

1

WHAT IS EVENT MANAGEMENT?

Event management refers to the targeting and managing of designed public events geared to invest emotional energies and economic resources to selected goals. Events are a branch of the hospitality, leisure and tourism industries. The field they address concerns aggregate issues known in the trade as Meetings, Incentives, Conventions and Exhibitions (MICE). The foremost examples of global events are single-issue international charity-building and consciousness-raising events such as Live Aid (1985), Sport Aid (1986), the Nelson Mandela 70th Birthday Concert, aka 'Freedomfest' (1988), the Indian Ocean Tsunami Relief Concert (2005), Live 8 (2005), Live Earth (2007), the Haiti Relief Concert (2010); and global cyclical events like the FIFA World Cup, the Olympics, Oktoberfests, Burning Man City, annual international literature, film and drama festivals, trade expositions, Carnival, Mardi Gras and heritage festivals.

At the local and national levels, events are also commonplace in the form of neighbourhood festivals, corporate meetings involving the whole workforce, management awaydays, horticultural shows, literary, comedy and film festivals, livestock shows and flower festivals. Event management therefore covers a large territory encompassing the general production, design, publicity and management of events (Getz, 2012).

However, as will become apparent in the course of this study, the scale and variety of events render blanket propositions pointless. In this book the foremost emphasis is upon the analysis of global events. While some of the points made in relation to event planning, strategy and consciousness apply to non-global events, it would be wrong to infer that differences of scale, organisation and level of impact can be ignored. There is all the difference imaginable between organising a jumble sale to save the parish youth club and launching an international programme of attractions, with multinational sponsors, telecast live in support of emergency relief or global consciousness raising.

The focus upon global events in this book reflects the extraordinary profile that they have attained in tackling questions of want, promoting

narratives of belonging and imprinting subjective psychology with a sense of shared purpose. They are a highly visible branch of what Ulrich Beck (1992) calls 'sub-politics', meaning the social interests and movements that are located outside the field of organised party politics and pressure group lobbying. For large numbers of the population the subsidiary importance implied in the term 'sub-politics' is redundant. Personal responses to humanitarian events, international sporting competitions and counter-cultural festivals, like the annual Burning Man event in Nevada, have emerged as one of the most revealing life-scales measuring personal character and integrity. They allow us to weigh both the validity of a cause and the worth of a person.

Indeed, there is a case that it is most useful to think of them as components of lifestyle architecture through which we now build competent, relevant, credible images of ourselves. Lifestyle architecture is critical in the question of holding a tenable self-image, and pivotal in portraying ourselves as competent, credible actors in social networks.¹ Not least, because to show support for a cause or identify unimpeachably with corporate or national values affords a short cut to recognition, acceptance and impact. Demonstrating support for an event 'says it all' about who you are and what you aspire to be.

At the social rather than psychological level, events are part of the urge to interrogate and utilise space and time to define occasions as special and worthy of commemoration. As such, they are frequently taken to be a sign of the health of the community and the vitality of ethics of responsibility. However, the expansion and size of some global events raise separate concerns about issues of social ordering, performative labour, task-centred regulation, manipulation and communication power. Events are powerful, short-hand mechanisms of social theming. They confer a readily comprehensible brand and glamour upon event management, organisation and participation.

Politicisation has emerged as a keynote theme in the contemporary analysis of events. In other words, event consolidation and the responses to events have become important proof of personal worth and social membership. Global events, which are also known as mega-events (Roche, 2000, 2002), involve the building of sports stadiums, hotels, blasting highways and constructing slip roads that often require the eviction of inner-city populations and the destruction of areas of outstanding natural beauty. The FIFA World Cup in South Africa (2010), the Beijing Olympics (2008) and, as we shall see in more detail in Chapter 5, the Vancouver Winter Olympics (2010), produced widespread evictions and protest.

Some events celebrate lifestyles and beliefs that have been traditionally marginalised or stereotyped in negative ways. For example, the annual Gay and Lesbian Sydney Mardi Gras originated as a political protest in 1978. It was designed as the legitimate, transitory occupation

of inner-city space to celebrate both the validity of nonconformist sexual values and to air the values of the counter-culture against the prejudice and narrowness of the heterosexual establishment (Forsyth, 2001). The event is telecast globally and draws a network public of 300,000. Less well reported is the continuing undercurrent of heterosexual resentment at the temporary annexation of urban space for the celebration of nonconformist sexual values. On closer inspection, events which are portrayed by the mainstream media as enhancing social integration often carry an undertow of social tension and spatial resistance (Mason and Lo, 2009: 97). There is circumstantial evidence to suggest that this undertow was a significant factor in the decision to drop the 'Gay and Lesbian' prefix and redefine the event as the Sydney Mardi Gras dedicated to the new event slogan of 'the freedom to be' (Munro, 2011).

