approach, is an open vertical polyarchy where all the citizens should have the complete capability to influence (also to think beyond) and take part in the mechanisms and competitions that create the public politics. Such public politics should be, in the limits established by the law, too near to the “will” of the same citizens. It can also be said that modern Democracy has been dealing with changing times and societies during the last thirty years; the post-modern age is a new, tough challenge to modern values that have in some way identified contemporary Democracy. Such challenge, leads to a reconsideration of the original values of ancient Democracy . This process takes place every time there is a clash among values in Western society because, in order to bridge the gap created by the latter, intellectuals elaborate theories and possible meanings of the “origins”. Therefore, there is the possibility that post-modern Democracy will be a renewed union between the old and the new, between different but converging heritages of the two patterns of Democracy that have been analysed in this paper. In conclusion, it is possible to claim that in order to find an answer to the word Democracy it is necessary to confront the identity at its origins and the various problems typical of the specific historical context taken into account. During the 20th century this combination of elements was embodied by political methodology of liberal thinkers and the political equality of the “polites”. In the future, the old Greek identity of Democracy might rise up to new heights.

References

Bobbio, N 1986, “Congedo”, in Bonanate, L & Bovero M (eds.), *Per una teoria generale della politica. Studi dedicati a Norberto Bobbio*, Passigli, Firenze.

Bobbio, N 1987, “La democrazia dei moderni paragonata a quella degli antichi (e a quella dei posteri)”, *Teoria Politica*, vol.III, n. 3, pp. 3-17.

Bobbio, N 1990, “Per una mappa della filosofia politica”, in Fiorot, D (ed.), *La filosofia politica oggi*, Giappichelli, Torino.

- Bobbio, N 1995a, *Il futuro della democrazia*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Bobbio, N 1995b, *Stato, governo, società*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Bobbio, N, Matteucci, N & Pasquino G 2004, *Il dizionario di politica*, Utet, Torino.
- Bovero, M. (ed.), 1999, *Norberto Bobbio. Teoria Generale della Politica*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Canfora, L 2004, *La Democrazia. Storia di un'ideologia*, Laterza, Roma.
- Canfora, L 2005, "Oscillazioni per un filosofo", in *Corriere della sera* 6 February, p. 35.
- Carnevali, B 2002, "Il Contratto Sociale: genesi di un classico", in Rousseau, J J, *Il Contratto sociale*, Mondadori, Milano.
- Chabod, F 1974, *L'idea di Nazione*, Laterza, Roma.
- Cofrancesco, D 2003, *La Democrazia liberale (e le altre)*, Rubbettino, Soveria Mannelli.
- D'Addio, M 1984, *Storia delle dottrine politiche*, ECIG, Genova.
- Dahl, R A 1971, *Polyarchy. Participation and opposition*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Dahl, R A 1989, *Democracy and Its Critics*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London.
- Dahl, R A 2002, *Sulla democrazia*, Laterza, Roma.
- Dahl, R A 2003, *Quanto è democratica la costituzione americana?*, Laterza, Roma.
- Erodoto 1990, *Le Storie*, Libro III, Fondazione Valla, Milano.
- Fenske, H 2004, *Il pensiero politico contemporaneo*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Finley, M I 1973, *La democrazia degli antichi e dei moderni*, Laterza, Bari.
- Fukuyama, F 1992, *The End of History and the Last Man*, The Free Press, New York.
- Hamilton, A, Jay, J & Madison, J 1788, *The Federalist*, MacLean, New York, trans. 1980, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Held, D 1996, *Models of democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge, trans. 1997, *Modelli di democrazia*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Hobsbawm, E J 1979, *Il trionfo della borghesia*, Laterza, Roma.
- Hobsbawm, E J 2004, *Il secolo breve*, BUR, Milano.
- Kelsen, H 1981, *La democrazia*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Lijphart, A 200, *Le democrazie contemporanee*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

- Marradi, A 1984, "Teoria: una tipologia dei significati", *Sociologia e ricerca sociale*, vol. V, n.13, pp. 157-81.
- Marx, K 1948, "La guerra civile in Francia", in *Il partito e l'internazionale*, Rinascita, Roma.
- Marx, K & Engels, F 1972, *La sacra famiglia*, Editori Riuniti, Roma.
- Marx, K & Engels, F 1999, *Manifesto del partito comunista*, Laterza, Roma.
- Mattew, H C 2002, "L'età liberale" in O' Morgan, K, *Storia dell'Inghilterra*, Bompiani, Milano.
- Montesquieu 2005, *Lo spirito delle leggi*, Utet, Torino.
- Morlino, L 2003, *Democrazie e democratizzazioni*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Musti, D 1997, *Demokratía*, Laterza, Roma.
- Musti, D 2003, *Introduzione alla storia greca*, Laterza, Roma.
- Paine, T 1995, *Rights of Man, Common Sense, and Other Political Writings*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rousseau 1970, *Scritti politici*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Sartori, G 1995, *Elementi di teoria politica*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Sartori, G 2000, *Democrazia: Cos'è*, BUR, Milano.
- Sartori, G 1979, *La politica. Logica e metodo in scienze sociali*, Sugar and co., Milano.
- Sartori, G 2006, *Democrazia. Ha un futuro?*, in AA.VV., *Lezioni Bobbio*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Sen, A 2004, *La democrazia degli altri: perchè la libertà non è un' invenzione dell'occidente*, Mondadori, Milano.
- Schumpeter, J A 1942, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Harper, New York.
- Soboul, A 1997, *Storia della Rivoluzione Francese*, Bur, Milano.
- Sola, G 2004, *Storia della scienza politica*, Carocci, Roma.
- Testi, A 2003, *La formazione degli Stati Uniti*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Tocqueville, A 1835-1840, *La Démocratie in Amérique*, Paris ; trans. 1968, *La Democrazia in America in Scritti Politici*, Utet, Torino.
- Urbinati, N 1997, *L'individualismo democratico*, Donzelli, Roma.
- Zagrebelsky, G 2005, *Imparare la Democrazia*, Gruppo editoriale l'Espresso, Roma.

Zolo, D 1985, "I possibili rapporti tra filosofia politica e scienza politica", *Teoria Politica*, vol. I, n. 3, pp. 91-109.

Comparing portraits: US media and foreign policy

Derrick I. Goodrich

University of Arizona

derrickg@email.arizona.edu

Introduction

The charge given to a nation's free press in informing the public of the world around them is immense and essential to a functioning democratic society.* A free press functions optimally when it operates independent from the constraining influence of powerful entities within its government, thus, allowing it to fulfil its role as an independent check on government action. As events unfold overseas, papers fill various columns with what is deemed "newsworthy." If and how these unfolding events are reported back to the public carries tremendous weight in helping to form public opinion that either supports, opposes, or remains indifferent to the policy that governments implement abroad. The boardrooms of a nation's leading news outlets are filled with individuals who also possess the ability to significantly counter or reinforce government claims concerning the relevance, consequences, or threats encompassed within overseas developments; from their leading headlines splashed across page one to the very wording used to depict a particular event. These abilities, when combined, allow a nation's media to exert substantial influence on constraining or expanding decision-making options for policy makers who wish to garner public support or avoid potential public backlash. This paper will examine how this influence was exercised within U.S. society and its three leading news sources (*The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Chicago Tribune*) in the reporting of four significant events: the 1960 Sharpeville Massacre in apartheid South Africa, the 1975 Indonesian invasion of East Timor, the Kwangju Massacre of 1980 in South Korea, and the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. The goal of this paper is to recount the historic role the U.S. media has played in its telling of developing international events, and determine whether it has fulfilled its duty to inform the public with the impartiality it lays claim to or whether, at times, it simply mirrors the foreign policy agenda of a particular administration and operates in a manner as to ensure its successful implementation.*

· I am very grateful for the assistance I received while constructing this paper. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Michael P. Sullivan of the University of Arizona's Department of Political Science for his constructive feedback and guidance throughout my work on this paper. I also want to extend my deep appreciation for the valuable comments and critiques provided by my colleague, Jason Hushour.

· The method used for research on this paper comprised of searching the historical archives of the three newspapers found in the University of Arizona main library. Using the selected database and using the year in question, a keyword was then entered for each event. The keyword "East Timor" under the years 1975 - 1979 was used for researching news coverage of the East Timor invasion. For the coverage concerning Sharpeville Massacre in South Africa, the keywords "South

South Africa 1960

Context:

In South Africa the implementation of apartheid had been in operation since the National Party was elected into office in 1948. As other African nations were acquiring independence from colonial subjugation, South African blacks and coloureds were facing more and more oppressive measures being issued against them from their white minority-ruled government. Forced relocation, police abuse and oppression, and “pass laws” preventing entry into white allocated areas were just some of these measures. In response, black South Africans began to form groups focused on ending the system of apartheid, and the two most prominent groups that emerged were the African National Congress (ANC) and, its offshoot, the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC). In an attempt to do away with the pass laws requiring all black South Africans over the age of fifteen to carry an identification card, the PAC organized mass protests designed to overwhelm the South African economy by flooding its jails with the cheap, black labour it so depended on. Protestors would surrender themselves to white authorities declaring that they did not possess the required identification and demand to be arrested. One of these demonstrations would take place in the town of Sharpeville on March 21, 1960. Violence ensued and, after South African police opened fire on the men, women, and children gathered outside the jail, 69 people were left dead and over 180 wounded.

