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| **JOURNALISM, LIBERALISM, AND DEMOCRACY****EPE 324 01, PLSC 244 01 Fall, 2018**Mondays, 1:30 -3:20 *Note: The first meeting will be on Friday, August 31, to accommodate Labor Day.* **Course Description and Syllabus**(Please read the whole document carefully.)

|  |
| --- |
| *(An examination of news media's changing role in configuring the democratic public sphere, from the synergy of print capitalism and liberal nationalism in the 17th and 18th centuries through the corporate consolidation of mass media in the 20th century and, now, the fragmentation and fluidity of 'news' and of the liberal-democratic public sphere itself.)*This course isn’t intended to teach you “how to” be a journalist or offer tips and connections in pursuing a journalism career. But it’s a course that has helped future journalists, and others who rely on journalism as citizens, to understand what kinds of “public” today's journalism serves or dis-serves, and what is happening to those publics, partly in response to changes in the nature of journalism itself. At this time of deep crisis in the American public sphere and politics, the course will reckon with undercurrents driving “current events” and “the media’s” handling of them. This is a readings-and-discussion seminar, with a couple of multi-media offerings and visits from current journalists and a professor whose long law-review article on corporate “speech” will focus one of our sessions and one your required posts. We will exchange information and insights in intensive discussions, for which you must come prepared by the assigned readings. Each seminar member will a) lead off a discussion of one week’s readings; b) write four short (1000-word) posts online and occasional, very informal comments in response to others’ posts; c) and take an in-class midterm and an in-class final. Your participation in class discussions themselves counts, because, in class and in the posts I’ve just mentioned, the seminar is itself a mini- public sphere. For that reason, though, the use of computers during class sessions themselves is discouraged, except for taking the exams and in cases of special need.  The readings aren’t overly long, but they’re carefully selected and require disciplined study. Because they are widely varied, this course demands a “synthetic intelligence” -- one that can integrate varied genres, themes and viewpoints into over-arching analyses or story lines that you’ll develop in your posts and exam essays. Some of the readings – such as Thucydides’ account of the ancient Athenian Myteline Debate and Walter Lippmann’s observations in assigned sections of his book *Public Opinion* -- are “classics” which you may not have seen before and may not have opportunities to study later. **Course Themes:** A liberal democracy or republic like that of the United States must debate and decide its political, economic, and cultural arrangements constantly in what is often called “the public sphere.” There, citizens, thinking of themselves as “We, the people,” feel responsible to one another and contribute to the well-being of public life. They strive to have a voice in public decisions affecting their lives together and to hammer out the terms of their shared power and sovereignty in relation to the state and markets. Journalism, standing somewhat apart from both state and market pressures, provides the information and interpretation the enable sovereign citizens to decide how their government and markets themselves should work. But the liberal-democratic model of public deliberation that journalism is supposed to serve is undergoing wrenching economic and technological upheavals, and it is being attacked politically. That makes it all the more important to understand the liberal-democratic sphere that is fragmenting and reeling before us and beneath us.  In the liberal-democratic model, journalism is the public sphere’s oxygen: it’s a civic craft whose purpose is to make public deliberation go well. It accomplishes this when it provides the flows of information and opinion that sustain reasoned deliberation by ordinary citizens and their chosen representatives, even amid powerful currents and centers of propaganda, force and fraud. Those currents must be deflected, channeled, or broken up constantly. At their best, journalists enable public deliberation to carry on the navigation and decision-making that good governance requires. But most “mainstream” journalism today is sustained by media corporations that are “public” in a very different, more limited sense: Shares of stock in their ownership are traded publicly, in open markets, but for one purpose only: to make money for the shareholders, who are joined together only as investors and who therefore come and go – and not as citizens who deliberate with one another about common goals and strategies out of a sense of mutual obligation. Like all business corporations, the media corporations that house and sustain most journalism exist not mainly to strengthen public deliberation but – by law and/or by their own charters – to increase the