

where the references to the process of communication could be found (pp. 75–124). This indicates that the government administration has a legal obligation to provide information not only in relation to the external environment, but also to other constitutional bodies. This means that all actions must be transparent. However, analysis conducted by Anaszewicz showed that the institutions treat the right the access to public information in very different ways. This is also the reason that some of the results are incomplete. The same data collection showed that there is no single policy for the management of information, especially that at the author's requests the offices respond in very different ways.

An interesting element of the study was the comparison of the sample models (the author presented them as examples), namely the UK and Sweden. Thereby, Anaszewicz presented differences between these systems and the Polish system and expands the research to other European countries with a long democratic history. It makes it possible to use already proven solutions and transfer them to the Polish ground.

Anaszewicz's monograph is worth recommending, not only for media experts, but also for political scientists and researchers dealing with the issue of public administration. As the author states, this work is not exhaustive, but represents the multi-dimensional context of legal, organizational, and financial government communication (p. 234). It is worth noting, that the future study will be supplemented by research in regional government or broadly speaking — in public administration. The field of the analysis would also be the effectiveness of performed communication and used tools. The book *Government communication in Poland. An institutional perspective* certainly can be considered as a position that is worth reading, especially that it draws attention to new fields of study which have not been analyzed in Polish science before. Moreover, the added value of the publication is its pragmatic character. The author is trying to propose a solution that would aim to improve the process of government communication. Therefore, the monograph should be interesting for political actors, civil servants, and everyone holding positions in the government apparatus who is engaged with the process of internal and external communication.

Waldemar Sobera

UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW, POLAND

DOI: 10.19195/1899-5101.10.1(18).11

Kaarle Nordenstreng, Ulf Jonas Björk, Frank Beyersdorf, Svennik Høyer and Epp Lauk (2016). *A History of the International Movement of Journalists. Professionalism Versus Politics*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 274, ISBN 978-1-137-53054-7.

This book is the historical account of international journalists' organizations roughly between the 1890s and 1990s. The story is accompanied by a discussion of the

core issues, which the organizations sought to address and, with which they had to grapple. As the book's subtitle suggests, those issues were professionalism and politics. The book is largely based on original research of period sources, such as resolutions and minutes of different organizations' meetings.

The book opens with a chapter by Svernik Høyer and Epp Lauk, which provides a concise overview of the development of journalism as a profession and of the journalists' struggle for professional recognition. The authors also remind us of more contemporary developments, both technological and ideological, and discuss their implications on journalists' professional identity. This chapter provides little in the way of news to someone familiar with the theme, but it serves as a backdrop and an introduction to the rest of the volume. For anyone less familiar with the debate over whether or not journalism is a profession, such as students and interested laypeople, the chapter provides a thankfully low-threshold introduction to the topic.

The main corpus of the book is formed by three thematically and temporally divided chapters. The first, by Ulf Jonas Björk, covers the period from 1894 to 1936, which constitutes the lifespans of the two earliest journalists' international organizations: the IUPA and the PCW. After two International Conferences of the Press (ICP) in 1894 and 1895 the International Union of Press Associations (IUPA) was officially founded in 1896 at the third ICP in Budapest. While the IUPA attracted mainly European membership, the Press Congress of the World (PCW) was a North American venture. An American editor, Walter Williams, had tried to invite the quasi-annual ICP to the United States. Faced with rejection, Williams organized a separate conference in St. Louis in 1904, the successor to which eventually gave birth to the PCW in 1915. The younger PCW was, in the words of its founder, meant to "supplement, not to supplant" (p. 59) the antecedent IUPA. According to Björk, competition between the two organisations never was a practical concern as the Paris-based IUPA had already been crippled by the onset of World War I, before the PCW's founding.

Both IUPA and PCW were interested in raising the professional status of journalists by, for example, formulating codes of ethics and discussing journalism education. Both represented working journalists just as well as their employers, which in part would spell their doom. Neither organization had much practical success: the IUPA's early years were spent on mostly social activities and discussions until the organization was paralyzed by the war, while the PCW suffered from financial and organizational problems. The long-dormant IUPA did try to stage a comeback in the interwar years, but eventually both organisations were eclipsed by the Fédération Internationale des Journalistes (FIJ) founded in 1926. Although Björk neglects to mention the exact expiration dates of both the IUPA and the PCW, both seem to have left the stage by the latter half of 1930's.

The second historical chapter of the book, written by Frank Beyersdorf, recounts the story of the FIJ, the first journalistic international organization that was exclusive to working journalists (both the IUPA and the PCW had admitted proprietors).

