Factors Related to Freedom In National Press Systems

BY RAYMOND B. NIXON*

Utilizing new data and a new theory appearing in recent books, the Editor of the QUARTERLY *makes a cross-country comparison of four variables in 85 national press systems. The results indicate that socioeconomic and cultural factors are closely related to the degrees of freedom reported by IPI and IAPA surveys.*

IN HIS ESSAY ON "THE CHALLENGE to Communication Research,"[1] Wilbur Schramm makes this observation:

> If one looks at a book like *World Communications,* or at twenty articles in the JOURNALISM QUARTERLY on twenty countries and their press, it is perfectly apparent that the literacy of each country, the gross national product, the distribution of wealth and population, and other elements are instrumentally related in some way to the pattern by which press systems have developed. But exactly how? A cross-country study of some of these variables in relation to communication systems would be revealing.

The same thought must have occurred to many other students of comparative journalism. For it long has been apparent, as Schramm suggests, that a particular kind of press or political system can develop only to the extent that certain variables—socioeconomic, cultural and otherwise—make it possible.

Yet it also has been obvious until recently that the data were inadequate to enable any large-scale comparative studies of these variables to be made. For example, until the United Nations and Unesco publications of the '50s[2] began to appear, comparable data were lacking for most countries on even such basic factors as literacy and per capita income; the statistics still leave much to be desired. And this is to say nothing of the kinds of survey research data that require elaborate and costly field studies by qualified scholars and trained native interviewers within each country. The paucity of data could explain why comparative analyses of communication systems have been so few, and why theory has been so slow to develop.

Happily, both the data and the theory of comparative journalism have been greatly enriched during the last 18

*Research for this article was facilitated by a grant from the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, where the author is professor of journalism. At various stages of the project he received valuable advice and assistance from several of his associates, especially Roy E. Carter Jr., L. John Martin, Edmund G. Blinn, Verling C. Troldahl, Y. V. L. Rao and Kenneth A. Gompertz. The author's own background includes study trips to 45 of the countries listed in the accompanying chart, some under a grant from the Ford Foundation and others on assignment for Unesco; he currently is president of the International Association for Mass Communication Research. The responsibility for interpretations and conclusions in this article, however, is his alone.

[1] In Ralph O. Nafziger and David M. White (editors), *Introduction to Mass Communications Research* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), p. 17.

[2] See sources cited in accompanying chart.

months by two new books. The first of these to appear was Daniel Lerner's *The Passing of Traditional Society*.[3] In this extraordinary work, a brilliant social scientist develops a theory that clearly shows the vital functions performed by the press and other mass media in the transition from "traditional" to "modern" ways of life. A few months later came the International Press Institute's *The Press in Authoritarian Countries*,[4] a volume completing a series of surveys in which journalists and scholars have collaborated to appraise the kinds and degrees of press control in all major countries of the world today. This is a body of new data[5] that assumes even greater importance in the light of Lerner's analysis.

It is when appraisals like those of the IPI are compared with the kinds of data analyzed by Lerner that we begin to glimpse a partial answer to the question of *how* and *why* one press system rather than another develops. There is nothing new, of course, in being able to say that a "free press system" like that of the United States usually is found only in countries with a high rate of literacy and per capita income. But it is new to have sufficient material for determining whether these cultural and socioeconomic factors are related to press freedom and control in a definite and systematic way.

The writer undertook the present study to test the hypothesis that such a relationship does exist. Accordingly, he arrayed the most recent UN and Unesco data related to national press systems alongside the information on press freedom reported by the IPI and a kindred organization, the Inter-American Press Association. The data were cross-checked with other sources for accuracy.

The results are striking, as the accompanying chart will show. And they become even more meaningful when the relevant aspects of Lerner's theory are kept in mind.

THE UNIQUENESS OF THE LERNER theory for journalism lies in the dynamic role that it ascribes to the mass media in the emergence and maintenance of modern society. Earlier analyses of UN and Unesco data had shown the fundamental importance of literacy. For example, Golden had found that literacy correlated at .87 with industrialization and at .84 with per capita income.[6] But this is a static relationship, bearing only indirectly upon the press and political systems. Lerner puts these cultural and socioeconomic factors into an overall theory of modernization that also includes *media* and *political* participation.

Lerner derived his hypothesis from history. Viewing the development of Western democracies, he saw that their modernization has exhibited "certain

[3] Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958. Reviewed by Malcolm S. MacLean Jr. in JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 36:70 (Winter 1959).

[4] Zurich, Switzerland: International Press Institute, 1959. Reviewed by Raymond B. Nixon in JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 36:227-29 (Spring 1959).

[5] The Associated Press for some 10 years has made an annual survey of freedom of the press, but it is concerned primarily with countries where foreign correspondents have experienced difficulties during the year. The most recent report (as published in the New York *Times*, Sunday, Jan. 3, 1960, p. 25) mentions 32 countries.

United Press International conducted a similar survey in late 1959, using a questionnaire prepared by the Freedom of Information Center at the University of Missouri (Columbia, Mo.: Freedom of Information Center Publication No. 21). Responses were received from 34 UPI correspondents, covering 35 countries and territories. While some of these replies were more comprehensive than the information reported by the AP from its correspondents, the UPI survey also suffers from inadequate attention to factors affecting the domestic press.

The present study assumes that a country with a free press normally will not interfere with the free flow of news to other countries.

