# COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS

## The Crisis in Public Service Broadcasting

In early 1987 the Director-General of the BBC, Alasdair Milne, was forced to resign; his successor was Michael Checkland, who had been in charge of the Corporation's financial strategy. Milne had begun his career as a programme maker, Checkland as an accountant. Thus, symbolically, a cultural institution dedicated to serving the public by providing information, education and entertainment, acknowledged the supremacy of economics.

Across the globe public broadcasting is being forced to come to terms with demands that it be more entrepreneurial in spirit and give better 'value for money'. It is accused of giving its audience too much of what the broadcasters want and not enough of what the public demands. Promotors of deregulation argue that publicly funded broadcasting services will contract as new technology delivers an abundance of channels, encourages programme diversity and expands consumer choice.

Public broadcasting may be retreating in some societies, but in Latin America, in India, and in other Third World countries, the ideal of a truly public broadcasting institution still has power to attract. The public service ideal still seems the only worthwhile alternative to the twin disasters of unconstrained commercialism and debilitating state control.

This issue of TRENDS brings together a variety of studies which analyze and debate the public service broadcasting as it faces an uncertain future.

REVIEW ARTICLE

# The Idea of Public Service Broadcasting

Broadcasting Research Unit. *The Public Service Idea in British Broadcasting: Main Principles.* London, 1986.

As public service broadcasting comes under threat observers have subjected the famous trinity of entertainment, information and education to scrutiny. How have these ideals been put into practice? How can we interpret what is meant by 'public service'? The arguments which rage about the idea of public service broadcasting are usually marked by the maximum of rhetoric and the minimum of clarity. Rarely, if ever, does anyone attempt to elucidate what public service broadcasting is supposed to be, other than to say that it is what the broadcasters are doing, or failing to do. It is assumed that everyone in the debate knows what public service means and what public service broadcasting is.

**Public Service Broadcasting: Eight Guiding Principles**

In an attempt to place these debates on a more rational foundation, the Broadcasting Research Unit produced, in 1986, a booklet entitled: *The Public Service Idea in British Broadcasting: Main Principles.* That booklet identifies eight major characteristics of public service broadcasting as it has emerged in Britain, and thus provides a useful starting point for considering what principles might be considered integral to the public service ideal.

The Broadcasting Research Unit defined eight major principles:

1. Geographic universality: broadcast programmes should be available to the whole population As the postal service will deliver mail to even the remotest homes, so the broadcaster recognizes a duty to provide programmes to everyone who wishes to receive them.

2. Universality of payment: one main instrument of broadcasting in a country should be directly funded by the corpus of users. This principle, embodied in Britain in the licence fee. a tax payable by every owner of a television set, is a kind of contract between the citizen and the broadcasting service. It ensures that an equally good service shall be made available to all and argues that the service would be undermined by any system that made reception of the broadcast signal dependent upon ability to pay, e.g. funding broadcasting on a pay-per-view or subscription basis.

3. Broadcasting should be structured so as to encourage competition in good programming rather than competition for numbers. Following on from the second principle this statement proposes a system in which broadcasting organizations do not compete for the same source of revenue. Thus in Britain the BBC is funded by the

licence fee and the commercial independent television (ITV) and local radio (ILR) companies by advertising. This arrangement allows the broadcasters to compete for audiences on the basis of the range and quality of their programme output.

4. Universality of appeal: broadcast programmes should cater for all interests and tastes. Public service broadcasting rejects the argument that it should appeal only to the mass audience and cater only for existing established tastes. It also rejects the argument that it should only produce educational and cultural fare for a minority audience. The audience as a whole has a right to expect the public service broadcasters to provide a range of programmes which will explore and extend the possibilities of the medium and stimulate new ideas and new talent. It should aim to make 'popular programmes good' and 'good programmes popular'.

5. Minorities, especially disadvantaged minorities, should receive particular provision. While serving the whole audience, public service broadcasting has a special regard for the needs and interests of minority groups. These are both minorities of taste and minorities in some way disadvantaged in the wider society, the handicapped, the very old and the very young, the poor and those of a different culture or racial origin. In Britain Channel Four television, though part of the commercial system, is charged with a particular responsibility to serve minority groups.

6. Broadcasters should recognize their special relationship to the sense of national identity and community. Public service broadcasting has an important function in providing a forum in which all citizens can find an expression of national concerns and communal interests. In its universality of appeal and geographic and social reach broadcasting can help create a shared sense of national identity.

7. Broadcasting should be distanced from all vested interests, and in particular from those of the government of the day. Public broadcasting should not be subservient either to governments or advertisers. The institutional arrangements in Britain, and in particular the establishment of the BBC as a public corporation under Royal Charter, are meant to be both symbolic and practical devices for ensuring broadcasting independence. In the commercial sector there are strict rules to keep responsibility for programme making and responsibility for advertising clearly distinct.

8. The public guidelines for broadcasting should be designed to liberate rather than restrict the programme makers. In addition to preserving the independence of broadcasters from vested interests the public service system of broadcasting should create an arena which broadcasters feel free to experiment and innovate. Though regulations are needed, for example to ensure that an advertising supported channel does not neglect commercially unprofitable programming, they should be, as far as possible, permissive rather than restrictive. The aim is to attract people into broadcasting who are genuinely interested in the artistic and creative possibilities of the medium. That such an aim can be realised is seen in Britain in the outstanding programming record of the commercial television company, Granada. They produced the widely acclaimed series *The Jewel in the Crown* and then found that many people thought it was a BBC production because of its quality!

These principles can be seen to reflect the manner in which public service broadcasting represents a set of delicate and fragile accommodations and compromises: between broadcasting aimed at mass tastes and at minority interests; between the freedom of the broadcaster and the demands of the audience or the state; and between broadcasting as a servant of national interests and as an autonomous institution.

If one is to understand the present state of public broadcasting in countries across the world one needs to grasp how it is being worked out in a variety of cultural, economic, social and political contexts. This review, therefore, considers research on public service broadcasting in a number of nations and tries to judge how far the principles ennunciated by the Broadcasting Research Unit have a future in today's media environment.

# Public Service Broadcasting in Different Cultures

Steven Barnett and David Docherty. *Public Service Broadcasting in Transition.* Gower, forthcoming.

Eva Etzioni-Halevy. *National Broadcasting Under Siege: A Comparative Study of Australia, Britain, Israel and West Germany.* London: Macmillan, 1987.

These books analyse the past and present state of public broadcasting in eight countries: Britain, West Germany, Australia, New Zealand, Eire, Canada and the United States in Barnett and Docherty; Britain, West Germany, Australia and Israel in Etzioni-Halevy. They investigate the ways in which the idea of public service broadcasting has adapted to particular cultural, political and economic contexts. Barnett and Docherty consider how far public service values depend upon particular financial arrangements; Etzioni-Halevy explores the extent to which public broadcasting has real independence from political pressures.

## Public Service Broadcasting Under Scrutiny

The Barnett and Docherty research grew out of the contemporary debate on the future of broadcasting in Britain. In 1986, the *Peacock Inquiry* was set up to consider the future financing of the BBC and whether or not it should begin to take advertising. At the same time debates on the future of broadcasting were taking place in Sweden, Eire, Canada and New Zealand; in France and Spain existing state monopolies were in the process of being dismantled.

The reasons for this interest in broadcasting's future were many and various, but Barnett and Docherty discern a few common strands: 1. New technology has undermined the concept of spectrum scarcity as a rationale for regulation. 2. Inflation and rising costs have tested governments' commitment to continued adequate funding without political strings. 3. The disparity between the low cost of imported programmes and the high cost of indigeneous productions continues to undermine the ideal of a national broadcasting system as a mainstay of national culture. 4. Ideological political tendencies in favour of market forces and competition make public broadcasting corporations appear simply as liabilities on the public purse.

In the deliberations of the *Peacock Committee,* one of the principles enunciated by the Broadcasting Research Unit as being essential to British public service broadcasting was questioned, that is, that competition between broadcasters should be competition on the basis of programming quality rather than solely for numbers of viewers or listeners. The defenders of public service felt that competition for the same funds would mean a cut-throat battle for

the mass audience that would ultimately reduce the range and diversity of programming. The truth of this contention was disputed, however, by advertisers and others who wished to see the break up of the BBC/ITV broadcasting 'duopoly'. Both sides appealed to the experience of other countries for evidence to support their claims.

## Financing Public Broadcasting

Barnett and Docherty's book is an attempt to establish which of those claims were well founded. Their study, therefore, deals with the different methods countries have used to finance their public broadcasting services: by a mixture of advertising and government grant in Canada; by a mixture of advertising and licence-fee in West Germany, New Zealand, and Eire; by government grant in Australia; and by government subvention, sponsorship and individual donations in the USA. The study also deals with the relation of these funding arrangements to the health of the system as a whole.

There are two central conclusions. First, the self-understanding of the broadcasters is crucially significant in ensuring that the public service ideal continues to survive. Second, political commitment to preserving the independence and integrity of the public service broadcasting organization is more important than the manner in which it is funded.

## Public Service and the Self-Definition of Broadcasters

The first point is well illustrated by the contrasting experiences of New Zealand and Eire. In both countries broadcasting is largely funded by a mixture of advertising revenue and licence fee. In 1985 the Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand (BCNZ) received 71.5% of revenue from advertising and only 16.3% from the licence fee. In Eire, RTE received 44.6% of its income from advertising and 38.6% from the licence fee.

In New Zealand this dependence on advertising has resulted in a narrowing of the range and type of programming. In addition, this conservativism has occurred without competition from another broadcaster. There is, therefore, considerable concern about the possible effect of private broadcasters making inroads into the same source of revenue[1]. The experience of the period between 1975 and 1979 when the two public television channels were in direct competition for audiences suggests that any unconstrained battle for ratings will discourage programming creativity.

In Eire, by contrast, advertising has not produced an overwhelming pressure for commercially oriented scheduling on the public network, RTE. The public service broadcasters have managed to retain a commitment to the making of quality programmes that helps keep commercial pressures under control. Barnett and Docherty point out, however, that RTE is not in competition with another major broadcasting organization for advertising revenue. The crucial difference between RTE and BCNZ is that, despite mixed funding, RTE's public service philosophy is central to its self-definition and self-identity.

Other important lessons derive from the experience of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) in the USA and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). In Australia the lesson is that if a public service broadcaster in an overwhelmingly commercial environment defines itself purely in a complementary role to commercial networks it may become diminished in the perception of the public, the funders and itself. It has to produce mass popular programming in competition with the commercial stations as well as programmes of more limited appeal.

The story of PBS in the USA simply reinforces this point, since it has never been able to establish itself as anything more than a marginal service in a commercial system. From Canada the lesson is that a public broadcaster, like the CBC, sufficiently committed to public service ideals, will struggle to realise those ideals in spite of economic difficulties.

## Political Power and Public Broadcasting

The question of the extent of political commitment to public service broadcasting focusses attention on yet another of the BRU's core principles. This is the seventh principle, that public broadcasting be seen to be distanced from all vested interests, in particular those of the government.