The organization was strongly rooted to post-war internationalism, and soon after its founding in 1926, the FIJ cemented its official status with ties to organizations like the League of Nations and the International Labour Organization. In a parallel development, newspaper publishers formed their own representative organizations around this time, marking the de facto dissolution of the mixed employer-employee organizations of the IUPA and the PCW. Like the IUPA, and to a lesser extent the PCW, the FIJ attracted mostly European membership. As a departure from the two earlier organizations the FIJ accepted only organizations consisting of working journalists.

The FIJ's activities mainly revolved around practical issues, such as representing the journalists' point of view in hearings arranged with the League of Nations. Its two major goals were also practical: firstly, the organization sought to set in stone an independent, international tribunal on matters of journalistic quality and press freedom, and secondly, it sought to establish a new type of journalistic passport which would, in effect, give foreign correspondents status akin to that of diplomats. Both projects failed due to the unwillingness of true power-holders to concede their authority to the FIJ: American news agencies rejected the tribunal (while their European counterparts paid lip-service to the idea), and sovereign states refused to recognize travel documents issued by the FIJ. The organization started to fall apart when authoritarian movements began to gather momentum in Europe — the FIJ was committed to liberal democratic ideals while some of its member unions were not. The FIJ suspended its German member union after it had banned communists and Jews from the profession, the Italian journalists' union was refused entry on the grounds of its willingness to restrict freedom of speech, and Soviet journalists were prevented from joining the FIJ on a technicality. The organization's demise came in 1941, when its headquarters in Paris were raided and shut down by invading German troops.

The final historical chapter covers the time period from World War II to the aftermath of the Soviet Union's collapse in the 1990s. The titular characters of the chapter are the IOJ and the IFJ. The chapter is authored by none other than Kaarle Nordenstreng, whose presidency of the IOJ spanned three decades (1970s–1990s).

After the FIJ's demise in 1941, Allied journalists established a new, temporary union (IFJAFJ) and based it in London. Their aim, even then, was to re-establish the FIJ after the war. To that end, the International Organization of Journalists (IOJ) was founded in 1946, and the IFJAFJ and what remained of the FIJ were disbanded. The Cold War, as with international politics in general at the time, soon cast a shadow over the organization: Western representatives accused the IOJ's socialist membership of overtaking the organization for political purposes. By the 1950s, Western European and American journalists' unions had left the IOJ, and had been replaced with much smaller, ideologically driven unions, which acted as representatives of those countries. Socialist countries, on the other hand, continued to fill the IOJ's ranks with their national organizations. Thus the IOJ, based in Prague, truly became dominated by socialist countries. It took a couple of years for

Western countries to organize themselves beneath one banner. Eventually the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), based in Brussels, was formed in 1952. The two organizations had a strained relationship, and they actively competed against each other for members, especially in the Third World. The IOJ was the larger and wealthier of the two, but it eventually collapsed alongside with the socialist system in the early 1990s. The IFJ was left as the sole international journalists' organization — despite the IOJ still continuing to exist as a legal (if dormant) entity. The period, in between, is wrought with Cold War politics and intrigue, of which the author provides ample details.

A History of the International Movement of Journalists is a fine history. Its chronological structure and clear focus on particular organizations in overlapping time periods makes the narrative easy to follow and comprehend. The amount of detail can be bewildering at times, but it also makes the book an invaluable resource. Details vary in significance, but the consistent and readable style of writing makes the barrage of minutiae pleasant to plough through. The book comes with a solid appendix, which consists of timelines, statistics, resolutions, excerpts, and paper clippings from the archives of the related organizations. Many of the documents, left behind by the now defunct organizations, would be cumbersome to track down were they not included in the volume. It is also worth noting that the book fills an indisputable void in scholarly texts by condensing a century of international journalists' organizations' history into a single, accessible book. Considering the compact page length of the book it is immensely rich in information — I would dare say it is sufficient to sate most people's needs and interest.

The historiographical merits of the book can also be seen as a shortcoming. It is principally a history and as such it offers scant discussion over the topic put forth in the book's subtitle. The theme of journalistic professionalism is mentioned from time to time, but on the pages it is by and large overtaken by the organizational histories of the various associations. Arguably, this aspect of the book can be read as a reflection of the movement in question: purely professional concerns and goals are easily bogged down by politics and administrative detail. Kaarle Nordenstreng and Frank Beyersdorf conclude the book with a truistic, but all-too-relevant remark:

It is naïve and self-deceptive to believe that international journalists and their associations could ever be apolitical. However, the movement is not deterministically driven by politics; it is also driven by professional interests with greater or lesser autonomy. At the crossroads of professionalism and politics the movement needs to be vigilant and reflective *vis-à-vis* its present challenges and its past history.

The history of the movement thus makes for a valuable lesson to be learnt, and *A history of the International Movement of Journalists* is an apt vessel for its delivery.

Ville Manninen

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND