

IDEALISM, AGGRESSION, APOLOGY, AND CRITICISM:
THE FOUR TRADITIONS OF RESEARCH ON 'INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION'¹

by

Heikki Hellman

in collaboration with

Kaarle Nordenstreng and Tapio Varis

(Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of
Tampere, Finland)

Paper prepared for the XII Congress of the International Association
for Mass Communication Research (IAMCR), Caracas, August 26-29, 1980

1. PREFACE

It was in the '50s in the United States and, for example, in the '70s in Finland that 'international communication' became established as a specific field of research. During its history it has accepted a cumulating multitude of 'communication phenomena' as its object. The following passage from Hamid Mowlana (1973, 80) reflects the prevailing extensive fashion of understanding the object of study:

"The term of international communication has been used in this study² in a rather broad sense. It is not restricted to international political communication and campaigns by governments, but it includes such varied activities as international mass communication and news agency activities, impact of mass media across cultures, communication activities of non-governmental organizations and the international contacts of students, scholars, tourists, and technical assistants."³

As a matter of fact, we can say that the research on 'international communication' does not seem to have an object of study, in the strict sense of the word, but only a certain 'area' or 'field of research'. The research on 'international communication' has appeared as "a rather immediate reaction to challenges provided by social development" (cf. Pietilä 1979, 42), and it has been formed like a puzzle, as ever-increasing problems have become as its object. Typically, it is a sort of concrete social research (on the concept see *ibid.*, 39-46), which has studied the phenomena in its 'field' from the perspectives of various disciplines: political science, sociology (and especially 'media sociology'), anthropology and psychology. The result has been an eclectic 'interdisciplinary' field of research, which "provides a

focal point for combining communication knowledge from several areas" (cf. Markham 1970, 62).

The present study - with the final report being published later in the autumn - has its origins in a research project on 'Transnational Communication' led by Dr. Tapio Varis.⁴ It started from the observation that our knowledge on the tradition of 'international communication' research is very poorly constructed. Systematic - to say nothing of critical - presentations or interpretations on the tradition do not exist. Reviews by Lazarsfeld (1952-53), Smith (1956), Bobrow (1972, 33-46), Mowlana (1973), Golding (1974) and Nordenstreng & Schiller (1979b) are too brief but still useful when trying to trace the tracks of the tradition. Some of them study the trends in the whole field of research. Most of them, however, only the development of certain thematics. Moreover, information on the development of 'international communication' studies in U.S. schools of journalism collected by Markham (1956), Markham & Chiao (1964), and Kappen (1970) are very helpful for our purposes.

The present author examined a great number of research reports, books, and articles on 'international communication', and also the available reviews on development of the tradition. The two bibliographies published on the field (Smith & Smith 1956 and Mowlana 1971) were used as a guide, but in addition to that also material left outside the bibliographies was studied. The purpose of the study was to present the general lines of how research on 'international communication' has developed, and what kind of themes and theoretical thinking have dominated the research in its different phases of development. Mainly the research originates in the United States, which is natural: there the processes related to the internationalisation of culture and communication were first understood as specific problems. In the United States mass communication research was vigorous already in the '30s and '40s, while, for example, in Europe it started to grow only in the '60s. Interest in 'international communication' came somewhat later than interest in communication in general. The first indications of academic research, however, date back to as early as the 1910s.

One of the central results of the study is that it is useful to distinguish four different phases of development in the tradition. The basis of the division is, what is the strategic political (especially from the aspect of foreign policy) and economic meaning or importance of the 'international communication' studies in the interests of the United States. The four phases in the tradition are:

- (1) 'idealistic phase'
- (2) 'aggressive phase'
- (3) 'apologetic phase'
- (4) 'critical phase'

'Idealism' lasted from the end of World War I to the beginning of World War II, 'aggression' from the war to the end of the '50s, through the 'coldest' period of the cold war, and 'apology' from the latter half of the '50s to the beginning of the '70s. It was at the end of the '60s that 'criticism' started to appear, and today, in certain research circles, it has an established position. Certain themes and approaches are characteristic of each phase of development.

The phases named above should not be understood too literally or rigidly. They are only trends in research typical of certain historical situations - they are not necessarily even major streams of research. For example, in the United States there is no strong tendency of 'critical' research, but rather the prevailing themes and approaches

are connected to 'apologetic' or even 'aggressive' thinking. The phases do not follow each other as a continuum but they live side by side and as parallels.

