

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH
TO MASS COMMUNICATION
RESEARCH:

The U.S. Press and Political Change in Latin America*

John Crothers Pollock
Rutgers University (Livingston College)

The "problem" of U.S. press reporting on Chile during the Allende period is by now well documented. What emerges from articles by journalists, journalism professors, and professors interested in Latin American affairs is a relatively consistent picture of U.S. news media performance: the U.S. press was openly hostile to the Popular Unity government in Chile; maintained its hostile perspective with astonishing homogeneity throughout the United States; and often reduced complex social, economic, and political issues to some of the most disturbing stereotypes found in the cold-war period. The same articles suggest, moreover, that reporting on Chile was not a total aberration but rather related to more general patterns of reporting on Latin America.¹

Documenting and categorizing the characteristics of U.S. press coverage of crises in the Third World is a useful task, but such endeavors reveal little about the origins of that coverage and the factors that maintain it, the emergence of similar press coverage in other "sensitive" areas of foreign affairs, or the way historical and institutional constraints interact with the daily work of editors and reporters to produce a rather special vision of Latin America. This essay represents an effort to address such issues, issues often neglected both by Latin American specialists and by experts in mass communication research.

MEDIA PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICAL CHANGE

Most research on U.S. reporting of Latin America has focused on a rather limited set of problems, decrying our "ignorance" of the region, our failure to appreciate indigenous cultures, and our distortion of or hostility toward movements and governments unfriendly to domestic and foreign investors. These problems of perception and interpretation are quite real, but they are typically constructed in

*Prepared with the aid of grants from the Joint Committee on Latin America of the Social Science Research Council, and the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Rutgers Research Council. A preliminary version was presented at the Sixth National Meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, Atlanta, Georgia, 25–28 March 1976.

such a way that the problem appears amenable to "solution" through minor corrections, for example: more frequent coverage of Latin America, more room for feature stories on the cultures of the region, and efforts to hold seminars between professors and journalists in order to improve mutual acquaintance with the orientations of each group. A change of reporting assignments may even occur, testimony to the belief that changing a newspaper's representative may change the way that paper reports news on the area.

Previous research has outlined a pattern of "biased" or "hostile" reporting against the Allende government in Chile, a pattern easily found in news coverage of Castro's Cuba and earlier, the Guatemala of Jacobo Arbenz in the early 1950s. But to label a cluster of news reports as "biased" or "hostile" is to employ terminology suggesting both that the origin of the coverage is largely rooted in perceptions of individuals and that these perceptions are of limited significance and duration, capable of modification by short-term corrections. In most public discussion of news reporting on Latin America, considerable attention is given to the specific merits and deficiencies of individual journalists, or to a given newspaper directed by one person or a discrete number of individuals. Rarely is serious mention made of larger dimensions.

Neither the "problem" of reporting on Latin America nor its possible creators and sustainers is considered from the viewpoint of organizational or, more broadly political, "systemic" explanations. This research attempts to correct that imbalance by: (a) proposing three perspectives found frequently in U.S. reporting on Latin America that link news output with several integrated, systemic views of change in Latin America; (b) composing various possible explanations for the persistence of such views, evaluating the relative importance of influences operating at the individual, organizational, and system levels; and (c) suggesting a special approach to the study of reporting on political change.

Sketching the rudimentary characteristics of an ideal reporting pattern is useful as a benchmark for evaluating the industrial world's press coverage of Latin America. A model of political reporting that maximizes a Third World nation's potential for participatory self-government might view political leaders as capable of autonomous innovation and growth, political institutions as capable of functioning through the application of energy and talent, and cross-national relations as opportunities for the exercise of national choices about trade, investment, diplomacy, and other interactions. This vision of Third World possibilities does not suggest that journalists brighten dismal political situations with hopes of civic participation where little hope exists. Rather, it is a model derived from the optimism of the Enlightenment, exalting not the certainty but the possibility of egalitarian participation in political life. This "ideal-type" vision of political reporting, rooted in eighteenth-century intellectual currents (and shared in the North American colonies by the Founding Fathers), can be called a participatory autonomy model, emphasizing the capacity of citizens to participate in their own self-government and of nations to manage their own affairs with relative autonomy.

