

8-2014

' ROAMING IN THE GARDEN OF
FREEDOM:' CONSTRUCTIONS OF U.S.
IDEOLOGY, IDENTITY, AND THE PAST IN
TELEVISION NEWS'S ANNIVERSARY
COVERAGE ABOUT THE BERLIN WALL

Rachel Eve Somerstein
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://surface.syr.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Journalism Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Somerstein, Rachel Eve, "' ROAMING IN THE GARDEN OF FREEDOM:' CONSTRUCTIONS OF U.S. IDEOLOGY, IDENTITY, AND THE PAST IN TELEVISION NEWS'S ANNIVERSARY COVERAGE ABOUT THE BERLIN WALL" (2014). *Dissertations - ALL*. Paper 130.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the SURFACE at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations - ALL by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

Abstract

This study employs a multimodal close reading to examine and compare how NBC's Nightly News and various primetime CNN news shows construct the story of the Berlin Wall's opening from 1990 through 2009. It does so first by examining the networks' 1989 coverage and assessing the themes and ideologies circulated when the Berlin Wall's opening was breaking news. These themes and ideologies are used as a baseline to assess anniversary coverage that aired from 1990 through 2009. In the process of this close reading, special attention is paid to silences and omissions amid images and spoken discourses; the circulation of World War II and Holocaust-related discourses; and the influence of hypermediacy and liveness on the programming. The results show that the coverage coheres into two distinct typologies: anniversary-as-process and anniversary-as-spectacle, two new concepts introduced by this dissertation. The implications for anniversary journalism, public memory of the Berlin Wall and collective memory of World War II are discussed.

**'ROAMING IN THE GARDEN OF FREEDOM:' CONSTRUCTIONS OF U.S.
IDEOLOGY, IDENTITY, AND THE PAST IN TELEVISION NEWS'S ANNIVERSARY
COVERAGE ABOUT THE BERLIN WALL**

By

**Rachel Eve Somerstein
B.A., cum laude, Cornell University, 2004
M.F.A., New York University, 2009**

DISSERTATION

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Mass Communications in the Graduate School of Syracuse University
August 2014**

Copyright 2014 Rachel Eve Somerstein

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgments

So many teachers to thank, starting with my committee. Dennis Kinsey gave me the support and the space to be my own person in the doctoral program. I am so grateful for his ceaseless encouragement, which endured throughout the many intellectual and personal events that took place during graduate school. Anne Demo's course in visual culture gave me the concepts and vocabulary that transformed how I think, write, and speak about images. Anne, you have helped me to bring my scholarship and criticism to a much deeper level. Bob Thompson showed me how to speak passionately and eloquently about television. Very early in this process, reader Brad Gorham asked thoughtful and direct questions that helped me to clarify my ideas. Shannon Novak, also a reader, taught a class in materiality that opened an array of new methodological and intellectual tools and inspired me to think about 'doing' history beyond the word and image. In her course on memory, my chair, Ann Gold, exposed me to key ideas about remembering and forgetting that inform this dissertation. Finally, other faculty at Syracuse have supported me on the doctoral journey, especially Barbara Fought, the teacher's teacher, and Richard Breyer, whose insights have made my work overall conceptually stronger and more personally meaningful.

At Cornell, professors Mary Roldan and Michael Kammen got me started on collective memory. They also taught me to do interdisciplinary, archival work, skills that have served me well ever since. Jon Jucovy, my history teacher at Ramaz, first showed me how fascinating, fun, and in-your-eye provocative studying history could be.

My fellow students at Newhouse have also been important teachers. I could not have finished the program without the time, energy, and graciousness of Greg Munno, Linda Daley, Laura Osur, Dan Amernick, Alicia Wright, Molly Kalan, Sherri Williams, or Kristi Gilmore. You have all taught me how to do research by example. Laura's insights in particular greatly improved this project, particularly the chapter on NBC News. Dan's thesis on the Muppet Show was an excellent model of how to do multimodal analysis.

People outside of the carrels also helped me through this dissertation with advice, great cooking, good humor, patience, support, and ice cream, most notably Briana and Jason Kohlbrenner, Mark Povinelli, Brendan Rose, Meghan Holtan, Charlotte Nunes, Rebecca Wester, Rachel Margolis, Laura Rowntree, Erica Tunick, and Rebecca Gordon. Thank you for helping me to remember how much there is to do beyond the computer and for your extremely loyal and loving friendship.

Thank you to my loving families: David, Debbie, Ben, Sam, Abby, and Josh Tyler; Tom, Karen, Ben, and Ehrin Lingeman; and Marianne and Mildred Mason. My parents, Mark and Lynn Somerstein, fielded complaints and frustrations, but also rejoiced in my successes, and reminded me to do so as well. Dad: I especially appreciate that you told me to "just write" when I felt lost, and for your historical metaphors for making it through when I felt most at sea ("Build a navy"). I wouldn't have stumbled onto this topic, or continued to see it through, without you. Mom: I cannot put into words how much your compassion, high standards, and sharp editor's eye improved this project. To say nothing of how watching you complete your doctorate inspired me

to do the same. Your calm and support in the face of my many manic Mondays have meant the world.

Thanks to my husband, Joe Lingeman. His influence is evident throughout this study. In particular, the idea of investigating the qualities inherent to television was inspired by the Transmedia seminar Joe taught in fall 2013 and our conversations about Clement Greenberg's essay *On Modernism*. Joe, thank you for your unshakeable belief that I could accomplish what often seemed impossible, impractical, and crazy, and for inspiring me to take a walk, get on the bike, and generally be less of a workaholic. In short: "How lucky I ran into you / When everything was possible!"

Lastly, this project would not have been possible without the support of John Lynch and his colleagues at the Vanderbilt Television Archive, who digitized and reproduced many, many hours of television news programming.

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract..... | i |
| Acknowledgements..... | iv |
| Table of Contents..... | vii |
| Chapter 1: Introduction..... | 8 |
| Chapter 2: Television, images, and research questions..... | 26 |
| Chapter 3: Methods..... | 44 |
| Chapter 4: NBC Nightly News..... | 55 |
| 1989 coverage..... | 56 |
| Anniversary-as-process..... | 68 |
| Anniversary-as-spectacle..... | 79 |
| Chapter 5: CNN..... | 102 |
| 1989 coverage..... | 104 |
| Anniversary-as-process..... | 109 |
| Anniversary-as-spectacle..... | 115 |
| Chapter 6: Discussion..... | 139 |
| Implications..... | 140 |
| Study limitations..... | 148 |
| Future research..... | 149 |
| References..... | 150 |
| Biographical information..... | 166 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

“It is easy to see the beginnings of things, and harder to see the ends.” Joan Didion, *Goodbye to All That*

Tom Brokaw got lucky. On 9 November 1989, the NBC News anchor was already stationed in Berlin when, during the final minutes of an otherwise “ponderous” press conference, Gunter Schabowski, spokesperson for East Berlin’s Communist Party, announced that the travel ban on East Germans wishing to exit the German Democratic Republic had been lifted (Goldberg & Goldberg, 1990: 259-261). Pressed by reporters, Schabowski specified that the freedom to travel even included passage from East to West Berlin – where the Berlin Wall had stood since 1961, and which hundreds of people died trying to cross.

That night, NBC News broadcast live from the Brandenburg Gate, becoming the first U.S. network to capture and beam back to the States images of Germans scrambling to the top of the Berlin Wall and celebrating the two nations’ openness (Goldberg & Goldberg, 1990). According to Nielsen’s ratings, 10.1 percent of all U.S. households with a television were tuned to NBC’s evening news to watch this broadcast of history being “made” (Associated Press, 1989). These millions of viewers experienced the opening of the Berlin Wall not as a “real” experience, but as a televised, mediated event; for them, the “television images [*were*] the historical event” (Buck-Morss, 1994, cited in Manghani, 2008). In other words, the mediatization of the Wall’s opening collapsed with the event itself, so that for millions of television spectators, the two were one and the same.

In the years since, these broadcast images of the Wall’s opening have been recirculated and deployed by a variety of American visual media. They have appeared in news specials and documentaries; feature films (*The Tunnel*) and television shows; even, most recently, video

games: a 2010 version of *Call of Duty: Black Ops* features a “Berlin Wall” segment. But perhaps most frequently these televised images have turned up in broadcast news coverage commemorating the events of November 1989. In their re-broadcast and recirculation, these images of the Wall’s opening have moved from “evidence” of breaking news to images that function largely as symbols of and shorthand for the past.

This dissertation looks at the ways that televised images of the Berlin Wall’s 1989 opening have been edited, amended, and recirculated over the past two decades by NBC News and CNN. It examines these American broadcasts as sites of the “symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed” (Carey, 1989:23). The “reality” that this programming constructs describes the Berlin Wall’s opening and mediated public memory; widely-circulated myths about America, capitalism, and U.S. identity; and “truths” (social constructions) about men and women’s roles. Because this study is longitudinal – surveying two decades’ worth of network and cable anniversary broadcasts, from 1989 to 2009 – the *process* of reality’s (and history’s) manufacture is of interest, as are the symbols created, circulated, amended, and disappeared along the way. Lastly, given that the ideological struggle between capitalism and communism is critical to this event and the mass media’s representation of it, I pay special attention to the ideologies embedded in reporting.

Overview of methodological approach

This project takes a multimodal approach to discourse analysis of the cable and network anniversary broadcasts’ visual, written, and spoken elements. Investigating all of these elements accords with W.J.T. Mitchell’s (1994) observation that all media are mixed media. Therefore, television, though a “screen” medium, requires discourse analysis that looks at visual, textual, and spoken components.

From a visual perspective, focusing on the still and moving visuals created, circulated, and omitted enables an accounting of the evolutions of the visual culture of the commemoration of the Berlin Wall. If for many the televising *of* the Wall's opening, rather than empirical experience, *was* the event, then the recirculation of these televised images can be understood as a continuation – or at least a reprisal – of the event as well. In that way, images can be understood as both “represent[ing]” and “creat[ing] reality” (DeLuca & Demo, 2000:744). This two-layered effect can be explained by applying DeLuca and Demo's (2000:744) logic: broadcast images show the Wall opening. But they also “construct” it by virtue of these images' relationship to related discourses, regarding the Cold War, capitalism, the Soviet Union, and broadcast news more generally. (The capacity of news writ large to construct social reality is discussed further below.)

As important, visuals initiate stronger emotions than text (Rodriguez, 2008:5). This strong impact lasts beyond the first moments of news consumption; people remember in “snapshot” images (Vestberg, 2005:76), while iconic pictures such as the Berlin Wall trigger and shape, and are often deployed by the mass media to initiate, memories of a whole era (Keith, 2010; Zelizer, 1998). Therefore, images are significant to both individual and collective remembering – even for those events where one's “memory” is not the event itself, but the media's representation of it.

In looking at anniversary television news broadcasts of the Berlin Wall's coming down, this analysis also takes into consideration remediation, hypermediacy, and liveness (Bolter & Grusin, 2000) as trends that explain visual changes in television news over the past 20 years. I argue that these qualities converge to create anniversary coverage that makes the networks' versions of history seem especially authoritative, the ideologies themselves naturalized. To

extract the visual ideological messages, I embark on a close reading of the visual texts, and as necessary apply the tools of visual analysis outlined by Kress and van Leeuwen (2006), which have been widely used to analyze still, moving, and electronic images.

This longitudinal visual analysis is complemented with an examination of the spoken and written components of television news. Lorenzo-Dus (2009) argues that television's spoken elements are most critical to creating the "socio-communicative arena in which television images exist" (3). In other words, television's audio gives order and – to some degree – meaning to the images with which it is paired. These pieces of spoken and textual information also advance a newscast's narrative arc; a news "story" is told in sound and pictures. Finally, media organizations devote considerable funds to creating the textual frames that accompany their stories. Thus, these elements are part of my analysis as well.

To best access broadcast news's spoken, written, and visual realms, I collect, classify, and analyze the metaphors that the broadcasts deploy in their anniversary coverage. Metaphor, as Lakoff and Johnson (2003) and others have shown, carries and transmits ideology. Thus, analyzing them within news broadcasts is a useful way to expose ideology in a genre whose primary value is objectivity. What's more, we often use metaphor unconsciously, without realizing it (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Therefore, metaphor analysis provides a tool for identifying structural ideologies that are otherwise difficult to detect, not least in a topic as ideology-laden as news coverage about the Cold War. Equally important, metaphor "is often applied to new situations, to expand the reach of language and thought" (Gozzi, 1999/2000). A post-Cold War political regime was truly a new world order, as was a united Germany, suggesting that we can expect to see metaphors employed to describe this new environment. Finally, metaphor functions similarly to images in a number of ways, which makes it a logical

complement to this project's visual analysis. Like photographs, metaphor is polysemic; like iconic images, it can initiate mass action. These likenesses suggest that as sites of the development and transmission of symbols, images and metaphor function similarly.

The introduction begins with an overview of the socially-constructed nature of news and the ways that macro-level influences manifest in news content. I then discuss public memory and how the mass media circulate collective memories. The introduction closes with a definition of anniversary journalism and an overview of its unique qualities.

Chapter one provides an overview of the function of television news in the United States. I discuss how still and moving images, deployed by television news, play a critical role in educating audiences about history. I then explain that these broadcasts disseminate collective symbols (Carey, 1989), establish and maintain collective discourse regarding "others" and "ourselves" (Van Ginneken, 1998; Lule, 2001), and create opportunities for viewers to take part in national events that reaffirm their personal feelings of national identity and belonging (Carey, 1989; Vanden Berg, 1998). The chapter closes with a look at how television – our "national religion," as Gerbner called it – can be understood as a site of production of hegemonic values; a destination for taking part in and learning about such norms; and a place for mass communications researchers to take the temperature of national discourse.

Chapter two introduces relevant concepts from visual culture and television studies, including liveness, immediacy, and hypermediacy. This chapter also looks at the ways that changes in technology and the network and cable industries have influenced the images shown on network and broadcast television news. I establish the necessary framework for my close readings of the anniversary coverage and the ways that the reportage naturalizes ideologies and a

singular, hegemonic version of past events. I close by discussing spoken and visual metaphor, its role in news, and explain why it is a useful tool to identify and analyze ideology.

Chapter four provides the methodology for this study. I explain how I collect the anniversary coverage; break down metaphors; and analyze the televised images. I describe my process of completing a close reading and argue that this method is best-suited for this project and best matches my epistemological, scholarly position.

Chapters five and six report the results of my analysis of NBC Nightly News and CNN, respectively. Chapter seven discusses these results and their implications.

Theoretical context

News as a social construct

The rich literature of media sociology, including seminal work by Shoemaker and Reese (1996; 2014), Schudson (2011), and Tuchman (1978), describes the ways in which news is socially constructed. Although in the United States objectivity is considered a central news value, true “objective” reporting is impossible to achieve. All news, because it is made by humans and constructed from language or pictures, is not an objective mirror of reality but socially constructed. Shoemaker and Reese (2014) identify five levels of such influence: the individual reporter’s values and beliefs; journalism routines, like relying on sources, deadlines, or working a beat; the journalist’s media organization, including its ownership and political bias; “extra-media” institutions, like markets, religious institutions, governments, and regulations; and the social system in which the journalist (and her organization) function, namely such overarching ideological systems as capitalism or communism. This project is most interested in the ways that extra-media institutions and the given values of a social system influence news.

Shoemaker (1996) argued that at the most basic level, news is deviance. Therefore, even at the level of defining news, macro-level forces delimit normal from strange: they establish the boundaries of deviance and normality, which in turn define what qualifies as news (deviance) and what does not (normativity) (Shoemaker, 1996). Importantly, “deviance” is not the same across cultures. Thus, in a capitalist economy like the United States, a store that operates per a socialist premise – pay what you can, as the café chain Panera did to much fanfare several years ago – makes the news (i.e. Depillis, 2013). Stores that sell products for set amounts, priced, presumably, at great profit for the seller, do not. In that way, deviance as a news value serves to uphold hegemonic standards, and to continually (re)establish and give shape to prevailing values.

Ideology also contributes to the social construction of news by way of “the other world,” a frequently-used structural metaphor that describes international news (Lule, 2001). This framework effectively delimits “us” and “them,” setting out the standards, morals, values, and identity of the “other” nation – and by extension setting off constructions about “us.” Relatedly, mainstream, Western depictions of the past tend to promote an ethnocentric view of historical progress as centered in the West while paying little attention to such ugly aspects of American history as the slave trade (van Ginneken, 1998:125). This ideological perspective, which is built as much from the voices and images included as it is from those omitted, suggests a second, important element of the socially-constructed nature of news: it is fictional. In other words, even “nonfiction” news engages and trades in fiction by virtue of its ideological orientation.

Perhaps more subtly, ideology shapes news by way of gendered representations made plain at the levels of a news story, its characters, and the words and images it employs. Tuchman (1978) argued that in the mass media, women are less frequently represented than men. When they do appear, they frequently accord with stereotypes: as mothers or in other stereotypically

“female” professions and roles. This “symbolic annihilation” has been shown to apply to media representations of the disabled and people of color (Gilchrist, 2010). Recent evaluations of the news media show that Tuchman’s observations still hold, both for the people who make the news and the subjects the news describes (i.e. Harp, Halrow & Loke, 2013; Stanley, 2012). Thus, even stories about the Berlin Wall’s opening, which on the surface may not appear to communicate any information about the status of men and women, do precisely that by virtue of the gender, clothing, and age of the reporters, anchors, expert interviewees, and other sources.

In sum, news’s socially-constructed content has enormous implications: it communicates hegemonic norms and ideals, and establishes and constructs those that “threat[en]” our ways of life (Van Ginneken, 1998:32). Some of these standards are tied directly to the story, as is the case with capitalism’s triumph over communism within coverage of the Berlin Wall’s fall. But other hegemonic norms, seemingly not related to the story under review, are nevertheless embodied and communicated by anniversary coverage. As discussed, these norms include standards of beauty and attractiveness and the positions of women and men in the public sphere.

Collective Memory

In *On Collective Memory*, Maurice Halbwachs – a student of Durkheim murdered at Buchenwald – developed the framework that underpins collective memory studies. Halbwachs (1941/1992) argued people form memories in society. But society also exerts an editorial role on recollections, demanding that we rearrange memories so that they seem more “prestigious” and complete than they really are (51). Partly as a result, memory is always in flux. It changes as groups, people, societies, and families change.

Collective memory is both universal and particular (Zelizer, 1995). Therefore, while we all have our own particular memories, we also share in collective stories about the past told by a given group, family, religion, or nation. These two modes of recollecting run alongside one another, at times intersecting, at other times, conflicting (Halbwachs:1941/1992). Thus, our collective memory might be understood as what we all know, not necessarily what we all believe (Edy, 2006:3). Importantly, however, even when these perspectives clash, we accord great internal authority to collective memory; as Halbwachs writes, memory functions as a kind of inborn, primordial belief system (86). Thus, even if we don't "believe" it, as Edy writes, collective memory still retains the power capacity to order our personal understanding of our place in society.

Although Halbwachs argued that collective memory concerned only those events recollectable within a lifetime, Whitehead citing Connerton (1989) and Assman argues that commemoration and ritual pass down the collective memory of events that took place before we were born (133). The mass media functions precisely in this way: that is, through their circulation and provision of collective memories of events that occurred before our time. And though the media are but one satellite in collective memory's creation and circulation, which also includes school, families, museums, monuments, and other elements (Wertsch, 2002, cited in Shahzad, 2012:380), researchers point to mass media's influence on the production of such learned memory. In their cross-generational investigation into high-school students' narratives of the Vietnam War, for instance, Wineburg and colleagues (2007) find that movies proved formative to students' conceptions of the war (67). Because of the influence of the media and popular culture, the researchers found that students' narratives of the war resembled one another far more than their respective parents' stories/memories – despite the informants' "vast" cultural,

religious, and political differences (Wineburg, Mosborg, Porat, & Duncan, 2007:65). Such research empirically supports the formative role of the mass media on collective memory. In this way, for events that took place *before* our lifetimes, collective memory can be conceived as what is “learned, not remembered” (Wineburg et al., 2007, p. 65) through the mass media.

The global reach of the electronic mass media is yet another reason they play a significant role in the circulation of collective memory. As discussed, for many, the televised images of the opening of the Berlin Wall constituted the historical event (Buck-Morss, 1994, cited in Manghani, 2008). Other more recent events, like 9/11, further underscore how the mediated version of historical events can take the place *of the* event itself. As an example, the 9/11 attacks were widely consumed through television even by people in New York and Washington who could have “seen” the events without the media (Sturken, 2007:29). Even as we move away in time from 11 September 2001, the mass media continue to play an important role for the public in coming to terms with this traumatic event (Sturken, 2007).

The same can be said about the opening of the Berlin Wall. Like 9/11, many watched it happen on television; also like 9/11, as 9 November 1989 recedes further into the past, the mass media play a critical part in (re)teaching the public why and how the Wall fell and (re)describing and affirming the boundaries and national identities of this new world order. That is, although joyful, the Wall’s opening breached the global, political, and ideological borders – metaphorically and literally – and the overall organization of the world. In the wake of such major breaks in social and political boundaries and roles, the mass media play the part of a “redressive ritual” (Edy, 2006:60-61, citing Turner, 1981), helping society to return to social order. They do so by reprising these events through commemorations and anniversaries of the

original trauma. Through these reprisals, the re-running of events, collective memories are formed and communicated, circulated and reinforced (Lorenzo-Dus & Bryan, 2011:282).

Commemorative journalism

Most simply, anniversary or commemorative journalism – the terms are used interchangeably in this project – is a story in any medium whose main topic is, or revolves around, a past historical event. Such a story, which “rewrites and revisits ... old events,” requires that the journalist “look[s] backward” (Zelizer, 2008:83). Without retrospection, there would be no story to tell. Thus in these cases, the news peg is not a new event but something that occurred in the past. As Zelizer (2008) writes, such stories “necessitate memory” – they are built on it. Thus, anniversary or commemorative journalism includes “publication and broadcast of retrospective issues, programs, special broadcasts, books and volumes that track either a general past ... or a specific past, as in the coverage of a particular news event or social issue over time” (Zelizer, 2008:83). Examples vary from a news organization’s “retrospective” of its own history (Kitch, 2002); the liberation of Paris from Nazi occupation (Keith, 2010; Keith, 2012); to television’s re-screening of the 9/11 attacks on September 11. As these examples suggest, over time the past being commemorated often becomes as much about history as it does about the media’s previous coverage of that event.

Anniversary stories differ from other kinds of news in a number of ways. On the most basic level, anniversary journalism does not provide, nor is it built upon, “new information” (Li & Lee, 2011:833). In fact, it frequently reprises a news organization’s old photographs and text (Kitch, 2002:48). By contrast, news organizations typically value timely stories with new information. They prize the eyewitness. Although contemporary television news makes extensive

use of file footage or materials from image banks (Machin & Jaworski, 2006), they nevertheless hold liveness and immediacy as greatly important. Thus, commemorative coverage differs at both the level of routine – in its production reporters return to their own organizations, and others’, archives -- and news stories’ content, in that it is overtly historical.

Another way that anniversary journalism differs from standard news is that it “tends to be long, personalized, interpretive, and seemingly contemplative” (Li & Lee, 2013:841). Some of these texts – and they were texts that Li and Lee analyzed, notably ones on the Berlin Wall’s opening – may also incorporate journalists’ personal memories (Li & Lee, 2013:841). As a result, they provide media professionals the opportunity to express ideological stances or political concerns (Li & Lee, 2013:831; Kitch, 1999) -- a sharp departure from standard (Western) news, which holds objectivity as a signal value (Schudson, 2011). Although, as discussed above, news that appears “objective” is in fact socially constructed, anniversary journalism more obviously engages in ideological work. As a result, concludes Kitch (2002), its versions of history resemble “pictures that are prescriptive as well as descriptive, mythology as much as reporting” (Kitch, 2002:61). These mythologies, however, are not stable. They change along with and according to shifts at a number of levels, including organizational changes, economic, political, and military events – effectively, those elements that Shoemaker and Reese (2014) identified at the upper-most levels of analysis.

Research on anniversary news (Edy, 2006; Zelizer, 1998; Li & Lee, 2013:841; Keith, 2010; Somerstein, 2014) has found that it tends to offer a condensed version of past events. As an example, singular “facts” will hold the place for the story in its entirety (Edy, 2006:10) or offer less complex textual and photographic versions of past events (Keith, 2010; Keith, 2012; Somerstein, 2014). (This finding coheres with work on sites of collective memory writ large,

which find that they tend to compress and rearrange time; see Zelizer, 1995.) As a result, anniversary coverage “provides consistency” in stories about the past, which may otherwise be inconsistent (Li & Lee, 2013). In that way, it functions similarly to the ways that Halbwachs (1980) described the relationship between society and memory: society forces us to amend our memories so that they seem more consistent than they really are (51).

Finally, any narrative structure effectively “provides consistency.” As Hayden White (1987) explained, life does not contain the same kinds of structures as stories, such as a climax (279). Narrative structures, when placed on “real events” – as they are with most news stories – imbue that event with some kind of artificial structure, such as an epic, a tragedy, comedy, and the like (280) – what White calls “emplotment” (280). It is important to note that virtually any narrative structure, whether employed in television news or written history, is imbued with such an artificial structure. Yet, given anniversary journalism’s tendencies to reduce complexity, and its tendency toward synecdoche, anniversary stories may engage in – or suffer from – “emplotment” to a significant degree.

Collective and journalistic implications of anniversary journalism

The social and collective functions of anniversary journalism are myriad. For one, such reportage presents significant, “mythological” (Kitch, 2002) collective symbols as well as a space for audiences to partake in their attendant meanings. As an example, bombastic Fourth of July celebrations symbolize the greatness of the United States, its military might. (Van Ginneken, 1998:123). In turn, watching such commemorative events provides viewers an opportunity to rejuvenate their feelings of “patriotism and pride in one’s civilization” (Van Ginneken, 1998:123). Similarly, in her analysis of JFK’s assassination footage, Vanden Berg (1998) argues that anniversary coverage enabling viewers to participate in the kind of pilgrimage

described by Turner. And anniversary journalism that responds specifically to a collective trauma can address and even mend a social break (Edy, 2006).

Still other scholars have shown how commemorative coverage activates “social cohesiveness” by “affirm[ing] collective boundaries” (Ha-Ilan, 2001:208). Specifically, Ha-Ilan (2001) found in her analysis of Israeli television news that images of history, deployed in daily news, refer to the past in order to create a contemporary, inclusive community. In that way television news functions to create and sustain the “imagined community” as conceived by Benedict Anderson. These images of the past are not static and depend largely on contemporary events; Ha-Ilan found that outside pressure and political and security crises manifest in television news through the deployment of images from the past (209).

For the media, these stories consolidate news organizations’ authority about the past. One way that institutions do this is by reprising their original coverage (Li & Lee, 2013:841). In so doing, news organizations position their prior coverage as “historical evidence” (Kitch, 2002:49). In that light, the materials ■ and the institutions themselves ■ seem to have historical authority, which only further supports their authority regarding current events. Even more, reprising previous coverage elevates the organization’s significance to “defining and explaining the past” (Kitch, 2002:49). This role, in turn, increases the media organization’s seeming cultural authority beyond the level of breaking news.

The implications of this ‘journalistic version of the past’ vary depending on a given country’s relationship among elites and news organizations. In the U.S. at least, coverage of traumatic events of national import tend to be “indexed” to elite versions of the event, including the Persian Gulf War, the Wall’s opening, and the torture of prisoners at Abu Ghraib (Li & Lee, 2013; Mermin 1996; Bennett, Lawrence, & Livingston, 2006). In other words, the news tends to

new closely to the official government line on these events. This tendency can be disastrous, as so recently made clear by the *New York Times*'s erroneous, front-page confirmation of WMDs in Iraq. But the persistence of indexing to elites persists, suggesting government leaders' continued worthiness of public trust.

For the story of the Wall, the media's relationship to the market need also be taken into consideration. The Wall's opening provided Western markets new audiences to sell their products; the success of this battle was felt economically as much as it once politically. Thus, the events can also be understood as indexed to the market, perhaps more so than other 'foreign affairs.' As a result, the media's relationship to and dependence upon advertising requires special mention. Advertising provides the bulk of the "income" for "world news media"(van Ginneken, 1998:55); consequently, media tend to shy away from stories that overly critique advertisers (van Ginneken, 1998:58). They also tend to support a "flattering environment" for advertisers' products (van Ginneken, 1998:58). For anniversary coverage of the Wall's opening, that may translate into an economic rationale for coverage that supports and promotes capitalism.

And yet, it is important to note that the media's presentation of the past is not necessarily or inherently meant to communicate dominant ideologies. As Bennett and Lawrence (1995) explain, neither a critical nor liberal view of the media is sufficient: "The same market imperatives and journalistic norms and routines which so often produce cultural products that reinforce dominant ideological views can also at times produce cultural products that challenge the status quo and dominant ideology" (Bennett & Lawrence, 1995:22). Likewise, depictions of the past are not monolithic.

Research questions

Based on the outline discussed above, this study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the story of the Berlin Wall's opening, and how has it changed over time?

RQ2: What are the ideologies circulated by the original and anniversary coverage?

RQ3: Why do these shifts and omissions happen?

RQ4: How do the qualities of television naturalize these versions of the past and their accompanying ideologies?

Study justification: Why broadcast anniversary journalism matters

Studying television addresses a gap in cultural, historical, and mass communications studies. Historians tend to look askance at television because they are trained to privilege the written document (Taylor, 2001:245; Rosenstone, 1996). Though Rosenstone (1996) Zemon Davis (2000) and others have looked to moving images' transmission of history, images-as-history are considered circumspect and somehow unscholarly. This anxiety and fear of images is a longstanding tradition within Western civilization, discussed at length in chapter two, and that informs current media discourse.

Those wishing to investigate television with historical methods can face particular challenges. For one, television is "largely neglected" as an "archival source" because it is often poorly and only partially archived (Taylor, 2001:244-245). The archival problem may be one reason that communications scholarship on broadcast anniversary journalism, with few exceptions (Lorenzo-Dus & Bryan 2011; Lorenzo-Dus & Bryan 2011b; Mumby & Spitzack, 1991; Meyers, Zandberg, & Neiger, 2009) is relatively under-developed and under-theorized. Further, while cultural studies takes images seriously (Stuart Hall, Roland Barthes), television still retains its legacy as a lowbrow medium undeserving of scholarly attention. And though in

the field of mass communications, cultivation researchers have looked to television since the 1960s to trace the impact of watching violent television on behavior (i.e. Gerbner), this approach is grounded in effects, not television as text.

This dissertation attempts to address these multiple gaps. It treats television as an archive; looks at the images as an historical, if not authoritative or fully trustworthy, source; and does not privilege text or speech over the image. As a longitudinal, multimodal investigation of U.S. broadcast anniversary coverage on the Berlin Wall's opening, this dissertation fills a need for identifying and analyzing the relevant retrospective broadcast discourses. It assesses these discourses for what they reveal regarding mediated versions of American identity and the recent past. Finally, this dissertation also broadens current scholarship on anniversary journalism, which tends to focus on singular points of time after an event (five, 10, 15 years on; i.e. Keith, 2010; Twomey, 2004). In that way, it addresses and extends an under-developed area of memory studies: the longitudinal, qualitative, closely-read extended case study.

