

The Role of the Media in International Relations: From the CNN Effect to the Al –Jazeera Effect

Filiz Coban¹

Abstract

International networks foster solidarity within an information audience by creating virtual communities. Namely CNN, BBC and Al-Jazeera are increasing people's awareness in their religion, culture and place in the world. In addition, faster and easily accessible information within global media had triggered the information wars among the states which have changed power politics. This article argues that the involvement of the media in international relations signifies interdependence and mutual exploitation between the media and politics. In this context, with a specific emphasis on the concept of 'the CNN effect' and 'the Al-Jazeera effect', it shows how the media have become integral parts of the world politics, how they have transformed international power struggle and have enabled the rise of the rest against the Western hegemony

Keywords: media; international politics; CNN effect; Al-Jazeera Effect

Introduction

Despite media's unquestioned importance in the conduct of international affairs, it seems that the Studies of International Relations (IR) still fail to address the issue adequately and comprehensively, in addition, less has been done to overcome absence of understanding the communication dimension of international relations. It can be argued that three factors might have played a role to the lack of attention given to the function of media in international relations (Le 2006): a) insufficient abilities to work in several languages; b) the definition of the international media echo whose narrowness can make it difficult to collect a large enough corpus; c) and the international relations approach in which media is considered.

¹Assistant Professor Dr., Department of International Relations, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University. filizzcoban@gmail.com.

The first two factors underline the importance of knowing more than one language to reach different national media reporting on each other's society, in other words, 'the international media echo', the report in one's national media of what is said in another's national media. The third factor suggests that the dominance of realism in traditional International Relations approach has contributed the lack of an improved explanation and understanding of the role of communication and mass media in world affairs. In the classical realist tradition of international politics analysis, the state is considered as the main actor in international arena. Foreign policy should be made by politicians, attuned to the national interest, and free of the influence of extraneous domestic factors such as the news media (Mermin 1999:147). In this realist tradition, which was developed in the 1940s, communication and mass media were not regarded as part of state power, but these were considered as the propaganda 'tools' that states used towards 'others' in interstate conflicts in the international arena.

In the 1970s and 1980s, there were new actors, non-state actors and forces, such as multinational groups and corporations in the international arena, particularly in deal with increasing importance of international political economy. Raising transnational's and interdependence theories argued that these multinational actors changed the traditional balance of power politics by losing state's dominant position in international relations (Brown and Ainley 2009). The latter part of the 1980s, the entry of postmodernism into IR encouraged strengthening the non-state centric discourses, meanwhile civil society organization and individual citizens were recognized as new international actors who expanded their influences across borders to the international level by using the power of new communication technologies and mass media. Thus, a recently growing amount of literature has emerged in International Relations approach in which the role of media is considered in international policy making.

According to the literature of media and politics, the political importance of media can be evaluated in a variety of ways. First, global media has created a 'global village' that we can point to changes in the way citizens of states view themselves and others. The media supply information, and at the same time shape people's learning process about the world, thus mass media have correspondingly large influence on individuals' picture of the world. In this context, the media become important tools for defining 'in-group' identity against 'out-group' identity based on representing a series of contrasts and oppositions.

By this end, the points of view of others are vital in international relations in terms of construction of allies and enemies of the state. In other words, the media help to construct the reality of international politics.

Second, the political importance of media can be identified by the shifts in the way the state's power configuration. Media are pluralizing forces which work against power's ability to influence and control. Essentially, local, national and international news agencies circulate information and images between countries and form relationships between people from the local level to the international level (Boyd-Barrett and Rantanen 2001: 127).

Third, global media have integrated its audiences to wars, peace and diplomacy process. The global media's efforts to attract public attention bring the crises and conflicts to the top of the agenda to persuade its audiences to pressure and influence government policies. At the same time, governments can also use the media platforms to set their own war agenda to make their views known to the public for their own purposes. The concept of 'the CNN Effect' has referred to this paradigm since the 1990s. In addition to this, the new paradigm of the 2000s which is the internet and all other networked information technologies' influence on the global politics, including democratization and terrorism is called 'the Al-Jazeera Effect' (Seib 2008).