Although elegant as an ideal, this perspective is seldom approximated in U.S. political reporting on Latin America, an omission especially noticeable in

coverage of governments in crisis. Preliminary empirical research reveals the persistence of at least three media perspectives on Latin America that seem tied to broad patterns of hemispheric relations.² One view can be called colonial, and refers to relatively enduring, static orientations toward peripheral or dependent countries and their populations. A second perspective can be considered technocratic, and subsumes within its confines all postures of benevolent parenthood, signifying approval of national efforts at capital formation that rely on guidance from western industrialized or core countries. In sharp contrast to these two visions is a third, which may be labeled a hegemonic perspective. It refers to orientations that, although doubtless present to some degree at all times, are evoked when dependent countries, classes, or groups attempt to change substantially their subordinate condition. A hegemonic perspective delegitimizes structural political change carried out without the guidance or in defiance of western industrialized countries.

A simplified comparison of these perspectives illustrates their distinct modal identities by referring to three aspects of every national political system: leadership, institutions, and cross-national (especially dependent) relations. In a colonial reporting perspective on political change, leaders are patronized and belittled as ineffectual, institutions are seen as disorderly, and cross-national dependency is viewed as both beneficial and essentially unavoidable. Parental guidance for Third World countries, as for children, is considered wholly natural. A technocratic perspective treats Third World politics more seriously and respectfully. Leaders are seen as competent, efficient, moving in the direction of competence, or at least capable of it. Institutions are orderly and capable of promoting national economic growth. Whatever the distributive inequities, whatever the restrictions on political access, they are necessary or irrelevant in the context of an essentially unified national wish for economic growth via large investments in the private sector. International dependency on industrialized countries is reducible only incrementally and only through the guidance of metropolitan countries and financial institutions.

Unlike the colonial vision, which humors Third World governments, or the technocratic view, which considers others capable of politico-economic maturity if they emulate the example of western industrialized states, a hegemonic perspective delegitimizes efforts at change that challenge or thwart the guidance of metropolitan countries. Leadership is vilified as unresponsive to majority will and worse, is slandered as ruthless, voracious, and dishonorable. Political institutions are treated as inaccessible, rigid, and dictatorial, with little regard for civil liberties. Efforts to reduce cross-national dependency, moreover, are demeaned in two ways: by suggesting that challenges to dependency invite economic and political chaos internally, and by picturing such efforts at autonomy as political examples dangerous for industrialized countries.

Regarding U.S. reporting on Latin America, a hegemonic perspective would consider serious political protest against U.S. influence as inherently threatening, regardless of the presence or absence of influences from socialist countries. This perspective is therefore a broader constraint than a "cold-war" orientation, because it encompasses hostility toward political, economic, and

social change, whether seen as aided or not by powerful nations outside the hemisphere. An outline of the major elements contained in each perspective would resemble the following chart.

*Mass Media Perspectives on Political Change*³

<i>Political Dimensions</i>	<i>Participatory Autonomy</i>	<i>Colonial</i>	<i>Technocratic</i>	<i>Hegemonic</i>
Leaders	Capable of substantial innovation	Ineffectual	Competent, efficient	Unresponsive (ruthless, voracious, dishonest)
Institutions	Accessible	Disorderly (the "masses" are atomized & primitive)	Orderly but boundaried	Inaccessible (rigid, dictatorial)
Cross-national Relations	Choices are possible and desirable	Dependency is natural; guidance is beneficial & unavoidable (e.g., substantial coverage of Central American countries)	Dependency reducible through guidance (e.g., much of the coverage of Brazil)	Efforts at autonomy invite chaos; political examples dangerous for industrialized countries (e.g., considerable coverage of the Castro and Allende governments)

This outline is only a primitive representation of reporting modalities and ideal types. It is not expected that reporting on any given country at any particular time will fall, empirically, within any single perspective on political change. The reporting models merely represent a cluster of connected elements. What is in fact printed in U.S. news media may resemble less any exclusive perspective on change than a predominance of one or two perspectives. A further caution is necessary. Reporting perspectives may not correspond to political or economic relations between metropolitan or core countries and countries on the periphery of the industrialized world. For example, a hegemonic perspective may be evoked most sharply precisely when dependency is most clearly challenged (as was the case in Allende's Chile), indicating that a "punishing," delegitimizing perspec-

tive may be deployed against a government by a metropolitan country's media when that country's capacity to punish has been diminished or at the very least become visible and subject to scrutiny. The presence of more benevolent perspectives, conversely, may not suggest reductions in the periphery's dependence on metropolitan, core countries. Evidence of colonial and technocratic perspectives, relatively gentle compared to the hegemonic vision, may accompany extraordinarily dependent economic relations.