A decade earlier, the U.S. was actively searching for Cold War allies as tensions between the world’s two superpowers grew as they contended for power. South Africa’s staunch anti-communist National Party, its strategic location on the southern tip of the African continent, and its valued resources (uranium deposits) made the allure of this country as an ally too great for U.S. policy makers to pass up despite its inhuman treatment concerning the vast majority of its own people. The actions of the South African authorities on the day of the Sharpeville massacre brought international condemnation and the potential for public support in the United States to distance itself from the apartheid regime. The Sharpeville massacre brought the extreme oppressiveness of apartheid out into the light of international viewing and offered an embarrassing resemblance to the very characteristics that U.S. rhetoric claimed came with Soviet oppression; not to mention the striking similarities it found with the U.S. domestic policies practiced in its Jim Crow South and northern, urban ghettos. In order to stave off this potential demand for change in the U.S.-South African relationship, it was in the U.S. government’s best interest if public outcries concerning this act of severe suppression remained mute and

Africa” and “Sharpeville” under the year 1960 were used for the search. “Kwangju” and “South Korea” were keywords used to research under the 1980 timeframe in regards to the uprising in the South Korean city of Kwangju. The Hungarian Revolution employed the keyword “Hungary” within a 1956 time period.

ineffective. How this event was portrayed to the American audience by U.S. media would play a large role in determining this outcome.

Reported:

The *Washington Post's* lead story was entitled, "62 Africans Die in Race Law Protest." The author notes that, "Blood seeped into the muddy sidewalk and into the gutters," and "Women and children were among those killed" (Porter 1960). When describing what led up to this event, the article states, "There thousands of Africans besieged 25 policemen inside a police station in the Negro quarter... The mob, growing every minute, began to form outside the police station" (Porter 1960). Quoted in the article is the Prime Minister of South Africa, Hendrik Verwoerd, who states that the PAC organized the protest "to go against the whites" and committed to "extreme deeds" (Porter 1960). Later in the article the PAC is described as "a militant offshoot of the African National Congress" (Porter 1960). *The New York Times* page one headlined, "50 Killed in South Africa as Police Fire on Rioters," took a similar perspective to their counterparts at the *Post*: "The police opened fire today on thousands of Africans besieging a police station at Sharpeville, thirty miles south of Johannesburg" (New York Times 1960). Covering the event as well, the *Chicago Tribune* entitled their piece, "South Africa Police Kill 62 Rioting Natives" (Chicago Tribune 1960). In much the same light as the two other papers, events surrounding the police shooting is reported as, "The mob, which had been stoning the police, refused to disperse when ordered and police followed up the warning with shots" (Tribune 1960).

A day later, the *Washington Post* would attempt to analysis the root causes of the conflict by detailing the radical nature found within the Pan Africanist Congress. "[The PAC is] vastly more radical than the parent organization [the ANC]... The Pan Africanist profess willingness to accept a multiracial society in South Africa, as does the ANC; in fact, however, theirs is an Africa-for-Africans philosophy and they would like to see all Europeans - about 3 million - ousted from the country" (Kasischke 1960). Offering up "radical" examples of the PAC, the article provides the following, "Defying police, Negroes chalked these slogans on walls: 'Freedom,' 'Minimum wage and equal pay for equal work' and 'Down with [identity] passes'" (Kasischke 1960). When describing another "radical" tactic employed by the PAC, a nationwide labour sit-down strike, the author states that "Negro sit-down [sic] strikers were reported trying to keep others from going to work. In Langa, a police official charged that Negroes wanting to go to their jobs 'have been intimidated by terrorists'" (Kasischke 1960).

The *Times* would follow this up in their article on the same day with their headline, "Riots Continue in South Africa." While containing the updated body count of the Sharpeville massacre to stand at 72 with 177 wounded at the hands of South African authorities, the article attempts to address the underlying reason for fear in the South African townships. "The Africans were

tense and fearful of another outbreak of violence by extremist elements. In the Vereeniging area many Africans said they were afraid to go to work for fear of reprisals by demonstrators” (New York Times 1960). Given that, “Police opened fire with submachine guns and rifles. Jet planes and armoured cars also were brought into use,” (Porter 1960) the assertion by the *Times* that the primary cause for fear among black South Africans laid with anyone other than the South African government seems somewhat flawed. Not to forget impartiality, the article also offers a critique of the South African government. “With the responsible leaders regarded as moderates banned or banished the extremist elements are left to whip up anti-white sentiment through organizations such as the Pan Africanist Congress ...The group’s motto is ‘Africa for Africans’” (New York Times 1960). Never inquired by the reporter is how the oppressive nature of apartheid or the detainment and execution of those who challenge it serve to “whip up” this anti-white sentiment. By effectively portraying the elements directly challenging the apartheid regime as anti-white, the editors and reporters helped ensure that the white American populace viewed the event as a race war rather than a pursuit of liberty and equality.

Nine days after the shooting in a Wednesday edition of the *Washington Post*, another perspective was given differing considerably from the South African government’s account of what transpired and what had been relayed by the three news outlets when the *Post* reprinted an article from the *London Observer* entitled, “Eye Witness Describes Shooting at Sharpeville.” In this report the witness, one of two journalists actually on site at the time of the shooting, reported that, “Before the shooting, I heard no warning to the crowd to disperse. There was no warning volley. When the shooting started it did not stop until there was no living thing on the huge compound in front of the police station...One of the policemen was standing on top of a Saracen, and it looked as though he was firing his sten gun into the crowd. He was swinging it around in a wide arc from his hip as though he were panning a movie camera” (Tyler 1960). This alternative description of the massacre warranted only a Wednesday edition, required the work of a foreign newspaper, and would not find a similar piece of reporting thereafter. A *New York Times* article on May 4, 1960, bolstered the account given in the *Post* when it reported that a senior district surgeon testifying before a judicial inquiry stated that about 70 percent of bullet wounds suffered by the gathered crowd entered from the back (New York Times 1960). Along with being allocated a small portion of page sixteen, this too would not be further expanded on by those reporting on apartheid in South Africa.

East Timor 1975-79

Context:

The people of the archipelago island of East and West Timor had known colonial rule as far back as the early 1700’s. The Portuguese colonized the Eastern portion of the island calling it Portuguese Timor and the Dutch, setting up settlements in the Western area, laid claim to it as part of the larger Dutch

East Indies. Contentions arose as expansion by the two European powers brought them into border disputes resulting in the Treaty of Lisbon in 1859 that established the border separating East and West Timor. Following World War II, nationalist fervor in the area of Dutch East Indies now known as Indonesia, led by a man named Sukarno who later became the country's first president, resulted in clashes with the Dutch colonizers eventually ending with Dutch recognition of an independent Indonesia in 1949 that included West Timor.

East Timor continued to be colonized by Portugal, who by 1926, was governed by a dictatorship under [António de Oliveira Salazar](#). In 1974 a bloodless coup, known as the Carnation Revolution, took place in Portugal that led to the fall of the government and replaced it with an aspiring liberal democracy. Portuguese policy towards the island, which before was little more than "benign neglect" (Simpson 2005), would change considerably. The new government began allowing political expression on the island while, at the same time, distancing itself from it as the new government attempted to hold on to the major remnants of its colonial past; namely Angola and Mozambique. Various rival parties soon emerged in the more politically free island; the Timorese Democratic Union (UDT), the Apodeti (Timorese Popular Democratic Association), and a left-leaning group called Fretilin (Portuguese for the Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor). While the first two would eventually come to advocate integration with Indonesia (while receiving substantial assistance from Indonesian intelligence), Fretilin came to garner the popular support of the island with their aim of an independent East Timor. On August 11, 1975 a military coup was attempted by the UDT causing a brief civil war to ensue for control of East Timor. Though suffering early setbacks, Fretilin forces were able to route UDT and Apodeti forces and gain control of the island (Simpson 2005).

Prior to this in Indonesia power had transferred from President Sukarno to General Suharto in 1967, and the new leader would institute a "New Order" aimed at ridding the island nation of communist influence. This ideological purge, which was greatly assisted by the United States' Central Intelligence Agency who provided the new regime with names of supposed communist sympathizers, would amount to an estimated 500,000 to one million deaths (Blum 1995). Relations between Indonesia and the United States were substantially closer after the emergence of this staunch anti-communist government. This U.S.-Indonesian relationship would only grow with significance in the eyes of policy makers in Washington following the failure of U.S. intervention in Vietnam. In 1975, President Suharto would claim that a Fretilin-dominated East Timor threatened the security of Indonesia and launched a covert operation entitled, Operasi Komodo, in order to set the stage for a future invasion (Simpson 2005). On December 7, 1975 Indonesia, supplied by U.S. arms and training, would publicly begin its annexation of the island and military occupation of the 600,000 inhabitants of East Timor. Giving the "green light" for the invasion, officials in Washington desired the forced integration to transpire quickly and without capturing the American public's attention. In the words of former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, in his talks with Indonesian

President Suharto a day prior to the invasion, “we would be able to influence the reaction in America if whatever happens, happens after we return... If you have made plans, we will do our best to keep everyone quiet until the President returns home” (Simpson 2005).

Reported:

As mentioned earlier, Indonesia’s Operasi Komodo preceded the official invasion by more than two months (Simpson 2005). News stories trickled into the public sphere in America by all three newspapers concerning Indonesia’s covert operations on the island. On September 30th, the *Chicago Tribune* reported on a border clash between Indonesian government troops and Fretilin forces (Chicago Tribune 1975). Following the *Tribune’s* report, the *Post* reported “Indonesian troops, in an attack across the border, wiped out a rebel base in Portuguese Timor, informed sources said... All soldiers defending the base were killed and their leader was captured” (Washington Post 1975). The *New York Times* reported on these incursions on October 8th in an article entitled “Big Indonesia Attack in Timor Reported.” The report cites a Fretilin spokesman who tells of a major offensive launched against them by Indonesian forces along a coastal town only a mile away from the Indonesian-East Timorese border. Summarizing the article, the *Times* (1975) state, “The action would be the first use of Indonesia’s Air Force in the fighting over East Timor. According to Fretilin leaders, Indonesia has until now waged only a guerilla campaign against border settlements”

Yet, a little more than a month later in late November, the *Times* ran an article by staff writer David Andelman contending that, “Indonesian officials take every opportunity when talking with foreigners, particularly Americans, to point to their hands-off policy with respect to the civil war that is engulfing Portuguese Timor, in the eastern part of the Indonesian archipelago... The Indonesian forces...have been showing remarkable restraint” (Andelman 1975). Besides the interesting play on words that presupposes Indonesian ownership of the island, Andelman effectively ignores numerous reporting by all three major papers that cite offensive operations that counter this “hands off” assertion. The self-induced amnesia suffered by Andelman spread throughout American media and resulting articles thereafter portrayed the invading Indonesian troops as stabilizing forces attempting to end the civil strife on the island. Had the papers chosen to remember their earlier reporting, the American reader might have read that a major reason for continued instability in East Timor was largely due to the activities of the very same nation exploiting it for a justifiable invasion.