According to these three points, it can be argued that the media's power is discussed divisively in the literature of Media and Politics, particularly in terms of their effects in domestic politics, foreign policy decision-making and distribution of the images of political actors and building a global civil society, public sphere and political activism (De Jong et al. 2005). With a departure from this literature, this article aims to observe the evolution of media's rising role in international politics with a specific focus on the concept of 'the CNN effect' and 'the Al-Jazeera effect'.

This observation serves to find out how the media flow from the U.S. to the rest of the world, so-called CNN effect, constituted a soft power and made the U.S. a global hegemonic power in the 1990s. In the 2000s, the broader range of information technology frames and new networks have been taking place in the form of contra-flows against American hegemony.

In this study, the Al-Jazeera effect is used for conceptualizing this new trend of counter-hegemony. This effect has contributed to constitute a milestone in thinking about world history and international affairs. Thus, the point which is highlighted in this study assumes that new media have pluralized powers in the international politics and carried the wars to a different level by igniting information wars. The media are influencing the world politics by creating a powerful arena for non-Western narratives, arguments and assumptions against the dominant Western viewpoints in news. In a nutshell, they are accelerating the rise of the rest in international politics which can be described as the emergence of 'the post-American world' (Zakaria 2008).

The Media's Power in the Domestic Politics: The Watchdogs?

Without an understanding of the media's political functions and their influences on the nations, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive picture of their impacts on the states and international relations. Thus, this section is devoted to explain five political functions of the media (Kuhn 2007:21), which include information provision, agenda setting, public watchdog, political mobilization and regime legitimating.

In the first function, the roles of media in expressing, reproducing and spreading information, ideologies and values to wider social and international structures constitute a crucial relationship between society and the media (Richardson 2007:114). These roles make them ideological instruments that produce meanings and naturalise power relations; they become the means to realise domination. The politicians would want to influence the information with the aim of maximizing their voters in order to promote desirable situations and definitions. Thus, the role of media discourse is crucial in the expression of ideas regarding how people think about themselves and other nations. The media select, organize and emphasize particularly news in order to decide what a significant subject for public discussion is. The media cannot force us what to think; but they certainly influence what we think about and how we think about it by their function of *agenda building*. Sometimes the media act as a window on the political affairs or as megaphones for the messages of politicians. In this case, intensive visibility of an issue in the news is an outcome of shaping the media agenda can be used to persuade or manipulate the public.

According to Nye (2004:53), increased information flows through the media have caused the loss of government's traditional control over information in relation to politics. The speed in moving information has created a system in which power over information is much more widely distributed, which means decentralisation and less official control of government agendas. In that spirit, the media are not just the means of reproduction of power relations, but also pluralizing forces which work against the government's ability to influence and control. The media's acting as the *public watchdog* works out a check on elite behaviour, thus it can help make political actors accountable to the public, assisting in the empowerment of the latter as citizens and voters.

Furthermore, the media can be used for *political mobilization* by political parties and pressure groups for the purposes of membership recruitment, calling for a public meeting, local party canvassing, protesting, campaigning or a demonstration. The final political function of the media, *regime legitimation* helps to socialize citizens into acceptance of prevalent social norms and the institutions that embody them; by this way they contribute to the legitimating of the political system. On the other hand the media can trigger to increase levels of political cynicism and voter apathy which can result demobilizing effect or delegitimizing effect at least for some of their audiences (Kuhn 2007:30).

It can be argued that the media's potential² is based on to what extent there is political control in the hands of politicians in policy making process in the linkage of media-source balance. The key question in this context is who determines what can be addressed and what cannot. This question is answered in various ways in different theories, in particular in political communication and political economy (Herman and Chomsky 2002). The first one focuses on the power of the words, sounds and images in the media which might have influences on policy. Contradictory, political economy approach uses the power and ownership relations that determine the structural constraints and communication to analysis the 'influence' on the decision making process.

² Robinson (2004:31) suggests that there are four types in the policy-media interaction: a supportive media, an uncritical role for official policy; non-influential and non-supporter of any side of the debate; critical media, having limited influence to change policy; and side taker media, effective in policy outcomes.