The three perspectives require further elaboration and testing. For example, are they qualitatively different, as their separate presentation implies, or are the technocratic and hegemonic perspectives merely modern overlays superimposed on colonial orientations? Preliminary study of U.S. reporting on Peru since 1968 suggests that as investments have been made more multilateral, as the proportion of foreign investment from other countries has increased in relation to that from the United States, U.S. coverage has become less colonial, more aware of broad social forces and indigenous cultures and experiments in popular participation at some levels of decision-making. At the same time, as signs of unrest arose in the early 1970s, the presence of a hegemonic perspective warning of the undesirability or "threatening" quality of structural change became evident in the U.S. press. Recently, as U.S. financial institutions have become more involved in Peru, a technocratic perspective, indicating approval of guided change, has become more apparent. Extensive research on these perspectives is required to document what are now little more than case studies and informed guesses, but some of the evidence from U.S. reporting on Peru suggests that:

- a. a colonial press perspective is associated with the relative predominance of U.S. investments in a given country;
- b. a technocratic reporting orientation is associated with increased interaction between political and economic systems, particularly with a "bureaucratic-authoritarian" political system in its politically nonparticipatory promotion of national economic growth;
- c. a hegemonic press perspective is associated with efforts at structural economic and political change; and
- d. these three perspectives may persist or diminish independently of one another (e.g., after the nationalization of U.S. oil and other interests in Peru in 1968, reporting became both less colonial yet more hegemonic, more attentive to the views of nonelites, yet more concerned about substantial change in the existing politico-economic order).

EXPLANATORY LEVELS

In order to test the way various factors influence the systemic perspectives described above, it is useful to divide explanatory variables into clusters corresponding to three levels of analysis: the individual, the organizational, and the systemic or national. Within each explanatory area different influences are presumed to operate, each influence associated with a related set of hypotheses or questions. At the individual level at least two influences are associated with

distorted reporting on Latin America: lack of adequate information available to or gathered by journalists; and prior socialization inducing journalists to view Latin America through a fixed historical, social, and national prism of expectations. (For the remainder of this analysis the term "hegemonic perspective" will be used to designate the dependent variable, for that perspective is our central concern. It is understood, however, that the theory and hypotheses mentioned may apply quite well to explanations of colonial and technocratic viewpoints.)

Hypotheses derived from a focus on such factors might include the following: the less the amount of available information, the fewer the number of reporters assigned; or the less the amount of news space allotted, the more inertia, and the more distorted (colonial, technocratic, or hegemonic) the news coverage. (This hypothesis is frequently mentioned by journalists when questioned about bias in covering Latin America.) Regarding socialization, it might be suggested that early school textbook learning and news exposure to Latin America create stereotyped concepts that persist into adulthood and affect perceptions of the region. Similarly, those journalists who underwent "formative experiences" during the period of the cold war (roughly 1948–1971) or periods of "crisis" can be expected to write material containing relatively clear and especially hegemonic perspectives. Formative experiences may include any of a number of transition periods: adolescence, college, graduate school in journalism, and the first years of occupational experience. Cohorts who experienced such transitions at the same age, during the same years, may be predicted likely to favor (exhibit or write approvingly) hegemonic views.

The preceding explanations are offered frequently by journalists themselves when responding to criticism of existing news coverage. Seldom mentioned are a variety of factors associated with the organization of news making institutions. A number of social scientists, however, have drawn attention to the following organization-connected variables:

1. the scarcity of opportunities for internal feedback and learning and artificial competition among newsgatherers (Argyris, 1974);
2. a "natural" competition between newsgatherers (reporters) and processors (editors), each concerned with different clientele (gatherers with news sources, editors with newspaper advertisers and buyers) (Tunstall, 1972);
3. the view of journalism as "nonroutine" work, which produces a special bureaucracy in which the hierarchy may be shallow, the occupation is segmented and indeterminate, the range of expected tasks is wide and likely to change from one work place to another, the number of "exceptional cases" or situations encountered in the "nonroutine" work is large, and the "search process" is not particularly regularized (logical, systematic, or analytical) (Tunstall, 1972);
4. the view of foreign correspondents as "special" reporters with relatively high autonomy, a broad range of topics to cover, a wide range of sources, and whose work has little demonstrable relation to either advertising or paper-selling revenue goals (Tunstall, 1972);
5. the view that newsmen create and sustain an "ideology" primarily in order to reduce "role strain" and uncertainty in their work roles (Sigal, 1973);
6. the "bureaucratic bargaining" model proposition that political report-

ing is the product of "compromise" and "bargaining" between journalist-bureaucrats on the one hand and politician-bureaucrats on the other, with each group offering, trading, and taking something (Sigal, 1973).