As we shall see in more detail in Chapter 9 when we consider the question of event appropriation, the Carnival in Rio de Janeiro, which has grown into one of the world's foremost hallmark events, has generated controversy from activists who claim that it has been cut adrift from its roots. The Brazilian tourist industry and government present the Carnival as the distillation of national identity and a positive image of Brazilian miscegenation. However, the lower income levels of the black population, whose traditions are associated with inventing the samba form of dance and exhibition upon which the Rio Carnival is based, now find themselves priced out of full participation (Sheriff, 1999).

Because drama, theatre and melodrama are integral to the event form, events illustrate in unusually graphic ways how the display of fellowship inadvertently produces conflict and how messages of global unity are exposed as media gloss. In modern cultural settings where a person's connection with others is often fragile and provisional, events exhibit unity and solidarity. By validating the self, the ideology of emotionalism that is central in event planning and management conjures up a form of emulsified spirituality that makes us feel personally affirmed and relevant. By being recognised as a small but necessary cog in a wheel at the company general meeting or donating \$50 to feed Africa during a concert relief telethon, we publicly exhibit social credibility and self-worth.

The therapeutic aspect of event participation is a fundamental reason for the vast expansion in event visibility over the last three decades. Events provide a forum for public recognition and personal confirmation. People nail their colours to the mast, not merely by supporting a good cause, but being *seen* to do so. Increasingly, this visual dimension requires a record in the form of an image captured on a mobile phone, SLR camera, iPad, lap-top or video recorder. Psychologically speaking, global events allow the individual to briefly enter into the romance of charity while submitting, in the rest of life, to the dominant, implacable logic required by acquisitive, divisive political economy.

In these opening pages another aspect of event culture must be remarked upon, not least because it appears to have gone unnoticed in the professional event management literature.² Events provide a compelling material analogue for the peer-to-peer, open-sourcing and advance of creative commons that has become such an exciting and prominent feature of the digital economy. The event is the material embodiment of new forms of cooperative labour, social recognition and social networking that are now commonplace on the internet (Baym and Burnett, 2009; Turner, 2009: 82–3). Like the net, events seem to represent *people power*. This carries unmistakable anti-corporatist, anti-government and anti-consumerist overtones. Cooperative labour, volunteering, social recognition and social networking through the digital economy are popularly represented as a ‘break’ from traditional modes of production and associated systems of politics. Similarly, events are often portrayed as part of the new politics, unlocking the power of the people in the digital age.

The Importance of Performative Labour

The concept of performative labour is especially important in understanding event management and event consciousness. It is widely used in studies of the workplace, especially those relating to the hospitality and tourist industries (Crang, 1994; Edensor, 2001; Hochschild, 1983). Nonetheless, while these studies go a long way to clarifying the concept, they omit to do justice to its importance by confining it to the shallow orbit of the work setting. For example, Alan Bryman (2004: 103) defines performative labour as ‘the rendering of work by managements and employees alike as akin to a theatrical performance in which the workplace is construed as similar to a stage’. In a book of many insights, he applies the concept specifically to the Disney theme park industry where Disney personnel use surprisingly tightly formulated and well-honed ‘people skills’ (rather than old-fashioned empathy, hospitality and spontaneity) to regulate crowd behaviour. As Bryman (2004) and other commentators make abundantly clear, the concept of performative labour has become pivotal in the sociology of Western employment market economies because of the growth of the service sector. Blyton and Jenkins (2007) calculate that seven out of ten workers in the advanced economies of the West are now employed in service work. This work is intimately connected with performative labour since it is based on communication, knowledge, information and broader ‘people skills’.

However, central to the meaning of performative labour is the idea that communication, knowledge and information are integral to all forms

of human interaction. In the digital economy, where data relating to personal life enhancement and modes of people skills are ubiquitous through television, the internet and the media, access to performative labour resources is continuously available. These resources are vital, not only in landing and keeping a job, but in developing effective relations with your partner, your parents, your children, your next door neighbour and so on. The internet, the iPad and mobile phone are now foundries of performative labour training which are of equivalent importance to schooling and the workplace.