In addition to addressing these gaps, this study examines television because it is so pervasive and ubiquitous (Vande Berg & Wenner, 1991:5) and watched by so many (Mumby & Spitzack, 1991:314). Partly as a result, it is a much-used vehicle for learning about the past in the United States, which makes it a fitting choice for an analysis of anniversary reporting. Lastly, despite a decline in ratings, in North America television is still the “primary source of news for most people most of the time” (Montgomery, 2007:13).

As important, the story of the Berlin Wall was a television story. Images of the Wall coming down were televised throughout Europe and the United States. People in East Berlin even learned that the Wall had opened by watching television (Manghani, 2008). Notably, even “behind” the Iron Curtain in the USSR and East Berlin, the “*same*” images seen on Western TV

were televised (Manghani, 2008:46). Thus, the story is one that was first seen and has subsequently been remembered in “moving images” Culbert (2001:241).

On a discursive level, television discourses are deserving of investigation because they are “socially shaped and socially shaping” (Fairclough, 1995:64). Their reach is manifest in other discourses that have largely adopted televisual media models and structures of talk, presentation, and representation (Fairclough, 1995:64). In other words, televisual media discourses help to constitute and are reflected in many different types of conversation. Although the broadcast media constitute a “public” kind of talking, within the public realm, their influence reaches into “private” realms like the home and school (Fairclough, 1995). In that way, the mass media contribute to establishing frameworks of commemoration discourses that take place in other realms. Taken together, these qualities make television a key vehicle in the production, evolution, transmission, and circulation of mass-society level discourses regarding the Berlin Wall, the end of the Cold War, the United States’s identity, and its position in the world.

Chapter 2: Television and images

Television news is multimodal, made up of images, spoken words, and written and visual icons that ground the programming in the past (“file,” “prerecorded”) and the present (“live,” “breaking”). But at its core television news demands “good” images. Longtime Middle East analyst Jim Lederman (1992) puts this bluntly: “Television news is enslaved to images. If an idea cannot be recorded in the form of an image, it will rarely, if ever, be given extensive time on a nightly network newscast” (cited in Domke, Perlmutter, & Spratt, 2002:132).

Superficially, a “good” image seems easy to identify: It is compelling. It features good-looking people in motion, not a group sitting around a conference table. But on a deeper level, “good” television images are also considered as such because of the ideologies that guide their selection and omission. Thus, to understand television images, their ideological implications, and the ways that they generate meaning, I discuss the ideological systems in which they function: namely, iconophobia and iconoclasm, which have long histories in Western culture; and capitalism, which exerts a significant pressure on broadcast news’ imagery and story selection. In that way, this project follows the approach modeled by W.J.T. Mitchell in *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*: in order to develop theories about images, he needed, first, to reckon with the system – iconoclasm – in which images function (Finnegan & Kang, 2004:381).

I begin by briefly by discussing the origins of iconophobia, fear and anxiety of images, and iconoclasm, the desire to control, manage, and destroy them. I then provide examples of their expression in contemporary media. I explore images’ qualities that lend themselves to anxiety, namely, their openness, polysemy, and consequent seeming “slipperiness.” Because

part of images' provocation of anxiety has to do with the tremendous power that we vest in them – to tell the “truth,” to show what was really there – I briefly discuss their indexicality.

The next section of this chapter looks at the qualities of television images, namely liveness, immediacy, and hypermediacy. I claim that anniversary broadcasts exploit liveness in order to make history seem like a neat arc – amplifying the tendency toward emplotment Hayden White (1987) argues emerges in any representation of the past. As a result, the ideological messages of visual images and spoken metaphors are that much more naturalized.

At the same time, this simultaneous liveness collapses the arc of history, making all events seem as if they are taking place at the same time. The effect is one of the “immediacy” Bolter and Grusin observe in 21st-century televisual media. But because the broadcasts that I examine are about the past, the effect is that time and history are made to seem both immediate and contemporaneous. This flattening makes the “version” of history transmitted by broadcast journalism seem that much more inevitable, shuttering out other potential versions or opportunities for critique. Finally, I argue that this collapse of time and the illusion of historical contemporaneity are two additional manifestations of immediacy. In that way, I extend the framework that Bolter and Grusin offer for understanding 21st-century screen media.

Brief history of iconophobia and iconoclasm

An often-cited origin story pervading Western culture goes something like this: Abraham's father, Terach, runs a shop that sells idols. While his father is away, Abraham, persuaded of the falsehood of idol-worship, smashes all but the largest idol, then places the club in the idol's hands. When Terach returns and sees the broken statues, he asks Abraham what

happened. Abraham responds, 'Isn't it clear? Your idol destroyed all the others.' To which Terach replies, 'It was you who broke the idols; my idol couldn't have done this.' Says Abraham: 'So you admit it; your idols can do nothing.'

If this midrash, or commentary, is any indication, it's how monotheism got its iconophobic and iconoclastic start: on the one hand, images aren't to be trusted; at the same time, they are deeply powerful, and can be used for any number of conflicting agendas; therefore they must be controlled, managed, and when necessary, destroyed.

Iconophobia still functions as fear and anxiety of graven images. Among religious iconography, this form of iconophobia is perhaps most recognizable in Judaism and Islam, which overtly ban idolatry; the prohibition even gave rise to strongly developed traditions of calligraphic and decorative Muslim art, and is often invoked as an explanation for the absence of figurative Judaic or Islamic art. But early Christianity also embraced this anxiety as well, with the Church asserting that "'ocular desire' diverted the masses from more spiritual concerns" (Finnegan & Kang, 2004:381). As these examples demonstrate, iconophobia is at the root of Western civilization's three major religions; arguably, as a result, it is part of a learned collective identity passed on to its members, especially among Jews and Muslims.

Secular writing and philosophy at the root of Western civilization also voiced this anxiety. Plato reinforced the distrust of images in *The Republic*, arguing that images, and even visual language, "too easily fool the senses, confusing reality with falsehood" (1987, 595c, cited in Perlmutter, 2006:52). Elsewhere in *The Republic*, he argues that "the artist's representation is . . . a long way removed from truth" (31). These declarations speak to a fundamental distrust of images and anxiety about what is "real" and what represented, or false. John Locke, Rene

Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, and many others expressed similar arguments (Finnegan & Kang, 2004). Taken together, these arguments show that although anxiety about images originates in monotheism, iconophobia spans religious and secular ideologies.

In contemporary Western culture, and in the United States in particular, iconophobia is perhaps best expressed within and by the mass media as a fear and anxiety about what images might inspire audiences to do. This fear is premised on the belief that images can initiate behavior among both individuals and groups, which speaks to the power accorded to images writ large (and helps explain why we might wish to control them). To cite one famous example, televised images of the Vietnam War are largely believed to have turned American public opinion against the war. Likewise, the ban on images of soldiers' coffins arriving to Dover Air Force Base, and the arguments for maintaining that interdiction, speak to a profound anxiety that images can "politicize" the war, "inflame controversy" and ultimately persuade viewers that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan should end (Bumiller, 2009). According to such arguments' internal logic, absent these pictures, war can continue without protest or end; it is the pictures, not written reporting, that can initiate change.

Because of the widespread belief that images can change opinion and behavior, the strands of iconophobia running strong in American culture, and especially American journalism (Domke, Perlmutter, & Spratt, 2002:132) ultimately result in iconoclasm: attempts to manage and control images. For instance, graphic photojournalism from the Vietnam War is widely believed to have turned Americans against the war; consequently, the Pentagon adjusted subsequent media (in)access to battlefields in the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and Afghanistan Wars. We see a similar myth regarding the televised debates between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon.

Nixon's five o'clock shadow and sweaty brow (he had an infected knee and was running a fever) are widely believed and often invoked as the reason the tanned and patrician-looking Kennedy won the 1960 presidential election (Thompson, 2012). Legend even has it that people who listened to the debate on the radio believed that Nixon won – presumably because they were not swayed by his appearance. Though no comparative radio and television polls are known to scholars (Thompson, 2012), as with the Vietnam images, it doesn't matter whether the televised debate ended Nixon's 1960 bid for president, so much as our belief that it did, an assumption that influences and corrals the significance of presidents' television appearances to this day.

Iconophobia and its iconoclastic effects guide television programs beyond news about politicians or war; television's relatively short history is littered with them. One early such example is *The Untouchables*, a mafia drama broadcast on ABC beginning in 1959 and critiqued for its depictions of gun violence (Castleman & Podrazik, 2010:129), and blamed for making its viewers violent. The whole of cultivation research, initiated by Gerbner and colleagues in the 1960s, stems from this very assumption: watching violent programs can affect behavior. Read in this light, regulations on violence, sex, and nudity, enforced by the Federal Communications Commission and the film industry's MPAA (to say nothing of video games), can be understood as iconoclastic responses to a pervasive fear about what images can do, and attempts to manage them as a result.

At the television program level, iconoclasm functions through attempts to affix and manage specific, and largely hegemonic, meanings to images. In broadcast news, it is the voiceovers or reporting from anchors and reporters that fix images' meanings. Qualities fundamental to the image that require these interventions. For one, images are, as Roland Barthes

argued, exceptionally open and polysemic. Identical pictures can mean something utterly different to people, even those in the same national group (Meyers, 2002). To take an example from contemporary news practice, during the Bosnian War in the 1990s, both Serbs and Croats circulated the same image of children who died after a town's bombardment, as evidence of the ills done to either side (Sontag, 2002; Broomberg, 2014). "Alter the caption: alter the use of these deaths," Sontag (2002) concludes. That images can so easily shift allegiances – based on changes in another medium (words) – makes plain their capacity to "fool the senses," as Plato wrote, and explains in part the anxiety they provoke.

Images' polysemy, their slipperiness, also manifests through their capacity to change meaning over time. This capacity is most clear in the evolution of iconic images, which can take on different symbolic resonances (Spratt, 2008). To become iconic, Perlmutter (2006) writes, an image must be frequently repeated (among other conditions). It is through this repetition in part that images "pick up" other meanings, symbolic values, and significance. For instance, when the photograph of black athletes at the Mexico City Olympics raising their arms in a black-power salute appeared in 1968, it was 'only' a news image of a controversial act of resistance. The athletes were severely punished by the IOC, and stripped of their medals. "Some hailed it as a gesture of independence and a move in support of a worthy cause," while "many others said they were offended and embarrassed. A few were vehemently indignant," wrote the *New York Times*. The paper declined to publish the photo on its front page. Today, the mass media circulate that image as "a symbol of resistance and defiance, seared into 20th-century history time" (Younge, 2012); CNN headlines a story about the picture "The third man: The forgotten Black Power hero" (Montague, 2012). The picture's iconic qualities, and its positive media framing, were not

instantaneous but became affixed to the image through repetition and re-circulation, in news stories, on television, and in documentary and fictional films as well.

In broadcast news, as in magazines and newspapers, iconic images function as visual shorthand to evoke an entire epoch or news episode. I am talking here, specifically, about news images that were once newsworthy, but that have – through repetition and circulation – become symbols of a whole story, such as Ground Zero in New York City, concentration camp inmates at Bergen Belsen, and revelers atop the Berlin Wall in November 1989. As previously discussed, scholarship on visual anniversary journalism (Keith, 2010; Somerstein, 2014) has shown that the reportage tends to offer singular, iconic images as stand-ins for a more-nuanced visual story. The seeming mutability of an image’s significance and symbolic value can partly explain why even seemingly established icons may be so tightly policed.

There is one final reason that images present special challenges to broadcast news, and that is their indexicality. Olin (2013), situating this term with Charles Peirce, explains that an index “points at, or is itself a trace of or mark made by its object;” by contrast, an icon is a representation “through resemblance” of an object. Thus, a painted portrait is an icon; a photograph, an index. “A weathervane” is an index; a graph, an icon. “Because the item had to be there for an indexical representation of it to exist,” Olin (2013) writes, “it is often thought that an index is inherently more persuasive than an icon” (10). This “persuasiveness” is, fundamentally, camera-images’ seeming *nonfictional* quality. In other words, by virtue of their very medium, and because they refer to something real in the world, camera images seem to be “true.”

Camera-images' lack of aura, as Walter Benjamin famously established, further exaggerates this indexicality. Typically, machines (even as they are operated by people) are thought to be more reliable than humans. They are thought to provide objective data and information, leaving nothing out – rhetoric that still prevails regarding footage provided by satellites (Parks, 2005) closed-circuit television (Finn, 2012), and drones (Stahl, 2013). According to this line of thinking, cameras do not 'forget' details; they do not, like human eyewitnesses, change their stories; they cannot flee or lose courage under duress. Their footage, therefore, tells the 'truth' in a way that coheres with the allegiance to truthfulness espoused by television news.

As a result of their seeming indexicality, objectivity, and completeness, the mass media as well as state and security apparatuses regularly treat images as evidentiary and trustworthy – pictures that are truthful and thus are to be trusted. Mug shots, for instance, delimit sick from well, criminal and insane from “normal” (Tagg, 1989). War images circulated by the mass media seem to offer an honest picture of events (Brothers, 1997), and as a result can function as evidence for state policies of intervention or isolationism. As an example, television news used satellite footage of the Balkans as “proof” of a mass grave, though in fact, as Parks (2005) argues, satellite footage is as highly partial and subjective as any photograph.

But any picture exists within the tension of symbol and index. In anniversary news, the images, through their repetition, slide toward the “symbolic” end of the spectrum. It follows that in such a visual environment, the fear of and anxiety about images should be highly pronounced, because the expectations of a given image – what it connotes – are extremely high. Such images are needed to convey a host of background information, like “the sixties” or “the Cold War.”

With the symbolic role of these images heightened, their denotative value is lessened, as is their capacity to function in an evidentiary role for television news. As a result, in anniversary news broadcasts television news must find ways to compensate, to emphasize their authenticity and the connotative value of their images. They accomplish this through liveness and closeness, which in turn imbue images with the capacity to function as proto-witnessing for viewers.

Liveness

Television began as a “live” medium, transmitting live programming from New York City to elsewhere in the country (Castleman & Podrazik, 2010; Couldry, 2004:355). In television’s early days, this ‘liveness’ served to differentiate it from other media, and showcased it as an improvement on film and live theater (Levine, 2008:394). Later iterations of television programming, though scripted and pre-recorded, were created to simulate liveness. Although satellite technology made possible the “live” transmission of breaking news around the world, much of television news is in fact made up of prerecorded elements. Regardless of television news’s actual liveness, the programming simulates this liveness through visual, textual, and spoken components.

In thinking about television news, it is critical to make plain that there are three kinds of images: ones captured “live” and transmitted, via satellite, to the studio, at the site of breaking news; pre-recorded images that go along with a certain report; and b-roll footage used to illustrate a story that editors and broadcasters obtain from image banks. Images transmitted live from satellites are often accompanied with a written element on-screen that specifies “live.” In that way, written and visual components function together to signify liveness. But at the same time, pre-recorded and b-roll footage also communicate liveness, and is not always identified as

coming from file footage or as having been pre-recorded. Machin and Jaworski (2006) argue that television news editors and broadcasters are relying on image banks for filler or “file” footage more than ever. What matters here is that this footage, although not actually recorded “live,” appears visually as if it is. And given the development of digital technologies, producers and editors can make changes to “news” images in order to better inspire a certain affect. As an example, Kusneutz (2007:76), a former producer for NBC News, writes, “video might be given a sepia tone or black-and-white treatment or some other effect, depending on the nature of the story, which in turn invited an emotive response, whether it was rage, satisfaction, nostalgia or patriotism.” In other words, these finishing, digital technologies can heighten the affect on footage previously selected and edited to transmit to viewers a certain feeling.

TV news also communicates liveness through the anchor. As discussed in later chapters, the evening news anchor might be shown standing and holding papers, as if he has only just been handed transcripts of breaking news. He might also be shown reacting to the report, as if he is only now just seeing it for the first time, and wasn’t involved in its production. These seemingly unscripted moments and visual cues amplify television news’s liveness.

The spoken components that emphasize liveness are found throughout television news programs. For instance, reporters’ lexical choices such as “now,” “today,” “here,” “on this very spot,” among others (Lorenzo-Dus, 2009) locate news rhetoric, as well as reporters and viewers, in a shared, simultaneous, and presentist time and space. Anchors’ salutations and closing statements also emphasize liveness, because they are keyed to the time of day that the news program airs (‘good evening,’ ‘good night’). The word live is also often embedded in these openings. For instance, Tom Brokaw began NBC’s News’s coverage from 9 November 1989,

“Good evening, live from the Berlin Wall” – even though the program began by showing prerecorded images of people flowing from East Berlin. Finally, the natural-seeming, unscripted and extemporaneous-sounding conversations between reporters and anchors ‘back in the studio’ further support this seeming liveness. In these ways, spoken rhetoric grounds the images they are paired with in a current, present temporal space – even if they are prerecorded, or are file images taken from an image archive.

Liveness matters because it lends television news an evidentiary role. The footage is made to seem as if it is happening as we speak – the result is to make television news seem unmediated, so to make the apparatus of the television fall away. The trustworthiness and seeming objectivity of television news is elevated as a result, as if the broadcasters and reporters are merely holding up a mirror, or opening a window, to reality. This kind of construction provides audiences with the chance to seemingly “witness” the “iconic moment” of the real event, and thereby share “a sense of being in the unfolding of that moment” (Lorenzo-Dus, 2009:67). With television news merely showing, rather than shaping or making, news, the stuff of its programs – images and dialogue – appear that much more authentic and trustworthy.

But as Levine, Couldry (2003) and others point out, television no longer has a unique hold on liveness; text messaging, online chatting, live-streaming online video, Skype, and other technologies have since emerged to challenge that unique claim (398). Partly as a result, to maintain its once-unique hold on liveness as a quality, over the past two decades television’s aesthetic has tended toward immediacy (Bolter and Grusin, 2000), which makes television seem “as if it were a direct channel between ourselves and the event” (188). Likewise, the emergence and incorporation of satellite visuals (Parks, 2005; Lorenzo-Dus, 2009) and, more recently,

images taken by drones (Stahl, 2013) enable television news to seem to occupy not only one but multiple “presents” at once.

There are other elements that television news draws upon in order to emphasize immediacy. These include the tools of hypermediacy, which Bolter and Grusin (2000) define as “fascination with media” that “take[s] pleasure in the act of mediation” (14). In television news, hypermediacy is communicated through a multiplicity of “windows that open on to other representations of other media” (34). In television news, these windows manifest as multiple screens, such as laptops, touch screens, maps, and other graphics. The resemblance to computer screens, Bolter and Grusin (2000) argue, is critical to television’s continued “survival” (185) given the rise and competition posed by the Internet and other digital technologies.

The logic of hypermediacy and immediacy seems contradictory, as the writers point out. On the one hand, television news is designed and executed to seem absolutely immediate, a witness to breaking news. At the same time, “hypermediacy,” which fetishizes the mechanical apparatuses of creating and broadcasting news, seemingly emphasizes the mediated quality of television news. But Bolter and Grusin argue that the tools of hypermediacy are used by news channels in the service of “liveness” and “immediacy.” Bolter and Grusin (2000):

CNN is known for its ‘up-to-the-minute’ coverage of wars, crimes, and natural disasters. The newscasters often remind us that the images are coming live from some disaster site, even though what the viewer sees is a multimediated screen in which the live feed is coned to one window. . . . Today, CNN still insists on the immediacy and timeliness of the report itself, and the viewer seems to agree. However, televised immediacy is no longer characterized by a unified, transparent screen (189-190).

Sunil Manghani (2008) points out that the Berlin Wall’s opening coincided with the development of twenty-four hour news and the “live-streaming of world events” (50). This live-

streaming, Manghani argues, imbues news images in particular with ever-more seeming truth value. That is, their continuity and liveness make the images seem as though they are “not tempered or transformed in any way by the ‘usual’ manipulations of the media – whether by structural, technological means or creative, journalistic decisions. In other words, these are nominally ‘pure’ representations, not re-presentations” (Manghani, 2008:51). Thus, the overall 24-hour news economy also contributes to news’ images seeming liveness and truthfulness. In this way, the indexicality of the camera is over pronounced, overly weighted, while its fundamental partiality, its bias, appears to recede. Important to keep in mind is that, as other scholars have shown, television can be comprised entirely of “actual footage” without giving “a truly realistic picture” (Rollins, 2001:114).

Unique about anniversary journalism is that it reaches to past “presents,” bringing them forward in time. A typical anniversary news story recycles previous “live” images and juxtaposes them with current pre-recorded and “live” shots. The result is such that the images all seem live. They seem especially truthful as a result. And, juxtaposed, they make the narrative that the television program offers seem inevitable.

In commercial broadcasting the viewer pays for the privilege of having himself sold. You are delivered to the advertiser who is the customer. He consumes you. –Richard Serra,

Television Delivers People

Another critical systemic pressure on television images, which runs alongside iconophobia and iconoclasm, comes from the market. Although new recording and playback technologies such as

TiVo make it possible for viewers to speed through commercials, this technology belies a fundamental reality: on television, “advertising is normal” (White, 1992:161). Even its ratings system, used to assess a program’s success, is bound up with this kind of logic, given that ratings are the mode by which advertisers decide what products to sell, to whom, and how much to pay for this privilege. Viewers of television news are especially attractive to advertisers because of their relative affluence and level of education, as well as the attention they pay to “what is on the screen” (Postman and Powers, 1992:5). Consequently, the images shown *adjacent* to television news – commercials -- are determined by the market, and by television news’s capacity to retain viewers’ attention.

This secondary pressure also manifests in the images screened by television news – and the ones left out. More broadly this pressure interferes with the kinds of stories television news covers, and partly helps determine which get told. Herman and Chomsky’s (1986) propaganda model holds that elites control the mass media, and that as a result the mass media is a tool of dominant propaganda – though its quality as such is hidden in “democratic” social systems as in the United States. Specifically, they argue that because publicly-traded companies, beholden to the stock market, own the mass media, only certain types of messages – namely those that support dominant and economic social paradigms – will filter through. Although too one-sided – as Daniel Hallin (1994) writes, “no forces working in other directions are taken into account in any serious way” -- their model provides a framework for explaining why television news programs typically espouse hegemonic ideologies particularly regarding capitalism (13).

Chomsky and Herman also point to the mass media’s reliance on advertisers for the majority of their revenue. This dependence means that broadcasters are reluctant to air stories

that might anger advertisers by critiquing them too strongly. Instead, mass media content ought to inspire audiences to consume. Relatedly, Chomsky and Herman argued that anticommunism is the dominant American/Western “religion.” Therefore, stories in which a communist entity seems sympathetic – in the case of a jet crash from a communist nation, for instance – will not appear in the mass media. By contrast, stories in which the communist can be cast as an aggressor will appear. Although this paradigm fell apart after the Cold War, it is still evident in anniversary coverage of the Berlin Wall.

The longitudinal nature of this project supposes that the ratios of iconoclasm, and its effects, as well as market pressures, are not uniform. Nor do they move in a singular direction. The versions of the past presented by television news are a moving target, as are the influences upon them. In the coming chapters, I discuss how these influences have impacted anniversary journalism on the Berlin Wall’s opening. I also pay attention to effects on iconoclasm and the market – namely, the 9/11 attacks, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan – to explain the images that are produced.

In sum, these influences and their effects matter because of the role television plays in bringing the “public sphere” into private homes. The notion that television news contains, communicates, or somehow “is” the public sphere is complicated and troubling. But as with the widespread belief in pictures to stimulate behavior, television news is frequently discussed and widely held as an emblem or manifestation of the “public sphere.”

Metaphor

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (n.d.) defines metaphor as “a figure of speech in which a name or descriptive word or phrase is transferred to an object or action different from, but analogous to, that to which it is literally applicable.” This definition reveals how metaphors function as the juxtaposition of two concepts, one more known, or knowable, than the other. As an example, consider the metaphor ‘my love is a rose.’ In this set-up, the “rose” – thorny, beautiful, not everlasting – gives its qualities to the abstract and unknowable “love,” illuminating it, thereby making love (‘y’) concrete and understandable. Put another way, in spoken, written, and visual texts, metaphor is a tool for helping audiences to understand the qualities of something unknown or unfamiliar by way of something familiar.

But as Lule (2004), Lakoff & Johnson (2003), and many others have argued, metaphor is critical to and emerges from human experience. Many of our most foundational metaphors come from our direct experiences with our bodies in the world (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). In that way, and at a primitive level, they are bound up with ontology. Metaphors are also how “members of a given culture interpret experience” (Trim, 2007:15), essentially, a tool for understanding our action and behaviors (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003:5).

But metaphors also have more power than functioning to interpret current surroundings or complicated events. Because they organize and “create social reality,” they can even “guide future action” (Gavriely-Nuri, 453). These future actions are enacted at the level of public life, including national conversations about going to war (Lule, 2004); peace negotiations (Gavriely-Nuri, 2010); and in the private, personal arena, people’s decisions to seek or aver medication or treatment for illness (Sontag, 1978). Rorty (1989) argued that “innovative” metaphors can even

inspire “social change” (Jensen, Doss, & Ivic, 2011). In their capacity to inspire or occlude future action, they resemble iconic images, which as previously discussed are widely believed to do the same.

Thus, metaphor matters more than its function within a given text. It is not simply a rhetorical or stylistic device. As a structure, it is how we make sense of the world, of all the intangible, abstract, and difficult to conceive concepts and emotions we encounter simply by being alive – what Mary Doty calls “a container for emotion and idea, a vessel that can hold what's too slippery or charged or difficult to touch.” It is suggestive of how we come to know the world: first, and primarily, through our bodies. And it is foundational to how we think. In these ways, the centrality of metaphor to human experience is what makes it worthy of discourse analysis.

Metaphor and ideology

Given the way that it is structured (‘x’ gives its qualities to ‘y’), and its centrality to human experience, metaphor is also a useful lens into exposing and critiquing ideology. To return to “my love is a rose,” a metaphor functions as a juxtaposition between known and unknown. Ideology is detectable simply through what is advanced as ‘known’ within a certain culture – for example, “freedom” or “democracy” – and what is foreign (“communism”). The words that fall into the ‘known’ category are emblematic of a culture’s mainstream collective knowledge. The same is true of images, when they are juxtaposed through quick splices to function as a metaphor: the “known” is placed just beside the lesser known; this relationship reveals ideology.

Metaphors also carry and communicate ideology because, as Lakoff and Johnson (2003) write, they contain the concept of the given thing described. As an example, the writers offer the concept “time is money” – a key concept that structures daily life in the West (7). This concept, so ingrained in Western (capitalist) culture, has spawned a number of metaphorical expressions: don’t waste my time, I don’t have the time for it, and so on. Identifying the key concept that these metaphoric expressions comprise reveals fundamental ideologies that structure our culture. Similarly, in her case study of “a hand extended in peace,” an important metaphor to Israeli culture, Gavriely-Nuri (2010) suggests that often-repeated metaphors central to a society may contain information about a culture’s foundational myths and belief systems that may otherwise be difficult to detect.

As important, their use is often unconscious; we deploy them “without awareness to comprehend reality” (Lakoff, 1991; cited in Lule, 2004:188). In that way, metaphors function akin to ideology – a global perspective that frames how we look at the world, and of which we are rarely aware. Lastly, metaphor is also a fitting area to mine because television frequently builds upon previous historical coverage or employs historical frames even for current events (Zelizer, 2011). Thus, even structurally television reportage is built of historical metaphor, suggesting the importance of this structure to the genre overall.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This investigation of broadcast news's anniversary coverage of the Berlin Wall is situated in the approach set forth by television scholar Steve Anderson (2001):

The process of understanding how the past is transformed into memory... is best described as an archeology in which the goal is not simply to uncover something that has been buried, but to discover how and why additional layers have been built on top of it (23).

Anderson's archeological metaphor-as-process fits this study for many reasons. For one, it makes plain the necessity of a close reading, as employed by this dissertation. It is only through closely reading a text that these layers will be discovered, along with the reasons for their accumulation. Second, in explaining "how and why" these layers have shown up, Anderson's model permits an interdisciplinary investigation. Interdisciplinarity rests at the very core of communications as a discipline, given that it borrows extensively from the literatures and methodologies used in history, cultural studies, and anthropology, among other fields. Applying this logic to my cases under review, explanations for "how and why" layers of Berlin Wall anniversary coverage have appeared might be drawn from changing geopolitics, such as the emergence of the European Union, the 9/11 attacks, or the U.S.'s most-recent recession. By contrast, the introduction of new visual regimes and the obliteration of others may be explained by changing media routines or technological innovation. Finally, Anderson's approach coheres with the multiple levels of influence on media that Shoemaker and Reese describe in their seminal book, *Mediating the Message* (1996). That is, to assert that ideologies, media organizations, and social systems influence media requires scholars to look to the market, politics, and economic systems in their analysis.

Artifacts for analysis: contrasting networks

NBC News is chosen for investigation because it was the only one of the big three U.S. networks – ABC, CBS, and NBC – with a reporter on the ground in Berlin when the first wave of East Germans came over the Wall (Culbert, 2001:235). Therefore, it has a vast archive of images to draw on in creating anniversary coverage. Second, although NBC Nightly News’s audience has steadily declined since 1980, it still reaches millions of viewers every night. During the time under review, NBC News’s ratings fell from an average rating of 9.9 in 1989 to 6.0 in 2009, or an average of 8.62 million viewers every night (Guskin, Jurkowitz & Mitchell, 2013). (Ratings measure the percentage of a population that owns a television tuned in to a given program (Guskin, Jurkowitz & Mitchell, 2013). Finally, NBC News was chosen because of its popularity as a news network during the time under review; from 1997 through 2009 (except for 2001), the show commanded the most ratings of the three networks (Guskin, Jurkowitz & Mitchell, 2013). Although the era of the mass audience has ended, NBC News’s wide reach demonstrates that the discourses it circulates are viewed by millions of Americans.

CNN is chosen as a comparison because it broadcasts news all day and night, not only in distinct time parcels. As a cable channel, its relationship to advertising differs from network television, which relies exclusively on advertising revenue for funding. Also of interest is that although founded in 1980, CNN did not come into its own until the Persian Gulf War – after the Wall fell. Thus, examining its anniversary content offers the chance to see how a still-developing network handled the Wall’s original coverage and the ways, once its reach had increased, the network managed anniversary content. Lastly, as a 24-hour news channel, CNN’s relationship to liveness differs slightly from NBC’s. Manghani (2008) pointed out that the 24-hour “live

streaming of news events” seemed to provide “pure representation, not re-presentations,” in a way that differs from the 30-minute news program like NBC’s Nightly News. As a result, the image that CNN makes use of, as well as the tools of hypermediacy it deploys, may influence anniversary journalism in a different way than they affect the network.

Obtaining and choosing anniversary coverage

Using Vanderbilt’s television news archive, I watched NBC News’s 1989 coverage of the Wall’s opening beginning 9 November and lasting through the 30th of the month. Accessing CNN’s coverage was more difficult, however, because it has not been digitized. Ultimately the Vanderbilt News Archive provided a DVD of 10 November 1989 coverage.