Organizational factors are doubtless of considerable importance in predicting the likelihood of status quo reporting, but any effort to examine the broad sociopolitical functions of reporting on the Third World must consider the sociopolitical system as an entity in itself which furnishes a context for all factors operating at both individual and organizational levels. It is precisely this third level of analysis, the systemic, which is frequently ignored. Systemic *consequences* of reporting are sometimes considered, but rarely are system-level variables used to explain reporting itself, nor is their relative impact compared with that of organizational and individual level variables. For purposes of this presentation it is sufficient to specify some of the systemic factors offered for study.

Two distinct theoretical schemes are available for comparison. One assumes that media bias in reporting on foreign affairs is relatively "natural" because of inevitable "cultural" differences. For example, Swedish social scientists Galtung and Ruge have argued that cultural distance (e.g., industrial countries are culturally distant from Third World countries), relative size of countries, and differences in internal stratification all promote cultural "bias" in foreign reporting. Thus, they hypothesize, reporting in "topdog" (industrial) countries on "underdog" (Third World) countries will be relatively biased and sensational, especially if the country is small. Further, elites from such small countries appear more important than nonelites and hold an almost exclusive interest among interviewers (Galtung and Ruge, 1970).

Another systemic view of the media assumes reporting is far more specifically political and purposeful. One such view is the assumption that media functions as a system maintenance or system control process, in particular relaying feedback of deviant or aberrant behavior and determining the extent to which information is distributed to the public at all. The latter role of distribution control may be performed by withholding knowledge, selectively distributing it, restructuring tension-laden information, or deciding the timing of message distribution (refer to Donahue, Tichenor, and Olien, 1972; Bobrow, 1974).

A more specific example of the system maintenance model of reporting is Louis Althusser's argument that the media are part of the "ideological state apparatus" functioning to help reproduce a currently existing mode of production (1971). To the extent the hegemonic perspective is linked to the maintenance of a given mode of production (e.g., some form of capitalism or socialism), the proposition is strengthened that reporting on the Third World reflects the media's role as a component of the ideological apparatus of the state. It is this last approach, of course, that links media performance most directly to the maintenance or reproduction of a particular economic order.

None of these system-level approaches necessarily wholly excludes the others. Armand Mattelart (1974), for example, argues that culture and economic structures are inextricably linked and that culture is itself a multinational enterprise. Whatever the explanatory mixture, it will be the working assumption of this study that the least researched level of explanation, the systemic, is the

most powerful in accounting for contradictory findings at other levels of analysis and is the most appropriate context for the explanation of what are essentially "systemic" colonial, technocratic, and hegemonic perspectives.

JOURNALISM AS A PARAPOLITICAL CAREER:
A COMPARATIVE ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH

One way to approach the comparative study of the impact of individual, organizational, and systemic factors on the maintenance of hegemonic perspectives is to attempt to trace their direct impact on reporting outcomes. But such an approach ignores something quite important. Even if, as expected, systemic factors help explain hegemonic reporting better than individual or organizational ones, it is not clear how such factors are *articulated* in the process of message production. How are systemic and other influences linked to reporting? How do reporters interact with environmental constraints to produce articles? How do journalists' lives and careers interact with cultural, political, and economic influences in the setting of media agendas? These questions address not simply the presence of influences affecting reporting but also the pattern of influences, the process of influence flow.

To do this it is useful to focus on journalism as a career. A career is not a bounded phenomenon, as is an organization, nor is it static. Rather it is embedded in particular historical and politico-economic formations. Spotlighting the career of journalism as an intervening variable between contextual influences and reporting outcomes provides several advantages for research. One is that the individual journalist's views about his environment and his reporting are taken into account. A totality of influences converging on journalists is examined across the span of an entire life's career. Furthermore, journalism careers have a history of growth that can be compared with the history of other careers. In addition, journalists in their careers contact sources in other careers, and occupational status discrepancies may influence the writing of news and career expectations of reporters. Moreover, a journalism career may exhibit "natural" intersection with and entries to other careers; for example, with business and diplomacy. Recruitment and "selection out" patterns may be predictable and may affect reporting. For example, the status of a particular occupation or career may render it relatively susceptible to "satellite status" or "companionship" with more powerful occupations.

