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1. Introduction

Interactivity—wide interactivity—characterizes today’s marketplace. From personal communication devices (PDAs) to social networks like Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, and Flikr, people and businesses connect with each other at an unprecedented rate. In this interactive world, conceptions of public and private discourse and behavior have become more ambiguous than ever; so too have the “right ways” to reach people.

This engaged reality has a significant impact for the field of marketing—a field traditionally understood as the means to build a public bridge between an organization, its product(s), and its current and/or prospective audiences through a production (product-based) orientation. According to Shiffman (2008), business today faces a wholly new marketing reality.

We can no longer write a marketing plan at the beginning of the year and execute against it over the year. The traditional marketing plan can do no more than give us a snapshot of a point in time. It doesn’t help us make the right decisions as we move forward in a complex and constantly changing marketplace. . . . The only marketing strategy that will work today is one that is designed to encourage and incorporate change as the product evolves. (Shiffman, 2008, p. 25)

The present emphasis on multiplicity, audience, and conversation calls for a nimbleness and agility within marketing not characteristic of its traditional theory and practices. To remain relevant, marketing must adapt by first recognizing how this moment of engagement and interactivity changes everything.

First, the engaged nature of this historical moment has reconstituted the role and function of marketing. Most companies do not resemble Apple: They cannot create products and have people come to them based on the quality and uniqueness of the product itself. Most companies have products and services that look like many other products and services. Therefore, they require consumer research and a sound competitive strategy to succeed. Second, the pervasiveness of “engagement” as a way of life elevates the centrality of communication to human experience in all contexts including the marketplace. It is not enough to gauge business decisions based on demographic data or extensive (scientific) marketing research. The marketplace demands rhetorical and interpretive practices that yield resonant insights and result in strong common interests between companies and the people they depend on for their existence. And third, marketing can no longer do it alone. Engagement coupled with a strong service orientation in today’s marketplace necessitates stronger connections across all facets of organizational communication. Specifically, it requires an integrated relationship between marketing and marketing communication in order to establish communicative cohesiveness internally and externally.

This essay explores marketing’s approach to today’s situation of interactivity and engagement as strategic integrated communication. Specifically referred to as Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC), this emergent discipline constitutes a prophetic response to today’s marketplace, privileging the consumer as the fulcrum for all marketing planning, strategy, and execution. This outside-in approach aligns marketing and marketing communication for the express purpose of navigating change and ambiguity in order to build strong communication plans. Agile internal and external communication strategies make up the ideal commitment of IMC. Together these create added value for a company by enhancing the sense of continuity between often disparate entities, as well as by emphasizing the value dimensions of an organization so that they can be communicated publicly. While the integra-
tation of internal and external organizational communication practices has not yet come to full realization in theory or practice, this commitment forms an undercurrent in IMC, eagerly pursued by scholars and practitioners of the discipline. To this end, this paper will establish the baseline for the fulfillment of this commitment by tracing IMC as an emerging discipline.

A. Introduction: The issues

Marketers today work within a complex moment to advance a discipline steeped in tradition. Scholars and practitioners of marketing realize that postmodernity and the philosophical disposition of postmodernism poses unique challenges to the way things have always been done. Christensen, Torp, & Firat (2005) bring to light this reality as they treat today’s increasingly fluid environments. The ambient emphasis in marketing poses new challenges for organizations used to doing business and marketing in more traditional contexts, not the constant change of today’s global marketplace. Ponsonby & Boyle (2004), Vargo & Lusch (2004), and Peñaloza & Venkatesh (2008) highlight challenges to marketing through the shift from production to consumption. They offer insight by heightening awareness of the increasingly service-oriented economy and its relationship to consumption. Proctor & Kitchen (2002) set the stage for examining a service orientation by questioning whether or not the consumer focus in marketing actually satisfies consumers, or whether marketers simply help them to live out postmodernism’s notion that consumers only know what they do not want.

Exploratory work related to marketing and the philosophical premises of postmodernism make explicit the critical juncture of consumer, consumption, and service today. Christensen (1997), Brown (1997), Firat and Schultz II (1997), as well as Denison and McDonald (1995) first sounded a collective warning concerning the potential for postmodernism to influence marketing in ways that alter its role and abet strategic decision making, or at the very least challenge the scientific underpinnings of the discipline on social and cultural terms. Prior to their contributions, the work of Firat, Dholakia, and Venkatesh (1995), Firat and Venkatesh (1995), Brown (1993), Elliott (1994), Rouleau and Clegg (1992), and Ogilvy (1990) established foundational investigations into postmodernism. Through their scholarship, each offered careful scrutiny of the broader philosophical implications of postmodernism for marketing and the marketplace. Likewise, scholarship from Rapp and Collins (1990) and others called attention to the excessive Western focus on “I” and “me” in individualistic terms as a point of attention and opportunity for marketers.

The metaphor of “marketing as a multiplex” provides a helpful overall approach to documenting the various challenges to marketing during and after the transition into the 21st century. Brown (1994) uses films to illustrate the significance of a multiplex metaphor for understanding the contemporary situation of marketing. He builds on conceptions of postmodernism (Berman, 1983; Bell, 1976; Habermas, 1987; Kroker, Kroker, & Cook, 1989; Jencks, 1989; Harvey, 1989; Smart, 1992; Hassan, 1985) to identify the significant challenges of this historical moment for marketing, not the least of which involves gaining an understanding of the moment itself. Brown presents postmodernism in the following way:

[Postmodernism is] a refusal to accept that there is one particular way of doing things and one way only. No form of knowledge is privileged and, rather than search for non-existent truths, one should be sensitive to differences and the perspectives of marginalized groups, exercise the art of judgment in the absence of rules, emphasize the importance of pragmatism, provisionality, and local forms of knowledge and recognize that the objectives of the Enlightenment project are Utopian and unattainable. (1994, p. 38)

His multiplex metaphor offers a cost-benefit analysis of 12 films that illustrate challenges to marketing. For example, he situates the relationship between postmodernism and marketing as parallel to the opening of Jurassic Park (1993). Like the film, Brown argues that postmodernism engenders responses ranging from accolades to cynical critiques of its technical wonders; the cost-benefit determination varies depending on a person’s point within the spectrum of potential responses. In another parallel, Brown suggests that postmodernism offers its own version of The French Connection (1971). He adduces a strong connection between postmodernism and post-structuralist thought, established for example in the work of Derrida, Lyotard, and Foucault, and examines postmodernism for its preoccupation with linguistic instability and the inability to ground meaning on anything other than a “sublimated metaphor” (Brown, 1994, p. 37). Brown offers a final, overarching conclusion that marketing has reached a communicative juncture, caught between its epistemological roots and the complex, undefined, contradictory world championed as postmodern.
For marketers today, the unavoidable question is, “where do we go from here?” (Schultz & Schultz, 2004). The answer requires a response that addresses marketing on two levels: (1) the form and processes of marketing and (2) marketing theory. Form connects to the everyday usability or the “handiness” (Heidegger, 1953/1996) of a given approach; it must communicate the relevance and applicability of the approach in each era. Content, or the “theoretical why,” substantiates the “how to” of form. It provides the substance that guides the application of a given approach. Although most cases do not make the theory explicit, the theory still shapes and informs the marketer’s framework for application.

Responsive marketing, then, requires a reorientation amidst divergent views on how form and theory work together, and under what paradigm. This review itself demonstrates that work to this end is well underway. However, the essay primarily examines more carefully the communicative dimension of this reorientation through the most common answer to the “what next?” question in marketing: integrated marketing communication (IMC).

Given the implicit and explicit communicative nature of integration and IMC as a whole, the scope of this examination pays particular attention to the communicative aspect of integration. After this introduction (Section 1), three primary sections develop the material. Section 2 introduces a shift in the fundamentals of marketing theory and practice. This shift culminates in what Shiffman (2008) calls the “age of engage”—a new era of marketplace and marketing communication grounded in a widespread socio-cultural movement characterized by people engaging and being engaged in more “participative, collaborative, user-generated, sharing, social, global, open, interactive generation” ways (p. 2). Section 3 introduces the move to integration and integrated marketing communication as a phenomenological shift in marketing. It situates the turn to integration in the broader context of an increasingly customer-centric marketplace and heightened importance of engagement as a means for reaching, developing, and sustaining long-term relationships with key audiences. Section 4 offers a concluding overview of insights from past and current conversations about IMC. This final section ends the essay with an invitation to continue the work already underway through an ongoing commitment to the question, “where do we go from here?” Thus, this essay begins and ends in the spirit of Christensen, Firat, and Torp’s observation that “integration is an outcome of many diverse sources... many different voices and types of wisdom in the organizational setting” (2008, p. 443).

2. A Shift in Fundamentals

The traditional approach to marketing treats it as a “business function” much like finance or production (Calder & Malthouse, 2003, p. 9). Indebted to practices from an era of industrialism and mass marketing, traditional marketing emphasizes “the functional translation of the planned STP [segmentation, targeting, and positioning process] into activities [collectively understood in terms of the ‘4Ps’—product, price, place, promotion]” (p. 9). The 4Ps emerged at a time focused on communication about physical products; they represent an organization’s ability to control specific aspects of its business. Under the control of the marketing manager, mass marketing’s emphasis on product (physical attributes, brand development, packaging, etc.), price (strategic pricing decisions, warranties, discounts/retail pricing, etc.), place (distribution channels, market coverage, inventory, etc.), and promotion (advertising, sales, public relations, etc.) aided decision-making aimed at producing perceived value for the consumer. In general, the 4Ps elevated the “science” of orchestration within the marketing mix and all activities according to the STP process, privileging a sense of tangible and measurable outcomes driven by management control of product-based communication (Brown, 1997).

More recent conceptualizations, however, have translated the functional focus of the STP process beyond textbook definitions that position marketing as the anticipation, management, and satisfaction of demand through the exchange process. The shift moves marketing definitions toward a more comprehensive statement of marketing as an indispensable presence in organizations as well as the global marketplace (Christensen, Firat, & Torp, 2008; Eagle,
As such, definitions have changed to reflect marketing as an organizational asset dedicated to a strong sense of purpose, process, and return-on-investment (Holm, 2006; Kliatchko, 2005). Notable among these revisions is the American Marketing Association’s 2007 definition of marketing as “the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large.” This advances the same group’s 2004 definition—marketing as “an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating, and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders”—foregrounding marketing’s long-term value and presence as an organization-wide activity with broader impact, not simply marketing as just another department.

Definitional re-calibration in marketing has coincided with significant theoretical developments. Marketing theory has adapted ideas from positivism and interpretivism (Deshpande, 1983), science (Arndt, 1985a; Arndt, 1985b), humanism (Hirschman, 1986), relational constructs (Christopher, Payne, & Ballantyne, 1991; DiMaggio, 1992), cultural studies as related to organizations (Hakansson & Snehota, 1990), social symbolic understanding of language (Capra, 1997), and critical theory (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2001). These varied perspectives have affected marketing practices in different ways to varying degrees depending on the marketing challenge and context. Most, however, affected the way in which marketing professionals conducted and evaluated basic research. Examples of the impact on marketing include but are not limited to the eschewal of attitudes and intentions as relevant to understanding/evaluating buying behavior (positivist); the evaluation of people and their purchasing patterns on their own terms in their own environment, also termed marketing ethnography (humanist); and the more careful consideration and evaluation of the way in which people consume symbols and meaning through their purchases/participation in the marketplace (social symbolic).

More recently, marketing theory has embraced what Vargo & Lusch (2004) call a “service-dominant logic” (S-D logic). This paradigm marks a transition in marketing towards customization, services, and value creation for the consumer in which there is an emphasis on the following:

- intangible services; value as perceived and determined by the consumer in use as benefits of specialized knowledge and skills they label as operant resources; the customer as co-creator of the service; and wealth as obtained in the form of economic capital from consumers to firms in the application and exchange of operant resources by consumers and firms. (Peñaloza & Venkatesh, 2008, p. 300)

Unlike other schools of marketing thought, especially the traditional marketing and marketplace worldview, this paradigmatic shift to a service-dominant orientation is unprecedented. The approach links resources such as intangible ideas and knowledge to foundational marketing processes of value creation, opening up possibilities for marketing research and development; and posing challenges to the systematic and measurable approach of a product-centered marketing approach. S-D logic changes the starting points, research, and strategic operations of marketing theory and practice (Peñaloza & Venkatesh, 2008, p. 301; Gupta, Grant, & Melewar, 2008). Through terms such as “co-creation,” Vargo and Lusch’s marketing theory posits a phenomenological turn in the conception of value from that of “value in exchange to value in use” (2004, p. 302). This refers to the use-value determined through interaction between consumers and marketers vis-à-vis a given service; this interplay of consumption and production is not limited to one party or the other. For Peñaloza and Venkatesh, the result could become as significant to marketing thought and practice as did the major socio-economic shifts in industrialization or urbanization during the 20th century. At the very least, it positions marketing activities as “the predominant organizational philosophy” within an organization (Peñaloza & Venkatesh, 2008, p. 300; cf. Christensen, Firat, & Torp, 2008).

Even with such a definitive move, Peñaloza and Venkatesh (2008) believe that the advancements of Vargo and Lusch (2004) do not take marketing thought and practice far enough. To this end, they contend that the more substantive move situates marketing as a socially constructed phenomenon.

Our view emphasizes value as constituted by marketers and consumers in their activities and discourses via an enacted process, a social construction that takes place prior to, during, and after the actual exchange and use(s) take place. Further, we do not limit marketers to production or consumers to consumption, as marketers consume and consumers produce (Firat &
At the heart of this perspective lies a practical commitment to value created in exchange and use. This commitment acknowledges markets in a comprehensive and practical way as co-created entities between marketers and consumers simultaneously. Therefore, marketing research and practice must attend to the intricacies of this relationship along its social terrain. Insight must include the meanings created in given contexts, reflexivity on the part of the marketer, attention to consumer subjectivity, consideration regarding the limits of the marketer, engagement of the consumer-marketer relationship from within community, and attentiveness to cultural differences (local and international) (Peñaloza & Venkatesh, 2008, p. 301).

In the end, the approach intends to better understand how “market valuations become our valuations and validations” (p. 312).