In a democracy the independence of a national broadcasting corporation is both a necessity and a threat. The broadcasters are at once supposed to be independent and accountable to the public and to the state. Problems arise because the rules which are supposed to govern this relationship are ambiguous and opaque, and it is never clear what are legitimate political pressures. Etzioni-Halevy hypothesizes that a national broadcasting corporation is likely to have some features in common with the government bureaucracy. Thus a country with a party-political bureaucracy is likely to have a national broadcasting service that is under greater pressure and/or is more likely to buckle under political pressure as compared to a country in which the bureaucracy has a more independent position vis-a-vis elected politicians.

In her book, Etzioni-Halevy considers broadcasting in two relatively populous (West Germany and the UK) and two relatively small countries (Australia and Israel). A further element of comparison lies in the nature of the governing bureaucracies; in Australia and the UK the bureaucracy is non-partisan, and in Germany and Israel the bureaucracy is party political. Etzioni-Halevy studied these issues by means of analysis of documents, reports and other written materials as well as by conducting eighty in-depth interviews.

Perhaps suprisingly the main hypothesis of the study, that political pressures would be more formidable and pervasive in countries with party political bureaucracies, was not borne out. Political pressure was extensive in all the countries examined. Of the devices used to bring pressure the most important were funding, the threat of privatization, political appointments and direct intervention.

## Political Commitment to Public Service

The second conclusion, the importance of political commitment to public service broadcasting, is well illustrated in West Germany, Australia and Canada. In the Australian case Barnett and Docherty claim that there is no evidence that direct government funding of the ABC involves more political interference in programmes than setting a licence fee would involve. The German experience of considerable party political influence in the administration of the broadcasting system reinforces the view that any form of public finance or publicly agreed finance is open to political pressure if the politicians are not committed to guaranteeing the independence of the broadcaster.

Finally, the failure of the Canadian regulatory authorities to make private broadcasters live up to public service obligations indicates how an uncontrolled commercial sector can effectively unbalance the programming of the public broadcaster. The CBC's problems have stemmed from the fact that while it has had to carry the financial burden of producing high quality indigenous programming, especially drama, the private broadcasters have been

---

[1] A recent policy statement by the New Zealand government (April 26, 1988) envisages a much more competitive and open broadcasting market and the possible abolition of the licence fee.

able to gain larger audiences by importing cheaper American material. For public service broadcasting to work well the obligations of public service need to apply to all elements in the broadcasting system.

### Political Influence on Broadcasting Policy and Appointments

In the UK and Australia the BBC model of an independent corporation is meant to keep the politicians at a distance. In practice, however, both the BBC and the Australian Broadcasting Corporation were initially rather politically compliant. As for Israel and West Germany, in both countries strong political leaders, Ben Gurion and Adenauer, tried to bring broadcasting under more direct government control, though in both cases they were unsuccessful.

In Israel the Israel Broadasting Authority (IBA) was set up in 1965 as divisions within the ruling Labour Party and political infighting coincided to produce a relatively more independent broadcasting corporation. The IBA is controlled by a Board of Directors on which sit representatives of the main political parties according to their number of Parliamentary seats. This structure gives the broadcasters some freedom to manoeuvre among the political factions.

In West Germany broadcasting is the reponsibility of the states, not the Federal government, and the control structure is set up in such a way as to give political parties a clearly defined role. In West Germany the independence of broadcasting is most clearly and precisely defined by legal statute, yet it is in West Germany that one finds the greatest degree of party-political influence.

Among the four countries the UK had the highest degree of informal contact between politicians and broadcasters, followed by Israel and West Germany. Australian broadcasters had less informal contact with politicians. In Israel and West Germany, links between broadcasting boards and political interests are direct, overt and institutionalized; in Australia they are well known and semi-institutionalized; in the UK they are covert and subtle. Political appointments, however, do not always result in political compliance. The governors of the BBC, for example, whatever their prior political affiliations have been, once appointed, tended to act in a more independent manner than their political friends might have expected. Etzioni-Halevy points out that extensive informal contact and thus the possibility of covert political pressures is probably more dangerous in democratic terms than the well publicized public rows.

### Direct Intervention in Programming

Direct intervention in internal programming policy by politicians was common in all countries. In the UK one can cite the episodes of political pressure on the BBC during the Suez crisis (1956). There was also political displeasure over individual programmes such as the satirical *That Was The Week That Was* (1962-3), and the political documentaries *Yesterday's Men* (1971) and *The Question of Ulster* (1982). A more recent example was the furore in 1987 over the television documentary which revealed the existence of the British Zircon spy satellite and which led eventually to BBC offices being raided by the police.

Australian broadcasters have had to weather complaints about political bias in the television news and current affairs programme *This Day Tonight* (1972), and in Israel broadcasters were under constant pressure during the rule of the Likud government between 1977 and 1984. West Germany saw determined efforts by the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) to influence broadcasting, especially after the Noelle-Neumann 1980 study which claimed that the CDU/CSU had lost the 1976 election because of unfavourable television coverage.

### Internal Pressures on Broadcasting

In every country there was evidence that individuals had been dismissed for professional reasons which had political overtones. There was no evidence, however, that people permanently employed in public broadcasting institutions had been dismissed solely for their political views. Political pressures were most blatant in Israel where broadcasters have been demoted from key-positions for overtly political reasons.

In West Germany political pressures are always strong though broadcasters of integrity can win a degree of autonomy. Where appointment procedures are the least politicized, as in the UK, political pressures through possible dismissal are the most pronounced. By contrast in West Germany people, having undergone a highly politicized selection process, once appointed, have greater immunity from political pressures.

British and Australian broadcasters with a more establishment outlook were more likely to rise to the higher levels. In Australia broadcasters tended to gravitate towards politically congenial programmes with those of a more left-wing disposition moving towards news and current affairs. In the UK Etzioni-Halevy found that the freedom of broadcasting staff has traditionally been qualified by internal organizational pressures to conform to the dominant political ethos which is slanted towards caution and the existing political establishment. In every country the most effective pressures are those internalized by the broadcasters whatever their political beliefs.

### Funding Pressures

Etzioni-Halevy agrees with Barnett and Docherty that the method of finance, whether by licence fee alone, or by some combination of fee and advertising or government subsidy, makes little difference to the degree of political interference. In practice all broadcasting institutions depend upon parliaments and governments for finance. The timing of funding, however, does make a difference. The periodic reviews of broadcasting finance in UK and West Germany help to insulate the broadcasters from the worst of the pressures felt by their counterparts in Australia, where the level of funding is set each year, and Israel where funding, at one time, was only assured from month to month. Israel showed the most blatant examples of funding used to bring broadcasters to heel, though in all countries restrictions on finance are commonly used to exert pressure on the broadcasters.

The threat of introducing a more commercial element into the national broadcasting system has proved a potent political weapon in the UK and West Germany. In the UK the *Peacock Report*, and in West Germany the campaign by the conservative Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) for more private broadcasting, have given governments and political parties new opportunities to exert pressure, precisely because the national broadcasters see these moves as threatening their status.

### Resisting Political Pressures

In attempting to counter political pressures and retain a measure of independence broadcasters have a number of weapons to hand. These include the support of public opinion, the power of staff trade unions, and appeals to the professional ethos of independence, credibility, and objectivity. There is also resistance by default, where staff fail to carry out management instructions. The most the broadcasters can do is to reduce or limit some of the worst excesses of political interference. Occasionally the broadcasters win a limited victory. In the UK, for example, there was the security vetting scandal in which it was revealed that the security services were compiling secret files on the political activities of BBC employees. After disclosure by the press, a parliamentary row, and representations by staff organizations the practice was much reduced.

# The Origins of Public Service Broadcasting in Britain

Asa Briggs. *The BBC: The First Fifty Years*. Oxford: Oxford Univ Press, 1985.

Michael Tracey. *The Throne We Honour: Essays on Public Service Broadcasting*. London: Sage, forthcoming.

Present day broadcasting policies and practices derive from and constantly refer back to, the policies and practices of the past. Understanding the past is, therefore, a necessary prelude to a deeper understanding of the significance of current changes in the status of public broadcasting. That understanding, however, depends upon the availability of detailed history of broadcasting.

In Britain, as in other countries, the history of broadcasting is still a relatively neglected field of work. Asa Briggs comments that when he began work on his four volume history of broadcasting in Britain in 1961 there were few general histories of broadcasting in any country. Since 1961, however, he has chronicled with painstaking detail the varied fortunes of the BBC and public service broadcasting. His latest book, a one volume history of the BBC until 1972, together with the work of Michael Tracey, provides the essential historical perspective needed to understand the significance of the BBC's achievements in the light of its present problems and tribulations. In addition Tracey's book explores the question of how far it is possible to transplant a conception of public service broadcasting from one culture to another and from one era to another.

## The BBC: From Company to Corporation

The first person to embody the ideals of public service broadcasting in institutional form was the Scotsman, John Reith, the first Director-General of the BBC. Reith is rivalled as the outstanding personality in the history of the BBC only by Hugh Greene, Director-General of the BBC in the 1960s. Reith and Green epitomise the ideal of public service broadcasting in quite distinct, and often conflicting ways. One needs to understand both the continuities between Reith and Greene, and their differences, before one can hope to grasp how and why the public service idea in British broadcasting developed and is now undergoing change.

Radio broadcasting in Britain was first organized under the auspices of a private company, the British Broadcasting Company, a consortium of radio manufacturers, which received its licence to broadcast in January 1923. In 1925 the Crawford Committee recommended, on the advice of the BBC and the Post Office, that the BBC should be established as a public corporation. Furthermore it was agreed that the experience of competition between radio stations in the USA demonstrated the need for the BBC to be a monopoly if chaos on the airwaves was to be avoided. Accordingly, on January 1st, 1927, the British Broadcasting Corporation was set up as a public corporation under Royal Charter, a device designed to stress the BBC's independence of government and parliament, though it was, of course, ultimately responsible to them.

The BBC's first Director-General, John Reith, was the son of a prominent Presbyterian minister. From the beginning he regarded his appointment as a 'calling' from God, and he determined to make broadcasting into a fit instrument for the Divine purpose. Even as Managing Director of the private British Broadcasting Company Reith worked hard to imbue it with the spirit and principles he thought proper for a public corporation.

Reith thought of public service broadcasting as having four main facets. First of all, the BBC should be protected from purely commercial pressures. Secondly, the broadcasting service should serve the whole nation. Thirdly, there must be unified control, that is, public service broadcasting needed to be organized as a monopoly. Finally, the quality of the programming should conform to the highest standards.

The problem for Reith and the BBC lay in translating such high ideals into organizational and practical form. The history of the BBC is the story of a continuing struggle of working broadcasters to accomodate the often different demands of government and audience while developing a distinctive programming philosophy and practice. The problems which the BBC, like other public broadcasters, is experiencing today are not dissimilar to those it had to face in earlier years.

## Between State and Public

The BBC's Charter stated that broadcasting was to be organized to serve the national interest. Before the Charter came into operation, however, the BBC had had, during the General Strike of 1926, the first of many encounters with the government over the question of how that national interest was to be interpreted and the extent to which the corporation could act independently. In order to preserve the principle of BBC autonomy Reith, in this instance, did not allow the BBC to be used by the government as a simple instrument of propaganda, but equally gave little or no coverage to views contrary to those of the government.