To study journalism as a particular career intersecting with other careers is a useful focus. A special approach to that focus is necessary, however, in order to imbed it accurately in the surrounding cultural, political, and economic matrix. This process of imbedding, itself an exploratory process, is probably best considered an "anthropological" approach. Summarized briefly, an anthropological approach to political reporting implies three tasks: (1) studying reporters and messages in historical and comparative (cross-occupational and cross-national) context; (2) examining news *production* rather than its consumption, studying communication at its source rather than among its effects, considering communication from the journalist's perspective rather than from the audience or

reader viewpoint; and (3) illuminating communications as an *interactive process* involving not simply a sender and a receiver but a complex set of multiple influences, all of which combine to affect message production.⁴

This approach helps resolve certain problems connected with the study of communication considered as a diffusion or transporting of information. Specific deficiencies in this view include the following three.

1. The examination of press activities as an isolated human activity lifted out of relevant historical and cross-national contexts. For example, focusing exclusively on U.S. reporting as a perfectable "technique" in the case of Allende's Chile ignores the cold war historical context and the comparative performance of other socialist governments, as well as the reporting of journalists from European countries, many of whom wrote about events from vastly different perspectives than those offered by U.S. reporters.

2. The preoccupation with media effects on audiences conceived as possible markets, rather than with media sources or producers. This audience concern leads to public opinion studies about media impact.

3. The companion methodology of the diffusion or transmission-belt model of communication is a linear flow model that limits comprehension of small groups (such as newsrooms) or social systems (such as careers and their interaction) and consequently minimizes the importance of interaction patterns in the production of messages.

These deficiencies in the study of communications have been mentioned both by Latin American and North American researchers.⁵ The suggested approach begins to reduce these deficiencies precisely because it is, in a quite literal sense, more related to the study of reporters themselves, a "total-person" study, the essence of anthropology.

In its emphasis on comparative and historical contexts, an anthropological perspective approaches news reporting as anchored in a particular setting and insists that particular environments have a crucial impact on reporters, their perceptions, and their writing. By paying more attention to news production than to news consumption, an anthropological approach scrutinizes closely the influence process affecting reporters as producers comparable to other producers, with outputs similar to other outputs. Finally, by drawing attention to patterns of organizational and human interaction (rather than measuring static attitudes and backgrounds) an anthropological approach, by recommending participant observation techniques, attempts to capture the dynamic aspects of message making. This perspective on a reporter's career requires that the serious researcher spend considerable time both in newsrooms and with reporters in the field, activities necessary in order to trace the way historical and comparative contexts, the various aspects of the news production process, and patterns of interaction (with sources, employers, and peers) meld together to define the contours of a journalistic career, a journalist's perception of it, and the reporting that emerges.

To urge the adoption of an anthropological perspective is not to abandon a concern with the way analytical elements are imbedded in more inclusive, cross-national frameworks. Such frameworks facilitate the comparative study of

patterns of interaction between career structures and system-level constraints. Questions of interest to scholars who employ modernization, dependency, or world economy perspectives might include the following:

1. On a world scale, is journalism (or more broadly, information production) as a career expanding or contracting in absolute terms and relative to other professional careers? Do variations in career opportunities correspond to, lead, or follow economic changes?

2. Are there cross-national career variations among each of the three world regions identified by a world economy perspective: core, semiperiphery, and periphery (see Wallerstein, 1974)? Within and among regions, are there information career structures that parallel larger political and economic structures? Is the history of information production as a career similar or dissimilar cross-nationally within regions and across regions?

3. Are there substantial variations in the way information (e.g., mass media) institutions and careers are associated with state power? How much "relative autonomy" (Althusser, 1971; Poulantzas, 1973) from state institutions do media institutions and careers enjoy in different nation-states or in different regions of the world economy? Specifically, as Jay Blumler and Michael Gurevitch (1975) suggest, how much variation is there along the following comparative structural dimensions:

a. degree of state control of the media (e.g., from control of appointments to control over media finance to the extreme of explicit control over media content);

b. degree of partisan commitment (e.g., level of explicit organized connections to political associations such as parties, the stability and intensity of editorial commitments, and presence or absence of legal restraints on the rights of media to back particular political associations);

c. degree of integration between media elites and political elites (e.g., political affinity, sociocultural proximity, recruitment and socialization similarities, personnel overlaps and exchanges); and

d. degree of media "professionalism" as a legitimizing creed. (This implies a "distancing" of the information producer from the pressures of "external" interests and a fidelity to the internally generated norms of the profession itself. Creeds promoting such an insulation may be composed of mixes with such elements as: belief in the primacy of service to the audience member [over and above any duties owed to organized political authority]; emphasis on the need to master certain specialist communication skills before audiences can be addressed effectively; and belief in the watchdog function of journalism and the need for media personnel to adopt an adversary stance. That is, to what extent does a communication system's legitimizing creed expect media personnel to pay allegiance and give service to some dominant or hegemonic ideology as against pride in some kind of "professional rationality"?)