In the following, each of the four phases of development are considered separately. At the end of the paper, some general remarks on the research tradition on 'international communication' are presented.

2. 'IDEALISM': THE PROMISE OF COMMUNICATION AND THE THREAT OF PROPAGANDA

On the one hand, the roots of research on 'international communication' can be traced in the development of journalist training. Already shortly before and immediately after World War I a handful of leading U.S. schools of journalism found it necessary to familiarize their students with foreign communications systems, and this is how courses of 'comparative journalism' started. Columbia University appears to have been the first to start such courses (1913), and although there was not much interest in the field until after World War II, 'comparative journalism' has had an important position in 'international communication' studies. (Markham & Chiao 1964, 247-248.)

However, more important for the development of tradition have been studies on propaganda. Their importance began to increase during World War I, and they were established during the decades between the wars. Scholars and also the public felt anxiety over the possible use of propaganda for military and political purposes, of which the recent war was a demonstration that everyone could remember. At the same time, also the demoralising effects of new means of mass communication - film and radio - were given attention. The rising mass communication research formulated a more or less explicit theory, which understood the public as a 'victim' of mass communications, as an 'atomized mass', which can be stimulated into action by each message without any possibilities to control its movements. The basis of the theory was the famous stimulus-response model, generally known as the S-R model. In this model the contents and effects of a message were seen as equal, and content analysis was a typical approach. However, modern quantitative methods had not yet been developed. In general, it can be said that the research had a moralising tone.

In the field of 'international communication' scholars concentrated on Nazi propaganda as well as on Soviet propaganda - both seen as 'totalitarian' -, and the amount of literature published in the field in the '30s was large. One of the objects was also the methods and activities of propaganda in the previous war. (See for example Lasswell 1927, Doob 1935, and Childs 1936.) It was at the end of the decade that a quantitative method of content analysis was developed.

Many people opposed propaganda, because it was believed to influence public opinion in a way which was politically undesirable. On the other hand the fear of propaganda also included a considerable portion of genuine 'idealism' and desire for peace. Propaganda was seen as attacking the struggle for both increased understanding among nations and for preventing a new world war. Thus, propaganda was dealt with from the principles and interests of international law and international relations. These approaches emphasized the rights and responsibilities of mass communications and the 'social responsibility' of journalism on a global scale. These 'idealists' understood that mass

communications have a kind of a double nature: they may be "powerful agents for good or for ill in working for peace and mutual understanding or for jealousy, hatred and misunderstanding between nations" (Bleyer 1926, 13). They considered that the use of mass communications in service of 'Good' should be favoured by the norms of journalistic ethics and by control of contents. They wanted to use communications for positive and integrative purposes.

One single study which is a good representative of 'idealistic' thinking in research on 'international communication' dates back to a short 'idealistic' period after World War II. The study in question is a report published by an unofficial organ, the Commission on Freedom of the Press, generally known as the Hutchins Commission: Peoples Speaking to Peoples (White & Leigh 1946). In the hope of linking "all the habitable parts of the globe with abundant, cheap, significant, true information about the world from day to day, so that all men increasingly may have the opportunity to learn know, and understand each other" (ibid., 13), the Commission set three objectives concerning 'international communication'. The first task would be to improve its physical facilities and operating mechanisms; secondly, the progressive removal of political barriers and the lessening of economic restrictions would be needed; and thirdly, and also foremost "the improvement of the accuracy, representative character, and quality of the words and images transmitted in international communication" would be necessary. (Ibid.) According to the authors, this was the only way of fulfilling the promise of the technical possibilities of mass communication.

Parallel to the prevailing thinking in the field of 'international communication' were the trends in research on international politics. 'Idealism' in the latter strongly emphasized the principles set by international law and ideals of international peace and integration. 'Idealism' was most vigorous after the both world wars. Its first major achievement was the establishment of the League of Nations; the second achievement was the United Nations.