[6] H. H. Golden, "Literacy and Social Change in Underdeveloped Countries," in *Rural Society*, 20:1-7 (1955); cited in Lerner, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

components and sequences whose relevance is global. Everywhere, for example, urbanization [to which he subsumes industrialization] has tended to increase literacy; rising literacy has tended to increase media exposure; increasing media exposure has 'gone with' wider economic participation (per capita income) and political participation (voting)." This, in the older democracies, is a "historic fact."[7]

The next task was to determine whether the statistics on these variables for nations at different stages of development today tend to support the historical hypothesis. By cross-checking the first (1951) edition of Unesco's *World Communications* with other UN and Unesco sources, Lerner obtained comparable data on 54 countries. From these he developed indices for the first four factors in his "model of modernization":

1) *Urbanization*—the proportion of a country's inhabitants living in cities over 50,000;
2) *Literacy*—the proportion of adults (*i.e.*, persons over 15) able to read in one language;
3) *Media participation*—the proportion buying newspapers, owning radios and attending movies (all combined into one index number);
4) *Political participation*—the average proportion voting in the last four national elections.

The multiple correlation coefficients of these four variables were found to be: Urbanization, .61; literacy, .91; media participation, .84; political participation, .82. Each of these coefficients represents the degree of correlation between the variable named and the three remaining variables.[8]

But this demonstration of systematic relationships among these four variables is merely the prelude to Lerner's chief contribution: the addition of the personality variable of *empathy*. Empathy, to use his simplified definition, is "the capacity to see oneself in the other fellow's situation"; it is the skill of "imagining oneself in another's shoes."[9] He identified the more empathic individuals among 1,357 survey interviewees in six Middle Eastern countries by using the "latent structure analysis" technique of Paul F. Lazarsfeld in analyzing their responses to nine projective questions. These included such questions as: If you were made "head of the government" (or "editor of a newspaper," or "put in charge of a radio station"), "what are some of the things you would do?"[10]

Lerner found that the more empathic individuals have more "mobile personalities"; this enables them to express opinions on a wider range of subjects. It is by providing people with vicarious or "psychic mobility" that the mass media accelerate the development of empathy and thus perform an indispensable service:

> Audiences and constituencies are composed of participant individuals. People "participate" in the public life of their country by having opinions about many matters which, in the isolation of traditional society, did not concern them. Participant persons have opinions on a variety of issues and situations which they may never have experienced directly—such as what the government should do about irrigation, how the Algerian revolt should be settled. . . . By having and expressing opinions on such matters a person participates in the network of public communication.
>
> The media teach people participation of this sort by depicting for them new and strange situations and by familiarizing them with a range of opinions among which they can choose. Some

[7] Lerner, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[9] A review of the literature related to the concept of empathy will appear in an early issue of the QUARTERLY.
[10] Lerner, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

> people learn better than others, the variations reflecting their differential skill in empathy. For empathy . . . is the basic communication skill required of modern man. Empathy endows a person with the capacity to imagine himself as proprietor of a bigger grocery store in a city, to wear nice clothes and live in a nice house, to be interested in "what is going on in the world" and to "get out of his hole." With the spread of curiosity and imagination among a previously quietistic population come the human skills needed for social growth and economic development. . . . On the institutional capacity to provide this new style of life hinge [a country's] prospects.[11]

Lerner concludes that "a communication system is both index and agent of change in a total social system. This avoids the genetic problem of causality, about which we can only speculate, in order to stress correlation hypotheses which can be tested. On this view, once the modernizing process is started, chicken and egg in fact 'cause' each other to develop."[12]

It is worth noting, however, that media participation comes *third* in Lerner's "typology of modernization." Thus, it follows urbanism and literacy, but precedes political participation and high empathy—two qualities characteristic of those societies where political democracy and press freedom have flourished.

THE BASIC PROCEDURE USED IN THIS study—that of arranging related data on different countries in parallel columns for comparison—is so simple that little explanation seems necessary. It requires no detailed statistical analysis to see the more obvious patterns of relationship among the four variables in the chart. However, since one of these variables represents a classification of qualitative appraisals by "experts" on the press, it is necessary to explain the method of classification so that the reader may judge its validity.

The UN and Unesco publications were the starting point, as they were for Lerner. Examination of these sources to the middle of 1959 indicated that reasonably comparable data could be obtained on 85 countries and territories[13] for three variables related to national press systems:

> *Per capita national income*—defined by the United Nations as the average income per inhabitant "accruing to factors of production supplied by normal residents of the given country before deduction of direct taxation."
>
> *Percentage of adults (persons 15 years and older) illiterate*—illiteracy being defined by Unesco as "inability to read and write in any language."
>
> *Daily newspaper circulation*—a daily being "any newspaper published more than four times a week."

The dates selected for each variable were the latest for which comparable statistics on the largest number of countries could be found. (See sources in chart.) For example, the most recent source in which the United Nations had reported comparable income data was *Per Capita National Product of Fifty-five Countries, 1952-54* (1957).[14] When a country's income did not appear in this volume but was to be found in the earlier *National and Per Capita Incomes of Seventy Countries in 1949* (the source used by Lerner), the country's relative standing in 1952-54 was estimated on the basis of the 1949 figure and/or more recent data from other sources.[15]

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 412.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[13] Hawaii is treated here as a territory, since its figures for the years under study were not included in the data for the United States. Egypt and Syria also are listed separately, since the United Arab Republic was not formed until 1958.