According to this approach, privately owned media within a liberal state with legal protection of free speech is different from the press which is owned and operated by the political parties or state. For instance, pluralist and democratic governments face more competition in shaping the news than nondemocratic governments. The media would be used for justifying policy decisions of elites and having popular support for it (Roselle 2006:9). In democratic regimes, leaders' powers rely on the public for votes. Thus, they use media to explain and legitimize policies, which means media are the fourth estate acting as a protector against unrestrained power, in other words they are independent watchdogs of the system.

In addition to democracy, unlimited freedom of the news market does not guarantee the ideal of freedom of communication (Keohane 1991). Marketing justifies privileging of corporate speech and of more choice to investors than to citizens. Here, the most important point is the empowerment of citizens and not just the satisfaction of citizens as consumers. In this context, a third way can be purposed: 'heterarchy' (ibid: 150) of communication media which are controlled neither by the state nor commercial market. Functioning of healthy public sphere can be improved in publicly founded, non profit and legally guaranteed media institution of civil society.

The rise in non-state actors offers competing views, information, and foreign policies to government views, information, and foreign policy that may undermine states' ability to influence media coverage of foreign policy. The development of a plurality of non-state media of communication which both functions as permanent thorns in the side of political power and serves the primary means of communication for citizens' living, working, loving, quarrelling and tolerating others within a genuinely pluralist society. In a nutshell, what is spoken and known in a society depend on the role of the television, freedom of expression, accession to media and news values in the society.

In addition, it should be highlighted that there is a media-politicians relationships into a co-evaluation. Media are not just used by politicians for tactical purposes and interests, but also media have their own motivation and interests which they have them into a more complex relationships and interactions with individuals and institutions.

The Media's Power in International Politics: the CNN Effect

The domestic and global public opinion have become key factors in the formulation of foreign policy in the age of mediation. Before this period, international politics were carried out mostly behind closed doors in secrecy and covert manoeuvrings (Mcnaair 1998: 177). Throughout the twentieth century, the media have been used by governments to influence public opinion on foreign policies of states in their favour. By an examination of the British Foreign Office, Cohen (1986) found that at the level of policy implementation, government departments, individual officials and ministers use mass media as direct channels to foreign societies in the purpose of explaining policy to overseas publics to advance or conceal policy opinions. Cohen (ibid: 52) noted that politicians use mass media in international negotiations in order to manipulate international public sphere and other governments. It can be described as an indirect media impact that mainly depend on pressure from the government's supporters and interest groups that can result to policy change at the planning stage of a decision in foreign policy

Specifically, during the Cold War the United States had used the media in getting its ideological message out in the rest of the world. Together with its hard power and economical means, the media had contributed to the empowerment of US hegemony. The media flows from the US to the other countries worked to spread its anti-communist propaganda and to provide reassurance to its alliances that the transatlantic perspective was valid against the Soviet threat. Tactical disinformation about opposing forces undermined the Soviet attempts and manipulated international public opinion.

Regarding this, Mcnaair (1998:178) worked on the examples from the East-West relations in the Cold war period and claimed that the nature of 'the enemy' changed because of manipulating symbols and images in the media. His work illustrated that the media made an important contribution to international relations as the tools of distribution of political actors' images.

CNN began in the 1980s with a goal of the 24 hour span of international news available with the local reporters from the different parts of the world. During China's Tiananmen Square uprising in 1989, CNN deserved respect through its 24-hour report.

As another remarkable success, in 1991 CNN could broadcast from the front lines of the war zone during the Persian Gulf War. CNN's coverage helped the international society to figure out what was happening in Iraq. It began to take attention to conflict areas and change people's minds. For instance, it is known that the pictures of starving children in the Somalia crisis pushed President Bush toward action.³

CNN International still remains influential as it broadcasts to a global audience on TV and via internet. In Taylor's (1997:58-59) summary of the historical development of the media and international political relationships, the television station CNN is presented as being a direct channel of diplomacy among politicians, the public and the rest of the world:

"Much has already been written by historians about that increasing role, from the Anglo-German press 'wars' in the build-up to the First World War to the role of newspapers, the cinema and radio in the program of 'moral rearmament' prior to the Second World War. A growing amount of literature also now exists about how the media came to be deployed as a psychological weapon, at home and abroad, first between 1939 and 1945 and then subsequently during the Cold War. Today, however, if a statesman wants to make a public statement or send a message across the world, he has the option of doing so on CNN rather than through traditional diplomatic channels."