Examining the preceding dimensions and questions can help define the political functions of industrial reporting on the Third World. One recent study has suggested that the way the U.S. press structured information on Allende's

Chile revealed it can perform several functions relevant to a political system by promoting reassuring or cohesive signs, such as "freedom"; diminishing signs that are dissonant with prevailing assumptions; and promoting a vision of a "stable world" by suggesting that "disquieting" regimes like Allende's are unpopular and temporary (Pollock and Pollock, 1975). A study of the more systemic, global functions of communications implies that we explore a different intellectual terrain and perhaps pose questions that are different from those asked thus far. Borrowing from the European anthropological tradition, a communications scholar recently contrasted the (North) American and European modes of studying communications by writing the following analysis:

American studies are grounded in a transmission or transportation view of communication. They see communication, therefore, as a process of transmitting messages at a distance for the purpose of control. The archetypal case of communication then is persuasion, attitude change, behavior modification, socialization through the transmission of information, influence or conditioning. . . . [This is] a transmission or transportation view because its central defining terms have much in common with the usage of communication in the nineteenth century as another term for transportation. It also is related strongly to the nineteenth-century desire to use communication and transportation to extend influence, control, and power over wider distances and over greater populations.

By contrast, the preponderant view of communication in European studies is a ritual view of communication: communication is viewed as a process through which a shared culture is created, modified, and transformed. The archetypal case of communication is ritual and mythology, for those who come at the problem from anthropology; art and literature, for those who come at the problem from literary criticism and history. A ritual view of communication is not directed toward the extension of messages in space, but the maintenance of society in time; not the act of imparting information or influence, but the creation, representation, and celebration of shared beliefs. If a transmission view of communication centers on the extension of messages across geography for purposes of control, a ritual view centers on the sacred ceremony which draws persons together in fellowship and commonality (James Carey, 1975:177).

This ritual approach is similar to one employed by French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss to explain the interaction among shamans, patients, and the tribe (the public) acting as witness to the shaman's performance and to the patient's reaction among Indian groups in North America. To comprehend the shaman's role, Lévi-Strauss invokes the public's need to "articulate . . . confused and disorganized states, emotions, or representations . . . into a whole or system (1963:179–85). The shaman's role is validated to the extent that he helps the tribe articulate and celebrate shared representations and beliefs. Perhaps modern journalists share aspects of the shaman's craft. By mapping the way communication careers are defined and structured in specific contexts, an anthropological approach can illuminate the possibility of journalism as a performance, func-

tioning to "maintain society in time" through the "creation, representation, and celebration of shared beliefs."

NOTES

1. Articles on the "problem" of U.S. press coverage of Latin America are found in many sources. Publications by Latin American specialists include Chain (1973), Birns (1973b), and Pollock (1973). Articles by professors of journalism include Knudson (1974a) and Lyford (1962). Articles written by and for the journalism community include the following citations: Kennedy (1957); a special section of the *Columbia Journalism Review* titled "The News from Latin America" (Fall 1962); Barnes (1964); Geyer (1969). On Cuba and the Bay of Pigs: Bernstein and Gordon (1967) and Aronson (1970). On the Castro Government: Francis (1967), Block (1962), and Mathews (1971). On Chile: Pearson (1973), Morris et al. (1974), and Schakne (1976).
2. A comprehensive critique of U.S. social science perspectives on the Third World generally and Latin America in particular has been written by Bodenheimer (1971).
3. Elements in the colonial perspective are derived from empirical observation and from the works of Pablo Gonzalez-Casanova, Albert Memmi, and others (Gonzalez-Casanova, 1969; Memmi, 1970). The technocratic perspective can be elaborated by referring to various portions of the vast literature on dependency (a recent review of which is found in Bath and James [1976]). The hegemonic vision is also derived from observation as well as from the works of Gabriel Kolko, Harry Magdoff, and a conference convened by Lester Markel and other journalists in the late 1940s (the results of which were published in Markel, ed. [1949]) to suggest shared newspaper perspectives toward the cold war.
4. In calling this approach "anthropological," the author makes no claim to special anthropological training or expertise. Rather, for a political scientist studying mass communications, anthropology is useful for its careful treatment of the historical and comparative context of human behavior. Anthropology's focus on the *production* of culture, of which news production is one component, emphasizes creation over consumption and therefore emphasizes that activity which is most necessary if a culture is to reproduce itself and survive. Finally, anthropology's affinity for studying people "on location" or "on site" allows evaluation of human interaction patterns engaged in the process of culture (in this case, message) creation.
5. For a short bibliographic essay assessing critiques of hemispheric communications by both North and Latin American scholars, see Beltrán (1975). See also Mattelart (1974).