In this study I want to expand the concept of performative labour from the workplace setting to apply it to *a central means of status differentiation and social impact in popular culture*.³ In doing so, I draw to some extent on the work of Judith Butler (1990, 1993), who deploys the concept of performativity in explaining how social identities and practices are moulded and disciplined. Butler's work chiefly addresses the relationship between performativity and gendered power differences. Concretely, it focuses upon how female embodiment and character are coerced to assume specific values privileged by patriarchy. While Butler's work is a useful resource, the emphasis she places upon the relationship between performance and gender is too restrictive. I submit that performative labour is now so generalised in society that it is essential for understanding *all* forms of social interaction. For a multiplicity of reasons, personal life has become increasingly preoccupied with standing out from the crowd and making social impact.⁴ We not only desire to believe that we are different, we need to register social impact as a mark of personal validation. Important questions of the meaning of personal authenticity and trust follow from this, but, for reasons of space, for the most part, they will be treated as separate from the core considerations in this book (but see Bauman, 2000; Sennett, 2003).

This way of thinking about the growing importance of social impact has been found useful in a number of fields that have nothing to do with event management. To take a dramatic example, the sociologist Mark Juergensmeyer (2003) has argued that the foundational element in terrorism is what he calls 'performance violence'. A conscious part of planning and executing a terrorist incident is the use of extreme violence to register maximum impact upon social consciousness. Personal validation does not lie first and foremost in the violent act, rather it resides in the incident being recognised as 'mind numbing', 'mesmerising' political theatre *for an audience*. The network public in question is of course connected to each other and to the incident through the global communication network. The camera has become fundamental in weighing up the social worth of an action. Just as extensive TV coverage 'validates' a suicide bomber, a kiss at a concert for emergency relief has more personal meaning *if it is filmed*.

In part, my interest in expanding the concept of performative labour goes back to the work on 'performative utterances' by the late J.L. Austin. For Austin (1962) when words are articulated in appropriate contexts they have the power of enforcement. For example, when an employer makes an offer of employment in the workplace it has an effect. It changes your identity. You cease to become an applicant for the post. You become an employee and generally, you perform the role that you have obtained through the job selection process. In this sense talk *is* action.⁵

In the present study the term performative labour will be applied to forms of behaviour designed to exhibit integrity, compassion, solidarity, competence, credibility, relevance and other types of status differentiation and social impact. As such, I depart from Austin in as much as I do not restrict the concept of performative utterances to speech acts. A much broader notion of *social linguistics* informs what I understand by performative labour. To be sure, this includes speech, but it also encompasses dress, grooming, manners, attitudes, values, politics, brinkmanship, flirting and other techniques of impression management.

Further, I maintain that performative utterances are primarily motivated by the object of building and managing confidence and achieving social impact in interpersonal relationships. No relationship between brokering confidence and being honest is assumed. Performative utterances are designed to be noticed and build trust. They are not necessarily related to virtue or sincerity. The purpose of these various techniques is to acquire recognition as a person of 'the right sort', 'good character', 'appealing', 'sexy' or 'sound'.

Because social impact depends so much upon being in the know and looking right, according to the mores of the peer groups to which one is attached, performative labour is now a perpetual, seven days a week undertaking. The articulation of choices about matters like diet, transportation, clothing, posture, car ownership, attitudes to sexism, racism, gainful employment, terrorism, animal rights, climate change, etc., are designed and exchanged as *utterances* that express wants of personal impact. Performative labour is the visual and linguistic means through which people convey what they take to be, or wish to be seen as, the mark of their inner personalities.

That theatre is inherent in performative labour has long been recognised by sociologists. Although the concept predated the work of Erving Goffman, his (1961, 1963) extensive writings on dramaturgy and the presentation of the self make transparent use of the concepts of performance, gaining advantage and making social impact. From Goffman we acquire the idea that the self is not bounded by subjectivity. Rather it is enmeshed with complex and multi-layered codes and symbolic networks of affirmation, solidarity and differentiation. These codes are much extended and additionally nuanced in the digital age where personal scripts, forms of

grooming and impact strategies owe as much to *para-social* relations developed through television and web as primary relations (Horton and Wohl, 1956).⁶ Even participation abounds in rich ethnographic material that exhibits scripts for emoting in public, acknowledging solidarity and engineering performance to achieve personal impact.