Some light began to be shed on the ongoing atrocities taking place on the island, however, on Feb 16, 1976 when the *Times* ran with an article on their page eleven entitled, “Fighting on Timor Said to Kill 60,000.” The article quotes a deputy chairman of East Timor’s provisional government, Francisco Xavier Lopez da Cruz, who estimates that “About 60,000 people have been killed since the outbreak of civil war in Portuguese Timor last August.” He

concludes that, “Most of the victims in the conflict were women and children on both sides” (New York Times 1976). Continuing with the emerging reports of casualties, John Sharkey’s article in the *Post* (Sharkey 1977) on March 13, 1977 would be headlined, “Indonesians Said to Kill 100,000 in East Timor.” This article would be allocated all of the paper’s page 19 as it reported the testimony of James Dunn, a former Australian consul to East Timor, who is quoted as saying “the refugees’ accounts of Indonesian behaviour in East Timor suggest that the plight of these people might well constitute, relatively speaking, the most serious case of contravention of human rights facing the world at this time.”

As powerful as these reports might have proved to inform the public of the atrocities taking place, each article presented the reports of massive casualties as only allegations that would be aggressively countered by the U.S. State Department. In the same paper as the Sharkey piece, State officials were heard on page ten under “Indonesia Charged with Atrocities” stating “We have pointed out that we believe the reports of atrocities have been greatly exaggerated” (New York Times 1977). State Department officials would be back again on March 18th to repeat the assertion in the *Washington Post*. “[Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert B.] Oakley said that casualty figures ranging up to hundreds of thousands in East Timor reported by the press ‘are greatly exaggerated.’ He said ‘we would judge the total casualties were under 10,000’” (Lescaze 1977). It is important to remember that these public remarks are being stated while, at the same time, private correspondence between the State Department and its embassies reported that estimates of at least 60,000 “were credible and had been confirmed by other sources” (Simpson 2005). While fault cannot be found with the media relaying government statements, fault can be found in their acceptance of the government as the sole provider of facts on the ground. Investigations by the three major papers into whether these allegations, which went contrary to the public statements of the U.S. State Department, were a true reflection of what was transpiring in East Timor were never taken. With the lack of an independent check concerning the number of casualties as a result of the military invasion and occupation by Indonesian forces, the U.S. press allowed for any statement challenging the U.S. official line to remain only an unsubstantiated allegation.

In addition to these allegations of atrocities, Indonesia continued to refuse to abide by U.N. Resolution 3485 that called for it to withdraw from East Timor. Despite this, the United States would continue massive military aid to its aggressive ally under the Ford administration and increase this aid substantially under Carter (Simpson 2005). However, U.S. law forbade U.S. arms given to other countries to be used in anything other than “self-defensive” operations. This was quickly sidestepped, however, by policymakers. This would be aptly demonstrated by the Assistant Deputy Secretary of State when he testified before the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. The *Post* covered the testimony on its page 23, “As a result [of U.S. recognition regarding Indonesia’s annexation of East Timor], from the U.S. standpoint, if Indonesia uses any of the \$58 million in proposed U.S. military assistance for fiscal 1978 in East

Timor, it is defending its own territory” (Lescaze 1977). The weapons would be used quite efficiently by the U.S. ally; the eventual loss of life suffered by the Timorese is estimated by Amnesty International at 200,000 out of a population of no more than 650,000 (Amnesty International 1994). “US and Indonesian officials later conceded that ‘Indonesian armed forces are equipped 90% with US equipment’” (Simpson 2005).

The decisions by the U.S. government in its desire to retain its strong ties to a strategic ally in the Pacific at the expense of upholding international law and U.N. resolutions cannot be laid at the feet of the U.S. media. However, the unwillingness to challenge the U.S. and Indonesian version of what was happening allowed for a U.S. foreign policy to go unrestrained by a public that remained ignorant to the actual reality transpiring on the ground. With its domestic public in the dark, the U.S. government was free to pursue a policy to block any movement internationally that may have hindered Indonesian’s occupation through its role within the United Nations. As the UN Ambassador to East Timor, Daniel Moynihan, would write in his memoirs, “The United States wished things to turn out as they did and worked to bring this about. The Department of State desired that the United Nations prove utterly ineffective in whatever measures they undertook. This task was given to me, and I carried it forward with no inconsiderable success” (Chomsky 1993).

Ultimately, the dim spotlight that was cast upon East Timor early in the invasion would be shifted and heavily intensified onto a more convenient setting where the constraints of reporting negative aspects of a U.S. ally did not exist. The infamous Pol Pot would emerge in the country of Cambodia and lead a ruthless government that would leave millions dead in its aftermath. The news concerning this fanatical ideology and the horrors it brought would remain a constant fixation by the three major papers while the tragedy of the East Timorese would fade from the mere passing glance they had been bestowed previously. This was well illustrated by the importance given to an article written by Jack Anderson, one of few journalists still focused on East Timor years after the invasion. In an article written in November of 1979, Anderson pleads with his audience to remember the plight of those in East Timor entitling his piece, “East Timor Shouldn’t Be Ignored” (Anderson 1979). Unfortunately for Anderson and the East Timorese, he and his article were ignored by the very newspaper he worked for. The piece would find itself on the *Post*’s Friday edition right beside the day’s comic strips and crossword puzzle. Despite the many faults found in the reporting surrounding East Timor’s annexing, the most powerful detriment the Timorese people were eventually dealt was their plight’s obliviousness to the American media. The coverage, January 1, 1976 to December 31, 1979, breaks down accordingly:

<u>Newspaper</u>	<u>Articles concerning East Timor</u>	<u>Concerning</u>
------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------

Cambodia*

* This information was obtained by searching each newspaper’s archives under the keywords “East Timor” and “Cambodia” within the time periods of 01/01/1976 to 12/31/1979.
<http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/nytimes/advancedsearch.html> New York Times archive

<i>New York Times</i>	35 articles
1884	
<i>The Washington Post</i>	34
1286	
<i>Chicago Tribune</i>	4
862	

South Korea 1980

Context:

Syngman Rhee had been placed into the South Korean presidency by the U.S. and its allies after World War II. He was officially elected by the Korean parliament in 1948, and later resigned amidst student protesting in 1960 due to his oppressive regime and remained in exile in Hawaii before dying of a stroke five years later. The forced resignation was followed by a military coup led by General Park Chung-hee that took over the presidency in 1961. He continued the political oppression that characterized Rhee's presidency until his assassination in 1979. Following this, South Korea entered into further political turmoil as General Chun Doo-hwan led a military junta to power setting up a token civilian government headed by President Choi Kyu Hah. General Chun was a protégé of the late Park and his ascension into authoritarian power touched off massive student protests throughout the country. One area where the voices demanding democratic reform could be heard the loudest was in the South Korean city of Kwangju. The students gathering there refused to disperse and discontinue their protests until democratic reform had been instituted. Other residents of the city joined the students and this culminated with the uprising beginning on May 18, 1980. Nine days later, South Korean paratroopers and Special Forces entered to retake the city. (BBC News 2000). The actual number of casualties that day is an issue hotly debated in South Korea to this very day. As a BBC report would conclude in 2005, "The final toll of those who lost their lives is still unknown, as it is believed the military dumped bodies in mass graves or lakes. Estimates today range from 500 to 2,000" (BBC News 2005).

Thirty years prior to this uprising, the United States was sending its military into South Korea to prevent a North Korean takeover marking the beginning of a U.S. military presence in the Korean peninsula. The strategic importance, especially in relation to Communist China, of this military installation was an asset of significant value to Washington foreign policy makers. Whether the American public would support the 39,000 U.S. soldiers in country acting as an insurance policy to an authoritarian regime gearing up to suppress a democratic movement weighed heavily on those on Capital Hill. This worry would be alleviated by the public's subjective exposure to the uprising via the U.S. media.

Reported:

<http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/washingtonpost/advancedsearch.html> Washington Post archives
<http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/chicagotribune/advancedsearch.html> Chicago Tribune archives

A fair amount of reporting was done during the Kwangju uprising by the three news outlets that provided ample and forceful criticism of General Chen's military rule. One such example is William Chapman's piece in the *Washington Post* where he states, "When the smoke cleared from the power grab today, military leaders were clearly in command. The shell of a civilian government remained, but it is regarded merely as a front for the generals" (Chapman 1980). A constant portrayal throughout the coverage, however, was the newspapers' acceptance by United States officials that the situation was outside the influence of one of the world's superpowers, which had a contingent of 39,000 troops in the country. As Don Oberdorfer of the *Washington Post* reported, administration officials preferred a "hands off" policy in regards to the Kwangju affair. A State Department spokesperson is quoted as saying, "In any case, it is difficult to see how a foreign government can intervene helpfully in a situation such as that in Kwangju" (Oberdorfer 1980). Oberdorfer does not question this very arguable assertion from the State Department, and, instead, goes on to provide statements attempting to explain the U.S. role. He states that "the United States publicly urged 'maximum restraint' by all parties involved... while making clear its opposition to the departure from the previously established path of political liberalization [sic]." This statement is later followed by, "The U.S. commander in Seoul, Gen. John Wickham, also approved a request by the Korean military to remove four South Korean regiments from the general reserve of the joint U.S.-Korea forces for use in riot control" (Oberdorfer 1980). The writer realized that some degree of hypocrisy resided in the two sentences, admitting "This action seemed to place the United States in sympathy with the military forces seeking to quash the insurgency" (Oberdorfer 1980).