For both networks, examining this early material provided a baseline of the original coverage’s tenor, its visuals, and its spoken and textual components. This archival material also showed the news’s 1989 visual regimes. Although even breaking news coverage refers back to past events, it is important to set this news coverage as a starting point against which later reportage is compared, a method practiced by previous scholars (i.e. Thomas, 2011). Together this exploration enabled me to assess how the coverage changed over the ensuing two decades.

For NBC News and for CNN’s news beginning in 1995, I located anniversary coverage by selecting “browse by date,” which allows the user to search through each month’s worth of broadcasts from 1989 through 2009. I select “November” for, say, 1990, and then click on the “NBC evening news” program for November 1. I then read the descriptions of each segment provided by the Vanderbilt Archive as an initial step to selecting relevant broadcasts and weeding out those that are not relevant. Even if the words “Berlin Wall” do not appear in the segments’ descriptions, I watch the segment if it may in fact include such footage – for instance,

if the descriptions refer to the end of the Cold War or the Paris Peace Talks. I then only include these segments in the analysis if the Berlin Wall is mentioned specifically or visually referenced. I repeat this process for each day in each month of November from 1989 through 2009. This approach should enable me to capture all relevant broadcast news.

Aside from special events, CNN materials prior to 1995 have not been digitized and are only available on tapes. Per my request, the Vanderbilt Television News Archive digitized materials CNN materials from 6 through 9 November of 1990 and 1992. A research assistant reviewed these DVDs for any material pertaining to the Berlin Wall, Kristallnacht, or the Cold War. Material was not available and therefore not reviewed from 1991, 1993, or 1994. Beginning in 1995, I reviewed CNN programming from the entire month of November.

Notably, during the time under review, programming by both NBC and CNN was often unavailable. In some cases, the broadcasts simply were not archived; for instance, on 8 November 1992, there is no NBC News broadcast, not even in the Nashville archive. Thus in this case the program aired, but it was not recorded. At other times, programs were preempted by special events (like “Inside Politics,” on CNN) or sports (which occurred frequently on NBC). The table below shows the three years that no material appeared on 9 November:

| Network | Year missing | Reason |
|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| CNN | 2000 | Post-election coverage |
| CNN | 2008 | No archival material |
| NBC | 1997 | No archival material |

This longitudinal approach has been adopted by previous scholars of television, notably Brewer (2013), who analyzed seven years of *The Daily Show*'s science-related clips to assess how the show presents science, and the ways that the show responds to external shocks or challenges to science throughout American culture. Like Brewer, the longitudinal scope I accomplish here enables me to assess what I term “shocks” – iconophobic, geopolitical, economic, technological, and other systemic disturbances – influence anniversary coverage.

I choose to focus on the entire month of November for several reasons. In the early years after the Berlin Wall's fall, when the story was covered as news, not as commemoration, developments occurred nearly every day. Reviewing this footage is important to establishing a baseline of how television news covered the Wall's opening. Second, previous scholarship on anniversary coverage has shown that despite a single date's significance, commemorative reporting appears before and after that date. Finally, several events heavily covered by the U.S. media fall in early November and may push Berlin Wall coverage to other dates. These include Veterans Day, November 11, and Election Day, the first Tuesday in November. Therefore, opening my search to the entire month of November should net relevant data that might otherwise be pushed before or after 9 November by other events in the news cycle.

During the time under review, particularly in 1990, television news devoted significant airtime to communism's unwinding in the then-USSR and other former Communist countries such as Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Although thematically related to this project, I do not include materials that do not refer specifically to the Berlin Wall through either visual or spoken discourse. Likewise, other political and military developments that same year further complicate an easy sorting-out of relevant broadcasts. By autumn 1990, Iraq had invaded Kuwait; Saddam Hussein had taken several hundreds of foreign nationals hostage. The U.S.

sought to persuade Russia, because of that nation's position on the U.N. Security Council, to vote for a strike against Iraq. Thus, many of the news broadcasts from 1990 weave together coverage of the Cold War's end with the escalating war in the Persian Gulf. As a result, I watch these segments, though again I include them only if the Berlin Wall is mentioned or visually referenced.

I log broadcasts that fit with this study's purview into a spreadsheet ordered by year. NBC and CNN have their own spreadsheets. In addition, in order to trace the ways that the coverage moved from breaking news to commemoration, I also log the broadcasts' duration, and their position within the overall news program. To that end, I note what segments come before and after, whether commercials or news item, opening or closing music, or commentary. This information can help to flesh out the anniversary coverage's discursive environment. Specifically, such data suggest how the anniversary coverage is positioned within the news program; they can also be read as the tag ends of the iconoclastic environment of television news, in that they contain the anniversary coverage within a certain discourse (i.e., coverage that appears after commercials is overtly linked to capitalism and specifically to the products advertised). Finally, the duration of these segments will also reveal their significance at the time that they aired. Changing durations of anniversary coverage may shed light on the significance of the symbolic role they play within the news broadcast.

CNN

Importantly, the CNN reporting evaluated does not all come from the same show, but it based on the materials available in the Vanderbilt Television News Archive. The 1989 and 1990 coverage comes from *World View*, anchored by Bernard Shaw and Catherine Crier. In 1992 I

evaluate *Prime News*; in 1999, it is once again *World View*. Beginning in 2004, the show available for review occupies a prime-time slot: 9 p.m. EST. This is *News Night* with Aaron Brown; by 2009, it is *Studio 360* with Anderson Cooper. As a result, some of the changes evident in the anniversary coverage are likely due to the programs' different objectives, styles, anchors, durations, and even time slots. At the same time, the different CNN news programs pull raw materials, like video, as well as fully-executed reports from the same, single network source (Flournoy & Stewart, 1997:3). Thus, although the shows examined here differ, and provide audiences a different array of news offerings, the reporting from which they are composed largely come from the same single source.

Close reading of the texts

Once the broadcasts are selected, I embark on a close reading of them, a method practiced by previous scholars of broadcast news seeking to identify the ideologies manifest within them. Ibrahim (2003), for instance, completed a close reading of 9/11-related television news to identify the ideologies embedded in the newscasts regarding Muslims and Islam. She looked specifically to patterns and repetitions, visually and rhetorically, as manifestations of “latent meaning” (14). I do the same, paying close attention to thematic repetitions in both images and speech. As part of this attention to patterns, I also examine to the personages who populate these reports: anchors, reporters, and sources, paying special attention to the role that government elites feature in these reports. At the same time, non-elite sources are important to this analysis. Their relationship to communism further elucidates the ideologies manifest in the broadcast news coverage. Therefore I analyze the non-elite sources featured on these reports, the issues they discuss, their gender, and their professions. An eye to these components will enable

an analysis of the seemingly unrelated but important hegemonic discourses, such as the roles of women and men. Finally, because collective memory is “processual” (Zelizer, 1995), I pay special attention to images and spoken rhetoric recycled from the past. These repetitions may be understood as keys to the emergence of collective memory regarding the Berlin Wall’s opening and are important to tracing the memorial process.

As important to what is shown on television news is what is not shown. Therefore this project also attempts to reckon with the absences and silences around the Berlin Wall’s anniversary. To start, I examine the years in which no anniversary coverage appeared on television and seek explanations for these absences. Other silences and omissions are found in images originally circulated as news that do not appear in the commemorative coverage. These can be understood as patterns of silence, blankness, that are critical to understanding the construction of layers of commemorative coverage. To aid me in this aspect of my analysis, I take into special consideration iconophobia and iconoclasm, the fear of images and the desire to control them, as sources for explaining why some images have disappeared while others are frequently reiterated. In sum, whether attempting to interpret the meaning of materials present or absent, my approach is inductive, interdisciplinary, creative, and highly subjective.

Why textual analysis?

To be sure, close readings are subjective and have been frequently critiqued as such. They cannot and do not intend to contribute generalizable knowledge. They are also difficult to falsify, given that close readings acknowledge a range of possible interpretations. Nor is a close reading easily replicated. In these ways, close readings seemingly violate the scientific method (McKee,

2003:118) and are more akin to modes of inquiry found in the humanities; when used in the social sciences, such an approach is typically and self-consciously situated after the postmodern turn and the rejection of positivism.

At the same time, close reading is in fact very old, akin to the method practiced by rabbinical sages and scholars from antiquity until today. The bulk of Judaic law in the Talmud and tomes of subsequent responsa is comprised of close readings of single phrases or only a few short lines of a single text. In fact, the different possible interpretations of a single word drive and enliven much of this scholarship; the Talmud is effectively comprised of transcriptions of these differing opinions based on close readings. Thus, although my method may seem iconoclastic within the realm of the social sciences, and may seem as if rooted in a short history, the method of close reading and producing fertile thought through multiple, conflicting interpretations extends back millennia.

Finally, and despite its limitations, close reading accords with my epistemological and scholarly positions. I do not believe that there is a singular, verifiable truth accessible by any social science or “hard” scientific method, qualitative or quantitative. In my opinion even those more-seemingly objective methods such as survey research or content analysis are influenced by the biases of the researchers designing the studies. In fact, the very act of putting concepts into language makes it impossible for researchers to avoid these biases (McKee, 2003).

What is more, close reading is an especially fitting methodology for this study given this project’s interest in the manufacture of ideologies and memorial narratives. Fairclough (1992) writes that language – and here I use that term to refer to visual and spoken texts – “is widely misperceived as transparent, so that the social and ideological ‘work’ that language does in

producing, reproducing, or transforming social structures, relations and identities is routinely ‘overlooked.’” Yet at the same time, Fairclough (1992) argues, texts function as “sensitive barometers of social processes;” close readings reveal those shifts, and thus can make plain instances of “social change” such as “the reconstitution of knowledge and ideology” (211). In these ways, close reading functions as a tool uniquely well-suited to the longitudinal study of Berlin Wall commemorative reportage, which spans a long history of social shifts: the emergence of a new world order; the ascendance of a unified Europe; the 9/11 attacks; technological revolutions in television news in terms of its visual regime and routine (that is, the 24-hour news cycle).

Analysis of visual coverage

As with previous scholars of television news (Ibrahim, 2003) I look to both the programs’ images and spoken discourses. To aid me in this analysis I draw on semiotics and discourse analysis as well as the visual regimes of television (Parks, 2005); the qualities inherent to the medium (Bolter & Grusin, 2000; Levine, 2003; Montgomery, 2007) will be invoked to explain the ideological content of the images under review. For an especially close reading of certain images I turn to the frameworks established by Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) in *Reading Images: Grammar of Visual Design*. As they write, “patterns of distance” regarding interviewees, objects, or landscapes contain ideological information is also made clear by choices evidenced by the visual frame. For instance, people shown close-up seem “friendly” and available; those shown in long shots, distant and authoritative (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006:126).

Fairclough (1995) observed that “visual choices,” iterated through a chain of decisions, carry meaning (24) and that shifts in society manifest through changes in media discourse

(Fairclough, 1995:33). In other words, images that are recirculated or shown but once, and images that are disappeared, convey ideological meanings at the same time that they are symptomatic of shifts at the sociocultural levels. To aid me in assessing the meaning of these visual choices longitudinally, I turn to scholarship on new imaging technologies and visual regimes (Parks, 2005; Mitchell, 2011) as well as socioeconomic, political, and global events such as the formation of the European Union and the 9/11 attacks.

Finally, I look to liveness, remediation, hypermediacy, and immediacy as qualities that implement the ideological content of anniversary coverage. Specifically, I explain how, within the anniversary broadcasts, these qualities make the “story” of the Berlin Wall presented by television news seem natural, authoritative, verifiable, and unquestionable.

Spoken discourses

To analyze the broadcasts’ textual and spoken components I draw on Critical Discourse Analysis, an interdisciplinary methodology that sees language, and the media, as sites of the production of power, dominance, inequality, and ideology (van Dijk, 2001:352; Montgomery, 2007:20; Fairclough, 1995). Essentially, CDA assumes that the groups that control public discourse also control social power (van Dijk, 2001). One way of accessing these public discourses of power is to analyze the media (van Dijk, 2001:355), as numerous researchers have done (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2001; Ibrahim, 2010).

To gain access to this discourse, I employ a close reading of the spoken components of the broadcasts, choosing to focus on the metaphors that the broadcasts employ. As discussed in chapter three, analyzing metaphors enables me to assess “what is regarded as reality,” because metaphors “feature[e] some aspects of an event or phenomenon [while] hiding others” (Vande

Berg & Wenner, 1991:33; Lule, 2004). Focusing on metaphor also provides an opportunity for ideological critique (Mumby & Spitzack, 1991:315). Finally, metaphor also provides a way into assessing what is not shown, what is absent, which as others have discussed (see Ott, Aoki, & Dickinson, 2011) can be very difficult.

Written discourses

A separate spreadsheet was created devoted to the texts used in the broadcasts – namely, written words used as visual framing devices, which can be understood as “structural metaphors” that provide a news broadcast a fundamental organization and theme (Lule, 2004:183). These texts are analyzed within the context of each year and over the time under review.

Chapter 4: NBC Nightly News

This chapter begins with an overview of NBC Nightly News's coverage of the Berlin Wall's opening in 1989, comprising reportage that aired from 9 November through the end of the month. In this chapter, I discuss the images, ideologies, and themes circulated when the story was breaking news in order to assess how they shifted and disappeared from subsequent anniversary programs.

In the second half of the chapter, I look at the anniversary coverage that aired from 1990 through 2009. I approach this material like the original coverage, searching for previously established and emergent patterns and ideologies and for new visual and spoken discourses that were not present in 1989. I also look for key omissions – materials that might have but were not present in any of the programming. Finally, with support from data on unemployment and ethnic violence supplied by Human Rights Watch and academic studies, I discuss how these tensions appear or are absent from the anniversary coverage.

An overview of network news in 1989: The view from Brandenburg Gate

NBC's comprehensive reportage began 9 November with Brokaw anchoring from the Brandenburg Gate's west side, where he remained until 14 November (except Sunday 12 November, when Garrick Utley anchored from the same place). Even after the program returned to New York, the unwinding of the GDR and the implications of the Wall's opening received substantial attention from NBC Nightly News through November. NBC Nightly News also aired the commercial-free special report "Freedom Night," a 15-minute program broadcast Friday, 10 November, preempting the *Late Show*. I consider all of these materials in this chapter.

Three main themes dominate the 1989 coverage: the Wall's opening as an immediate news event; the implications of the Wall's opening for the GDR, the USSR, West Germany, and the rest of the world; and a peek behind the curtain at the people and landscapes of the GDR. Each of these themes expresses NBC News's ideological stance, the latter two most baldly. Each also embodies the push-pull that Daniel C. Hallin (1994) observes as endemic to television news: purveyor of information and source of entertainment.

The Wall's opening is illustrated through prerecorded and live images of people crossing over to the West on foot and by car, celebrating at the Wall, clapping, cheering, drinking, and drumming. Other footage shows people, soldiers, firefighters, and machines dismantling the Wall by hand and with heavy machinery and welding equipment. These constitute what later became the iconic images from 1989, which are most frequently recirculated in anniversary coverage. They are most likely the most familiar to U.S. audiences.

But there was no similarly vibrant footage that the network could draw on to show the largely intangible geopolitical and bureaucratic architecture that the Wall's opening prompted dismantling. Thus, to tell this part of the story, the network largely relied on interpretation by anchors and reporters and interviews with European and American premiers, mayors, and other elites to explain and forecast political reforms within East Germany; the anticipated influx of Eastern immigrants; the future of the USSR; and the impact of German unification on greater Europe and the U.S. Frequently, in lieu of interviews with GDR or communist leadership, the American reporters offer the "Eastern" perspective. For instance, rather than interview a member of the East German parliament about elections held for the first time by secret ballot, Brokaw explains that "Party officials were quick to learn one of the first lessons of secret ballots: There was a surprise winner in the race for speaker" (13 November). His interpolation of the

communists' experience pattern coheres with typical patterns of U.S. media coverage of the Cold War, which tended to shy away from stories told from indulging perspectives of actual communists.

The "peek behind the curtain" comes first in the form of footage of the Eastern side of the Wall, taken with a video camera held aloft (10 November, "Freedom Night," 13 November). The quality of these images is poor, the information they provide paltry; one fuzzy night picture shows lines of people (soldiers?) silhouetted against the dark, the Brandenburg Gate behind them (10 November); another shows a group in the same position, illuminated by floodlights (13 November). Brokaw even puzzles about one scene, a dark shot of what appears to be East German police carrying away civilians: "This is the East Side of the Brandenburg gate where thousands of east Berliners have been crossing all day long.... We don't quite know what happened to these people, whether they were in a fight or just fell" ("Freedom Night"). Aesthetically the images recall closed-circuit television, given their distance and surveillant quality, which reads as a referral to the consistent surveillance under which East Germans lived and anticipates the future visual regime of television news.

The network also provides a "peek behind the curtain" through on-the-spot interviews with East Germans who have come West. These include brief interviews typically limited to a single question, asked off camera: Do you intend to stay in the West? Other similar segments offer human-interest stories about East Germans' domestic lives (14 November; 18 November), reminding viewers that although "for so long we have taken the Wall for granted," the East Germans have not (14 November). The repetition of 'we,' referring to the reporters and U.S. audiences, and "them" for East Germans, further asserts the sense that such segments are

providing a peek behind the curtain at another, foreign way of life – the “other world,” as Lule (2001) put it.

Still, it is important to note that not all coverage during November, or even during the first week of the Wall’s opening, revolved around Berlin. Beginning 10 November, and with the Wall at his back, Brokaw relayed news about the United States and elsewhere, such as a plane crash in Georgia, a murder in Boston, a new U.S. housing program (10 November). All the while the celebrants at the Wall were visible behind him, their shouts of joy audible. In this way, NBC News used the Berlin Wall’s opening as the visual frame for making sense of seemingly unconnected happenings throughout that week in 1989, a sort of rhetorical container for the rest of the world. This visual and oral backdrop also served to further circulate the now-iconic 1989 images even when they were not the center story. Finally, the images consistently showcased NBC’s main theme: the breaking news of the Wall’s opening.

As important, Brokaw’s position seemingly embedded him within the breaking news. He became, visually, part of the Berlin Wall’s opening, and functioned as the signal interpreter of the events for television audiences. This closeness bestowed his reporting with the highest seeming evidentiary authority. It suggested that TV news is no social construct, but a mirror of events as they are happening on the ground. In these ways, Brokaw’s authority and seeming trustworthiness as a journalist, and NBC News’s authority as showing real events, increased. Additionally, by relaying other news items from Berlin, the authority of field-reporting bleeds into Brokaw’s presentation of these other news items, further increasing his seeming authority as a journalist. Finally, these scenes contribute to a visual link between Brokaw and the wall that will endure throughout all 20 years of coverage, such that Brokaw himself becomes a visual brand of the network.

Ideologies

The German threat

The network's presentation of the changes that the Wall's opening set in motion is ideologically fraught with hegemonic U.S. perspectives on Germany that draw on the legacies of World War II and communism. Taken together, this perspective serves to diminish the East Germans' power and aligns them with established anti-communist and anti-German rhetoric. The subtle ideologies communicated in 1989 also buoy up the U.S. by defining freedom as freedom to buy – the ultimate expression of capitalism.

Visually, these anti-German ideologies are most frequently communicated through archival footage from World War II: a clip of Hitler from *Triumph of the Will* (9 November); a firebombed Dresden in 1945 (13 November); and Nazi flags flying on Brandenburg Gate (15 November). Such images play on the long-established public memory of German aggression. Spoken discourses, from elite and non-elite sources, also express this position: an unnamed French farmer who does not speak to the camera but whom, we are told, “still hates Germans” (18 November); Olivier Todd, a journalist identified here as a French political commentator, who says: “The writer Francois Mauriac once said, ‘I like Germany so much that I want two of them forever.’ I think a lot of French people deep down feel a bit like that” (9 November). Even West German mayor Willy Brandt is quoted to convey this position: NBC shows him claiming that young people are the reason the “world has not to fear a unified Germany.” In these ways, the ideological implications of the “other world” showed it to be a dark, threatening place.

Anchors and reporters also emphasized this ideological frame. NBC reporter Jim Bitterman devoted a segment to questioning if the surge of nationalism following the Wall's opening is “to be feared” (12 November). That same night, anchor Garrick Utley, speaking from

Berlin, described unification as “an idea heavy with painful memories for millions of people” (12 November). Importantly, and as Culbert (2001) asserts, such segments demonstrate that the network took for granted the inevitability of German unification. But the network also took for granted that unification might be bad, despite the euphoria of a united Berlin, revealing deeply-held suspicions of Germany and assumptions regarding German leaders’ inherent thirst for power.

Communism as contagion

Coverage examining the implications of the Wall’s opening also serves as a vehicle for communicating hegemonic ideologies about communism. Repeatedly, the network positions communism as a contagion, a highly-charged ideological concept informed by containment, the U.S.’s first Cold War policy, expressed through rhetoric and foreign and domestic programs alike. Although elite and non-elite sources express this ideology -- one unnamed West German interviewee says, “I hope that there will be many of them coming to West Germany, and I hope that many of them go back to East Germany” (November 10) -- this theme is most frequently communicated by U.S. anchors and reporters. For instance, while West Berlin mayor Walter Momper publicly welcomes East Berliners -- “If they want to come here and stay forever or for a longer time, I accept that,” he says, in English -- Brokaw asserts that “privately, West Berlin authorities have worried that too many of them [East Berliners] would stay on this side of the wall, where housing and jobs are already in short supply” (November 10). Likewise, despite East Berliners’ continued insistence on living in the east, Brokaw repeatedly sounds the alarm: “For now at least it looks as if West Berlin won’t be overrun by East Germans” (13 November). Similarly, Jim Bitterman speaks of the “Iron Curtain...no longer hold[ing] back an invasion of Easterners in their smoky little two-cycle cars” (18 November). In addition to evoking fears of a

communist takeover, the frequent recurrence of such words as “invasion” and “overrun” fits within and recalls the United States’s most virulent anti-communist rhetoric.

Communists as children

The peek-behind-the-curtain stories enabled reporters to indulge another ideological stance that diminishes and disenfranchises East Germans: likening communists to children. As with communists-as-contagion, the television journalists truck overtly with this metaphor. Brokaw: “The joyous crowds rushing from the drab poverty of East Germany to this showcase of capitalism are in some ways like small children who have been let loose in a candy shop” (10 November). Still other reports indulged this cliché visually and through spoken discourse. Martin Fletcher: “With their new freedom, East Berliners are like kids in a toy store. In fact, many are kids in a toy store” (11 November). His words play over footage of a blonde girl watching a model train and other children playing with computers and toys. Yet other scenes highlight children singing at Brandenburg Gate (15 November). And in one segment, a profile of the Mikowskis, an East German family, the reporter neglects the adults to devote much of his time to interviewing the eight-year-old and a teenager, who give their perspectives on the West. For instance, the eight-year-old says, through a translator, “I was told that in the west there were all the murderers. But that’s not the case.” Visually the report also adopts his point of view: from behind the boy the camera pans the landscape beyond the Mikowskis’ apartment, as if taking on his perspective; emphasizing this, the reporter says, “the western view from a living room window had been the limit of the children’s experience with the other side” (14 November). By adopting children’s spoken and visual points of view, the reports convey the wonder and sublime deliverance of capitalism. Likewise, they offer material expressions of the entertaining, youthful, and fun-loving capitalist culture not available under the “drab,” work-oriented world of

communism. In this way, the programming constructs reality under communism as well as the good life under capitalism.

Other coverage extends this childishness to naiveté, if not outright stupidity: East Germans are described as “docile as sheep” (11 November); they line up in traffic jams to go back to East Germany, “returning,” says Brokaw, “to the same conditions that prompted them to demand change in the first place,” although the East German government is “long on promises, short on details” (12 November). Martin Fletcher, speaking over a scene of a Trabant squealing to a stop, declares in a contemptuous tone that East German cars are not the “status symbols” here as they are in the East (10 November) – as if the driver had no idea. The reporters’ haughty tone suggests their – and their Western audiences – wisdom; Western viewers are in on the joke. But the East Germans, from “docile” minions to “party officials,” have a lot to learn, a position that also emphasizes communists’ mistrustfulness.

At first blush, childishness and naiveté seem to contradict the characterization of communists as a contagious threat that may overrun the West. In fact, these themes function within the logic of capitalism and a hegemonic perspective on the free market as the supreme economic system: only naïve, uncivilized, unsophisticated people would be foolish enough to believe one could flourish under communism, or that communist leaders are capable of real reform. This naiveté is critical to explaining, however obliquely, why East Germans did not abandon their homes en masse, and why they consistently chose to return home to the east, despite their “liberation.” Finally, this naiveté also serves to defang the East Germans, who are committed to “freedom” – as made evident by footage of the popular uprisings that helped lead to the Wall’s opening – but are still communists and thus dangerous. In other words, although

they are powerful to some degree, the communists are still fundamentally clueless, requiring shepherding (as ‘sheep’) through the world.

Freedom as freedom to buy

Finally, the peeking-behind-the-curtain and the implications of the Wall’s opening segments use visual and spoken metaphors to define freedom as access to consumer goods and freedom to shop (10, 11, 13, 15, 17 November), which some journalists remarked on at the time. Frantic crowds are shown shopping on 10 and 11 November, in a kind of “frenzy,” says reporter Martin Fletcher. East Berliners, “flirting with their new freedom,” make their “first stop” at the bank to collect the 100 marks West Germans give to East Germans each year. A family from Dresden is shown looking at a window display, while the reporter, Mike Boettcher, explains that they “marveled over what can be purchased in West Berlin” (13 November). Even anonymous groups are reduced to consumers: Brokaw describes “East Germans returning from the well-stocked stores of West Berlin,” as the camera pans a crowd (13 November), while East German demonstrators calling for more openness are reduced to their position at the bottom of the capitalist pyramid: “a town that marched by the hundreds of thousands for freedom when there was none will not be satisfied to be the poor cousins of the West Germans” (13 November). In this way, shots of crowds at banks or department stores are made visually and rhetorically equivalent to the crowds at the Wall or protesters in the streets. The freedoms for which they campaigned – travel, elections, the press – recede, while capitalism’s “freedom of choice” comes to the fore. Visually, these are well-worn metaphors that American audiences are familiar with and can understand; television news regularly covers holiday shopping, for instance, highlighting shopping the day after Thanksgiving – an American tradition – with crowded shops and people lining up earlier every year.

This operative definition of freedom reaches its apex on 15 November, in a segment that compares two families in East and West Berlin where both fathers work as mechanics. The segment is set up as a competition between “have” (capitalist West German) and “have not” (communist East German), itself a capitalist perspective on the world. In each arena, the communist comes up short: it takes him seven times as much pay to buy a refrigerator; his East German supermarket lacks “decent cuts of meat” and fresh produce; he doesn’t own many electronics. The East German must even travel to West Berlin to purchase lipstick and eye shadow for his wife, suggesting that under communism, one cannot perform gender roles properly. By contrast, the West German family’s supermarket is stocked “full of high quality products,” including fresh fruit and meat; they own a VCR, color television, stereo and a microwave. Taken together, the accumulation of these deficits implies that the East German lives under primitive, deprived circumstances. Even the East’s advantages, cheap “staples” like milk and bread, are framed as disadvantages; the reporter explains, “those subsidies are good for the worker but not for the economy.” And while the difference in consumer goods available in the East and West was dramatic, the segment does not mention the additional services and macroeconomic programs that East Germans received as part of the communist system, like the fact that all people worked, a social reality that provided women more equality and independence than in the West (Nickel, 1991).

On the most basic level, the segment celebrates consumerism and equates the variety of goods with freedom, a trope especially pronounced in commemorative rhetorics surrounding contemporary American sites of memory, such as the memorial to the 1993 Oklahoma City bombing (Sturken, 2007). The idea of freedom as freedom-to-buy also illustrates the socially constructed nature of television news, and makes plain the ideological elements of programming

produced within a capitalist system. The segment also recalls Nixon's 1959 "kitchen debate" with Nikita Khrushchev, in which Nixon praises color television and cites it as an example in which "we're ahead of you [Russia]." That is, wrangling about consumer goods has long stood in for rhetoric regarding a more serious competition: nuclear might. In that light, even such frippery as the cost of a refrigerator takes on greater significance. Finally, this construction of freedom reverberates with the economic reality of television news: the programs command significant advertising revenue and deliver audiences to advertisers. To that end, it is worth noting that many of the commercials embedded in this program are selling food, and thus provide further evidence of Western (U.S.) plenty: Here in the free world, the ads tell us, we can buy Cracklin' Oat Bran; Louis Kemp's "Crab Delights;" Hellman's' cholesterol-free mayonnaise.

Overview of 1989 coverage

As shown, NBC Nightly News's 1989 coverage revolves around three key themes: breaking news of the Wall's opening; the implications of its coming down; and a peek behind the curtain at the landscapes and daily lives of the East Germans. The network conveyed these themes alongside ideologies that hold capitalism as the supreme system, that sustain suspicion of Germany, and that subtly denigrate communism and communists. Further, by framing freedom as the freedom to buy, the network upheld capitalist logic, maintained and constructed U.S. "reality," and promoted a colonialist outlook on the east. As described in the next section, these ideologies persist through the anniversary coverage.

As for public memory, the continued hangover effect of World War II on the programming is notable. Zelizer has written that the historical frame of World War II persists in

journalists' coverage of more recent traumas such as 9/11, but this analysis suggests that the influence might apply more broadly, even to coverage of joyous global events.

A brief narrative of anniversary coverage

In this next segment I describe and analyze the anniversary coverage about the Berlin Wall's opening that has appeared from 1990 through 2009. As with the original footage, I assess the patterns and ideologies conveyed. I also argue that the anniversary coverage coheres into two distinct typologies. The first, which I term "anniversary as process," describes coverage that appeared prior to 1999. This coverage is negative; recirculates images from the past that are not iconic and otherwise little seen; and highlights negative aspects of German society. I call this "anniversary as process" because the narrative of the Berlin Wall's opening, according to this coverage, is a difficult process still underway. The second typology, "anniversary as spectacle," appears from the tenth anniversary on. This coverage eschews the Berlin Wall's opening as an ongoing story and focuses instead on reprising the original footage. I use the term "spectacle" because of the emphasis on a positive narrative and the recirculation of previously mediated images, both fundamental elements to the spectacular as described by Guy Debord in "Society of the Spectacle."

To some extent, the original 1989 coverage functioned according to this logic, because for so many viewers, the images of the Wall's opening served as the experience of being in Berlin. But the recirculation of iconic images that appear beginning in 1999 suggests that the function of the prerecorded image has taken on a different role. Further, as Debord writes, "the spectacle manifests itself as an enormous positivity, out of reach and beyond dispute." Indeed, as

described below, the anniversary coverage that appears from 1999 on is so positive as to be bombastic.

1992 to 1998: Anniversary as process

NBC did not air any formal anniversary coverage until 1992. The few references to the Berlin Wall during this time read as breaking news, such as a 20-second report from 14 November 1990 that described the eviction of squatters -- called “political militants” – who had been living in vacant houses “since the Berlin Wall was opened.” But the network did not let the one-year anniversaries of anti-communist uprisings go unremarked, profiling the transformations in Poland (November 16) and Czechoslovakia (17 November). Specifically, the network reprised its coverage of Czechoslovakia’s 1989 uprising, showing university students “now” juxtaposed with images from 1989. The coverage highlights the police’s attack of the unarmed demonstrators and explains that distrust of police is still pervasive. Interestingly, during the time under review, neither the Polish nor the Czechoslovakian anniversary is recognized again. The network’s switch to marking the Berlin Wall anniversary might be explained by Germany’s continued importance to the U.S. as a military and economic partner. By contrast, with the Cold War over, and with it the U.S.’s public-relations fight against communism, the importance of Poland and Czechoslovakia as victim-states plummeted.

NBC Nightly News aired the first commemorative coverage about the Berlin Wall’s opening in 1992. During that month the network devoted more time to post-unification Germany than during any other period examined here. The bulk of the anniversary programming in 1992 casts the Wall’s opening, and German unification, in a negative light. It does so by highlighting especially ugly episodes from Germany’s past; refraining from recirculating the “euphoric”

images from Berlin in 1989; and even including a special commentary, broadcast the day before Thanksgiving, in which former NBC Nightly News anchor John Chancellor states plainly that the end of the Cold War has caused substantial chaos, harm, and economic and social upheaval.

The 1992 Berlin Wall anniversary coverage begins 9 November 1992 with a commemorative report that details both the Wall's opening and Kristallnacht, the two-day-long pogrom beginning 9 November 1938, during which people burned and looted 267 synagogues and more than 7,500 Jewish-owned businesses in Germany, Germany-annexed-Austria, and parts of Czechoslovakia, per instruction from Germany's head of secret police (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2013). In his introductory remarks, Brokaw makes clear that the program revolves around both anniversaries: "November 9th was a day of defining moments in German history 54 years ago: It was called Kristallnacht, the night of broken glass, the start of the Nazi attacks against Jews. Three years ago the spectacular fall of the Berlin Wall." During the time under review, no other NBC coverage commemorates Kristallnacht – neither alone nor along with the Wall.

Ostensibly, this segment is situated as a measure of how Germany has gotten on since 1989. For instance, reporter Dennis Murphy stands in front of the Brandenburg Gate, the iconic backdrop to the Berlin Wall's opening, and says: "On this anniversary, a worrying public opinion poll." In that way, he situates the report as an anniversary piece about both the Berlin Wall and Kristallnacht. But the report's visual icons indicate that it is primarily a Holocaust story: the introductory graphic above Brokaw's shoulder shows a yellow Jewish star and a swastika, with a drawing of smoke or flames upon the star; the segment title, Nazi Echoes, is illustrated with a swastika. Other scenes suggest the same: the report opens and closes with a memorial service to Kristallnacht and highlights the rise of neo-Nazism in Germany as well as large-scale

demonstrations against it. Sources interviewed are representatives of Jewish and Holocaust organizations; the archival footage, shot on Kristallnacht, shows looters running into a shop, and a synagogue in flames. As these images air, reporter Dennis Murphy explains, “Kristallnacht...it was the beginning of the Holocaust.” The Berlin Wall, and German unification, receive no further attention. But communism and Nazism have effectively been collapsed, in a way similar to the way they were muddled in 1989.

To be sure, the negative coverage does reflect the situation on the ground. Neo-Nazism and attacks on “foreigners” and “Jews” rose after unification; according to Human Rights Watch (1995), attacks on foreigners rose 800 percent from 1990 to 1992, though anti-Semitic attacks remained relatively low, with 65 reported in 1992. (The number of attacks was likely far higher than those reported.) Still, in the course of the 20 years examined here, this odd coverage stands out. Why cover Kristallnacht and the Wall only one time? The most cynical answer is that the rise of anti-Semitism, given German history, may command viewers. The Holocaust provides a useful background against which to connect the current trend, without demanding further investigation into why anti-Semitism and xenophobia have increased. Alternatively, the segment may just as easily be the result of a producer with a special interest in Kristallnacht. Or, if understood as the network’s attempt to probe Germany’s ongoing identity struggle – a fundamentally ideological, non-narrative problem, which conflicts with television news’s tendency to offer neat, visually compelling stories – perhaps there was no other way for it to do so. But anti-Semitism, which as shown here essentially asks Who is a German, is a widely understood trope that could contain and convey that struggle.

More relevant anniversary coverage appeared five days later, on 14 November: the trial of the GDR’s Erich Honecker, characterized by NBC as “the father of the Berlin Wall,” charged

with manslaughter for ordering border guards to shoot to kill anyone caught trying to escape the East. The coverage's visual and spoken frames necessitate memory: the report's title is "crimes of the past;" anchorman Garrick Utley introduces the segment with, "It isn't just the problem of the present people are wrestling with; there is also the recent past" (14 November). He then provides a brief overview of the Berlin Wall and those who died trying to cross it. The report visits with two women whose sons died attempting to cross the Wall and overviews the difficulties that have come to East Germans since unification: namely, unemployment.

Several elements of this footage stand out as evidence of anniversary as process. For one, by focusing on Honecker's trial, the report covers Germany's official attempts at redressive ritual to heal the "social breach" (Edy, 2006:60-61) of East Germans murdering their countrymen, and of the negative fallouts of unification. To that end, the segment is set in a courtroom, with Honecker in the defendant's seat, a scene that recurs throughout the report and that also closes the segment. Spoken discourses also identify the segment as a redressive ritual: "Germans need some trial, some justice, to help work through all their hurt," says the reporter, Jim Maceda. The concept of a national wound, of ongoing trauma still in need of repair, comes in the form of two women whose sons died trying to cross to West Berlin. One of the women, says Maceda, "lives to see Honecker and the others punished." Her rage and the other raw emotion here – in the form of angry protesters, frustrated, we are told, by high rates of unemployment – make clear that the ramifications of the Berlin Wall's opening are still ongoing, that the breach is still open.

Finally, on 25 November NBC ran a negative overview of the state of the world post-Cold War that also suggests the anniversary is unresolved. "Remember how hopeful we were a few years ago, when we hoped the Cold War might come to an end?" asks former NBC anchor John Chancellor, sitting beside Tom Brokaw at the anchor's desk in the New York headquarters.

He proceeds to list the ways that the past few years' economic outcomes have been disappointing: "No peace dividend so far;" the U.S., Japan, and Europe are in the midst of "a painful recession." Further, he asserts, "Western Europe is a complete mess," given that a pan-Europe "with a single stable currency is off the tracks." Chancellor then counts other negative outcomes, including the rise of neo-Nazism, anti-Semitism, and "right-wing racism" throughout Europe. He wonders if the paralysis and fear of nuclear annihilation kept "everyone better behaved" than the present world order. He concludes with his disappointment: "The world we got when the Cold War ended is not the world we expected to get when the Cold War ended." But his disappointed tone and dashed expectations seem an answer to the images of demonstrators as would-be shoppers so frequently seen in the 1989 coverage.

Remarkably, none of the 1992 coverage reprises images from Berlin in 1989. Instead, the archival footage shows East German border guards behind barbed wire carrying a lifeless body (14 November) and Kristallnacht (9 November). The absence of 1989 coverage may be explained by the programming's overall negative tone, its conclusion that reunification has been psychologically and economically painful. Juxtaposed with these concepts and the images used to illustrate them, the "euphoric" images of Berliners celebrating the Wall's opening would be discordant with the "reality" that this reporting constructs: Germany is troubled; the Wall's opening is a troubling story.

The 1992 coverage also makes plain a key theme of the anniversary story, which is to tell the narrative of the Berlin Wall through individuals – the same approach often employed by historical films (Rosenstone, 1996). For instance, the women in the 14 November segment stand in for the whole of East Germany that has been wounded by the East German government. In losing their sons, they suggest that the country is somehow upside down, operating against the

natural order, with children dying before their parents. Further, by telling the story of East German rectification through women, the segment connects to war coverage across the board, which so often advances women mourners remembering fallen men. Lastly, this approach also embodies a uniquely American perspective on the world: the cult of the individual.

As seen, the 1992 coverage maintains a key theme from 1989: Germany as a latent threat. Here, the sleeping giant of Germany's aggression comes in the form of anti-Semitism, a well-known trope with a long German history, which the news plays on to manufacture. But the coverage also subtly suggests a connection between Nazism and communism, by staging Dennis Murphy in front of the Brandenburg Gate. This collapsing of multiple histories will emerge repeatedly in later years.

1994

By 1994, the anniversary story had changed, though it still told a story of disappointment. The 9 November report highlights the high unemployment rate among East Germans and their inability to participate in the consumer economy. The segment also suggests that unification has failed psychically: One interviewee, an East German who campaigned for "democracy" but has since been laid off, tells the reporter, "Emotionally, there is mistrust. There's still a wall between us and them." In that sense, unification is a failed – or at least an incomplete – project. Other evidence of disappointment comes from a present-day interior scene of a Leipzig church, which closes the report. We see older people sitting quietly in the darkened pews. The reporter's voiceover asserts that Leipzig's churches "are no longer filled with joyful, idealistic youth, but with those whom change has left behind." The program then zooms in on an old, glowering woman (gnawing her inner lip? Adjusting her dentures?) who looks skeptically at the camera. As

an image she stands in for the former East Germany's spiritual, economic, and psychic exhaustion. In these ways, as with the 1992 coverage, visual and spoken rhetorics suggest that the story of the Wall's opening is still ongoing and unresolved.

This report, based in Leipzig, is the only instance in the time under review set in a city other than Berlin. Yet, according to this version of the anniversary story, Leipzig is “where it all began.” It is also the first of the commemorative coverage to feature archival images from 1989: Leipzig-based New Forum meetings and demonstrations calling for greater openness, but no images of a euphoric Berlin. Instead, the archival images show protest marches and church meetings in Leipzig. Other scenes suggest that the democratization process was messy, with protesters shoved by police clad in riot gear. In these ways, the archival coverage focuses on the *process* of what led up to the Wall's opening. Much as the 1992 coverage, this material reads like a reexamination of unresolved trauma.

Unlike the coverage from 1992, the 1994 report makes no mention of anti-Semitic, anti-foreigner, or other racist attacks. Nor does it mention the rise of neo-Nazi parties. Given the continued prevalence of these attacks (see Table 1), as well as the attention paid to them only two years prior, the program's silence on these topics stands out. Its silence is even more significant given that from 1992 to 1994 the number of reported anti-Semitic incidents rose 20-fold, to 1,065, including a firebomb on a synagogue thrown on Passover – the first time since Kristallnacht that the synagogue had hosted a Seder. Nevertheless, NBC does not mention this or any other anti-Semitic events in November 1994 (nor did it cover the synagogue arson when it occurred). The disconnect between anti-Semitism on the ground and anti-Semitism on the air is notable and deserving of future study.

Table 1. Instances of racist violence in Germany, 1991 – 1994

| Year | Number of reported anti-Semitic attacks |
|-------------|--|
| 1991 | 40 |
| 1992 | 65 |
| 1993 | 656 |
| 1994 | 1,040 |

Source: Human Rights Watch, 1995

Unlike the coverage from 1992 and 1989, the five-year anniversary does not demonize East Germans or communists. But it does define freedom, and success, as the freedom to buy things. Below, the reporter talks with former East German Michael Gretch:

Maceda: Michael Gretch was a 25-year-old leader of the new forum movement. Calling for free elections. Unification then was just a dream. Today he's a journalist in a democratic Germany but admits it's harsher than anyone expected.

Gretch: Now they are looking to their flats, to their cars, to their possibilities, to their jobs. And it makes the people angry.

Maceda: Angry because only the rich can afford the goods from the west. These German watches cost over a month's average wage.

Maceda sounds sympathetic. But the source of disappointment is purely economic: people are angry because they cannot afford Western products. Again, as with 1989, the objective of the Wall's opening and unification – however frustrated – was to buy things. This way of communicating “freedom” sustains a key theme of American identity, one that later presidents

will draw on (President Bush's suggestion that we shop, we "get *down* to Disney World," after 9/11; see Bacevich, 2008).

As in 1992, the network focuses on the stories of individuals to make history felt. In this case, they comprise Gretch, the journalist, and an unemployed tool-maker who once demonstrated for "democracy" and who has since lost his job. Both are portrayed as dissatisfied. Because they are positioned as former demonstrators, they seem sufficiently authentic to speak for the rest of East Germany. Further, they embody two distinct social classes, intellectuals and blue-collar workers, which extends their seeming claim to stand in for Germany at large.

This focus on "individual lives" (as Brokaw will put it in 1999) distracts from and stands in for the macroeconomic shifts initiated by unification, specifically privatization, job losses, and massive economic restructuring. Focusing on these individual outcomes enables the network to avoid covering systemic responses to these shifts, namely welfare programs meant to stimulate new jobs or provide subsidized, temporary work (Goedicke, 2006:97). The individual stories obscure the fact that post-unification employment outcomes were due more to the sector or industry a person worked in prior to 1989, rather than individual qualities or luck (Trappe, 2006:122). And it offers a specifically American way of looking at history – the history of individual people – that also supports the internal logic of capitalism, that Horatio Alger, pull-yourself-up-by-your-own-bootstraps way of living. Lastly, even this focus on the individual draws on consumerism; so many advertising campaigns operate by emphasizing the product's fit for YOU (i.e. Fiske, 1989:7).

1997-1998

In 1997 and 1998, the network did not offer any formal anniversary coverage. But in both years it covered the attempts of previous Olympics Games in which East German athletes used illegal drugs to enhance performance. Both stories feature American athletes seeking redress, claiming that they rightfully should have won. And both stories emphasize the cruelty of the former East German government, which in the 1997 coverage allegedly dosed women swimmers without their knowledge or consent. Neither story offers resolution. No medals are stripped, no doctors or trainers are put on trial or in prison. Although both read as coverage of redressive rituals, official attempts to set things right post-unification, the real winners have not been formally recognized, and the cheaters have escaped prosecution. Like the anniversary coverage that comes before it, this material reads as a take on a past that is still in process.

New American Ideologies

As discussed, the anniversary coverage tells the evolving story of the Berlin Wall's opening through a uniquely American lens, one that constructs and maintains a particularly a hegemonic U.S. identity: namely by emphasizing the importance of individuals and suggesting that freedom is the freedom to buy. But there is yet another way that the anniversary coverage conveys its American ideology: by telling a story that is disproportionately male, and that focuses on men's unemployment. Although television news in general is male dominated, among reporters, sources, "experts" and others, the paltry number of women featured here deserves special mention because of the importance of gender equality to the GDR, a tenet that was part of the country's constitution (Fisher, 403). By law both fathers and mothers were expected to work outside the home; the GDR even mandated equal pay between men and women. Rendering this

lost equality invisible is yet another way that the television news communicated an American paradigm.

Through the '90s, some coverage does not give women any voice at all. Women do not have speaking parts in either the 1994 or the 9 November 1992 footage. When women are permitted to speak, they do so from the role of mothers (1992) or, as with the 1997 coverage of the former East German swimmers, would-be mothers whose chances at maternity have been thwarted by the GDR (i.e., one source had seven miscarriages, another suffered an “acute infection” of her ovary). Emphasizing women as mothers resonates with Western notions of femininity (as well as the Nazis’ cult of motherhood) and contrasts sharply with reality on the ground for Eastern women, who – like the men – had children and nurtured jobs at the same time.

Also notably, through both visual and spoken rhetoric, the network suggests crisis of unemployed men. For instance, a group of five men is pictured when the reporter comments that “one in five here is jobless;” the story’s unemployed source, a former tool-maker, is male. Elsewhere men are shown peering into a window display of watches, which the reporter’s voiceover suggests they cannot afford (1994). Taken together, the implication is that the real threat from unification is to men’s social position as breadwinners.

This theme stands out in particular because East German women faced the most extreme job losses after 1989. Along with “low-skilled” workers, women “were without doubt losers in the East German labor market” (Goedicke, 2006:111). Though men in the former East Germany faced unemployment rates of about 10 percent in 1992, women’s unemployment rates were almost double that, and exceeded the men’s until about 2002, when both genders met at about 20 percent (Goedicke, 2006:55). Though women were overrepresented, in the early years after the

Wall's fall, in economic sectors that were immediately liquidated – “textiles, clothing, [and] food processing” – their inability to find new jobs was due in part to existing Western firms, which preferred hiring men (Goedicke, 2006:113). But none of this drama was shown by the U.S. television news.

To put the women's unemployment in perspective, it is also important to make clear that in 1989 in the GDR, more than 90 percent of working-age women either held a paid job or were studying or training for a career (Nickel, 1991:99). Although it was no “dolce vita,” as Nickel (1991) puts it, widespread employment allowed East German women some “financial independence, legal autonomy, and a chance to make their own demands on life” (99). By contrast, despite the large numbers of women in the U.S. who entered the workforce in the 1970s and 1980s, in 1989 only 70.9 percent of all women aged 20 to 60 held a job (Juhn & Potter, 2006:33). Even today in the U.S., when women's work still causes headlines (“can women have it all?” “Why women still can't have it all,” and so on), the notion that such a large percentage of women worked outside the home *because of government mandates* is unthinkable. It makes sense, then, that images of women unemployed would be subject to iconoclasm: policed and omitted.

1999 to the present: Anniversary as spectacle

This section begins by offering a new concept: anniversary as spectacle. I then describe the footage and explain how it fits with this idea, and make note of the previously established themes that the coverage expresses. I close with explanations of why this shift may have occurred.

The network devoted two days to anniversary coverage in 1999, 7 and 9 November. That year, from interviewees to the anchors' spoken points, it positioned the anniversary as an

exclusively economic story, much in line with the previously established theme of freedom as freedom to shop. To begin, on 7 November anchor John Seigenthaler introduces the segment, saying: “The fall of the Berlin Wall 10 years ago was supposed to usher in an age of prosperity in the new, reunited Germany.” This sweeping declaration – “the age of prosperity” –reduces the opening to a purely economically-motivated shift and sets the tone for the 1999 coverage.

The coverage then focuses on former East Germans’ financial successes and failures. These include a food wholesaler who brings in \$300,000 per month; a family – the Mikowskis, featured originally in 1989 – who built a scaffolding business; and a woman who runs her own hardware store, flower shop, and serves as mayor of her town. These accomplishments are framed as successes within the free market, given that the people started their own businesses -- “unthinkable under communism,” as Brokaw says (9 November). Even the eldest Mikowski son is described as working “the office job he always dreamed of,” as if such an accomplishment would not have been possible prior to the Wall’s opening – despite the fact that in the former GDR all adults worked, and bureaucracy flourished.

To emphasize how much better life is without the Wall, this coverage also compares archival footage showing the Mikowskis and compares them “now.” In the 1989 footage, the family lived just beside the Berlin Wall, and the sons are shown kicking a soccer ball against it. The camera pans outside their apartment window, showing the Berlin Wall and the death strip in front of it. The light is gray and depressing. “This was their view of the world,” says Brokaw. The picture then switches to a lush, grassy, sunny, open field, with trees and, beyond it, a row of buildings and traffic flowing on a street. “And this is the view today,” Brokaw says. The improvement is evident, the implication that the Wall’s opening provided fresh air to apartment-dwellers and entrepreneurs alike.

The report also includes two unsuccessful entrepreneurs: a family that runs a failing restaurant and a father-and-son duo that operates a machine shop. Their inclusion may be explained as an attempt at “objectivity,” that American journalistic norm. But both failed businesses are portrayed unsympathetically. The machinists are suggested to be neo-Nazis; they “vote for extremist parties” because they believe workers have gotten “a raw deal.” The segment then cuts to film footage of neo-Nazis marching and drumming, suggesting with this juxtaposition that the machinists are akin to neo-Nazis, and that communists may be as well (given the lexical choice of ‘worker’).

For their part, the restaurateurs are portrayed as naïve, irresponsible, childish: “like most East Germans under communism,” Brokaw intones, “they didn’t understand the fundamentals of business.” The woman’s complaints – “Today it’s all about money, work, stress. Everybody is envious of each other. It is awful” – seem hollow and out of touch, particularly compared with the next frame, which returns to the young, successful Mikowski, whom, we are told “misses none of it: not the Wall, not the system, and he hopes it never happens again.” Finally, the rhetoric describing these unsuccessful entrepreneurs speaks to the power of capitalism: Brokaw describes the restaurateurs closing their restaurant as “a surrender, for now, to capitalism.” The machinist and his son, he says, have been “squeezed” “by capitalism’s high rents and tough competition.” Should the unsuccessful entrepreneurs raise any doubt about capitalism’s prowess, this ideological rhetoric demonstrates its almost physical power.

Through these individuals, the 1999 materials maintain the emphasis on men’s unemployment. For instance, the 7 November coverage only features men as examples of successful and failed entrepreneurs. And though the 9 November coverage includes two women entrepreneurs, one successful and one whose restaurant has failed, men still outnumber women

in speaking parts and time devoted to their points of view. Finally, as in previous years, the programming's visual rhetoric suggests that the unemployment crisis is a man's problem: as reporter Jim Maceda describes the situation ("In the east, 20% unemployment, despite \$1.5 trillion pumped into the infrastructure"), the program shows men working in a factory. The implication is that the men's jobs are in danger.

Importantly, the 1999 coverage is also the first anniversary to recirculate the euphoric images from 1989 showing people in Berlin climbing over the Wall and chiseling away at it by hand. These images appear first on a screen behind Brokaw, playing in slow motion as he introduces the report. The coverage then cuts to "contemporary" coverage of the celebration, then returns to Brokaw's 1989 reportage. Notably, none of the archival pictures show machines taking apart the Wall, or firefighters or soldiers doing their part. Instead, the emphasis suggests that individuals took the Wall down by hand, literally and metaphorically, without state or official support. The seeming importance of the single person coheres with hegemonic American norms of the cult of the individual, by now an established anniversary trope. The role of the individual also suggests the authenticity of the event itself, and of NBC for succeeding in showing it.

Anniversary-as-spectacle

Beginning in 1999, the coverage shifts from process to spectacle. This new typology is evident in a number of visual and spoken rhetorics. For one, many screens are used to tell the anniversary story, embodying Debord's notion of mediation taking the place of genuine or real referents. For instance, on both nights, as the anchors introduce the anniversary, enormous screens behind them play the archival footage. Then, at the close of the program, there are dozens of small screens behind them. Likewise, the teaser on 9 November that appears during the commercials leading

up to the second half of Nightly News features the Berlin Wall footage. As seen below, the image shows a television-shaped screen showing Brokaw in 1989 embedded within the larger screen advertising the program. This visual device emphasizes 1989 as a mediated event; the authentic article at its heart is a television screen.

Anniversary-as-spectacle is also evident from the positivity of the reporters' rhetoric.

Brokaw's introductory remarks from 9 November:

One of the momentous events of the 20th century, a stunning and unexpected development that symbolized the beginning of a new world. The Berlin Wall: the cold, gray, concrete slab that imprisoned millions, the Berlin Wall came down.

The unfettered positivity – “stunning,” “beginning of a new world” – is further emphasized in contrast with the description of the wall (“cold, gray, concrete...imprisoned millions”). Brokaw's bombast continues with his description of the anniversary events in Berlin, which he calls “a gala celebration,” supplemented with clips of fireworks. The 7 November report contains similar bombast, though less of it. Reporter Jim Maceda introduces the segment saying, “The new Berlin: a multibillion dollar facelift turning the dark capital of the Nazi era into a city of renewed symbols.”¹ Later Brokaw describes Stephen Michowski, the office worker, as having “the office job he always dreamed of,” a declaration that so over-the-top it sounds positively ironic.

Interviewees also echo this unfettered positivity: one former East German, who fled to Hungary before the opening but has since returned, “remembers the joy,” says Maceda; “All of my expectations back then have been fulfilled; life has improved so much now” (7 November).

Another source has enjoyed almost outsize success: she opened a flower shop, was elected mayor, expanded a hardware store.

¹ To be fair, he tempers his enthusiasm by contending that neo-Nazism and communist parties are “on the rise,” and describes the high unemployment rates.

² This form of visual implied violence has frequently been deployed in the U.S. in recent years,

Finally, beginning in 1999, the coverage is positioned as meaningful to the history of NBC News, which almost outweighs what it meant to the world. This theme makes plain anniversary-as-spectacle, given that its meaning within the economy of mediation is positioned as more important than the events of 1989. To that end, archival footage is tagged with “Brokaw reporting” along with the NBC peacock; other footage retains the peacock throughout. Tagged with these icons, even the once-authentic past becomes remediated and reorganized to belong to NBC’s economy and history. Likewise, although there is no formal coverage in 2004, to celebrate Tom Brokaw’s retirement the network aired a special program called “Brokaw remembers,” which includes footage of Brokaw from 9 November 1989 and images of people, crowds, standing by the Wall, chipping away at it, walking through it. Brokaw’s words from 1989 play over these images. This clip ends NBC Nightly News for that night, making clear that the images belong more to the history of news-making, and one anchor’s legacy, than the history of the world. Importantly, this construction of reality differs dramatically from other highly-mediated world changing events, like 9/11, or the assassination of JFK, which emphasize both the role of the media and the event’s impact on society more broadly.

2009

NBC committed two days to its 20th-anniversary coverage. The first day is devoted mostly to reprising the events of 1989 through archival footage. An explanation of the events comes from Brokaw’s 1989 commentary and his commentary recorded in 2009. To aid this synopsis, the program includes a German tour guide explaining the significance of the Berlin Wall, in English, to tourists who stand in for viewers. About halfway through the five-minute segment, the program switches to focus on Berlin’s commemorations of the 20th anniversary. To that end, the report shows decorated Styrofoam blocks meant to stand in for the Wall – a commemorative

project called the Mauereise, commissioned by Berlin's Goethe Institute. (The next day the blocks, lined up along the former path of the Wall, topple.)

As in previous coverage, the 2009 programming uses interviews with individuals to assess how the former East Germany is getting on. To that end Brokaw interviews a woman who grew up in the GDR, who speaks in broad strokes about the challenges of "freedom." Though thematically in line with previous anniversary coverage, this interview (8 November) does not probe any specific issue:

Brokaw: Although [Katya] Tanhardt was only 11 when the real wall came down, the change still has been tough.

Tanhardt: From one day to the other, you get the freedom, and no one teaches you how to take this freedom and how it is to take decisions and to be responsible for your own life. Suddenly it changes.

Brokaw: Is that still an adjustment for you?

Tanhardt: Yes. Yes, it is. Every day.

"Freedom" here is not overtly defined, though Tanhardt's comments suggest that it means self-determination. Another, similarly broad interview appears in the 9 November coverage, this time with a schoolteacher who suggests that the division between east and west, which persists among her students, reflects class – the West is "posh" and the East is not.

Unlike previous coverage, the 20th-anniversary reportage also includes interviews with elites to assess the extent of German changes. Their inclusion makes plain the significance of the anniversary. For instance, Brokaw closes the 8 November segment with a brief interview with Gorbachev. Though politically loaded, the exchange is as vague as the conversation with Katya Tanhardt:

Brokaw: Twenty years after the fall of the wall of Berlin, we're sitting here in an elegant hotel in what was East Germany. This part of Central Europe has changed enormously, your country has changed. There are still many difficulties, but what encourages you

most?

Gorbachev: (Through translator) There are people who believe that, during transitions, democracy can be a hindrance, that freedom can be a hindrance, that what we need is an iron hand, a firm hand. I don't think so. What encourages me, what inspires me is that people are beginning to understand.

The program does not explain what “people are beginning to understand” or whom these people are – former communist leaders? Subjects?

Brokaw closes the 9 November coverage with a similarly brief exchange with Hillary Clinton, then Secretary of State:

Brokaw: Today Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said the Germans are doing as well as can be expected given their history.

Clinton: This has been a very difficult political decision for them, given their understandable allergy to being looked as though they were once again a military power.

The ideological messages behind these interviews and the other materials in the programming connect to key themes established by the 1989 coverage. For one, East Germans are portrayed as children: Tanhardt, sounding like a child, says, “No one teaches you how to take this freedom and how it is to take decisions and to be responsible for your own life.” Second, the division between West and East is framed primarily as a contest of consumer goods: the “posh” division between east and west, and Brokaw’s declaration that “Now in East Berlin you can buy everything from a Ferrari to an Armani suit. Twenty years ago in this part of Berlin, you had to stand in line to buy a loaf of bread. Now you stand in line to get a Starbuck's cappuccino.”

Finally, the old suspicion of Germany as a threat emerges: Clinton’s comment regarding the German “allergy” to seeming too much like a global military power; Brokaw’s paraphrase of her comments, that “Germans are doing as well as can be expected given their history.” Brokaw closes his 9 November coverage by reflecting on this legacy: “After all the trauma of the 20th century, most of it self-inflicted, tonight's celebration could be the next major step for Germany

to renew itself as a whole country and as a leading member of the community of nations.” To be sure, these comments do not suggest that Germany is a present threat. But they do collapse communism with Nazism and a vague, threatening, undefined, military excess, effectively demonizing Germany for its past.

Anniversary as spectacle

By 2009, the shift to anniversary-as-spectacle is especially clear. For one, the network’s coverage is positively grandiloquent. Where the Wall’s opening was “one of the momentous events of the 20th century” in 1999, by 2009 it was “the dawn of a new era,” “the biggest part in the free world” (November 8). During his report, Brokaw describes the 2009 commemorative events in Berlin as a “gala celebration,” “an extravaganza,” featuring “all-star lineup of Cold War veterans” including Gorbachev, Poland’s Lech Walesa, and Hillary Clinton. Berlin itself is “a dazzling city on the East and west sides.” Visually, the program also shows bombast: present-day scenes of fireworks over the Brandenburg Gate and young people dancing in joy. Dignitaries including Clinton are shown in festive clothing – tuxes and oversize pearls – further conveying the party-like atmosphere.

The spectacle is also evidenced by the ways that reporters situate the 1989 events as meaningful to the news itself. Brian Williams, in his introduction to the segment:

I made it over there to see the Berlin Wall come down before our very eyes. I was reporting as they say at that time for another network. And we were all jealous of Tom Brokaw of NBC Nightly news for getting there first and reporting the story back to the States first.

His declaration makes plain the event’s importance within the economy of newsmakers – Brokaw got there first! – further reducing the story from the level of a real to a mediated experience. Lester Holt makes a similar point in his 8 November introduction: “Tom Brokaw in

1989 providing the only live network coverage of the fall of the Berlin Wall.... Tonight Tom is back in Berlin with a look at how things are now.” Again, Brokaw’s and NBC News’s roles in ’89, and today, are most salient.

At the same time that the 2009 coverage embraces the spectacle, it has also shifted to a quasi-educational mode, with more extensive explanation about the Wall and East Germany than in previous years. Holt, 8 November: “The wall stood for 28 years as a symbol of the Cold War, the visible fault line between East and West.” Brokaw’s overview also is more elaborate than in years past: “This sinister symbol of oppression which divided Berlin for almost three decades came apart,” he explains. “And as it did the Cold War was all but over. East Berliners were allowed freedom to travel to the west, some of them for the first time.” Key personages are named and identified (“Mikhael Gorbachev: Then, the president of what was the Soviet Union”), an elaboration that previous coverage does not employ. The 2009 coverage even turns to an interpretive source: a tour guide shown explaining to tourists – and, by extension, viewers – the significance of the Wall and West Berlin’s position within the GDR. No previous coverage sought to situate the Wall so plainly, or to provide explanatory, quasi-historical information about the Cold War. Lastly, these details also domesticates Berlin, and Germany, as a tourist destination – a radically different description and construction of reality than the sad, tormented Berlin constructed by coverage prior to 1999.