3. 'AGGRESSION': THE PROBLEM OF EFFICIENCY OF PROPAGANDA

During World War II and the Cold War following it, propaganda became more and more frankly recognized "as a regular branch of government alongside economic and military departments" (Whitton 1951, 142). It was then that campaigns of propaganda started to be systematically or 'scientifically' planned and carried out. The Smith-Mundt Act, the basis of U.S. foreign communication and propaganda efforts, was passed in 1948, and, for example, the USIA and the Voice of America got started under its jurisdiction. During the war a specific Office of War Information, with considerable research resources, had studied the 'morale' or 'psychological state' of the enemy as well as of friendly nations. Wartime experiences and resources were channeled into the psychological warfare of the late '40s and the '50s. Unlike during the 'idealistic phase', scholars were not interested in the ethics of 'international communication' or possibilities in ensuring the peace, but rather their duty was to search for measures to strenghten the effects of propaganda. On the one hand, the research was directed by politico-strategic interests but, on the other, the economic interests of U.S. capital. The result was a "Marshall Plan of ideas" (see Wanger 1950, 446), which was supported by the doctrine of free flow of information, introduced by the United States during and immediately after World War II.⁵

It was in the '40s that mass communication research took its first noteworthy steps. Especially the study of effects was in focus, and as a result the concept of the omnipotency of mass communication began to wither away. The more effects were studied, the more the simple S-R model was substituted by a more complicated S-O-R model, which introduces certain preconditioning variables between the message and its effect. The audience was no more considered as a homogenized mass but as a organized group of people selecting messages. A central element in this thinking was the theory of 'opinion leaders' on which the famous two-step-flow hypothesis was based.⁶ At the same time Shannon (1948) presented his "schematic diagram of a general communication system", which understood communication as an abstracted exchange process. The same logic, but in a bit more 'practical' shape, can be found in the well-known Lasswellian formula of 'who says what to whom with what effect'.

In the beginning of the '50s Paul Lazarsfeld (1952-53, 486) predicted that "international communications research will have most of the talent, funds and interest which domestic communication has commanded for the past twenty years". The prediction came true within the decade (Smith 1956, 7-12), when the new communication theory was applied to 'international communication', with significant funding from the U.S. government. 'International communication' became "one of the most important communication laboratories of our time" (Schramm 1954, ii).

Although the effects of communication were the central object of study, all research did not concentrate solely on it. The Lasswellian phrase enlarged the horizon of effect studies - and if, in the '30s, the focus had been in the 'what' component, i.e. the contents, it was the 'who' and 'to whom' components that now gained more importance. Problems of 'international communication' deserved special attention, because the communication process was considered more complicated in the international than in the domestic context. Davison & George (1954, 434) described the difficulties in the following way:

"When we turn our attention to international political communication, where the 'who' is a complicated propaganda apparatus in one culture, the 'whom' is often an amorphous audience in another culture, and the purpose and circumstances are bound up with all the intricacies of international relations, then it is clear that we are not yet qualified to undertake a systematic study of international political communication." (Emphasis omitted; cf. Glock 1952-53, 469, Smith 1952-53, 170, and Klapper 1960, x.)⁷

Observations like this directed scholars more and more to debate on the preconditions of effects. For example, Glock (1952-53, 479) emphasized that the "full comprehension of the life of peoples of another culture" is essential for the success of psychological offensives. Similarly, Davison & George (1954, 441) wrote that "for our purposes, (...) an important part of our audience or 'target' analysis must be to assess in detail the political structure and dynamic political processes in the country to which our communications are addressed". As many as possible of the preconditioning variables should be reached through research, because it is only if "the communications content is adequate, and geared in with other types of action, if the conditions of communication are favorable and audience characteristics are taken adequately into account" that "a communication may have certain effects on one or more members of the audience which receives it" (ibid., 442).

Studies providing background material were, thus, important. One

of the specific objects was public opinion in different countries (see for example Public Opinion in Western Europe, 1953), another was Soviet Union (see Inkeles 1950, Leites 1953, and Berghoorn 1960).

As in the 'idealistic phase' also in the 'aggressive phase', there can be seen parallel tendencies between research on 'international communication' and international politics. In international political science, so called 'realism' had started to strengthen in the '30s, and it was in the years of Cold War that Hans J. Morgenthau (1955) presented 'six principles of political realism' in his book Politics among Nations.⁸ According to him a 'realist' - unlike an 'idealist' - does not search for an abstracted moral basis for actions of states, but he is only interested in the success of these actions with regard to politically accepted goals. International politics is not directed by coherent interests of states but by a conflict of national interests, and the major interest is power, Morgenthau argued. 'Realism' conducted U.S. foreign policy through the '50s, and this policy was supported by the scholars of 'international communication'.