Additionally, an unvarying theme presented by all three papers was the negative portrayal of the assembled protestors. The *Tribune* described the situation in this way, "Meanwhile, armed paratroopers dispersed a violent anti-military demonstration by 50,000 persons in Kwangju" (Chicago Tribune 1980). In the *Post*, the students were labelled "young militants [who] resisted with weapons seized last week" (Chapman 1980). While in the *Times*, an article appearing on May 28th would state, "In what appeared to be a last appeal for a peaceful resolution, President Choi Kyu Hah called on the rebels to settle the issue through talks rather than confrontation and promised 'maximum leniency' if the dissidents laid down their arms" (Kamm 1980). Now with the authoritarian government depicted attempting a peaceful end to the standoff the protestors would be described in this manner, "The Martial Law Command's statement told of looting and robbery by militants. A moderate faction was reported to be ready to surrender to the military, while the hard-liners were said to be holding out for the lifting of martial law" (Kamm 1980). With these descriptions of those fighting for political reform, the reader can rest assured that the South Korean authorities' plan to quell the rebellion is both needed and justified.

Furthermore, on June 29, 1980 two American doctors were arrested by the South Korean government for possessing “rolls of film, color photos and mimeographed statements and many other antigovernment propaganda materials in their baggage” that related to the Kwangju suppression that occurred a month earlier (Washington Post 1980). These arrests were covered by both the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* (New York Times 1980). The doctors’ release and immediate deportation to Japan would be covered by the *Post* the following day with the added statement that, “The two doctors [Dr. John Kim and Dr. Glenn Gordon] had visited Kwangju at the request of the United Presbyterian Church, which expressed concern about arrests and injuries suffered by church members and other South Koreans during the Kwangju uprising” (Washington Post 1980). The testimonies of these individuals would seem to be worthwhile in attempting to seek a differing perspective than that of the authoritarian government, but, as far as this paper could find, reporting on what these men had in their baggage that proved worthy enough to warrant their arrests and what they had to say about the government’s actions in Kwangju were not pursued.

What’s more to the point of this coverage concerning the Kwangju uprising and latter massacre is the newspaper’s framing of the situation. All three papers commented on the demands of the students massing in the city and how fundamentally democratic these demands were in principle. The end to military rule, freedom of thought and expression, and free elections were not the shouts of political radicals. Yet they were portrayed that way. As we will see in the later portion of this paper concerning Hungary, the South Korean students and the many other citizens who joined them were simply protesting for democratic reform in the wrong country. A strategic ally and one where over 50,000 American lives had been given to its safeguard, South Korea held more importance as a functioning, undemocratic ally than an ally moving towards democracy. On May 16, the *Times* described the South Korean government in this regard, “Mr. Choi has ended emergency decrees that prohibited criticism of the Government or Constitution and has freed many political prisoners. But he has warned that progress toward total democracy must be gradual and careful” (New York Times 1980). This quote, coming from the powerless president of South Korea, is telling in that it reflected the stance of the United States government as well. This “gradual and careful” nudge for democratic reform by the superpower that guaranteed the security of the military dictatorship in question would play a profound part in ensuring military rule in the country for another decade (BBC News 2000).

Hungary 1956

Context:

Following World War II Hungary came under Soviet rule as a satellite state and member of the Eastern Bloc. Although there was a brief period of democracy directly after WWII, by 1948 Communist strongman, Matyas Rakosi, implemented a “Stalinist” rule in the country. This ironhanded rule fomented

resentment amongst the people culminating in late October of 1956 with a revolt led by students calling for the ousting of Rakosi, the re-instituting of free elections, and a withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. The Soviets, after some delay, brutally quelled the uprising on November 10, 1956 resulting in the death of over an estimated 2,000 Hungarians. As with other Soviet suppression of political activism within the Eastern Bloc, the clash between state and citizen in a Communist nation provided U.S. media with a very attractive opportunity to detail the “evils” inherent in Communist rule and to reemphasize the seriousness concerning the stakes involved in “winning” the Cold War. While extreme restraint would be practiced by our media when reporting events involving “friendly,” journalistic freedom would be vastly expanded when covering state suppression by Communist regimes.

Reported:

Headlines for these articles concerning the Hungarian uprising presented the opening frame as to how the reader should view this uprising. The *Chicago Tribune* led its page one article dealing with the Hungarian crisis with the title, “Defy 200,000 Red Troops.” The second line in this article would be the phrase, “Rebels Fight Desperately in Hungary” (*Chicago Tribune* 1956). The *New York Times* headlined their page one on November 11, 1956 with the title, “Hungary Orders ‘Merciless’ Steps to Quell Revolt.” Within this article, the Hungarian protestor is portrayed by the following, “The Scandinavian correspondents, who left Budapest at noon, reported they had seen armed freedom fighters walking boldly in the streets by daylight” (Abel 1956). The *Washington Post* printed the title, “Workers Stand By ‘Freedom’ Demands at Mass Meeting in Hungary Capital,” on page A1 of their November 16th issue. The article would go on to say, “Budapest’s industrial workers, who bitterly fought Russian tanks and troops, voted today to continue their general strike” (Maron 1956). Whereas the papers stood by the government line of non-participation concerning the Kwangju uprising in South Korea and the Indonesian invasion of East Timor, the *Times* would tell of the impact the U.N. hands-off policy had on the rebellion. “But the failure of the General Assembly to take any positive action was said to have thrown the revolutionaries into despair...One of the refugees remarked bitterly: ‘The Russians, after all, were acting like Russians. But we expected more from the West than to be let down this way’” (Abel 1956) On November 8th, the *Times* printed the last-minute radio transmission by a pro-rebellion station entitled, “Hungarians Plead Desperately by Radio to Soviet Troops and to ‘All Honest Men’” (*New York Times* 1956).

Following the violent suppression by the Soviets hundreds of thousands of Hungarians fled the country. Some escaped to the United States, and the *Tribune* allocated a page one story of a particular 73 refugees that arrived in Milwaukee on November 23, 1956. Complete with pictures of the two babies brought over, the author’s opening paragraph expresses his justifiable sympathy. “They filed docilely - almost dazedly - off the plane that brought them, waited passively... climbed tiredly aboard waiting buses, and winced at the sirens of the police escort which sped them thru the streets” (Holmes

1956). More articles would fill the three papers detailing the struggle and aftermath of the suppressed uprising. The *Washington Post* would summarize the event, “For a few brief days between the first coming of the Russian tanks and their final, massive employment in crushing force Sunday morning, Budapest time, the fire of freedom blazed openly in Hungary” (Marder 1956).

Although there can be many similarities drawn between the students mounting their protests in South Korea in 1980 and their preceding Hungarian counterparts in 1956, the reporting by our newspapers of the two were starkly different. The term of “violent militants” would not be used to describe the Hungarian, student-led protests that defied their state authority. Instead, terms such as “patriots” and “freedom fighters” that were “bitterly” fighting massive Russian troops would be employed by reporters all too aware of the Cold War context they were reporting in (Abel 1956; Maron 1956). The American reader could find a hero in the Hungarian rebel fighting Soviet oppression in the headlines splashed across the U.S. media’s front pages while their Korean counterparts half a world away were dismissed as radical for protesting an authoritarian regime that happened to serve U.S. interests in the region.

Summary:

This paper has attempted to analyse the media’s role in portraying events unfolding around the globe and its affect on U.S. foreign policy. In South Africa, the reporting of the Sharpeville Massacre saw the creative reporting of events by the press in turning the extremely well-armed South African authorities into “besieged” victims attempting to thwart a rampaging mob corrupted with “militant radicals.” Throughout the reporting of the three papers, the danger posed by black, stone-throwing “radicals” was elevated to the status of equals with the jets and machine guns employed by the very state that denied them any semblance of equality.

In East Timor, the reporting by the U.S. press presented the picture of a bickering, backward tribal people whose integration with invading Indonesia was presupposed and often deemed as natural by journalists relying almost completely upon an invading army’s assessment on how things were transpiring and their own ignorance of the region. When this fell into contention, a reinforcing statement by a U.S. government official would fill the void providing authoritative reassurance to a press all too eager to sacrifice its independent analysis. Finally, the story of the Timorese people and the horrors plaguing their lives found itself buried by the more pressing matters of journalistic importance that effectively dismissed their plight as newsworthy.

In South Korea, the student’s demands in Kwangju were “understandable” but their refusal to lay down their arms and work within the vast opportunities presented in an authoritarian regime dismissed their cause as justifiable in the chronicles of America’s leading papers. The dangers posed by North Korean forces along the DMZ and our historical sacrifice to the country would trump

the desires of South Korean youths to attain the very same democratic reforms that our nation's media would praise in Hungary decades before.

