

美英新闻价值观比较

2002-01-01

作者：Tunku Varadarajan

关键词：新闻价值观 海外传真 | 阅读：504次 |

倘若有一天我到了地狱，我想我会喝英国的咖啡，法国的卫生洁具，狱卒要是德国的，而看报则要看美国的。（和我一样，读者会想到，在那里是看不到华尔街日报的。）

我把这些主题搁置起来留待审查，但是建议只留下报纸这个主题来好好讨论一下——这倒不仅仅是因为其他的主题没有太大的可争议性，或者没有多少讨论的价值。

本周有一个话题，从新闻学的角度来看，还是颇有些指导意义的。这个话题的中心是Laura Landro，是这家报纸的高级编辑。周二，日报的专题刊载了一篇Landro的题为“良药敌不过烂新闻”的文章，在文中，她批评一组西雅图时报的系列文章，认为那是一种纯粹奔着普利策奖去的东西。

在谈到这篇以一家医院的所谓玩忽职守问题为主题的报道时，她说：“它更应该被当作是一种反面教材，暴露媒体是怎样地在传播有关生物医学研究的偏见和误导的信息，它不是可以角逐大奖的作品。”

Landro的这篇文章一经发表，反应也是立竿见影的，尤其是来自西雅图时报方面（这个你完全可以想象到的）。纽约时报节选了这篇文章，但是把它包装成了一篇更多地讨论到美国新闻学的东西，标题为“大奖将近，竞选报纸相互攻击”。

纽约时报这篇文章的作者Felicity Barringer在她的第一段时，将矛头指向了Landro的明显的失礼（Barringer把这称作是“极为不寻常的举动”）：公开指责西雅图时报的这个系列报道的发表日期“仅在普利策奖揭晓前不到一个月的时间里”。后来Barringer又说到：“对于许多从事新闻报道的人来说，这一挑战最让人惊异的就是它到来的及时性。”

作为一名曾任职于英国报纸的记者，我发现Barringer有关这一事件的行为颇为引人注目。刚开始，并没有什么很新鲜诱人的东西——对于一名记者来说——不过是在版面上一家报纸攻讦另一家罢了。但是这篇报道背后所隐藏的主题是，

Landro打破了她所从属的那个圈子的行规，几近疯狂残酷地攻击她的记者同行，而这一切就发生在她们要角逐大奖的那一刻。也许是我太幼稚了，但这恰恰表明一个问题，对于一个不公正的竞争者，人们应该保持警觉并给予还击吗？

在这篇针对Landro的批评的背后，实际上要表达的是一种深深的信仰，那就是一个记者的言辞，一经登载到一份严肃的报纸上面，即有了一定的圣洁性。这一观点在美国记者群中又得到了发扬光大，美国的记者群体并没有那么多的攻讦磨擦，而是一个类似于僧侣似的团体。而英国作法则就大相径庭了，在英国，记者们把自己叫做“爬格子的”。如果一个英国记者表示，仅仅因为某报的文章是出于获奖的目的而写，而去对这篇文章横加指责，这样做会有失公允的话，那么他将会受到很多人嘲笑的。

没有人会认为英国报纸天生就比美国的要优越多少。在许多方面，其实恰恰相反。他们随意使用这种那样的消息，他们的消息来源——甚至是高价购得的那种——经常是出自于一些不显明身份的来源。

英国报纸通常无视事实与观点之间的界限，并且那些小报——你是爱它们也好，恨它们也罢——似乎经常不能分辨什么是事实，什么是虚构，什么是报道，什么是鼓吹。但是在这个行业的最顶端——比如每日电讯，卫报等报刊，他们的文章质量就相当精良，而且总是那么生动。这或许是因为，作为国家性报刊，他们当然有着大城市的大家风范，而不带丝毫的小地方的底气不足，而这一点正是许多美国报纸的特点。形成他们生动笔法的另一个原因，就在于与美国同行相比，英国作者们更少受到客观性法则的限制。

客观性，事实上已经成为了美国报纸的一种迷信。昨天我与现已停刊的Encounter杂志编辑，同时也是《新闻语言》作者的Melvin Lasky通了电话，他对这个问题提出强烈的抨击。Lasky先生住在柏林，他这样描述这种美国式做法对德国报纸的影响。“1945年，德国人是美国的简单教条的追随者，即新闻应该是客观的，而不是主观的，事实与评论之间应有一个明确的分界，以及诸如此类的观念。这样做的结果，只能是让报纸变得乏味。那是德国报纸的一段死沉期，直到数年以后，他们又回归到他们的老传统。”

据Lasky先生所讲，典型的美国消息通常是这样报道的：林博富（音译）喝着第二杯茶。他望着窗外。他看着他的塑料茶杯。这，在他的手中，就是印度尼西亚成千上万的陶瓷茶杯制造命运。而英国报纸就不会这样，他们不会提到印度尼西亚（当然也不会提到第二杯茶），除非是这成千上万的制造商被屠杀了。