As Taylor noted, government departments, individual officials and ministers use mass media as direct channels to societies with the purpose of explaining policy to their nation and overseas publics to advance or conceal policy opinions. Therefore, the media seems to enable the evaluation of international society by distributing information that builds bridges between groups and individuals around the world.

This makes the media an integral part of international relations. With a departure from Taylor's this summary of the historical development of media-politics relationship, in the following section the role of mass media is indicated in two fields of international relations: the studies of war and peace.

³See also: Babak Bahador, *the CNN effect in Action: How the News Media Pushed the West toward War in Kosovo*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

The CNN Effect: The Media at War and Peace

Since the 1990s, the dominant debate on the media-politics relationships has centred on the so-called "CNN effect". Three different approaches of the CNN effect are defined by Steve Livingston (1997: 4-6). He suggests that the media would act as a pitfall *agenda setting agent* in related to the choice and selection for the sake of national interests. They would become an *accelerant* in shortening response time for decision and policy making or they would move as an *impediment actor* that operates through the impact of public opinion.

As an agenda setting agent, the news media have an important job in defining issues, primarily to help the public understand the newest array of priorities and alliances. In this context, the news coverage can be useful for justifying state actions by shaping what people around the world think of it. For instance, in 2003 the U.S. war against Iraq was defined as a war of liberation by the White House and produced a media campaign to support that idea. In this case, modern media acted as considerable allies in selling the war and sustaining public support for it.

When the media become an accelerant, they influence the strategies and behaviour of those in power by creating sense of urgency, increasing public awareness and anxiety, leading to pressure to "do something". But media coverage alone does not guarantee a particular effect on foreign policy, regardless of how or whether the media may exert a direct effect on policy-making elites both at home and abroad. The media coverage does not guarantee a policy response. For example, despite the media coverage of Bosnian atrocities and the genocide in Rwanda, none of the major Western powers intervened for years.

As the third approach of the CNN effect, when the media act as an impediment actor, they help to spread multiple frames, bring third parties into conflict and help to shape public opinion which in turn affect policymakers' decisions on political conflicts. The opposition to government's foreign policy can be an outcome of the media coverage which is sourced by the domestic political division. In this circumstance, the media's power to distribute the reaction against official policy in public, pressure and interest groups can led the change of balance of power due to administration fail into control the process of the crises management (Wolfsfeld 2004:69).

For an illustration, it can be argued that the collapse of America's will to fight in Vietnam resulted from the media's reporting of foreign policy. In this case, the media coverage was affected by the domestic political divisions and spread a demoralisation of involving in an unsuccessful limited war. The media caused the Johnson administration's failure to explain to the American public and Congress why the U.S. troops were fighting in Vietnam; thus the strong public reaction occurred against the government's foreign policy.

It can be argued that in the linkage between the media and foreign policy, public opinion is the key component in the media's effectiveness on a certain foreign policy decision. The media's contribution in conduct of policy is its power to create a favourable climate for the officials in decision making by the coverage of certain issues which can attract large audience attention to gain public support. This proposition is however rejected by some scholars who argue media influence on the public is not adequately clarified by a theory.⁴

As it is given with the examples, "the CNN effect" concerns mainly situations of media influence on international interventions. In addition to these, the news media can serve as a forum for peace building in which a wide and representative proponent and opponent set of voices are encouraged to express their views in an open and democratic public debate involves the perspectives of leaders, activists, and citizens. Therefore, the media's impact on creating an environment that is conducive to compromise and reconciliation is important for the political atmosphere surrounding the peace process (Wolfsfeld 2004:12).

Otherwise, the media can also serve as destructive agents in the peace process. They can emphasize the risks and dangers associated with compromise, raise the legitimacy of those opposed to concessions, and reinforce negative stereotypes of the enemy. In addition, the media can influence peace process in a negative way. This would be by decreasing public support for key peace objectives, by decreasing the secrecy needed for delicate foreign policy initiatives, or being a tool of carrying out war or genocide.