Post-Cold War:

The question to be rendered is whether these skewed practices of reporting were part and parcel of the ideological conflict that was the Cold War, and therefore whether this journalistic "filtering" was a Cold War ritual that has ceased to be relevant with the collapse of the U.S.'s superpower competitor. Recent journalistic portrayals, however, recast the dye that found itself in the papers delivered to so many Americans decades before. This dye has, with the advent of twenty-four hour news, transformed itself from an ink blot to a visually stimulating television screen packaged for easy digestion by a populace "on the go." While many examples can be brought to bear, no one portrayal truly encapsulates the continuation of the journalistic trend discussed above more than the events surrounding the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

In the United States, mainstream media failed to investigate the many holes surrounding the Bush administration's case for war that centred on the threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) in Iraq and a Saddam Hussein connection to al-Qaeda. Instead of seeking independent verification for these claims, major media largely relied solely upon White House officials or "eye witness accounts" from members of Ahmed Chalib's Iraqi National Congress (INC) for information. As Bill Moyer would state in his segment concerning the American media's role towards war with Iraq, "What the White House was now marketing as fact, would go virtually unchallenged" (Moyer 2007). Claims from the White House were not scrutinized, but reinforced and elaborated upon in all major avenues of media. The *New York Times's* William Safire and the *Washington Post's* George Will consistently appeared on television shows such as "Meet the Press" defending the President's precedent of preemptive war and wrote op ed pieces bolstering the case for war. The *Post*, alone, would run over 140 front page articles making the case for war from August of 2002 to the invasion in March of 2003 while only a handful of articles appeared on the front page attempting to question or challenge White House claims (Moyer 2007). *New York Times* reporter, Judith Miller, would feature numerous articles presenting the claims of Chalibi's INC as conclusive proof that Saddam possessed WMDs (Shafer 2003). When NBC, ABC, CBS, and the nightly news aired its 414 segments concerning Iraq, nearly all of the segments drew its sources exclusively from the White House, Pentagon, or U.S. State Department (Moyer 2007).

Furthermore, anyone deviating from the march towards war with Iraq received minimal reporting from the nation's major media. The detailed speech given by Senator Ted Kennedy regarding his opposition to invasion and his elaboration on the inconclusive intelligence the White House was relying upon was given a scant 36 words in the *Washington Post*. The coverage of the anti-war protest in Washington D.C. that gathered over 100,000 in October of 2002 making it the largest anti-war protest since the Vietnam War (Zernike 2002) was allocated to

the “Metro” section of the *Post* (Moyer 2007) and a page 8 in the *Times*. The article in the *Times* attempted to minimize the number of protesters to only thousands and stating, “Fewer people attended than organizers had said they hoped for” (Clemetson 2002). The Washington D.C. police later estimated the crowd was 100,000 strong while anti-war organizers, thrilled with the amount of participation, estimated they were around 200,000 (Zernike 2002)

On February 5, 2003 Secretary of State Colin Powell gave his infamous presentation to the United Nations concerning the threat posed by the Saddam regime. While the American mass media applauded the presentation as an effective case for war, foreign presses offered critical analysis and commented on the contentious assertions found within the speech. The most damning revelation was picked up by the British press regarding Powell’s description of a British intelligence dossier that “describes in exquisite detail Iraqi deception activities” (The Guardian 2003). It was learned that the British dossier in question was actually the thesis of a post graduate student in the state of California. Complete with the spelling errors found in the original, the student’s work had been plagiarized off the internet and found its way into the speech of the U.S. Secretary of State (Moyer 2007). Whereas the foreign press ran articles and television segments elaborating on this enormous blunder that undermined U.S. credibility and the case for war, the American press fell silent on the story and continued to fully endorse the speech (Moyer 2007). The collaboration between the major press and the foreign policy agenda of the Bush administration would continue after the invasion of Iraq as well.

On April 9, 2003, many Americans were shown the symbolic tearing down of Saddam Hussein’s statue in Baghdad complete with news correspondent’s reinforcement as to the historical significance this moment held. As the FOX News channel’s Brit Hume and colleagues would comment during the live coverage, “I wonder what Dominique de Villepin and Jacques Chirac are saying if they’re watching right now?” (Fox News 2003). Another correspondent would elaborate, “Dominique of course, being the foreign minister of France and his boss, the president of France, who of course opposed the liberation of Iraq at every step along the way” (Fox News 2003). American liberation now possessed an iconic moment to be played and replayed throughout major media. The media presented this jubilation by those gathered around the crumbled statue as an act of simple spontaneity born out of the liberation found with American intervention. However, the iconic moment that was serving as irrefutable justification for American “preemption” was tainted with U.S. stage-crafting. The *Los Angeles Times* reported on an Army internal study in July 3, 2004 that criticized its psychological operations unit’s role during the Baghdad event. According to the internal report a Marine colonel in charge of the Marines converging on Firdos Square in central Baghdad saw a “target of opportunity” when he viewed the massive Hussein statue that lay conveniently close to the Palestine Hotel that held international journalists. Contrary to the media’s portrayal, the report states that it was this particular colonel’s decision to topple the statue, and it was a nearby Army psychological operations unit’s

desire to make “it appear to be a spontaneous Iraqi undertaking” (Zucchino 2004).

What is even more troublesome than this crafted propaganda on the part of the U.S. military is the collaboration of the news media in reporting the event. Both newspaper headline photos and live television coverage zoomed in on the gathered crowd surrounding the statue filling the television screen with a sense of massive celebration on the part of Iraqis. If these lenses were to scan outwards, however, the American audience would have seen that Firdos Square was completely encircled by U.S. military vehicles and completely empty save the few hundred Iraqis gathering around the statue in an upper portion of the square (McAlister 2001). Yet, this is not what American audiences were shown, because as Melani McAlister states in her book, “Working within an ideological frame that predisposed them [the media] to see smiling Iraqis, they showed only those aspects of the scene that fit the frame” (McAlister 2001).

Later in 2004, both the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* would publicly apologize for their coverage of the war (McAlister 2001). Yet, the same people who led the drumming up to war with Iraq and proved to be so cataclysmically wrong about their assessments are still hired on as columnists in major print and television “experts” throughout major media. As is demonstrated, aspects all too similar to those practiced decades before seem to have remained lurking within the present-day media’s mind frame.

From these historic events and the portrayals for each that the media manufactured for public viewing, the cherished free press seems all too willing, at times, to limit itself for the “greater good” of furthering the ambitions of powerful decision-makers in Washington. The ideal “free” press detached from government influence has been shown to cling to the coattails of U.S. officials who fulfil the role as sole provider of information needed for print. From the accounts taken above, a disturbing trend seems to lie grounded in our media’s coverage of international events. Dictating how the “story” will be conveyed just as much as what is actually transpiring is *where* the event is transpiring. The unfulfilled role the media has played in checking executive ambitions overseas that disregard founding tenets of international law and morality has wreaked havoc on those unfortunate enough to be under the trampling foot of these undertakings, and has played a substantial role in allowing U.S. decision-making processes to bypass constraints that might have been posed by a well informed public. Whether an informed public would derail these policy ambitions cannot be said and, more to the point, is irrelevant in this discussion. The fundamental issue at hand lays in the fact that the American public was never given an opportunity to do so. The entity that is supposed to arm the public with the tools to confront government policy that attempts to bypass their seal of approval has been shown to frequently fail them.

References

Abel, Elie 1956, ‘Hungary Orders ‘Merciless’ Steps to Quell Revolt’, *New York Times* 11 November, 1956. p. 1

Amnesty International 1994, *'Power and Impunity': Human Rights under the New Order*, London.

Andelman, David 1975, 'Jakarta Strives to Keep Foreign Aid; More U.S. Arms and Other Help Due', *New York Times* 26 November, p. 8.

Anderson, Jack 1979, 'East Timor Shouldn't Be Ignored', *Washington Post* 9 November, p. B13.

BBC News 17 May 2000, 'Flashback: The Kwangju Massacre', viewed June 22, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/752055.stm>

BBC News 18 May 2005, 'Lingering Legacy of Korean Massacre', viewed June 22, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/4557315.stm>

Blum, William 1995, *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II*, Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Chapman, William 1980, 'S. Korean Try at Liberalization Comes to a Halt', *Washington Post* 19 May, p. A1.

Chomsky, Noam 1993, *Year 501: The Conquest Continues*, Boston: South End Press.

Chicago Tribune 12 November 1956, 'Defy 200,000 Red Troops', p. 1.

Chicago Tribune 30 September 1975, 'Indonesian Troops, Leftists Clash', p. A13.

Chicago Tribune 20 May 1980, 'Military Closes Korean Assembly,' p. 11.

Chicago Tribune 22 March 1960, 'South Africa Police Kill 62 Rioting Natives,' p. 5.

Clemetson, Lynette 2002, 'The Protestors: Thousands March in Washington against Going to War in Iraq,' *New York Times* 27 October, p. 8.

FOX News 9 April 2003, viewed June 26, 2007, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wss_urnuB7o&mode=related&search

Guardian 5 February 2003, 'Full Text of Colin Powell's Speech,' viewed June 22, 2007, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/Story/0,,889531,00.html>

Holmes, Paul 1956, '73 Refugees Get Warm Welcome in Milwaukee', *Chicago Tribune* 24 November, p. 1.

Kamm, Henry 1980, 'Seoul Seems To Plan A Move On Kwangju', *New York Times* 26 May, p. A6.

Kasischke, Richard 1960, 'Negro Rioting Erupts Anew in South Africa', *Washington Post* 23 March, p. A6.

Lescaze, Lee 1977, 'U.S. Stopped Aid to Indonesia in '75 Over E. Timor Repression', *Washington Post* 18 March, p. A28.