Consistent with this perspective on a social construction of marketing, Peñaloza and Venkatesh align beliefs and practices surrounding a given organization and its consumers with the social context emergent from a given time and place. The authors state, “the market is both a force to be reckoned with and a social terrain that consumers construct in a continuous, dialectical process with marketers towards their life projects and goals” (2008, p. 312). Peñaloza and Venkatesh provide a context for marketing grounded in social relation. They envision the future of marketing as one in which markets are not entities to be mined down to “ones and zeros”—people deconstructed to fundamental numeric code like those at the core of all computer programs. Instead, a market exists as a force within a larger social web. Therefore, marketing must engage this larger social web in order to elevate social life and resituate the market within that context.

A number of different theoretical perspectives have applied the web metaphor to both the marketplace and to the human condition. The applications range from the web metaphor as illuminating the fabric of our social existence to the web metaphor as a means for validating the human condition through a visible representation of the narrative connectivity that defines us. Some examples of this include a web as referring to the significant relationship between people, God, and work (Weber, 1992/1930); “webs of significance” as the symbolic interplay that forms and suspends a person’s life and their relationships, social and otherwise (Geertz, 1973); “webs of interlocution” that frame a communicative space out of which one establishes a personal standpoint as well as one’s relation to others (Taylor, 1989); and “webs of significant relationships” as a metaphor for the intricate dynamics between identity formation and the social economy (Lapidis, 2004).

Unless you count the World Wide Web, an explicit use of a web metaphor in marketing has not occurred. The present time, however, supports a dominant metaphor that advances the “experience economy” (Pine & Gilmore, 1999) to embody the fundamentally communicative nature of the web metaphor, making overt the importance of realizing human social relation and representation through the marketplace. That metaphor is “engagement.”

The idea of engagement has permeated marketplace discourse to the degree that Shiffman (2008) calls this historical moment “the age of engage.” She offers the metaphor of engagement as a responsive approach to the complexity and constant change of the marketplace. Engagement also reinforces the need for a shift in marketing toward meeting individuals on their own terms as well as in terms of how they live in relation to their respective communities, both social and historical (Peñaloza & Venkatesh, 2008). Marketing must now recognize a more complex relationship with the market—one made up of a “semi-autonomous social group comprised of multiple firms, and of marketers and consumers” (p. 309).

Engagement subjugates a traditional product focus with a hyper-emphasis on the audience (Reid, Luxton, & Mavondo, 2005). Being audience-centered coupled with technological advances ushering in unprecedented speed and choice to marketplace interactions forces organizations to address a simultaneous yet divergent call to communicative action: simplify communication to combat an oversaturated marketplace, and expand communication to intensify connections between current and prospective clients and consumers (especially with so many ways to connect). This unresolved tension characterizes not only external communication; it also reflects back on the organization and its marketing management, marketing communication, corporate communication, and brand development (Holm, 2006).

Where marketing theory and practice fail to meet this age of engagement, strategic organizational communication remains underdeveloped or sabotaged by one of its own. Characterized in broad terms
as the strategic communicative decision-making by people within a given organization, strategic organizational communication aims to situate the organization in conversation with the industries, communities, and cultures it intersects (Conrad & Poole, 2004). The efforts of marketing communication, corporate communication, interpersonal communication, intercultural communication, philanthropy, as well as any number of internal and external initiatives that work together to form a gestalt understanding of the organization support it in theory and practice. While not yet fully developed, the recalibration of marketing through IMC infuses the conversation with an attempt at aiding strategic organizational communication through integration. And so, we now turn our focus to integration.

3. Anticipating “The Age of Engage”: Introducing Integration

Since its inception, marketing has undergone a number of transitions. From its more formal introduction as a discipline focused on the 4Ps of promotion, production, price, and placement of goods (mass marketing) to today’s emphasis on more cerebral concepts including social construction of consumer communities, service industries, and the intangible aspects of products (brands), each transition resulted from different answers to the question “where do we go from here?” The range of these responses reflects an overarching shift from one-way communication practices to interactive and engaged “meetings” with current and prospective consumers. Responsiveness and relevance have replaced the recalcitrant assumptions of a marketing era that believed if you build it, they will come. This transition includes adjustments to quantitative and qualitative research methodologies (Greenyer, 2006; Mriampolski, 2006), inquiries aimed at expanding marketing theory through concepts such as the “fourth hermeneutic” in marketing—a value dimension not yet fully realized by any approach to the discipline—and paradigms that have been lost in marketing’s maturation process (Lowe, Carr, Thomas, & Watkins-Mathys, 2005; Arias & Acebron, 2001; Firat & Schultz II, 1997; Brown, 1997; Deshpande, 1983), arguments about the scientific capacity of marketing (Brown, 1995; Anderson, 1983; Kotler, 1972; Alderson & Cox, 1948; Converse, 1945), and, most recently, valuations regarding the integration of marketing, marketing communication, and corporate communication functions (Schultz & Schultz, 2004; Cornelissen & Harris, 2004).

Until IMC, no response has significantly altered the traditional starting point for doing marketing—the product. The next three sub-sections examine key developmental stages in moving from a product orientation in marketing to an integrative and consumer-oriented framework in greater detail, bringing added clarity to integration’s introduction into the marketplace. The first sub-section offers an answer to the question “why integration?” It presents the communicative significance of integration as tied to a phenomenological shift in orientation to the consumer. The second recalls IMC’s formative development vis-à-vis key junctures in its advancing a praxis definition. Finally, I briefly introduce IMC through the concept of re-engineering—a first-attempt at translating integration into internal agency and corporate contexts. The gestalt of this section focuses on a picture of marketing’s phenomenological turn through IMC—a move that advanced the discipline and “prophetically” anticipated the pervasiveness of today’s engagement economy.

A. Why Integration?

To say that marketing has reached an impasse (Brown, 1997; Buttimer & Kavanah, 1996; Hunt, 1994) simultaneously acknowledges an opportunity for change and growth. Today, marketing’s longstanding practices embedded within business models propelled by modern assumptions about a mechanistic, mass-produced, and a stable market (Arias & Acebron, 2001) confront the shifting appetites, fragmentation, paradox, and multiplicity characteristic of the postmodern marketplace (Brown, 1997; Firat & Schultz II, 1997). According to Ponsonby and Boyle (2004) in their literature review of marketing, the intersection of these two paradigms prompts a re-examination of the relationship between production and people’s lives; and marketing must figure out how to work in this new environment (Pettegrew, 2001; Twitchell, 1999).

From bartering to early industrialization, production and consumption have been “viewed as a single operation” (Ponsonby & Boyle, 2004, p. 346). The service orientation of today’s marketplace gives
renewed meaning to this relationship, calling specific attention to the dual importance of instrumental value (product) as well as personal value (consumption) in establishing a coherent experience for people (Ponsonby & Boyle, 2004). While revisiting marketing’s methodological and paradigmatic associations regularly address the former, the latter involves a pre-occupation with the audience and has, until more recent conceptualizations of marketing, received only peripheral treatment (Valentine, 2000).

Business people and researchers now commonly identify incorporating the personal into marketing with consumer research and the overall goal of bridging marketing with people’s everyday life. Consumer research reclaims a valuable part of the communicative interchange between marketing and the marketplace—the relationship perspective (Grönroos, 2004). To date, evidence supports that consumer research has become an increasingly visible aspect of marketing research as well as marketing management.

Helgeson, Kluge, Mager, and Taylor (1984) inspired consumer research through their content analysis of trends in consumer behavior early in the development of consumer research as a necessary aspect of strategic organizational planning and development, especially in the area of marketing. Around this time, Hirshman and Holbrook (1982) focused on evaluation methods for hedonic (pleasure-seeking) consumption while Zajone and Marcus (1982) examined preferences in consumer decision-making processes. These basic building blocks for socio-cultural and behavioral consumer research led to contemporary work by Mriampolski (2006, 1999), Arnould and Price (2006), and Goulding (2005) who all seek to shift the intercultural methodology of ethnography into the world of advertising and marketing communication. Their research advances efforts at acquiring a deep understanding of consumers through participatory engagement, conversation, and observation conducted alongside them in the places they live, work, and play.

Consumer research textures not only insights into the human condition, but also insights into marketing management and strategy through interdisciplinary means. For example, work by Holbrook (1994, 1999) and Endler and Rosenstein (1997) offer frameworks for analyzing consumers that provide management with data that can then support more esoteric initiatives in branding, as well as traditional product development opportunities. Holbrook and others appropriate constructs, such as the “personali-ty construct” associated with psychological measurement, as well as evaluative categories such as “consumer value,” for metric adaptation in marketing. Additionally, Mick (1986) opens consumer research in another valuable way by connecting it to semiotics. Mick explores the relationship potential of symbols, signs, and significance to consumer research, offering a textured read of the ways in which visual associations can inform inquiries into particular audiences. This particularly helps organizations frame who they are through words and symbols, creating a visual and literate context for association and participation.

The answer to the question “why integration?” emerged from the need to address an historical moment influenced by the value of intangible assets—those things that cannot be owned but have a direct impact on costs, service, profitability, etc. within an organization (e.g. brand, trademark)—and the consumer’s role in the marketing process (Ratnatunga & Ewing, 2005). Several researchers and practitioners introduced IMC as an integrative perspective that united the fundamentals of marketing with the rhetorical sensibilities of communication to better meet and address the needs of a consumer dominated society. IMC brought to the fore knowledge and understanding of the consumer as the means to achieve marketing success (Ponsonby & Boyle, 2004; Muniz & O’Guinn, 2001; Peppers & Rogers, 1995).

To the end that companies implement this orientation, IMC scholars and practitioners believe that it marks the promise of a “critical step”—a point of necessary advancement for the field—in which marketing becomes an idea that drives strategy and tactics, and makes the message meaningful and relevant for the consumer (Calder & Malthouse, 2003, p. 14). Through integration, this critical step advances marketing accountability as well as strategic activity used to manage the firm (Schultz, 2004). At a functional level, marketing and marketing communication integrate to relate sales to communication efforts and to increase the possibility of a more organic process between the organization and the consumer (Schultz & Wang, 1994).

But IMC does more. Integration reinvests the whole of marketing with an overt commitment to “stewardship”—accountability and ethics—not only in terms of finances but also for organizational communicative practices (“mission through messaging”) as they touch the lives of people (Schultz & Wang, 1994). IMC begins to call greater attention to the inter-relation of marketing, marketing communication, and the mar-
ketplace as they intersect and impact people’s lives (Ponsonby & Boyle, 2004). In this capacity, IMC represents a phenomenological shift in marketing whereby a product-centered understanding of the world no longer advances communication. In IMC, production and consumption are inextricably linked, and the role of the consumer drives marketing success (Rust, Lemon, & Zeithaml, 2004).

B. Defining IMC: Revisiting the Sender-Receiver Model of Communication

The phenomenological shift to a consumer-focused model in marketing began during the late 1970s and continued throughout the 1980s as advertising agencies merged and acquired different firms in an attempt to offer more than just traditional advertising to their clients (Duncan & Caywood, 1996). According to Novelli, the idea of “one-stop shopping” became popular “because ad dollars [were] flowing to other marketing communication disciplines and ad agencies needed to do something to respond” (1989, p. 8). As suggested by the phrase, “one-stop shopping” refers to “offering a variety of marketing communications functions with little emphasis on ‘integration’ of the functions or the end result of the communication” (Duncan & Everett, 1993, p. 30). This definition characterizes those agencies that initially claimed an integrated framework by offering a number of tactical solutions to the client, not just advertising.

Unfortunately, with the bottom line as the driving motivation, these mergers and acquisitions failed to provide a more comprehensive and integrated program for clients. In addition, they failed to build respect and a true integrated partnership between advertising and its counterparts. As a result, clients could not see the benefit of dissolving their current relationships with different firms (i.e., one for advertising and one for public relations) for a one-stop agency whose parts were still functioning as separate, specialized entities.

In the late 1980s, agencies adopted the term “new advertising” in an attempt to move away from a vendor status toward a more unified and integrated organization (Duncan & Caywood, 1996; Schultz, Tannenbaum, & Lauterborn, 1993; Caywood & Ewing, 1991). When this term did not work, others like marketing imperialism, orchestration, seamless communication, whole egg, and integrated marketing communication were offered as alternatives (Duncan & Everett, 1993). In 1991, the American Association of Advertising Agencies (AAAA) and the Association of National Advertisers (ANA), together with Northwestern University’s Medill School of Journalism, surveyed national advertisers to learn how industry professionals perceived “integrated marketing communication” (IMC), the newest and most consistently used term for what was taking place between advertising and its marketing communication counterparts (Schultz, 1996a). For the purposes of the study, IMC was defined by the American Association of Advertising Agencies as:

a concept of marketing communications planning that recognizes the added value of a comprehensive plan that evaluates the strategic roles of a variety of communications disciplines, e.g., general advertising, direct response, sales promotion and public relations—and combines these disciplines to provide clarity, consistency, and maximum communications impact (definition established in 1989). (Duncan & Everett, 1993, p. 33)

Based on this definition, 67% of the executives surveyed from major U.S. corporations said that their companies were integrated; “nearly half said they had been integrated for more than three years, and a little over a third said they had become integrated within the last three years” (Duncan & Everett, 1993, p. 30).

Following the initial investigation in 1991, Duncan & Caywood (1996) published an historical review of IMC that chronicled the various scholarly and practitioner efforts to develop a more theoretical definition. According to Duncan & Caywood, shortly after the 1991 study Schultz and his colleagues at Northwestern articulated a refined definition directly centered on eliciting a behavioral response by the customer or prospect: “[IMC is] the process of managing all sources of information about a product/service to which a customer or prospect is exposed which behaviorally moves the consumer toward a sale and maintains customer loyalty” (Duncan & Caywood, 1996, p. 18).

Then, in 1993 Schultz, Tannenbaum, and Lauterborn published The New Marketing Paradigm: Integrated Marketing Communications. In this landmark work, the authors argued that technological advances had ended the days of mass marketing. They advanced an alternative, integrated process—beginning from the “outside-in”—starting with the customer or prospect and working back toward the organization and brand (Schultz, Tannenbaum, & Lauterborn, 1993; Schultz, 1993). Schultz and his colleagues publicly formalized the characterization of this process as...
a new way of looking at the whole, where once we only saw parts such as advertising, public relations, sales promotion, purchasing, employee communications. . . . Integrated marketing communications means talking to people who buy or don’t buy based on what they see, hear, feel, etc.—and not just about [a] product or service. It means eliciting a response, not just conducting a monologue. And it means being accountable for results . . . delivering a return on investment, not just spending a budget. (Schultz, Tannenbaum, & Lauterborn, 1993, p. xvii)

These definitional refinements had a direct impact on Northwestern’s conceptualization of integration. As a result, they put forth a more comprehensive, refined framework for understanding IMC.