Essential to my use of the concept of performative labour then is the notion of theatre. That is, I do not hold that it is necessary for people to believe in the values and attitudes that they articulate. Rather I see the articulation of these matters as what might be called cultural chips exchanged in the roulette wheel of social encounters with the end in mind of making a notable and, usually, positive impression. Social impact is the name of the game (Rojek, 2010, 2012).

The same rule of thumb applies to event culture. On one level, the disinterest, social inclusiveness and concern for suffering and corporate solidarity expressed in events are genuine responses to issues and emergencies. I don't wish to be understood as proposing that events do not enhance social consciousness or raise funds. Nor are they simply exercises in unrealistic pedagogy and wishful forms of cultural literacy, i.e. by hiding the real roots of power in society and distracting us from the necessary structural transformations required to produce meaningful contributions to problems of, for example, global inequality, injustice and environmental pollution. All the same, in addition, if we do not see them as performative utterances designed to display qualities of personal worth which have telegenic impacts we do not get the full picture of their effect in modern culture.

As popular culture has become more sceptical about the prospect of fundamentally transforming dominant political economy through collective resistance, the biomedical idiom has become more significant (Furedi, 2004: 173). We now use the body to resist. This involves tattooing, piercing and other forms of body styling, but it also encompasses using other speech acts to *display* resistance.

Global humanitarian events are group speech acts designed to dramatically highlight issues and problems. They have not, however, produced a form of transformative politics that is a genuine threat to capitalist hegemony. The old idea that the personal is political has been replaced by the more general, but vastly more superficial notion, that *representation is resistance*.

In network society it is impossible to underestimate the centrality of the media in agenda setting and conditioning the content and vernacular of performative labour. The pivotal importance of communication networks in the formation of identity and life politics means that, as consumers, we use para-social prototypes of display and representation drawn from television studios, film sets, concert halls and radio mikes at all levels of interpersonal communication.

Work by Manuel Castells (2009: 167–90) demonstrates the indisputable effect of network communication power in framing public agendas and encouraging preferred readings of news. It is, of course, still the case that we think for ourselves, but it is necessary to add that the media, dominated by transnational corporations, like the Murdoch family's News Corporation, Time Warner, Viacom, Bertelsmann and Disney, provide the electronic eye through which we cognitively register understanding, exchange information and reach conclusions.

However, it is not just a question of communication networks providing content. They also set the parameters of the form of language used to make sense of the world and the style of exchange that provides speech utterances with social impact. Television, film, pop music and social networking widen and refine the ideas of theatrical performance and stagecraft in every avenue of everyday life. The vital importance of communication networks in life politics and perpetuating para-social relations means that we borrow media-based forms of display and performance at all levels of interpersonal communication and redeploy them in our own speech utterances. The mimicry that follows a widely seen reality TV show in which catch-phrases and looks achieve instant circulation and general recognition provides evidence of the integral power of communication networks in contemporary social encounters. When the Scottish singer Susan Boyle appeared in *Britain's Got Talent* in 2009 she was an instant, overnight global sensation causing unprecedented levels of blogging. It was not just that people instantly knew her name, they became automatically adept in mimicking her look and manner so as to have impact over others about a happening event in the media sphere. In a word they *performed* her in social settings that were disconnected from her or reality TV in general.

More worryingly, as Castells (2009: 167–90) demonstrates, transnational communication networks condition general perceptions of politics, economics and culture. They colluded in the programmes of misinformation launched by the White House, Downing Street and elsewhere to persuade Allied forces to invade Iraq (2003). It would be wrong to cast the media as a monolithic force in proliferating subjective passivity. For the same channels of information that are used to misinform the public about the threat of, for example, armed Iraqi aggression under Saddam carried a backlash from those who accused Western governments of distortion and manipulation. Whether or not misinformation and exposure is balanced is a question for empirical investigation. However, at the analytic level the proposition that media communication power inscribes and perpetuates the cognitive maps which the public use to read reality is well established (Curran, 2010, 2011). Communication network power is therefore central to life politics. As such, it is fundamental to any enquiry into global event management.