[14] "National product" in the UN report for 1952-54 (Source 3) is defined as "identically equal" with "national income" in the 1949 survey (Source 4).

[15] The annual *Britannica Book of the Year* and the *World Almanac* provided information on economic developments in some countries since 1949.

For figures on illiteracy and daily newspaper circulation, Unesco's *World Illiteracy at Mid-Century* (1957) and *World Communications* (1956) were the basic sources. The circulation figures in the latter book were mostly for 1954 or 1955; none could have been later than 1956. Therefore, when Unesco's new *Statistics of Newspapers and Other Periodicals* appeared in late 1959, circulation figures were revised only in those cases where the later source appeared to have more definite information for the 1954-56 period. *World Communications* contains data on a number of countries not represented in the new volume.

It was decided to use daily newspaper circulation, rather than a general index of "media participation" like Lerner's, partly because circulation figures were available for a larger number of countries. But further reflection revealed a much sounder reason: Since broadcasting systems in most countries outside the Western Hemisphere are either owned by the government or operated by a government-controlled monopoly, the conditions affecting press freedom relate primarily to the printed media.

THE MAIN PROBLEM OF METHOD arose in trying to bring together "modern, precise research procedures and the more traditional broad approaches of historical . . . and journalistic appraisal."[16] In the first place, before setting up a continuum with *freedom* at one end and *control* at the other, it was necessary to define the two terms and the various points of classification between. Secondly, a method was required for quantifying the various degrees of freedom so that this factor could be correlated statistically with other variables.

The author began by accepting the IPI's definition of an "authoritarian regime" as one characterized by "a permanent censorship or a constant and general control of the press," either by the government or the political group in power. A "free press system," by contrast, is one marked by the *absence* of such a permanent censorship or constant and general control; it is one in which private owners and independent journalists are free to supply news and opinion to the general public under statutes of libel and decency which are applicable to everyone and not capable of arbitrary and discriminatory interpretation by the ruling power. In other words, the chief criterion is the degree of control normally exercised by any official agency which has the power to interfere with the dissemination and discussion of news.

It immediately became apparent that a classification of countries according to their constitutional guarantees or statutes regarding press freedom would be of little help in determining the actual situation.[17] Most countries have constitutions or laws that pay lip service to the principle of freedom of expression and the press, but their practices frequently are something quite different.[18] It therefore was decided to base the classification primarily upon the situation as reported by IPI-IAPA observers and analysts.

[16] Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "The Prognosis for International Communications Research," in *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 16:481-90 (Winter 1952-53).

[17] Edmund G. Blinn made a special study of legal provisions in different countries, the results of which are available in two mimeographed charts, "Classification of Constitutional Guarantees of Press Freedom" and "Classification of Constitutions and Statutes in Combination in Regard to the Possibility of Press Freedom."

[18] Carter R. Bryan of the University of Maryland, who searched the constitutions and other "social covenants" of various countries, found that the Provisional Constitution of the United Arab Republic was "the only such document examined" that makes no guarantee of freedom of the press and/or expression.

On the basis of the two major IPI surveys (1 and 2 in the sources listed in the chart), a five-way classification was set up:

F Free press system; normally no major government controls.

F– Free press, but with less stability and/or more controls than F.

I Intermediate; some characteristics of free press, but with varying kinds and degrees of authoritarian control.

A– Authoritarian, but with less rigid press controls than A.

A Authoritarian press system; strong controls over all mass media.

Since journalists in the Communist countries object strongly to having their particular type of government and party controls classified as "authoritarian,"[19] a sixth category of "C" was created for the Communist systems, with "C–" designating countries in which there is substantial evidence of less rigidity in enforcement.

However, the writer did not wish to depend upon his own unaided judgment in classifying qualitative data. He was aware that he might have been influenced by impressions received over the last three years on personal visits to some 45 of the countries and territories under study. He therefore submitted his own classification to two other judges, one in Europe and one in the United States. Both are journalists and scholars whose principal area of research is comparative journalism.

The two judges together raised questions about seven of the 85 classifications. In each case it was a question only of moving a particular country from one position to an adjoining position on the scale; in no case did either judge suggest that an "F" or "F–" country should be classified as "A" or "A–", or the reverse. In the four cases where both judges disagreed with the writer, the classification was changed to agree with the majority opinion.

BUT TO WHAT EXTENT HAD TWO OR more judges been influenced by the same biases? How would a person who had to rely entirely on available documentary sources classify the same countries?

A graduate student was assigned to work on this problem.[20] For information, he searched not only the IPI and IAPA sources but also the New York *Times* and *Editor & Publisher.* In the period since the founding of the IPI in 1951, he found reports related to press freedom in 101 countries. When he eliminated those countries on which information was incomplete or fragmentary, 61 countries remained.

The press controls reported in these 61 countries were classifiable into 10 different categories. Three of these eventually were dropped because of inconsistency of pattern or infrequency of occurrence. One of the categories that had to be discarded, as might be suspected, was a classification on the basis of legal guarantees. The seven categories that appeared to establish a "typology" were:

1) Control through punitive action, legal and extra-legal, other than that covered by statutes against libel and obscenity. This includes civil and criminal action, arrests, detention, jail sentences, fines and deportation. Such action was recorded only if it discriminated against the journalist, such as through the law of *desacato* ("disrespect toward authority") found in most

[19] For the official Communist viewpoint toward "press freedom" as defined by the IPI, see review of *The Press in Authoritarian Countries* by B. Stanislav in *The Democratic Journalist* (Prague, Czechoslovakia), official organ of the International Organization of Journalists, June-July 1959.