那么最好的中间状态应该是什么样子呢？Lasky先生认为，就应该像法兰克福的Allgemeine Zeitung那样，正如其他一些德国报纸一样，它已经摆脱了“美国阴影”。他这样来描述这份报纸，说它“一半是Richard Wagner，一半是Cole Porter”，同时也是“世上最好的”。为什么这样说？因为它既不像英国媒体那样一心盯着华丽而庸俗的娱乐新闻，也不像美国报道界那般一派冷血毫无生气。它信奉一种在事实与评论之间的明智联姻，相信在娱乐读者的同时也能使他受到

请输入您要搜索的关键词



jin 文章 jin 动态

SEARCH»

上一篇 PREVIOUS

MORE»

参与式影像与参与式传播

作者：韩鸿 | 1900-01-01

1999年，世界银行调查每天生活水准不足1美元的6万名贫民，影响他们发展的最大障碍是什么。回答不是食品、住房或医疗卫生，而是自我发声的渠道。[1]如何在媒介生态的建设中，给弱势群体尤其是农村弱势群体一种声音，……

下一篇 NEXT

MORE»

四大传媒上市公司资本结构、财务和

作者：高宗仁 | 2002-01-25

（节选）一、股本结构（一）东方明珠该公司于1994年由上海广播电视发展总公司、上海电视台、上海人民广播电台和上海每周广播电视报组建、成立（已成立的子公司有“东方明珠出租汽车公司”，即将成立的子公司有“东……

动态 NEWS

MORE»

首届中国少数民族地区信息传播 2009-10-13

香港浸会大学第三届普利策新闻 2009-10-03

“中国主张：传播理论本土化的 2009-09-27

第三届“当代中国话语研究”讨 2009-09-27

第九届“新世纪新闻舆论监督研 2009-09-24

教育。换一句话说，它避免了迷信，同时即没有一个占主导地位的教条，又不是完全没有原则。

美国式作派(教条主义)与英国式作派(散漫作风)的最后对照集中体现在纽约邮报上。那里最近的一次争端，起因是一名被澳大利亚开掉的美国编辑抱怨说她之所以被开掉，就是因为她不是澳大利亚人或是英国人——这就给了我们另一个审视比较世界上两大强势报纸文化的机会。(出于分析的目的，我们就姑且把澳大利亚记者也归属到英国伦敦新闻队伍的类别中吧。)

英国学派认为新闻作品的保质期是很短的，只能发挥一种小报的作用，因为它从本质上就是具有分裂性。美国新闻艺术的实践者们会发现今天的邮报已经完全是一块令他们陌生的领地，这一点就不难理解了。英式小报则倾向于追求影响力，不管要为此付出什么样的代价，代价甚至可能高到造成间接的破坏。这种战争状态要求有足够强壮坚韧的士兵，能够在白天趟过险山恶水，到晚上则放下一天的疲累，纵饮开怀。像澳洲人，英国人就是这样。

这样的新闻主义便使得诸如种族，性或是宗教之类的问题全都堆在了那些为某些特殊利益而担忧，那些永远为涉及到某一特定集团圈子的消息的后果而不安的人们面前。英国学派，不管它有些什么样的弊端，它的优势在于挑起冲突。而美国人，相反的就是擅长避免冲突。这就使得美国人总能成为好人，当然。但这是否也能使他们的报纸成为好报呢？

(作者TUNKU VARADARAJAN，华尔街日报副总编辑)

来源：网友提供，中华传媒网编辑Danny编译

Tedium on Deadline

By TUNKU VARADARAJAN

In hell, my coffee would be British, my hygiene French, my jailers German and my newspaper American.

(Readers will assume, as I do, that The Wall Street Journal would not be available there.)

I hang these observations up for scrutiny but propose only to dwell on the subject of newspapers -- and not merely because the other points are too uncontroversial to merit discussion.

An episode this week proves journalisticly instructive. It centers on Laura Landro, a senior editor at this newspaper. On Tuesday, the Journal's features page ran a piece by Ms. Landro titled "Good Medicine, Bad Journalism," in which she criticized a Seattle Times series thought to be in the running for a Pulitzer.

Writing of the series, which focused on alleged malpractice at a hospital, she said: "Rather than racking up prizes, it should be used as a textbook case on how the media can convey biased and misleading information about biomedical research."

The reaction to Ms. Landro's piece was swift, especially (as you might imagine) from the Seattle Times.

The New York Times picked up the story but spun it in a way that says much about American journalism:

"With Prizes Near, Paper Prints Attack on Another's Entry."

Felicity Barringer, who wrote the Times piece, chose to focus in her first paragraph on Ms. Landro's apparent solecism (Ms. Barringer called it a "highly unusual step"): to wit, denouncing the Seattle Times' series "less than a month before the announcement of the Pulitzer Prizes." Later Ms. Barringer again said: "The most startling aspect of the challenge for many journalists was its timing."