Time and again, Reith found himself battling to extend the BBC's freedom of action. Even as the Second World War approached the BBC was hampered in its desire to prepare the public for the catastrophe about to occur by a government unwilling to admit publicly what it had accepted privately. According to Scannell and Cardiff, the BBC came to see that the government, in spite of its own claims, was not acting in the national interest[2]. The BBC saw itself as having a primary responsibility to its audience, and not to the state, but was hampered in alerting the public by both government and Labour Party unwillingness to admit the imminence of war. As the managers and programme makers within the BBC manoeuvred to gain and hold what freedom of action they could they were constantly renegotiating the practical autonomy of the corporation.

## Popular Tastes and Cultural Aspirations

The BBC's understanding of its responsibility to the listening public was constantly evolving, even under Reith's stern rule. In Reith's view, broadcasters had a moral duty to use radio as an instrument of enlightenment. He believed that public taste was too fickle and unstable to be taken as the guide for programme making. The task of the broadcasters was to set their own standards of taste and accustom the public to adopt those standards.

The war and the need to keep the morale of the troops high had a profound effect on BBC programme policy. Entertainment became a priority. The Forces Programme provided an alternative 'light' service to the more speech-based Home Service. After the war Reith's ideal of a single programme service catering to all tastes was finally abandoned and radio broadcasting was reorganized into three distinct services. This reorganization was the work of the new Director-General William Haley and it represented his view of the audience as a 'cultural pyramid slowly aspiring upwards'; the listener was to be gently led from the banalities of the Light Programme through the more demanding, and more speech based Home Service, to the intellectual heights of serious music and talk in the Third Programme.

## The Advent of Commercial Television

The war had two other major consequences for the BBC: it enhanced its reputation as a reliable source of news and information, but its role

[2] Scannell and D. Cardiff. 'Serving the Nation: Public Service Broadcasting Before the War', in B. Waites, T. Bennett and G. Martin (eds.), *Popular Culture: Past and Present*. London: Croom Helm, 1982. pp.161-188.

as an arm of government propaganda drew attention to its monopoly position. Both during and after the war the monopoly came to be seen by many as a threat to freedom.

In the view of Asa Briggs the movement towards a more affluent society combined with the election of a Conservative government eager to escape from Socialist planning and nationalisation made the introduction of commercial television almost inevitable. In 1954 the BBC's monopoly was broken and independent (commercial) television (ITV) established.

At first ITV did not see itself in public service terms. It defined its task as the provision of a popular alternative to the elitist fare of the BBC. As the ITV companies began to win a larger share of the audience, however, the BBC was forced to broaden its concept of public service broadcasting in order to justify a more populist approach to programming. According to Michael Tracey, this more populist approach marked a decisive shift with the past in that it abandoned the idea of cultural mission which had been one of the pillars of the Reithian public service ideal.

### Serving the Public and Provoking the Audience

The pressures from audience and state came together in particularly dramatic form during the Director-Generalship of Hugh Greene in the 1960s. Greene, like Reith, believed passionately in the ideal of public service and detested commercial broadcasting. Unlike Reith, however, he was a man of secular opinions and outlook and had none of his predecessor's religious fervour. Greene held a philosophy of public service broadcasting that regarded tolerance as an ideal and which supported the making of programmes designed to challenge, provoke, or even shock the audience. He believed that public broadcasting should be ready to serve the public even by antagonizing substantial portions of the audience. It was a belief that overturned completely the Reithian concern to avoid anything which might be regarded as 'hurtful'. Not surprisingly, the Greene era, while it produced what many observers regard as some of the finest satire, drama and light entertainment in British television, also saw the rise of Mary Whitehouse's National Viewers and Listeners Association as the champion of those offended by what they saw as an increase in bad language, violence and sexual license.

Politicians too were offended by unwelcome satirical comments in shows such as *That Was The Week That Was*. The extent of the Labour government's displeasure was revealed in 1967 when the Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, appointed the former Chairman of the Independent Television Authority, Lord Hill, as BBC Chairman. In the event, however, Hill proved to be more willing to defend the BBC's independence than perhaps the government had hoped or the broadcasters feared.

By the time of Greene's resignation in 1969 the British public broadcasting system had settled into a 'duopoly' between BBC and commercial broadcasters, both committed to a public service ideal. The acceptance of independent television as an integral part of the public service broadcasting system was confirmed in 1981 when Channel Four was established as a commercial channel designed to offer an outlet for more specialized and minority programmes.

### Public Broadcasting and Public Culture

Michael Tracey's analysis of the challenges facing the public service ideal stresses the connection between public service broadcasting and the political and social culture which brought into being and sustained it for over fifty years. That political and social culture was one in which the idea of broadcasting as a public, collective good was taken for granted. In Britain and other countries the state was seen to have an important role to play in ensuring that broadcasting was organized as a service in the national and public interest.

As Tracey points out, this conception of broadcasting and its social role was articulated with particular clarity in the post-war reconstructions of German and Japanese society. In a detailed analysis he shows how the victorious Allies sought to establish public broadcasting in both Germany and Japan as essential components of a new democratic society. In Germany Hugh Greene was called in to imbue the newly established Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk with the spirit of the BBC. In Japan the desire to provide democratic institutions that would be accepted by the conservative Japanese was so strong that the Americans adopted a British public service organizational model of broadcasting in preference to a more American commercial system.

In both Germany and Japan, however, the new models of broadcasting did not operate in precisely the fashion envisaged by their founders. Tracey makes it clear that in transferring an ideal and an institutional model from one culture to another both the ideal and the institution undergo significant changes. The public service ideal in Germany and Japan is worked out in very different socio-political structures. In West Germany, for example, public broadcasting was politicized from its origin despite Hugh Greene's attempt to keep politicians at a distance on the BBC model. In a similar fashion, Tracey argues, moving public broadcasting from an era of public culture into a more privatized social environment, symbolized by the political ascendancy of free market rhetoric and deregulatory policies, entails significant adaptation of the practice of the public service ideal.

### Professionalism, Public Service and Consumer Choice

Looking back over the history of the BBC one can see that its achievements and the continuation of the public service ideal in British broadcasting has crucially depended upon the selfbelief of the broadcasters and their adherence to the ideal of service. As Tracey argues, in the 1950s the BBC, under the leadership of Director-General, Ian Jacob, was able to rethink its relation to the audience in a creative way that resulted in the programme successes of the 1960s. Since the end of the 1960s, however, the broadcasters have had to operate in an ever more socially and morally pluralistic society. In response they have adopted an ideal of professionalism, concerned with producing good programmes, in an effort to appeal to the broadest range of tastes and opinions. They have largely taken for granted the ideal of public service broadcasting. In effect public service broadcasting has tended to become what the broadcasters have chosen to do.

This professional ideal, however, has not equipped broadcasters with an adequate or convincing public philosophy of broadcasting and leaves them open to the charge of self-regarding elitism. The present Conservative government in Britain has been particularly successful in arguing its case for a less highly regulated system by characterizing the broadcasters as yet another restrictive profession indifferent to the needs and wishes of the audience. Against public service broadcasting the government has raised the banner of consumer choice, and the broadcasters have not known how to respond.

Even as Channel Four was being born, the very idea of public service broadcasting in Britain itself was coming under question. In 1982 the *Hunt Report* on cable television recommended that cable should not be subject to public service obligations. Four years later the *Peacock Report* considered the possibility of introducing advertising on BBC television and argued that the BBC should cease to compete with commercial broadcasters across all areas of programming. Today the British government is preparing a bill to substantially deregulate radio broadcasting and looks for new opportunities to introduce increasing commercial competition into broadcasting.

Tracey fears that, in the face of such pressures, public broadcasters will prove adaptable enough to maintain their position in the media marketplace as major suppliers of entertainment programmes but not creative enough to renew the public service ideal. Increasingly public service institutions will play safe and concentrate on competing with purely commercial broadcasters for the mass audience. The institutional shell will remain but the creative substance will be gone.

# France: From Statism to Deregulation: Some Continuities

R. Kuhn. 'France: The End of the Government Monopoly', in R.Kuhn (ed.) *The Politics of Broadcasting.* The London: Croom Helm, 1985.

J.-J. Ledos, J.-P. Jézéquel and P. Régnier. *Le Gachis Audiovisuel.* Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières, 1986.

J. L. Missika and D. Wolton. *La Folle du Logis: La Télévision dans les Sociétés Démocratiques.* Paris: Gallimard, 1983.

Every country in Western Europe has adopted some form of public broadcasting system. In each one a different set of institutional arrangements has had to be worked out in order to accommodate prevailing national cultural and political expectations and behaviour. In recent years, however, countries as different as Britain, West Germany, France, Spain and Italy have found themselves moving towards a future in which market forces seem to be replacing public service values at the core of the broadcasting system. This tendency has been particularly marked in France where broadcasting policy seems to have undergone the equivalent of a revolution. From having one of the most highly centralised state broadcasting systems in Europe France has gone to a situation in which the main public service television channel, Antenne 2 has just over 25% of the audience. How has this new era in French broadcasting come about?

Kuhn, Ledos et al, and Missika and Wolton all consider the politics of French broadcasting and all reach similar conclusions about the enduring pattern of the relationship among governments, political parties and broadcasters. For all the importance of the shift away from a traditional model of centralised state monopoly control of broadcasting towards a more deregulated system, the problem of political control and influence remains at the heart of French broadcasting. Political interference in French broadcasting has arisen naturally out of a political system which has never achieved any significant degree of political consensus. This situation is a result of unstable parliamentary majorities, themselves the reflection of fundamental and permanent divisions in French society. According to Kuhn politicians still regard control of the state broadcasting system as a natural spoil of electoral victory.

## The Early Years of French Broadcasting

This pattern of activity has remained remarkably stable since broadcasting first entered French society. In 1923 the French government extended its monopoly of postal and telegraphy services to cover radiocommunications. The monopoly, however, was largely nominal as the State retained ultimate control but sold permits to private companies which operated alongside the state network. In June 1927 radio was given its own administrators within the French telecommunications administration and in 1933 private stations were given a monopoly of advertising in return for accepting an extension of government control. The state radio network was a part of the administrative system of a centralised state, and its personnel were civil servants. The figure of authority was the Minister of Posts and not the Director of Radio. Government control and bureaucratic procedures became ingrained habits. In addition radio was seen as a legitimate arena for party political struggle. In 1937, for example, the election of listeners' representatives to the state radio stations' management councils (Conseils de gérance), became a political contest between government and opposition.

The Second World War, the defeat of France and the establishment of the Vichy government had profound consequences for French broadcasting. Vichy took over the radio system and used it as a major instrument of propaganda. In addition some private radio stations sympathetic to the aims of the Vichy regime continued to broadcast in southern France. When France was finally liberated all private censes were officially revoked and a new state monopoly and public service, Radiodiffusion-Télévision Francaise (RTF), was set up.

The Fourth Republic lasted until 1958 when the Algerian crisis brought the downfall of the Pflimlin government and return of De Gaulle. In the intervening years political instability had meant constant changes in the ranks of those responsible for broadcasting policy. In a paradoxical fashion this instability helped to reduce the growth of political control over RTF but at the same time gave many opportunities for political interference. Until 1956 most pressures were negative, mainly interventions designed to prevent the broadcast of news deemed unhelpful to the ruling party; from 1957 onwards there was more positive intervention, including the replacement of a Director-General, and censorship as the Algerian crisis intensified. When De Gaulle came to power his supporters and sympathizers were moved into almost every key post concerned with influencing public opinion.

## From Gaullism to Liberalism : The Problems of Control

The era from 1958 to 1974 was characterized by the dominance of the Gaullist party and a pervasive government control of broadcasting. In a revealing comment in 1961, André Gérard, the head of radio and television news, remarked that 'A journalist should be French first, objective second'. Though RTF was reformed as the Office de Radiodiffusion-Télévision Française (ORTF) in 1964, governmental control was not lessened. The events of May 1968 and their consequences did shock the government into allowing a greater degree of freedom in news coverage, but the underlying structures of influence were not touched.

By the time the 1974 presidential election brought the liberal, Giscard d'Estaing, into office, the Gaullists had ceased to be the overwhelmingly dominant political force they had been until 1968. Now they were only the largest of the political factions on the right. The Giscardians, with their ideology of liberalism and modernization, could not simply adopt the same kind of political strategy for influencing broadcasting as the more Bonapartist Gaullists. The Giscardian strategy was to project the image of a neutral state, above the factionalism of party politics, and to reform broadcasting so that it would seem more pluralistic, and less authoritarian. According to Missika and Wolton political ends were expressed in the more neutral and seemingly inevitable rhetoric of economic and technological imperatives.

The Giscardian presidency could not, however, shake off the ingrained habits of French political life. Giscard d'Estaing made sure that his supporters were placed in key broadcasting positions, and in the final years of his presidency there was a sharp increase in overt news manipulation. Giscard also hesitated to open up the broadcasting system for fear that any significant relaxation of the government monopoly would give new opportunities to his political opponents on the left. Hence the repression of pirate radio stations, including one owned by the Socialist party, after 1978.

## Socialism, Liberalization and Deregulation

When the Socialists came to power in 1981 it seemed for a time as if a new era was about to open for French broadcasting. The Socialists, having experienced over twenty years of right wing political control of a centralised broadcasting system, hoped to introduced a measure of liberalization. They licensed local independent radio stations in 1982 and set up the pay-television channel, Canal Plus. This attempt at a controlled deregulation, however, soon came under pressure from commercial, industrial and political lobbies pressing for a more commercial system with even fewer restrictions. The government found it hard to liberalize while keeping public service ideals such as a desire to restrict the amount of imported programming. It found that political wisdom suggested that it revise some of its policies.

The extent of the revision required was seen in 1985 when it became clear that President Mitterand had conducted secret negotiations with a Franco-Italian media group led by Silvio Berlusconi for the allocation of a fifth national television channel. This dealing with the most prominent exponent of broadcasting commercialism in Europe can only be explained by political expediency. One aim was to produce electoral popularity in the run-up to the National Assembly elections in 1986 which the Left seemed likely to lose. Given the Right's new-found commitment to deregulation and privatisation, Mitterand probably calculated that Socialist influence could best be maintained by accommodating media entrepreneurs, like Berlusconi and Robert Maxwell (in satellite broadcasting), who were less unsympathetic to the Left than their rivals Murdoch and Hersant.

The Gaullists and their allies did win the 1986 elections and Mitterand's manoeuvres with Berlusconi were frustrated. The first state television channel, TF1 was privatized and two other private television channels authorized. The High Authority was abolished and replaced by the weaker Commission Nationale de la Communication et des Libertés.

Deregulation is often presented as a step towards a more open and democratic media system. It can also be regarded as just another turn in the continuing political battle over the control of broadcasting. For Ledos et al., deregulation marks an abandonment of public service ideals in the face of political expediency and commercial pressure. The loser in this battle is, as always, the public interest and the realization of a broadcasting system that is animated by a public service ideal. Missika and Wolton's analysis suggests that this may be too bleak a view. Their study points out that in French public service broadcasting political control has gone hand in hand with a set of cultural assumptions among broadcasters and politicians alike which has denigrated popular tastes and aspirations. This elitist view has united in unholy alliance politicians and broadcasters of otherwise opposing views. In their view, therefore, a weakening of state control and an expansion in broadcasting outlets can help redress the balance of power in favour of the mass audience. Moreover, if the structures of broadcasting are freed from excessive state interference, television can be a force for the extension of democracy in society, by making politicians and others more visible and accountable to the public.

# The USA: Public Broadcasting in a Commercial Environment

Mary Mander. 'The Public Debate About Broadcasting in the Twenties: An Interpretative History', *Journal of Broadcasting*, Vol. 28, No.2 (Spring) 1984, pp. 167–185.

Willard D. Rowland. 'Continuing Crisis in Public Broadcasting: A History of Disenfranchisement'. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, Vol. 30, No.3 (Summer) 1986, pp. 251–274.

Today the commercial structure of United States broadcasting is so taken for granted that it requires a considerable effort of historical imagination to consider that it might have been organized differently. After all, the first person to speak of radio broadcasting as a 'public service' was the American broadcaster and entrepreneur, David Sarnoff. In a speech in 1922 he claimed that 'considered from its broadest aspect... broadcasting represents a job of entertaining, informing and educating the nation, and should therefore be distinctly regarded as a public service'.

Why did the United States organize its broadcasting system as a commercial enterprise and not as a public utility? What is the status of public broadcasting in the USA today? These are the questions addressed by Mary Mander and Willard Rowland in their articles. In both cases the researchers argue that the answers can only be found if we have a clear grasp of the historical background to today's broadcasting activities and policies.

### Broadcasting in the USA: Legislating by Analogy

The answer to the first question is to be found, among other factors, in the way in which the issue was first formulated and considered by the legislators who considered the issue in the early 1920s. Mary Mander's essay begins to answer the question by analysing the public debate prior to the passing of the 1927 Radio Act. Mander argues that most protagonists in the debate cast about for analogies and precedents which could guide their regulatory approach to the new medium. Eventually nearly all the arguments were in terms of three models and metaphors: transport, public utilities and the newspaper.

The most contentious model was that derived from the experience of regulating public utilities. There was significant support for the idea of regulating radio as a utility in order to ensure that it developed as a true public service. This argument, however, could not overcome the fear of centralized monopoly power and of a further extension of federal regulations. One potent image employed against the public utility model was that of the radio as a newspaper of the air. This analogy suggested that radio should

have a diversity of private ownership in order that its programmes could make their proper contribution to the debates in the marketplace of ideas.

The transport model proved to be particularly attractive to legislators because of its embodiment in existing laws. As Mander, puts it: 'Because some ships had wireless sets, the licencing of broadcasting was based partly on licensing precedents from transportation. Secondly, future precedent for the regulation of radio was found in the regulation of the rails, the telegraph and the telephone. The locus of federal over state power in regulating radio rested on the commerce clause of the US Constitution. This point is significant because the commerce clause provided an over-arching model by which broadcasting's future was envisaged: a market model.'

In Mander's view, the framing of the debate within the terms of these models ensured that broadcasting was regarded mainly as a commercial enterprise and that it was not thought of or regulated as 'a symbol-producing, culture maintaining medium, the purpose of which was art, intellectual exchange and the maintenance of a public sphere or community. Instead a market model prevailed.'

### Public Broadcasting: The Marginal Service

Mander's analysis is supported by Willard Rowland, who argues that policy debate has always marginalized public broadcasting in relation to the dominant ideology of the market. He sees recent efforts to find a more secure future for public broadcasting through the use of new technologies as mirroring a misplaced early faith in the capacity of commercial broadcasting to fulfill public service commitments.

From the start the Federal Communications Commission defined public broadcasting in predominantly negative terms, as 'noncommercial educational'. Rowland contends that 'noncommercial' implied a negative definition in terms of the commercial system and had no sense of 'positive vision'. In the same way the term 'educational' at the level of common usage, suggested

a use for broadcasting that was 'dry, unattractive and forbidding'.

Even when a public dimension to broadcasting was explicitly acknowledged and catered for, as in the reservation of radio frequencies, it was done so in grudging terms, structured by a minimalist policy. The initial 1938 radio reservations were placed in much higher frequencies, and later, in 1940, only in FM, which at the time could not be widely received and therefore had no audience.

That minimalist policy survived even into the 1960s and the debates around the Carnegie Report in 1967. Those debates eventually led to the setting up of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), the creation of the Public Broadcasting Service and the establishment of National Public Radio. However, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, which set up the CPB, failed to implement any of the Carnegie recommendations for permanent long-term funding. Problems over funding finally led to the Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1975 in which it seemed public broadcasting's finances had been put on a more solid foundation. For a time public broadcasting showed 'considerable promise of becoming more directly central to the social, political and cultural discourse of the nation.'

Unfortunately for public broadcasters, the years since 1975 have seen a marked turn against public conceptions of broadcasting. The deregulatory movement across all sectors of the US economy has proved inhospitable to a further extension of the public broadcasting concept. The market model in its purest form has become the ideology of the day. Public broadcasting, never central to US media policy making, has once more returned to the margins. In Rowland's words: 'the new orthodoxy, with its faith in the invisible hand of technology and commercialism, is remarkably reminiscent of those mythologies of the 1920s and 1930s that celebrated the progressive, public service, educational cooperation possibilities for a business-based broadcasting system and that led to the initial restrictive pattern of policy options for anything outside it. There continues, then the long-term federal policy tendency to avoid building public broadcasting in the U.S. into anything more than a relatively minor auxiliary to the dominant private system.'

# Latin America: The Failure of Public Service

Elizabeth Fox (ed.). *Media and Politics in Latin America: The Struggle for Democracy.* London: Sage, 1988.

In the United States public broadcasting is marginal to a system which, however commercial, yet acknowledges an obligation to serve the public interest. In Latin America commercialism seems so prevalent that the ideals of public service and public accountability seem almost utopian. Why has the public interest been so poorly served in Latin America's broadcasting systems?

This is the fundamental question to which a number of Latin American communication scholars have recently begun to offer the beginnings of an answer. Their analysis of broadcasting history and the politics of media policy in ten countries identifies a number of typical and recurrent patterns which have shaped, and continue to shape, the development of Latin American mass media.

These patterns derive from, and are sustained by, a socio-economic and political system which effectively concentrates power in the hands of wealthy elites, often allied or subservient to US commercial and political interests, and which are highly resistant to fundamental social change. The inconsistencies, arbitrariness, timidity and ultimate ineffectualness of national media policies are a symbolic expression of that underlying social instability and political immaturity which is Latin American society's ever present problem.

This research marks something of a shift of emphasis in current Latin American communication scholarship. In part, this shift has been influenced by the failure of the media reform hopes which were entertained in the 1960s and 1970s, in part by the new, if tentative, hopes born of the gradual return to democratic rule in Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and, perhaps one day, in Chile too. The researchers refrain from elaborating major plans for reform, and concentrate instead on describing and analyzing the historical evolution and present-day interplay of political, social and economic forces which determine broadcasting practices and policies. Such an analysis is a necessary first step if media reform is ever to move from rhetoric to reality.

One can identify four major phases in Latin American broadcasting history: (1) the 1920s and 1930s in which broadcasting was introduced into Latin America; (2) the late 1930s to the end of the 1950s, a period of rapid industrialization and the formation of media monopolies; (3) the 1960s and 1970s when expectations for media reform coincided with profound social conflict and, in many countries, the establishment of military rule; (4) the 1980s and the gradual waning of military power and new hopes for democracy and reform.

## The Failure to Establish a Public Broadcasting Tradition

Radio began in most of Latin America in the early 1920s. Most countries already had a strong tradition of privately owned and politically partisan newspapers, a tradition drawn upon to provide the dominant model for the organization and functioning of the new broadcasting technology. Eventually a pattern emerged. The majority of radio stations were private commercial undertakings financed by advertising. The remaining few stations were either government owned or under some form of state regulation. By the mid-1930s radio was well established and had begun to compete with newspapers as the main advertising medium. Newspaper companies, in their turn, began to invest in radio and as cross-ownership developed media monopolies began to appear.

The first radio stations were established by governments, commercial entrepreneurs, and, in Brazil, private associations or clubs which set up educational and cultural stations. From the beginning the private commercial stations were the most successful. Even the Mexican government, which had a strong interest in using film for promoting ideological and nationalist ideals, and which used radio both for information and propaganda and,later, for culture and education, had by 1941 sold state-owned stations to private investors. In Argentina, and Venezuela there was minimal governmental interest and in Peru the state owned Peruvian Broadcasting Company went bankrupt in two years. Only in Uruguay did the government subsidize a non-commercial public broadcasting service (SODRE), but this was generally regarded as a cultural and educational adjunct to commercial broadcasting.

The position was further complicated by the activities of US broadcasters and private companies. Both the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Company invested in, and helped to set up, Latin American networks, and in some countries US companies bought and operated their own commercial networks to advertise their products.

## The Consolidation of Media Monopolies

From the late 1930s onwards, commercial interest, allied to governmental tendencies to concentrate and centralise political power allowed little space for the growth of non-governmental broadcasting operating as a public service. As the radio audience grew and politicians began to depend upon broadcasting for access to the public, they started to take a closer interest in broadcasting. Censorship was introduced into Brazil from 1932, and in 1936 Colombian radio owners and industrialists combined to oppose government proposals for nationalization. As populist regimes, such as those of Peron in Argentina and Vargas in Brazil, came to power in the 1940s and 1950s state *political* control was intensified.

The coming of television to most of the continent in the 1950s did not significantly disrupt the predominant commercial orientation of broadcasting. Latin American governments were making rapid industrialization an economic priority and setting out to provide a stable and protected business climate in which economic growth could occur. Governments, therefore, imposed censorship and other curbs on free expression but refrained from adopting policies (restrictions on advertising or on the use of imported US programmes, for example) that might have threatened broadcasting's economic viability. Broadcasters, for their part, acquiesced in their subservient political role and concentrated on making money. In the factional world of Latin American politics no significant political actors demanded the establishment of a balanced and coherent media policy that would serve longer term goals of social development.

Once again a further distorting influence was that of the US. US foreign and trade policies supported the extension of US commercial investment and concentrated on building up political and diplomatic support for US interests. It was no part of the US strategy to press for national policies to build public service broadcasting institutions or to place limits on US cultural influence. In addition the dependence of broadcasters on advertising revenue served to enhance US influence as cheap imports of American shows were the key elements in winning audience popularity.

## Social Conflict and the Search for Reform

The drive for industrialization was accompanied by a development strategy that sought to stimulate rural modernization by the application of communication technologies. Broadcasting from metropolitan centres to the rural areas was employed as an educational and developmental tool. Unfortunately this approach only strengthened existing centralising tendencies and enhanced the power of elite groups in the rural areas. The combination of a modernizing developmental programme and continuing expansion of commercial broadcasting simply hastened the erosion of indigenous popular cultures and encouraged an ever faster drift to the cities. Urban growth, economic expansion, rural poverty and rigid and repressive political and social structures were fertile grounds for the growth of social unrest and conflict.

As unrest grew, and the demands for political and social change intensified, media reform began to make its way on to the political agenda. The media were increasingly seen as important agents of socio-economic development. New emphasis was given to the development of grass-roots popular alternative communication and the Catholic Church initiated the radio-school movement. Media researchers analysed the history of Latin American communications in terms of dependency on the USA and called for structural reforms to diminish US and commercial influence.

The contributors to Fox's book analyse a number of efforts at media reform undertaken in this period (the 1960s and early 1970s). (1) In Chile there was a process of negotiation and public debate among leading political parties to introduce a public television service; (2) in Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela media policy experts and populist executive presidents attempted reforms

through executive action; and (3) in Peru a reformist military regime tried to bring about changes in the media as part of its reform programme. All three strategies failed.

## The Chilean Experience

Chile's experience is particularly interesting because of the fact that it was the one country in Latin America in which an attempt to set up a public television service expressly modelled on the European ideal of public service broadcasting might have been expected to succeed. The attempt failed, and failed tragically, because political arguments over the organisation of broadcasting became an integral part of a wider political struggle over the future of Chilean society. The political battle quickly became a contest of incompatible ends, and as Chilean society revealed the structural incompatibilities which lay at its core, the possibility of public service broadcasting, an idea which depends upon a high degree of moral and political consensus, became more and more to seem a utopian dream.

In Chile between 1958 and 1963 there was much discussion and argument as to how television might be introduced. In 1963 a consensus was reached when television was neither left to private enterprise nor organized as a government monopoly, but was entrusted to the universities. This decision was the consequence of a number of factors. First, the Conservative government felt that it could not afford to create its own television system. Secondly, the government was not at all eager to set up a commercial system that would encourage even more imports of North American programming. Thirdly, Chilean political life had already begun to become more polarized. Only the universities among public institutions were considered free from political manipulation and commercial exploitation. Unfortunately, the two university television channels discovered that they were unable to fill all the airtime at their disposal with national cultural products. Without state subsidies the university channels soon began to show US imports and accepted commercial advertising.

Until the Christian Democrats came to power in 1964 it seemed as if the Chilean political system would prove sufficiently adaptable to ensure the preservation of a democratic social order, however imperfect. However, when the Christian Democrats introduced their programme of social reform designed to reduce the power of the old economic and political oligarchy and to bring lower-status groups into the political system the limits of flexibility and adaptation began to become apparent. Alongside agrarian and social reform the Christian Democrats stressed the use of radio for popular education of the rural poor. The government set up a chain of pro-government radio stations and assisted the growth of television by distributing locally produced receivers at controlled prices and by rejecting a direct tax on television. More dramatically, they introduced a law in 1970 that set up a government-owned National Television Channel in addition to those of the universities.

Both the right and the left saw this reform as a ploy to increase governmental power. The bitter disputes over broadcasting policy became a highly visible symbol of the growing social and political polarization of Chilean society. Victory for the Popular Unity coalition of Salvador Allende in 1970 meant at first a series of compromises with the Christian Democrats. The 1970 television law was one immediate result. This law was an attempt to give Chile a television system anchored in the ideals of public service and responsive to the needs of all sectors of society. The 1970 reforms, however, were soon overtaken by the increasingly bitter political disputes about state control and freedom of the press. As the Popular Unity coalition extended state supervision over radio, publishing houses and the film industry the Conservatives and the Christian Democrats became ever more vehement in defending the rights of private ownership. The situation was not helped by the meddling of the US government, fighting to destabilize what it saw as a subversive communist government.

The fragile social consensus that had held Chilean political society together for fifty years was shattered, and in 1973 all reforms were swept away by the military coup. When the military took power it set about consolidating control over the mass media. The priorities were economic growth and political order and it was an eager practitioner of the arts of censorship.

### The Failure of Media Reform

Media reform initiatives in Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela, though largely ineffectual, were also the subject of intense, and often bitter, political argument. In the end media reform proposals were either blocked or marginalised by coalitions of vested political and economic interests. In Venezuela, President Perez had an elaborate plan drawn up by media policy experts but was unable to win sufficient political support in the face of opposition by the Christian Democrats, the press, advertisers and members of his own party fearful of adverse political publicity. The succeeding Christian Democrat president had as little success. In Colombia, reforms in the television system made little impact on the overall commercial orientation of the media, and neither Conservative nor Liberal governments were able to convince their opponents that they had the public, rather than their party, interests at heart.

Mexico saw attempted reforms under three presidents largely as a response by a somewhat moribund authoritarian regime to leftist opposition. There was a rhetoric of reform, but personal ties between members of the government and of the private media, a political fear of creating a genuinely free broadcasting system, and the active lobbying of private broadcasters ensured that the main effect was an increase in the government's political influence.

Peruvian broadcasting reforms in the period 1968 to 1975 were sweeping but were imposed by a reforming military regime that could not resolve the tension between its professed democratic ideals and its authoritarian practice. Its control of the private media was expressed largely as political censorship while commercial content remained largely unaffected. It was never able to build a viable political consensus in favour of reform and was eventually out-manoeuvred by its political and media opponents. In 1980 the democratic president it had ousted in 1968 returned to power.

### From Dictatorship to Democracy

When the military regimes in Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Chile took power, the old patterns of commercial expansion and political quietude returned to broadcasting. The most spectacular symbol, of this new order was Brazil's media empire built around TV Globo, the fourth largest television network in the world. It was particularly symbolic then that the ownership of TV Globo, moved by a shrewd instinct for self preservation, abandoned the regime and supported the popular demand for democracy as soon as it saw that military rule was doomed.

As democracy returned to Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay, reform of broadcasting was not high on the political agenda. Apart from lifting censorship the newly elected governments had no clear policy towards the media. In their absence from power the commercial media had grown economically stronger and Brazil's TV Globo could claim to be an important multinational company. The experience of state control under the military had effectively set back reforms based on any extension of public control and there was, as ever, no political consensus in favour of radical restructuring. At the end of the 1980s Latin America was still paying the price of the failure to build a public broadcasting tradition in the 1920s and 1930s.

# Africa and India: Government Control and Autonomy

Paul A. V. Ansah. 'The Role of the State in Broadcasting in Africa'. *Media Development*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1985, pp. 6-9.

P.C. Chatterji. *Broadcasting in India*. New Delhi: Newbury Park, CA: London: Sage Publications in association with The International Institute of Communications, 1987.

Mehra Masani. *Broadcasting and the People*. 2nd ed. New Delhi: National Book Trust, 1985.

George Wedell (ed.). *Making Broadcasting Useful: The African Experience: The Development of Radio and Television in Africa in the 1980s*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986.

Few so called 'developing' countries have allowed broadcasting to be so dominated by market forces and commercial interests as have the countries of Latin America. More typical have been the experiences of India and the countries of Africa where broadcasting has always been firmly under government control. The colonial administrations saw broadcasting as a service to the settler communities and later on, especially during the Second World War, as a useful instrument for consolidating political control and influence. This tradition was continued when the former colonies gained their independence. As Ansah argues the new governments were faced with immense and pressing problems of illiteracy, economic and social underdevelopment, and the acute need to establish a politically viable state. They considered broadcasting too important, and potentially dangerous, to be allowed unfettered freedom. Their perception of the national interest meant that firm governmental control of broadcasting was inevitable.

In Africa and India the pattern of early broadcasting development is remarkably similar. Chatterji recounts how in 1927 the Indian Broadcasting Company (IBC) started the first regular broadcasts to the small European community and westernised Indians. The IBC went bankrupt in 1930, and in the same year the British Government of India reconstituted broadcasting as the Indian State Broadcasting Service. In 1935 the name was changed again to All India Radio (AIR) and Lionel Fielden of the BBC became Controller of Broadcasting. In 1941 AIR was placed under the control of the new department of Information and Broadcasting which, after Independence in 1947, became a Ministry. Television began in 1959 as a constituent part of AIR, and in 1976, at the height of the Emergency, Mrs Gandhi's government reorganised the television service, Doordarshan, as a separate department with its own Director-General.

A similar history could be recounted for numerous African states.

In Tanganyika, now Tanzania, for example, radio broadcasting began in 1951 under direct government control. In 1956 the Tanganyika Broadcasting Corporation (TBC) was formed and an ex-BBC man, Tom Chalmers, became Director-General in 1958. At independence in 1960 the TBC was retained by the new government and in 1965 it was renamed Radio Tanzania and became a government department under the Ministry of Information and Culture.

## Indian Broadcasting: The Quest for Autonomy

The influence of the early organization of broadcasting is still strongly felt in present-day AIR and Doordarshan. According to Masani, All India Radio's administrative structure and programme pattern has not changed since the time of the British. Broadcasting is still a centralised service firmly under the control of a government department and its personnel are still civil servants.

Autonomy has been proclaimed as an ideal for the Indian broadcasting system since Independence. In 1948, for example, Nehru stated that, in his view, Indian broadcasting should approximate as far as possible to the model of the BBC; that is a semi-autonomous corporation. However, like Rajiv Gandhi nearly forty years later, he argued that broadcasting was not yet ready for autonomy. The Chanda Committee report of 1966, which examined the workings of AIR, recommended that AIR be converted into a corporation run by a Board of Governors on the model of the BBC. A similar recommendation was also made by the Verghese Working Group set up by the Janata government in 1977. However, though the Janata party had pledged itself to give a significant measure of independence to AIR and Doordarshan, the politicians could not bring themselves to relinquish government control. In response to criticism the Janata government claimed that giving broadcasting more than a limited degree of autonomy would set up a new constitutional entity, parallel to the judiciary and the legislature.

As Chatterji points out, both Nehru and Rajiv Gandhi assumed that it was for the government to decide when and to what extent broadcasting should be freed from government control. This point is also made by Masani who criticizes the Indian public for passively accepting the deficiencies of AIR and Doordarshan. In recent years, however, there have been attempts by private citizens to use the courts to challenge government broadcasting policy, most recently by Chatterji himself arguing for the right to set up a private broadcasting network.

It seems unlikely that any of these attempts will bear fruit as the tradition of centralized government control and influence over broadcasting remains deeply entrenched. The latest manifestation of this centralizing tendency is the new national channel of All India Radio which will broadcast in English and Hindi. Proponents of the scheme argue that it will give more time to programmes in regional languages which will not have to broadcast national programmes. Critics contend that the channel will cut into local and regional programme hours and be a mouthpiece for the central government.

In challenging the government monopoly Chatterji and others are fighting to overturn habits of thought and action that are woven into the fabric of Indian culture. The Indian government's assimilation of the administrative structures of British India, of which broadcasting is only one example, reflects the extent to which those structures were in conformity with the traditions of governing a diverse and fragmented country which was also a highly stratified caste society. Governments from the time of the Mughals have been constantly fearful of allowing too much power to regional centres lest the state itself begin to disintegrate.

Chatterji believes that until the early 1960s there was some ground for supposing that broadcasting might one day become an autonomous institution. This dream depended upon the strength of the Congress Party as a unifying political force across all regions of the country. However, once the overwhelming dominance of the Congress Party broke down in 1967, no political party was prepared to release its hold on so powerful a political instrument as broadcasting. The concept of an autonomous corporation implies a stable and liberal political system but India's recent political polarization and growing violence and disruption have given little hope that the proper conditions for an autonomous public broadcasting system can emerge.

## Africa: Broadcasting as a Developmental Tool

As Ansah's article and the chapters in Wedell's book make clear, African governments see broadcasting primarily as a tool for national integration and development. Wedell and his contributors emphasise, however, that the realization of this ideal is severely handicapped by lack of financial resources, low standards of professional training and inadequate audience research. For countries struggling to overcome so many acute economic and political problems it is difficult to ensure that broadcasting institutions get the resources, material, financial and human that they need.

In addition, broadcasting is handicapped by its regulatory structure. As in India the degree of governmental control has a number of negative consequences. The developmental goal means that in practice there is little difference between those broadcasting systems regulated as a public corporation and those operated as a government agency under ministries of information. Ansah gives Ghana, Malawi, Nigeria, South Africa, Namibia, Sudan, Zimbabwe, and Mauritius as examples of broadcasting organized under the public authority model. He observes that in the, not untypical, case of Ghana the government has extensive powers to ensure that the corporation complies with government policy.

Broadcasting systems are highly centralized, suffer from a civil service mentality which inhibits initiative and creativity and tend to become identified with the interests and policies of the ruling party or group. However, Ansah also argues that there is no realistic alternative to government involvement in broadcasting but that the nature and amount of control that should be exercised should be debated. In his view, echoing those of Masani and Chatterji, the credibility of broadcasting demands a certain freedom from day-to-day government interference. As he points out, 'once the public does not perceive radio or television as a trustworthy medium, its capacity for informing, educating and mobilising the people is gravely undermined'. In this way the development goals which are the rationale for governmental control are seen to be undermined by the exercise of that control. Ansah's suggestion is that broadcasting be entrusted to a statutory board composed of government representatives and individuals who have a reputation for service in the public interest.

# Public Broadcasting: Cultural Good or Commercial Commodity?

Public broadcasting has traditionally been regarded as a major forum for a national cultural tradition, and its regulation has been justified on the grounds of its importance to the public culture. Today, as the research studies discussed in this issue reveal, policymakers are more and more ready to consider broadcasting as a commercial commodity. This tendency is particularly evident in debates regarding the impact of new communication technologies and proposals for deregulation policies. The discussion can soon reduce the cultural goals of broadcasting to questions of commercial viability.

This trend has been noticeable in the British debate about the future of public service broadcasting. Economic forecasts and analysis abound while the cultural and social dimension of broadcasting are reduced to a simple clash between increased consumer choice and public service regulation.

## The Importance of Social Research

The intellectual poverty of this debate about broadcasting's future should be a challenge to researchers to help broaden and deepen the policy discussion. There are three pressing needs. One is for genuinely sociological studies of the audience. There are, of course, any number of market research studies which purport to reveal public attitudes to broadcasting institutions and channels. These studies, however, do not treat people as social beings with a range of attitudes, opinions, and values dealing with the cultural political future of a country, but simply as actual or potential consumers of programmes. The findings elicited by this type of research, therefore, tend to distort one's understanding of the public's often contradictory, and always complex, relationship with public broadcasting. For these reasons we need many more studies, such as those undertaken by the Broadcasting Research Unit in Britain, which attempt to elicit the full range of public attitudes and opinions to broadcasting in relation to public culture as a whole. Such research helps remind policy makers that ultimately broadcasting is the responsibility of citizens, not just an industry responsive to managers.

## Understanding the Politics of Broadcasting

Much of the research discussed in this review has dealt with the politics of broadcasting in national contexts. There is no one universal model of public broadcasting, and every model is the result of negotiation among different socio-cultural and political actors. This research is important because national regulatory policies and communication policy decisions for different countries can only be understood if we analyze the beliefs and values of different actors and the kinds of policy networks and power relations that exist. Once again, this research helps place broadcasting in a wider social context and underlines the fact that decisions about broadcasting represent political and social choices, not just economic or technological necessity.

The focus on the national politics of broadcasting does not, of course, imply that international pressures are not also of major significance. It is quite obvious in places as far apart as Western Europe and Latin America, for example, that national broadcasting systems are subject to a wide variety of external economic, technological and political forces. The point of this comment is that these external global factors must be studied in an analytical frame that gives due weight to the internal political structures and processes that ultimately determine the precise shape of broadcasting in any particular country.

## The Need for a Historical Perspective

Finally, the present policy discussions must be anchored in historical understanding. In broadcasting, as in so many other areas of social life, past decisions and actions continue to exert a profound and, sometimes, an overwhelming influence on the courses of action open to policy makers in the present. Detailed historical analysis is valuable because it recognizes and explores the diversity of ideals embodied in public service broadcasting and helps us to avoid taking only one institutional model as the norm. For those still struggling to build genuine public broadcasting organizations in countries such as the Philippines or in Latin America the historical perspective indicates which kind of broadcasting policies and structures are likely to fail or succeed.

If we are to continually rediscover the ways of implementing in different socio-cultural and political contexts the kind of ideals of public service broadcasting outlined in the opening section of this article, we need a *combination* of different research approaches. This research should be based on cultural analysis which probes the values held by the public regarding public service in broadcasting, but it should also include political analysis exploring the power relations sustaining broadcasting policies and historical research into the ideological and cultural foundations of present-day broadcasting institutions. In this way, researchers can help build a potentially more rational basis for public policy discussions in the broadcasting arena.

James McDonnell
Issue Editor

# Current Research on Public Service Broadcasting

**AUSTRALIA**

Prof Eva Etzioni-Halevy (Australian National University, GPO Box 4, Canberra, ACT 2601) has written 'Inherent Contradictions of Democracy: Illustrations from National Broadcasting' to appear in *Comparative Politics*.

Dr Kate Harrison (Public Interest Advocacy Centre, P.O. Box A236, Sydney South, NSW 2000) recently completed a Ph.D. on broadcast licencing policy and is co-ordinator of the Communications Law Centre.

Ms Ros Patterson (Armidale College of Advanced Education, Armidale, NSW) is finishing a Ph.D. on the Special Broadcasting Service and the Construction of Ethnic Radio and Multicultural Television.

**AUSTRIA**

Dr Hannes Haas (Institut für Publizistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Universität Wien, Universitätsstr. 7, 1010 Wien.) studies changes in broadcast programming quality and local television in Austria.

Dr Kurt Luger (Institut für Publizistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Universität Salzburg, Sigmund-Haffner-gasse 18/111, Salzburg 5020) is engaged in a major long-term study of the consequences of growing up with TV since the 1940s. He also studies Austrian broadcasting politics and changes in media consumption patterns.

## BELGIUM

**Jean-Claude Bergelman** (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussels) recently completed a Ph.D. on the political history of broadcasting in Belgium and with **Dr. H. Verstraeten** is studying the impact of transnational satellite TV on European broadcasting institutions.

## CANADA

**Prof Stuart McFadyen** and **Prof Colin Hoskins** (Dept of Marketing and Economic Analysis, Univ of Alberta, Faculty of Business Bldg, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2R6) have written 'The Canadianization of European Television Broadcasting: A Canadian Solution?' which considers Telefilm Canada's broadcast fund as a promising example of how to stimulate an independent indigenous tv production industry.

**Rolf Mirus** and **Prof Colin Hoskins have completed** A *Study of the Economic, Social and Cultural Reasons for the Significant International Popularity of Television Fiction Produced in the United States*. With **Prof Hoskins, Rozeboom** has written a paper on 'The Pricing of US Television Program Exports'. Prof Hoskins is also working on a paper with **Bernard Yeung** entitled 'On the International Trade in Television Programs'.

**Thomas L. McPhail** (Communication Studies Prog, Univ of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4), is completing a new introductory text which deals with Canadian Broadcasting policy and its relationship to cultural and public policy issues. He is also completing a piece for Sage Publications on international trends in broadcasting.

**Prof. Marc Raboy** (Université Laval, Faculté des Arts, Dépt d'Information et de Communication, Cité Universitaire, Qéubec, Canada G1K 7P4) has recently completed a book manuscript on the history and evolution of Canadian broadcasting policy from 1928 to the present, to be published in 1989.

**Dorothy Zolf** along with **Frederick Rainsberry** and **Bernard Benoist,** (Univ of Calgary, Communication Studies Prog, Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4) has proposed research on 'Canadian Broadcasting Policy; Provincial/Educational Broadcasting Authorities in Canada."

## CHILE

**CENECA,** Santa Beatriz 106, Santiago. **Valerio Fuenzalida** has recently completed a study tour of Britain and continues to be involved in the debate on future prospects for public broadcasting in Chile. **Maria de la Luz Hurtado** co-ordinates the research programme of **CENECA** on cultural and broadcasting policies.

**Diego Portales** (Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacionales, Casilla 16637, Correo 9, Santiago) has been studying ways of introducing policies of regional decentralisation of TV, greater openness to independent producers, and more programme diversity.

## FRANCE

**BIPE,** Bureau d'Information et de Prévisions Economiques (122 Av Charles de Gaulle, 92522 Neuilly) (Director of Communication Studies: **Alain Le Diberder**) undertakes a variety of research on the economic aspects of media policy, including changes in broadcasting.

**Bernard Guillon** (Direction Générale de Télécommunications, Service de la Prospective et des Etudes Economiques, 20 Av de Ségur, 75700 Paris, France) with **Jean C. Padioleau,** in liaison with the Groupe Européen des Médias of the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme in Paris, and the Commission Nationale de la Communication et des Libertés, is completing research on the regulation of broadcasting systems in the United States, the United Kingdom and France, with a special interest on the complexity and the oddities of the implementation process. (This research should be published in 1988).

**Guy Pineau** (Institut National de l'Audiovisuel, 4 Av de l'Europe, 94366 Bry-sur-Marne, Cedex.) in collaboration with **Pierre Muso** (SPES-DGT) is working on deregulation in France and Italy and alternatives to public service.

**Dominique Wolton** (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 27 rue Damesme, 75013 Paris) studies the processes of political communication and has recently written 'La role des intellectuels et des jornalistes dans la communication politique' in *New Media and Concepts of Communication*. (Frankfurt; New York: Sringer Verlag, 1988).

## IRELAND

**Wolfgang Truetzschler** (College of Commerce, Dublin Inst of Technology, Rathmines Rd, Dublin 6) researches community radio, local media, deregulation and public service broadcasting in Ireland.

## ITALY

**Roberto Grandi** (Inst di Comunicazione, Univ di Bologna, Via Toffano 2, Bologna.) is doing a socio-economic analysis of tv commercials as well as research on tv news formats, and on marketing and television.

**Dr. Gianpietro Mazzoleni** (Dept di Sociologia, Univ degli Studi di Milano, Via Conservatorio 7, 20122 Milan) is currently studying electoral communication by commercial and public broadcasting systems.

**Verifica qualitativa programmi trasmessi, Radiotelevisione Italia** (Piazza Monte Grappa 4, 00175 Roma.) have published their broadcasting research in *Dati per la verifica dei programmi trasmessi* edited by **Nicola Di Blasi** and **Giancarlo Mencucci.**

## JAPAN

**NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Inst, Theoretical Research Centre** (2-1-1 Atago, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105) researches the concept of public service as defined in Japanese society and re-examines the role and function of public broadcasting taking into account institutional and ethical aspects as well as audience views and perceptions.

## MEXICO

**Maria Antonieta Rebeil C.** (Dept de Comunicacion Social, Univ Iberoamericana, Cadiz Sur 32-7, Colonia Insurgentes Mixcoac, Mexico, DF 03920) has been studying possibilities for regional decentralisation of TV and the improvement of the regional stations of Mexico's public TV broadcasting system.

## NETHERLANDS

**Kees Brants** (Univ van Amsterdam, Grimburgwal 10, Gebouw 3, 1012 GA Amsterdam) focuses on the future of public broadcasting and the effects of the new media on political parties and political culture, both on a comparative level.

## NORWAY

**Asle Rolland** and **Sissel Lund** (Norsk Rikskringkasting, 0340 Oslo 3) are involved in research on broadcasting policy and audience research. They are also responsible for the IAMCR working group on communication policy and planning.

## PERU

**Rafael Roncagliolo** (IPAL, Apartado Postal 270031, Lima 27) has sponsored a series of Latin American conferences on ways of increasing public service regulation in commercial TV and strengthening the role of the public sector in TV broadcasting. IPAL has sponsored a series of studies evaluating TV reform movements in Latin America which will be reported in a forthcoming publication by Elizabeth Fox.

## SWEDEN

**Lowe Hedman** (Associate Prof, Dept of Sociology, Uppsala Univ) is working on a research project on the introduction of cable-TV and satellite-TV in Sweden and the policy-making and decision-making connected with this. This research has resulted in a text book which he has written with **P. G. Holmlöv.** Lowe Hedman is also heading a research project on the function of local radio.

**Olof Hultén** (Dept of Audience and Programme Research, Sveriges Radio, Stockholm, until the end of the academic year 1987/88 visiting associate professor at Univ of Texas at Austin), plans to write a paper on 'The concepts of public service and US public interest'.

## UNITED KINGDOM

**Jay G. Blumler** (Centre for Television Research, Univ of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT) with **Dr. T. J. Nossiter** (London School of Economics) has edited *Broadcasting Finance in Transition: A Comparative Handbook* (Oxford Univ Press, forthcoming) and is conducting an enquiry into 'The New Television Program Marketplace' in the United States, examining how programme-making creativity fares in a commercially driven multi-channel broadcasting system.

**Broadcasting Research Unit** (39c Highbury Place, London N5 1QP), **Stephen Barnett** continues to explore audience attitudes to public service broadcasting in Britain and Europe.

**Prof. Kenneth Dyson** (School of Studies in European Studies, Univ of Bradford, Bradford, W Yorkshire BD7 1D) recently completed, with **Dr. Peter Humphreys** (Univ of Manchester) *Broadcasting and New Media Policies in Western Europe*. (London: Croom Helm, 1988) and is researching the role of small states in the future of European broadcasting.

**Peter Humphreys** (Dept of Government, Univ of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL) is finishing a book on the press and broadcasting in West Germany.

**Charles Jonscher** (Booz Allen & Hamilton, 100 Piccadilly, London W1V 9HA) continues to study the economics of broadcasting and telecommunications.

**Dr. Raymond J. Kuhn** (Dept of Political Science, Queen Mary College, Univ of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS) studies current political developments in French television.

**Dr. Ralph Negrine** (Dept of Politics, City of London Polytechnic, Calcutta House, Old Castle St, London E1 7NT) is planning a study of international news services and with **André Goodfriend** has written 'Public Perceptions of the New Media: A survey of British Attitudes' to appear in *Media Culture and Society*. He has also edited a new book on *Satellite Broadcasting* (London: Croom Helm, forthcoming).

Ms. Jeanette Peasey (School of Modern Languages, Univ of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY) is completing a doctoral study on public service broadcasting and the challenge posed by commercial broadcasting in West Germany.

Dr. Donald Sassoon (Dept of History, Westfield College, Univ of London, Kidderpore Avenue, London NW3 7ST) is comparing the relation between governments and television in 15 countries for the Italian broadcaster, RAI.

Prof. Jeremy Tunstall (Communications Policy Research Centre, City Univ, Northampton Sq, London EC1V OHB) with Dr. Michael Palmer (Univ Rennes) is studying communication policy in Britain and France.

UNITED STATES

Prof William H Davidson (Univ of Southern California, Dept of Management and Organization, School of Business Administration, Los Angeles 90089-1421) is conducting a study of the evolution of the American broadcasting industry.

John Havick (Dept of Social Sciences, Georgia Inst of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332) is doing research and writing a book about the relationship between mass communication and democracy, and the joint impact of democracy and mass communication upon the political process.

Prof Burton Paulu (Prof and Director Emeritus, Radio and Television, Univ of Minnesota) is planning a comparative research study on 'Channel 4 in the UK and its effect on the broadcasting services of the country'.

Dr. Thomas Streeter (Dept of Communication Arts, Univ of Wisconsin, Vilas Communication Hall, 821 University Av, Madison, WI 53706) analyzes the relationship between patterns of policy 'talk' and policy 'action' in broadcasting.

WEST GERMANY

Hans-Bredow Institut, the Director, Prof Dr Wolfgang Hoffman-Riem (Heimhuder Strasse 21, 2000 Hamburg 13) is directing a number of projects among which are: 'Freedom of Communication in the German Constitution' and 'A Comparative Analysis of the licensing of private radio stations and four cable pilot projects'.

Prof Dr Hans J. Kleinsteuber (Inst für Politische Wissenschaft, Universität Hamburg, Allende-Platz 1, 2000 Hamburg 13) directs a two-year research project on trade unions and electronic media politics, and an 18-month project on non-commercial local radio in 15 countries.

# Additional Bibliography on Public Broadcasting

## Public Broadcasting: General

Gournay, Chantal de, Pierre Muso and Guy Pineau. Télévision Déchainées: La Déreglementation en Italie, en Grande-Bretagne et aux Etats-Unis. Paris: La Documentation Francaise, 1985. 189pp. Useful survey of recent changes in public broadcasting policies, especially in Italy.

Head, Sydney W. World Broadcasting Systems: A Comparative Analysis. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1985. 457pp. Overview of broadcasting structures and regulations.

Katz, Elihu and George Wedell. Broadcasting in the Third World: Promise and Performance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ Press, 1977. 305pp. Still the standard work on Third World broadcasting-though much in need of updating.

Kuhn, Raymond, (ed.). The Politics of Broadcasting. London: Croom Helm, 1985. 305pp. Essays on broadcasting policies in the UK, USA, France, Germany, Italy, Japan. Canada and Australia.

McCavitt, William E (ed.). Broadcasting Around the World. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Tab Books, 1981. 336pp. Brief explanations of broadcasting systems in 18 countries.

Media, Culture and Society, Vol5/3-4, (July-October 1983). Issue on 'Public Service Broadcasting: The End?' with essays on West Germany, France, Australia, the USA. and the UK.

Smith, Anthony. 'Deregulation, New Technology, Public Service: Vision versus Rhetoric.' Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol10/4 (Autumn 1984), pp.1-15. A defence of the public service ideal.

Rowland, Willard. The Challenges to Public Service Broadcasting. Berlin: Aspen Institute, 1987. 42pp. Report of a conference which identified the major challenges as technology, privatization, finance, political pressures, and the viability of the public service ideal.

## African and Asian Broadcasting

Paul Ansah. The Ghana Broadcasting Corporation., Accra: GBC, 1985.

Douglas A. Boyd. Broadcasting in the Arab World: A Survey of Radio and Television in the Middle East. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1982. Systematic account of all aspects of broadcasting in all parts of the Arab world.

Cruise O'Brien, Rita. 'Broadcast Professionalism in Senegal', in F. O. Ugboajah (ed.) Mass Communication, Culture and Society in West Africa. Oxford: Hans Zell, 1985. pp.187-200.

Geller, Judith F. Japanese Public Broadcasting: A Promise Fulfilled. New York: Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1979. 104pp. A history of the post-war development of Japanese broadcasting.

Head, Sydney W. (ed.). Broadcasting in Africa: A Continental Survey of Radio and Television. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1974. 453pp. Old study valuable for its historical material.

Ito, Masami. Broadcasting in Japan. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul in association with the International Institute of Communications, 1978. 125pp. Comprehensive summary of Japanese broadcasting.

Khalid, Muhammad. 'Radio Broadcasting in Pakistan: Promise and Performance, (1947-1977). Communications (The European Journal of Communications) Vol 13/2 (1987), pp.43-49. Radio Pakistan was set up to be an educational service but has given too much time to entertainment programming and has failed to promote national solidarity and integrity.

Ladele, Olu, V. Olufemi Adefela and Olu Lasekan. History of the Nigerian Broadcasting Corporation. Ibadan: Ibadan Univ Press, 1979. pp.251. Covers the years from 1950-1977.

Luthra, H.R. Indian Broadcasting. New Delhi: Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 1987. 531pp. Detailed narrative history of broadcasting.

Mytton, Graham. Mass Communication in Africa. London: Edward Arnold,1983. 159pp. Contains useful case study material on broadcasting in Zambia, Nigeria and Tanzania.

Zaffiro, James J. 'Political Legitimacy and Broadcasting: The Case of Zimbabwe', Gazette, Vol 37/3 (1986), pp.127-138. Analyses the political pressures on the Zimbabwean Broadcasting Corporation.

## Australian and New Zealand Broadcasting

Armstrong, Mark. Broadcasting Law and Policy in Australia. Sydney: Butterworths, 1982. 291 pp. Basic reference book for Australian broadcasting.

Barr, Trevor. The Electronic Estate: New Communications Media and Australia. Harmondsworth, Mddx.: Penguin, 1985. 271 pp. Chapter 6 considers the problems of public broadcasting.

Bear, Andrew. 'Recent Developments in Broadcasting Policy', Australian Journal of Communication, Nos 9/10 (January-December) 1986, pp. 1-12. Discusses implications of broadcasting policy and the weaknesses of Australian policy research in this area.

Department of Transport and Communications. Review of National Broadcasting Policy. Discussion Papers: Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Canberra: The Department, 1988. 350 pp.

Gregory, R. J. Politics and Broadcasting: Before and Beyond the NZBC. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press, 1985. 138 pp. The focus is on 1962-1975; examines news and controversial programming as well as political pressures in New Zealand broadcasting.

## Canadian Public Broadcasting

Fortner, Robert S. 'The System of Relevances and the Politics of Language in Canadian Public Policy Formation: The Case of Broadcasting'. Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol 12/3-4 (1986) pp.19-35. Shows how the rhetoric of public policy has shifted in favour of private broadcasting.

Hardin, Herschel. Closed Circuits: The Sellout of Canadian Television. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985. 339 pp. A polemical history of Canadian public broadcasting from 1965.

Hoskins, Colin and McFadyen, Stuart.
'The Economic Factors Relating to Canadian Television Broadcasting Policy: A Non-Technical Synthesis of the Research Literature'. Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol 12/1 (1986) pp,. 21-40. Argues for subsidies to Canadian programme makers rather than for content regulations.

Peers, Frank W. The Public Eye: Television and the Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1952-1968. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Raboy, Marc. 'The Public Dimension of Broadcasting: Learning from the Canadian Experience.' Paper to 1986 International Television Studies Conference. 45pp. Argues for measures to increase public participation in broadcasting.

Raboy, Marc. 'Public Television, the National Question and the Preservation of the Canadian State', in P. Drummond and R. Paterson (eds.). Television in Transition. London: BFI Publishing, 1985. pp.64-86. Argues that one problem with Canadian public broadcasting policy is the confusion of 'nation' with 'public' and a narrow idea of the 'nation'.

Report of the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1986. 731 pp. This 'Caplan-Sauvagereau' report completed a review of broadcasting policy begun in 1984. It called for a stronger Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, for more Canadian content and for the creation of new Pay-TV and cable networks.

Zolf, Dorothy. 'The Regulation of Broadcasting in Canada and the United States: Straws in the Wind'. *Canadian Journal of Communication*. Vol 13/2 (1988), pp.30–44. Compares legal bases of broadcast regulation in the two countries and considers the possibilities of Canadian deregulation.

## Public Broadcasting in Europe: General

Burgelman, Jean-Claude. 'The Future of Public Service Broadcasting: A Case Study for a 'New' Communications Policy'. *European Journal of Communication*, Vol 1/2 (June 1986), pp.173–202. Drawing on the Belgian experience proposes a way of restructuring the ownership of public service institutions.

Fleck, Florian H. (ed.). *Planung, Aufsicht und Kontrolle von Rundfunk-Unternehmen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987. 180 pp. Essays on planning, control and supervision of broadcasting institutions, both private and public, in West Germany and Switzerland.

Kuhn, Raymond (ed.). *Broadcasting and Politics in Western Europe*. London: Frank Cass, 1985. 174 pp. Countries discussed are the UK, Eire, France, Italy, West Germany, Netherlands, Spain and Greece.

LeDuc, Don R. 'French and German New Media Policies: Variations on a Familiar Theme'. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*. Vol 31/4 (Fall 1987), pp. 427–447. Contrasts French and German media policies in the 1980s.

McQuail, Denis and Karen Siune (eds.). *New Media Politics: Comparative Perspectives in Western Europe*. London: Sage, 1986. 216 pp. A detailed discussion of the political factors influencing media policies, including the pressures on public broadcasting.

Rostan, Blaise. *La Service Public de Radio et de Télévision*. Lausanne: Ed. René Thonney-Dupraz, 1982. 293pp. A study of Swiss public broadcasting.

## British Public Broadcasting

Blumler, Jay G, Malcolm Brynin and T J Nossiter. 'Broadcasting Finance and Programme Quality: An International Review.' *European Journal of Communication*, Vol 1/3 (September 1986) pp.343–364. Comparative study which concludes that the present method of financing the BBC is probably the best way of serving the interests of public and broadcasters.

Committee on Financing the BBC Report. London: HMSO, 1986. (Cmnd.9824). 219pp. The report of the Peacock Committee which investigated the issues surrounding the finance of public broadcasting.

Docherty, David, David Morrison and Michael Tracey. *Keeping Faith? Channel Four and Its Audience*. London: John Libbey, 1988. 184 pp. Study which reveals the complex nature of public attitudes towards public broadcasting generally as well as Channel 4 in particular.

Leapman, Michael. *The Last Days of the Beeb*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1986. 299pp. Journalistic account of the history of the BBC from the 1960s to 1985.

MacCabe, Colin and Olivia Stewart (eds.). *The BBC and Public Service Broadcasting*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986. 116pp. Papers from a seminar held in 1985 looking at the present state and future prospects for public broadcasting.

Milne, Alasdair. *DG: The Memoirs of a British Broadcaster*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988. 237 pp. A remarkably detached account by Milne of his career at the BBC and the problems and pressures he faced as Director-General. A revealing insight into the difficulties of managing such a large and culturally important institution as the BBC.

Morrison, David. *Invisible Citizens: British Public Opinion and the Future of Broadcasting*. London: John Libbey, 1986. 89 pp. Revealing study of the British public's range of attitudes to public broadcasting.

Paulu, Burton. *Television and Radio in the United Kingdom*. London: Macmillan, 1981. 476 pp. Useful source of basic information about British broadcasting.

Sendall, Bernard. *Independent Television in Britain*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1982–1983. 418p. The first two parts of a three volume work on ITV. They cover the period from 1946 to 1968.

## French Public Broadcasting

Commission Natiuonale de la Communication et des Libertés. *Douze ans de télévision, 1974-1986*. Paris: La Documentation Fran aise, 1987. 302pp. Systematic account of changes in French television regulation and programming.

Dossiers de l'Audiovisuel, No 20 (July/August 1988). 'L'Esprit des Lois ou Comment Reformer l'Audiovisuel? (1917-1988)'. A series of articles on the politics of broadcasting reform.

Mediaspouvoirs, Vol 2 (March 1986), pp.59–124. 'Moins d'Etat dans la Communication?' Eight articles on the process of media deregulation in France and other countries. Four articles comprise a political debate among representatives of French political parties.

## German Public Broadcasting

Glotz, Peter and Reinhold Kopp. *Das ringen um den Medienstaats vertragder Länder*. Berlin: Speiss, 1987. 278 pp. Examines the political struggle among the German states over the introduction of private broadcasting.

Grimm, Dieter. 'Verfassungrechtliche Perspektiven einer dualen Rundfunkordnung? *Rundfunk und Fernsehen*, Vol 35/1 (1987), pp.25–35. Discusses the implications of the 1986 German Federal Constitutional Court decision to require public broadcasters to ensure the essential basic broadcasting service.

Schumacher, Birgit. 'Kommunikationspolitisch relevante Urteile de Bundesverfassungsgerichts seit 1976' *Publizistik* 32/4 (1987), pp.405–421. Review of the decisions taken by the Federal Constitutional Court with regard to media and broadcasting law since 1976.

Stock, Martin. 'Ein fragwürdiges Konzept dualer Rundfunk systeme'. *Rundfunk und Fernsehen*. Vol 35/1 (1987) pp.5–24. Analysis of the 1986 decision of the Federal Constitutional Court on dual broadcasting systems. Finds that the demands made on private broadcasters are lowered and argues that this may lead to a loss of quality in the broadcasting system as a whole.

Wallenburg, Gabriela von. 'Private Broadcasting in Germany: Legal Foundations and Practice.' *Journal of Media Law and Practice*, Vol 8/3 (October 1987), pp. 86–89. Brief summary of recent developments in German broadcasting regulation.

## Latin American Broadcasting

Fuenzalida, Valerio. 'Problemas y Desafios a la TV Chilena'. Santiago: Corporacion de Promocion Universitaria 1986. 38pp.

Lira. B. Juan Pablo (ed.). *Television en Chile: Un Desafio Nacional*. Santiago: Centro de Estudios del Desarollo and Centro de Indagacion y Expresion Cultural y Artistica, 1987. 226 pp. Discusses the evolution and future of television in Chile.

Mahan, Elizabeth. 'Mexican Broadcasting: Reassessing the Industry-state Relationship'. *Journal of Communication*, Vol 35/1, pp.60–75.

Mattos, Sergio. 'Publicidad y gobierno en la Television Brasilena'. *Chasqui* Vol 9 (March, 1984), pp. 17–22. The development of Brazilian television and the effects of advertising and government influence.

Richeri, Giuseppe and Cristina Lasagni. 'Precocious Broadcasting '. *Intermedia*, Vol 15/3 (May 1987), pp.22–33. Study of Brazilian broadcasting with emphasis on the emergence and growth of the Globo network.

## United States Public Broadcasting

A Public Trust: The Landmark Report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting. New York: Bantam Books, 1979. A key document which provides a good starting point for considering the problems of US public broadcasting.

Pepper, Robert M. *The Formation of the Public Broadcasting Service*. New York: Arno Press, 1979. 493pp. The emergence of the Public Broadcasting Service out of educational broadcasting in the USA.

Stone, David M. *Nixon and the Politics of Public Television*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1985. 370 pp. Tells the story of how the Nixon administration fought to hamper the development of public broadcasting.

Witherspoon, John and Kovitz, Roselle. *The History of Public Broadcasting*. (available from *Current*, 2311 18th St NW, Washington, DC 20009. 85pp. Useful short account of PSB over the past 20 years.