- Maron, Endre 1956, 'Workers Stand By 'Freedom' Demands At Mass Meeting In Hungary Capital', *Washington Post* 16 November, p. A1.
- McAlister, Melani 2001, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, & U.S. Interests in the Middle East since 1945*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moyers, Bill. 2007, *Buying the War*', viewed on June 22, 2007, <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/btw/watch.html>
- New York Times* 22 March 1960, '50 Killed in South Africa As Police Fire on Rioters', p. 1.
- New York Times* 8 October 1975, 'Big Indonesia Attack in Timor Reported', p. 9.
- New York Times* 15 February 1976, 'Fighting on Timor Said to Kill 60,000', p. 11.
- New York Times* 8 November 1956, 'Hungarians Plead Desperately by Radio To Soviet Troops and to 'All Honest Men'', p. 15.
- New York Times* 13 March 1977, 'Indonesia Charged With Atrocities', p. 10.
- New York Times* 16 May 1980, 'Korea's Premier Moves to Placate Student Protesters', p. A1.
- New York Times* 4 May 1960, 'Many Shot in Back in Sharpeville Riot', p. 16.
- New York Times* 23 March 1960, 'Riots Continue in South Africa', p. 5.
- New York Times* 29 June 1980, 'Two Americans Are Held By South Korean Police', p. 9.
- Oberdorfer, Don 1980, 'Pessimism Deepening on Seoul Stability', *Washington Post* 27 May, p. A1.
- Porter, Adrian 1960, '62 Africans Die in Race Law Protest', *Washington Post* 22 March, p. A1.
- Shafer, Jack 2003, "Reassessing Miller", *Slate* 29 May, viewed June 22, 2007, <http://www.slate.com/id/2083736/>
- Sharkey, John 1977, 'Indonesians Said to Kill 100,000 in East Timor', *Washington Post* 13 March, p. 19.
- Simpson, Brad 2005, "'Illegally and Beautifully': The United States, the Indonesian Invasion of East Timor and the International Community, 1974-76', *Cold War History*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 281-315.
- Tyler, Humphrey 1960, 'Eye Witness Describes Shooting at Sharpeville', *Washington Post* 30 March, p. A8.
- Washington Post* 1 October 1975, '4 Killed in Beirut Shooting', p. A19.
- Washington Post* 30 June 1980, 'South Korea Releases 2 Americans', p. A18.

Zernike, Kate 2002, 'Threats and Responses: Rally in Washington Is Said to Invigorate the Anti-War Movement', *New York Times* 30 October, p. A17.

Zucchini, David 2004, 'Army Stage-Managed Fall of Hussein Statue', *Los Angeles Times* 3 July, p. A28.

Does pragmatism always work? Political objectives of the Australian government in North-East Asia

Rachel West
Flinders University of South Australia

As with any country, the political objectives of Australian foreign policy are based on Australian national values. Yet, because such values are inherently based on governmental interpretation, political leanings have created legitimate differences in the objectives pursued in Australian foreign policy over time. This article will explore these differences through Australia's position as a Western, liberal democracy located in the Asia-Pacific. This will be done by examining Australia's relations with those countries which represent the convergence of the Asia-Pacific's most significant economic, strategic, and political links - Northeast Asia.¹ What will be apparent is that, while determined in its resolve, the political objectives pursued by the current Howard government have proved to be both contentious and potentially damaging to Australia's standing in the region.

Differences in the political objectives pursued as part of Australia's foreign policy in the Asia-Pacific have resulted from different understandings of how to reconcile Australia's "history" with its "geography". As a result, this has led to two very distinct policies from the major political parties regarding Australia's engagement of the region, including with those countries of Northeast Asia.

Under previous Labor government, the difference between Australia's history and geography was seen as a barrier to Australia's relationship with countries of the region. The opposite is true, however, under the current Liberal-led government of John Howard: Australia's European history, the American alliance, and its location in Asia together are seen to create a unique strength in advancing Australia's interests, both regionally and on the global stage. Because of this strength, to change Australian values or its politics to converge with those of the region would be a mistake. Rather, the political objectives of foreign policy in Northeast Asia under the Howard government have come to be

¹ Northeast Asia is generally understood to encompass China (including Taiwan), Japan, North and South Korea, and the eastern regions of Russia. However, due to the decline in Russia's in regional significance since the end of the Cold War, these eastern regions hold limited significance to Australia's engagement of Northeast Asia. Thus, for the purpose of this article, Northeast Asia refers to China (including Taiwan), Japan, and North and South Korea.

defined by mutual respect: shared interests are promoted, while differences are “managed”.

Such mutual respect is crucial to understanding Australia’s political relationships in Northeast Asia under the Howard government. While the shared attributes of liberal democracy and the American alliance are regarded as the foundation of Australia’s partnerships with Japan and South Korea, it is the management of difference through bilateral dialogues which characterizes Australia’s political relationship with China. This pragmatism on the part of the Howard government has seen all three relationships grow in strength.

Yet, divisions between Japan, South Korea, and China themselves mean that little has yet to be achieved in terms of a cohesive, meaningful Northeast Asian political unit. Regionalism has instead had to be advanced through the much broader framework of East Asia, and is being directed by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). For ASEAN member countries, for whom gesture and symbolism remain crucial elements of regional politics, Australia’s lack of willingness to converge with Asian values and ideals has proven contentious: the East Asian Summit process is a case in point. Thus, while Australia has achieved great success in strengthening its bilateral political relationships with the countries of Northeast Asia, its relations with the Northeast Asian region as a whole have first had to be filtered through ASEAN. The Howard government’s success at a regional level has therefore been less impressive. Ultimately, success requires a greater degree of foreign policy flexibility, and indeed foreign policy foresight, than this government has been able to provide.

The role of Australian values in foreign policy

The task of Australian foreign policy makers is to advocate and advance the national interest in a way that is “both effective and in accordance with the values of the Australian people” (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p. vii). This extension of Australian values into foreign relations is achieved through the political objectives of foreign policy. Such responsiveness to, and representation of, Australian values therefore implies certain foreign policy traditions which continue to shape the pursuit of the national interest, regardless of the politics of the government in power. Clearly, these political objectives are informed by Australia’s almost unique status as a Western, liberal democracy located in the Asia-Pacific.

As a liberal democracy, the political and economic values that have shaped Australia’s institutions and outlook are acknowledged as guiding its approach to international affairs (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p.vii). Working with other liberal democracies in promoting political and economic freedoms is therefore seen as one way of helping to build a more prosperous and secure world (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p.2). Moreover, Australia’s immediate political focus is necessarily to the north: the inaugural foreign and trade policy white paper, introduced under the Howard government, concluded that “changing relativities of power and influence of

East Asia's economic rise" was one of only two major trends with the capability to reshape the international environment (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, p. 17-18).²

As with every Australian government since World War II, the Howard government also frames Australia's political relationships with Northeast Asia through the prism of its alliance with the United States. While the significance attributed to this special relationship may have fluctuated with changes of government, the Australia-US partnership, as well as the US alliance system more broadly, has continued to influence the way in which Australia interacts politically. Thus, the United States' global reach in international affairs has meant that strengthening Australia's ability to influence and work with the US is essential in advancing Australian national interests (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, p.xvi).

However, the Howard government is also responsible for key departures in traditional Australian foreign policy thinking. Under Howard and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Alexander Downer, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade has been active in promoting its "hard-headed" assessment (see, for example, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p. xvi) of the Australian national interest. In particular, while Labor governments have in the past attempted to define Australia as "part of" Asia, the Liberal-led government of Howard and Downer has consistently argued that Australia is "not Asian" and not "part of" Asia (Fitzgerald 1997, p. 38). Thus, while engagement with East Asia continues to be an important feature of Australian foreign policy under Howard, this "does not imply or require modification of other long-standing links and loyalties", (Dalrymple 2003, p. 97) including Australia's alliance with the US.

Dalrymple argues that Labor's identification of Australia as part of Asia was to overcome what was seen as a major obstacle in Australia's engagement with the region: the incompatibility between Australia's "history" and its "geography" (Dalrymple 2003, p. 221). Howard, however, argues that Australia does not need to choose between its history and its geography, because "we have learned not to tie ourselves in knots defining Australia's place in the world with some unyielding and rigid formula" (Howard 2005a). Australia should focus on the strength derived from the "unique intersection" it occupies as a country in the Asian region with a strong European heritage and close links to the United States (Liberal Party 2001, p.8). This interplay between geography and history is not a "zero-sum game" (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p. 4). Nor does it imply a need to choose between East and West, or a need to qualify Australian values in the pursuit of its interests in Asia.

Rejecting the need for Australia to adapt in order to fit in, the Howard government has instead argued that Australian security and prosperity in Northeast Asia (and in Asia generally) requires a "balance of principle and

² The other trend was globalisation. Both were regarded as having the ability to profoundly influence Australia's foreign and trade policy over the next fifteen years.

pragmatism” (Howard 2005a). Engagement with the region therefore proceeds not just on the basis that the values and traditions of Australian society are taken as a given, (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p.5) but also involves mutual respect and acknowledgement of differences. Under Howard, Australian political relationships in Northeast Asia are built upon common interests, in particular through emphasizing important economic, diplomatic, and security relationships (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p. xv).

While recognizing the role of national values in foreign policy, this balance of principle and pragmatism has resulted in the Howard government engaging principally with “those countries with which [Australia’s] primary strategic and economic interests reside” (Howard 2005a). By endorsing political objectives that are “somewhat values-based”, the government is therefore promoting a sense of “practicality” in its approach to Northeast Asia (Fallows 2006, p.10).

This pragmatism has also resulted in a focus on strengthening of Australia’s bilateral relationships under the Howard government, rather than “ambitious initiatives designed to demonstrate regional credentials and capacities” (Dalrymple 2003, p. 144). Such “practical bilateralism” (as it has been termed by Downer) has come to fundamentally define the political objectives pursued as part of Australian foreign policy in Northeast Asia, and is based on identifying common interests and building on them at the bilateral level (Downer 1996) (check quote).

The pragmatism promoted in Australian foreign policy under the Howard government has also come to characterize Australia’s approach to the Northeast Asian region as a whole. In 2000, Downer claimed that there two types of regionalism: cultural regionalism, built on common ties of history, mutual cultural identity, and what he described as “emotional links”, and practical regionalism, in which “countries which are bound together by geography find practical ways of working together to achieve their mutual objectives” (Downer 2000).