REFERENCES

- ALTHUSSER, LOUIS
1971 "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes toward an Investigation." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Sheed and Ward.
- ARGYRIS, CHRIS
1974 *Behind the Front Page*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
- ARONSON, JAMES
1970 *The Press and the Cold War*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- BATH, C. RICHARD AND JAMES, DILMUS D.
1976 "Dependency Analysis of Latin America." *LARR* 11, no. 3:3-54.
- BARNES, PETER
1964 "The Wire Services in Latin America." *Nieman Reports* (March).
- BELTRÁN, LUIS RAMERO
1975 "Research Ideologies in Conflict." *Journal of Communication* 25, no. 2 (Spring): 187-93.
1976 "Alien Premises, Objectives, and Methods in Latin American Research." *Communication Research* 3, no. 2 (April).

Latin American Research Review

- BERNSTEIN, VICTOR AND GORDON, JESSE
1967 "The Press and the Bay of Pigs." *Columbia University Forum* (Fall).
- BIRNS, LAURENCE
1973a "Chile: A Bloody Fall." *Worldview* (November).
1973b "Chile in the 'Wall Street Journal.'" *The Nation* (3 December).
1973c "The Death of Chile." *The New York Review of Books* (November).
1973d "Requiem for Chile: La Moneda Is Burning." *The Village Voice* (20 September).
- BLOCK, M.
1962 "The Night Castro 'Unmasked.'" *Columbia Journalism Review* (Summer), pp. 5–10.
- BLUMLER, JAY G. AND GUREVITCH, MICHAEL
1975 "Towards a Comparative Framework for Political Communication Research." In Steven Chaffee, ed., *Political Communications: Issues and Strategies for Research*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- BOBROW, DAVID B.
1974 "Mass Communication and the Political System." In W. Phillips Davison and Frederick T. C. Yu, eds., *Mass Communication Research: Major Issues and Future Directions*. New York: Praeger.
- BODENHEIMER, SUSANNE JONAS
1971 *The Ideology of Developmentalism: The American Paradigm-Surrogate for Latin American Studies*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Comparative Politics Series No. 01–015, vol. 2.
- CAREY, JAMES
1975 "Communication and Culture." *Communication Research* 2, no. 2 (April): 173–91.
- CHAIN, PAT
1973 "Press Coverage of the Chilean Coup: The Information Gap." *Community Action on Latin America (CALA) Newsletter* (October).
- DONAHUE, GEORGE A.; TICHENOR, PHILLIP J.; AND OLIEN, CLARICE N.
1972 "Gatekeeping: Mass Media Systems and Information Control." In F. G. Kline and Phillip J. Tichenor, eds., *Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research*, vol. 1. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- EPSTEIN, EDWARD J.
1974 *News from Nowhere*. New York: Vintage.
- FARAONE, ROQUE
1974 "Some Theoretical Problems on Mass Communication Research in 'Developing Countries.'" Paper presented at the Ninth Assembly of the International Association for Mass Communication Research, Leipzig, September.
- FRANCIS, M. J.
1967 "The U.S. Press and Castro: A Study in Declining Relations." *Journalism Quarterly* (Summer), pp. 257–66.
- GALTUNG, JOHAN AND RUGE, MARI HOLMBOE
1970 "The Structure of Foreign News." In Jeremy Tunstall, ed., *Media Sociology: A Reader*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 259–98.
- GEYER, G. A.
1969 "Latin America: The Making of an 'Uncontinent.'" *Columbia Journalism Review* (Winter), pp. 49–53.
- GONZÁLEZ-CASANOVA, PABLO
1969 "Internal Colonialism and National Development." In Irving Louis Horowitz et al., *Latin American Radicalism*. New York: Vintage.
- HURWITZ, LEON; GREEN, BARBARA; AND SEGAL, HANS E.
1976 "International Press Reactions to the Resignation and Pardon of Richard M. Nixon: A Content Analysis of Four Elite Newspapers." *Comparative Politics* 9, no. 1 (October): 107–23.
- KENNEDY, P. B.
1957 "Problems of Reporting on Latin America." *Nieman Reports* (July), pp. 5–6.