[20] Kenneth A. Gompertz did the work on this phase of the project, which is summarized here from his unpublished seminar paper, "A Method for Determining a Typology of Governmental Control of the Press." The study is being extended.

South American countries. Such a law typifies public security measures used to control journalists considered "dangerous to public order."

2) Control of a publication's existence or very life through such action as a) seizure of newspapers, b) restriction of newsprint and other supplies, and c) permission to publish only under favorable government disposition.

3) Control of official news through governmental attitude toward official news releases (*i.e.*, that such news must be published without change) or through limited access to governmental news.

4) Control of newspaper personnel, either by direct approval or by appointment of staffs or punishment or censure.

5) Control through official censorship, either through overt censorship organs or by police or police-like actions. The existence of an office of censorship was considered control through threat even in cases where relatively little activity was reported.

6) Control of periodical content or format, ranging all the way from complete planning and policy control to pressures exerted to restrict ideological "wandering."

7) Control of periodical distribution, either directly or indirectly.

The 61 countries were "scored" on each of these controls. The resulting rank data were subjected to a Guttman-scale type of analysis to find out whether the different kinds of restriction did, indeed, cumulate.[21] This scalogram analysis produced a "model of press control" with eight types, ranging from 0 controls to 7 (Table 1).

In the listing above, the types of control are presented in the order in which they tend to cumulate. Thus a country which has control 7 (distribution) typically will have most if not all of the other controls. Again, a country with restriction 4 (control of personnel) will tend to have the controls which appear to the right of it in Table 1, but not controls 5, 6 or 7.

TABLE 1
Model of Press Control

	METHOD OF CONTROL						
CONTROL TYPE	*Distribution (7)*	*Content-Format (6)*	*Censorship (5)*	*Personnel (4)*	*Official News (3)*	*Seizure (2)*	*Criminal-Civil (1)*
Type 7	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Type 6		x	x	x	x	x	x
Type 5			x	x	x	x	x
Type 4				x	x	x	x
Type 3					x	x	x
Type 2						x	x
Type 1							x
Type 0							

An "x" indicates the presence of the control category in a governmental system.

When the independent ratings obtained by this method for the 61 countries were compared with the classifications of these countries by the three judges, a statistical correlation of .94 was found; the correlation with the final ratings of these countries in the chart was .96.[22]

This phase of the project accomplished three things: 1) It tended to support the ratings of the three judges; 2) it pointed to the possibility of establishing an objective method for classifying types of press control; 3) it called attention (as the judges also had done) to the desirability of further shadings and qualifications in the classification scheme finally to be adopted.

For this latter reason, the five original categories on the freedom-control

[21] For a description of the method used, see Louis H. Guttman, "The Cornell Technique for Scale and Intensity Analysis," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 7:248-79 (1947). The coefficient of reproducibility was .92.

[22] The coefficient is tetrachoric *r*, which provides an estimate of the product-moment correlation between the two scales.

Press Freedom in 85 Countries and Territories Compared with Income per Capita

(Situation in press is classified as of January 1, 1960; statistics

Annual Income per Capita in U.S. Dollars	*AFRICA*	*MIDDLE EAST*
OVER $1,000	EXPLANATION: F, F[1] *Free press system; normally no major government controls* F– *Free press, but with less stability and/or more controls than F* I+, I, I– *Intermediate; some characteristics of free press system, but with varying kinds and degrees of authoritarian control* A– *Authoritarian, but with less rigid press controls than A* A *Authoritarian system; strong controls over all mass media* C, C[1] *Communist press system (C–, less rigid than C)* *Classification of press systems is based primarily upon IPI Surveys (1,2), monthly* IPI Report *and reports of IAPA through 1959.* *Countries are listed in descending order of annual income per capita; figures are for 1952-54 (3) unless marked otherwise.* *First figure following a country's name is Unesco estimate of percentage of adults illiterate "at mid-century" (6, 7).* *Second figure following a country's name is circulation of daily newspapers per 1,000 inhabitants ca. 1954-56 (7,8).* (Numbers in parentheses refer to sources below; for F[1], C[1], see text)	
$600 - $1,000		
$300 - $599	F– Union of S. Africa, 55-60%, 57 $300	F– Israel, 5-10%, 163 $470
$100 - $299	I Ghana, 75-80, 18 †150 I Rhodesia & Nyasaland, 75-80, 16 100	F– Lebanon, 50-55, 76 260 I+ Turkey, 65-70, 32 210 A Syria, 70-75, 42 ** A Egypt, 75-80, 23 120
UNDER $100	I Belgian Congo, 60-65, 2 70 I Kenya, 75-80, 5 60 I Uganda, 70-75, 2 50 A– Libya, 85-90, 6 †40 I Liberia, 90-95, 1 *38 A– Ethiopia, 95-99, 0.2 *38	I Iran, 85-90, 7 *85 A(R?) Iraq, 85-90, 6 *85 A– Jordan, 80-85, 17 † A– Afghanistan, 95-99, 2 *50 A Saudi Arabia, 95-99, 2 *40 A Yemen, 95-99, 0 *40

ita, Percentage of Adults Illiterate, and Daily Circulation per 1,000 Inhabitants

cs are for periods indicated in Explanation and Notes below)