⁴See also: Ien Ang(1996) *Living-room Wars: Rethinking Audiences for a Postmodern World*. London: Routledge; Catherine Murray and Kim Schroder (2003) *Researching Audiences: A Practical Guide to Methods in Media Audience Analysis*, Bloomsbury Academic; John L. Sullivan (2012) *Media Audiences: Effects, Users, Institutions, and Power*, London: SAGE Publications.

Thus, giving too much access to the news media can reduce the chances for success of resolution. It should not be forgotten that the media are not the neutral communication channels due to they have their own motivations which define the frame through which they present the coverage of an issue.

Hammond (2007:11) contributed a remarkable point by noticing the changing character of war since the Cold War. He argues that the politics of fear and 'risk society' have provoked the new understanding of war. Particularly, the 9/11 terror and the images of the planes hitting the World Trade Centre towers and their collapse, were mediated repeatedly by the mass media and the media coverage of this traumatic event increased the feeling of insecurity and war hysteria (Kellner 2003: 144).

In the academic literature the role of American media in the Bush administration's "the war on terror" and how the national media constructed a link with the events and Saddam regime in Iraq were indicated in the various attempts (Bennett et al. 2007; Rampton and Stauber 2003). Washington's surge morality tale (King and Wells 2009: 158) offered all the components of a complete and substantive frame to gain the public support for the Iraq war. The era of post- 9/11 has provided Western leaders a preventative measure to pre-empt possible risks and threats which has produced rationale new forms of humanitarian and human rights based intervention. In doing so, they hoped to recapture a sense of purpose and meaning for themselves and their society. Therefore, it can be argued that the staging war or acts of terrorism as the media events feed the change in the character of war. This fundamental shift in the politics of Western societies has given rise to importance of media coverage by intensive emphasis on image, spectacle and media presentation.

The New Media's Power in International Relations: The Al –Jazeera Effect

As a fact of the 21st century, the evaluation of power is dependent on information, which is supplied through communication and mass media. Whilst the dependency of the international system on developing information and communication technologies is regularly and rapidly increasing, the army, politicians, state officials, international institutions, NGOs and other international actors are making use of communication as a power source.

In the new millennium, the statesmen are aware of performance in international politics can change the image of state in the eyes of global audiences and even their voters. The success in foreign policy can affect the popularity of the leaders and their re-election chance in domestic politics. On this literature framework, this study highlights that beside the military and economical power, the media are vital to gain power and influence over other states in international relations. More importantly, by focusing on the concept of "Al Jazeera effect", this section argues that the United States' global hegemony has been challenged in the power struggle on information.

First of all, Seib (2008) used the concept of the Al Jazeera effect in reference to its impacts on the Arab world. In particular, the trend of empowering the silenced or marginalized nations and groups is called as Al Jazeera effect. Subsequently, this notion has been used to indicate the effects of new transnational networks and internet-based news media on international relations (Seib 2012).

In 1996 Al Jazeera was founded by the emir of Qatar in order to spread uncensored and critical coverage of news in the Middle East with the slogan of 'the opinion and the other opinion'. It aimed to break the hegemony of the pro-western international news gathering of CNN and BBC World. By offering a counter-hegemonic resource and power, it claimed to provide a new perspective to the world reached beyond the lens of the West. In 2003 Al Jazeera became accessible through its website for English speakers in order to reach greater audience and greater influence.

Al Jazeera has played a major role providing a platform for discussing the problems of Arab societies and has triggered the demands of democratic change which means it has a power to impact policy and public opinion. Moreover, it has challenged American perspectives and actions around the world with extensive local news networks as it was seen during the Iraq War. The non-Western journalists and networks brought the Iraqi perspective to the discussion; hereby the world simply could see what was going there from different viewpoints. Broadcasting the events internationally broke the monopoly of Western media on reporting and defining the war. In 2012 Al Jazeera America began to broadcast to American audiences in New York to secure access to cable and satellite distribution in the US.