These explanations are ideologically situated within and according to the logic of capitalism. Viewers are addressed as “tourists of history,” which Marita Sturken (2007) defines as “a mediated and reenacted experience” that emphasizes the tourist’s innocence, consumerism, and “search for authenticity” (9) – a market-oriented approach to the past. Sturken sees this approach to history, and memory, as particularly American – a path that engenders “politically

naïve responses” at sites of “collective trauma” that emphasize consumerism. And while she is writing about history consumed at physical sites in the U.S., NBC’s 2009 programming suggests that media coverage functions similarly. For instance, the segment features a tour guide who “explain[s] to tourists what life was like.” Similarly, to convey the profundity of changes since the Wall’s opening, Brokaw says: “Now in East Berlin you can buy everything from a Ferrari to an Armani suit. Twenty years ago in this part of Berlin, you had to stand in line to buy a loaf of bread. Now you stand in line to get a Starbuck's cappuccino.” Using consumer products as metaphors recalls the coverage from 1989, which suggested that freedom really meant freedom to buy. The use of consumer products as metaphor also makes plain the network’s fundamental capitalist ideology that underpins the entire program: capitalists talking to other capitalists in the language of late capitalism.

The 2009 coverage also offers a reductive presentation of “Mauereise,” a Goethe Institute project that arranged for Berliners and people in Israel, the Palestinian Territories, Yemen, Korea, China, Mexico, and Cyprus to decorate Styrofoam blocks meant to symbolize the Berlin Wall (Goethe Institute, n.d.). Evaluating Mauereise’s merit is beyond the purview of this study. But the Goethe Institute intended it to stimulate conversation about “global border experiences” among nations that have recently built border walls (Goethe Institute, n.d.). NBC shows the Styrofoam wall toppling as dozens of cameras flash. Brokaw’s describes it as kitsch, in the sense that it connotes “easy emotionalism,” sentimentality, and cheapness (Sturken, 2007:19-21). In that way it is as meaningless an experience of “freedom” as buying a Starbucks cappuccino around the corner from Brandenburg Gate. Yet, the blocks are meant to contain memory, which the spectacular mediatization of their toppling communicates, enabling – by proxy – viewers to experience.

As with previous anniversary coverage, the 2009 reportage also tells the story of the Wall's opening by focusing on individuals. Like other elements of the 20th anniversary, the individual chosen to stand in for the arc of history represents outsized success. Brokaw, in his opening remarks:

Twenty years ago tonight, tens of thousands of East Germans came through the Berlin Wall, one of them a young woman with her two sisters. She was a lab technician then, and now, 20 years later, her name is Angela Merkel, and she came through another gate, the Brandenburg Gate tonight, as the chancellor of a unified Germany.

Merkel's personal journey stands in for the arc of Germany's transition and makes clear that the East German revolution has been successful. At the same time, as an example she connects to the American tradition of the individual, the U.S. fantasy of social mobility: the possibility of a stellar rise. Finally, the way that Brokaw positions her success – from East German to chancellor – also suggests that the East Germans have achieved political unity, though in fact even by 2009 the east and west regions of Germany differed politically, culturally, and economically.

The 2009 coverage also maintains the emphasis on men's unemployment. As an example, when Brokaw comments that "it is the economy that is now the common enemy of all Germans," the accompanying B-roll shows a man looking into the camera, sipping from a porcelain teacup, suggesting leisure. Likewise, a former East German male factory owner is quoted to explain the country's economic disappointment: "The economy just couldn't keep up with our expectations after the fall of the wall." But this emphasis on men may not only be due to extant sexism and media portrayals of women, or to our country's fundamental misunderstanding, and distrust, of communism. Perhaps, given the relative position of men and women in the U.S., focusing on men's unemployment was a strategy to communicate to U.S. audiences the fundamental restructuring of East German social fabric. For men, such a crisis is news-making. Because in the U.S. women do not have the same history, or perceived history, of working outside the home,

there may be no extant frames to tell this story. Emphasizing men's unemployment may have been the only way to effectively communicate to U.S. audiences changes in East German society.

A (still) divided Germany

As perhaps is to be expected, the theme of Germany as a divided country runs through all years of coverage. But what stands out is that the anniversary programs describe Germany as *still* deeply divided – even two decades after the Wall's opening. The country is “a paradox” (1992), a “country with a split personality” (2009), a “rift” running through its citizens (1999). Yet, on each anniversary, the source of this divisiveness, the “wall,” changes. These evolutions may be explained less by shifts on the ground in Germany and more by concurrent tensions in U.S. culture. In this way, even reportage about “them” becomes a site of exploration about ‘us,’ an ethnocentric approach to defining ourselves by defining the “other world.” Put another way, these segments demonstrate that looking back to the past “helps journalists interpret the present” (Zelizer, 2011:381) -- even current, seemingly unconnected affairs.

Here is Brokaw in 1992, introducing the Kristallnacht/Wall segment: “As one wall has fallen, a deeply divided Germany now is facing another: New racial tensions in that country.” Superficially, the “wall” here is racial tension. In fact, the scenes that follow suggest deep ethnic divisions that differentiate Jew from German. The visual arc of the 1992 coverage makes this point clearly: after Brokaw's introduction, the tape shows a group of people, whom we are told are Jews, at a service commemorating Kristallnacht. A reform cantor sings. The segment closes with this same scene, the reporter's voiceover saying, “The neo-Nazis have spoken. Now the majority of Germans are struggling to find their moral voice.” The cantor, from the report's

beginning, is shown singing again, his voice filling in what the reporter has left unsaid: that the Jews have already found *their* “moral voice,” and are speaking it. By implication, then, Jews and Germans are two different groups who speak with different voices.

The report further differentiates Jews from Germans by suggesting that only Jews attended the Kristallnacht commemoration: As the camera pans the memorial service, the reporter intones: “Once again tonight, Jews repeated the vow, ‘Never Forget.’” Similarly, other scenes show a German demonstration against racism, and its devolution into a scuffle with police. The segment then cuts to Jews reading the Torah, wearing tallisim (prayer shawls). This juxtaposition suggests that Jews were not at the rally, but praying in synagogue. The implications are clear: Jews commemorate; Germans demonstrate. Taken together, these scenes suggest that Jews and “Germans” are separate groups, even suggesting that to be at once Jewish and German is not possible – precisely the argument advanced by the neo-Nazis and skinheads whom the report purports to condemn.

This differentiation is also communicated through the segment’s visual discourses. Although the segment’s spoken narrative condemns neo-Nazism, Jews are depicted in ways that accord with frequently circulated anti-Semitic discourses. To begin, only men are featured, in both nonspeaking parts symbolizing Jewry (a singing cantor, men gathered at the Torah, Hassids) and as official, authoritative sources (representatives of the Holocaust Memorial Council, the Frankfurt Jewish Council, Berlin’s Jewish community). With one exception, they appear to be older, perhaps over 70; all are formally dressed in dark suits. These sartorial details and the men’s ages stand in contrast to the youthful, informally dressed, healthy, and fertile German crowds, indicated by two women pushing baby carriages and smiling at the camera. Jews, by contrast, are aging, male – therefore not a growing or fecund people – bespectacled.

They are mostly shown inside, while “German” crowds are shown outside, in open air and sun. The suggestion is of Jews as a dying culture, obsessed by death. They are capable of remembering, but otherwise shut in, and removed from wider society.

To be sure, the coverage reflects the rapid rise of neo-Nazism post-unification (Schmidt, 1993). But the program’s emphasis on attacks against Jews demands attention given that attacks on blacks or African migrants receive no mention, though these far exceeded the number of anti-Semitic attacks at the time and were among the most brutal (Human Rights Watch, 1995). On the most superficial level, the emphasis on anti-Semitism may be explained by Germany’s history; as a result, anti-Semitism there will always be “newsworthy.” On closer inspection, the absence of coverage of racist attacks, and the concurrent emphasis on anti-Semitism, may be understood as “repressive erasure” (Connerton, 2008:60). This kind of forgetting, Connerton (2008) explains, “can be encrypted covertly and without apparent violence” (60). In that way it resembles the symbolic annihilation of people of color in the media, but with a greater purpose: an “edit[ing] out” (Connerton, 2008:61) of narratives whose presentation would too greatly connect to the racial tensions that boiled over in 1992 in the U.S.: Rodney King’s beating by the LA police, and subsequent riots; racially-charged clashes between New York City’s black and white police officers; former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke’s unsuccessful bid for the Republican presidential nomination. In other words, exploring anti-Semitism is a “safe” way of exploring racism in the U.S., without looking at it too closely. Further, emphasizing anti-Semitism, and diminishing (or not mentioning) white-on-black racism should be understood within the greater legacy of the U.S.’s sensitivity toward its “international standing” over “official treatment of African Americans” during the Cold War (Rubio, 2001:183). By contrast, because anti-Semitism has never been as great of a problem in the U.S. as it has in Germany,

emphasizing Germany's enduring problem with anti-Semitism offers a way to differentiate the U.S. from Germany and, subtly, to elevate it.

Two years later, in 1994, the divisive "wall" explored by the memorial coverage is largely economic. The program describes rampant East German unemployment and layoffs, and compares them with continued West German success. As the reporter puts it, "Construction in Leipzig is booming, but these banks and companies are West German, who have closed over 400,000 inefficient businesses in the East." As with the rise of neo-Nazism, unemployment among East Germans did increase, most especially for women (Goedicke, 2006:55). But unemployment grew even worse over the following decade. By 1999, both men and women in the former East Germany faced unemployment rates of nearly 20 percent, up from 10 percent for men in 1994 (Goedicke, 2006:55). The emphasis in 1994 on unemployment, which does not appear nearly as dire in later coverage, may have been driven by the economic crisis in the United States, from which the country was only just emerging. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014), in the U.S. unemployment in 1994 was 6.1, down from 6.9 the year before.

But the turn away from racist violence is what makes this shift especially fascinating. Reading it as a shift in choice relations (Fairclough, 1995), which itself represents a cultural change, the turn away in U.S. coverage from race to the economy may be tied in with a larger shift in U.S. public culture. By the mid-'90s, the Supreme Court had overturned a number of historic decisions enabling affirmative action (Rubio, 2001). More directly, in a 1995 race-based hiring case (*Adarand v. Peña*), Justice Scalia, writing the majority decision, averred the "post-racial" attitude so widespread today: "Under the Constitution there can be no such thing as either a creditor or a debtor race. We are just one race in the eyes of government" (cited in Rubio,

2001:177). In that way, the post-racial or “race blind” zeitgeist, which became codified in parts of U.S. law in the mid-1990s, was reflected in the turn of media discourse away from race and toward the economy. As Rubio (2001:183) squarely put it, “There is also evidence that many whites who complain of being ‘tired of hearing about racism’ are actually and ominously tired of black people.” In that way, the media’s silence on race and shift in focus to the economy reflects a turn away from publicly reckoning with race in the U.S., in spite of continued racism.

This turn away from race, neo-Nazism, and anti-Semitism to focus on the economy lasted through the ensuing fifteen years of anniversary coverage. The emergence of the European Union in 1999, and the move toward a globalized world with interconnected global financial systems helps to explain this persistent concentration. To be sure, the expressions of this economic focus change over time, turning toward class divisions: blue-collar sources who make things with their hands are contrasted unfavorably with white-collar managers (1999); later, West Berlin is characterized as “posh,” while East Berlin is not (2009). And though one episode in these four nights of coverage mentions the enduring popularity of rightist and neo-Nazi parties, this is presented as an afterthought, not a significant aspect of the unified republic.

That’s the way it was: World War II, Communism, and the Holocaust: The Collapsing of Memory and Inevitability of History

In the preceding sections I have discussed the visual and spoken rhetorics NBC Nightly News drew upon to communicate hegemonic ideologies regarding communism, capitalism, Germany, and the position of women. In this next section I discuss how the qualities specific to television, namely liveness and hypermediacy, naturalize these ideologies and render this version of the past persuasively and authoritatively. I begin by showing that the network collapses time and public

memory by evoking the visual rhetorics of communism, Nazism, and the Holocaust. Then, I demonstrate that the juxtaposition and seamless integration of disparate archival footage from multiple time periods makes NBC's version of history seem inevitable. I close by explaining how that water-tight version of the past naturalizes the accompanying ideologies.

As discussed in chapter two, television news communicates liveness and hypermediacy through visual and spoken discourses communicated by anchors and reporters, who pepper their reports with such temporal and geographic-specific words as “tonight,” “here,” “on this night,” and so on. In the anniversary coverage the reporters employ these verbal signs repeatedly. These words provide the anniversary coverage a sense of immediacy that, in turn, grants the reportage legitimacy and advances “the experience of watching television as itself authentic and immediate” (Bolter & Grusin, 2000:187). But the network also leans quite heavily on reprising previous coverage, such that there are multiple locative and authoritative “tonights” and “heres” in a single segment. As an example, in 1999, Brokaw introduces the anniversary newscast, saying: “Ten years ago tonight, one of the momentous events of the 20th century...” The segment then segues into his 1989 coverage, in which he says, “We have a remarkable development here tonight at the Brandenburg Gate...” The decade between the two “tonights” collapses and seems to disappear. With the time between them shrunk to invisibility, other possible outcomes are eliminated, and this particular historical narrative – a celebratory version of unification – seems inevitable. In fact, as even the anniversary coverage from the early '90s makes clear, a very different Germany and unification story could have emerged.

This same collapsing of past and present occurs in 2009. The table below charts this collapse as it plays out during the first two minutes of the broadcast. As this chart makes clear,

the archival and present-day footage, and the spoken parts that accompany them, are spliced together as if belonging to a single, contiguous scene.

| Image | Year | Speech | Year |
|---|-------------|--|-------------|
| Night: people streaming through a gate; Brandenburg Gate with Brokaw in front of it. Revelers behind him, shouting. | 1989 | Good evening. Live from the Berlin Wall on the most historic night in this wall's history. What you see behind me is a celebration of this new policy announced today by the East German government that now, for the first time since the wall was erected in 1961, people will be able to move through freely. | 1989 |
| Lester Holt at anchor desk; above his shoulder, archival footage of the Wall opening. | 2009 | | |
| Celebrants at the Wall pounding on it, shouting, die Mauer muss wegg. | 1989 | Twenty years ago, one of the most dramatic nights of the 20 th century. | 2009 |
| Celebrants atop the wall. | 1989 | Men and women atop the wall tonight, hammer and chisel, taking down the wall. | 1989 |
| Celebrants. | 1989 | Piece by piece. This sinister symbol of oppression which divided Berlin for almost three decades came apart. And as it did, the Cold War was all but over. East Berliners were allowed unrestricted travel to the west some of them for the first time. | 2009 |

The footage is so seamlessly edited together that it reads visually as a single scene. As a result, Brokaw's hind-sighted overview seems authoritative and authentic, as if it may have been spun at that moment. The footage, too, suggests that he was correct then, and is correct now. As a result, the ideological aspects of his reportage – i.e. “sinister symbol of oppression” – sound like

and are positioned as authoritative and historical takes on the past, rather than statements of opinion. Finally, that Brokaw is a key continued link throughout the coverage from '89 to the present seems to further collapse time and support a single version of the past. Notably, during this collection of archival and present-day scenes, Brokaw is shown only in 1989 – making the 20-year jumps and gaps appear immediate, rather than the *longue duree*.

The collapsing of time is also evident in the ways that anchors and reporters talk about German history. For instance, in his introduction to the 9 November 1992 segment, Brokaw identifies November 9 as “a day of defining moments of German history,” mentioning both Kristallnacht and the Berlin Wall. The 50 years between them is collapsed; the two are made to seem equivalent. Likewise, on 14 November 1993, Brian Williams introduces a segment on Germany’s national memorial to all war victims – effectively, the country’s World War II memorial – saying, “Even now, a half century after World War II, Germany is still a deeply divided nation.” The description “deeply divided” seems to belong to, or be a cause of, the Second World War; but this is the metaphor that the network uses most often to describe the Berlin Wall and Germany since unification.

The collapsing of history also emerges in the segments themselves. Jim Maceda, in his anniversary coverage from 1999, proclaims: “The new Berlin: A multimillion dollar facelift, turning the dark capital of the Nazi era into a city of new symbols.” As in the case above, Nazism and communism are collapsed. A decade later Brokaw collapses these histories during an interview with then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton:

Brokaw: It is the economy that is now the common enemy of all Germans. Unemployment is at 8 percent. It's twice as high in the East. That is a much higher priority for Germans than helping the US in Afghanistan, where German forces are keeping a low profile. Today Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said the Germans are doing as well as can be expected given their history.

Clinton: This has been a very difficult political decision for them, given their understandable allergy to being looked as though they were once again a military power.

Clinton's oblique comment collapses numerous histories: World Wars I and II; communism; the Cold War; the Holocaust; the War in Afghanistan. And it cleverly subsumes whatever reasons Germany may have for its role in Afghanistan into the U.S. ideological position of Germany as an aggressor.

The program collapses these histories through visual discourses as well, with anniversary coverage featuring archival clips from 1945 showing a bombed-out Reichstag (9 November 1999) and 1938 footage from Kristallnacht (9 November 1992). Contemporary coverage contributes to these collapsed histories as well, such as the Sachsenhausen concentration camp and Hassids sealing a time capsule containing the names of Jewish Berliners murdered during the Holocaust (9 November 1992). Also in 1992, reporter Dennis Murphy speaks to the camera with the Brandenburg Gate behind him, that icon of the original Berlin Wall footage; but his words link the image to a different past: "One German in three believes there is something good to be said about the Nazi era." Superficially, collapsing these pasts suggests that Nazism and communism are similar, or at the least equally culpable and "bad." Another reading sees this collapsing of histories as an inevitable effect of collective memory, which tends to compress time (Zelizer, 1995), a hallmark identified by previous research on anniversary coverage (i.e. Edy, 2006; Keith, 2010). Given that the footage appears to occupy the same time frame, the effects also suggest that there is a singular history, and that it is knowable: one narrative, moving forward with a singular end, from 1938 to the present.

There is yet another way that multiple pasts are collapsed: through the rhetoric of "never forget," which emerges from Holocaust rhetoric but is applied here broadly to the Berlin Wall. As an example, Brokaw tells viewers that the tour guide who conducts tours about the Berlin

Wall “will not stop trying to keep the memory of what was a dark and deadly Berlin Wall fresh in the minds of those who have forgotten” (2009). Anniversary coverage from 1999, featuring Stephen Mikowski, the teenager who grew up in East Berlin, applies similar language, with Brokaw telling us that the teen “hopes it never happens again.” The phrase in its Holocaust paradigm is also applied to Kristallnacht commemorations (1992): “Once again tonight, Jews repeated the vow, ‘Never Forget.’” As Fairclough (1995:64) observed, television discourses are “socially shaped and socially shaping.” NBC’s adoption of “never forget” as a commemorative mnemonic for the Berlin Wall stems from a vast array of other discourses, created, amended, and circulated by the media and other social institutions. In recycling this trope and applying it to an unrelated event, the network both recalls and elides specific Holocaust discourse, summoning “Germany,” perhaps “Nazis,” but neither specifically. What is more, the network’s contemporary, post-2001 use of this discourse connects to September 11th, another highly traumatic, highly-mediated event that the press – among other institutions – instructs viewers never to forget. In that way, the “never forget” discourse collapses three distinct traumas, while playing on widely-known and widely-circulated collective references to the past.

Despite and because of these multiple memorial tropes, the subject of what is supposed to be remembered is never made clear: not the Holocaust, World War II, nor communism. The blurriness of the memorial subject, the obliqueness of the Holocaust and other references to the past, make plain that they are employed as metaphors without any concrete referent. In that way they are the ultimate empty sign, simulacra a la Baudrillard: they refer only to a simulation, a mediated image of the past, to the archive of images and stories that constitute American identity, American reality, and our mythological conceptions of our place in the world.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have laid out the coverage that appeared on NBC Nightly News in 1989. I have parsed the themes and ideologies this original coverage circulated. I have shown how the effects of the ideological system in which the U.S. news is produced manifest in this coverage, namely through the portrayal of communism as a contagion, of communists as naïve children, and the depiction of Germany as a potential aggressor. This first section showed that the original coverage defined freedom as the freedom to buy, a metaphor understandable and frequently used in American television news, and demonstrated that the network peeked behind the Iron Curtain to further diminish the East Germans and emphasize capitalist plenty.

This chapter also described the 20 years of anniversary coverage that have appeared since, demonstrating the continuity of some themes, such as freedom as freedom to buy. The concepts “anniversary as process” and “anniversary as spectacle” were introduced and explained, and the anniversary coverage that corresponds to each one described and analyzed. The overrepresentation of men in the coverage is also documented and explained as another way that the network communicated U.S., capitalist ideology. This section of the chapter closed with an overview of how NBC Nightly News uses the metaphor of Germany as a “divided country” throughout the 20 years as an example of how the news constructs another nation’s story to express and explore its own identity and ideological shifts. To conclude the chapter, I discussed how the programming collapses time through visual and spoken discourses, and argued that the ideologies presented alongside these versions of the past become naturalized as a result.

Chapter 5: CNN

This chapter begins with a brief history of CNN. I discuss its 1980 debut, lay out the network's commitment to 24-hour-a-day news coverage, and explain how this style of news delivery influences the network's content writ large and Berlin Wall anniversary coverage in particular.

I then discuss CNN's coverage of the Berlin Wall's opening in 1989. Because of limited access, I look only at programming from 9 and 10 November 1989. I extract and identify patterns, themes, and ideologies established by this original coverage.

The next portion of the chapter examines anniversary broadcasts. Because of the difficulties obtaining materials prior to 1994, I look only to materials that aired from 6 through 9 November from 1990 through 1994. Beginning in 1995 and through 2009, relevant materials that aired throughout the month of November are considered and discussed. In all years, I examine these materials for patterns, themes, and visual and spoken metaphors, and trace the ideologies circulated by the programming's visual, spoken, and textual elements. I compare these extracts to the themes and ideologies circulated in the coverage from 1989. Lastly, I look for absences, silences, and omissions.

The final portion of this chapter discusses the effects of remediation and hypermediacy on the anniversary coverage. I demonstrate how CNN's compression of time, its collapse of distinct histories, and the effects of remediation and hypermediacy converge to suggest that all time is contiguous, occupying a single present. I conclude by discussing how this single, contiguous time smashes any sense of a grand narrative of history, thereby rendering invisible the ideologies that the programming circulates.

A brief history of CNN: “America’s news network”

Ted Turner launched CNN in 1980 as a 24-hour news network, calling it “America’s news channel.” The channel’s debut coincided with the development of cable television channels such as ESPN, Nickelodeon, C-SPAN (launched 1979), and MTV (1981) (Castleman & Podrazik, 2010:296-297). Though created to compete with the networks, and despite Turner’s claims to eschew network news’s sensationalist coverage, from the beginning CNN devoted plenty of time to “fires, murders, and accidental explosions...with typical network abandon” (Traub, 1981:60). The lack of innovation in CNN’s approach to telling news was not surprising, perhaps, given that most of the staff came from commercial television (Traub, 1981). The network reprised the same stories throughout the day, regardless of the availability of new information, an approach to news delivery that it has maintained since. And in an observation that would prove prescient, given the effects of remediation, James Traub (1981) remarked that “much of what we see on the screen seems to represent a fascination with the new medium itself – going live at the drop of a hat, for instance” (61).

At the time of its 1980 launch, only 1.7 million U.S. households had signed up for the cable channel (Flournoy & Stewart, 1997:1). Although CNN expanded during the 1980s, reaching Europe in 1985 (Amdur & Bell, 1994), the channel continued losing money for years (Flournoy & Stewart, 1997:1). It did not fully come into itself until the Gulf War, when satellite hookups and 24-hour-a-day coverage enabled the channel to transmit war coverage from the Middle East around the clock, which bolstered CNN’s ratings in the U.S. and its global reach: after the war’s January launch, 1 million more Europeans began subscribing to the network; ratings in the U.S. jumped too, peaking at 9.4 on January 16, the first night of the war (With Persian Gulf War over, 1991). As testament to the network’s “real-time” war coverage, some

networks substituted CNN's live-feed instead of their own programming (Castleman & Podrazik, 2010:354).

This 24-hour-a-day coverage demands different routines than NBC's 30-minute evening news. For one, there is simply more time to fill. As a result, its reports need not paraphrase officials' public statements, but screen them in near entirety. I mention this to make clear that while this production decision expresses an ideological position, it is also necessitated by the channel's structure, with its great demands to fill airtime. Another key element of CNN's 24-hour-a-day coverage is that, by running news at all times, and frequently going live, the programming seems less a mirror of "real" events and more like a window on "reality." As a result, CNN's programming seems even more trustworthy, more authoritative, and less packaged than a 30-minute news show like NBC, though of course it is highly produced, edited, and structured.

Finally, although the network's programming is comprised of many different shows, CNN news programs pull raw materials, like video, as well as fully-executed reports from the same, single newsgathering source (Flournoy & Stewart, 1997:3). Thus, although the shows examined here differ, and provide audiences a different array of news offerings, the reporting from which they are composed largely come from the same single source.

CNN in 1989

CNN's 1989 coverage of the Berlin Wall falls into two categories: the Wall as breaking news and predictions regarding the future of Germany and U.S. relations with Europe and the USSR. Although thematically similar to NBC's 1989 coverage, CNN's approach to relaying this information differs radically.

First, the program, *World View*, is anchored in 1989 by Bernard Shaw in Washington, D.C. and Catherine Crier in Atlanta. The two relay information about the Wall's opening from their desks; the program toggles back and forth between them. Reporter Tim Mintier bolsters this material, speaking on the phone from Berlin. As he talks, prerecorded segments of the festivities play in a loop, showing people celebrating at the Wall and driving and walking through checkpoints. The loose collection of scenes was sloppily edited, moving from day to night and back again. There doesn't even seem to be enough coverage to continue showing new visual information; during the phone call, the same scenes repeat, which the network breaks up with a headshot of Mintier affixed to a map of Europe. These same scenes also provide the visual segue from commercials back to the programming, an entertaining teaser of what's in store.

But Mintier's descriptions do not match the pictures. For instance, while he describes people in wheelchairs at the Wall, the video shows people standing at the Wall and celebrating. Consequently, although the segment is meant to seem live and close to the action, with Mintier's up-to-the-minute descriptions of the changing scene, the visual material accompanying his disembodied voice seems disconnected and old, not live and news-breaking.

As with NBC, the network had little commanding visual material to deploy to illustrate its forecasts of future developments. To that end, it devoted extensive time to public statements by President Bush, Margaret Thatcher, and the Soviet diplomat to the U.S., Yuri Dubinin, about Germany's future. These statements are supplemented by interviews with other leaders, such as Secretary of State James Baker and Indiana Representative Richard Lugar, also provide an official, U.S. response and perspective on the future. A prerecorded interview with Nancy Reagan looks briefly at "Ronnie's" (Reagan's) influence on Gorbachev, but is mostly concerned with Nancy Reagan's recent autobiography, *My Turn*, and internecine squabbling in the Reagan

administration. And in what feels like a desperate attempt to make meaning of the events, and to predict Russia's response, the network even interviews a former KGB agent who defected to the U.S. a decade before, in order to gain access – however circuitously! – to “what is going on behind the Kremlin's walls,” as anchor Shaw puts it. (The agent runs roughshod over Shaw in his dogged quest to make his points.)

The reasons for this surfeit of official points of view may be driven by CNN's news routines: they are efficient ways to fill 24-hour news coverage; and they fill the void of the network's incapacity to provide live footage from the Berlin Wall. But taken together, these segments suggest the importance of the official, largely American, governmental response to the events in Europe, and contrast with NBC News's 1989 interviews with a variety of leaders and pundits from France, Ireland, Britain, and elsewhere. Further, the lengthy screen time devoted to these sources' spoken points of view transforms the story from one of euphoric images of a “liberated” population into a heady, complex discussion about government strategy: spoken statecraft.

The U.S. perspective is also communicated and emphasized through archival footage of President Kennedy at the Wall in 1961, declaring “Ich bin ein Berliner!” (I am a jelly donut) and Ronald Reagan's 1987 speech at the Wall. Curiously, this last bit of footage does not include the now-iconic statement “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!” but rather the somewhat less provocative “General secretary Gorbachev: If you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization, come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, Open this gate.” As with the contemporary interviews and public statements, these archival materials demonstrate that the network hewed extremely closely to the official U.S. line

on the Wall's opening, and sought to accord responsibility for it with American leaders – Reagan in particular.

The distinct histories of World War II and communism are also collapsed in this early coverage, mostly through spoken discourses. As an example, Bernard Shaw introduces *World Today* on 10 November saying, “World War II finally ended today. The people Joseph Stalin thought he had entombed for all time to come are roaming the garden of freedom, going over and through the Wall.” There is any number of remarkable elements to Shaw’s comment, not least that World War II formally ended in 1945. Later, Shaw says, “For Europeans, the thought of a reunited Germany is greeted with a good deal of unease. Understandable for the Europeans, they suffered most during this century’s two world wars.” While journalists often invoke the past as a way to explain current events (Zelizer, 2010:381), the repeated invocation of World War II activates the widely-held mythology of World War II as a good, moral war, thereby lending the Cold War a similar “good war” status, and the U.S. the role of liberator and crusader for European freedom.

In sum, and unlike NBC News’s coverage, the CNN material is far more reliant on spoken, not visual discourses. Breaking news is relayed by phone, accompanied by prerecorded coverage that repeats every few minutes; expert perspectives are provided by talking heads in blank settings. And in sharp contrast to Tom Brokaw, the anchors relay the news from the newsroom, not the field.

Ideologies

The network’s uncritical advancement of the official U.S. perspective contains a number of ideologies. First, the screen time the network devotes to these officials, their uncritical

reception, and the questions the reporters ask of them make plain a great faith in U.S. leadership. Implicit therein is a great trust in officials' wisdom, their insights and capacity to see to the heart of this foreign affair, and belief that they will tell the truth (November 10). As an example, here is anchor Catherine Crier talking with Rep. Lugar:

Crier: Senator, the Berlin Wall is on its way down. And Helmut Kohl has said that two German states seems unnatural. Is the U.S. concerned about a reunified Germany?

Lugar: Well the U.S. has said it would welcome unification under the right terms, that is under freedom, under a market system. I think we're some distance from that, but just tracing what may occur if in fact the East Germans are prepared to move toward free elections, and perhaps they will, we can see a mirror of the West German political system in East Germany. We can see elections, maybe results that turn out fairly comparable. What I think we'll also see as people go back and forth across the wall, they compare prices they compare the availability in the system, very great pressures for convertability of currency and for some type of economic rationalization of the two systems. That's not impossible, but it's likely to be very difficult, and that's going to lead to further pressures upon the regime to produce at least the West German standard....