Integrated marketing communications is the process of developing and implementing various forms of persuasive communication programs with customers and prospects over time. The goal of IMC is to influence or directly affect the behavior of the selected communications audience. IMC considers all sources of brand or company contacts that a customer or prospect has with the product or service as potential delivery channels for future messages. Further, IMC makes use of all forms of communication which are relevant to the customers and prospects, and to which they might be receptive. In sum the IMC process starts with the customer or prospect and then works back to determine and define the forms and methods through which persuasive communication programs should be developed. (quoted in Percy, 1997, p. 2)

Shunning integration at the level of media choice and execution alone, the group advanced integration as the embodiment of a new process “lived and demonstrated by the top person or persons in an organization” (Schultz, 1993, p. 5). The overarching commitment was to IMC as a discipline supported by communication that leads an organization, not communication as an exercise in tactical execution.

At this point in IMC’s development, two trends emerged. First, seeking a return on communication investment became a matter of “measurability, valuation, and evaluation” built into the strategic plan (Schultz, 1993, p. 5). The call for communication leadership required companies to situate IMC on two crucial cornerstones—measurability and accountability. The second trend suggested that the marketer and consumer engage each other in more of a conversation; however, the consumer now formed the locus of control. No longer a catchy phrase for one-stop-shopping, integration meant engagement over the long-term—a systems approach, not a process approach (Schultz, 1993). As a result, brand loyalty and relationship management assumed a privileged position over integration’s initial emphasis on achieving communicative impact through a unified message strategy (Duncan & Caywood, 1996).

Revisions to IMC’s definition continued to evolve conceptions of relationship building, behavioral and attitudinal response, as well as the importance of dialogue between both the organization and the consumer (Duncan & Moriarty, 1998). For example, in 1997 Percy expanded the process-orientation of IMC by stressing a “single ‘positioning’” for all communication messages (p. 2). Percy’s definition pronounced the key to integration as a realignment of all communication based on the consumer’s perspective. As such, he and others considered modern database marketing a point of communicative engagement with the consumer—a means for sending and receiving valuable information. Following Percy and Schultz, Pettigrew (2001) offered his idea as eight necessary conditions that must be met in order for total and sustained integration to occur. These ranged from speaking in a consistent voice through all communication and placing the consumer at the center of all communication planning, to engaging consumers in dialogue and cutting through the clutter of the marketplace to do so. All eight of the conditions were communication-centered; six, however, related in some way to the various audience(s) addressed by the IMC efforts. Both Percy and Pettigrew’s insights reflected the phenomenological shift to marketing’s consumer orientation through the development IMC.

In recent years, definitional refinements have continued (Kliatchko, 2005). Notable revisions came from the pioneers and experts of IMC. In their 2003 collection of published essays on the subject, Northwestern’s Kellogg School of Management and Medill School of Journalism reaffirmed that marketing “has always meant, and will continue to mean, responding to consumers (or, in the case of intermediaries, customers) to increase sales” (Calder & Malthouse, p. 6; cf. Shultz, 2003). The acknowledgment that marketing as a whole has always been “naturally integrated” is referenced for its banality—a stated but not engaged philosophy actually estab-
lished in modern marketing theory’s principles of the Industrial Age which privilege integration and response from the perspective of the marketer (Calder & Malthouse, 2003; Schultz, 2003). As advocates for “new” integration in IMC, Calder and Malthouse (2003) note that any attempt at advancement must include the strategic creation of strong brand concepts, the invitation to a total consumer experience, and the plan for a mass customization model. Beginning with a “strong connection to corporate strategy,” the goal is to “create a consumer, or customer experience that is as meaningful and relevant as possible . . . delivered through contact points both within and outside the product platform itself” (Calder, 2003, p. 262, 263, 283).

The point is clear: IMC marks a phenomenological shift in marketing from the marketer as the locus of control to the consumer as the new locus of control. Creating a continuous dialogue (Vargo & Lusch, 2004), representing the voice of the brand to consumers (Keller, 2001), developing strong brand equity (Keller, 2003), harnessing media for the benefit of products and services (Naik & Raman, 2003), and bringing an interdisciplinary approach to the integration process (Kalla, 2005) all rely on an outside-in orientation for instituting IMC. Schultz and Schultz (2004) offer a more comprehensive statement to this effect in their most recent book, citing the American Productivity and Quality Center’s 1997 definition of IMC: “Integrated marketing communication is a strategic business process used to plan, develop, execute, and evaluate coordinated, measurable, persuasive brand communication programs over time with consumers, customers, prospects, and other targeted, relevant external and internal audiences” (p. 20-21). Though we may lack evidence to support a total shift from mass marketing to IMC (a marketing development that some might contend as reinforcing a neo- or post-Fordist advocacy for flexible specialization or generalists that can work in a number of specialized contexts), even the most ardent skeptics cannot deny that today’s postmodern moment demands change in marketing (Cornelissen, 2003). Without symbolic alignment (Smith, 1996), consistency and clarity across communication channels (Percy, 2008; Duncan, 2005), and consistency between communication messages and associated organizational behaviors (Balmer, 2001), organizations put at risk their long-term presence in the global marketplace.

The promise of IMC is a move towards bridging these communicative gaps in marketing by inviting a stronger dialogue with consumers.

C. Reengineering: Outside-in Integration from within the Organization

As an influencer of behavior, a driver of creating and establishing relationships and partnerships, and a tool to solve business problems (Gonring, 2002), IMC by design elicits and engages consumers with the end goal of consumer behavior’s answering the organization’s IMC invitation (Schultz, 1993). Working from this perspective, we can argue that the greatest communicative value comes through strong links between IMC, the bottom line, and organizational goals (Gonring, 2002; Balmer, 2001). Thus, it follows that for IMC to achieve all its claims, a phenomenological shift in external communication practices must have a parallel in internal communication that reflects an outside-in commitment.

Reengineering provides one way to adapt an integrated approach to agency and corporate settings. This organization-based integrative process reflects the “new regime” shaping today’s marketplace—the consumer (Hammer, 1996). As a process, reengineering takes place internally but should also create something of value for the consumer. The proposed value in the process of reengineering delivers on its promise in the most comprehensive and complete way possible. The reengineered “soul” puts “loyalty to the customer over loyalty to the company—because that is the only way the company will thrive” (Hammer, 1996, p. 159).

Theorists and practitioners developed reengineering based on this heightened awareness of the consumer as well as on the recognition that one organization or agency may have an IMC philosophy while maintaining separate, specialized departments while others might claim integration through outsourcing, and still others may treat IMC through cross-functional teams. Hammer and Champy introduced reengineering as a vision for what true organizational integration means, offering a formal definition as “the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service, and speed” (1993, p. 32). The foundation of this radical rethinking and redesign exists in the character of an organization (Hammer, 1996). However, a “process” of reengineering—the re-ordering of an organization—to maximize the communicative impact and
reach to the consumer follows. This process remains specific to an organization, and cannot be reified by a set technique or approach for making it work.

The central idea in reengineering consists of process. Maintaining this focus enables an organization to “stay attuned to the needs of the changing business environment” (Hammer, 1996, p. 17). Yastrow unites the theme of “process” in reengineering with IMC, arguing that “fully integrated marketing” is something a company does. He states the following about this action.

Fully integrated marketing suggests that every part of the organization that touches a customer is involved in managing the brand, with the customer integrating every contact with the brand into an overall impression . . . The challenge, then, becomes managing the ongoing stream of contacts a company has with each customer as an integrated marketing dialogue. (Yastrow, 1999/2000, pp. 1, 3)

Being fully integrated means going beyond IMC as an external communication orientation (i.e., integration within agencies, or integrated marketing communication in philosophy only) to integration existing throughout the entire organization. For Hammer, Champy, Yastrow and others, reengineering provides an organizational investment done today that affects the marketplace of tomorrow. Reengineering prepares an organization to be agile, flexible, and nimble amidst an increasingly complex and global marketplace. It assumes the spirit of IMC in a broader context, fully aware that integration meets the needs of today’s historical moment and adapts to address the demands of tomorrow.

4. IMC: Where do we go from here?

In this age of engagement, IMC marks the intersection of modern and postmodern marketing thought as well as a proliferation of divergent approaches to the field (Kliatchko, 2005). As proponents strive to bring about greater confidence in integration as more than just a passing trend, the question of “where do we go from here?” remains at the forefront of conversation. It addresses today’s situation and prepares IMC as a framework for advancing the field of marketing as a whole. IMC offers a communication infusion into an otherwise business-oriented field, inviting a hermeneutic approach often contrary to conventional marketing wisdom into the conversation.

To move forward in IMC, one should look back in search of issues and opportunities that may open the future of this young discipline. In 1948, Alderson and Cox called attention to a major issue that may do just that: the art-science tension in marketing. Although initialized by Converse in 1945, the debate over marketing’s scientific status developed significantly in the wake of the Alderson-Cox publication which problematized marketing because of its reliance on other fields to stimulate growth, particularly the field of social science (cf. Deshpande, 1983). Alderson and Cox (1948) called for integration in marketing through clarification regarding the interplay of behavior, system, and organization as these apply to marketing. In the latter part of the 20th century, the questioning of modern social science, both in general and in relation to marketing, further illuminated issues for clarification, especially the overemphasis on quantitative marketing communication methods that presupposed “linked assumptions” for studying an organized world and did not take seriously the social realities that offer “shades of meaning” behind statistical formulations (Deshpande, 1983, p. 107). This has resulted in an implicit conversation over the decades regarding the inherent nature of marketing as a scientific field of study or as an art that employs empirical data to support humanistic insights.

According to Brown (1997), the art-science debate has entered its third wave. The first wave—the “pro-science era”—capitalized on the development of the American Marketing Association (AMA) and the Marketing Science Institute to provide an official point of demarcation for marketing’s aspirations of “scientific status.” This era emphasized positivist and empirical efforts to curtail criticisms that marketing was not scientific by advancing substantive theoretical and research-oriented marketing scholarship. Significant among those advancing marketing as a science, Buzzell (1963) contended that marketing could only attain scientific status if marketing met stringent criteria; it had to become a systematic and classified body
of knowledge organized around a key theory supported by quantifiable evidence.

This pro-science phase began in the late 1940s with Converse’s publication, continued through multiple iterations, and ended with Anderson’s (1983) challenge to the fundamental philosophical premise of marketing science as established in positivist assumptions about the world. Marked by a strong relativist position, Anderson ushered in the second phase by challenging the sensibilities of a discipline long ordained by its faith in logic and quantitative outcomes, ultimately calling into question modes of knowing and attaining “truth” through marketing (Hunt, 1990). For Anderson, one could not access external reality “independent of human sensations, perceptions, and interpretations. Hence, reality was not objective and external to the observer but socially constructed and given meaning by human actors” (Brown, 1997, p. 172). Anderson’s invitation for marketers to consider social realities offered the first directive towards a social constructionist view of marketing.

Today’s “anti-science era” is, broadly speaking, framed by “the postmodern consciousness [and] is predicated on a repudiation of Western science. Or, to be more precise, it is exemplified by its renunciation of ‘scientism,’ the long-standing modernist assumption that science is capable of solving all our problems, that science is a force for the good, that science is unproblematic” (Brown, 1997, p. 173). The postmodern consciousness expects and even welcomes inconsistency and ambiguity. It is the fulfillment of a rebellion against marketing science that came to the foreground post-World War II. Brown (1997) sums up the critique of marketing science that led to Anderson’s social constructionist position as hinging on two issues: first, that marketing science lacks moral, spiritual, and ethical fiber; and second, that marketing science has not achieved anything of worth since the post-war period.

IMC’s development emerges on the crest of this third wave amidst the juxtaposition of modern and postmodern thought in the art-science debate concerning marketing (Arias & Acebron, 2001). Under these circumstances, its limitations and the quickly diminishing value of tools such as segmentation typologies become explicit (Peñaloza & Venkatesh, 2006; Cova, 1997; Firat & Schultz II, 1997). Additionally, it questions the reliance on a scientific paradigm. This results in a complicated relationship between business and marketing as more subjective, sensory-oriented modes of engagement call into question traditional business models driven by data collection for the purposes of directing organizational action.

The manifestation of the art-science issues in today’s marketing literature appear subtle; nevertheless, they do exist. For example, in spite of the positive trajectory of IMC, views on its definition, terminology, perception, and actual success still vary due in large part to issues over measurability and accuracy (Kliatchko, 2005; Reid, Luxton, & Movendo, 2005; Ratnatunga & Ewing, 2005; Kitchen, Schultz, Kim, Han, & Li, 2004; Cornelissen, 2003; Cornelissen, 2001; Cornelissen & Lock, 2000; Schultz & Kitchen, 2000; Beard, 1997). The art-science tension also appears in emergent themes within IMC. As this essay has indicated, these themes include IMC as more adept at handling the changing marketing and organizational landscape (e.g., Nowak & Phelps, 1994; Duncan & Caywood, 1996; Gronstedt, 1996; Schultz, 2001); IMC as holistic, integrative thinking (e.g., Schultz, Tannenbaum & Lauterborn, 1993; Percy, 1997); and IMC as solving a significant problem in marketing by providing a means for the unification and coordination of all organizational communication, administrative and otherwise (e.g., Schultz, Tannenbaum & Lauterborn, 1993; Duncan & Caywood, 1996; Duncan & Moriarty, 1998; Gronstedt, 1996). Both a movement toward artful engagement that compels people to respond and a scientific methods of data gathering and application ground these themes and the larger scope of IMC.