4. 'APOLOGY': THE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

During the '50s various scholars noticed that 'international communication' research should concentrate its efforts on developing countries. This was already observed by Lasswell (1951, 545), who wrote that "the greatest successes of Russian propaganda have been scored among non-industrial people". In the course of the decade, the 'aggression' typical of the Cold War period changed into more subtle means of propaganda, with technological cooperation and modernization as its facades. Bruce Lannes Smith, who was one of the advocates of the new 'positive' approach, called it "Free World development communication", and he defined enlargement and consolidation of the Free World as its goals (Smith 1956, 14-15).⁹ The 'new strategy' presented itself as a humanitarian development program, with the United States as its moving force supported by the prestige of the United Nations, but, in reality, it became an apology of cold war and the westernization of developing nations.

At the beginning of the '60s, the importance of functionalist approach increased in mass communication research and in other social sciences, too. This 'structural-formal' school studied communication as a many-sided but organized phenomenon, and, according to Veikko Pietilä (1977, 19-20), a Finnish scholar, characteristic of this approach is that it does not conceive communication only as a sociopsychological interplay between the sender and the receiver, but also - more than the former 'behavioral' school had done - as a social system serving certain social functions.¹⁰ Research on modernization related to 'international communication' can be seen as a manifestation of functionalism: there communication is given a certain 'function' as an instrument of the development of a 'system'.

Modernization signified the transition of 'traditional' societies towards a 'modern', urbanized and industrialized society formed according to the 'Western model' (see for example Lerner 1958 and 1967). The focus was not so much on economic-technological development but rather on political development or, as it was called, national development. The connection between communication and national development was seen as instrumental. For example, according to Lerner mass communications may produce in the developing nations empathy, which is a

capacity or 'state of mind' encouraging a person to break away from traditional modes of thought and behavior, to participate, etc. (Lerner 1958, 412). He even argues that the "modernization process begins with new public communication - the diffusion of new ideas and new information which stimulate people to want to behave in new ways" (Lerner 1963, 348; emphasis added). In the last instance, Lerner's approach is psychological - he thinks the key to development is in the minds of men, in a certain psychological state. On the other hand, he believes there is a correlation or even causality between communication and national development, but this idea remains a hypothesis. A similar approach also characterizes the studies by Pool (1967), Pye (1963) and Schramm (1964; see also Schramm & Ruggels 1967).¹¹

Also certain other themes were vigorous during the 'apologetic phase' of 'international communication' research. Very close to the problems of national development were the studies on the diffusion of innovations (see for example Rogers 1962). Various books and articles on the barriers and difficulties of intercultural communication were also published. Moreover, the increase in research on news and information flows seems to be connected with this phase. These studies pushed scholars little by little towards criticism of global communication structures. But, in general, American researchers did not want to reject the principles of free flow, because, as it was thought, barriers to free flow of information meant barriers to modernization.

5. 'CRITICISM': CRITIQUE OF GLOBAL STRUCTURES OF COMMUNICATION

The 'softening' of U.S. propaganda activities was a correlate of the 'new strategy' of foreign policy. Instead of aggressive words, 'propaganda of deeds' - i.e. transfer of technology and social practices - was exploited. Propaganda became opaque, it ideologized. But it was not opaque enough, because criticism of prevailing communication structures was raised in many parts of the world, both in the field of politics and in the field of research.

In politics, the problems of 'international communication' were most extensively considered among the movement of non-aligned countries. It argued that free flow principles had resulted in the situation where the national sovereignty of nations is threatened by a few industrial nations dominating the flow of information, its direction as well as its quantity and quality. According to the movement the information structure was a manifestation of imperialism in the cultural sphere.

In the field of research, parallel ideas were formulated in a thesis of cultural or media imperialism (see for example Boyd-Barrett 1977, Schiller 1969 and 1976, and Wells 1972). For example, Schiller (1969, 16) emphasized that it is not only the domination in communication or culture which is important, but it is the domination of the whole capitalist system, making use of the communication apparatus. Without the help of communications "the new imperial surge would be ineffective", he argued. Central agents of this new power are the multinational corporations operating as a military-industrial complex, aiming at capital accumulation. The repressive results of this process are not limited to the sphere of economy but extend deep into culture.