- KNUDSON, JERRY
 1974a "Allende Falls, the Press Reacts." *Masthead* (January).
 1974b "Whatever Became of the Pursuit of Happiness: The U.S. Press and Social Revolution in Latin America." Paper presented at the International Communications Division, Association for Education in Journalism, San Diego, California, August.
- KOLKO, GABRIEL
 1969 *The Roots of American Foreign Policy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, CLAUDE
 1963 *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- LYFORD, JOSEPH P.
 1962 "The 'Times' and Latin America." In *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*. Reprinted in the *Columbia Journalism Review* (Fall), pp. 54–56.
- MAGDOFF, HARRY
 1969 *The Age of Imperialism: Economics of U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- MARKEL, LESTER, ED.
 1949 *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy*. New York: Harper and Bros.
- MATHEWS, H.
 1971 "Cuba and 'The Times.'" In H. Mathews, *A World in Revolution*. New York: Scribner's, pp. 337–65.
- MATTELART, ARMAND
 1974 *Cultura como empresa multinacional*. México, D.F.: Ediciones Era.
- MEMMI, ALBERT
 1970 *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- MORRIS, ROGER; MUELLER, SHELLY; AND JELIN, WILLIAM
 1974 "Through the Looking Glass in Chile: Coverage of Allende's Regime." *Columbia Journalism Review* (November/December), pp. 15–26.
- MOWLANA, HAMID
 1974 "International News Communicators: A Cross-Cultural Analysis." Paper presented at the Mass Communication Conference sponsored by the Association for Education in Journalism (U.S.), Mexico City, March.
- MUELLER, CLAUS
 1973 *The Politics of Communication: A Study in the Political Sociology of Language, Socialization, and Legitimation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- PEARSON, T.
 1973 "Coverage of Allende: 'Preconceived, Wishful View.'" *Chicago Journalism Review* (November), pp. 3–5.
- PERRONE, FERNANDO
 1974 "Le contrôle des Mass-Media au Brésil." Paper presented at the Ninth Assembly of the International Association for Mass Communication Research, Leipzig, September.
- POLLOCK, JOHN
 1973 "Reporting on Chile: What the Press Leaves Out." *The Nation* (29 January).
- POLLOCK, JOHN AND DICKINSON, TORRY
 1974 "Apologists for Terror: The Chilean Junta and the U.S. Press." *Worldview* (March), pp. 27–32. Reprinted in Gary MacEoin, ed., *Chile under Military Rule*. New York: IDOC.
- POLLOCK, JOHN WITH DICKINSON, TORRY AND SOMMA, JOSEPH
 1973 "The New York Times and Militarism in Chile." *The Latin American Studies Association Newsletter* (December).
- POLLOCK, JOHN WITH EISENHOWER, DAVID
 1973 "The New Cold War in Latin America." In Dale Johnson, ed., *The Chilean Road to Socialism*. New York: Doubleday.
- POLLOCK, JOHN C. AND COHN, EILEEN M.
 1976 "Political Reporting on Revolution: Cuba in Cross-National Perspective." Paper

- delivered at the Tenth General Assembly of the International Association for Mass Communication Research, Leicester, England, September.
- POLLOCK, JOHN AND POLLOCK, MICHELE RICHMAN
1975 "The U.S. Press and Chile: Ideology and International Conflict." In June Nash and Juan Corradi, eds., *Ideology and Social Change in Latin America*. (Available from editors: New York).
- POULANTZAS, NICOS
1973 "The Problem of the Capitalist State." In Robin Blackburn, ed., *Ideology in Social Science*. New York: Vintage.
- SCHAKNE, ROBERT
1976 "Chile: Why We Missed the Story." *Columbia Journalism Review* 14, no. 6 (March/April):60-62.
- SCHILLER, HERBERT
1969 *Mass Communications and American Empire*. Boston: Beacon Press.
1973 *The Mind Managers*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- SEYMOUR-URE, COLIN
1974 *The Political Impact of Mass Media*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- SIGAL, L. V.
1973 *Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co.
- SMYTHE, DALLAS
1974 "The Role of Mass Media and Popular Culture in Defining Development." Paper presented to the Ninth General Assembly of the International Association for Mass Communication Research, Leipzig, September.
- TUNSTALL, JEREMY
1972 "News Organization Goals and Specialist Newsgathering Journalists." In Dennis McQuail, ed., *Sociology of Mass Communications*. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books.
1974 *Journalists at Work*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- VERON, ELISEO
1971 "Ideology and Social Sciences: A Communicational Approach." *Semiótica* 3.
- WALLERSTEIN, IMMANUEL
1974 *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.