Despite the fact that all these are the aspects of a new post-American world's reality, Zakaria (2008:74-78) notes that the West still offers a role model for advancement and modernity which the rest of world have admired and emulated. For instance, Al Jazeera English follows a CNN model with its political talk shows, anchors, on-air experts and debates. The rest of the world is challenging the US hegemony in a Western-looking way.

Not just Qatar's Al Jazeera English, but also China Central Television (CCTV) and Russia Today's (RT) English broadcasting distribute different views on global views which serve to reduce the West's monopoly on information and in particular the hegemony of the U.S. (Xie and Boyd-Barret 2015: 71-73). CCTV, the state network in China started to work as the mouthpiece of the Chinese Communist Party in 1958. But, it enjoyed rapid development toward an ambitious global expansion with its Chinese Mandarin, English, Spanish, French, Arabic and Russian languages services. In addition, CCTV officially launched to its service of CCTV America headquartered in Washington DC, and CCTV Africa based in Nairobi, Kenya in 2012. Today's CCTV reflects Beijing's policy preference for non-interventionism and inoffensiveness. Unlike CCTV, RT has provided international news from a critical perspective to the U.S. economy and politics since it came out at the end of 2005 to supply a Russia-friendly view point in English. Furthermore, Kremlin fund to establish the Arabic language channel Rusya Al-Yaum in 2007, the Spanish language channel RT Actualidad in 2009 and RT America in 2010.

This plurality of sources reveals the information war among international broadcasters and countries. Beyond the cable and satellite carriers, Al Jazeera English and all other new international networks actively use the advantages of broadband, social media and mobile applications to reach wider audiences. They have remarkable popularity both on Facebook and YouTube. This is to say that new media has taken the information war to another level by Al Jazeera effect.

It is clear that the new system of communication has impacts on politics (Street 2011). The citizens are no longer just consumers of communication, thanks to the internet they also create their own coverage of politics and create new aspects of political activism and leadership by using social network sites. It can be said that one of the crucial areas in which the internet's impact has been felt is that to be enabling new forms of social and political activism (ibid: 263).

Another area where the impact of new media is seen in journalism by the rise of the blog and so-called blogosphere where enable every citizen to act as journalist, interpret and distribute news reports. Also, the network communications and organizations empower the ways of text messaging, micro-blogging and blogging for the campaign and propaganda has emerged the impact in the conduct of politics. As another considerable area in which the new media impact on politics is that using internet technologies are configuring the state-citizen relationship. Internet is changing the operation of government in delivering services, distributing information and consulting citizens and implementing policy. However, it enables the authorities monitor and control to ever more effectively act as an Orwellian 'Big Brother' (ibid: 264).

According to Nye (2004: 53) increased information flows through new media cause the loss of government's traditional control over information in related with politics. The speed of internet and the speed of information create a system in which power over information is much more widely distributed that means decentralizing and less official control of government's agenda. The private armies or arm industry too evoke the decentralization. The information revolution has enhanced the role of markets in the means of to accelerate the diffusion of power away from governments to private actors (ibid: 51). Nye describes power relations today as a three-dimensional chess game, comprising from the top down, the military board, the economic board and, at the bottom, the 'soft power' of information.

The new communication and mass media revolution are increasing the importance of soft power, namely the ability to achieve desired outcomes in international affairs through attraction by convincing others rather than coercion. Thus, it can be argued that in the 21st century world politics, the new communication and mass media, so-called Al Jazeera effect, are significant channels for the empowerment of states and citizens in setting the political agenda in politics, distributing a particular discourse and convincing people to improve cultural, political and economic cooperation among nations.

Conclusion

In a summary, the media's CNN effect function as the channels of communication can be used to give a response to foreign affairs by politicians or they can be used to gain public support for policy as well.

The exchange of information occurs between the sides of politicians, public and media. It is therefore media's power to influence the political process depends on their relations to and impacts on the public's perception of foreign affairs. On the other hand, the governments need the media for the achievement of publicity. The aspects of this relationship tie the media with politicians and public in reporting of political issues. This serves to provide a particular understanding of the media's profile as a player in the shaping of foreign policy.