Rather than probe any of these statements – which relay a number of assumptions, notably that the products and prices of capitalism will inspire East Germans to make demands on their government, and that, given the choice, Eastern voters will not elect communists – Crier proceeds with the next question: “With the Soviets in mind what do these developments have to do with the Malta Summit? You think it will change the format of the conference?” Her unquestioning acceptance of Lugar's points, as well as the time she allows him to make them, make plain his credibility, authority, and trustworthiness. The bulk of CNN's coverage continues in precisely this vein: the anchor asks a question, and then steps out of the way as the source provides a lengthy answer. The anchor does not probe or question, but moves on to the next question, the source's credibility enshrined.

Another ideological theme that emerges in this early coverage characterizes communism as a regime of deprivation. While waiting lists for consumer goods were quite common, the

deprivation implied here is malnourishment. Crier: “The open border policy instituted yesterday offers a banquet of opportunities to freedom-starved East Germans. Some will feed their hunger for a different life by immigrating. Many others are content to sample the long-forbidden delights of the capitalist society, then return home” (10 November). Shaw: “Inside East Germany, a political system in turmoil. And a populace eager to taste the unfamiliar flavor of freedom” (10 November). This frequently reprised freedom-as-food metaphor transforms the desire for “freedom” into a physical, bodily need, elevating its importance. Further, the implication that East Germans were deprived of nourishment denigrates the GDR’s leadership – it could not even “feed” its people. Finally, the image of a hungry population subtly evokes previous war coverage and histories of real hunger, including those who starved during World War II (in camps, in Leningrad, in villages across Europe). In that way, the story suggests that the East Germans have been liberated from war, and that – as with World War II – the west has been the liberators.

In sum, the 1989 coverage relies heavily on spoken discourses, interviews with U.S. government leaders, and collapses multiple histories so to elevate the U.S.’s role in the Wall’s opening. And, it relies heavily on looping the same two to three second intervals of footage from the Wall’s opening.

Anniversary footage: from footnote of history to the main event

Like the NBC reportage, CNN’s coverage of the Berlin Wall’s opening fits into two categories: anniversary-as-process and anniversary-as-spectacle. But the network’s expression of these categories differs from NBC’s, and provides the opportunity to further refine these concepts. In the CNN material, anniversary-as-process is communicated through reports that

downplay the significance of the Wall's opening, and that subsume it within other, more contemporary news described as more important and noteworthy than the anniversary. These anniversaries, which describe anniversary from 1990 through 1998, the Berlin Wall is advanced as a data point against which to contrast or measure ongoing events related to unification that are still being developed. The Berlin Wall is invoked as year zero for a set of changes that Germany is still undergoing.

By 1999, the network's coverage of the Wall's anniversary transformed. Beginning this year, it began exhibiting the characteristics of anniversary-as-spectacle. Specifically, the anniversary itself became big news, while other processual issues – unemployment, the rise in xenophobic violence and neo-Nazism – faded to the background or were omitted altogether. Like the NBC anniversary-as-process, the programming from 1999 described the story using extremely positive, bombastic terms. But it also promoted history as souvenir and advanced tchotchkes as containers of history and – through their purchase – the avenue for viewers to consume the past. In this way, the reportage from the 10th anniversary on evoked the other, critically important component of Debord's explication of the Society of the spectacle: “as the advanced economic sector which directly shapes a growing multitude of image-objects, the spectacle is the main production of present-day society.”

1990

Unlike NBC Nightly News, CNN's World View marked the first anniversary of the Wall's opening. This segment, which only lasts about a minute, suggests that the Wall's opening was but a blip of history. The report shows the unveiling of a commemorative plaque in Berlin and then reprises the 1989 coverage of celebrations at the Wall. It closes with brief comments by three former East Germans, who address questions not shown on camera. These brief

“recollections,” as the anchor, Crier describes them, run the range from disappointment in the Wall’s opening to determination: “It was supposed to stand 100 years;” “To think about November 9th and the Brandenburg Gate sends shivers down the spine;” “I wanted to go through and I was convinced no one would stop me.” None of these sources is identified with a name, suggesting further the lack of importance the channel placed on the individuals and the story itself.

As with the 1989 coverage, in 1990, the network collapses World War II and the Holocaust with the Wall’s opening. Before the commercial break, Shaw says, “Elsewhere in the world it’s the first anniversary of the opening of the Berlin Wall, and in Germany there’s joy and sadness. We’ll tell you why.” The reason for this sadness, as shown later, is the anniversary of Kristallnacht, which Catherine Crier calls “crystal night.” Says Crier: “the celebrations were tinged with sadness, that’s because today is also the 52nd anniversary of ‘Crystal Night,’ the Nazi rampage against Jews that was a preview of the Holocaust.” This is merely stated, without any accompanying footage.

But overall, this anniversary downplays the significance of the Wall’s opening. For instance, Crier’s introduction of the segment is somewhat muted: “One year ago today, the Berlin Wall started to tumble down....The event riveted the attention not only of Germans but of the whole world.” “Riveted the attention” makes it sound more significant as a media event than life- or world-changing. Further, the anniversary is used to segue to real and important news.

Anchor Shaw explains:

Those celebrations served as a backdrop for an historic moment in diplomacy. Soviet president Gorbachev and German Chancellor Kohl signed a non-aggression treaty on Gorbachev’s first visit to united Germany. Gorbachev said, the era of confrontation is over. Gorbachev said the treaty closed the book on the past and cleared the way for a new beginning between the new nations (9 November 1990).

This treaty – not the Wall’s opening – is “historic,” and has “cleared the way for a new beginning.” In time, the channel will ascribe this language to the Wall’s opening, while Gorbachev’s treaty will be forgotten.

1992

CNN devoted significantly more time to the anniversary in 1992. That year, the reportage spans 8 to 9 November. But as in 1990, the programming subsumes the significance of the Wall’s opening, highlighting instead racism and anti-Semitism in present-day Germany. Specifically, the opening functions as a high point for Germany, which has since declined, given high unemployment, unequal wages, “a psychological gap in how each side views the other,” and xenophobic violence.

The 1992 reportage downplays the Wall’s opening primarily through spoken discourses. Anchor Andrea Arceneaux’s introduction is one such example:

In unprecedented numbers people gathered in Berlin Sunday to show the world most Germans reject racism. The rally came on the eve of the anniversary of Kristallnacht, a notorious attack on Jews in 1938. And just three years ago Monday the Berlin Wall fell. But some neo-Nazis have seen the reunification of Germany as the birth of a fourth Reich (8 November).

The anchor’s 9 November introduction features a similar set-up:

In Germany this was a day for rallies and remembrance. Tens of thousands of people held protests across Germany against a surge of racist and anti-Semitic violence. They also marked two contrasting moments in Germany’s history: the 54th anniversary of Kristallnacht attacks on Jews and the third anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall (9 November).

In both of these introductions, the anniversary is embedded almost as an afterthought, adjacent to the meaningful, newsworthy events (the surge in xenophobic violence; the rallies against it). It functions as a referent to the current “real” news, rather than functioning as news itself. As these examples attest, the 1992 reportage sustains the collapsing of multiple histories: the Wall’s

opening and Kristallnacht, the latter evocative of and a metonym for the Holocaust and World War II.

The network's support for the official, governmental point of view was also evident in this year's reportage. For instance, consider reporter Rick Sallinger's description of the interplay amid protesters and the president and chancellor:

But even this march against violence would end with violence. The German president Richard von Weizsacker had to be protected by riot police as he spoke. Left-wing demonstrators and anarchists pelted the stage with eggs and stones, and tried to shout von Weizsacker down. But the German president would not give in. He pleaded for tolerance for refugees, and urged his countrymen to take action against right-wing violence. The Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, had to be removed from the march for his own safety.

Sallinger's reporting valorizes the leaders: the President "would not give in," the Chancellor a would-be victim of the crowd. Later in the report, Sallinger further conveys support the German government as a whole:

It is the worst such outbreak [of violence] since the Third Reich. The racial violence brings back chilling memories of the Nazi rise in the 1930s. But there's a big difference. Then, the attacks were state-sponsored, and encouraged. This march is designed to show today, they are state-condemned (8 November).

Again, the report takes pains to describe the government as inculpable, pointing out that the state condemns contemporary violence. This simplistic portrait, which positions the state as the "good guys," omits the fact that from the 1980s on, right-wing groups had successfully gained seats in Lander (state) elections (Braunthal, 2009:75). It also implies that the state and its functionaries have fully recovered from and disavowed Nazi ideology. In fact, denazification was never fully successful, not least because administrators of the West German and the U.S.-controlled regions recruited former Nazis – particularly in intelligence – in their Cold War fight against Russia and the GDR (Braunthal, 2009:21). But Sallinger's declarations convey an amnesty for the state.

Another way in which the network supports government figures is by covering the celebrations of honorary citizenship bestowed on Helmut Kohl, Mikhail Gorbachev, and Ronald Reagan (9 November). Reagan, who did not attend the ceremony, is nevertheless given a speaking part: archival footage of him in 1987, in front of the Brandenburg Gate, declaring “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this Wall.” The politicians’ popularity is visually communicated as well, through scenes showing the German parliament giving the men a standing ovation (8, 9 November). Similarly, the 8 November reportage highlights Gorbachev’s trip to Germany to receive an award “recognizing his contributions to the fall of the Wall and reunification of Germany.” Taken together, these reports relay the anniversary story’s significance as one of diplomats and diplomacy. Government leaders – particularly in the capitalist west – are positioned as heroes, which further conveys and legitimates the authority and public trust accorded them.

Such politicians also emerge as trustworthy by virtue of their contrast with the visual depictions of the protesters. The anti-racism demonstrators are repeatedly shown as if out of control: chanting, shouting, beating their fists, scuffling with police in riot gear. Scenes from the protest are stitched together to highlight moments of loud chanting and expressed anger.² The images of the police also imply the crowd’s violent potential: clad head to toe in green, infantry-like suits, they bear plastic shields and helmets, prepared to defend (or attack). The crowds’ volatility is further suggested by the reporter’s final comment: “It was a march for tolerance. But one group shouted, ‘Protect the foreigners, drive out the Nazis.’” Set up in this way, the crowd seems intolerant for its call to “drive out Nazis.” By contrast, the chancellor and president seem reasonable, voices of real peace.

² This form of visual implied violence has frequently been deployed in the U.S. in recent years, notably during the Occupy Wall Street and anti-war protests in New York City.

The crowd's dangerousness is further evoked through repeated juxtapositions with footage of skinheads and Nazis committing violent acts. On 8 November, the segment jumps from a shot of the protest to file footage of skinheads firebombing a building that housed asylum seekers in Rostock, Germany. Similarly, on 9 November, after reprising footage of the demonstration from the day before, the segment cuts from a scene of protesters chanting and pumping their fists to archival footage of Kristallnacht showing a synagogue in flames and men smashing in a window. The link between the protesters and the pogrom is further underscored by the reporter's seamless transition between the two: he says that the demonstration was "marred by left-wing violence; the president of Germany had to be guarded by shields, and was pelted by eggs and stones. The anniversary of the Wall coming down is also the anniversary of Kristallnacht, the day in 1938 when Nazi gangs smashed windows of Jewish businesses and synagogues." Visually and verbally, both groups are characterized as thuggish; by juxtaposing the "left-wing violence" with actual Nazis, the report criminalizes the crowd further, ennobling the German government leaders as a result.

1999 through 2009: Anniversary as spectacle

Beginning in 1999, CNN's coverage of the anniversary changed dramatically to cohere with the concept of anniversary-as-spectacle. Like NBC's programming, the anniversary as spectacle manifests in part through a bombastic, overly positive framing of the Wall's anniversary, which manifests through visual and spoken discourses. But CNN's anniversary-as-spectacle also admits different qualities of the spectacle, namely an emphasis on consumption of souvenirs, the stuff of late capitalism. Souvenirs are repeatedly offered as the metaphor through which to understand contemporary Germany, to partake in its anniversary, and to consume

history – a way of experiencing the past that Marita Sturken describes in *Tourists of History*. But because these souvenirs are mediated – the experience of “having” them not even possible – their presentation bespeaks the passivity and depoliticization that Debord identified as part of the logic of the spectacle and its demands of viewers/participants.

1999

CNN devoted four days to the Berlin Wall’s anniversary in 1999, more consecutive coverage than any other programming examined in this project. Relevant material began 6 November with a historical overview of the Wall’s architecture, which emphasized how difficult it was to get past the Wall. This overview relied on undated, black and white archival footage that played as the reporter, Chris Burns, described the Wall’s material qualities: “Part Wall, part fence, part underwater barrier.... In central Berlin the Wall was made of concrete slabs... 300 observation towers lined the so-called death strip, along with electric fences, tank trips, guard dogs.” He also focused on the tubular structures at the top of the Wall that made it difficult to climb over, as well as barbed wire running around it. Nowhere, however, does Burns explain what escapees might have been looking to outrun, or whom or what these structures were designed to corral.

The Wall’s impenetrability made plain, the report then highlights attempts to escape it. These are shown through relics of flight at the museum at Checkpoint Charlie, including a car’s hidden compartment; a “flying machine,” a zip-line-like contraption; and surfboards lashed together. Such materials of memory are bolstered by archival footage of escape attempts, including a tunnel, an East German border guard running through barbed wire, and a person jumping out of a window. Finally, escapees’ recollections ground these material traces, making

them seem even more authoritative: one speaks of swimming the Spree River, another of running through barbed wire. In these ways, the report emphasizes the material relics of escape, as well as their images – via newspaper clippings and archival footage. Given the emergence of anniversary-as-spectacle, in which the image trumps the object, it makes sense that the news emphasizes how the Wall and escape attempts *looked*.

Further, focusing on the relics of these fantastic escapes, the how-done-it, lends the story a fun, hair-raising kind of drama, diminishing the gravity of life behind the Wall and establishing an almost playful, light-hearted approach to the anniversary story. What's more, the segment effectively transfers the drama of the Wall's opening to the escapes that preceded it. Finally, and importantly, the story omits coverage of communism, suggesting that the reasons for these escapes are implicit – a tacit assumption that indicates expectations of widespread and widely-agreed upon knowledge of how bad life was in the GDR. At its heart, the implicit ideology here is that any rational person would have wished to flee – itself an indictment of communism. And though the reporter mentions people who died trying to get out, and one piece of archival footage shows border guards carrying a lifeless body, the segment emphasizes successful escapees. In these ways, the whole of the segment suggests that escaping – and surviving to tell about it – was a more or less regular phenomenon.

The second part of the 6 November coverage is positioned to offer a deeper context for the Berlin Wall's opening. The interview, between anchor Andria Hall and Jackson Janes of Johns Hopkins University's American Institute for Contemporary German Study, covers the continued implications for Germany, for Europe as a whole, and for the region's former communist nations. Rather than create opportunities for Janes to reprise the events, Hall's questions are largely forward-looking: "Tell me about the lasting effects [of the Wall's opening],

and will it continue?” “As we turn the corner into the 21st century, what would you say Germany needs to do in order to make its economy more competitive?” In that way, the report takes for granted a high level of familiarity with and understanding of the GDR’s history. It also bestows importance to the Wall’s opening itself – though in past years, the opening was not so important.

The 7 November coverage looks at how the East was won by focusing on the former GDR’s souvenir economy. It begins with archival images of people hammering at the Wall, handing off a piece that has come free. The report then cuts to contemporary footage of a man whaling on what appears to be a piece of the Wall, amid rubble. The reporter explains: “They called them woodpeckers when the Wall began to tumble... And woodpeckers are still at it ten years later. Though a different breed: enterprising capitalists.” This link implies that the people who worked to remove the Wall have been transformed into “enterprising capitalists,” suggesting that the whole project was for the sake of buying and selling.

The report then reviews the souvenirs for sale in Berlin: postcards showing Erich Honecker or the Wall, a bit of rubble attached; a fake transit visa; the ampermenschen, the East German crosswalk symbol, emblazoned on mugs, a mouse pad, a welcome mat, even as Gummy Bears. As if the meaning of the stuff itself were not clear enough, a shopkeeper explains, “All this ampermenschen stuff is marketing, is capitalism.” Together, the products and the commentary demonstrate the extent to which capitalism has taken over.

The reporter, Burns, closes the story by suggesting that the legacy of communism lingers in the materiality of souvenirs: “It’s hard to say who will get the last laugh: disciples of Adam Smith or Eric Honecker? After all, Honecker’s TV tower still dominates Berlin’s sky line. His biggest souvenir here casting a long shadow on the city that toppled him.” Though posed as a question, the report itself is the answer: Berliners have ascended to late-stage capitalism,

peddling GDR nostalgia through kitsch. At the same time, this comment diminishes the significance of communism overall; Honecker's legacy is reduced to a "souvenir" – a building.

As Sturken (2007) has written, kitschy memorabilia emphasizes the tourist's innocence, consumerism, and "search for authenticity" (9). The report gets at these elements by focusing on the souvenirs' authenticity. For instance, the reporter observes that "[in 1989] people came from all over the world to chip off a piece, a jagged geopolitical souvenir of a breathtaking moment." The description -- "jagged" "breathtaking moment" -- evokes the materiality of the souvenir, as well as its proximity to the real, both qualities that attest to its (seeming) authenticity and meaningfulness.

Yet, focusing on the peddlers of these items gets at the manufacture of this seeming "authenticity." And the report makes clear that many of the "authentic" souvenirs are fake: "Nowadays it's mostly sold by the slab as a piece of art... It's also packed into all kinds of mementos. Don't worry, they're not running out of these," says the reporter of the pieces of the Wall. "They'll make more." Volker Pawlowski, identified as a "Wall Salvage Businessman," says through a translator, "We could deliver 100 meters of the wall. It wouldn't be a problem." Whether 'real' segments from the rubble, or of recent manufacture, his comment reduces the Wall to a desirable commodity. The report bolsters this and the other souvenirs' desirability visually, as well, panning them as if a commercial.

But despite their manufacture, commodification, and the somewhat mocking tone the reporter uses to describe the souvenirs, the materials are also described as offering buyers a companionable, pleasant experience: "Missed out on getting a transit visa into the German Democratic Republic? Now you can write home with one. And, East Germany's crosswalk figure can now light up your living room. Make those java moments more enjoyable, even greet

visitors. You can chew on him like a gummy bear, and he's a cyber-man – you can web surf with him.” The anchor's introduction to the segment also keeps the segment from total irony:

“Tuesday marks 10 years since communism and the Berlin Wall toppled in Germany. But souvenirs from that era are still big business. As CNN bureau chief Chris Burns reports, some symbols of oppression are now campy keepsakes.” In that way, these keepsakes are emblematic of a significant psychic recovery, having transformed from “symbols of oppression” to “keepsakes.” Finally, they are also legitimated by the reporter's earlier description: “jagged geopolitical souvenir of a breathtaking moment,” and by his contention that they are sourced from “one of those ash heaps of history.”

If this sounds like advertising – it basically is. The segment provides a visual overview of the products, lingering on each one just long enough to create desire. The spoken rhetoric also evokes the language and logic of commercial advertising, particularly the emphasis on what each product promises YOU can do, or on what the product can do for YOU (Fiske, 1989). In that way, this segment also obliquely evokes the American cult of the individual.

As these examples attest, the economy of the product-image has fully taken over social life – specifically, the processes and experiences of memorialization or partaking in history. Given that “a commodity is ideology made material” (Fiske, 1989:10), they are emblematic of and communicate capitalism's success. That these image-objects are mediated puts them at one more stage of remove from the real. Similarly, that the report suggests that the authentic war relics can be used to make a movie further attests to their importance and potential within the domain and economy of mediated images. Even Honecker and Lenin are reduced to mediated images: “in souvenir shops it comes in postcard form, just like the leader himself,” says the reporter, as the screen focuses in on a postcard of Honecker; later, Lenin is shown as a stern,

white plastic bust, also for sale.

The segments that aired on November 8 and 9 are nearly identical. Both reprise footage from November 1989 and cover the present-day, Berlin-based celebrations; offer brief comment regarding the economic challenges that the nation has faced since unification; and provide excerpts from public speeches made by Chancellor Kohl and former President HW Bush about the anniversary. Finally, on each day, the reporter mentions people who died seeking to flee the Berlin Wall, anchoring the reportage to memorials across the board, and suggesting that the city has almost, though not entirely, emerged from its past.

One key theme emphasized during this part of the reportage is the role of elites – specifically, diplomatic forces – in opening the Wall. To that end, the programming includes multiple excerpts from speeches by President Bush and Helmut Kohl (8 and 9 November) and with Berlin mayor Eberhard Diepgen (6 November). Unsurprisingly, the men celebrate their colleagues:

Burns (paraphrasing Kohl's speech): Kohl said Bush supported without hesitation Germany's drive for unification.

Kohl (through translator): For that, I say from the bottom of my heart thank you to a friend in many deeds, but especially to a friend during the decisive days of our people's history (8 November).

The excerpts from Bush's speech aired on 9 November make a similar point about the role of the world leaders:

Burns: Former president George bush said the outcome could have been tragically different a decade ago were it not for friendship between the leaders.

Bush: We were in the midst of a delicate dance. And it helped more than words could explain to know innately that we Americans could trust Helmut Kohl and his able team. And despite the incredible pressures that Mikhail Gorbachev was under at the time, both Helmut and I believe in his commitment, solid, unbending commitment to reform.

Anchor Judy Woodruff even links the opening to the Pope, introducing a segment that follows the Berlin material by saying, “The fall of the Berlin Wall was also on the mind of Pope John Paul the Second Monday. In a visit to the former Soviet Republic of Georgia, the Pope hailed the contribution of Georgian President Eduard Shevardnadze, Soviet foreign minister ten years ago....” (8 November). Linking the Pope and Shevardnadze to the anniversary amplifies its global resonance among the most elite leaders, and again suggests the role played by diplomatic (and – in the Pope’s case – extra-governmental) figures.³ Finally, this link recalls NBC’s usage of the Berlin Wall’s opening during 1989 as a visual and metaphoric container for other seemingly unrelated events – the key frame through which to understand the world. But the key difference here is that while NBC used this approach during 1989, with Brokaw stationed at the Wall for nearly a week, CNN makes use of this frame even ten years later.

 Anchors’ and reporters’ explanatory statements further emphasize and construct the Wall’s opening as a government-led event. For instance, on 8 November anchor Judy Woodruff introduces the anniversary segment saying, “Germans thanked three former cold warriors a decade later.” Then reporter Chris Burns begins his report, describing President Bush, Helmut Kohl, and Gorbachev as “the power brokers behind that allowed the Berlin Wall to fall as gently as it did on November 9, 1989 without bloodshed.” He then details Gorbachev’s role – “it was Gorbachev who told the East German rulers they could no longer count on Soviet tanks to prop them up” – while the camera pans crowds cheering and clapping for the dignitaries. Visually, these cheering crowds further prop up and construct the theme of the dignitaries’ importance.

³ Woodruff’s comment is also emblematic of TV news’s tendency to push an entire program into a single narrative, so that even seemingly disparate segments relate to one another (Hallin, 1994).

Other visual and spoken rhetorics focus on the macro-level implications of the Wall's opening and reunification. For instance, anchor Andria Hall's 6 November interview with American Institute's Jackson Janes focuses on the "lasting effects" of the Wall's opening in Europe and elsewhere, and asks Janes to evaluate Germany's social and economic structures. Reporters and anchors provide further evidence to the anniversary's global implications. Burns, 8 November: "Germany is marking the moment that changed Europe and the rest of Europe a decade ago."

The effects of remediation and hypermediacy are also evident beginning in 1999. As an example, during the interview with Janes, the program shows a split screen with Janes on the right, anchor Andria Hall on the left. Both appear in a square, with their location ("CNN Center," "Washington") below them, to show that they are speaking from two different places; the WorldView graphic, a globe-like picture, is behind them. This is a major update from the 1990 coverage, when reporters in different places were shown in entirely different settings. Together, these visual elements evoke "the windowed and multimediated look of the computer screen," even suggesting "a multimedia presentation" or an event that takes place in "cyberspace" (Boltin & Grusin, 2000:189). While these images certainly evoke the computer screen and the internet, they also indicate a time-space unique to the CNN network.

The split-screen also allows viewers to see the anchor's immediate, nonverbal responses, which further conveys the sense that the pictures are happening right now, unedited, and thus – seemingly – unrehearsed and authentic. As an example, midway through the 6 November interview, Hall asks:

As we turn the corner of the 21st century, what would you say that Germany needs to do in order to make its economy more competitive and its social structure really work for the people of Germany as we head into the millennium?

Janes: Well that's a tall order but I think basically Germany's going to be having to go through structural changes...

When Janes says "Well that's a tall order," Hall smiles and inclines her head – as if to say, Well, yeah, it is. This extemporaneous seeming response amplifies the interview's authentic and hypermediate qualities.

Hypermediacy is also communicated through the word "LIVE," which stays fixed to the bottom-right of the screen. The screen also shows a time-stamp – i.e., 6:15 ET – which suggests that the pictures are being broadcast instantaneously and consumed across the world (ergo the need to specify Eastern Time). Beginning 8 November, the footage is also accompanied by a stock exchange indicator showing the number of points that Nasdaq and the Dow rose or fell that day. This small icon fixes the program indelibly to "now," and suggests that the channel is receiving up-to-the-minute updates about the markets, although they closed hours before. Its ubiquitousness also indicates the market's importance above all. Lastly, this icon, which is superimposed on the archival pictures of the 1989 celebrations, domesticates even the "revolutionary" images of the Wall's opening into the visual and economic logic of capitalism.

Also for the first time in the anniversary coverage, the collapse between past and present is especially pronounced. This collapse is facilitated by the lack of dates or other identifying information, such as "file" or "live," to identify and affix the footage to the past or the present. Certainly the material quality of the older archival footage – grainy, black and white – suggests that it shows the "past." How far past is not clear. Other coverage that may show the past, such as footage of the tubular structures topping the Wall (6 November), is in color and therefore does the material's temporality. Making it still more difficult to discern when any of this footage was filmed, CNN's red logo, "CNN," is superimposed on all of the coverage: contemporary

interviews; archival footage of underground tunnels and people leaping out of buildings; celebrations at the Wall in 1989. This sign suggests that all of the footage belongs to “now,” though much of it predates the network’s founding. Along with the stock exchanges indicators, these visual icons may be the best evidence yet that CNN’s version of the past was inevitable: with all past footage branded with CNN’s logo, these reports read as if the channel controls the past as well as the present.

2004: Nostalgia

By 2004 the network’s anniversary coverage shrank dramatically. The first mention of it is 8 November at the end of Aaron Brown’s show, *News Night*, a teaser for the next night’s program. Brown introduces the anniversary as a personal yardstick of how much he and his viewers have aged: “Before we go one quick programming note. And not just yet another way to make you feel old. I don’t need to feel any older this week by the way. It’s been 15 years since the Berlin Wall came down, changed the map, changed the world, ushered in what one historian called the end of history.” As he speaks, 1989 footage from Berlin plays, showing people scrambling up and down the Wall. There is no Brandenburg Gate, no chisels, only the playful images of people at the Wall hoisting one another up. But the significance of this world-changing event is circumscribed within Brown’s aging, his personal narrative.

Wolf Blitzer anchors the coverage the following night, 9 November. The segment alternates between archival footage of people celebrating at the Wall with interviews about the Wall’s opening with Peter Soetje, director of the Goethe Institute, who offers his personal recollections of the night’s events, and Charles Kupchan, professor at Georgetown University, who speaks about what the Wall’s opening meant for the world at large. The cuts between the

present-day narratives and the archival footage suggest that the men are narrating the events. In fact, Soetje begins speaking without any verbal or visual introduction; his voice is simply overlaid the 1989 images. He begins, “When we came to the Brandenburg Gate that night, a lot of people were there.” The images show this scene, which looks as if it is from Soetje’s perspective. He continues, saying, “youngsters, trying to climb up the Wall...” as an image of a young person is hauled up to the top of the Wall by two others. The match-up between his words and the images continues throughout the segment: “I remember that nearly all the people around me have tears in their eyes because they were so joyful,” he says, as images show people clapping, dancing, and drumming – the same images used in 1989 to segue from commercials to the news program. Matched up in this way, the images and Soetje’s recollection seem especially authoritative, like two sources corroborating the same events.

Anniversary as spectacle

Even more than 1999, the 2004 coverage describes the anniversary in exuberant terms.

For instance, here is Blitzer’s introduction:

One of the truly triumphant moments of the 20th century: the fall of the Berlin Wall 15 years ago tonight. It marked not only the liberation of the East German people who had been forced to live under communism. The toppling of the Berlin Wall also triggered a series of events that ultimately led to the toppling of the Soviet empire, a bloodless revolution that simply stunned the world.

His word choices are outsized: the East Germans’ “liberation;” the “revolution...stunned the world,” the “Soviet empire.” Aaron Brown’s teaser comments are similarly lofty: the Berlin Wall’s opening “changed the map, changed the world, ushered in what one historian called the end of history” (8 November). Even the interviewees describe the events in lofty terms. Soetje: “It was as if all the world would embrace the Berliners. It was triumphant for the human race, for

all human beings. These events shows, life in a nutshell, that it's possible to come together and combine our efforts for a better future.... Joy was the overwhelming feeling that night.” To put these outsized descriptions in perspective, it may be useful to recall that in 1990, the anchor introduced the Wall's anniversary with “One year ago today, the Berlin Wall started to tumble down....The event riveted the attention not only of Germans but of the whole world” (9 November 1990). Lastly, and in addition to these examples, the positivity is evident from the fact that not a single negative detail is mentioned – not about Germany's past, the rise of xenophobic violence, unemployment, or other difficulties that the country faced since unification.

The bombast comes from visual rhetoric as well, which show a man uncorking a bottle of champagne and footage and the sounds of a trumpeter playing Auld Lang Syne, the Scottish song typically played by the media on New Year's Eve or coverage from that night. Partly as a result, and along with the overwhelmingly positive recollections that Soetje shares, the segment takes on a nostalgic tone. In so doing the report constructs the image of this simpler time – the Wall's opening – though in fact it was dynamic and complex. This nostalgia mixed with positivity may be explained by the anniversary's falling during a turning point in the mass-mediated narrative of the U.S.-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Until May 2004, the media's “war of images was mainly running in favor of the United States,” writes Mitchell (2011:94). But that spring, a new visual vernacular was introduced: images made by both U.S. soldiers and Americans and their enemies. These include atrocity photographs, beheadings, torture photographs from Abu Ghraib, even dismembered U.S. contractors (Mitchell, 2011:94). These images did not effect or influence policy, or even the U.S. public, as some expected; but by the same token, they never really

disappeared, and so prompted “efforts at censorship and forced amnesia” (Mitchell, 2011:106). CNN’s nostalgic whitewashing of this ‘good’ historical era coheres with such attempts.

In contrast to these bloody, graphic, and morally ambiguous atrocities, as well as the U.S.’s attempts to fight a dispersed enemy (a difficulty that prompted Pentagon officials to screen *The Battle of Algiers* as a primer on guerrilla warfare), the Cold War was a good war. Sides were clear, lines drawn. Most important: without doubt, we won! An “other” (the Germans) were more brutal! Though of course, this, too, is a fable; subterfuge, lies, and spies were common enough during the Cold War, and particularly important to the U.S.’s strategy of fighting cultural battles (i.e. Saunders, 2001; Somerstein, 2000), which even included shell “foundations” that the CIA operated to promote U.S. culture abroad.

Despite this positivity and nostalgia, however, the network maintained its aloof, almost managerial position on the anniversary. While Soetje provides a personal take on the experience of being at the Berlin Wall in 1989, he seems somehow above the scene: he speaks from an elegant room, a marble fireplace behind him; his voice is measured, calm, not brimming with the joy and euphoria he describes. Likewise, Kupchak speaks with the confident reserve of the academic: he wasn’t there, is not giving eyewitness testimony, but explaining what the event meant globally and to the end of communism.

Lastly, this year, the effects of remediation are even more pronounced. As in 1999, the screen is crammed with text: the word “live” perpetually pasted in the corner, and the CNN logo on the lower left, along with the show’s name on the lower right. The now-ubiquitous news ticker scrolls throughout the segment, including Blitzer’s introduction, the sources’ comments, and atop the archival footage. Other elements of remediation also bespeak the highly-mediated society of the spectacle. For one, screens and screen-like surfaces have proliferated: an enormous

screen stands behind Blitzer's right shoulder, with the words "Segment 7" illuminated and shiny, and a screen showing the U.S. Capital to his left. His desk is translucent and glassy, almost like Lucite; the surface reflects the screens behind him. An open laptop also rests in front of him, along with a pile paper notes. In all, Blitzer appears to be anchoring from within a computer, relaying information about the past from within the mainframe.

2009: "The Shot"

By 2009 the coverage shrank ever further, reduced to a teaser and "final shot" in the 9 November Studio360 show hosted by Anderson Cooper. Cooper first introduces the anniversary midway through the show, following an interview with Oprah Winfrey. "Reliving history," he calls it; the segment jumps to the iconic Ronald Reagan sound byte, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." Cooper continues: "Why Mikhail Gorbachev nearly did not hear this famous plea, because it almost didn't make it into the speech. New information 20 years after the Berlin Wall came down." In that way, the segment is positioned as an historical puzzle, and the importance is placed on Reagan's comment – not the event itself.

The promised segment returns at the end of the show. Cooper runs breathlessly through the summary:

Tonight's shot: the fall of the Berlin Wall happened 20 years ago today. Built of course in 1961 the wall toppled November 9 1989. who can forget this, an historic moments marked the end of the Cold War. A lot of people believe the incredible events of this day were triggered two years earlier when Ronald Reagan stood before the wall and said this: [archival clip]: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall."

It's interesting to note, Reagan almost never spoke those words. In *The Wall Street Journal*, Anthony Dolan, his former chief speechwriter, says the State Department was battling the White House over the remarks, arguing that Reagan should not say "Tear down this wall," because the State Department believed the wall would remain for decades to come.

In the end, the words stayed, the wall did not. There you have it.

As in previous years, the channel's coverage suggests that the Wall's opening was due to the actions and declarative statements of singular state leaders. While Ronald Reagan is heralded as the responsible leader, others whom the network previously lauded as heroes are absent, namely George H.W. Bush and Helmut Kohl. Cooper's declarations fit with this ideology precisely, by implying Reagan's speech was responsible for the Wall's coming down.

In that way, this 30-second segment expresses Debord's observation that "the spectacle is the existing order's uninterrupted discourse about itself, its laudatory monologue." Cooper's comments are certainly "laudatory;" nothing interrupts or negates the implied argument of Reagan's and the U.S.'s might and significance within the Cold War narrative.

Also by 2009, remediation and hypermediacy reached fever pitch. To begin, Cooper introduces the segment in a split-screen with another television personality, Erica Hill. The words "Live," "CNN" and "360.com" appear on screen in much larger letters than in years past. The show then cuts to the graphics of "The Shot," a digital camera interface with a target at the center, in which float the words "The Shot." Even the font is hyper: "The Shot" is written in bubble letters. "The Shot" continues to float on the screen beside the CNN logo, as the words "AC360.com" float by.

But in addition to making the segment look like a multimedia presentation, these visual details also amplify to the segment's entertainment value. For one, the words "The Shot" and "AC360.com" rotate like toys or instant playback from a sports competition. The entertainment component is further bolstered by its position within the newscast; it comes after the "360 Bulletin," which this year describes a nine-year-old from West Virginia who stopped a carjacking. The nine-year-old does the talking. Lastly, "the shot's" entertainment value is further solidified by the reporters' final comments:

Erica Hill: Talk about staying power with those words.

Anderson Cooper: Yes, I know, incredible. It rings true today.

These comments do not broaden context or understanding. If anything they muddle meaning: What rings true today? There is no informational value here, only talking. And yet the elements of hypermediacy and liveness make the segment seem like a “pure representation, not a re-presentation” (Manghani, 2008:51) – as if this is a live, unedited window thrown open on a past world, not the hyper-packaged, hyper-mediated segment it really is.

Ronald Reagan: The enduring icon

As shown, one of the most frequently repeated images in CNN’s original and anniversary coverage is the clip of Ronald Reagan commanding Gorbachev to tear the Wall down. The frequent iteration of this particular scene demands further attention, especially given the absence of scenes showing other politicians (one notes that President Bush – the sitting president at the Wall’s opening – made his own impassioned speech in 1989, calling for a Europe that is “open, whole, and free”). The repetition of the Reagan sound byte can be explained partly by the mythological values associated with Reagan and perpetuated during, and since, his presidency: the all-American, ultra-masculine, rugged Hollywood hero who spoke plainly to main-street U.S.A. (see Sallot, 1990, for an overview of these archetypes). This all-Americanness is perhaps the ultimate contrast to, or argument against, American constructions of communism, including those constructed by CNN’s coverage: a deprived, hungry, not fun, imprisoned worker’s system. Its hyper-circulation, therefore, demonstrates the multiple levels on which “we” won, and makes clear that the Cold War was not only a nuclear, scientific, or arms battle but a fight for the dominant culture of the world.

Additionally, this clip's endurance can also be explained in part by President G.W. Bush's ascendance to the American presidency. Like Reagan, President G.W. Bush promoted the image of an all-American, simple, boots-wearing, rugged American man – an image that the U.S. media was instrumental in perpetuating. Thus, recirculating the “grandfather” of G.W. Bush's image – as CNN did throughout his presidency – grants Bush greater, seemingly historical, legitimacy. Lastly, the network's reliance on Reagan as a memorial trope evokes its founding tagline: “America's news network.”

Liveness, hypermediacy, and the inevitable past

In this next segment I discuss the ways that CNN engages in the collapsing of distinct histories, and of past and present, in manners similar to NBC News. I then demonstrate the extent to which the effects of hypermediacy and liveness make the all of the footage seem as if it is happening in the immediate present. I close by explaining how remediation and hypermediacy, taken with the collapsing of multiple memory rhetorics, serve to naturalize CNN's version of the past.

As with NBC, CNN collapses multiple histories through reporters' and sources' spoken rhetorics. For instance, Jackson Janes, the Johns Hopkins representative, collapses Nazism and communism during his interview on 6 November 1999:

Well, there's a saying that the Germans use -- it's called the "wall in the head" -- about the fact that East Germans who lived for -- not only under the GDR, the East German dictatorship, but had the period before that, in the Nazi period. And so as a result the division has been very difficult to overcome over these last 10 years. I think that the economic situation will gradually improve, but in the long run it's a psychological transition that's going to take a generation or two.

Janes conflates Nazism and East Germany even within a single sentence. And he suggests that the psychic effects of the “the Nazi period” have lingered, making it even more difficult for Germans to “overcome” “the division” between East and West. Other verbal asides effectively collapse these distinct histories. Describing the former East German border guards who are facing jail time for killing would-be escapees, reporter Chris Burns says, “judges aren’t buying the argument they were just following orders” (6 November). The phrase “just following orders” summons the defense of many Nazi criminals.

CNN also collapses these distinct histories by repeatedly juxtaposing coverage of the Berlin Wall’s opening with commemorations of Kristallnacht and even by covering the two anniversaries in a single segment. The chart below sets out these many instances.

1990

The celebrations were tinged with sadness, that’s because today is also the 52nd anniversary of “Crystal Night,” the Nazi rampage against Jews that was a preview of the Holocaust.”

1992

The day in 1938 when Nazi gangs smashed windows of Jewish businesses and synagogues.

They also marked two contrasting moments in Germany’s history: the 54th anniversary of Kristallnacht attacks on Jews and the third anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall (9 November).

1999

Bernard Shaw: German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder said November 9th is also a day of shame, unquote. For it marks the anniversary of Germany’s Kristallnacht, the Night of Broken Glass. The year was 1938. Hitler’s storm troopers smashing Jewish-owned stores and destroyed synagogues. The Nazis killed scores of Jews and rounded up thousands more during Kristallnacht, considered a prelude to the Holocaust.

At other times, the network flows directly from commemorating unification to Kristallnacht:

(Reporter) Chris Burns: Despite the troubles in Germany’s unification, it is a time to appreciate how far the country has come in a decade, a moment to pause and remember

the victims as well as those who made possible the end of the Cold War. Chris Burns, CNN, Berlin.

(Anchor) Bernard Shaw: German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder said November 9th is also a day of shame, unquote. For it marks the anniversary of Germany's Kristallnacht, the Night of Broken Glass. The year was 1938. Hitler's storm troopers smashing Jewish-owned stores and destroyed synagogues. The Nazis killed scores of Jews and rounded up thousands more during Kristallnacht, considered a prelude to the Holocaust.

The juxtaposition links these two events, not only because they occurred on the same day, but through the emphasis on victims who crossed West and died/suffered on Kristallnacht. In that way, the victims of the Holocaust and the victims of the Cold War are made equivalent, with both groups are also in need of remembering. Crucially, neither set of victims is pictured – only referred to through speech: Burns makes the comment about Cold War victims directly to the camera; the Kristallnacht footage shows Nazis riding trucks or drawing Jewish stars on shop windows. The visual absence of these victims makes them that much easier to conflate.

Further, the emphasis on the buildings destroyed during Kristallnacht also rhetorically links the two anniversaries. Only in 1999 does the reporter mention that “Nazis killed scores of Jews and rounded up thousands more.” Otherwise, as shown below, the emphasis is on structures that came down. When included, the visual depictions of Kristallnacht support this focus as well: the archival pictures – typically the same ones – show a building in flames and a smashed shop window. Images of murdered Jews, Jews forced to participate in public humiliation, of the 30,000 Jewish men arrested and ultimately deported to concentration camps, or of homes that were destroyed (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, n.d.) do not appear. In addition to sanitizing the past, this focus on public structures links to the Wall, which at the most basic level was a large piece of concrete that came down. More generally, the focus on structures collapsing fits with depictions of “the history of communism,” as Mitchell (1994:375) writes: “from

Eisenstein's *October* to CNN's coverage of the collapse of the Soviet Union, [communism's collapse] has been largely framed by images of the demolition of public monuments." That is, destroying the other's built icons is iconoclasm functioning at its most-basic level: Terach's tearing down of his father's idols, or destroying your enemy's temple.

Comparison of CNN and NBC

From 1989 through 2009, CNN coverage of the Berlin Wall's opening differed from NBC's approach. Most critically, CNN framed the story from the very beginning as one of experts and government leaders, while NBC sought to find meaning through the stories of individuals. During 1989, CNN's reliance on officials may be explained by its reporters' distance from Berlin and the breaking crisis which, as indexing theory predicts, will force reporters to rely heavily on official sources (Mermin, 1996). But as shown, the network's focus on government leaders persists throughout the anniversary coverage. Relying heavily on government leaders enabled the channel to transmit a largely uncritical history of the Wall's opening. By the same token, as history, this managerial view – the view from 50,000 feet – more legitimately reflects how history is “made:” that is, by government elites.

By contrast, NBC sought to tell the story of history through individual lives. These individuals stood in for the whole of East Germany's evolution, in that way functioning as metonyms (parts of the whole) and metaphors (symbols) of widespread shifts. At the same time, focusing on individuals coheres with and activates American mythologies regarding the importance of the individual and her power to transform her life. In that way, the emphasis on the individual transmits and upholds ideology far less obviously than CNN's reportage on elites.

The personages who most frequently appear in the reporting further support this key thematic difference. The figure most associated with NBC's version of events is Tom Brokaw, who after 1994 appears in virtually all of anniversary reportage about the Wall's opening, and in the archival materials from 1989 that the network recirculates. The story so belongs to Brokaw that he even comes out of retirement to report the anniversary story in 2009. Though an elite himself, as a reporter and anchor whose front-talking suggests a para-social relationship with viewers ("Good evening," "good night," and so on) Brokaw is more closely aligned with viewers – that is, with the individual view of history – than a government elite.

Like Brokaw, the figure who most frequently appears in CNN's coverage, Ronald Reagan, shows up repeatedly from 1989 through 2009. Reagan's endurance is amplified by the network's rebroadcasting of the same 1987 clip (with the exception of 1989, when CNN airs Reagan demanding that Gorbachev "Open this gate"). His association with the Berlin Wall is further emphasized by the absence of any CNN-specific personality who is linked to the Wall's opening as Brokaw is for NBC. This absence can be explained by the network's lackluster visual reporting in 1989, which was primarily comprised of a map with reporter Tim Mintier's face affixed to it and a loop of prerecorded pictures from the Wall. By contrast, NBC's 1989 pictures, which show Tom Brokaw, are "good" television: an attractive person at the center, surrounded by active people who look as if they are having a good time.

Finally, both networks rely heavily on World War II's visual and spoken images and metaphors. They did so overtly, by showing archival images of Kristallnacht, Hitler, a bombed-out Reichstag, and Bernard Shaw's stunning introduction on 10 November that "World War II finally ended today." Less obviously, the networks evoked the Second World War through the

rhetoric of “never forget” and by constructing communism and the GDR as a regime of deprivation.

As Zelizer (2011) has written, news organizations often rely on and invoke the past in order to make sense of present events. Both CNN and NBC deploy commemorative rhetorics as such. But the tools that the network used to relay this past differ. CNN repeatedly leaned on Kristallnacht, as if to convey the extent that present-day Germany differs from the nation in 1938 and to show that, as two events, Kristallnacht and the Wall’s opening are diametrically opposed: the two are “contrasting moments in Berlin’s history” (1992); “November 9th is also a day of shame” (1999). This use of Kristallnacht makes sense given the network’s alliance with official perspectives: it shows the previous regime’s culpability, which contrasts with the current government’s (positive) character. This instrumental use of Kristallnacht is fascinating, given that it is used not to showcase why Germany is – or was – “bad,” but to set off that Germany today is “good.” By contrast, NBC only mentions Kristallnacht the once, in 1992. Otherwise, and overall, its evocation of World War II is less overt. When it does offer archival images or even contemporary rhetoric about that past, it does so to demonize Germany or to characterize the nation as a continued threat.

Critically, the two networks make use of the past-as-yardstick in two very different ways. In that way, and at a most basic level, NBC and CNN offer radically different interpretations of history: the past is a foreign country (CNN); the past is prologue that shapes the present (NBC). These remarkably different perspectives are all the more notable given that both networks are owned and operated in the United States.

Conclusion

In this chapter I traced the evolution of anniversary coverage of the Berlin Wall's opening. I described CNN's reporting from 1989 and identified the themes and ideologies embedded within it, namely a reliance on and great trust in U.S. leaders; a conflation between World War II and the Cold War that suggests the two are morally equivalent; a dependence on spoken, rather than visual, rhetoric; and an operative definition of communism as a regime of deprivation.

This chapter then described the 20 years of anniversary coverage that have appeared since, demonstrating the continuity of some themes, such as a reliance on the U.S. government's version of the past and continued invocation of Kristallnacht and Ronald Reagan. The concepts "anniversary as process" and "anniversary as spectacle" were reintroduced and further elaborated, and the anniversary coverage that corresponds to each one described and analyzed. Specifically, I showed how CNN engages and expresses the consumerist component of the spectacle. I closed by discussing the key thematic differences between CNN and NBC and the differing ways that the two networks make use of the past.

Chapter 6: Discussion and conclusion

In the preceding chapters I outlined both CNN's and NBC's 1989 coverage of the opening of the Berlin Wall and anniversary coverage that appeared from 1990 through 2009. Through a close reading, I identified key themes and their attendant ideologies, and traced the process of the channels' construction of the Berlin Wall's opening each year and over time. These descriptive materials address *RQ1: What is the story of the Berlin Wall's opening, and how has it changed over time?* and *RQ2: What are the ideologies circulated by the original and anniversary coverage?*

For NBC, I found that the 1989 coverage's key themes repeated in anniversary coverage: Germans as a threat; the debasement of communists; and an operative definition of freedom as the freedom to buy. Importantly, however, I demonstrated that despite the endurance of these themes, the story of the Berlin Wall's opening changed dramatically over time, in ways that manifested at the broadest levels in terms of anniversary as process and anniversary as spectacle. I also outlined significant omissions, including women's unemployment and xenophobic attacks on groups other than Jews. To explain some of the most notable shifts and silences in the anniversary reportage, I looked to cultural, social, and economic changes in the United States. This level of analysis answered *RQ3: Why do these shifts and omissions happen?*

Establishing the themes embedded in CNN's coverage was more difficult because of the limited 1989 programming available. However, based on the materials secured, I found that in 1989 CNN committed to perpetuating an uncritical, U.S. governmental perspective, which persisted throughout the anniversary coverage. This commitment to the government's point of view relayed trust in U.S. officials and emphasized their wisdom and trustworthiness.

I identified the typologies of anniversary-as-process and anniversary-as-spectacle, which I refined further in this section. I charted the escalation of hypermediacy and explained how this

quality further promoted capitalist ideology. Finally, I discussed the significance of Ronald Reagan, the figure who appears most frequently in the channel's anniversary reporting.

All told, the results suggests that, while seemingly engaging questions of global and diplomatic value, American television news covered the Berlin Wall's anniversary to sustain and maintain an ethnocentric construction of the past and the present – images that enshrine and codify widely-held ideas about American power, the American past, and American identity.

I addressed *RQ4, How do the qualities of television naturalize these versions of the past and their accompanying ideologies?*, by looking at the ways that both networks compressed multiple histories through spoken and visual discourses that conflated Nazism, communism, World War II, and the Holocaust. The conflation of these histories served to make each era's internal logic, victims, and aggressors morally equivalent. More broadly, I showed that by juxtaposing past and present scenes, both channels compress time. Such compression is a hallmark of sites of collective memory, as scholars have shown. But I argued that this compression of time, which suggests only a single possible version of the past, naturalizes and renders invisible ideologies embedded in the reporting.

Implications: Forgotten, jumbled, dishonored past

As previously discussed, the media play an important role in communicating and shaping public memory, particularly for those events that took place before our lifetimes. The rise of anniversary as spectacle suggests the degree to which recently-circulated memorial narratives are more reductive and positive and – to the degree that they omit key news elements, like xenophobia and unemployment – fictitious. Paradoxically, as we move further and further away from 1989, the need for nuanced, well-crafted reporting becomes even more essential; the people

relying most on the media for historical information are those who were not yet born when the news first broke, and who learn about U.S. collective memory through the mass media. Instead, the version of 1989 that they can see is a triumphant story of the U.S. that enshrines Ronald Reagan (CNN) and constructs an exuberant story of a successful U.S. “win” for the world.

The collapsing of the distinct histories of communism, Nazism, the Holocaust, and the Wall’s opening have further implications for public memory. As discussed, the coverage seems to imply that the regimes were morally equivalent and that their victims were as well. The visual absence of victims makes it even easier to conflate the distinct histories. Again, however, given that each of these historical periods took place decades ago, clear and nuanced reporting about these pasts is extremely important. Yet, as with the material about the Wall’s opening, the version of the past circulated is largely hegemonic.

Further, there is something morally queasy about equating Nazism with communism, the victims of the one regime with the other. While people suffered under both systems, the ways in which they did differed dramatically. I mention this not to argue for a hierarchy of suffering, but to point out that it seems useful to document the diverse ways in which Nazism and communism enforced obedience and social control, demarcated undesirables, and selected people for torture and murder. Much as each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way, these regimes expressed their versions of evil distinctly – as did their resisters. To blanket together the excesses of these regimes and the effective and ineffective acts of resistance they spawned is more than a disservice and a dishonor to the past – it is bad history.

Lastly, conflating communism with Nazism forecloses conversation about communism. As Mitchell (1994) points out regarding CNN’s Gulf War coverage, in which the network repeatedly likened Saddam Hussein to Hitler, “the main function of this caricature was . . . to

make rational debate and opposition to the war seem like an act of treason” (404). In other words, Nazism, like Hitler, is such a strong, fundamentally anti-American trope that evoking it closes down any possible rational conversation about the benefits of life in the GDR.

There is yet another way in which this anniversary coverage dishonors memory: by so easily invoking a tidy narrative of World War II. As shown, the many references to it are neat and compact: Kristallnacht, shown through archival footage of buildings in flames, or looters riding trucks; a bombed out Reichstag in 1945; Hitler speaking in *Triumph of the Will*; comments by reporters and other sources about lingering bad blood between Germans and other Europeans. Overall, these archival and contemporary discourses construct World War II as a war of destroyed buildings and prolonged resentment instead of gruesome mass slaughter and maiming of millions dead. In that way, they connect to previous versions of widely-circulated American coverage of World War II, which largely failed to picture the “the bizarre damage suffered by the human body in modern war,” as Paul Fussell puts it in his 1989 essay, *The Real War: 1939-1945*. Such seemingly unimportant asides, throwaway metaphors used to provide context to current events, perpetuate Americans’ innocence about World War II’s horrors of body and mind, which in turn sustains the construction of World War II as a “good war.” In this way, although used more for their symbolic than evidentiary value, such archival pictures also function as indexical evidence of a hegemonic version of the past. Taken together, these results show that the multiple realities “produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed” (Carey, 1989:23) by television news include the United States’s place in the world, its identity and values, and 20th-century European wars.

Identity

Previous literature on broadcast anniversary coverage has shown that such programming circulates collective symbols, which in turn activate “social cohesiveness” by reaffirming “collective boundaries” (Ha-Ilan). Anniversary coverage of the Berlin Wall functions in this way for the United States, by insisting on our (imagined) borders as a capitalist country, an “us” and a “them.” NBC indulges this perspective through discourses that repeatedly insist on the East Germans’ otherness. Discourses that reify the value of capitalism – as an Eden, replete with good food and material plenty – confirm these boundaries and affirm our worthiness and the value of our economic system.

Another way that the programming affirms U.S. identity is by constructing an image of the U.S. as morally right. The juxtaposition of the Berlin Wall to World War II, largely thought of as the “good” war, aids in building of this image. Another key strategy through which both channels, but CNN in particular, affirm U.S. identity is by recirculating the scene of Ronald Reagan ordering Gorbachev to “tear down this Wall.” As discussed, this sound bite attests to Reagan’s power, his success at forcing Gorbachev to obey (though it was rulers in the GDR who ultimately opened the Wall), while activating widely-held mythological constructions of American identity.

Germany as the “other world”

Another way in which the reportage perpetuates American identity is through the ideologically-loaded and ethnocentric depictions of Germany and communism. Specifically, in the coverage, communism and Nazism occupy “the other world,” a mythological framework Jack Lule (2001) identifies as one of journalism’s central organizing myths. In the 1989 reportage, and anniversary coverage that appears in later years, the characterization of this other world as childlike, naïve, a

contagion, and a land of deprivation contrasts with the implied characterization of the U.S.: culturally sophisticated, a land of plenty, morally inculpable.

This “other world,” communicated partly by a continued insistence on Germany’s rotten past (and its impact on the present), takes on added meaning after 2003. By this point, the war in Iraq, the search for fabricated weapons of mass destruction, Guantanamo Bay, extraordinary rendition, and the widely circulated images of Abu Ghraib had diminished the U.S.’s moral standing. Given the U.S.’s moral decline, Tom Brokaw’s 9 November 2009 declaration sounds positively ironic: “After all the trauma of the 20th century, most of it self-inflicted, tonight’s celebration could be the next major step for Germany to renew itself as a whole country and as a leading member of the community of nations.” His comments reveal much about the U.S.’s mythological view of itself as righteous among the nations, the arbiter of who gains entry to the “community of nations.” Silenced by this assessment is the U.S.’s own spate of self-inflicted trauma. Given our nation’s position, however, affirming another country’s widely agreed upon “bad” past is essential to maintaining the U.S.’s positive image. While always important, such an image is especially essential given the country’s participation in two bloody, unpopular, and costly wars.

Images

This dissertation began with a discussion of the slipperiness of images. I explored how an iconic picture’s meaning can shift with time, and described the ways that text can affix a specific meaning to a picture. As my work on NBC and CNN shows, this tension exists with television programming as well, though here, the anchors’ and reporters’ words serve to affix specific meanings.

CNN's reprisal of the 1989 images is perhaps the best evidence of the pictures' capacity to change, depending on how they are positioned verbally. In 1990, the pictures are described as celebratory; by 1992, they are used to mark a high point for Germany, from which the nation has declined. Their appearance in 1999 reduces the revelers to would-be souvenir hawkers, while in 2004 the pictures are characterized as a nostalgic moment of history. Finally, by 2009, the images are used solely as the backdrop to and evidence of Reagan's successful triumph over Gorbachev.

Despite these differences, the spoken texts affixed to these pictures keeps them from sliding into dangerous territory, to suggest the toppling of another, Western (capitalist) government, say. These rhetorical restrains include such descriptive, caption-like comments as "the liberation of the East German people" and "The Berlin Wall: the cold, gray, concrete slab that imprisoned millions, the Berlin Wall came down." These comments legitimize the otherwise chaotic and dangerous images of massive acts of civil disobedience and chaotic outpouring of emotion – dangerous events for any government. Without these explanations, the crowds might easily seem too powerful, too dangerous – as, for instance, CNN shows a crowd of protesters can be in 1992. To explain what is at stake for such pictures, and why the networks need corral them in such a way – in other words, to provide an explanation for these acts of iconoclasm, in addition to Western culture's prevailing image-anxiety – one needs to recall the power that we vest television images with: the capacity to change public opinion or initiate mass action.

The selection of these frequently circulated pictures, mostly of individuals knocking at the Wall as if taking it down by hand, also deserves special attention. As previously discussed, iconic images tend to accord with established, hegemonic ideologies. The archival pictures that are frequently rebroadcast suggest the extent to which individual East Germans longed for

“freedom,” and worked against the oppressive, communist “Wall,” a narrative that fits with established anti-communist notions. In their circulation in later years, even once communists had enjoyed a resurgence, they sustain the notion of communists’ unpopularity – though the real story is far more complex and dynamic. By highlighting individuals, these pictures also suggest the role of the singular person in taking down the Wall, which fits with an American version of the past: that individuals make history. Relatedly, this point of view suggests that each person has the power to transform her situation, despite the role that heredity and luck play in ‘making it’ and social mobility’s glacial rate of change (Friedman, 2014:40-42).

The archive and The Archive

These results suggest implications for what I term the archive and The Archive. The archive refers to the televised story of the Berlin Wall. As my exploration of the 1989 coverage shows, the newsbreaking reportage is robust and contains many scenes and tropes that have not been circulated in the years since. The networks’ selectivity is fascinating, and comparing the archive to the materials that do circulate forces the question of why and how an archive functions within the mass media, particularly in the early years after the event, when memory tropes are first established. There are people who have made these selections, and who consistently chose to re-screen some images and omit others. But when we see anniversary footage the archive behind these selections is invisible, and thus the omitted materials are easily forgotten and avoided. This topic, which can be investigated by examining media content or through interviews with media workers, is ripe for future research.

The term The Archive refers to the well of archival images within American televisual discourse and, at an even broader level, visual discourse writ large. This is Allan Sekula’s (1984)

“shadow archive,” which “encompasses an entire social terrain.... The general, all-inclusive archive necessarily contains both the traces of the visible bodies of heroes, leaders, moral exemplars, celebrities, and those of the poor, the diseased, the insane, the criminal, the nonwhite, the female, and all other embodiments of the unworthy ” (10). Given its frequent circulation in television news and other media, Berlin Wall anniversary coverage is a significant piece of this Archive, as are well-trodden and frequently circulated images of World War II, Kristallnacht, and for that matter Vietnam. As this study shows, the repetition of Berlin Wall anniversary coverage delimits the celebrities and exemplars – Reagan, capitalism, commodities – from “the unworthy:” – communists and communism, Nazis.

But the images activated and circulated by Berlin Wall anniversary coverage are only singular pieces from the complex and voluminous archival troves mostly invisible to viewers. To some degree, I am speaking about the silencing effect iconic images have on other pictures: those images help us remember, but as Barbie Zelizer (1998) pointed out, they also help us to forget. I also mean to point out that this study has shown that The Archive of Berlin Wall-related circulating icons represents just the tip of a vast network of archives, rarely seen and little known. Although ideological influences are one reason that some pictures are omitted, others are little seen because of difficulties accessing archives and—especially in the case of an NBC News—because the program’s length demands selection and omission.

Lastly, examining the 1989 archive provides the opportunity to introduce new images into the anniversary vernacular. Such little seen pictures startle the established narrative and disturb the ideologies that travel along with it. In digging up this widely agreed upon history, these pictures demand, by virtue of their unfamiliarity, greater and more thoughtful explanation and reporting on past events. As an example, I submit the image of two people walking through

the death strip to hand flowers to East German border guards, which NBC News broadcast on 10 November. This startling image showcases bravery, strategy, and civil disobedience, qualities that East Germans and others agitating for change exhibited as they planned for and executed mass struggles for greater openness and true freedom, and whose corresponding narratives are largely invisible amid Berlin Wall anniversary icons today.

The spectacle, Debord (effectively) argued, will eat you. Alive. And from within. The only way out is to forge an “active, creative, and imaginative practice, in which individuals create their own ‘situations,’ their own passionate existential events, fully participating in the production of everyday life” (Best & Kellner, 1999:142). In other words: be an active spectator. Open the archive.

Limitations

Among this study’s limitations is the difficulty of accessing CNN’s material prior to 1994. As a result, the memorial tropes, themes, and ideologies established and circulated through those years may not fully reflect all of the relevant programming. Another limitation is the number of days for which archival footage is unavailable for both NBC and CNN. As previously discussed, television archives are often incomplete, making their investigation quite difficult. Here, numerous dates were not available because the archive did not contain the broadcasts, or because CNN preempted many nights of regular programming with special coverage of presidential elections, the Gulf War, or other events. While this preempting makes data sparse, and research more difficult, it also attests to CNN’s style of news delivery: a continued insistence on rerunning the same news, and an obsession with liveness. In that way, this limitation is also revelatory of CNN as an object of study. Finally, as discussed at length in chapter three, this close reading was highly inductive and subjective and its results thus are not generalizable.

Future research

This study sets up a number of future areas for research. The assessment of the news's anniversary motifs provides a baseline on which to see how the Berlin Wall is commemorated through other media, such as film and videogames. Such research would establish the extent to which U.S. television news established and maintains a singular version of memorial tropes and the degree to which this visual and ideological accounting extends into other areas.

This study also prompts future cross-cultural research. The events of 9 November 1989 were broadcast around the world. Compared with the U.S., how did other nations' television news cover the Wall's opening? What ideologies did these broadcasts circulate? To what extent do other countries continue to commemorate the Wall's anniversary? What kinds of images are repeated, omitted, and introduced? Such follow-up research might compare communist nations' coverage (such as the former USSR, the Czech Republic) or, alternatively, examine how other European countries, such as the U.K. and France, covered the events. Given the different television news systems in these nations – the U.K., for instance, provides significant government support to the BBC – these studies may also shed additional light on how ideological systems influence anniversary reporting.

References

- Adoni, H. & Maine. S. 1984. Media and the social construction of reality.
Communication Research, v. 11, n. 3, p. 323-340.
- Amdur, M. & Bell, N. (1994). The boundless Ted Turner: road to globalization.
Broadcasting & Cable, 124(15): 34.
- Anden-Papadopoulos, K. & Pantti, M. (eds.) 2011. Amateur images and global news.
Bristol, United Kingdom: Intellect.
- Anderson, S. (2001). History TV and popular memory. In *Television Histories*, Edgerton
G. & Rollins P. (Eds.). Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 19-36.
- Anonymous. (1991). With Persian Gulf war over, CNN ratings plummet. *The Sun*. 13
March: 3D.
- Associated Press. (1989). 'Cosby,' NBC remain atop Nielsens. *Orlando Sentinel*, 16 November.
- Bacevich, A.J. (2008). He told us to go shopping. Now the bill is due. *The Washington
Post*, 4 October. Retrieved from [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-
dyn/content/article/2008/10/03/AR2008100301977.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/03/AR2008100301977.html)
- Bennett, W.L., Lawrence, R.G., and Livingston, S. (2006). None dare call it torture:
Indexing and the limits to press independence in the Abu Ghraib scandal. *Journal of
Communication*, 56(3), 467-485.
- Bennett, W.L., & Lawrence, R.G. (1995). News icons and the mainstreaming of social
change. *Journal of Communication*, 45(3): 20-39.
- Best, S. & Kellner, D. (1999). Debord, cybersituations, and the interactive spectacle. *SubStance*,
28(3): 129-156.

- Bolter, J.D. & Grusin, R.A. (2000). *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Braunthal, G. (2009). *Right-wing extremism in contemporary Germany*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Brewer, P.R. 'Science: what's it up to?' *The Daily Show* and the social construction of science. *International Journal of Communication*, 7: 452-470.
- Broomberg, A. (2014). Interview. 6 March 2014.
- Brothers, C. (1997). *War and Photography: A Cultural History*. TK: Routledge.
- Bumiller, E. (2009). Defense chief lifts ban on pictures of coffins. *The New York Times*, 26 February. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/27/washington/27coffins.html?_r=0
- Carey, J. (1989). *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Castleman, H., & Podrazik, W.J. (2010). *Watching TV: Six Decades of American Television*. 2nd Ed. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Connerton, P. (2008). Seven types of forgetting. *Memory Studies*, 1(1): 59-71.
- Cotter, C. (2001). Discourse and media. In *The handbook of discourse analysis*, Schiffrin, Tannen, & Hamilton (Eds.), Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 416-436.
- Cottrell, C. (2013). In Berlin, a Protest to Keep What Remains of the wall. *The New York Times*, 4 March. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/05/world/europe/protesters-want-last-of-berlin-wall-to-stand.html>.
- Couldry, N. (2003). *Media rituals: A Critical Approach*. London: Routledge.

- Culbert, D. (2001). Memories of 1945 and 1963: American television coverage of the end of the Berlin Wall, November 9, 1989. In *Television Histories*, Edgerton G. & Rollins P. (Eds.), Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 230-243.
- Debord, G. (1967). *Society of the Spectacle*. Retrieved 10 May 2014 from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/debord/society.htm>
- DeLuca, K.M. & Demo, A.T. (2001). The imagining of nature and erasing class and race: Carleton Watkins, John Muir, and the construction of wilderness. *Environmental History*, 6(4): 541-560.
- Demo, A.T. (2007). The Afterimage: immigration policy after Elián. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 10(1): 27-49.
- Depillis, L. (2013). Panera's pay-as-you-go pricing experiment failed. Here's how they could fix it. *Washington Post*, 14 July. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/07/14/down-with-price-tags-heres-how-to-profit-when-people-pay-what-they-want/>
- Domke, D., Perlmutter, D., & Spratt, M. The primes of our times? An examination of the 'power' of visual images. *Journalism*, 3(2): 131-159.
- Doty, M. (2000). Souls on ice. Poets.org. Retrieved 18 February 2014 from <http://www.poets.org/poetsorg/text/souls-ice>
- Drechsel, B. (2010) The Berlin Wall from a visual perspective: comments on the construction of a political media icon. *Visual Communication*, 9(1): 3-24.
- Edy, J.A. (2006) *Troubled pasts: news and the collective memory of social unrest*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Fiske, J. (1989). *Understanding Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Finnegan, C.A., & Kang, J. (2004). 'Sighting' the public: iconoclasm and public sphere theory. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90(4): 377-402.
- Fisher, P. (2010). Women and employment in East Germany: the legacy of German equality. *The Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law*, 32(4): 401-409.
- Friedman, B.J. (2014). What's in a name? Everything. *The Atlantic*, July/August, 40-42.
- Flournoy, D.M. & Stewart, R.K. (1997). *CNN: Making News in the Global Market*. New Barnet, United Kingdom: University of Luton Press.
- Fussell, P. (1989). The real war 1939-1945. *The Atlantic*, August. Retrieved 28 June 2014 from <https://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/unbound/bookauth/battle/fussell.htm>
- Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2010). If both opponents "extend hands in peace" – Why don't they meet? Mythic metaphors and cultural codes in the Israeli peace discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 9(3), 449-468.
- Gilchrist, K. (2010). "Newsworthy" Victims? Exploring differences in Canadian local press coverage of missing/murdered Aboriginal and White women. *Feminist Media Studies*, 10(4): 373-390.
- Goedicke, A. (2006). Firms and fortune: the consequences of privatization and reorganization. In *After the Fall of the Wall: Life Courses in the Transformation of East Germany*, Martin Diewald, Anne Goedicke, and Karl Ulrich Mayer (Eds.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Goethe Institute.(n.d.) Mauerreise: The Wall in the world. Retrieved from http://www.goethe.de/ges/prj/mar/pro/flyer/flyer_goethe.pdf

- Goldberg, R. & Goldberg, G.J. (1990). *Anchors: Brokaw, Jennings, Rather and the Evening News*. New York: Birch Lane Press.
- Gozzi Jr., R. 1999. *The Power of Metaphor in the Age of Electronic Media*. Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Guskin, E., Jurkowitz, M., & Mitchell, A. (2013). Network: by the numbers. State of the News Media 2013: An Annual Report on American journalism. Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. Retrieved 18 February from <http://stateofthemedias.org/2013/network-news-a-year-of-change-and-challenge-at-nbc/network-by-the-numbers/>
- Ha-Ilan, N. (2001). Images of history in Israel television news: the territorial dimension of collective memories, 1987-1990. In Edgerton G.R. & Rollins P. (Eds.), *Television Histories*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. (1992). *On collective memory*. L.A. Coser, (Ed.) (L.A. Coser, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1952, 1941).
- Hallin, D.C. (1993). *We Keep America On Top of the World: Television Journalism and the Public Sphere*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Harp, D., Harlow. S., & Loke, J. (2013). The symbolic annihilation of women in globalization discourse: The same old story in U.S. newsmagazines. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 21(5), 263-277.
- Herman, E. & Chomsky, N. "A propaganda model," in M.G. Durham & D.M. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies: keywords*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 257-294.

- Horner, J. (2011). Clogged systems and toxic assets: News metaphors, neoliberal ideology, and the United States 'Wall Street bailout' of 2008. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 10(1), 29-49.
- Human Rights Watch. (1995). "*Germany for Germans:*" *xenophobia and racist violence in Germany*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Ibrahim, D. (2010). The framing of Islam on network news following the September 11th attacks. *International Communication Gazette*, 72(1): 111-125.
- Ibrahim, D. (2003). Framing of Arabs and Muslims After September 11th: A Close Reading of Network News. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: where old and new media collide*. New York: NYU Press.
- Jensen, R.E., Doss, E.F., & Ivic, R. (2011). Metaphorical invention in early photojournalism: *New York Times* coverage of the 1876 Brooklyn Theater fire and the 1911 Shirtwaist Factory fire. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 28(4), 334-352.
- Juhn, C. & Potter, S. Changes in labor force participation in the United States. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(3): 27-46.
- Keith, S. (2012). Forgetting the last big war: collective memory and liberation images in an off-year anniversary. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(2): 204-222.
- Keith, S. (2010). Collective memory and the end of Occupation: remembering (*and forgetting*) the liberation of Paris in images. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 17(3): 134-146.
- Kellner, D. (1992). *The Persian Gulf War*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Kitch, C. (2002). Anniversary journalism, collective memory, and the cultural authority to tell the story of the American past. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 36(1), 44-67.

- Kitch, C. (1999). Twentieth-century tales: newsmagazines and American memory. *Journalism and Communication Monographs*, 1(2): 119-155.
- Kitch C. & Hume, J. (2008). *Journalism in a culture of grief*. New York: Routledge.
- Kimmelman, M. (2008). Outrage at cartoons still tests the Danes. *The New York Times*, 20 March. Retrieved 6 March from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/20/books/20cartoon.html?ref=danishcartooncontroversy&r=0>.
- Kress, G.R. & Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: the grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.
- Kusnetz, M. (2007). Network news's perfect storm. *Nieman Reports*, 76-79.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. 3rd Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levine, E. (2008). Distinguishing television: the changing meanings of television liveness. *Media, Culture, & Society*, 30(3): 292-409.
- Li, H. & Lee, C-C. (2013). Remembering Tiananmen and the Berlin Wall: the elite U.S. press's anniversary journalism, 1990 – 2009. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(7), 830-846.
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. & Bryan, A. (2011). Dynamics of memory: commemorating 7/7 in British television news discourse. *Memory Studies*, 4(3).
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. & Bryan, A. (2011b). Recontextualizing participatory journalists' mobile media in British television news: a case study of the live coverage and commemorations of the 2005 London bombings. *Discourse & Communication*, 5(1), 23-40.
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2009). *Television Discourse: Analyzing Language in the Media*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Lule, J. (2004). War and its metaphors: news language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003. *Journalism Studies*, 5(2), 179-190.
- Lule, J. (2001). *Daily News, Eternal Stories: The mythological role of journalism*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Machin, D. & Jaworski, A. (2006). Archive video footage in news: creating a likeness and index of the phenomenal world. *Visual Communication*, 5(3): 345-366.
- Manghani, S. (2008). *Image Critique and the Fall of the Berlin Wall*. Intellect Books: Bristol, United Kingdom.
- Marcotte, A. (2013). Is that a nipple on the front page of the *New York Times*? *Slate*, 27 November.
- http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2013/11/27/nipple_on_the_front_page_of_the_new_york_times_now_what_s_that_about_the.html Accessed 15 January 2014.
- McKee, A. (2003). *Textual Analysis: A Beginner's Guide*. London: Sage.
- Mermin, J. (1996). Conflict in the sphere of consensus? Critical reporting on the Panama invasion and the Gulf War. *Political Communication* (13), 181-194.
- Meyers, O. (2002). Still photographs, dynamic memories: a study of the visual presentation of Israel's past in commemorative newspaper supplements. *The Communication Review*, 5(3): 179-205.
- Meyers, O., Zandberg, E., & Neiger, M. (2009). Prime time commemoration: an analysis of television broadcasts on Israel's Memorial Day for the Holocaust and the Heroism. *Journal of Communication* 59, 456-480.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. (2011). *Cloning terror: the war of Images, 9/11 to the present*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Mitchell W.J.T. (1994). *Picture theory: Essays on verbal and visual representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Montgomery, M. (2007). *Discourse of broadcast news: a linguistic approach*. London: Routledge.
- Montague, J. (2012). The third man: The forgotten Black Power hero. *CNN.com*, 25 April. Retrieved 1 March 2014 from <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/04/24/sport/olympics-norman-black-power/>
- Mumby, D., & Spitzak, K. (1991). Ideology and television news: a metaphoric analysis of political stories. In Vande Berg LR & Wenner LA (Eds.), *Television criticism: approaches and applications*. New York: Longman, 313-330.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 9 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 10 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 11 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 12 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 13 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 14 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 15 November.
- NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 17 November.

NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 18 November.

NBC Nightly News (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 10 November.

NBC Nightly News (1990) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 14 November.

NBC Nightly News (1990) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 16 November.

NBC Nightly News (1990) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 17 November.

NBC Nightly News (1992) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 9 November.

NBC Nightly News (1992) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 14 November.

NBC Nightly News (1992) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 25 November.

NBC Nightly News (1994) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 9 November.

NBC Nightly News (1999) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 7 November.

NBC Nightly News (1999) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New

York, 9 November.

- NBC Nightly News (2009) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 8 November.
- NBC Nightly News (2009) television program, National Broadcasting Company, New York, 9 November.
- News Night* (2004) television program, CNN, New York, 8 November.
- News Night* (2004) television program, CNN, New York, 9 November.
- Nickel, H.M. (1991). Women in the GDR: Will renewal pass them by ? *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature & Culture*, 6: 99-107.
- Olin, M. (2013). *Touching Photographs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ott, B.L., Aoki, E., & Dickinson, G. (2011). Ways of (not) seeing guns: presence and absence at the Cody Firearms Museum. *Communication Critical/Cultural Studies*, 8:215-239.
- Parks, L. (2005). *Cultures in orbit: satellites and the televisual*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Perlmutter, D. (2006). Hypericons: famous news images in the internet-digital satellite age. In Messaris P & Humphreys L (Eds.), *Digital Media: Transformations in Human Communication*. New York: Peter Lang, 51-64.
- Postman, N. & Powers, S. (1992). *How to Watch TV News*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Prime News* (1992) television program, CNN, Atlanta, 8 November.
- Prime News* (1992) television program, CNN, Atlanta, 9 November.
- Rollins, P.C. (2001). "Victory at sea: Cold War epic." In Gary Edgerton & Peter C. Rollins (Eds.) *Television Histories: Shaping Collective Memory in the Media Age*. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 103-122.

- Rosenstone RA (1995) *Visions of the past: The challenge of film to our idea of history*.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rubio, P.F. (2001). *A History of Affirmative Action, 1619-2000*. Jackson: University
Press of Mississippi.
- Sallot, L.M. (1990). The man on a white horse: the presidency, persuasion, and myth. *Florida
Communication Journal*, 18(1): 1-8.
- Schmidt, M. (1993). *New Reich: Violent Extremism in Unified Germany and Beyond*.
L.A. Coser, (D. Horch, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Schudson, M. (2011). *The sociology of news*. 2nd Ed. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Schudson, M. (2001). The objectivity norm in American journalism. *Journalism*, 2, 149-170.
- Sekula, A. (1986). The body and the archive. *October*, 39: 3-64.
- Shahzad, F. (2012). Collective memories: a complex construction. *Memory Studies*, 5(4):
378-391.
- Shoemaker, P. (1996). Hardwired for news: using biological and cultural evolution to
explain the surveillance function. *Journal of Communication*, 46(3): 32-47.
- Shoemaker, P. & Reese, S. (2014) *Mediating the message in the 21st century: a media
sociology perspective* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Somerstein, R. (2014). Newspapers commemorate September 11th: A cross-cultural
investigation. Advance online publication. *Journalism*. DOI:
10.1177/1464884913519033
- Sontag, S. (2002). Looking at war: photography's view of devastation and death. *The New
Yorker*, 9 December. Accessed 13 March from
<http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2002/12/09/021209crat_atlarge?currentPage=all>

- Sontag, S. (1978). *Illness as Metaphor*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Spratt, M. (2008). When police dogs attacked: iconic news photographs and construction of history, mythology, and political discourse. *American Journalism*, 25:2: 85-105
- Stahl, R. (2013). What the drone saw: the cultural optics of unmanned war. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 67(5): 659-674.
- Stanley J (2012) Women's absence from news photos: the role of tabloid strategies at elite and non-elite newspapers. *Media, Culture & Society* 34(8): 979-998.
- Studio 360 (2009) television program, CNN, New York, 9 November.
- Sturken M (2007) *Tourists of history: Memory, kitsch, and consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tagg, J. (1988). *The Burden of Representation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Taylor, P.M. (2001). "The first flawed rough drafts of history." In Gary Edgerton & Peter C. Rollins (Eds.) *Television Histories: Shaping Collective Memory in the Media Age*. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.
- Thompson, R. (2012). Syracuse, NY. Lecture.
- Trappe, H. (2006). Lost in transformation? Disparities of gender and age. From *After the Fall of the Wall: Life Courses in the Transformation of East Germany*, Martin Diewald, Anne Goedicke, and Karl Ulrich Mayer (Eds.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Traub, J. (1981). The nonstop news network. *Columbia Journalism Review* 20(2):58-61.
- Trim, R. (2007). *Metaphor Networks: The Comparative Evolution of Figurative Language*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Twomey, J.L. (2004). Searching for a legacy: the Los Angeles Times, collective memory

- and the 10th anniversary of the 1992 L.A. “riots.” *Race, Gender & Class*, 11(1): 75-93.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York: Free Press.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (n.d.). Kristallnacht. Retrieved 3 May 2014 from <http://www.ushmm.org/research/research-in-collections/search-the-collections/bibliography/kristallnacht>
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis, in *The handbook of discourse analysis*, Schiffrin Tannen, & Hamilton (Eds.), Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Van Ginneken (1998). *Understanding Global News: A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Vande Berg, L.R. (1995). Living room pilgrimages: Television’s cyclical commemoration of the assassination anniversary of John F. Kennedy. *Communications Monographs*, 62(1): 47-64.
- Vande Berg L.R. & Wenner, L.A. (1991). “An introduction to television criticism.” In *Television criticism: Approaches and Applications*, Vande Berg & Wenner (Eds.), New York: Longman, 3-43.
- Vestberg N.L. (2005) Photography as cultural memory: imag(in)ing France in the 1950s. *Journal of Romance Studies* 5(2): 75-90.
- Wasburn, P.C. (2002). *The Social Construction of International News: We’re talking about them, they’re talking about us*. Praeger: Westport, Connecticut.
- White, H. (1987). *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, M. (1987). Ideological analysis and television. In *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled: Television and Contemporary Criticism*. Robert C. Allen (Ed.), 121-151.

- Wineburg, S., Mosborg, S., Porat, D., & Duncan, A. (2007). Common belief and the cultural curriculum: An intergenerational study of historical consciousness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), 40-76.
- With Persian Gulf War over, CNN ratings plummet. (1991, Mar 13). *The Sun* Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/407128091?accountid=14214>
- World View* (1989) television program, National Broadcasting Company, Atlanta and Washington, D.C., 10 November.
- World View* (1990) television program, National Broadcasting Company, Atlanta and Washington, D.C., 9 November.
- World View* (1999) television program, National Broadcasting Company, Atlanta and Washington, D.C., 6 November.
- World View* (1999) television program, National Broadcasting Company, Atlanta and Washington, D.C., 7 November.
- World View* (1999) television program, National Broadcasting Company, Atlanta and Washington, D.C., 8 November.
- World View* (1999) television program, National Broadcasting Company, Atlanta and Washington, D.C., 9 November.
- Younge, G. (2012). The man who raised a black power salute at the 1968 Olympic Games. *The Guardian*, 30 March. Retrieved 10 February from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/mar/30/black-power-salute-1968-olympics>
- Zelizer, B. (2011). Photography, journalism, and trauma. In Zelizer & Allan, eds. *Journalism After September 11* (2nd ed.), New York: Routledge, 48-68.
- Zelizer, B. (2008). Why memory's work on journalism does not reflect journalism's work

on memory. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 79-87.

Zelizer, B (1998) Remembering to forget: Holocaust memory through the camera's eye.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zelizer, B (1995) Reading the past against the grain: The shape of memory studies.

Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 12(2): 214-239.

Zemon, N.D. (2000). *Slaves on Screen: Film and Historical Vision*. Cambridge,

Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

RACHEL SOMERSTEIN

215 University Place, Syracuse, NY 13244-2100 • resomers@syr.edu • (917) 538-4105

EDUCATION

Syracuse University, S.I. Newhouse School for Public Communications, Syracuse, NY

Ph.D. in Mass Communications, 2014

Dissertation: ‘Roaming in the Garden of Freedom:’ Constructions of U.S. ideology, identity, and the past in television news’s anniversary coverage about the Berlin Wall

Certificate in University Teaching

New York University, Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York, NY

M.F.A. in Creative Writing, May 2009

Cornell University, College of Arts and Sciences, Ithaca, NY

B.A. in English and History, *Cum Laude*, with Distinction in All Subjects, May 2004. Columnist for the *Cornell Daily Sun*

Honors Thesis in History: Biennale as Battlefield: MoMA and the CIA at the Venice Biennale, 1948–1956

Lang Prize for best thesis in history or American Studies departments

ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS

Somerstein, R. (2014). The Taste Test: applying Q methodology to aesthetic preference. *Operant Subjectivity*, 37(1/2). doi:10.15133/j.os.2014.006

Somerstein, R. (2014). Newspapers commemorate September 11th: A cross-cultural investigation. Advance online publication. *Journalism*. DOI: 10.1177/1464884913519033

Somerstein, R. (2014). On liminality and loss: A decade of Israeli and Palestinian film. *Visual Studies*, 29(1): 94-98.

Jung, J., **Somerstein, R.**, & Kwon, E. (2012). Should I Scan or Should I Go? Young consumers’ motivations for scanning QR Code advertising. *International Journal of Mobile Marketing*, 7(3), 25-37.

ACADEMIC BOOK REVIEWS

Somerstein, R. (2014). Review of Teresa Bergman’s *Exhibiting Patriotism: Creating and contesting interpretations of American historic sites*. Left Coast Press, 2013. *Visual Studies*, DOI:10.1080/1472586X.2014.887317

Somerstein, R. (2014). Review of Barbara Mittler’s *Continuous Revolution: Making Sense of Cultural Revolution Culture*, Harvard East Asian Monographs, 2013. *Visual Studies*, 29(1): 94-98.

Somerstein, R. (2013). Review of Margaret Olin's *Touching Photographs*, Chicago University Press, 2012. *Visual Anthropology*, 26(5), 460-462.

PEER-REVIEWED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Somerstein, R. "Newspapers Commemorate September 11th: A Cross-Cultural Investigation." Paper presented at the Popular Culture Association, Washington, D.C., Mar. 2013.

Somerstein, R. "The Fractured Media Landscape: Photography and the future of collective memory." Paper presented at the National Communication Association, Orlando, Nov. 2012.

Somerstein, R., Wright, A., & Kalan, M. "The Digital Divide on the Move: Demographic influences on patterns of mobile phone use." Scholar to scholar session at the National Communication Association, Orlando, Nov. 2012.

Somerstein, R., & Kinsey, D. "The Taste Test." Paper presented at the International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity Conference, Pittsburgh, Sept. 2012.

Jung, J., **Somerstein, R.,** & Kwon, E. "Should I Scan or Should I Go? Young consumers' motivations for scanning QR Code advertising." Poster session at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago, Aug. 2012.

Somerstein, R. "The Image, Written: Using Photography and Mixed Media to Teach Nonfiction Writing." Organized and chaired panel; presented paper at the Association for Writing Programs National Conference, Chicago, Mar. 2012.

Somerstein, R. "The Image, Written: Using Photography to Teach Writing." Organized and chaired panel; presented paper at the Society for Photographic Education Northeast Conference, Providence, Nov. 2010

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Syracuse University

Newhouse School of Public Communications, Syracuse, NY September 2013 – May 2014

Research assistant, Department of Mass Communications

Assist Professor Robert J. Thompson with research projects on television and popular culture.

Write research briefs and meet weekly.

Syracuse University

Newhouse School of Public Communications Summer 2011, Summer 2012

Research assistant, Department of Mass Communications

Assisted Dennis Kinsey with summer research projects on aesthetics. Administered Q sorts, explained methodology, recruited subjects, analyzed results. Conducted literature reviews and wrote up results.

D.E. Shaw and Company, New York, NY

December 2007 – February 2009

Researcher, Resource Development

Redesigned, reorganized, and rewrote materials for department's online newsletter. Researched banks, private equity firms, and rival hedge funds; synthesized research into one-page snapshots for internal use; researched and designed organizational maps of competitor firms. Executed search algorithms to identify and recruit high-level (C-suite) talent.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Syracuse University

Newhouse School for Public Communications, Syracuse, NY September 2011 – May 2012

Adjunct Lecturer, Goldring Arts Journalism Master's Program

Taught AJP 606, critical and feature writing, and AJP 611, the literature of art journalism, to 16 graduate students. Created syllabi, grading criteria, writing exercises, and assignments.

New York University, Stern School of Business, New York, NY January 2010 – May 2011

Adjunct Lecturer, Management Communication

Taught discourse section of Business & its Publics (C40.0125), part of NYU's social impact core, to 20 undergraduates. Covered critical thinking and writing skills as well as economic and environmental sustainability, globalization, and social entrepreneurship. Created lessons for use across all 30 sections of the course, required of all Stern freshmen. Mentored students one-on-one to improve their writing.

Lehman College, Bronx, NY

January 2009 – January 2010

Adjunct Lecturer, Department of English

Taught LEH 100: Freshman Seminar, ENG 135: remedial freshman composition; ENG 110, ENG 120: basic and advanced freshman composition; and ENW 210: creative writing. Also taught summer ACT reading/writing workshops to high-school students and adult learners seeking to pass the entrance exam to Lehman College. Supervised two assistant teachers; developed intensive reading/writing course; advised freshmen on long-term academic plans. Designed syllabi, writing exercises, grading criteria, midterms, and final exams. Completed training in teaching English language learners.

New York University, New York, NY

September 2007 – December 2008

Adjunct Instructor, Department of Creative Writing

Taught introduction to creative writing seminar to 15 undergraduates; create syllabus, writing exercises, and grading criteria.

WRITING, EDITING, AND JOURNALISM EXPERIENCE

Next American City, Philadelphia, PA

December 2009 – January 2011

Staff Writer

Wrote features, city focus, and front-of-the-book stories about urban development and the relationship between cities and cultural institutions; blogged about sustainability initiatives, housing, and public transportation. Live-blogged from urban planning, women's health, and real estate conferences.

Freelance Editor and Writer, Brooklyn and Syracuse, NY

August 2004 – Present

Writing on art and politics:

- Essays and reviews appearing in *AfterImage: The Journal of Media Arts and Cultural Criticism*, *ARTnews*, *Guernica: A Magazine of Art & Politics*, *ARTINFO*, and *Architectural Record*, *Women's Review of Books*.

Magazine reporting:

- Art criticism appearing in *Art + Auction* and *Aspect: The Chronicle of New Media Art*.
- Essays on literature and book reviews in *Jbooks.com*.
- Urban planning reporting for *n+1*.
- Generalist reporting for *PBS.org*, *RL Magazine*, *Syracuse University Magazine*, and *Wired*.

Government writing:

- Research, report, and write articles for the Department of Housing and Urban Development publications *Breakthroughs*, *Evidence Matters*, *The Edge*, and *ResearchWorks*.

Corporate writing:

- Develop, write, edit, and proofread mission statements, client-relations and promotional material for Web and print. Clients include the Brooklyn Arts Council, BCMS Corporate, Dillon Thompson, FiveGates Healing, and Trickle Up.

Books:

- Contributor, *The Where, The Why, and the How* (Chronicle Books, 2014).
- Writer and researcher, *American City X: Syracuse After the Master Plan* and *New Public Works* (Princeton Architectural Press, 2013).
- Development editor, *The Art of Choosing* (Twelve Publishing, 2010).
- Copyeditor, *Brooklyn Modern* (Rizzoli, 2008).

Fiction writing:

- "A Brief Personal History of Anti-Semitism," *Border Crossing*, fall 2013.

Carnegie-Knight Initiative

The Future of Journalism Education, New York, NY Summer 2006; Summer 2007

News21 Production Manager

Copyedited, fact-checked, and proofread print and multimedia features. Produced stories in content management system.

ARTnews, New York, NY

August 2004 – June 2006

Editorial Assistant

Wrote national and international news stories, book and exhibition reviews, and artist profiles. Supervised three interns. Translated newspaper stories, press releases, and other documents to English from French. Managed contributor payments. Tracked flow of galley through editorial department; proofread each after every stage of production. Assisted with photo research.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

Guest lecturer, race, gender, and the media course, Syracuse University, Newhouse School of Public Communications. Lecture on stereotypes of Jews in the media. 2011, 2012.

New York Foundation for the Arts: Artist's Roundtable. Panelist, Brooklyn, Nov. 2010

Visiting Critic, Syracuse University Graduate School of Visual and Performing Arts, Dec. 2010

GRANTS

2013

Research Grant, Newhouse School of Public Communications
\$1,060 for archival research of Israeli and Venezuelan anniversary coverage of 9/11

2012

Research Grant, Newhouse School of Public Communications:
\$500 for expanding digital divide study to four additional campuses

HONORS

2013

Catherine L. Covert Research Award for top student paper in mass communications
Feinberg Dissertation Support Award
Certificate in University Teaching

2012

Syracuse University Graduate Fellowship
Society for Photographic Education Scholarship

2011

Finalist for *Glimmer Train*'s April 2011 "Family Matters" Award

2010

New York University Professional Development Grant
Friend of SEEK for outstanding contributions to Lehman College's SEEK Department

2008

Finalist for *Glimmer Train*'s August 2008 Very Short Fiction Award

2004

Lang Prize for Best Thesis in History or American Studies departments
Einhorn Discovery Grant
College of Arts and Sciences Research Award

SERVICE WORK

Salt City DISHES, Syracuse, NY

October 2010 - January 2013

Founder and co-organizer

Founded and co-organized DISHES, a nonprofit community organization that hosts a community dinner, charges \$10 for admission, and donates the funds to a public art project chosen by the audience. Solicited project proposals, organized four dinners for 200 people each, secured donations of food and beverages from local businesses, and raised more than \$4,000 for community art projects. Secured a \$2,740 What-If Neighborhood Mini Grant from the Gifford

Foundation to pay for space rental, graphic design, and food. Wrote press releases and led the organization's social media presence. Managed one public-relations intern. Press appearances include *Bridge Street*, the morning news program; the *Syracuse Post-Standard*; and *The Good Life: Central New York Magazine*.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Reviewer, International Communications Association, Journalism Studies division | 2013 |
| Reviewer, International Communications Association, Visual Communications division | 2013 |
| Reviewer, <i>New Media & Society</i> | 2013 |
| Founding member, Mass Communications Pop Culture Interest Group | 2013 |
| Member, Alexia chair search committee, Syracuse University | 2012-2013 |
| Member, Syracuse Public Arts Task Force, Syracuse, NY | 2010-2012 |

SKILLS

Proficient in Adobe Suite, Content Management Systems, FinalCut Pro X, MSOffice, Photoshop, Quark, Sharepoint, Visio, and Wordpress. Proficient in French, Hebrew, and Spanish.