

**IAMCR Conference Closing Session Celebrating IAMCR 60th Anniversary
Cartagena (Colombia), 20 July 2017**

Professor Roque Faraone, Uruguay

Let me express my gratitude for this undeserved distinction. I come from a small country, Uruguay, whose share of the world's population is 0.04%. It is a relatively under-developed country, though characterized by its political stability and some social achievements. In 1907, capital punishment was abolished; in 1912, divorce became legal even at the unilateral request of the wife, not to mention early labour and pension laws. For that reason, and for having installed a collegiate executive power, it was called "the Switzerland of America".

In 1956, I was a young history teacher still studying law and sociology. Soon after Jacques Kaiser published *Une Semaine dans le monde* with UNESCO, I wrote him a letter from Montevideo, asking for methodological help with similar research on the Uruguayan press. I got his generous support and the research ended up being published by our university's School of Law. Thus began the relationship with Jacques Kayser and Fernand Terrou, who later founded IAMCR.

I am therefore a founding member from the underdeveloped world, even though I had studied in France. I identify myself as someone who has been influenced by some contributions of Marxism, which I believe are now incorporated in scientific knowledge. One of them, the concept of "ideology", understood as a false representation of reality with the aim of holding together society as a whole, is precisely what helps us to understand that there may be other contributions of Marxism not regarded as scientific. Sartre added that in each historical moment, only two ideologies are possible: the **dominant** one, and an **emerging** one. And I add: the latter is in an advanced stage but still in the making, because nobody can claim to be totally liberated from the dominant ideology. I believe that the movement of France Insoumise, launched by Jean-Luc Melenchon, represents a significant progress, in praxis terms and therefore in terms of the theory to be applied, because it combines the principles of political liberalism with a solid basis of materialism.

I have very precise memories of the academic atmosphere inside the Association at the times of its foundation. It was the international context of the Cold War. Huge and continuous efforts were necessary to hold together an international institution with participation on an equal footing of members representing academic and scientific researchers who worked under governments (and large mass media) that confronted one another ideologically and politically. Western scientists were in principle critical of quasi-monopolistic concentration of large (resulting from a system of production based on competition) mass media. Scientists from the Eastern Bloc were in principle critical of ideological uniformity backed by so-called socialist regimes. All of them had to deal with two conflicts at the same time: the domestic ones (from getting the necessary funding to the fighting for legitimacy of an international activity which was considered unorthodox by both sides) and the specific ones: to develop knowledge with a scientific value which could be exchanged on the international level.

Memories of Dallas Smythe and Herbert Schiller from the United States, Yassan Zasourski from the USSR and Mieczyslaw Kafel from Poland (whom I consider as my teachers in this area of my learning) come to my mind. There were also other Europeans from countries traditionally more open to academic dissidence, I could mention Jim Halloran, Cees Hamelink, Kaarle Nordenstreng, Janet Wasko, and Robin Cheesman. All of them have been building this international association whose main feature has always been, until today and unlike many others, the considerable independence it keeps from commitments resulting from conflicts and from international political interests. Especially in a field, like communication, so closely linked to those issues.

The recent statements of our Association on Turkey and Hungary, that I am proud to support, encourage me to mention here three more permanent questions that, without necessarily requiring a collective position statement, nevertheless deserve strong academic attention.

First: Political liberalism, more or less functioning in around one third of the countries in the world, is based on competitive economies, which is why social communication systems are conditioned not only by possible violations of guarantees by governments, but also, in all those countries, by the continuous action of the market, which leads to the concentration and monopoly of information, which is in turn dependent on advertising.

Therefore, even though we seem to enter a discipline unrelated to social communication, we should distinguish between what is called the “**right**” in political science and what could be called, even provisionally, a “**mass media right**”, i.e. the large national and international mass media. Because this mass media right constantly strengthens the dominant ideology, by all its means, from advertising to the most trivial or entertaining messages, while the political right does it from the government (when it is in government) or from its political parties, but always by means of direct messages, recognizable as such.

When remembering Aldous Huxley's terrifying nightmare in *A Brave New World* (published in 1932), we have to admit it was premonitory, since it anticipated, although under another form, the anesthetizing and conformist function exercised nowadays by television. And if we think about Guy. Debord's *The Society of the Spectacle*, published half a century ago, we can see that the current President of France managed to exceed that terrible denunciation by putting on stage, in front of the Louvre Pyramid, semi-naked women dancers, to be broadcast on TV to the whole world, together with political analysts unaware of the ridiculousness of the spectacle they were taking part in.

From an academic point of view we should not forget that, whether ordinary citizens or researchers, all of us get information - and then act upon it - under the influence of the same mass information, daily interpreted and increasingly manipulated by this "mass media right" that owns the large corporate media,

Second problem: There is no law regulating international mass or individual electronic communication, Doctrine has produced little work on the subject. The European Union's "Television Without Frontiers" directive is a start worth promoting, however insufficient, so as to encourage increasing rationality in the broadcasting not only of mass messages, so as to have information that interprets the interests at stake instead of exploiting the dramatic and emotional dimensions, but also in that of individual messages, sanctioning authors and distributors of illegal messages.

Third problem: Advertising keeps expanding to fill all possible gaps, not only threatening the content of mass messages and disrupting access to electronic information, but acting as an accelerator of superfluous consumption, while reducing the ability of critical thinking. A rationalizing state intervention at the national level, or from the UN, restricting or imposing conditions on advertising messages should be encouraged by academia, as far as platforms, quantity and content are concerned. Naturally, people made redundant by the phasing out of this unproductive jobs would have to be retrained and redeployed.

Summary: In short, to improve communication, we must first get out of capitalism!