Para-social Relations and Media Networks

My understanding of the concept of performative *labour* links it closely to communication technology and the social conventions that have grown up around this technology. Horton and Wohl's (1956) classic concept of para-social relations is relevant here. A para-social relation refers to relations of presumed intimacy and fellowship that network publics develop with media presenters. Horton and Wohl (1956) coined the concept at the dawn of the TV age. Today media communication power is much more sophisticated and penetrating (Castells, 2009; Curran, 2011). The concept therefore needs to be elaborated from the fronts of presumed identification and fellowship of the airwaves, to concrete mimicry of attitudes and opinions of personal validity to every area of life. By the term performative labour in connection with para-social relations then, I mean *the construction of a valid self-image through actions and practices as well as language, that are heavily, but not, of course, exclusively, modelled on the motifs, role models and preferences supplied by the media.*

It is a convention in the field to refer positively to the creative power and knowledgeable ability of social actors. This has grown up in reaction to cultural and social determinist approaches to human behaviour. While I have no wish to depart from the convention, I must stress the foundational importance today of the media in planting and nurturing the resources that are exploited and developed through performative labour outside media settings. The media are part of the *invisible government* of day-to-day relations.⁷ They pump-prime audiences with a sense of urgency, an agenda of issues, values, norms, identity and a mode of cognition (Curran, 2010: 39). Their impact in this respect is all the more significant since the dominant motif of airwave transmission is speaking for the common man. But global media networks are not owned by the common man. Most are privately owned by influential individuals who have interconnected corporate interests. They can hardly be expected to suspend these interests when it comes to the management of multinational broadcast policy. The *communication power* of the media reflects the *network power* of the influential individuals that own and ultimately control them (Castells, 2009).

Para-social relations breed *para-social impacts*. By the latter term, I mean forms of activism that rely upon theatre, spectacle and other forms of representation for validation. Causes and dilemmas that emerge from the mouths of celebrity activists on TV certainly generate media interest and mobilise social energy. But they create an imitative form of activism that is based on glamour, impact and the appetite for personal recognition. Para-social impacts may have real consequences in alleviating hunger, poverty, injustice and other forms of distress. Notwithstanding this, they

are also a means of interpersonal validation and self-gratification. Global events constantly slip between matters of sober international problem solving and the messier world of interpersonal politics of self-affirmation and self-aggrandisement.

In all of this the media are no innocent agent. They transmit issues of public interest, including news items and issues that may constitute the basis of events. However, the public is not directly involved in the selection, management and presentation of these issues. These questions are defined by the social interests that finance the media. For them, parasocial impact is no less important in the ratings war than lobbying governments and corporations for multilateral fundraising or geopolitical intervention. The broadcast agenda shapes personal behaviour. This is why I opt to use the term 'invisible government' to describe the effects of the media.

In this study, I propose that the media, together with the public relations industry (the PR-media hub) are central in the social ordering of popular conduct.

Social ordering may be defined as the process of conditioning social behaviour through both formal processes (education, the law, policing) and informal processes (tacit understandings of rights and justice, the display of compassion and a 'can do' attitude). Performative labour is therefore the means through which particular types of social ordering are initiated and accomplished. This ordering is neither arbitrary nor random. If we begin to use catch-phrases from the TV adverts that punctuate programming we utilise a resource devised and implemented by the PR-media hub in order to generate economic value. The PR-media hub is most effective when it *naturalises* a particular kind of social order. When we come to believe that it is 'normal' or 'common sense' to have the freedom to bear arms or to pay for health care and education rather than receive them as rights of citizenship, to regard the catastrophe in New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina (2005) as an act of God, and to uncomplainingly pay mortgage and credit rates that are substantially in excess of inflation, the PR-media hub in alliance with business interests and government has achieved an optimum social reaction in social ordering for the interests of corporations and the state.

Now I do not wish to be understood as claiming that because the media are part of the process of invisible government they are wholly unaccountable to the public. There are instances in which the interests behind media power are forced into disclosure and public scrutiny. The phone-tapping scandal that engulfed the *News of the World* in the UK in the summer of 2011, led to Rupert and James Murdoch of News Corp submitting themselves to uncomfortable parliamentary investigation. The decision to close the *News of the World* to calm public disquiet about the newspaper's involvement in illegal phone-tapping raised difficult

questions about journalistic rigour. The role of News Corp in titillating and inflaming the public, rather than informing became a widespread matter of global debate.⁸

That said, the occasions in which the invisible interests that own and control the media are required to account in public for the use of media power are relatively sparse. The most compelling reason for this is the vast concentration of power in the world's leading media corporations.