For a country which is “only able to attain, and thus only interested in” practical regionalism (Dalrymple 2003, p. 155), Downer’s comments are revealing of the way in which Australia wishes to engage with Asia. Australia wants an East Asian regional architecture that will evolve in an open, transparent, and inclusive manner, and “with the expectation that the US will continue to play a prominent role in bringing prosperity and stability to our region” (Downer 2006a). Significantly, when asked to discuss drivers of regional integration, Downer placed the newly formed “ASEAN+3 East Asia Summit” last on the list, as the only region-wide institution that formally excludes the United States (Downer 2006b). Yet, while significant in their own right, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) grouping and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) - the two institutions Downer ranked above the East Asia Summit process - are both also regarded by regional countries as institutions which engage “outsiders” with the region (Dalrymple 2003, p. 103).

Australian distinctions between practical and cultural regionalism, and between Asia-Pacific as opposed to exclusively Asian regional institutions, are a way not only to promote Australia's own involvement in an emerging East Asian sense of regionalism. It is also designed to ensure the continued presence of Australia's great and powerful, the United States.

Australia and Northeast Asia: the political relationship between Australia and Japan

Australia continues to have no greater friend in Asia than Japan - Australia's largest export market for almost forty years and a "strategic partner for regional peace and prosperity" (Howard 2005a). Yet, in highlighting the practical role national values can play in foreign policy formulation, John Howard has acknowledged that the long-standing close ties and cooperation between Australia and Japan are not only based on strategic and economic capability, but is also due to "shared values of democracy, freedom, [and] the rule of law" (Howard 2002b). With both countries established liberal democracies, Howard has gone so far as to describe the most important aspect of this partnership as "common values and common beliefs and practices" (Howard 2002a).

These shared values are clearly displayed in Australia and Japan's roles as key US allies in the Asia-Pacific. Downer recently used Australia's military cooperation with Japan in Iraq to demonstrate the significance of such values in Australia's political relationship with Japan. Thus, the Iraq collaboration had not only served to highlight "our ever-deepening bilateral relationship" (Downer 2006a), it also highlighted the overall alignment of Australian and Japanese strategic, economic, and political interests (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, p. 60).

Japan's pivotal role in deciding how regional institutions emerge and develop in East Asia, as well as the "quality of East Asia's linkages with other parts of the world" (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, p. 60), has been to the benefit of Australia. Japan has long been a supporter of Australian involvement in Asian affairs, and in particular has pushed for Australia to be part of an emerging East Asian community (Howard 2002b). Australia's invitation to the inaugural East Asian Summit in late 2005 was largely due to such Japanese support. Together, Japan and Australia have also made it clear that they wish to see East Asian regional architecture evolve in an open, transparent, and inclusive way, and both expect the US to be an integral part of this process (Downer 2006a).

The Howard government has acknowledged the decisive bearing Australia's relationship with Japan has both on Australia's standing in East Asia, and the degree of participation it has in regional affairs (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, 60). Politically, as well as economically and strategically, this partnership with Japan remains one of Australia's "most important and mature" relationships anywhere in the world (Downer 2003).

The political relationship between Australia and South Korea

The Australian political partnership with South Korea is also one of Australia's most important regional relationships. South Korea is a liberal democracy, a market economy, and a long-standing American ally. These common values and beliefs, like those with Japan, make South Korea a close regional friend of Australia.

Australia's role during the 1950-53 Korean War is also significant, with South Korea still regarding Australia as a long-term friend and ally (Hakjooon 2002, p. 99). Both countries remain committed to peace on the Korean peninsula; that Australia is one of the few countries worldwide with full diplomatic relations with North Korea adds a further dimension to Australia's own political relationship with the South.

Also significant for Australia is South Korea's own developing political relationship with China. Rozman argues that due to Seoul's "superior" relations with both China and Japan, South Korea increasingly holds a critical position in the politics of Northeast Asia (Rozman 2004, p.373). Despite its smaller population and economy, therefore, South Korea has come to have a "disproportionate say" in the Northeast Asian region (Rozman 2004, p.372). Like Japan, South Korea's critical role in emerging East Asian regional institutions makes Australia's political relationship with this country increasingly important to the pursuit of the Australian national interest.

The political relationship between Australia and China

Unlike South Korea and Japan, the Australia-China partnership is defined primarily by the political differences between the two countries, as well as their economic complementarities, rather than any political values they share. With the Howard government identifying China's growing regional weight as the single most important trend in the region (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p.22), Australia has worked with China to build a common understanding of how to manage relations in a way that makes the most of shared values, whilst acknowledging differences (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, p.79).

Central to this understanding has been the use of bilateral dialogues, which are seen as offering not only the best prospects to manage differences in a practical way, but also to "maximize shared economic interests and advance Australia's political and strategic objectives" (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, p.79). In particular, Sino-Australian relations improved dramatically after Australia established a bilateral human rights dialogue in 1997, in return for Australia dropping support for annual moves in the UN condemning China over human rights abuses (Smith 2003, p.2). At the time, the Howard government maintained that a bilateral human rights dialogue would improve relations, while also giving Australia greater influence in China itself (Smith 2003, p.2). Though the government acknowledges that progress has been slow, it believes that this is preferable to the alternative - public

condemnation of China - which would generate no progress at all and could well have a corrosive impact on the bilateral relationship over time (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2006).

China's increasingly important role in East Asian regional developments is also significant in Australia's political relationship with this country. Australia has welcomed China's regional involvement, in particular with ASEAN and the ASEAN+3 process (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2005, p.17). Beijing is also playing a growing diplomatic role on such regional issues as North Korea's nuclear program and economic cooperation. Australia has, however, continued to remind China that regional structure should be open and inclusive, and that "continuing strong political, strategic, and economic engagement in the region by the United States is vital to regional security and prosperity" (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2005, p.17)

Clearly, the type of interaction Australia enjoys with South Korea and Japan is not something it shares in its political relationship with China. Howard has acknowledged that there is instead a "strong streak of pragmatism" in his country's relationship with China (Tucker 2006). Australia's One-China policy is therefore frequently restated as a key element on foreign policy, while Australia supports unofficial contacts with Taiwan only to promote economic and trade interests (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2006). As Beijing's diplomatic clout continues to increase, it is difficult to imagine that Australia's approach to be anything but pragmatic.

Australia and the Northeast Asian region

While Australia works hard to maintain its strong bilateral political relationships with Japan, China, and South Korea, it also confronts the increasingly complex challenges that arise in Northeast Asia as a region. In particular, deteriorating diplomatic relations between China and Japan are presenting a clear strategic risk for the wider region. Irritants range from growing competition over regional resources and the long-running dispute over prime ministerial visits to the Yasukuni Shrine in Japan, to China's rising nationalism and concerns over the future role of the Japanese military. Moreover, this mutual distrust is escalating at a time of deepening economic interdependence and regional integration (Dupont 2005).

As the region's two obvious leaders, good relations between China and Japan are crucial to stability and prosperity throughout East Asia, and thus intrinsically tied to Australia's own national interests. Because of Australia's strong political and economic ties with each power, Dupont argues that Australia has the ability to do more to ameliorate tensions between the two countries and the long-term security risk they present (Dupont 2005). Although the Howard government is keen to see the Sino-Japanese relationship strengthen and gain a positive focus, up till now, however, Howard has declined to offer "gratuitous advice", arguing that he would not appreciate such advice from either country concerning a bilateral relationship between Australia and another country (Howard 2005b).

Deepening Sino-Japanese mistrust highlights the continuing division throughout Northeast Asia, along with the lack of an adequate framework to deal with such tensions. It also serves to spotlight the Australian government's broader strategy in Northeast Asia of balancing relations with Japan, China, and South Korea, whilst avoiding being drawn into such regional flashpoints as the Korean peninsula and Taiwan (Jones and Benventui 2006, p.116).

The politics of the region

An emergent sense of East Asian regionalism is, however, providing hope for future regional collaboration, as well as a potentially active role for Australia in this process. ASEAN+3 links the ten ASEAN states with those of Northeast Asia, creating an opportunity to discuss issues of importance to East Asia, and to forge a deeper sense of common identity (Dalrymple 2003, p.146). While APEC and the ARF's ineffectiveness through the Asian financial crisis of 1997/98 saw their regional significance decline, ASEAN+3 began to be seen as the new focus for regional dynamics in East Asia. Significantly, the enthusiasm shown by the countries of Northeast Asia for the ASEAN+3 process has led to suggestions that is the growing ties between China, Japan, and South Korea, with only a weak presence of ASEAN, that really matter (Rozman 2004, p.374). Offering a new venue, minus the US, to bring together the countries of Northeast Asia, by 2001 the '3' had "upgraded an informal breakfast chat into their own annual summit" (Rozman 2004, p.377).

Regional countries' affinity with, and commitment to, the concept of East Asia was clearly demonstrated with the launch of the East Asian Summit in 2005. Seen as "having the potential to evolve into the principal economic and political decision-making body for East Asia" (Kelly 2005), a number of Asian states, led by Japan, canvassed Australia's attendance at the inaugural Summit.

While the Howard government was seeking closer links to regional groups and institutions, a major point of contention developed between Australia and the region over ASEAN's Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC) being set as the effective price of admission. A key document of the Southeast Asian group, the ASEAN Treaty obliges member countries to uphold the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, and the peaceful settlement of disputes. For Howard, such principles represented "a mind-set that we've really all moved on from" (Kelly 2005). The TAC was also deemed inconsistent with Australia's obligations under the ANZUS alliance with the US, despite the fact that fellow American allies Japan and South Korea had already signed the Treaty.

When it became obvious that Australia would not be invited to attend the inaugural East Asian Summit because of its refusal to sign the Treaty, it was clear that the Howard government had "misread the role of the Treaty, the mood of the region, and, possibly, the importance of Australia's participation in the Summit process" (Kelly 2005). Recognizing the opportunity almost lost,

Howard eventually signed the Treaty, securing Australia a foundation seat at the Summit, and hopefully the first step of a budding East Asian regional process.

Australia's efforts to gain a meaningful role in East Asian institutions demonstrates that it is in the area of cultural regionalism "that the grounds for the rejection of Australia's overtures are to be found" (Dalrymple 2003, p.156). The formation and evolution of regional institutions like ASEAN+3 and the East Asian Summit have clearly been influenced by the "emotional links" of cultural regionalism, as demonstrated by the significance attributed to ASEAN's TAC. Ultimately, it is these links which have revealed the Howard government's inability to show policy flexibility, due to its clear preference for pragmatism and bilateralism in its engagement with East Asia. Paul Kelly argues that the furore surrounding Australia's eventual invitation to the East Asia Summit exposes the myths underpinning Howard's Asian diplomacy - firstly, that "gesture, symbolism and cultural signals" are not critical to Australia's acceptance into the region, and, secondly, "that Australia can largely dictate the terms of its engagement" (Kelly 2005).

The announcement of an ASEAN-sponsored East Asian Summit "crystallized Australia's ongoing dilemma about the amorphous character of the region, the uncertainty this breeds," and the policy response best able to address it (Jones and Benvenuti 2006, p.117). In doing so, the East Asian Summit "revealed the diplomatic limitations in Howard's pragmatism and its propensity to disparage regional architecture" (Jones and Benvenuti 2006, p.117). Indeed, what this experience has highlighted is that fact that, for Australia to play an active role in an ASEAN-led East Asian regionalism, Australia must do most of the adapting.

Howard's foreign policy sophistication?

Regionalism provides a form of organization to deal with regional problems that countries are unable to, or lack the resources to do so (He 2004, p.119). Presently, any sense of Northeast Asian regionalism is wrapped up in the broader concept of East Asia; Northeast Asia remains too divided to form an organization based solely on the core countries of Japan, China, the two Koreas, and Taiwan (Rozman 2003). Growing economic interdependence between all states (with the exception of North Korea) means that the potential for regionalization in Northeast Asia remains. However, currently this process is occurring principally through the ASEAN-sponsored East Asian Summit process. While Australia's need to 'adapt' to win acceptance in East Asia is primarily due to ASEAN's formative role in the East Asian Summit's evolution, it is a modification Australia needs to make nevertheless. For Australia to be a part of this process, therefore, it needs to accommodate the need in Southeast Asia for greater convergence from Australia.

While the Howard government's pragmatism may have proved unsuccessful in its quest for active engagement in East Asia, the opposite has been true in Northeast Asia itself. Australia now has strong, mature political ties with all of the core countries of Northeast Asia, and this has largely been because of the

pragmatic use of values in Australia foreign policy. While it has been practical to put to one side the difficult issues attendant in Australia's relationship with China, the citing of democratic values, free market enterprise, and the American alliance has also been because of a 'hard-headed' assessment of Australia's political relationships with South Korea and Japan. Australia promotes these shared values with Japan and South Korea because Australia's political relationship with each helps to advance the national interest. Paradoxically, Australia manages the differences over those same values in its partnership with China for the very same reason. Howard's focus on bilateral relations is well suited to the pragmatism that runs deep in Australian foreign policy under a Liberal-led government.

Yet, this focus also denies the advantages offered by an emerging East Asian regional process that has evolved from an ASEAN foundation. Howard's pragmatism and its effective dismissal of 'regional initiatives' means that Australian foreign policy lacks the flexibility it needs to interact adequately with an ASEAN-sponsored East Asian process, where symbolism and gestures are still very much an important part of the political process. For the countries of East Asia, and for many Australians, the Howard leadership has been caught out by the intricacies and idiosyncrasies of regional engagement.

References

Dalrymple, R. 2003, *Continental Drift, Australia's Search for a Regional Identity*, Ashgate, Aldershot, Hampshire.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1997, *In the National Interest, Australia's Foreign and Trade Policy White Paper*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2003, *Advancing the National Interest: Australia's Foreign and Trade Policy White Paper*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2005, Submission to the Inquiry by the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee to: Australia's Relations with China, March, pp. 1-31.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (last updated August 2006), "People's Republic of China Country Brief: Australia-China Relations", available www.dfat.gov.au/geo/china/cb_index.html, accessed 13 August 2006.

Downer, A. 1996, "Australia, Northeast Asia, and China: Opportunities in a Changing World", Address to a joint Asia/House/Austcham Luncheon, Hong Kong, 4 July, available www.dfat.gov.au/media/speeches/foreign/1996/hongkong.html, accessed 29 September 2006.

Downer, A. 2000, "Opening Speech", Asia Leaders' Forum, China, 23 April, available www.dfat.gov.au/media/speeches/foreign/2000/000423_alf.html, accessed 12 August 2006.

Downer, A. 2003, "Australia and Japan: Shared Interests, a Mature Understanding", Speech to the National Conference of Australia-Japan Societies, Adelaide, 20 September, available www.foreignminister.gov.au/speeches/2003/030920_australia_japan.html, accessed 13 August 2006.

Downer, A. 2006a, "Australia-Japan: A Global Partnership", Speech to the Japan Press Club, 1 August, available www.dfat.gov.au/media/speeches/2006/060801_japan_press_club.html, accessed 14 August 2006.

Downer, A. 2006b, "Doorstop Interview", Kuala Lumpur, 27 July, available www.foreignminister.gov.au/transcripts/2006/060727_dskl_1150cc.html, accessed 14 August 2006.

Dupont, A. 2005, "Regional Tensions Awaken", *Australian Financial Review*, 3 March.

Fallows, J. 2006, "In Praise of Hypocrisy: The Role of 'Values' in Foreign Policy", *Lowy Institute Perspectives*, May 2006, pp. 1-11.

Fitzgerald, S. 1997, *Is Australia an Asian Country?*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards.

Hakjooon, K. 2002, "Political and Security Issues Between the Republic of Korea and Australia", Paper presented at the Fourth Australia-Korea Forum, Hobart, 16-18 July, pp. 99-100.

He, B. 2004, "East Asian ideas of regionalism: a normative critique", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 58, no. 1, March, pp. 105-125.

Howard, J. 2002a, "Joint Press Conference with his Excellency Mr Junichiro Koizumi", Parliament House, Canberra, 1 May, available www.dfat.gov.au/geo/japan/media/transcript_pm_010302.html, accessed 13 August 2006.

Howard, J. 2002b, "Joint Statement with Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi, Australia-Japan Creative Partnership", Media Release, Canberra, 1 May, available www.pm.gov.au/news/media_releases/2002/media_release1623.html, accessed 13 August 2006.

Howard, J. 2005a, 'Australia and the World', Address to the Lowy Institute for International Policy, 31 March, available www.pm.gov.au/news/speeches/speech1290.html, accessed 1 April 2006.

Howard, J. 2005b, Press Conference, Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, 20 April, available www.pm.gov.au/news/interviews/Interview1338.html, accessed 14 August 2006.

Jones, D. M. and Benvenuti, A. 2006, "Tradition, myth and the dilemma of Australian foreign policy", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 60, no. 1, March, pp. 103-124.

Kelly, P. 2005, "Howard Taught a Lesson in Asia", *The Australian*, 27 April.

Liberal Party 2001, "The Howard Government, Putting Australia's Interests First", Liberal Party, Canberra, pp.1-16.

Rozman, G. 2004, *Northeast Asia's Stunted Regionalism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Smith, A. 2003, "Banking on a Constructive China: Australia's China Debate", in *Asia's China Debate, Special Assessment*, December, Asia-Pacific Centre for Security Studies, pp. 1-8.

Tucker, S. 2006, "Engaging China 'an Australian priority': Financial Times Interview with John Howard", *Financial Times*, 1 March.



The Editorial Board of *Politikon*, the International Association for Political Science Students' Academic Journal, invites graduate and undergraduate students to submit papers for review and possible publication.

Founded in 2001, the journal is published twice yearly and distributed in hard copy and online to more than 10,000 IAPSS members in more than 40 countries on every continent. *Politikon* publishes the best in undergraduate and graduate student scholarship from around the world. *Politikon* is recognised globally for its position as one of the leading academic journals publishing the work of students from across the fields of political science and international relations. The peer-review and refereeing process involves full Professors, leading academics and experts from across the world and abstracts from *Politikon* are included in the International Political Science Association's (IPSA) Annual International Political Science Abstracts.

Politikon is funded through contributions from both private and public institutions. These have included local and regional political science associations from throughout Europe and, in recent times, the European Commission. As well, *Politikon* benefits from IAPSS's partnerships with other established political science associations - including IPSA, the International Studies Association (ISA) and the European Political Science Network (epsNet) - with *Politikon* authors being invited to attend and present their research at major conferences and seminars. Events where *Politikon* authors have been invited include the 2006 ISA Annual Convention in San Diego and the 2007 IPSA Congress in Fukuoka.

In a crowded academic publication market *Politikon* has carved out a niche, becoming one of the longest standing and most highly regarded journals of political science and international relations for students in the world.

Articles submitted to the journal should meet the following standards:

- English language
- 4000 - 7000 words, including footnotes
- Microsoft Word or RTF file format
- Fully referenced in Harvard style (see <http://tinyurl.com/nsfcg>)
- An abstract of no more than 125 words
- Biographical information of the author (no more than 50 words)
- Be concerned with political science, international relations, international law, political economy, public policy or a related field.

Submissions should be emailed directly to politikonjournal@iapss.org. A reply confirming receipt will be sent within 48 hours.

<http://www.iapss.org>