If we are to discuss the impact of media coverage on policy, we should ask whether a particular decision would have been made if media coverage had been different. What is more, argumentation of media caused making a particular decision is to claim that it was one of the necessary factors (not only one) in multiple factors in the process. It cannot be said that all policy is driven by the media, however, the question that it may affect it. How the public opinion can affect governmental policy making provides a crucial place to look in order to find out whether it has happened for analyzing the influence of media.

In the 21st century, the internet is changing sovereignty while transnational communication is opened to many millions of cyber communities. Moreover, national security is changing, states are facing a growing list of threats and attackers may be states, groups, individuals or some combinations. Some states are weaker than the private forces within them. The private organizations, the NGOs, industry and unions can compete for the attention of media from major countries in a transnational struggle over the agenda of world politics.

In this context, this research highlighted that beside Al-Jazeera, Russia's RT and China's CCTV have challenged with CNN International's hegemony in international news coverage. Both this trend of information struggle between the states and the new media's impacts in international relations is called as the Al Jazeera effect. With a departure from these aspects, it is argued that the media and its soft power in the world politics have been displaced the American hegemony in the last decade which can be characterized by the notion of post-American world. In a nutshell, it revealed how the new media have been contributed to change power relations in the 21st century.

References

- Boyt-Barret and Rantanen, T. (2001), "News Agency Foreign Correspondents" in Tunstall, J. (ed.) *Media Occupations and Professions*, Oxford University Press
- Brown, C., and Ainley, K. (2009) *Understanding International Relations*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Cohen, B. (1986) *The Press and Foreign Policy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- De Jong, W. et al (2005) *Global Activism, Global Media*, London: Pluto Press.
- Hammond, P. (2007) *Media, War and Postmodernity*, New York: Routledge
- Herman, E.S. and Chomsky, N. (2002) *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, US: Pantheon
- King, E. and Wells, R. (2009) *Framing the Iraq War Endgame: War's Denouement in an Age of Terror*, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Kuhn, R. (2007) *Politics and the Media in Britain*, Palgrave Macmillan
- Le, E. (2006) *The Spiral of 'Anti-Other Rhetoric': Discourses of Identity and the International Media Echo*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Livingstone, S. (1997), *Clarifying the CNN Effect: An Examination of Media Effects According to Type of Military Intervention*, Research Paper R 18, Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Mcnaur, B. (1998) *the Sociology of Journalism*, London: Arnold.
- Mermin, J. (1999) *Debating War and Peace: media coverage of U.S. intervention in the post-Vietnam era*, USA: Princeton University Press
- Miller, D. (2007) *Media Pressure on Foreign Policy: The Evolving Theoretical Framework*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miller, D. (ed.) (2003) *Tell Me Lies: Propaganda and Media Distortion in the Attack on Iraq*, London: Pluto Press
- Nye, J. (2004) *Soft Power: Means to Success in World Politics*, USA: Public Affairs
- Rampton, S. and Stauber, J. (2003) *Weapons of Mass Deception: The Uses of Propaganda in Bush's War on Iraq*, NY: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin Books
- Richardson, J. E. (2007) *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach From Critical Discourse Analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Robinson, P. (2002) *The CNN Effect: The Myth of News, Foreign Policy and Intervention*, London: Routledge

- Roselle, L. (2006) *Media and the Politics of Failure: Great Powers, Communication Strategies, and Military Defeats*, Palgrave Macmillan
- Seib, P. (ed.) (2012) *Al Jazeera English: Global News in a Changing World*, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Seib, P. (2008) *The Al Jazeera Effect: How the New Global Media Are Reshaping World Politics*, Potomac Books Inc.
- Street, J. (2011), *Mass Media, Politics, and Democracy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Taylor, P. M. (1997) *Global Communications, International Affairs and the Media since 1945*, New York: Routledge.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2004), *Media and the Path to Peace*, Cambridge University Press
- Xie, S. and Boyd-Barret, O. (2015) 'External-National TV News Networks' Way to America: Is the United States Losing the Global "Information War"?", *the International Journal of Communication* 9.
- Zakaria, F. (2008), *The Post-American World*, Penguin Book.