To remain for a moment with the example of News Corp, the most recent GAO Report (2010) shows that the Murdoch-owned company operates 782 foreign subsidiaries, of which 152 are based in tax havens such as the British Virgin Isles, the Cayman Islands and Luxembourg. Not surprisingly, most commentators concur that the independent policing of News Corp assets globally is challenging, with all of the journalistic regulation and fiscal control problems that this implies. Multinational corporations typically develop what I refer to as a *bespoke aggregation* model of accumulation. By this I mean businesses and brands that have the external appearance of autonomy and independence but which are in reality interlocked and operate in mutually reinforcing ways to build and augment brand capital. This equips media multinationals with immense global resources to coordinate publicity and accumulation strategies.

For example, News Corp dropped the BBC from its Star TV satellite in Asia to appease the ruling elite in China, and it uses Fox TV News, which it owns and controls, to create a public climate that is sympathetic to deregulation, since this accords with its business interests. The framing of public opinion largely occurs through socioeconomic interests that are invisible to public scrutiny. This has consequences not only for the character of performative labour that prevails in a geopolitical territory, but also the types of representation and resistance that can be mounted against them.

As we shall see, performative labour is seldom disinterested and its articulation always reflects social institutions. In other words, performative labour involves a perceived dividend in terms of generating some form of impact and recognition. In Marxism, the metric in which this recognition is expressed is usually economic value. This study does not discount the importance of this measure. Nonetheless, it treats performative labour primarily as a means of status differentiation which is integral to maintain a general cultural sense of 'normality', i.e. social order.

At this point in the discussion these somewhat *minimalist* definitions will have to suffice. Make no mistake, the concepts of performative labour and social ordering are crucial for the arguments outlined in this book. Neither is as simple or straightforward as it looks at first sight, not least because each must be contrasted with older ideas of the public

sphere and transformative politics (Habermas, 1989). For this reason we will be obliged to come back to consider them at greater length in relation to a specific comparison with Habermas's argument at a later stage in the discussion.

Notes

- 1 In a social world which is so responsive to visual culture, the metaphor of architecture to describe lifestyle is appropriate and just. Design and representation are important features of resistance. Lifestyle architecture immediately provides us with a sign of to whom we belong and from whom we depart in social values.
- 2 With origins in hospitality management, leisure studies, tourism studies and business studies, the professional event management literature has not developed a strong critical profile. The present book is an attempt to rectify this state of affairs. The aim is not to be critical, but *constructively* critical. I take a receptivity to criticism as a sign of the maturity of a discipline or field of academic study.
- 3 Status differentiation refers to honorific distinctions that derive from either specific forms of social practice or occupying particular social roles. Chief executives who insist on corporate awaydays as sessions that allow management and workers to have a frank exchange of views are regarded as progressive. Similarly, celebrities like Sir Bob Geldof or Bono who engage in advocacy or diplomacy gain social respect.
- 4 See MacCannell (2011: 22–7).
- 5 Needless to say there is many a slip between cup and lip. Talking about an action or actions is a precondition of positive outcomes, but nothing is guaranteed. In general, approaches to action that separate discourse from the material level are methodologically flawed.
- 6 Para-social relationships refer to the imaginary relationships that a network public has with performers in the media. Horton and Wohl's (1956) concept is hugely important and has been underutilised in the fields of event management and celebrity studies.
- 7 The term 'invisible government' was coined by Edward Bernays (1928). He used it as an anodyne description of what public relations specialists do to present policies and strategies in the best light. In the present study I use the term in a more critical way to refer to the state–corporate amalgamation of power that oversees resource distribution, social investment and the manipulation of social reactions.
- 8 The News Corp scandal exposed dirty tricks in journalism. It resulted in the closure of the *News of the World* and compensation payments to public figures on grounds of invasion of public privacy. However, it would be naive to imagine that phone-tapping is banished from the journalistic repertoire. The nature of the social reaction to the issue is dictated by the ends of journalism. Thus, phone-tapping celebrities to find sensitive details of their private lives is deplored. But phone-tapping which exposes financial irregularities or crime is applauded.