ASIA AND OCEANIA	*EUROPE, INCLUDING U.S.S.R.*	*AMERICA*
F Hawaii, 5-10%, 257 (1958, $1,852) $1,720		F U.S.A., 3-4%, 347 (1958, $2,057) $1,870
	F Switzerland, 1-2%, 296 $1,010	F Canada, 2-3, 244 1,310
F New Zealand, 1-2, 390 1,000		
F Australia, 1-2, 408 950	F Sweden, 1-2, 462 950	
	F Luxembourg, 3-4, 445 890	
	F Belgium, 3-4, 384 800	
	F U. Kingdom, 1-2, 573 780	
	F Iceland, 1-2, 433 780	
	F Denmark, 1-2, 376 750	
	F Norway, 1-2, 374 740	
	F[1] France, 3-4, 246 740	
	F[1] Finland, 1-2, 420 670	
		F- Venezuela, 45-50, 102 540
	F[1] W. Germany, 1-2, 277 510	
	F Netherlands, 1-2, 264 500	
		F- Argentina, 10-15, 151 460
		F- Puerto Rico, 25-30, 69 430
	F- Ireland, 1-2, 242 410	F Uruguay, 15-20, 225 ***
	F[1] Austria, 1-2, 187 370	
	C Czechoslovakia, 2-3, 170 ***	F Chile, 20-25, 110 360
	C E. Germany, 1-5, 118 †	
F- Hong Kong, 40-45, 156 †	C- Poland, 5-10, 150 ***	
F- Singapore 50-55 } 70	C U.S.S.R., 5-10, 107 ***	
F- Malaya, 60-65 }	F[1] Italy, 10-15, 107 310	I(R?) Cuba, 20-25, 129 310
	A Spain, 15-20, 68 †	
	C Hungary, 4-5, 122 ***	
		F- Panama, 30-35, 115 250
	C Bulgaria, 20-25, 170 †	F- Colombia, 45-50, 60 250
	C[1] Rumania, 20-25 †	F- Brazil, 50-55, 51 230
	F- Greece, 25-30, 71 220	F Mexico, 35-40, 46 220
	A- Portugal, 40-45, 61 200	F Costa Rica, 20-25, 92 ***
F Japan, 5-10, 397 190	C- Yugoslavia, 25-30, 48 ***	F- Jamaica, 25-30, 49 180
		F- El Salvador, 60-65, 35 ***
		A- Nicaragua, 60-65, 50 ***
		A Dominican Rep., 55-60, 24 160
F Philippines, 40-45, 19 150		F- Guatemala, 70-75, 26 160
		F- Ecuador, 45-50, 49 150
		F- Honduras, 60-65, 21 150
		A Paraguay, 45-50, 21 140
F- Ceylon, 40-45, 37 110	*C[1] Albania, 25-30* †	F- Peru, 50-55, 39 120
		A- Bolivia, 65-70, 19 **
		A- Haiti, 85-90, 3 **
I Thailand, 45-50, 15 80		
I+ Nat. China, 40-45, 33 **		
I+ Rep. Korea, 50-55, 55 70		
I Pakistan, 80-85, 9 70		
F- India, 75-80, 7 60		
I+ Burma, 55-60, 9 50		
C Com. China, 50-55, 9 *27		
I- Indonesia, 80-85, 7 *25		

NOTES:

*1949 (4) latest UN figure.

**1952-54 rank estimated from 4.

***1952-54 rank based on 4, 5 and more recent estimates.

†1952-54 rank estimated from sources other than UN publications.

SOURCES:

1. IPI SURVEY, *The Press in Authoritarian Countries* (1959).
2. —, *Government Pressures on the Press* (1955).
3. UNITED NATIONS, *Per Capita National Product of Fifty-five Countries, 1952-1954* (1957).
4. —, *National and Per Capita Incomes of Seventy Countries in 1949* (1950).
5. —, *Preliminary Report on the World Social Situation* (1952).
6. UNESCO, *World Illiteracy at Mid-Century* (1957).
7. —, *World Communications* (1956).
8. —, *Statistics of Newspapers and Other Periodicals* (1959).

continuum were expanded to eight, with a ninth category possible. Thus, "F¹" was inserted between "F" and "F–" to identify five countries where the existence of a strong "free press system" was unchallenged by the judges, but where special circumstances had led to the imposition of certain controls on an emergency basis during the period studied. The "I+" symbol was added for those "Intermediate" countries where long-term tendencies since 1951 have seemed to favor press freedom, and "I–" for those in this category where the long-term development has been less favorable. Finally, a "C¹" symbol was adopted for two European Communist countries that had been listed in the chart (*in italics*) for general comparison, but which could not be included among the 85 studied simply because their controls are so thoroughgoing as to make adequate information impossible to obtain.[23] An "A¹" also was provided, but insufficient statistics were available for countries so classified to be ranked on the chart.

The scale of the "freedom-control" continuum then was expressed quantitatively, for purposes of statistical analysis, as follows:

					C–	C	C¹	
F	F¹		F–	I+	I	I–	A–	A	A¹
1			2		3		4		5

These nine categories made it possible to identify qualitative differences not shown by the original classification. For purposes of correlational analysis, however, the five-point numerical scale was retained (as shown above) in order to approximate the assumption of equal intervals along the continuum. In general, it was felt that the differences in degree of control were approximately equal along the five-category scale.