While the marketplace gives evidence for these themes, IMC remains in its infancy—and by all standards in its growth stage (Kim, Han, & Schultz, 2004). No claim exists about IMC as an art or science. Shultz and Schultz (2004) suggest the next step(s) in advancing integration in general categories as “future challenges for IMC” (p. 377). Seven identified challenges, or avenues for future research include: (1) aligning internal (corporate communication) and external marketing communication (IMC); (2) moving to a behavioral base for marketing communication outcomes (a humanist, not scientific base for treating communication between organizations and their related audiences); (3) reversing the flow of marketing communication programs (moving from an inside-out, production orientation to an outside-in, consumer orientation); (4) making the brand the key element in the marketing effort (elevating the role of intangible assets in communication strategy and planning); (5) developing a global perspective; (6) developing forward-looking systems of forecasting, measurement, and evaluation (instead of benchmarking and tracking studies that
focus on past and present moments); and (7) developing new organizational structures and compensation methods (retooling organizations to support the shift towards more holistic, integrated communication baseline for strategic organizational decision-making) (Schultz & Schultz, 2004). Each challenge references the consumer and makes explicit the need to overcome distance in order to capitalize on the simultaneity of the production-consumption process. Each also points to organizational communicative competency through the alignment of internal and external communication so that every aspect of the exchange functions well.

What’s next for IMC may not, however, be as functional (or scientific) as Schultz and Schultz (2004) suggest. The work of Christensen, Firat, and Torp (2008), Lowe, Carr, Thomas, and Watkins-Mathys (2005), Schultz and Schultz (2004), and Cornelissen (2003) imply a call to action for IMC that takes place before integration can fully occur. It has to do with the language, rhetorical capacity, cultural relevance, and symbolic interaction that characterizes the human condition. Specifically, the call to action hints at the significance of the values implicit in IMC initiatives. These values come from people—from the human community—and represent a much deeper sense of meaning than any product or service can ever fully embody. This inspires compelling and resonant communication messages.

While this is crucial for IMC success, those values represented in and through IMC impact the way people encounter, interpret, and share their marketplace experiences. In order to engage IMC with conviction, the implications of a value-laden approach to run deeper than value as constituted in use or exchange because they emerge from life together. What’s next in IMC—the prophetic voice of an age conspicuous in its proclivity towards engagement as a consumptive practice—may involve a flexible, hermeneutic approach aimed at the purposeful and artful enactment of the interplay between the consumer, a product and/or service, and an organization in a given historical moment. In both theory and application, this invites IMC into a web of relationships. More than a definitive approach (e.g., inside-out or outside-in), IMC must remain consumer-informed and idea-led. A proactive engagement of the consumer through ideas increases the potential for a true gestalt engagement of IMC in which the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts.

Exemplified by responses to IMC in its growth stage, marketing cannot shift its locus of control and expect an uncontested transition to the new paradigm, nor can it expect evidence of this paradigm’s success to pass without scrutiny. In response to the question of what’s next in IMC during a time of heightened consumer engagement, the present postmodern moment invites marketing to make this hermeneutic investment—to continue re-visioning IMC theory and processes with greater care for their impact on the human condition. As the age of engage and S-D logic suggests, the intersection with the storied nature of human experience and the knowledge that “all social experience is founded on a narrative—that is, a story constructed by a social group about life, its conditions, and its requirements” must constrain IMC processes (Firat & Schultz II, 1997, p. 188). IMC theory and practice must attend to the reality that people do not organize their lives around things; rather they use things to communicate order and organization in their lives, even if only for the sake of appearances. People ascribe to a way of life, not to products and brands. They exchange and use products and brands as ways of associating with others, challenging IMC to encounter consumers, not just communicate at or with them. IMC must recognize that while cost/benefit assessments no longer define the consumer, the narrative through which he or she seeks to unify meaning and purpose in his or her life do define the consumer.

Working from within a framework that guides not dictates will allow IMC to remain relevant and continue its diffusion in the marketplace (Christensen, Firat, & Torp, 2008; Kim, Han, & Schultz, 2004). Against any form of technological imperialism, a value-orientated core from which to institute IMC programs calls for greater reflective planning that involves the interplay of the organization, its product, and the audience in a given historical moment. Answering the question, “Where do we go from here?” continues to situate IMC in historical context and conversation with other equally viable aspects of marketing. The promise of considering IMC and its impact on the human condition, in particular the way in which people encounter and share their marketplace experiences, rests on an underdeveloped aspect of marketing. In spite of marketing’s prophetic insights leading to IMC as a pre-emptive response to the engagement economy, marketing still lacks a defined body of scholarship that artfully examines its relationship to the human condition. Thus, this essay begins and ends in the spirit of Christensen, Firat, and Torp’s (2008) observation that we need multiple sources informing our marketing efforts. An interpretive, artful approach, IMC offers one such avenue for further research.
The word “marketing” is distasteful to many people who are chiefly concerned with religious evangelization, and it is almost as distasteful to those whose focus is the development of educational institutions and educational opportunities for otherwise disadvantaged students. In fact, most people whose deeply-felt motivations are social or political would be at least somewhat uneasy if they were described as “marketing” the reforms they envision for accomplishing their social or political goals. The same reaction could be expected in the fields of medicine and public health.

Nevertheless, all these human endeavors have “products” which must be promoted if the fields are to remain significant. Distasteful or not, their successful promotion shares many of the requirements of commercial marketing mentioned in this paper. On the one hand, many successful religious evangelists, for example, have unashamedly adopted some of the worst methods of commercial marketers. On the other hand, the use of modern mass media usually requires some adaptations to fit into the media culture. While respecting the non-commercial values of their own field and rejecting some of the extreme means that are incompatible with their own values, some ideas of the commercial marketers can be employed safely even by religious “marketers.”

One positive approach of this kind was taken by Father Pedro Arrupe, S.J., who said, shortly after his election as Superior General of the Jesuits, in the 1960s that Christians should promote Christianity with as much vigor as soft drinks are sold by their manufacturers. It was in response to Father Arrupe’s initiative that the Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture, and its publication, Communication Research Trends, were established in the 1970s to explore ways in which current advances in communication research might be useful to Catholic communication specialists. As Professor Groom’s review essay emphasizes, citing Shiffman (2008), marketers, including religious “marketers,” must be aware that the ways they present their products must change constantly to match changes that occur in their audience’s environment with each moment of engagement. Change is unavoidable in the modern world, and every “marketing plan,” including the “marketing plans” designed to “sell” religious “products,” must include mechanisms that adapt those plans to the ever-changing environment in which they engage their audience. This does not mean that the fundamentals of the product have to change, but the ways in which they are presented to their audience must change to meet the evolving expectations of that audience through successive moments of engagement.

—W. E. Biernatzki, S.J.
General Editor
Communication Research Trends
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Introduction by Philip Lee
Michael Traber was born in Switzerland on 5 July 1929 where his secondary education took place during the years of the Second World War. In 1956 he was ordained as a Roman Catholic priest into the Bethlehem Mission Society from where he went to the USA (1956-60) to study sociology and mass communication at Fordham University and New York University (Ph.D. in Philosophy). His doctoral thesis was called *The Treatment of the Little Rock, Arkansas, School Integration Incident*. It studied the degree and focus of attention given by the daily press of South Africa, West Nigeria, and Ghana to what was one of the most dramatic racial conflicts in the USA of the 1950s. Journalism, racism, and Africa defined an intellectual territory that Mike vigorously pursued in subsequent years.

The Bethlehem Fathers’ close ties with Southern Africa led Mike to work in Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) as Director of Mambo Press and Editor of the critical weekly newspaper *Moto* (1962-70). As well as producing audiovisuals, Mambo Press published books in English and Shona—a language that Mike took time to learn, especially its proverbs. In 1970 he founded and managed Imba Verlag, a book publishing house in Fribourg, Switzerland, before returning to Africa as Senior Lecturer in journalism at the Africa Literature Centre, Kitwe, Zambia (1973-76). During those years he also did research in Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Uganda, Tanzania, and Zambia.

Mike Traber joined the staff of the World Association for Christian Communication (WACC) in 1976 as Director of its fledgling Periodicals Development Programme and Editor of its quarterly journal *Media Development*. One of his first responsibilities at WACC was to find a way of using the press to support the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa. In the 1970s a number of organizations in that country, and several church-related donor agencies, had been considering how to establish a newspaper that would be truly representative of black peoples. In early 1976 WACC convened a meeting of representatives of various organizations from South Africa to discuss different possibilities and from that meeting the Black Press Fund (BPF) was born. It was agreed that the BPF would be used to support periodicals that most effectively critiqued the apartheid regime and its inhuman policy of segregation and discrimination. When the South African Council of Churches (SACC) set up a newspaper in Johannesburg, called *The Voice*, for which it sought financial aid, the BPF contributed to its operational costs as well as supporting *Grassroots*, a black community newspaper in Cape Town. Mike Traber was a consultant to both newspapers.

Communication rights in theory and practice
In 1976, in response to the call of many developing countries for the “decolonization of information,” UNESCO undertook a review of communication in contemporary society against the background of technological progress and developments in international relations. It established the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems under the presidency of Sean MacBride. The outcome, published in 1980, was *Many Voices, One World: Communication and Society Today and Tomorrow* with its slogan “Towards a new more just and more efficient world information and communication order.” Under Mike’s guidance, WACC became one of the earliest church-related and non-governmental organizations to support the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO).

1988 *Media Development* . . . devoted the first of several issues to the theme “Communication is a human right.” Its editorial identified the still evolving third generation of human rights as “solidarity rights,” calling for international cooperation to implement them and for human interests to be placed above national interests. The editorial reaffirmed the need for a more just and more efficient world information and communication order:
As yet there is no definition of the right to communicate. But the majority of thinkers want it to stress the equality of all partners in the communication process. It should embrace a multi-cultural, multi-way flow of information, including a passive as well as an active right to communicate, while promoting the highest possible degree of feedback, participation, and access. (Traber, 1988, p. 1)

In 1989 Mike Traber became a founding member of the MacBride Round Table on Communication, which met for the first time in Harare, Zimbabwe, continuing what was to become a lifetime’s unwavering support for the values inherent in the MacBride Report and, later, the communication rights movement.

Similarly, he put his intellectual weight behind the growing call for a systematic study of the connections between theology and communication, a WACC program that began in the early part of 1983. Six years later some 48 working papers, 59 course outlines for teaching communication in seminaries, and 12 complete syllabi had been produced. A book on theology and communication was published in Latin America and an extensive study of courses in every major theological seminary in North America was carried out. This pioneering work stood Mike in good stead when a logical seminary in North America was carried out.

In 1984 at the suggestion of Dr. Hans W. Florin, Mike Traber drafted eight propositions on communication for discussion by its Central Committee. He argued that although information and communication were drastically changing the world, instead of establishing commonality and solidarity, they were tending to reinforce divisions, widen the gap between rich and poor, consolidate oppression, and distort reality. The effect was to maintain systems of domination and to subject the silenced masses to media manipulation.

Formally adopted in 1986, WACC’s Christian Principles of Communication affirmed that genuine communication liberates, creates community, is participatory, supports and develops cultures, and is prophetic. This landmark in the political development of WACC provided the theological basis and rationale for its first international Congress (1989). It also laid the foundations for WACC’s study and action programs, in which Mike took the lead in elaborating six thematic areas: “communication ethics”; “the right to communicate”; “communication and religion”; “communication, culture, and social change”; “communication education”; and “women’s perspectives.”

Mike Traber retired from WACC—but not from communications—in 1995. A book on The Democratization of Communication was published in his honor, containing contributions from colleagues working in the field of mass communications. As the introduction emphasized, Michael Traber stood for: “. . . the universal values of humanism, above all peace, democracy, human rights, social progress, and national liberation, while respecting the distinctive character, value, and dignity of each culture, as well as the right of each people freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems.”

Until 2004 Mike continued to teach for one month each year at the Gregorian University, Rome, but his principal activity was to spend six months of every year in India, working with colleagues to build up a master’s and later a doctoral degree course at United Theological College, Bangalore, where he combined his passions for journalism, theology, and communication rights. . . .

Mike Traber died on 25 March 2006.

In recognition of his many years of writing, editing, and scholarship on behalf of Christian communication, COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS publishes this yearly bibliography of his work, prepared by Dr. Fritz Frei, Missionsgesellschaft Bethlehem, Immensee, Switzerland.—Ed.
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Sir Garfield spent his entire career trying to get people with similar ideas to coalesce into groups. His religious group was particularly ecumenically minded and was interested in education and “reasonably” (p. 2) Christianity. He worked to bring to fruition his notion of Zimbabwe, to which he had moved with his wife in 1934, as a multiracial society. His religious training (he trained in Dunedin, New Zealand) gave his speeches and rhetoric (with which this book particularly deals) what Casey describes as “its distinctive theology, style, and ways of thinking” (ibid.). He was an extraordinarily capable and skillful speaker and it was this that helped to develop his career in the public eye, which gave a platform for his support of human rights issues. His brilliance as a speaker is frequently mentioned by friend and foe alike.

Todd is described variously as “highly intelligent, instantaneous, and humorous” (p. 3); “down to earth and appropriate for politics” (ibid.); as having a “sure, broad, well-informed humanitarian outlook and his way of address is attractive” (ibid.); and as having a “fine mind and cultured heart . . . he is a really great preacher” (ibid.).

For those of us who are British and old enough to remember the birth of Zimbabwe, one of the names that is remembered is Todd’s. He spoke extensively against the racist establishment and for majority black rule. This, of course, did not sit well with many of the other white people in the country. Amongst other things, he took considerable risks which endangered his own safety. In 1978, after arriving back from chairing an Amnesty International Conference in Stockholm, he was arrested for “treason for helping the guerrillas” (p. 4). When Zimbabwe became independent in 1980 he became a senator in Robert Mugabe’s government, a job he continued until his retirement in 1985. However, after his retirement he became a critic of Mugabe’s repressive regime. He became involved in the ZCC (Zimbabwe Christian Council), an ecumenical human rights organization, writing many documents for them. For Casey, it was his influence that moved other religious leaders and assisted the churches to have a political voice in the nascent country (p. 5). All did not end well, however, despite his remaining optimistic of reversing racism and fighting Mugabe’s oppression. Days after he and his wife, Grace, were called “white heroes of Zimbabwe” (p. 121), the Mugabe government, perhaps fearing his symbolic power as Casey sug-

**Book Reviews**


Since Zimbabwe has been in the headlines so much recently, this is a timely book, dealing as it does with Sir Garfield Todd (1909-2002), who was awarded a Knight Bachelor of the Empire (KBE) by Queen Elizabeth II in 1986, began his life as a missionary in Africa in 1934, becoming, according to this book, the first missionary to become a head of state when he became Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia (as Zimbabwe was then known) in 1953. Outspoken in his criticism of racist policies in the 1960s and ’70s, he was later put in prison under the government of Ian Smith, eventually suffering detention for five and a half years. In 1973, during his detention, he was awarded a papal medal and sent a blessing by Pope Paul VI, unusual for somebody who all his life was a member of the New Zealand Churches of Christ.
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Since Zimbabwe has been in the headlines so much recently, this is a timely book, dealing as it does with Sir Garfield Todd (1909-2002), who was awarded a Knight Bachelor of the Empire (KBE) by Queen Elizabeth II in 1986, began his life as a missionary in Africa in 1934, becoming, according to this book, the first missionary to become a head of state when he became Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia (as Zimbabwe was then known) in 1953. Outspoken in his criticism of racist policies in the 1960s and ’70s, he was later put in prison under the government of Ian Smith, eventually suffering detention for five and a half years. In 1973, during his detention, he was awarded a papal medal and sent a blessing by Pope Paul VI,
gests (ibid.), stripped Todd and his wife (Todd was then 93) of their citizenship and he was unable to vote in the 2002 elections. Notwithstanding this slight to Todd, he continued his campaigning to the end of his life.

While the book up to page 123 discusses the life and times of Garfield Todd, the second section (pp. 127-346) reprints some of his sermons and speeches, which had never previously been collected together. These are divided into three sections: sermon texts, political texts, and prophetic texts.

Dealing as the book does with a man who was in effect an incomer to Rhodesia, who could perhaps have been looked upon as a colonizer of the country, this book may be seen to be contentious by some. However, it does show that not all of those who went to the colonies were racist and only keen to take what they could from the country to which they went.

In the final speech of the book, a sermon that reflected on 54 years of service to Rhodesia/Zimbabwe (pp. 343-346), the man’s belief and ability to forgive those who had treated him so badly comes through. One paragraph I found particularly sad given the problems that Zimbabwe has experienced, problems which it is to be hoped will soon be obviated. Todd said:

The civil war was long and brutal and cost 40,000 lives. Dadaya Mission and Hokonui Ranch were at times a center of warfare. But in 1979 peace was negotiated successfully at Lancaster House in London. Robert Mugabe announced a policy of reconciliation, not a Nuremberg trial, and we have experienced eight years of healing instead of a period of vengeance. (p. 346)

With more men like Todd, the world would be a better place. One hopes that the healing, mentioned above, will return to Zimbabwe and her people very soon.

This is a very well-researched book, with extensive notes and bibliographical references. It would appeal to students of African studies, of history, of the colonial and the post-colonial eras, and of politics. Most of all it would be useful for anyone studying rhetoric from a truly Christian missionary who lived his faith even to the point of risking the lives of himself and his family.

—Maria Way

Communication and Media Research Institute
School of Media, Art and Design
University of Westminster, London


Grounded in political communication studies, this work aims less to explain “how religion became a political weapon in America,” as its subtitle has it, than to document or chart the rise of political religion, manifest in the political rhetoric and communication of the last 25-30 years. The basic explanation, not surprisingly, lies in gaining political advantage. The documentation makes clear the steps and strategies the political parties took. Either way, the book provides a valuable service and highlights an important change in U.S. politics. Examining what they call the “God strategy,” the authors contend that the strategy rests on communication: “Central to this approach is a series of carefully crafted public communications employed by politicians to connect with religiously inclined voters” (p. 7). This forms the subject of the book—the political communication allied with injecting religion more firmly into public life in the United States.

Only in the last chapter—and probably appropriately so, after the reader can weigh all the evidence—do the authors make clear their opposition to the “God strategy.” They argue that it results in “too intimate a relationship between religion and politics” (p. 140), something that runs against the spirit if not the fact of the U.S. Constitution’s separation of church and state and something that can all too easily lead to religious strife, discrimination, and enthusiasm for ideological positions. They fault the strategy not only for pushing against the First Amendment but also against Article VI, section 3 of the Constitution, which bans any religious test as a qualification for public office (p. 141). In their reading, the religious rhetoric of the past 25 years has imposed a de facto religious test on the presidency. What do they mean?

The four main chapters of the book each examine a religious move, particularly manifest in presidential rhetoric and communication: the role of the president as head of a changing civil religion, the religious consciousness of the country, the practice of a kind of religious “communion,” and morality politics. Each has its specification in political communication.

The authors lay out the general theme in Chapter 1, where they track voting statistics and voting blocs, particularly among religious groups, from 1972 to 2004. The period shows a shift in political identifica-
tion between the two main parties (Democrats and Republicans) and various religious groups. The most dramatic lies in the ascendancy of evangelical Protestant voters.

Chapter 2, “Political Priests,” examines how presidents invoked God in presidential addresses from Roosevelt (1932) through G. W. Bush (2004). The rate moves from 40-50% in the earlier years to almost 100% of national addresses invoking God, from President Reagan on. In addition to direct invocations of God, presidential addresses also used faith language (similarly increasing) and religious terms like “crusade” and “mission.” The key turning point, they find, came with the speeches of Ronald Reagan. The use of religion, embraced more by Republicans, also benefits Democrats, as seen in the rhetoric of Bill Clinton. The authors find that those who hesitate to speak in the tongues of religion do less well in the halls of power.

In Chapter 3 the authors examine the linking of God and country. This goes back to a myth of America as a “city on a hill,” in the language of the 17th century Puritan settlers. Presidents weave a political narrative of a mythic and religious America and in recent years almost never end a speech without inviting God to bless America. Their religious imagery includes a very American emphasis on liberty and freedom and has tinges of Biblical language. Each recent president has—especially in times of crisis—taken on a prophetic mantle and recalled America to its foundational images.

But presidents do more than talk. Domke and Coe argue that they also perform political communication that has religious overtones. Chapter 4 introduces some of these “acts of communion.” These include “symbolic pilgrimages to places of religious significance”—a church, a religious university, a shrine (p. 73); the performance of “foundational religious practices” like prayer and thanksgiving (p. 74); and the celebration of religious rituals, most notably Christmas (p. 74). The chapter reviews each of these performances carefully, tracking how presidential political communication has changed over the years, to the point where any serious candidate must engage such “communion rites” in order to have the electorate take him or her seriously.

Finally, Chapter 5, the last substantive chapter, presents evidence of “morality politics.” By this the authors mean the extent to which candidates and presidents have embraced (or distanced themselves from) key moral issues that resonate with the religious electorate. They consider five key issues: “school prayer, abortion, research on stem cells, the Equal Rights Amendment, and gay and lesbian relationships” (pp. 101-102). Each of these functions as a kind of signal to religious voters. The increased discussion of such issues begins, again, in 1980; of course, only at that time did many of them enter the national consciousness, with Supreme Court decisions in the 1970s raising their profiles. Here the authors include a discussion of failed morality politics, when the Republican-dominated Congress overreached itself to take over an “end-of-life” issue: whether a family could allow a patient in a permanent vegetative state to die by removing artificial supports to life.

As they survey the shifting of presidential rhetorical and communicative actions, Domke and Coe, identify what they call the “golden rule” of religion and politics:

The God strategy requires walking a fine line. Politicians must signal to devout religious believers that they share and appreciate these citizens’ faith, but do so without pushing away religious moderates or secular-minded voters, the latter of whom are particularly important for Democrats. Hence the golden rule of today’s U.S. politics: exhibit faith, but don’t be too strident or nakedly partisan in doing so. (p. 130)

Tracing how that strategy has worked, they also warn against it, as noted above. While religiosity may attract voters, it should not become the sole measure of a candidate. They claim that good political and religious leaders avoid that and they appeal to three institutional groups in the United States to take the lead in preserving the separation of church and state: the news media, the public education system, and clergy and religious organizations.

In examining the “God strategy,” the authors illustrate how it can fail, as the Republicans found out following their end-of-life intervention and their subsequent losses in the 2006 mid-term elections. Too much religious identification puts voters off, particularly when the religious rhetoric fails in the face of practical political problems or overreaches.

The book ends with a look forward, from the beginning of the 2008 presidential election season, at the adoption of religious rhetoric for centrist purposes. In the best sense of rhetoric—adapting the style to the audience—the young Senator Barack Obama, addressed an unfriendly audience at the evangelical Saddleback church (who regarded him as unacceptably liberal and Democrat) in these words: “Giving all
praise and honor to God for bringing me here today, let me send greetings from my church, Trinity United Church of Christ on 95th Street on the South Side of Chicago” (p. 153). The religious signal came across clearly and the message that followed it looked for common ground on the less contentious but important moral issue of treating AIDS. For Domke and Coe, that speech redefines the political center.

The God Strategy provides a fine example of political communication analysis and an interesting look at the changing landscape of American politics. While the authors report the strategy and follow its growth, they do not venture to explain why it grew so strong so quickly nor do they compare it with earlier, religiously-driven moments in American political life. Clearly, politicians, especially on the right, found the strategy effective. It certainly resonated with the personal beliefs of some individual politicians, who used it to greatest effect. But can’t we know more? Aware that this asks the authors to do something they did not set out to do, one could note that this book might benefit from a more explicit contribution from political science and political theory. The examination of political communication, excellently done here, leaves too many questions open to debate.

The book, with detailed statistics on presidential rhetoric and communication, features extensive endnotes, which include references. There is no separate bibliography but there is an index.

—Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Santa Clara University

[For ordering information, see http://www.logospublications.com/]

This book comes from the Federation of Asian Bishops’ Councils, an organization with 14 participating Councils who, between them, cover 17 countries and 11 ecclesiastical territories in Asia. The OSC (the Office of Social Communication), one of its offices, has major function to co-ordinate and help the planning of communication pursuits that are works of the FABC both inside and outside the organization.

It is often forgotten that all of the major religions come from Asia and, too often, as believers we think only of OUR church or religious group, not thinking at all of other believers, either outside our own faith group or even within it. I have often heard scholars from the West talk at length about the problems that beset “religion” in a supposedly secular world, when what they are really talking about is the problems in their own region and their own faith. FABC called together a Roundtable of scholars in October, 2005, in Bangkok at the Assumption University, and this volume holds at least some of the papers given there. The Roundtable was a result of the earlier meeting (reported in Interreligious Dialogue as Communication, Volume 6 of this book series), which dealt with interreligious dialogue as communication. Eilers defines “social communication,” which is the phraseology of the Roman Catholic Church of which he is a priest, as “the communication of and in human society [that] is part and parcel of every Religion” (p. 7); the intention of the meeting reported in this volume was to consider how “social communication” is seen and practiced in Asia’s various religious traditions (ibid.). In addition, the meeting considered communication’s role in a religion’s origins and in their further development and looked at the similarities between traditions from various religions which might aid interreligious understanding. Are there correlations in their uses of communication and how traditions have reacted to the world in which we live, which is so often seen as being determined by modern technology?

It is interesting that Eilers points to the paucity of scholars who are interested in such matters and who are qualified to speak about them and he thus explains the lack of papers on certain faiths. In putting together this book he intends to draw the attention of communication scholars and theologians to communication as part of bodily and spiritual life, which he considers essential to religious thought and practice (and I would agree with him) and not just become fixated on the technology that is used, as scholars so often are. It is for this reason that the group uses the term “social communication” which covers all of humanity’s social and communicative practices. He sees this book as one of the “first seeds” (p. 8) which he hopes will enable the growth of a more researched and consolidated field that will serve peace, harmony, and communion in a continent that is portrayed often as being divided. He hopes this book will encourage peace and harmony there. One would hope that Western scholars would also take on board these fine sentiments as religions are often seen as the tools of division, rather than as agents for social cohesion. I am glad to see that here the emphasis is on
similarity rather than difference—something that is sorely needed in today’s world.

This volume has sections on Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Christianity, and Confucianism and a final statement or round-up of the thoughts expressed in these papers. I was particularly struck by Edwin Ariyadasa’s comment that we, as communicators, must have “an adequate awareness of the ‘background of reference’ of the target audience.” This is such a simple idea and, seemingly, so obvious, but is one that is so often forgotten by those who try to get a religious message across to an audience.

The conclusions of the group were that social communication has been part of all religions from their beginning and communication stands at the start of religious experience. In their understanding, social communication is not only mass media in all of their forms, but also in communication between people(s).

All major religions in Asia, amongst other traditions of social communication

• have an oral tradition, story-telling, teaching, and preaching;
• use symbols and icons in addition to artistic expression such as art, music, dance, drama, and theater; and
• use languages as important vehicles for religious message—by which I am supposing they intend specifically religious languages, Hebrew for the Jewish faith, Sanskrit for the Indian faiths, perhaps even Latin in Christianity.

Religious communication needs equality between communicator and audience; the message is, or should be, shared rather than “sold.” The message should be about participation and sharing rather than about information spreading. Religious communication is based on spirituality which grows from the experience and inspiration of the holy in silence. It should have a liberating function in people’s lives and experiences.

Communication in religion should not only rely on technical means, but also on reflection and action. It should, however, use the modern means at its disposal.

Communication in religion works on two levels: internal (to those within a belief system) and external (to those outside the belief and to the greater world) (pp. 189-190).

The authors recommend (pp. 190-191) that:

• Religious leaders, activists, scholars, and artists should be involved in inclusive dialogues that will lead to greater interreligious understanding. These should underline the commonalities, rather than the differences in religious experience.

• More work should be directed to research and communication education (by which I suppose they mean media and interpersonal education) in the Asian institutes of academia (and elsewhere too, I would suggest) so that there is a greater awareness of the pitfalls and benefits of the “new cultures, new languages, and new psychology” (Redemptoris Mission, 37c) of the new culture of communication.

• Governments and NGOs in Asia (and, again, elsewhere) should facilitate efforts for peace “in and among Asian religions” (p. 191) to demonstrate the values of social communication, such as accuracy and impartiality, and to encourage harmony and tolerance and an understanding between religious groups.

• The group intends to request the UN Secretary General to set up an “Interreligious Council” at the United Nations to promote harmony between religions. This Council should have national groups in Asia to assist in this interreligious dialogue.

• They remind the communicators in religions of their responsibilities in fostering understanding and dialogue between religions and request the training of media professionals in the effective reporting of news and events. They are particularly concerned with the media’s role as a peace builder.

As I mentioned earlier in this review, we too often look at religious phenomena only from our own viewpoint. This book has also done this, even if its viewpoint is the vast continent of Asia. Many of the recommendations and thoughts expressed here apply equally to countries outside that continent. It is sad that we can talk about the dialogues between religions, yet there are so often arguments even within confessions: between Shites and Sunni, between Protestant and Catholic, for instance. As well as looking outside to other faiths, we might also consider the problems within our own faiths.

—Maria Way

Communication and Media Research Institute
School of Media, Art and Design
University of Westminster, London

This is a book that follows from earlier books by the same team (here Jean Ward is replaced by Nora Paul) and continues to develop material on the means and methods of information gathering. Having tried these exercises for students in the University of Minnesota, the authors make their suggestions, quite confidently to the journalism fraternity in the world.

This new title reflects a subtle but important shift in approach, as it contains not just search strategies, but places the overall model into an information strategy framework and introduces along with various methods of information gathering, the processes of message analysis and information selection, evaluation, and synthesis.

The book argues in a quite subtle manner that students and professional communicators in various media industries may use this material in many ways, but a common information strategy process allows all of them to proceed securely in developing an information gathering and evaluation strategy.

For example, the authors argue that news reporters, advertising copy writers, and public relations specialists may require the same census figures on the percentage of American population over 50 years of age. The subsequent use of this information by these media professionals will vary, but the process for getting the information is the same. This same model applies to the search process for academic and scholarly work.

These books have affected the quality of curriculum and teaching methods employed by schools of journalism worldwide. Hence these books are valuable in the areas of curriculum innovation.

The book begins by introducing the new information universe that communicators face today, and tries to help readers understand the types of messages and message delivery formats that affect information strategies. Chapter 2 covers the information strategy model that forms the conceptual framework for the book as a whole. This model reflects the new focus on information strategies rather than simply on the search process. The third chapter speaks of the importance of analyzing both the context and content of the messages. Chapter 4 analyzes four sources of information for communicators: informal, institutional, scholarly, and journalistic.

In the next chapter we have three major methods of gathering information: monitoring, searching, and interviewing. The library as a crucial source of information gathering gets coverage in the Chapter 6. Chapters 7 to 10 study in depth the four sources of information with suitable case studies. Chapter 11 introduces the importance of critical thinking and information education skills so necessary for journalists today. Major areas covered are evaluation of statistical claims and survey data, and strategies for evaluating information from online sources. How to synthesize and make clear sense out of all the chaos that news is, is the focus of the next chapter. The final chapter reviews the concept of social responsibility that needs to be the major criteria in news gathering and analysis.

There is also a very valuable appendix—a case study of an information strategy process from beginning to end. This reproduces the entire text of a major page-one news story, identifies the sources of information that contributed to every paragraph, and suggests several access points a reporter might use to locate those sources.

The book also offers a “Topical Tool Index” and a “General Index” which allow communicators to use the book as a reference guide. There are also extensive side bars and examples throughout each chapter, all useful tools for journalists.

To conclude, the areas covered in the book are the results of the authors’ experiments with students of journalism. As these are suggestions made after having been tried with students, as we say in all honesty that “there is many a slip between the cup and the lip,” the vision and ideals presented here are not much put into practice in the world of journalism. Somewhere down the line, journalists living in a world which seems increasingly obsessed with instant gratification, the lure of gain, the pursuit of profit and the overriding importance of possessions, either ignore or do not have the capacity or the political will, to put into action these ideals presented in this book.

—Jacob Srampickal S.J., Gregorian University, Rome


John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson have succeeded in compiling a series of critical essays by various film scholars regarding the historical, social, and economic structure of the mainstream American Hollywood film industry. The text is a thorough study that emphasizes past and present critical views of the evolution of American cinema. As long as the reader has an advanced understanding of the historical, social, and theoretical factors taking place in society, from the beginnings of
the industry to the present day, the text is a rich and informative one that reveals how the critical looks at the industry throughout the years have come about.

Chapters 1–4 center upon the historical, technological, structural, and storytelling elements of the mainstream Hollywood film industry. John Belton begins with a thorough explanation of the American film industry from its beginnings in the late 1880s and early 1890s. He points to the fact that the first historical accounts were written by and for the film industry. He then goes on to state that this trend of industry participants writing these histories would continue up until the 1970s. Belton’s indicating that the differences of opinions between revisionist and ‘scientific’ scholars regarding issues (such as the social classes of moviegoers in the development of the early film industry) makes this chapter come alive.

In his discussion of history and cinema technology, Duncan Petrie immediately references French film theorist Andre Bazin. Petrie emphasizes how Bazin wrote about “the myth of total cinema” in which filmmakers use technology to reconstruct reality as they know it. Petrie emphasizes how film technologies such as CinemaScope, sound, and lens technology (displayed by the use of deep focus) were technologies designed to forward this striving towards this re-creating of individual reality. Petrie emphasizes, through historians such as Douglas Gomery and Jean-Louis Comolli, the belief that cinema technology is preceded by a social motive: the desire to communicate a particular ideology. Occurrences such as the development of telephone technology by AT&T, and radio technology by RCA, as well as the coming of sound systems such as Vitaphone, were merely technological tools for social construction.

Douglas Gomery focuses on evolution of the mainstream Hollywood film industry from its beginning to its modern state. Gomery breaks down the key foundational structural elements that forged the success of Hollywood. He begins with the explanation of how Hollywood came to be, followed by the popular demand by audiences resulting in the industry’s conversion to sound in the late 1920’s. What makes his study so effective is the emphasis on how this period of time results in Hollywood’s apex of power via vertical integration; the control of production, distribution, and exhibition of their films. In addition, the dismantling of this system via the Paramount Decrees anti-trust proceedings by the U.S. government in 1948, coupled with what would be television’s popularity, shows the downfall of the Hollywood studio system. Gomery also goes into Hollywood’s efforts to challenge television’s dominance via the blockbuster films of the mid- and late-1970s to the present day, coupled with increased use of computer technology for special effects.

Tom Gunning explores what film historian Noel Burch terms the “exteriority” of early American film. He explains how Burch explains this exteriority of early cinema being a “primitive mode of representation” that addressed visual material identified by the working class, to an institutional mode of representation that emphasized bourgeois values once the Hollywood studio system became firmly entrenched. For example, he, like Belton, discusses the historians’ differences of opinion as to whether working class or middle-class patronage was more responsible for the growth of the film industry. Gunning also stresses the fact that only one study has looked into African-American patronage of the early film industry, indicating that not enough has been done to look at issues of race and ethnicity in patronage, as well as class.

Chapters 5–8 concentrate on classical Hollywood film and issues of genre and authorship. E. Ann Kaplan’s look at classical Hollywood film and melodrama first traces the genre’s developmental roots from ancient Greece, to its late-18th century written form. Kaplan then goes from the revelation of this foundational element to the theorizing of classical cinema in the 1950s by Andre Bazin and Christian Metz. Kaplan also explains how Metz emphasized a “film language” that spoke to audiences psychologically though the visual and aural signs and sign systems. At the same time, Kaplan shows how Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson see the melodrama as a more cognitive event in which the characters are involved in problem solving, with the result of their success, or lack thereof. Further, Kaplan states how Laura Mulvey’s key look into Hollywood melodrama from a feminist perspective indicates that the melodrama in this environment is one in which men, and not women, construct meaning through storytelling.

Richard Maltby and Rick Altman explore narrative structure in Michael Curtiz’ Casablanca (1942). Here, Maltby and Altman state how the construction of the film’s characters, the pacing of the story, the scene-to-scene transitions, as well as the suspense and audience expectations propel the story, regarding its effectiveness as a melodrama. Maltby and Altman are in agreement that the audience’s caring about and being concerned with the characters in the film, primarily
Humphrey Bogart and Ingrid Bergman, coupled with the surrounding topical elements such as the dramatic tension of war, the act of human beings finding themselves in a stressful environment, and the constant element of danger and distrust are all key melodramatic elements that successfully drove the narrative from one point to another, resulting in a still constant fascination with the film’s structure.

Peter Kramer’s look at Post-classical Hollywood is a fascinating study into the Hollywood film industry’s chosen direction after the studio system era that ended in the late 1940s. Kramer states how American cinema went in a direction of focusing on films such as Gentlemen’s Agreement (1947) and Pinky (1949) that attempted to tackle issues of racism and anti-Semitism. Next, Kramer centers upon a key historical point by stating the fact the mid-1950s to the late 1960s and beyond have resulted in a type of Hollywood new wave in which directors with television backgrounds contributed to American mainstream cinema’s filmic language. Films such as Marty (1955) and Bonnie and Clyde (1967) are key examples referenced in the chapter. Kramer adds to this emphasis of the shift in American cinema by stating that critics such as Pauline Kael noted that American cinema went in a new direction that was influenced by European new wave cinema of the 1950s and 1960s.

Stephen Crofts’ look at authorship in Hollywood begins with Bazin’s foundational look at the subject by stating stages of authorship headed first by early filmmakers such as D.W. Griffith and Charlie Chaplin, then concentrating on filmmakers such as King Vidor and Orson Welles; a look into authorship from 1920 to the early 1940s. He then focuses on a post-World War II influential authorship of filmmakers such as Fritz Lang, Douglas Sirk, and Nicholas Ray. At the same time, Croft takes the time to analyze Andre Bazin’s look at authorship in John Ford’s Young Mr. Lincoln (1938). He concludes by stating that when looking at the historical analysis of film authorship, the trend, from the 1970s to the present day, has been just as commercial as it has been creative. He points to filmmakers such as Stephen Spielberg, George Lucas, and Frances Ford Coppola, who have achieved box office success through the blockbuster film, and still maintaining their own individual style of filmmaking that results in their being identified as authors of their work.

The discussion of authorship continues with Peter Wollen’s look at John Ford’s authorship. Here, Wollen looks at Ford’s trend to take male characters that are “untamed” and place them in an environment where they make a decision to become “responsible and civilized.” Wollen refers to his film My Darling Clementine as a key example, focusing on Henry Fonda’s portrayal of Wyatt Earp, as he “puts down roots” and becomes a responsible, married law-enforcer in Tombstone, Arizona.

Tom Ryall’s exploration of genre and Hollywood explores the beginnings of genre with the popularity of the western film genre in American silent and sound cinema. At the same time, Ryall states that there are critics and historians who see all genre films as separate individual entities: A western is a western, a gangster film is a gangster film, and a musical is a musical, for example. At the same time, Ryall states that another group of critics and historians see the lines of genre blur. He uses the example of Seven Brides for Seven Brothers (1954) as a look into the western-musical, while also stating that certain genres can blur due to their subject matter and their settings, such as the gangster genre occurring in a “western setting” such as the film High Sierra (1941). The chapter’s conclusion concentrates on Linda William’s look at “body genre” in the form of genre films that have recurring themes that emphasize issues of gender construction in melodramas with film noir elements such as Mildred Pierce (1945).

Chapters 9–12 look at Hollywood’s star system, while also observing Hollywood’s impact on society. Jeremy Butler cites actresses such as Sarah Bernhart of the silent era; the “filmed theatre” of the time resulted in this star vehicle that emphasized her presence as the filmic icon that drove the visuals. Butler looks at feminist theory to emphasizes that from the early 1900s to the present day, the star system has been composed of an alluring image that draws in spectators based on their perception of what a star is, and what they represent. Butler then emphasizes the feminist viewpoint of this system, pointing to past and present female actresses and their images’ presentation as an illusion of what society expects them to be.

Douglass Kellner, Albert Moran, Robert Ray and Toby Miller focus on the Hollywood system’s effect on the United States and the world. This final critical look at the Hollywood system is a strong finishing statement to the work in that it emphasizes how this structure and its ideology culturally-produced by American cinema eventually gains ongoing acceptance in many, if not most of the areas where it is placed. Although Kellner does reference the Cahiers Du Cinema critics (among whom Andre Bazin played a major role) in studying
American cinema, he emphasizes other key critics and historians who, during and after the 1960s, looked at American cinema’s role in forwarding dominant ideologies and viewpoints of American society of the time. Kellner emphasizes the work of John Howard Lawson, Richard Averson, and Peter Biskind, who, among others, discussed the presence of theory and social commentary in American cinema. Kellner states the role of genre as a promoter and contesting element of society that has been present in American cinema; an element that draws spectatorship from a multiplicity of people in American society, regardless of ideology or political affiliation.

In his look at American film policies, Moran looks at the 1922 establishment of the Hays office to self-police the industry, regarding censorship, as well as societal and organizational forces outside the Hollywood system that resulted in its policy changes. Moran points to the fact that little has taken place regarding the study of the fact that government and social entities have influenced what the Hollywood cinema producers will and will not create. Moran also states that although the Hollywood system has always been privately owned, it has, especially from the 1930s to present day been influenced by historical political occurrences, and has continued to adapt, when society has expected it to change when needed.

Miller concentrates on looking at cultural imperialism, regarding Hollywood’s relation to and influence on the world. Miller shows, through examples, a type of accepted ethnocentrism that Hollywood exports to the world; accepted, for the most part by foreign countries that either admire or tolerate the imagery due to popular demand of the product in their own country. Miller states that the self-censorship that was in full swing in the 1930s cleaned up and corrected enough ethnic stereotypes that it was enough for successful overseas marketing of their product. At the same time, Miller’s emphasis that some countries such as Japan were threatened with the prevalence of stereotypes if they did not accept importation of Hollywood cinema into their countries.

In conclusion, American Cinema and Hollywood: Critical Approaches succeeds in being an effective critical study of the Hollywood motion picture industry. Yet, in order to full appreciate its historical direction, those who are familiar with an understanding of the theories of authorship, revisionism, feminism, and semiotics will more fully understand and appreciate its purpose and goals. For those who need a dictionary of theories nearby, that is okay; invest in one, and have it standing by as you read.

—Patrick Stearns
Morgan State University


This book is a reaction to a sociology of art that has been more sociology and a lot less art over recent decades. It is clear that there is a dialectic at work in the book from the beginning that wishes to argue for a both/and approach rather than an either/or in assessing the place of artistic creativity in current society. In a number of places throughout the book, the authors make clear that they are in agreement with a cultural studies approach that looks at the social and economic structures that influence the creative product, but they also wish to recognize that the message communicated in each work is an act of creation. They end their brief but dense book with this summary statement: “It is one thing to recognize that the meanings of artistic and cultural products are related to particular social, political, and historical conditions and circumstances, but quite another to assert that they are reducible to such conditions and circumstances” (p. 160). In short, Negus and Pickering wish to save the creative message of art from the sometime reductive analysis to which various communication studies have subjected the creative arts in recent decades.

This brief book consists of a survey of the creative process and its meanings for people across historic periods. It is both conceptual and philosophical in its analysis of terms like “creativity,” “genre and gender in the arts,” “tradition,” and “genius.” It tackles contested issues of creativity in the culture industries from Frankfurt School writers to those of current cultural studies and political economy approaches. They define creativity as the communication of experience in an early chapter, thus tying the book into communication studies as well as sociology and art theory. They argue the need for the emphasis on creativity for three reasons:

First, experience only acquires meaning and resonance once it has been creatively worked on, shared, and exchanged. Second, cultural and artistic products are regularly valued for what they say to people about experience and for the
creative quality with which they say it. Third, an emphasis on experience can help counter the tendencies to relegate artistic practices to the status of industrial manufacture, to equate aesthetic value and political worth, to advance authoritative readings of isolate texts, and to abstract the affective dimension of creativity into apparently objective sociological structures. (p. 24)

It is clear, then, early on that this book will be an attempt to adjust cultural analysis to include the creative content of the message within the constraints and structures of creation.

In their chapter on “Industry,” Negus and Pickering argue for a more nuanced approach to creativity and structure than is typical among current critical writers (whom they do not quote by name). They argue that focusing on creative forces “as constantly endangered or shackled by institutional, bureaucratic, and economic monoliths, the resulting picture is crude and simplistic” (p. 58). This is not to say that these forces do not constrain creativity but that they also in some ways promote it. This, too, goes for the important structure of copyright, which for the authors is both constraint and reward for authors, a contested area of production and consumption that is again a both/and kind of argument rather than one that only stresses the limitations of structure on creativity.

Chapters on “Convention,” “Tradition,” and “Division” deal with a continuing analysis of creativity within structure. Convention seems destined to deal with genre, but typical to the surprises of this book, it rather takes a close look at two sociologists of art, Howard Becker and Pierre Bourdieu. Both had their theories of how artists achieve acclaim, Becker arguing for a closed art world that collaborates to promote an agreed-upon set of practices that help promote those who are a part of this world; Bourdieu arguing more for competition among those aspiring for power in legitimating their place in the world of art. In the end, Negus and Pickering argue that they have deliberately moved away from the question of how much influence the structures of production have on creativity and rather have concentrated on how creativity gains audiences through cooperation or competition. The chapter on Tradition is an argument against the many writers who define modernity as the antithesis of tradition. The authors disagree and argue that “. . . we can only be original on the basis of some existing tradition, and that an abiding value of tradition lies in providing opportunities for its extension and transformation” (p. 101). They make the point early in the chapter that tradition itself is redefined by modern practice. Following this, the chapter on Division takes up the issue of how gender, race, class, and other social divides make it difficult for certain groups to bridge the gap of achieving recognition for their creativity. This chapter seems less satisfactory in that having made the well known arguments for how these divisions have hindered creative careers, the authors make the counterargument for the exception of creative achievement of these groups with few convincing examples.

The final chapter on Genius summarizes the main arguments of the book by asking how exceptionality in artistic creation can be accounted for. The authors illustrate by citing Tia DeNora’s book on Beethoven. DeNora argues that the title of genius given to the composer is not a recognition of some natural hierarchy of talent but is “an ideological category about fame and how it is promoted by social and political forces in society” (p. 147). To counter this, they cite a critic of DeNora who argues that “if genius is explained solely as constructed reputation, anyone can become a genius if they’re given the right connections and requisite publicity” (p. 149). The authors state flatly, in contrast to their usual nuanced argument (and perhaps revealing their deep frustration with current treatment of cultural creativity), that “. . . DeNora’s denial of the phenomenon of genius has become orthodox in cultural studies and the sociology of art and music” (p. 148). The theme of this book argues for nuance and balance in treating the creative work of artists and its communication to audiences. As a general thesis it seems a bland statement, but it conceals the weight of decades of writing. It obviously is not the last word in this discourse. (There is an extensive bibliography and a detailed index.)

—Emile McAnany
Santa Clara University

Reference


In the scheme of things during the past decade, Latin America has tended to be overlooked by the English, and especially American, political speaking world. Central America is even further down the hier-
The six countries that make up the land bridge between the North and South American continents are forgotten in the communication literature as well. That is one of the reasons that this history of media in these countries is so welcome in English, and the background of the two authors makes us confident that the study is grounded in long experience with both the media and the cultures. The authors lay out their thesis early in the book: “One of our central tenets will be that in the Central American context, lacking strong historical roots in democracy, media systems tend to support and reflect a country’s oligarchic tendencies. Furthermore, the owners of the media systems tend to protect their market interests in a nation, which usually means providing support for an institutionalized hierarchy or oligarchy rather than opening the market to nation building, democratic forces, or the true marketplace of ideas” (p. 4). Although the field research of the book is a decade old, much in the book still remains relevant historically and politically. As the tenet above suggests, the more things change, the more they remain the same. But the book also documents slow progress for democracy and media in spots and is buoyed by a firm hope for the outcome of such struggles.

After the brief introductory chapter, the first six chapters deal with individual media histories of Honduras, El Salvador, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. The histories of all of the six countries are both unique but similar as they share both a culture and a social-political history that suggests a strong regional similarity. Indeed, as the authors note at the beginning and end of this book, there is a depressingly similar story of government suppression, corruption, and even violence in all of the six national histories. Because six separate accounts are given in some depth of detail, the reader may be confused by all of the names of media owners, presidents, editors/reporters, and military factions that cover the century or more of media histories. The good part of these stories is that the patterns are quite similar: frequent direct pressure by political parties and presidents on the media owners; both institutions of politics and media mostly in the hands of a limited number of elite families in small countries; and occasional small victories by crusading journalists. But the details are not the gist of the book.

The last four chapters of the book try to generalize the myriad details into some more general areas of concern: State Power (Ch. 7), Threats of Journalism (Ch. 8), Corruption and Corporate Censorship (Ch. 9), and a historical summary (Ch. 10). The authors define the dilemma on state power and the media starkly in Chapter 7: “In fact, the media in Central America possess little if any independence from the state” (p. 127). The solution is also succinct but somehow left unresolved. Speaking of how media can escape state control, they argue that “then they [the media] must find independent power in the marketplace” (p. 127). The rest of the chapter and even later chapters do not give a clear answer to this admonition of finding independence. The problem with this chapter, however, is not the assertion that the state continues to try to control the media and censor their stories but the manner of trying to flesh this out by further examples of this generalization. By taking examples from each country, the book falls back into the repetition of names and instances without being able to draw out a more general conclusion other than the one boldly stated at the beginning of the chapter.

Chapter 8 on threats of journalism makes clear the analytical principle that is driving the book. The authors say about their methodology: “Because each country is unique, we examine the trends in each one . . . although perhaps limited [these cases] prove illuminating. . . . Trends and commonalities certainly exist, but it would be a mistake to lump together all these nations without first examining the specifics of each” (p. 166). This illustrates the challenge of the book. The six histories are seen as individual nations with separate histories—and indeed they are—but to make history understandable, there has to be some overarching scaffolding that helps the reader make sense of the detail. This chapter illustrates the dilemma of trying to give six national histories and keeping the storyline clear. Needless to say, the many stories of threat of violence and intimidation to journalists is well illustrated, but perhaps the chapter could have dwelt on a few examples rather than moving through all six countries.

The penultimate chapter on corruption was less about government or military corruption and more about the issues of journalists’ poor pay scales and their need to supplement their salaries by taking payola for placing or not placing stories for clients; in short, acting more as PR functionaries than reporters. The final chapter is a kind of summary that still gives more detail than summary. The reference to the civil wars that affected El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and even Costa Rica in the 1980s and early 1990s is a historical framework that prevails in the book, but little explanation is given to the reader about the conflict itself. Still, the authors do make a stab at summarizing, providing.
10 factors that have affected the media’s development in the last several decades (p. 216), but these are listed without much follow-up generalizing or concluding. The book is rich in detail but refuses to give a broader interpretation. For some readers this may be seen as a refusal to distort a complex story; for others, it may leave them with too many details to make much sense from the stories of six individual countries. Whatever the individual judgment, readers will find a rich history of news media trying to bring citizens information to help them build democratic societies in Central America. The book is scholarly with detailed notes for each chapter, an extensive bibliography (though surprisingly few works in Spanish), and a detailed index.

—Emile McAnany
Santa Clara University


With this translation and partial revision of their Kommunikative Theologie, Scharer and Hilberath introduce their work on “communicative theology” to an English-speaking audience. Fitting into the larger discussions of communication and theology, this work presents the systematic ideas emerging from and with a methodology grounded in Ruth Cohn’s Theme-Centered Interaction (TCI). For them, the object of communicative theology

is a critical reflection on communication against the background of religious and ideological conflicts in a knowledge-based society. . . . Communicative theology is an “anthropologically oriented theology”: to its object belongs, on the one hand, the encounter with the communicative God of revelation in God’s de facto communication in history, that is, the tradition . . . and, on the other hand, the encounter with unstable and broken human experiences of communication in groups, in parishes, in the church, and in society. (p. 139)

“Communicative” in the title refers to both the content of the theological reflection and the method for doing such theology. “However much theology and TCI remain unmixed in communicative theology, they must not be separated in such a way as to put on the one side theological truth as the contents and on the other the process as method” (p. 145).

A group discussion method lies at the heart of this project. Though they come to it only late in the book (in Chapter 6), their reliance on Cohn’s TCI forms the background and backbone of their work. That chapter narrates how they have come to Cohn’s work and provides an introduction to the method (something already described in COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS, in a review of Communicative Theology: Reflections on the Cultue of our Practice of Theology by the Communicative Theology Research Group [Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2007], vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 27-29). This book devotes less time and space to method and more to the development of the theology, showing how communicative theology fits into the ongoing theological project of the church—at every level, but especially at that of the professional theologian and that of the local parish. Both levels benefit from the group approach.

After an introduction by Professor Brad Hinze of Fordham University (who has done more than anyone else to bring the communicative theology approach to the United States), the book develops a communicative theology. Chapter 1 situates it by acknowledging theology as process-oriented. The current theological anthropology approaches make communication a valid point of entry; the theology (or “speaking of God”) in Christianity always speaks of human beings too (p. 19). Examining this speaking more closely reveals both God and humanity. This insight also borrows from communication studies (particularly in the media ecology approach) that “form, medium, and content of communication must not be separated” (p. 21). Scharer and Hilberath develop this dual focused approach in terms of the dynamics of theology and the hermeneutics of contemporary thinking.

Chapter 2 examines human beings as defined by communication. The chapter briefly reviews some basic communication theories, highlighting the importance of dialogue and dialogic communication. This chapter, unfortunately, shows real weaknesses in its understanding of communication; at the same time, the authors write as theologians, not communication scholars. (One can also note a similar weakness—from a communication studies standpoint—in the TCI method, as it has its origins in psychology and psychoanalytic methods. To their credit, Scharer and Hilberath make no claims beyond their method.)
Chapter 3 begins the theological analysis proper, looking first to contemporary society and its rootedness in communication. They identify various splits between speaking of God and a somewhat godless world of communication.

The image of the global village with its boundless communication takes on particularly religious connotations when the new media and the global market invade those areas of human life where faith and religion traditionally held sway. These are the areas of meaning and orientation, of history and the future, of right action and enduring happiness. Stopping to think about modern communication and its religious and ideological implications makes one aware of the degree to which the “little gods” of boundless knowledge, global communicative ability, and never-ending consumption are replacing the hope for the coming of the “great God.” (p. 42)

This poses a challenge for theology and for the church, a challenge that both formal theology and pastoral (parish-based) theology must address. Scharer and Hilberath carefully identify this current situation, not only in the terms presented here, but also in terms of science, diversity, community, and power.

Chapters 4 and 5 develop the theme in terms of revelation and church community. Both take the road of systematic theology, but approach the same end by different tracks. Chapter 4 examines the God of Christian revelation and sees God as a “communicative Being” (p. 64). It reminds the reader of Christian belief about the Trinity, about God’s self-communication, about revelation, and about tradition. Chapter 5 develops a model of church communication as “communio.” Here they turn to particular models of communication and explore what communion might mean for the church.

As noted above, in Chapter 6 Scharer and Hilberath give a detailed introduction to and explanation of the TCI method. This systematic presentation takes the reader through the various axioms and practices, through common misunderstandings and dangers. While thorough, the chapter remains a bit frustrating, as the reader gets the impression that one learns TCI better through apprenticeship than through reading.

Chapter 7 spells out the application of TCI to theology, showing how it can balance the faith tradition and the “speaking of God” in the local groups practicing TCI. Each aspect of TCI—the I (subjective concern), the We (the group), the It (the content), and the Globe (the context)—finds a place in theology; in turn, theology and the church provide an authentication for the method. Finally, Chapter 8 provides a kind of transcript of a TCI parish group studying the Nicene Creed.

The overall book presents an important introduction to this creative approach of communication and theology. Because any kind of ongoing reflection on communication and theology shows the marks of its youth, Scharer and Hilberath make few connections to other approaches in this area. Hinze’s introduction mentions several Congresses and one hopes that these will encourage more contact among the small but growing practitioners who wish to bridge communication and theology. This book should prove quite valuable to them.

The endnotes to each chapter give bibliographic references (mostly to German-language materials); the volume contains a brief subject index.

—Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Santa Clara University


In this legendary volume of essays, McLuhan’s rich and controversial legacy is explored, critiqued, and assessed by 29 leading experts from areas as diverse as communication studies, literature, art, philosophy, theology, and computer science. This anthology of essays originates from the “Legacy of McLuhan Symposium” held at Fordham University, New York on March 27-28, 1998, but not its proceedings. Although the focus of most essays is on McLuhan’s content, the discussions really highlight his contributions to the future.

This collection of essays is organized into six sections. The first section, “McLuhan’s Message” provides a general discussion of his work, while the final section “Extensions,” applies McLuhanian categories like “hot and cool,” “medium is the message,” “global village,” to the new media such as the Internet, digital media, and hypertext. Section 4 “Letters and Law” explores the literary, humanistic, and Christian connections of his ideas.

Section 3, “Art and Perception,” has an inspiring exploration by E. Wachtel on the role of perception. Other essays, however, do not reach “the heart of McLuhan” as claimed. Section 5, “Communication and Culture,” “covers the sector of scholarship that McLuhan is best known for” (p. 14). One would expect
to see more in this section than what is offered. Gozzi’s article on hot and cool media in the light of metaphor theory offers something new.

The most interesting part, to my perspective, is Section 2 on “The Media on McLuhan.” Here we find genuine reactions to the McLuhanisme in the writings of five media professionals. Neil Hickey and Michael J. O’Neill try to validate the McLuhanian reflections in the light of current socio-political and cultural events, while Mark Dery looks for traces of Romanticism in McLuhan; Kitman and Dobbs take a humorous stand.

The essays in this volume definitely highlight the legacy of McLuhan and its relevance today. They invite us to go beyond McLuhanism, which idolizes McLuhan and sanctifies his aphorisms. Among these essays, Strate’s discussion on media as the vehicle of transcendence and Meyrowitz’s exploration of theory of history based on changes in the media and technology stand out as capturing best the spirit and legacy of McLuhan.

Marshall McLuhan (1911-1980) is a central figure in the field of communication studies. He is an intellectual icon and an international celebrity, characterized as “Media Guru” and/or “Oracle of the Electronic age.” His legacy is better appreciated as how he made media a popular subject and how he proclaimed all tools and technologies of the word (a phrase from his student, Walter J. Ong) as media.

His apparent projection of communication media as prime mover is a stepping stone to understanding about the way communication influences society. The emerging media ecology approach (H. Innis and others) of this volume leads us evidently beyond technological determinism and aphorisms like “medium is the message.” Today it makes more sense to say “medium is the milieu.”

I have no doubt that this volume of essays has succeeded in showing the broad and far-reaching impact of the thoughts, writings, and life of Marshall McLuhan, one of the most influential intellectuals of the 20th century. With or without his aphorisms, McLuhan’s legacy is accompanying us into the 21st century.

—Dr. Joseph Palakeel
IMpACT, India


Jeremy Tunstall, in traditional Hollywood fashion, is doing a sequel. His first book published 30 years ago, The Media are American, with the thesis contained in the title, struck a popular chord with people who perceived a superpower in pop culture threatening a culture imperialism. Today, with a perception of perhaps a declining superpower, this book might well capture an interested public.

Tunstall’s thesis is quite clear: “This book makes a quite separate (and different [from his 1977 book]) argument—namely, that the U.S. media on the world scene peaked in the mid-20th century” (p. xii). He continues with several other aspects of his thesis: “Most people around the world prefer to be entertained by people who look the same, talk the same, joke the same, behave the same, play the same games, and have the same beliefs (and world views) as themselves” (p. xiv):

A global or world level of media certainly does exist. But world media, or American media, play a much smaller role than national media. . . . I argue that Euro-America [both North and South America and Europe] possesses a single media industry that, at least for some years, will be the leading single force in world media. (p. xiv)

The thesis makes some sense in the light of growing national production of television by most larger countries with the consequence that U.S. media imports, although still dominant compared to other exporter countries, constitute a smaller percentage of daily viewing in many countries. He also reiterates a common argument long promoted by scholars like Joe Straubhaar (2007) that people prefer their own television programs when they are available. His final assertion that Euro-America constitutes a single media industry is much harder to support with reasonable evidence.

The book is divided into four major sections: 1. American Media in Decline; 2. Big Population Countries: India and China; 3. World Media Pecking Order; 4. National Media and World Regional Media, with each section containing a number of chapters. The book length is 454 pages, not unreasonable for the ambition of covering many of the nations of the world and explaining their media growth and change from their beginning until today. The task is challenging, and in some respects does not achieve the unity of his former book since it looks at dozens of countries instead of just one, the U.S. The other challenge for the book is that the world media are vastly more complex than they were more than 30 years ago. Added to this, the cultural imperialism thesis itself has been in decline so that arguments
for a decline in the power and presence of U.S. media may not be news. Still, the argument that the author proposes goes against the popular perception of the dominance of American pop culture on a global scale. Let us look, then, at Tunstall’s arguments in each section.

The first section promises to contain the heart of the argument about U.S. media decline. It contains nine chapters over about 120 pages, but the direction and focus of the argument seems to be diffuse and unclear. At the beginning, the author makes a not unreasonable argument based on population, i.e., that we need to look at the 10 largest population countries and the regions to which they belong to talk about dominance of U.S. media. The argument that large countries are self-sufficient in media (news, radio, film, TV, and new media) does not mean that they import little or no content from elsewhere. How much is a lot? Tunstall offers no clear evidences about imports but argues “Taking these 10 countries together, probably no more than 10% of their entire audience time is spent with foreign media” (p. 6). Going forward, the author tackles what has been a central argument in the issue of global media dominance (not cultural imperialism), namely export market revenues, something he calls “Freakish Media Finance.” Although he spends a chapter on the issue, he fails to bring up the argument that the U.S. has been and continues to be the dominant power in media content export. In later chapters in this section, he argues that the U.S. has lost its moral authority and brings in a variety of examples from Vietnam to CIA-backed coups, all factual but not clearly related to his thesis. His final chapter here mixes a series of issues on satellites and television exports to the belief in the U.S. as “sole superpower” after 1990 to the Iraq invasion in a way that does not convince readers about the central thesis.

Section 2 covers the four Asian countries with large populations: China, India, Japan, and Indonesia. In each case, the author gives a sometimes lengthy political and media history (three chapters cover over 100 pages). Detailed footnotes assure the reader that the author has done his homework with current research, but it may be too detailed for those who want to follow the media argument without a detour into political history. The India story provides an important contribution that much of the trade references he cites do not usually allude to: non-Hindi speaking parts of India constitute over half of the one billion plus population and that half has flourishing media industries that few outside India know about. He argues against significant influence of global media presence in India but gives little evidence about those media except for Murdoch’s Star TV and its hit, Who Wants to be a Millionaire (in Hindi). He alludes to its British origin but fails to mention that it was a major hit later on Fox and brought to India with that allure. The China section is detailed, with a long background on the politics of China from 1900 until 2005, and rightly argues that China has been parsimonious in allowing foreign media into its television market.

In the next section on the World Media Pecking Order, the author admits at the end of the first chapter, somewhat reluctantly, that “The United States remains at the top of the pecking order but less unambiguously so than previously . . . [it] has to share the top end . . . with leaders of several other regional media blocs, especially in Europe” (p. 246). His main theme in this section is that all of the major and minor European Union members are cultural nationalists and therefore, despite significant imports of U.S. media content (except news), the American media are kept in their place. He ends with a section that illustrates very well his thesis and general tone of the book: “Europe and America: Who’s Winning?” You have probably guessed the answer already: Europe. He concludes that to put it into perspective, we need to consider the Western Hemisphere and Europe (except Russia) as a single media market. This tends to cover up more problems than solves, but it fits into the author’s notion that the world is made up of large regions: Euro-America, Asia (North and South), Africa, and the Arab cluster.

The final section promoted national media (of big countries especially) and the world regions as the areas of particular interest and importance. This emphasis certainly counters the popular emphasis on globalization and is a correction that perhaps is overdue. Tunstall never directly challenges globalization theory nor denies the role of global or world media, which he says is the domain primarily of American media (and seemingly contradicting his thesis). He argues that the big players in the major world regions will be largely self-sufficient while the smaller ones will continue to be dependent on the U.S. The final chapter, “American Media Decline to Continue?” illustrates some of the problems of the book. It repeats arguments that have been made frequently in the previous 450 pages arguing that the U.S. foreign policy mistakes have made it forfeit the “world news agenda and history” (p. 452). The rhetoric gets away from the focus of the book,
arguing for instance that “the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a belligerent group that frightens American politicians with lobbying tactics similar to those of the National Rifle Association (NRA)” (p. 455). In the end, the author admits that the complexity of the world media is complex enough to make predictions of the future—well, unpredictable.

This is a large and rambling book that deserves reading for all of the many scholarly insights and facts that are put forward. The thesis is an interesting one, well worth considering as it is a counterweight to the globalization discourse that has marginalized a focus on regional and national concerns. The book is hurt by a lack of editing that would have made a much more powerful argument in half the number of pages. There is a detailed index at the end, but no bibliography.

—Emile McAnany
Santa Clara University
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It is perhaps as a result of Communication in Religious Traditions of Asia (Volume 7 in the FABC-OSC Book Series) that FABC-OSC have published this glossary and stylebook. Now in semi-retirement, Welgampola has worked as a journalist in Asia since 1958 and has worked on a variety of newspapers and in 1988 joined the Union of Catholic Asia News (UCANews) as Executive Editor. His book is dedicated to “Asian Church journalists, the unsung heroes of Church media in Asia, and to Father Robert F.X. Astorino, MM.” Fr. Astorino, whom I met many years ago, was one of the founders of UCANews.

In his Introduction (pp. 9-10) Franz-Josef Eilers, SVD, introduces the author and notes that Communio et Progressio, the Roman Catholic Church’s pastoral instruction of 1971, which developed from the Second Vatican Council and is a follow-up document to Inter Mirifica (1963), a document which, amongst other things, established World Communications Day, asks “Christian Journalists” to bring “a knowledge of the Church to the world and a knowledge of the world to the Church” (Inter Mirifica, ¶23). These journalists were also supposed to stimulate public opinion while they were telling us what they knew. Eilers continues to talk about the Christian press and how Communio et Progressio asks it to bring balance, correction, and completion to news and comment on religion and the Christian life, while at the same time reflecting the world and showing the way (p. 9). This book, Eilers suggests, is a tool to assist journalists in the way they follow this instruction. This, Eilers adds, is only a first step. There are, he says, more extensive books of this type (here he mentions the Catholic News Service [Washington, DC] Catholic News Service Stylebook on Religion: A Reference Guide and Usage Manual, 3rd Edition, 2000, and the Religious Newswriters’ Association’s 2007 Reporting on Religion2: A Stylebook on Journalism’s Best Beat. A Resource Guide from Religion Newswriters, available on the Internet at http@www.religionstylebook.org), but this particular book comes from Welgampola’s 50 years of experience as editor and journalist for the Catholic Church in Asia.

Few of us now live in a “one religion” state and we certainly do not live in a one religion world. Today, there is a greater need for journalists, journalism students, and broadcasters—as well as those within the churches (and here I mean all religious faiths)—to have some understanding of the terminology of other faiths. In London, for instance, I teach in a school where there are many who profess no faith, but there are also Hindus and Muslims, Jews and Christians, Zoroastrians and Buddhists, who exist harmoniously. This book does not just give us the meanings of words associated with the Christian faith, but also with the many others with whom those in Asia coexist. It also lists acronyms for many world organizations. I, for one, will keep this book on my desk and will certainly recommend it to my colleagues and to students in our School, as well as in those other universities where I have the pleasure to visit and teach from time to time. It will be a valuable addition to the shelves of anyone who might have to report on religion or to write about it in some other way.

—Maria Way
Communication and Media Research Institute
School of Media, Art and Design
University of Westminster, London

Intended to fill a gap in general reviews of media and media studies, this introductory text presents seven overview chapters and a general concluding one, all of which seek to tell the student that the media landscape features more than North American and U.S. companies and products and that Europe extends beyond Great Britain when it comes to approaches and interests of media studies. As often happens in the case of such introductory works, the book’s strengths become its weaknesses: the desire for breadth and completeness lead the survey chapters to often include too much, with not enough detail. Many times, fairly complex matter receives only one or two sentences. Some chapters, particularly those on public service broadcasting and Eastern European media, appear more completely developed—the author notes that he had prepared both for earlier publication in journals.

An initial chapter (“The European media landscape”) provides a look at the media in post-1945 Europe, the various forces for change beginning in the 1970s, ownership patterns, and the media market. Several sidebars offer particular detail on different aspects of the European media world.

Chapter 2 examines the press in Europe, outlining—as do most reviews of newspapers—the declining readership over the last decades. This has led to a number of effects: changing economics of the industry, changing ownership, depolitization, state subsidies, and the move to the Internet.

The next chapter, on the public service model of European broadcasting and deregulation, sketches the most distinct aspect of the European media world. Using a case study from Italy, Williams highlights what has become a crisis in the media—the challenge from independently owned stations or satellite channels and the rapid shift in audience viewing habits. The chapter carefully presents the variations of the public service model in Britain, German, France, and the northern European countries. A North American reader or undergraduate would find this chapter most interesting, but would probably want more detail.

Chapter 4 returns to journalism, comparing different models of journalism and news values. But, as with the case of the newspaper, economic and readership pressures have transformed the existing models and Williams asks whether the European model can survive. The alternatives he sketches do not please: “the PR State” and journalism as entertainment.

Chapter 5 turns to the film industry. Here the key issues for Williams develop out of the economic shift brought about by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in the 1990s. After a brief history of the European film industry, from the early 1900s, he asks whether one can argue for a European cinema in an industry that has moved from individual national cinemas (more or less manifesting the cultures of each nation) to a Europe-wide and even international system of co-production.

Chapter 6, on the media in Eastern Europe, gives an important look at a relatively new area of media studies for the West; at the same time, it suffers from its separation of Eastern European media from those of the rest of Europe, implying (at least) that one cannot have a European media studies. The old regional divisions remain too strong. The chapter looks at the role of television, in particular, in the fall of the various Communist governments and the rise of various post-Communist media systems. The East has seen a resurgence of journalism and other media; whether the privatization model will work remains an open question.

In Chapter 7, Williams strikes out into somewhat uncharted territory for U.S. (and perhaps even for European) readers: media policy as developed by the European Union. He provides a good guide to the EU and its various policy bodies, admitting the confusion caused by overlapping responsibilities among different directorates in the European Commission. Within this model, he notes the struggle between those favoring media competition and those supporting state or EU subsidies to preserve a distinctively European communication structure. He concludes the chapter with a summary of media policy.

The last chapter attempts a summary, a look at the “Europeanization” of the media. It reviews continent-wide structures (including the success of sports broadcasting and the innovative market model of MTV), news coverage of the EU, what Williams calls “fictional Europe”—an image of Europe in film and entertainment television—and a growing European media sphere.

European Media Studies works well as an introduction, but it requires some kind of supplement, whether faculty lecture or explanation or additional reading. The book sketches the territory, mostly in the manner of tourist guide. It will take you only so far in understanding the countryside. It does have a fairly extensive bibliography and an index.

—Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Santa Clara University