'Critical' research has never got much of a foothold in the United States, where the focus is still on the themes familiar from the 'apologetic' or even 'aggressive' phase. The American positivist-

pragmatist scientific atmosphere, typical for historical reasons, has not provided fruitful soil for genuine criticism. For this reason, the most critical voices concerning 'international communication' come from other parts of the world, usually from Europe or Latin America (see for example Mattelart 1976, Somavia 1976, and Sunkel 1976) - but, in general, the analyses presented by Herbert Schiller have not often been surpassed. The problem with 'criticism' has been the inability to elaborate the phenomena of internationalization of culture and communication with the help of general theories of society - there has not been a carefully weighed theory, for example, of global monopoly capitalism supporting the concept of media imperialism. The criticism of global communication structure was developed in a theoretical vacuum, where the thesis of media imperialism was no more than a hypothesis.¹²

However, there were parallel 'critical' trends in neighboring fields of research. The modern theories of imperialism, developed in the '60s with their concepts of 'center' and 'periphery' (Galtung 1971), or 'metropole' and 'satellite' (Frank 1967), could have provided help for the elaboration of 'international communication' - as it partly did (see Salinas & Paldán 1979). That the gap between general (capitalism) and specific (communication structure) has not yet been more carefully bridged, must be attributed to the theoretical impotence of mass communication research.

One important achievement of the 'critical phase' of research has been that scholars have started to consider communication structure a totality, and, accordingly, the difference between 'international' and 'domestic' aspects has been understood as only apparent. Criticism has been directed at the total communication structure - an approach which well can be called a 'wholistic framework' (cf. Nordenstreng 1975, 278-279). At the same time, there has been a 'trend towards communication policy' (ibid.) in research, which means that criticism has been linked with sociopolitical goals and reforms. Although the criticism may have been limping, it has raised important problems and questions to the level of debate - all that is left for scholars is to search for better criticism and to advance towards the possibilities of emancipation.

6. SOME REMARKS ON THE 'PRACTICABILITY' OF RESEARCH TRADITION

At the beginning of the article it was mentioned that 'international communication' as a field of research has developed on a highly 'practical' basis as a rather immediate reaction to challenges presented by social development. In this sense, the tradition has been a part of concrete social research.

However, it is not enough to call the tradition 'practical', but we could make use of the concept of social technology by Karl Popper (1952). According to Popper, a social technologist is not interested in the origin of social institutions. Instead he asks - and this is the ideal of science Popper wants to present - whether the institution is adequately planned and organized in relation to its goals. In other words, the social technologist is an official who has a limited duty to look for methods and to produce measures to make the objectives come true. Thus, in Popper's concept, science remains "a technique narrowly serving for attaining goals" (Pietilä 1980, 13).

It has been argued that "after World War II, a noticeable share of social science was methodologically organized in the service of social technology".¹³ Science has become a manifestation of 'technical

rationality', and social research has given itself up to the "direct service to army generals and social workers, corporation managers and prison wardens", as C. Wright Mills (1959, 91) has written. According to Mills, two tendencies can be traced. Firstly, bureaucratic use of research has been increasing and, secondly, studies are also used in ideological ways. The result has been "a bureaucratic social science", which does not address the public; it has "specific clients with particular interests and perplexities". (Ibid., 91-92, 114-116.)

The tradition of 'international communication' research can be elaborated in the light of the sociotechnological break in social sciences. Its early tradition is still connected with the old 'social philosophy' with its ethical and normative tendencies. Thinking may have been based on practical presumptions, but research was not yet subsumed under the command of prevailing social practices. The situation changed decisively during World War II, when empirical and quantitative methods, the whole behavioral tradition, was established. Research started to serve whatever ends its bureaucratic clients may have had in view, and governmentally organized and ideologically loaded 'international communication' research was increased in talent, funds and resources. Studies concerning public opinion or efficiency of propaganda campaigns served as planning instruments for political and economic operations. The research itself was a part of a general 'Marshall Plan of ideas' (cf. Wanger 1950).

If the 'aggressive phase' in the tradition was a manifestation of the sociotechnological break, the 'apologetic phase' was a consummation of social technology - the research was more and more fully connected to communication policies. So far, the linkage between research and economic-political processes had been very firm in the United States (and also in various other Western industrial nations), but from then on, the bureaucrat-ideological use of 'international communication' research became a general or even global habit, supported energetically by the United Nations and Unesco.

Though in its 'critical phase', the research has not been able to discard its administrative burden, and, thus, the criticism has suffered from its dependence on commissions of bureaucratic organs.¹⁴ Scholars of 'international communication' - or rather of the internationalization of culture and communication - have not reached the ideal of 'critical theory' presented by Max Horkheimer (1937), the founder of the Frankfurt School of thought.