Support for the decision to assign the same weight to class "C" as to class "A" systems was found in the "model of press control" shown in Table 1. When the ratings of the 61 countries forming the basis of this model were compared, both the major Communist country (the Soviet Union) and the Dominican Republic, under whose military dictatorship the press system was classified as "A," fell into Type 7. This is the scale type of category in which control of the press by governmental authority is most nearly complete.

It is obvious, nevertheless, that there are important differences between the "C" and "A" systems. Some of these will be brought out in the discussion that follows the statistical findings.

THE STATISTICAL FINDINGS OF THIS study strongly support the hypothesis that there is a definite and systematic relationship between the degree of freedom in a national press system and three other variables. The correlation between press freedom and each of these variables[24] is as follows:

Per capita national income	.64
Proportion of adults literate	.51
Daily newspaper circulation per 1,000 inhabitants	.63

Each of these correlation coefficients is significant at the 1% level. In other words, there is less than one chance in one hundred that the relationship could be purely coincidental.

Thus, in the world of today, wherever per capita income is high, press

[23] Albania and Rumania were the only two Communist countries of Europe that the author was unable to visit in the summer of 1959—Albania, because the U.S. does not have diplomatic relations with its government, and Rumania, because of its delay in issuing a visa. Other journalists have reported the same difficulty.

[24] Because the data for the relationships between press freedom and the three independent variables did not meet the assumption of linearity, the correlation ratio (eta—coefficient of curvilinear correlation) was used instead of product-moment *r*.

freedom is likely to be found—along with its necessary concomitant, political democracy. Literacy also is related to press freedom, but not so closely as per capita income.

The statistics also support what both the history of the press and the pattern of the chart reveal: that high newspaper circulation and press freedom tend to go together.

DISCUSSION

In looking for specific patterns, it will be noted that every country which had an annual per capita income of $600 or more in 1952-54 had then, and has today, a strong free press system. Most of these countries also have an adult illiteracy rate of only 1-2%. With the former territory of Hawaii now included within the United States, the highest illiteracy rate of any nation in this group would be 3-4%. This top group in per capita income also embraces the 15 countries highest in daily newspaper circulation per 1,000 population, except for Japan.

Only two countries in the $600 or more annual per capita income group required the "F¹" classification, indicating the occurrence of certain emergency controls during recent years in what otherwise is a strong free press system. One of these countries is France, where recurrent economic and military crises appear to account for deviations from its normal pattern of freedom. The other is Finland, where the press probably is as free as any in Europe except for a law which makes it an offense to "endanger Finland's relations with her neighbors"—*i.e.*, the Soviet Union. But both these countries repeatedly have shown their determination to maintain freedom of expression, even under adverse circumstances. The same could be said of present-day West Germany, Austria and Italy, the three countries in the next economic bracket with an "F¹" rating.

Even when all countries with an annual per capita income of $300 or more are considered, only six have classifications other than "F, F¹ or F–." These are Spain, classified as "A"; Cuba, classified as "I(R?)"; and the four Communist countries of Europe that are most advanced industrially: Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland and the U.S.S.R. To these four might be added Hungary, whose more recent per capita income figures put it on approximately the same level as Poland.

Spain, as the IPI survey points out,[25] is the only non-Communist country in the world today with an authoritarian system based upon "a well-established doctrine on information." To understand its system of press controls one must remember that the country over which General Franco gained supreme power in 1936 was, like the Tsarist Russia which the Bolsheviks took over in 1917, an old-style monarchy with strong religious underpinnings. It had been touched scarcely at all by the liberalizing influences that had led to the development of democratic institutions in Western Europe and the United States. The main difference between what happened in Spain and what happened in Russia is that Franco led a "broad" revolution which kept essentially the same elements in power, whereas the Communists appealed to long-suppressed, "deep" revolutionary forces that completely overthrew the old ruling classes in what is now the Soviet Union.

Although Cuba overthrew the Batista dictatorship at the end of 1958, it was still in the throes of a national revolution as of January 1960. Thus, it is classified in the chart as "I(R?)," but

[25] *The Press in Authoritarian Countries*, p. 199.

this obviously is a temporary status that could shift very quickly to a complete dictatorship, with thorough-going press controls, or perhaps more gradually toward greater freedom. Regardless of the eventual outcome, there is little doubt that Premier Fidel Castro's strong appeal to the masses is based upon their belief that he will improve social and economic conditions.

Cuba's plight points up the general instability that has characterized even the richest of Latin American countries during most of their independent existence. Essentially it grows out of the fact that these countries, as colonies of Spain and Portugal down to the early part of the 19th century, likewise were isolated from the liberalizing influences that revolutionized politics, economics, religion and the press in England and elsewhere during the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. Even the leaders of independence movements in most Latin American countries came from a relatively small class of European descent, and their ideas did not penetrate very far down into the Indian and mestizo masses. The strong middle-class support that leads both to a stable democratic government and to a strong free press has been generally lacking, except in three countries (Uruguay, Chile and Costa Rica) where a fairly homogeneous population has helped to produce a more equitable distribution of income, and one country (Mexico) which has made consistent progress in improving the general welfare over the last 30 years.[26] The continuance of press freedom in countries like Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil and Colombia—all of which have emerged from dictatorships within the past decade—seems to be tied up inextricably with the success of their present democratic governments in raising the living standards and literacy of the poorer and more ignorant masses.

THIS BRINGS US TO THE FIVE COMmunist countries of Europe that are highest in per capita income and literacy (Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, the U.S.S.R. and Hungary). These five nations stand out as the most conspicuous deviations from the general rule of a close relationship between these two variables and the existence of press freedom as defined in the Western world. The exception which they represent to the general pattern is so marked, in fact, that the writer decided to see how much change there would be in the correlation between press freedom and each of the other variables if no Communist countries were included. Using the same methods of analysis that had been applied in obtaining the correlation coefficients for all 85 countries and territories, the coefficients went up as follows with all the Communist countries omitted:

Press freedom and per capita income: from .64 to .73.

Press freedom and literacy: from .51 to .76.

Press freedom and daily newspaper circulation: from .63 to .70.

The correlation not only rises substantially when the Communist countries are omitted, but the spread between the highest and lowest of the three coefficients is narrowed considerably.

The deviation shown by the Communist countries is not as difficult to explain, however, as it might at first ap-

[26] Vera Micheles Dean, *The Nature of the Non-Western World* (New York: The New American Library (Mentor Books), 1957), pp. 173-92. This book is extremely helpful to an understanding of the present situation in all the non-democratic countries.

pear. In the first place, it must be remembered that when the Communists came to power and installed their system of press controls, the adult illiteracy rate of the Russians by their own figures was between 60 and 70%,[27] and the old Russian Empire was on the verge of economic collapse. Moreover, it was the long-suppressed aspirations of the Russian people for a more democratic political system, as well as for economic improvement, that hastened the rise of the Communists to power. It was the need to appeal to these deep revolutionary forces—quite similar to the forces that much earlier had led to revolutions in France and England—that led the Communists to include in their political apparatus a number of democratic forms, including "freedom of the press," which in turn are counterweighted by totalitarian controls that enable the party to use the press as one instrument for achieving its social goals.[28] These goals include the elimination of illiteracy and the raising of living standards—the same goals which the Western world had been achieving gradually over a period of years by less authoritarian methods.

From conversations with journalists in seven Communist countries during the summer of 1959, the writer feels sure that many of these journalists are sincerely convinced that their system of controls does permit them press "freedom," although of quite a different type from freedom as the West defines it. The paradox of this situation has been explained by an American historian, who points out that "man can seem to be free in any society, no matter how authoritarian, as long as he accepts the postulates of the society." To this the Western democracies have added the important concept that "man can only be free in a society that is willing to allow its basic postulates to be questioned."[29]

So far the Communist leaders of the Soviet Union have not allowed their "basic postulates" to be questioned. But now that their country has attained a high degree of literacy and industrialization, there seems to be reason for believing that it may tend increasingly to follow the pattern shown by Lerner's historical "model of modernization," and thus to manifest more of the characteristics of a truly "participant society."

As for Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland and Hungary, they already had attained the conditions for press freedom, along with industrialization and literacy, before they fell under Communist control as a result of developments following World War II. There is impressive evidence that they would have essentially the same kind and degree of freedom today as that of the West, except for circumstances beyond their control. These circumstances can be explained only in terms of the rise of the Soviet Union to a position of great military strength.

Already there are signs of some relaxation in the extent to which the Soviet government controls the lives of its citizens, and this is spreading to the other Communist countries of Europe. The possible benefits of an extended period of peaceful coexistence with the Western democracies are implicit in Siebert's "theory of press freedom." After an exhaustive study of the development of press freedom in the West-

[27] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Education in the USSR* (Washington, 1957), p. 13.

[28] John N. Hazard, *The Soviet System of Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 1-11.

[29] John B. Wolf, "Man's Struggle for Freedom Against Authority," in *Social Science and Freedom* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1955), p. 1.

ern world, Siebert advanced as a tentative law of history that "the area of freedom contracts and the enforcement of restraints increases as the stresses on the stability of government and of the structure of society increase."[80] Obversely, as the stresses on the stability of the government and the structure of society *decrease,* the area of freedom may be expected to expand.

One of the greatest dangers in any highly centralized political system with strong press controls is that the government and ruling party can use the mass media to create whatever tensions they may regard as necessary to justify the imposition of even more rigid controls. It is no longer unusual, however, to find Communist journalists who will admit that this is one weakness of a system which they otherwise may strongly defend. In the same breath they frequently will declare that the Soviet Union today would not tolerate another dictator like Stalin. The fact that some Communists thus recognize the dangers of absolute power is one of the most hopeful signs of all.

Certainly it is in the Communist countries that still have the farthest to go along the road to literacy and high per capita income (Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania and China) that one finds the controls over the press and other institutions to be the most severe. The difference between the stern discipline of China's "great leap forward" and the more relaxed atmosphere of present-day Russia is so great, indeed, that some observers believe the Soviet Union some day may find itself closer in many respects to the United States and the democracies of Western Europe than to its great Asian ally.

BUT WHAT OF THOSE EUROPEAN AND Asian countries with a low per capita income—some also with high illiteracy —that nevertheless have made substantial progress up the ladder toward political democracy and press freedom? It is here that one finds the clue to other factors related to press freedom that deserve careful study.