As a journalist who once worked for a British newspaper, I found Ms. Barringer's take on the affair rather striking. For a start, there ought to be nothing more delicious -- to a journalist -- than to see the pages of one paper attack those of another. But the underlying thesis of the report was that Ms. Landro had broken the rules of the club to which she belongs by being beastly to her fellow journalists just at the moment when (gasp!) they were up for a prize. I may be naïve, but isn't that precisely the point at which one should kneecap a dubious contender?

Embedded in the criticism angled at Ms. Landro is the belief that a reporter's words, once printed in a serious paper, acquire a near sanctity. This view is further nourished by the sense among American journalists that they belong not to a bruising profession but to a priestly class. How different from the British approach, where reporters, refer to themselves as "hacks." And if a British journalist had suggested that it was somehow not on, mate, to put the boot into another paper's story merely because it was up for an award, he'd have been laughed right out of the pub.

No one would suggest that British newspapers are inherently superior to American ones. In many respects they are quite the opposite. They take liberties with facts, and they rely heavily on unnamed sources, often hanging entire stories -- even highly charged ones -- on a single veiled source.

British newspapers disregard the lines between fact and opinion, and the tabloids -- bless them if you will, or damn them -- often fail to distinguish between fact and fiction, or reporting and advocacy. But

at the top of the scale -- with broadsheets such as the Daily Telegraph or the Guardian -- the writing is often very fine, and invariably lively. This may be because, as national newspapers, they have a certain metropolitan panache, and none of the provincial diffidence that is a hallmark of many American papers. Their liveliness may also owe something to the fact that their writers are less constrained by the Objectivity Police than their American counterparts.

Objectivity, in fact, has become something of a fetish with American papers. Melvin Lasky, the editor of the now defunct Encounter magazine, and author of "The Language of Journalism," was scathing in this regard when I picked his brains over the telephone yesterday. Mr. Lasky lives in Berlin and was describing the effect of American practices on German newspapers. "In 1945," he said, "the Germans were suckers for the simple American credo -- stories should be objective, not subjective, there should be a rigid separation of fact from comment, and all that stuff. You can't do that without producing a very boring newspaper. It was the death of German papers, until years later, when they returned to their own traditions."

According to Mr. Lasky, a typical American story might run like this. Lin Po Foo drank his second cup of tea. He looked through the window. He looked at his plastic teacup. This, in his hands, was the fate of thousands of ceramic teacup manufacturers in Indonesia. A British newspaper, by contrast, wouldn't bother with Indonesia (and certainly not that second cup of tea) unless thousands were being slaughtered.

Where is the golden middle? Mr. Lasky thinks it's in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, which, like some other German papers, has emerged from the "American shadow." He describes the paper as "half Richard Wagner, half Cole Porter," as well as "the best in the world." Why? Because it veers neither toward meretricious entertainment, as the British press does, nor toward the general bloodlessness of American reportage. It believes in a judicious marriage of fact and comment and assumes that it is possible to educate a reader while entertaining him. In other words, it avoids fetishes and has neither a prevailing dogma nor a complete absence of one.

This last contrast between the American way (dogmatic) and the British (insouciant) is being played out at the New York Post. A recent spat there -- in which an American editor, fired by the paper's Australian editor in chief, complained that she was let go because she's not Australian or British -- provides another opportunity to compare the world's two great newspaper cultures. (For the purposes of analysis, let us treat Australian journalists as being a species of Fleet Street Hack.)

The British school regards journalistic output as perishable, and a tabloid hack's role as essentially disruptive. It stands to reason that an American practitioner of the journalistic arts might find the Post today to be unfamiliar terrain. British-style tabloids tend to go for impact, at whatever cost, and the cost is often high in terms of collateral damage. These battle conditions require tough, leathery soldiers who will wade through minefields in the daytime and drink the fatigue away in the evening. Ergo Aussies and Brits.

This kind of journalism is stacked against those who worry about special interests, and who are forever nervous about the consequences of a story on a particular group, be it ethnic, sexual or religious. The British school, whatever its failings, is good at giving offense. Americans, by contrast, are good at not giving it. This makes them better people, for sure. But does it make their papers better?

(责任编辑:)

[收藏本文](#)

！ 打印本页 ！ 关闭窗口 ！

读者留言

用户名: * 密码: (游客)请在用户名处输入化名, 无需密码

邮箱: * 游客发言需提交邮箱

效验码: * 请输入: 5107

[发表评论](#) 评论内容: 不能超过250字, 需审核后才会公布, 请自觉遵守互联网相关政策法规。

[▲ 返回首页](#)

[传媒资讯网](#) | [传媒学术网](#) | [传媒考研网](#) | [传媒博客](#) | [传媒社区](#) | [传媒书店](#)

| [关于我们](#) | [会员注册](#) | [交换链接](#) | [联系我们](#) | [法律声明](#) | [广告服务](#) |



© 2001-2009 中华传媒网版权所有 京ICP061016
Copyright © 2001-2009 MediaChina.net All Rights Reserved