A scholar aiming at genuine criticism would not try to "eliminate one or other abuse, for it regards such abuses as necessarily connected with the way in which the social structure is organized". Moreover, critical theory has not as its purpose "the better functioning of any element in the [social] structure. On the contrary, it is suspicious of the very categories of better, useful, appropriate, productive, and valuable, as these are understood in the present order, and refuses to take them as nonscientific presuppositions about which one can do nothing." (Ibid., 207.)

Critical theory would try to find out, what characterizes our social practices and why. Critical theory would try to elaborate the 'second nature' that subsumes our practices, and through overthrowing it, it would aim at man's emancipation.¹⁵

REFERENCES

- 1) The present paper is based on a research report that will be published later in the autumn by the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Tampere (Hellman 1980).
- 2) Mowlana has conducted a project on the research tradition of 'international communication'. The article used here presented some quantitative trends in research.
- 3) Cf. Smith (1956, 6), who writes: "In this essay, the term 'international communication' will be used in a rather broad sense. It is not restricted to campaigns of information conducted by governments, although these play an important part in it. 'International communication' also includes the negotiations conducted by diplomats; the activities of international news-gathering agencies; the creation of impressions abroad by tourists and other migrants; the probably massive but generally unplanned impact of books, art works, and movies distributed in foreign countries; the international contacts of students, educators, scientists, and technical assistance experts; the negotiations and correspondence of international business interests; the activities of international missionaries and religious movements; the work of international pressure groups, such as trade unions, chambers of commerce, and political parties; international philanthropic activities, like the Ford Foundation's 'private Point Four' program in India; the 'propaganda of the deed' implicit even in the unpublished activities of leaders and collectivities, as perceived by various audiences; and a great many other processes by which information and persuasion are consciously or unconsciously disseminated across national and cultural boundaries." This, perhaps better than the passage above from Mowlana, reflects the prevailing fashion of seeing the object of study.
- 4) The project concentrated on the activities of transnational corporations in communications (see Guback & Varis 1977), but it also elaborated possible codes of conduct (see Varis 1978).
- 5) Schiller (1976, 24-45) presents the history of the free flow doctrine.
- 6) The central results of these studies are summed up by Klapper (1960).
- 7) Cf. Klapper (ibid., x), who explains the reason why he does not deal with 'international communication' in his famous book in the following way: "The problems which would be evoked by so broadly expanding the width of concern are compounded by the fact that foreign communication systems are organized and controlled in various dissimilar ways, and by the fact that the audiences exist in milieus culturally different from that of the United States. Proper consideration of the effects of mass communication under such conditions would involve taking account of such an array of variables as to render the task unfeasible within the limitations of the present study."
- 8) Morgenthau does not present the 'principles' in the first edition of his book, which was published in 1948.
- 9) Smith (1956, 14) writes as follows: "One of these [areas of research needed] is the design and testing of hypotheses concerning various kinds of 'consolidation communication' for audiences in the Free World. For example, what forms of communication can moderate the gap

between hunger and poverty of the economically less-developed areas of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East and the relatively extreme prosperity of Western Europe and the United States? What types of policy (including communication policy) will most promptly eradicate the after-effects of the age of colonialism? Of racism? (...) Only if appropriate policies and communications on these themes were pre-tested, applied, and post-evaluated could one say with confidence that the psychopolitical foundations exist for the defense and development of the Free World to a level of strength sufficient to contain world Communism."

10) On the 'schools' of mass communication research see more thoroughly Pietilä (1977).

11) On criticism of the modernization doctrine see for example Golding (1974) and Hedebro (1979).

12) This criticism is presented, for example, by Leena Paldán (1980), a Finnish scholar. A good overview of general thinking and themes of 'critical phase' can be found in a reader edited by Nordenstreng & Schiller (1979a).

13) Argumentation is presented, for example, by two Finnish philosophers, Matti Juntunen & Lauri Mehtonen (1977, 115).

14) A good example is provided by the research activities of Unesco (see for example Many Voices, One World, 1980).

15) More about critical theory, see Horkheimer (1937) and Pietilä (1980).

LITERATURE

- Barghoorn, Frederick C. (1960), The Soviet Cultural Offensive. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Bleyer, Willard Grosvenor (1926), The Press and Public Opinion in International Relations. Journalism Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 2, June 1926, p. 7-20.
- Bobrow, Davis B. (1972), Transfer of Meaning across National Boundaries. In Richard L. Merritt (ed.), Communication in International Politics. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1972, p. 33-61.
- Boyd-Barrett, Oliver (1977), Media Imperialism: Towards an International Framework for the Analysis of Media Systems. In James Curran & Michael Gurewitch & Janet Woollacott (eds.), Mass Communication and Society. London: Edward Arnold, 1977, p. 116-135.
- Childs, Harwood Lawrence (ed.) (1936), Propaganda and Dictatorship. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1936.
- Davison, W. Philips & George, Alexander L. (1954), An Outline for the Study of International Political Communication. In Wilbur Schramm (ed.), The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1954, p. 433-443.
- Doob, Leonard W. (1935), Propaganda: Its Psychology and Technique. New York: Henry Holt, 1935.
- Frank, Andre Gunder (1967), Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- Galtung, Johan (1971), A Structural Theory of Imperialism. Journal of Peace Research 2/1971, p. 81-117.
- Glock, Charles (1952-53), The Comparative Study of Communications and Opinion Formation. In Wilbur Schramm (ed.), The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1954, p. 469-479.
- Golding, Peter (1974), Media Role in National Development: Critique of a Theoretical Orthodoxy. Journal of Communication, Vol. 24, No. 3, Summer 1974, p. 39-53.
- Guback, Thomas & Varis, Tapio (1977), Transnational Communication: Film and Television. Manuscript, submitted to Unesco, August 1977.
- Hedebro, Göran (1979), Communication and Social Change in Developing Nations. A Critical View. Studies in Economic Psychology 110. Stockholm: The Economic Research Institute, Stockholm School of Economics/School of Journalism, University of Stockholm, 1979.
- Hellman, Heikki (1980), Ajatusten Marshall-suunnitelma. Tutkimus 'kansainvälisen viestinnän' tutkimustradition kehityksestä (Marshall Plan of Ideas: A Study on Development of 'International Communication' Research - in Finnish). University of Tampere, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication (forthcoming).
- Horkheimer, Max (1937), Traditional and Critical Theory. In Max Horkheimer, Critical Theory. Selected Essays. New York: Seabury Press, 1972, p. 188-243.
- Inkeles, Alex (1950), Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

- Juntunen, Matti & Mehtonen, Lauri (1977), Ihmistieteiden filosofiset perusteet (The Philosophic Foundations of Social Sciences - in Finnish). Jyväskylä: Gummerus, 1977.
- Kappen, Charles W. (1970), A Survey of Curricula in International Communication. In James Markham (ed.), International Communication as a Field of Study. Iowa City: International Communications Division/Association for Education in Journalism, 1970, p. 73-80.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1927), Propaganda Technique in World War I. New Edition. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1971.
- (1951), The Strategy of Soviet Propaganda. In Wilbur Schramm (ed.), The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1954, p. 537-547.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (1952-53), The Prognosis for International Communications Research. In Heinz-Dietrich Fischer & John Calhoun Merrill (eds.), International and Intercultural Communication. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1976, p. 485-492.
- Leites, Nathan (1953), A Study of Bolshevism. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953.
- Lerner, Daniel (1958), The Passing of Traditional Society. Modernizing the Middle East. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.
- (1963), Toward a Communication Theory of Modernization. In Lucien Pye (ed.), Communications and Political Development. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963, p. 327-350.
- (1967), International Cooperation and Communication in National Development. In Daniel Lerner & Wilbur Schramm (eds.), Communication and Change in Developing Countries. Honolulu: East-West Center, 1967, p. 103-125.
- Many Voices, One World. Communication and Society Today and Tomorrow. (The Final Report of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems). London/New York/Paris: Kogan Page/Unipub/Unesco, 1980.
- Markham, James (1956), Journalism School Courses in International Communications. Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 2, Spring 1956, p. 201-206.
- (ed.) (1970), International Communication as a Field of Study. Iowa City: International Communications Division/Association for Education in Journalism, 1970
- & Chiao, Theodore (1964), Growth of International Communication Studies in U.S. Schools of Journalism. Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 41, No. 2, Spring 1964, p. 247-252.
- Mattelart, Armand (1976), Multinational Corporations and The Control of Culture. The Ideological Apparatuses of Imperialism. Sussex/New Jersey: Harvester Press/Humanities Press, 1979.
- Mills, C. Wright (1959), The Sociological Imagination. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1975.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. (1955), Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Mowlana, Hamid (1971), International Communication: A Selected Bibliography. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1971.

- (1973), Trends in Research on International Communication in the United States. Gazette, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1973, p. 79-90.
- Nordenstreng, Kaarle (1975), Tiedotusoppi (Communication Research - in Finnish). Keuruu: Otava, 1975.
- & Schiller, Herbert I. (eds.) (1979a), National Sovereignty and International Communication. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1979.
- & Schiller, Herbert I. (1979b), Introduction [to the Part I]. In Kaarle Nordenstreng & Herbert I. Schiller (eds.), National Sovereignty and International Communication. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1979, p. 3-8.
- Paldán, Leena (1980), A book review on Armand Mattelart's 'Multi-national corporations and the Control of Culture'. Media, Culture and Society, forthcoming autumn 1980.
- Pietilä, Veikko (1977), On the Scientific Status of the Communication Research. University of Tampere, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Reports No. 35/1977. 2nd revised edition. Tampere, 1978.
- (1979), Yhteiskuntatieteiden tieteenfilosofisia lähtökohtia (Introduction to Scientific-Philosophical Foundations of Social Sciences - in Finnish). University of Tampere, Research Institute, Reports C: 26. Tampere, 1979.
- (1980), Yhteiskuntatiede ja yhteiskunnallinen käytäntö (Social Science and Social Praxis - in Finnish). Tiede ja edistys 1/1980, p. 13-20.
- Pool, Ithiel de Sola (1963), The Mass Media and Politics in the Modernization Process. In Lucien W. Pye (ed.), Communications and Political Development. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963, p. 234-253.
- Popper, Karl (1952), The Open Society and Its Enemies I-II. Second, Revised Edition. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952.
- Pye, Lucien W. (1963), Introduction. In Lucien W. Pye (ed.), Communication and Political Development. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963, p. 3-23.
- Rogers, Edgar M. (1962), Diffusion of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Salinas, Raquel & Paldán, Leena (1979), Culture in the Process of Dependent Development: Theoretical Perspectives. In Kaarle Nordenstreng & Herbert I. Schiller (eds.), National Sovereignty and International Communication. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1979, p. 82-98.
- Schiller, Herbert I. (1969), Mass Communications and American Empire. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1969.
- (1976), Communication and Cultural Domination. White Plains, N.Y.: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1976.
- Schramm, Wilbur (ed.) (1954), The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1954.
- (1964), Mass Media and National Development. The Role of Information in the Developing Countries. Stanford, California/Paris: Stanford University Press/Unesco, 1964.
- & Ruggels, W. Lee (1967), How Mass Media Systems Grow. In Daniel Lerner & Wilbur Schramm (eds.), Communication and Change in Developing Countries. Honolulu: East-West Center, 1967, p. 57-75.

- Shannon, Claude E. (1948), The Mathematical Theory of Communication. In Claude E. Shannon & Warren Weaver, The Mathematical Theory of Communication. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1964, p. 31-125.
- Smith, Bruce Lannes (1952-53), Communications Research on Non-Industrial Countries. In Wilbur Schramm (ed.), The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1954, p. 170-179.
- (1956), Trends in Research on International Communication and Opinion, 1945-1955. In Bruce Lannes Smith & Chitra M. Smith, International Communication and Political Opinion: A Guide to the Literature. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1956, p. 5-21.
- & Smith, Chitra M. (1956), International Communication and Political Opinion: A Guide to the Literature. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Somavia, Juan (1976), The Transnational Power Structure and International Information. Elements of a Third World Policy for Transnational News Agencies. Development Dialogue 2/1976, p. 15-28.
- Sunkel, Oswaldo (1976), The Development of Development Thinking. Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Essex, England, 1976 (occasional paper).
- Varis, Tapio (1978), The Mass Media TNCs: An Overall Review of Their Operations and of Control Options. Cooperation and Conflict 4/1978, p. 193-213.
- Wanger, Walter (1950), Donald Duck and Diplomacy. Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 14, No. 3, Fall 1950, p. 443-452.
- Wells, Alan (1972), Picture Tube Imperialism? The Impact of U.S. Television on Latin America. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1972.
- White, Llewellyn & Leigh, Robert D. (1946), Peoples Speaking to Peoples. A Report on International Communication from the Commission on Freedom of the Press. Reprinted Edition. New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Whitton, John B. (1951), Propaganda in Cold Wars. Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 15, No. 1, Spring 1951.