price of their stock: Their managers’ and employees’ priorities are market-driven, not “civic” or deliberative. They work to draw and hold the largest possible number of “eyeballs,” under competitive pressures so intense that they tend to transform a deliberating “public” of citizens into an ever-shifting kaleidoscope of consumer audiences, mass or niche, assembled and reassembled on whatever ideological, religious, erotic or nihilist pretext might pull in more audience members and, through them, advertisers. Sensationalism and titillation, reaching for the lowest common denominator in search of the biggest returns, stimulate what is least deliberative and public-minded, sometimes in tandem with demagogic public leaders. The new engines of media have also achieved unprecedented ability to target, track, and indebt their users.  Defenders of media conglomerates and platforms insist that the popularity and profitability of their offerings proves that they’re upholding liberal democracy by “giving consumers what they want.” They ask, rhetorically, who else is to judge what people want besides consumers themselves. The course reviews these arguments and studies alternative claims that a liberal capitalist republic needs something more. We examine what that “something” is by surveying the history, philosophy, and changing prospects of the American public sphere and journalism. We review three typical responses to recent upheavals in public life: One response assails capitalism and liberalism by contending that while they liberated journalism and the public sphere itself from feudal, theocratic, and other tyrannical constraints, they are now devouring the liberal democracies that they helped to create. In this view, excesses in profiteering and individualism degrade democratic dispositions and habits. A second response to recent upheavals in journalism and public life acknowledges that profit-driven journalism and liberal individualism often do amplify destructive tendencies. But this view holds that those tendencies were rampant long before capitalism and liberalism existed and that they can be addressed only through public affirmations of society, in religious, national, and/or civic-republican narratives and commitments strong enough to face the dark side of human inclinations. Such responses often rely on intensive training in communities that nourish a public sphere but whose varied orientations pose challenges to civic unity. A third response, well-known in America since the late 19th century but often eclipsed in recent decades, would pursue the “civic-republican” training of future citizens and leaders. It would combine the republican critiques of capitalism mentioned above (including the belief that a sovereign, deliberating public stands somewhat free of states and markets, in order to govern them) with a deeper, somewhat darker understanding of the human condition, in order to strengthen a more public-minded liberalism.  This strategy encourages journalists and reformers to use public reason and courage in their work, sometimes drawing on elements of civil religion and civic patriotism to stimulate others to hold concentrations of power to account by democratic standards. Here elements of “new media” and “citizen journalism” demand our attention. Some journalists have started ProPublica, the Center for Investigative Reporting, and other centers -- independent, non-profit news organizations that produce the kind of journalism in the public interest that conglomerate fiduciaries of shareholder interests consider too expensive and insufficiently profitable. Others have started community-based, collaborative news sites such as the New Haven Independent, whose editor, Paul Bass, will visit our class. Our survey of these varied approaches to the crisis of the public sphere revivifies a central lesson: A liberal-capitalist democracy has to rely on virtues and beliefs that cannot be nurtured or enforced by the liberal state, capitalist markets, or a journalism captive to either or both. Liberalism’s commitment to defend individual autonomy keeps the state and markets from judging between a) citizens who are free, entrepreneurial spirits with a sense of the common good, not just their own interest and b) opportunistic free riders or would-be dominators. The counter-intuitive lesson is that even though the liberal state and markets should not be the judges, citizens and leaders must be nurtured and trained somehow to sustain a robust public spirit and vigorous give and take that aerates and tests various moral, legal, and policy options confronting the public.  Some of those options will gain wider acceptance as debate proceeds; others will be pushed toward the margins. But none is foreclosed over the long run, if public discussion continues. In this view, truth emerges not from radical pronouncements of the General Will, from religious doctrines, or from public and private bureaucracies giving orders; instead, truth emerges only provisionally, from the trust-building processes of deliberative democracy itself. As Yale President Kingman Brewster noted in the late 1960s,  "[A]nyone who is himself willing to listen deserves to be listened to. If he is unwilling to open his mind to persuasion, then he forfeits his claim on the audience of others." Yet those claims on the audience of others continue to be made, loudly and clearly, by people and entities that are closed to persuasion. Civil society by itself cannot dissolve basic conflicts between private interests and public purposes, between markets and morals, or between media corporations as profit maximizers and journalism as the oxygen of democracy. But it can mitigate and channel those conflicts in constructive directions. As we study the varied understandings of the public sphere and journalism mentioned above, we devote later sessions to recent developments in news media.  **Course Requirements:**1.     After the opening session, any student who isn’t already pre-registered and wants to take the seminar will e-mail the instructor at james.sleeper@yale.edu with a few paragraphs describing your relevant previous coursework, extra-curricular experiences and mentioning what parts of the course interest you most. This will help me to assess the range of the class’ interests and needs, and it will help you to orient yourself to the course if you are admitted. 2.     During the semester, each student makes a brief, but rigorous in-class presentation, including a 10-or 15-minute summary and assessment, preceded by a short, explanatory paper submitted to the instructor and the class, of a week’s readings, chosen by the student in consultation with the instructor. Preparation and participation are essential. I do not expect every student to speak up in every class, but I do take note of every student’s level of engagement and participation across the semester. 3.     As is especially appropriate to a course on the public sphere, the Canvas Forum section will be used to share your thoughts informally between classes. These Forum posts are the equivalent of short papers, never more than 1000 words, often closer to 250-500 words. They can be informal in tone, prompted by your reflections on a previous session, or your reactions to the coming week's readings. You are urged to respond to one another's posts in Forum: By reading and responding to one another, you enhance our own public sphere. These posts will be required at least four times during the semester.Although I don’t formally track or grade your in-class comments, I do take note of your contributions to our discussions together and weigh them in deciding your grade. You are not expected to engage in every week’s discussion, but will remember your contributions in class during the semester, not just on the day of your formal class presentation.4 .     There will be an in-class mid-term consisting of two essays, each well-grounded in the readings and discussions. Essay topics will be chosen by the student from four or five options presented on the mid-term.  5.     We will also have an in-class final, although in rare cases students may write a final paper after consultation with the instructor.   **SYLLABUS****August 31, Friday: Overview of course themes, units, and requirements.**In this first class we rough out some definitions and themes that will guide us through the semester, during which we’ll develop the following questions together via our readings, discussions, presentations, and speakers. Keep these questions in mind and try to draw them together in your thinking during the semester.1. **What is a liberal-democratic public sphere, ideally and in essence?** What are its essential premises and constitutive elements? (In other words, who needs it, and why?) What are the differences between liberalism and republicanism, and what is civic republicanism? What are the public sphere’s its problems, internal and external? In light of those challenges, what are its prospects? And what are some of the likeliest alternatives?
2. **What is journalism**, as practiced and utilized by participants in a liberal-democratic public sphere? To what other uses has journalism often been put, and how does our model of it compare and contrast with others?
3. **What is nationalism, what is globalization, and will the latter really replace the former?** What is nationalism’s relationship to the public sphere, historically and currently? Amid talk and signs of a “flat” world and global village, how “finished” are nationalism and other imagined communities of ethno-racial solidarity? How “global” can a liberal-democratic public sphere be? What other configurations seem likely and/or possible?
4. **What is capitalism’s role,** historically and today, in the formation and deformation of the liberal democratic public sphere, of journalism, of nationalism, and of globalization? Are there points of leverage, or “launching pads” -- from which far-seeing, ambitious participants in a public sphere might shape such developments?
5. **How, exactly, are digitalization and other technological change** transforming a) essential liberal-democratic premises and practices and b) journalism’s methods and purposes, within nations as well as globally?

**September 10: What is a healthy liberal-democratic public sphere?**          For this class, you need to assess two records of the public sphere in action: **an ancient Athenian debate about war**, as recounted by the Greek general and historian Thucydides, and **a recent American debate about war,** during the “run-up” to the war in Iraq, as hosted and transcribed by the Council on Foreign Relations. But before you read either of these two accounts, you need to know what standards you’re going to use to judge them, and for that we have an interview with Yale Prof. of Political Science and Philosophy Seyla Benhabib1. **“On the Public Sphere, Deliberation, Journalism, and Dignity,”** an interview with Seyla Benhabib.

<http://www.resetdoc.org/EN/Benhabib-interviewed-by-Karin-Wahl-Jorgensen.php>**Study Benhabib’s contention that an effective democratic public sphere requires more than a technical capacity to “connect” with others; it also requires public beliefs, virtues and practices that aren’t guaranteed by a classically liberal state such, at least as we find it in the West now, or by global free markets.**Citing the German political philosopher Jurgen Habermas’ theories of public “discourse ethics” and communicative action, Benhabib suggests that recent technological developments may hamper as much as advance good public deliberation. But the most important parts of the interview for our purposes this week are her comments on the elements she thinks are essential to public deliberation. (The first couple of pages of this interview may seem unrelated to our subject, which she addresses very clearly after that.)As you read Benhabib, take notes on what she claims is necessary for a good public sphere. Then, evaluate the ancient Mytilenean debate and the CFR Iraq War debate by these standards, and come to class prepared to offer your assessment to the rest of us.1. **Thucydides’ account of the Mytilenean debate, 427 B.C.**

<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/imperialism/readings/thucydides6.html>**This is a classical presentation not only of the “Western” democratic public sphere in early practice but also in principle: Not only do the two Athenian speakers, Cleon and Diodotus, advocate different political strategies to respond to the island-state of Mytilene’s refusal to support Athens in a war; more important for our purposes, Cleon and Diodotus also accuse each other of distorting political reality and degrading the integrity and quality of public deliberation itself.**In other words, each speaker departs from the subject at hand – how Athens should treat Mytilene – to remark on how he and his opponent are presenting their arguments to the assembly. This is instructive for us because each speaker is explaining what he thinks (or wants his listeners to think that he thinks) a healthy public sphere requires. Notice also that there are no “media” to report what the speakers were saying to others who couldn’t be present. But we can assume that all citizens were present or were very soon informed by those who were. Thucydides was not functioning as a journalist, because he didn’t write his account of the debate until long after the Mytilene controversy had played out. In other words, what you are reading is not journalism but an account that he wrote for future generations, not for the deliberating public of that moment.  1. **Iraq: The War Debate, Council on Foreign Relations, Feb., 2003 A.D.**

<http://www.cfr.org/iraq/iraq-war-debate/p5513> During the run-up to the Iraq War, CFR hosted a debate between advocates of a war (William Kristol and Max Boot) and opponents of one (Steven Walt and John Mearsheimer). Just as you have read the Mytilenian Debate not mainly to take a position on Athenian war strategy but to focus on the conduct and misconduct of public deliberation in the debate, so now, too, nearly 2500 years later, your purpose here isn't to take a position for or against the Iraq War but to examine how the participants present their case to an assembly -- in this case a few hundred members of the Council on Foreign Relations.. Here, as in the Mytelinian debate, the American audience voted after hearing the speakers, although, this time, their vote was non-binding. (The CFR transcript also records some audience questions and speakers’ responses. Thucydides left no record of the questions from the Athenian assembly, although he did report the final vote.)Your assignment for this reading is to decide what standards and practices for public deliberation in the 5th century B.C. also apply to deliberation in 2003 A.D. What kind of public debate does a democratic public sphere need in order to remain democratic? **Drawing from these three readings, your first required post should sketch out, in 500 to 1000 words your sense of what a good liberal-democratic public sphere requires.** **Sept. 17. How is Public Deliberation Nourished or Discouraged?** 1. **Gordon Wood, The Radicalism of the American Revolution, pp 95-109.**

The rise of the liberal-democratic public sphere in the early American republic. Wood shows how republican (and liberal-democratic) thinking grew unofficially within and gradually replaced monarchical thinking in the 18th century. Pay close attention to Wood on what republican “character” requires, pp. 104-107. Take notes on this and assess it. See also the one-page summary in the course pack of "What the American founders got from Edward Gibbon's account of the Roman Republic's decline and fall.1. [**Win McCormack**](https://newrepublic.com/authors/win-mccormack)**, False Concepts of Liberty: Individual freedom and the public square** <https://newrepublic.com/article/151151/false-concepts-liberty-pt-2> This is a good, 850-word summary of many of the concepts presented by Wood.
2. **(not required): Jim Sleeper, “Academic Jarheads?”** in Leatherneck, a U.S. Marine Corps veterans' publication, <http://www.leatherneck.com/forums/showthread.php?t=25288>  and **“Humanists and Warriors,”** The Politic. <http://thepolitic.org/?p=59>.
3. **My Philanthropy, by George Soros.**  <http://www.georgesoros.com/articles-essays/entry/my_philanthropy/>

**4-a.** **George Soros Bet Big on Liberal Democracy. Now He Fears He is Losing. (NY Times Magazine, July 17 2018)** <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/17/magazine/george-soros-democrat-open-society.html?hpw&rref=magazine&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&module=well-region&region=bottom-well&WT.nav=bottom-well>1. **Walter Lippmann, background description of his work, from Ronald Steel’s biography, and excerpts from his book Public Opinion.**

Is Gordon Wood’s and Jonathan Schell’s republican optimism now being reversed, with more people inclining toward rule by a strong leader rather than toward active, democratic citizenship? The billionaire investor and philanthropist George Soros warns that the American civic-republican model of the public sphere has become seriously damaged and even deranged. Drawing (perhaps too heavily) on his own formative personal experiences with the collapse of public spheres of Europe during WW II, Soros asks why and how people sometimes prefer lies and delusions to truth and rational investigations. Is he right to see parallels between events of the 1930s and ‘40s and developments in the American public sphere today? Historical analogies can be facile and dangerously misleading, but before we blame the derangement of the public sphere on recent political and technological developments, it’s important to see how Lippmann assessed in long before these recent changes.1. **“They Were Trained for This Moment: How student activists in Parkland demonstrated the power of a comprehensive education,” by Dahlia Lithwick.** <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2018/02/the-student-activists-of-marjory-stoneman-douglas-high-demonstrate-the-power-of-a-full-education.html>

 **Sept. 24**  **National public spheres, past and present.** People move through history in groups, but why have they formed nations and states? Some of our readings suggest that nationalism is driven by deep anthropological and spiritual needs, not only economic and political ones. Early in the 16th century, nationalism and capitalism converged to generate not only warring states but also liberal public spheres and understandings of citizenship whose rights many Europeans and Americans take for granted. But, now, nationalism, capitalism, and liberalism seem to be heading off in different directions. It’s important to understand the historical contingencies that generated liberal democracy when capitalism and nationalism were converging, as well as to understand their divergence and its likely consequences now. **1. *Imagined Communities,* by Benedict Anderson** (excerpts, in coursepack), an historical overview of how nations and liberal public spheres rose together. Notice how the new print technology engendered both religious dissent and new, unifying understandings of national community.2. ***Who We Are: A History of Popular Nationalism,* by Robert Wiebe** (excerpt, and a review of this book by Sleeper) Wiebe defends nationalism, which isn’t the same thing as statehood: He warns that states hover like crows over the nests that nations make. See if you can grasp what he means by this.3. **One America? “American National Identity in a Post-National Age,**” by Jim Sleeper What is a civic-republican idea of nationalism, and how does it differ from “Blood and soil” ideas? As you read this, recall Gordon Wood’s observations and connect them.  4. **“Dead Souls,” by Samuel Huntington.** A conservative political scientist protests what he thinks global capitalism is doing to American civic-republican leadership. He argues for the necessity of national identity even to a liberal society. <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/1111567/posts> **5. A Radical Cure: Hannah Arendt & Simone Weil on the Need for Roots, by Scott Remer (a member of this seminar in 2016)** <https://philosophynow.org/issues/127/A_Radical_Cure_Hannah_Arendt_and_Simone_Weil_on_the_Need_for_Roots>**Oct. 1: No More Nations? Globalization Triumphant?**In this unit we look at arguments to transcend nationalism as global challenges and opportunities transcend states' abilities to cope with them.1. **Excerpt from Bound Together, by Nayan Chanda,** Director of Publications and the Editor of YaleGlobal Online Magazine at the Yale Center for the Study of Globalization. (Coursepack only).  Shea Jennings

You should also watch Chanda presenting some of his book’s insights and arguments at: [http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/sites/default/files/flash/about/globalization/PART1-1/Presentation\_Files/index.html](https://www.mail.yale.edu/services/go.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fyaleglobal.yale.edu%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fflash%2Fabout%2Fglobalization%2FPART1-1%2FPresentation_Files%2Findex.html)[http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/sites/default/files/flash/about/globalization/PART2-2/Presentation\_Files/index.html](https://www.mail.yale.edu/services/go.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fyaleglobal.yale.edu%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fflash%2Fabout%2Fglobalization%2FPART2-2%2FPresentation_Files%2Findex.html)1. **“Can Democracy Survive Interdependence?”** by Benjamin Barber, a widely discussed working paper for his book, If Mayors Ruled the World. http://interdependencemovement.org/CanDemocracySurviveInterdependence\_BenjaminBarber.pdf.

**Critique of Barber’s argument by the [U.S.] Council on Foreign Relations:** <http://blogs.cfr.org/patrick/2013/10/17/start-spreading-the-news-can-cities-govern-the-world/>**Oct 8**  **Challenges facing journalism across borders.****“Journalism and Democracy Across Borders,” by John Keane**, a long overview of some problematic ways in which globalization may be advancing something other than democracy and a journalism that serves democracy. <http://www.johnkeane.net/journalism-and-democracy-across-borders/>**Should American Journalism Make us Americans? By Jim Sleeper,** an overview of American conglomerate newspaper owners’ attempts to treat new immigrants as niche markets rather than as future citizens. Harvard’s Joan Shorenstein Center for Press, Politics, and Public Policy, [**https://shorensteincenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/d38\_sleeper.pdf**](https://shorensteincenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/d38_sleeper.pdf) **Oct. 15: The New Capitalization of Journalism, Part I: Conglomerates, Finance Capital, and News Media**This week we review the first of two trends: The conglomeration of journalism under the aegis of publicly traded news corporations. **“Conglomerates and the Media,” by Todd Gitlin,** **“Liberation Marketing and the Culture Trust,” by Thomas Frank, “The Corporate Takeover of News,” by Richard M. Cohen.****“How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy,”** by Guy Aitchison, openDemocracy.net (coursepack)<https://www.opendemocracy.net/guy-aitchison/how-capitalism-is-turning-internet-against-democracy-and-how-to-turn-it-back> **Oct. 22: The movie “Network” (CLASS BEGINS AT 1 PM, ONE-HALF-HOUR EARLY )** The movie “Network” (1976) dramatizes the propositions of Gitlin, Frank and Cohen about conglomerates and news media and brings a satirical edge to an argument that today’s corporate emphasis on boosting “shareholder value” is socially destructive. **Oct. 29: Midterm in class****Nov. 5: How new journalism can accelerate civic decay**  **“ How The Search For 'Narrative' In Journalism Helps Donald Trump”, Bernard Avishai,** *Talking Points Memo***,** [**http://talkingpointsmemo.com/cafe/avishai-donald-trump-journalism**](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/cafe/avishai-donald-trump-journalism) **“Ten Big Media Realities in the Trump Era,” by Don Hazen and *AlterNe*t staff.** <http://www.alternet.org/media/10-big-media-realities-trump-era> **….”Transparency: What’s Gone Wrong With Social Media?, by Wael Ghonim** [www.shorensteincenter.org/transparency-social-media-wael-ghonim](http://www.shorensteincenter.org/transparency-social-media-wael-ghonim)**Nov. 12: How can local, digital journalism nourish a public sphere, not fragment and degrade it?****Paul Bass, founder and editor of The New Haven Independent,** the online daily news organization of the city. “The New News: How I Returned to Journalism – on the Web” Bass, JE ‘82, has pioneered a new form of journalism on the web that, he argues, strengthens the public sphere and journalism itself. This essay is not online but is in your coursepack. So is Prof. Sleeper’s brief essay, “Who Needs the New York Times? We all do. Still.” Bass will visit us later this semester, but now is the time to consider his use of journalism to strengthen the key elements of a healthy public sphere as we’ve discussed them so far. Visit the NIH website and read a few stories and, especially, some of the posted comments, to see what reader participation brings to the format:  <http://www.newhavenindependent.org/>**And read Bass on what the life and death (last year) of The New Haven Advocate,** which he edited in print before starting NIH, teaches us about journalism’s mission and prospects: <http://www.newhavenindependent.org/index.php/archives/entry/new_haven_advocate_1975-2013/> **For a very different take on digital journalism, we also read Dean Starkman, author of The Watchdog That Didn't Bark** and award-winning former Wall Street Journal reporter and now the Los Angeles Times' Wall Street correspondent. A review by Sleeper of Starkman's account of the failures of the American business press is at  <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/blog/reporting-for-the-republic>  ) Starkman is a sophisticated critic of cheerleaders for the internet’s “liberation” of journalism from its traditions and from its crises in financing, sales, production and reader interest.  **“Confidence Game: The Limited Vision of the [New] News Gurus,” by Dean Starkman,** Columbia Journalism Review <http://www.cjr.org/essay/confidence_game.php?page=all><http://www.shirky.com/weblog/2011/12/institutions-confidence-and-the-news-crisis/>[*http://www.cjr.org/the\_audit/the\_hole\_in\_fon\_theory.php?page=all*](http://www.cjr.org/the_audit/the_hole_in_fon_theory.php?page=all)***The Comin*g Competition Between Digital Authoritarianism and Liberal Democracy**<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2018-07-10/how-artificial-intelligence-will-reshape-global-order?cid=nlc-fa_twofa-20180802>**(optional) Fake News was a Hallmark of MSM Long Before Trump and Twitter. It’s time to stop blaming social media. Jim Sleeper.** <http://www.newsweek.com/dont-blame-social-media-fake-news-mainstream-media-was-there-first-663056>**Nov. 26 Digitalization: A new democratic public sphere, or none?**Just how much better than conglomerates for serious journalism has the internet free-for all proved to be? Varied answers:1. **David Eggers’ “The Circle” (excerpt from his novel) “**We Like You So Much and Want to Know Your Better,” in the NY Times Magazine:  <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/29/magazine/dave-eggers-fiction.html?_r=0>

**Discussion of ‘The Circle” in The New York Daily News** <http://www.nydailynews.com/blogs/pageviews/2013/10/what-dave-eggers-the-circle-gets-wrong-about-millennial-culture>**And a column on “The Circle” by NY Times’ Joe Nocera:** <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/15/opinion/nocera-a-world-without-privacy.html?_r=0>1. **How Technology Disrupted Truth, by Katherine Viner,** *The Guardian* <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/jul/12/how-technology-disrupted-the-truth>
2. **Geng Ngarmboonanant, “The End of Big Things”,** YDN
3. **Ramon Gonzalez, “The Year the World Said No,”** *(Stapled with Ngarmboonanant’s essay)*
4. **Tony Curzon Price, "Das Google Problem: Is the Invisible Mouse Benevolent?,** openDemocracy.net

 **Dec. 3: The capitalization of journalism: Part II: American jurisprudence on corporations and the First Amendment.** **Tim Wu: Is the First Amendment Obsolete?** <https://knightcolumbia.org/content/tim-wu-first-amendment-obsolete>**“The Corporate Free Speech Racket,” Washington Monthly,**<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2014/features/the_corporate_free_speech_rack048355.php?page=all>**Essential Speech: Why Corporate Speech is not Free,**” by Daniel J.H. Greenwood. This essay is a long, difficult law review article that will require careful reading. I will ask you to post something on this and for Greenwood to respond. <http://mawww.reclaimdemocracy.org/corporate_speech/essential_speech_greenwood.pdf> **Dec. 10  Class dinner: Daniel Greenwood will be our guest. Also, exam prep, Hopper Fellows’ Lounge, 6 pm** *(At the dinner, everyone who has given a class presentation will summarize that presentation’s three or four main “take-away” points, in just 3 minutes. This should take no more than 30 minutes of our time together during the dinner.)* **Friday Exam, in the classroom, to be announced.**  |

  |
|  |