Greece, of course, is "the world's oldest democracy," with a proud tradition to maintain. Despite a relatively low per capita income ($220 in 1952-54) and adult illiteracy of 25-30%, Greece probably would be classified as "F" instead of "F–" except for two factors: the measures which its government has felt necessary to take against the Communist press, and an unfortunate law which puts in the hands of the Premier the approval of bank credits to newspapers. This, in effect, puts some newspapers in actual or potential debt to the government, which could lessen their editorial freedom. So far this danger appears to have been more potential than real.[81]

In the Asian column are two countries in the $100-$299 per capita income group whose press systems have been described as among the "freest in the world." One of these is Japan, the other the Republic of the Philippines. Without lessening in any sense the credit due the Japanese and Filipino people, it can be said that the policies of the United States have been a contributory factor in the development of their free systems. Both Japan, since regaining its sovereignty in 1952, and the Philippines, since becoming fully independent in 1946, have shown their determination to maintain press freedom. The Japanese press, however, appears to

[80] In Introduction to Fredrick S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1952).

[81] This situation is described in the University of Missouri's Freedom of Information Center Publication No. 21 (December 1959), pp. 4-5. See footnote 5 above.

have the stronger foundation, because of Japan's higher literacy, high per capita income and huge newspaper circulation—the fifth largest per capita in the world. The foundation in the Philippines is potentially less stable, both because of the lower literacy rate and because newspaper ownership and circulation are so heavily concentrated in one city, Manila.

The most amazing country of all is India (F–), which has attained a fairly stable democracy and free press system despite a per capita income of less than $100 a year and an illiteracy rate of 75-80%. A long period of association with British democracy and press freedom must be given some credit here, as also in Ceylon (F–) and in the present and former British dependencies elsewhere in Asia and in Africa. But one cannot explain the phenomenon of India without considering the strong personal charisma of leaders like Gandhi and Nehru, and also the possible influence of the Hindu religion. Certainly a thorough analysis of media and political participation in present-day India would be one of the most fascinating of all studies.[32]

The other Asian country with a per capita income of less than $300 which can be definitely classified as having a free press system is tiny Lebanon (F–). Almost invariably its system is rated by those familiar with the area as "the freest press in the Middle East." This can be attributed in part to a favorable geographic situation, which has helped to give it a higher per capita income than all its neighbors except Israel. But it also is probably due to a relatively long period of development as a French protectorate, and perhaps most of all to the stabilizing influence of a Constitutional truce between the Christian and Moslem populations.

IT IS THE "I" AND "A" CLASSIFICATIONS that seem to be the least satisfactory. In Africa, for example, all the countries and territories except the Union of South Africa are in one sense "authoritarian," not because any totalitarian government has usurped the power, but simply because in many places there would be no communication system at all unless the government provided it.[33] The widespread illiteracy, the multiplicity of native languages and dialects, and the lack of adequate electric power in some regions to maintain even radio communication on any widespread basis—all these tend to keep most of the newly emerging African states in a strange mixture of free and authoritarian forms. In the larger and more prosperous cities inhabited by people of European descent will be newspapers much like those of the countries from which whites have come, and enjoying much of the same freedom; for the natives, the situation may be quite different. Even the press in the Union of South Africa, where democratic institutions have been developed to the highest level, must be classified only as "F–" because of the pressures and suspicions created by the official policy of *Apartheid*. The best that can be said for most of the newly emerging African states is that their press is in an "intermediate" state of development; "mixed" would describe the situation better as of today.

Actually, the term "authoritarian" as used by the IPI and as adopted in this

[32] Y. V. L. Rao, an experienced Indian journalist who is now a candidate for the Ph.D. in journalism at the University of Minnesota, is engaged in such a study.

[33] A provocative discussion of African communication systems will be found in *Bulletin du Centre International d'Enseignement Supérieur du Journalisme de Strasbourg* (Strasbourg, France), No. 1 (April 1959), especially pp. 20-21 and 44-45.

study for all except the Communist countries, covers too wide a range of non-democratic systems. It includes, at one extreme, the absolutist monarchy of Yemen, which has no daily newspapers at all and depends for mass communication mainly upon a government-owned weekly and radio station. But it also includes the more democratically inclined constitutional monarchies of Libya and Ethiopia; the military dictatorships of Spain, Latin America and other areas, varying widely in their objectives if not their methods; and the still different type of authoritarian rule represented by the more dynamic United Arab Republic.

This latter type of authoritarianism, as Lerner analyzes it, seems, like Communism, to represent "people in a hurry" to obtain more of the better things of life. The violent upheavals so frequent in the Middle East can be attributed, indeed, to the fact that the demands and expectations of the people, stimulated in part by the mass media, greatly exceed their socioeconomic and cultural capacity for achievement. But if they continue to improve their economic status and their capacity for genuine media and political participation, they too may eventually succeed in establishing the conditions that make true press freedom possible. As Lerner has said:

> In these large areas of the world, where the drama of modernization is now being re-enacted, governance perforce tends to be authoritarian. It is not necessarily despotic. . . . Genuine political democracy [and a free press] can operate efficiently only in a genuinely participant society. . . . The conditions for participant society do not yet exist among the impoverished, illiterate, inert peoples of the underdeveloped lands.[34]

[34] Daniel Lerner, editor, *The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences* (New York: Meridian Books, 1959), pp. 32-33.

Above all, the pattern of the different press systems as shown in the present study suggests why the hopes of those who sought to establish freedom of the press around the world through international treaties were doomed to disappointment. Those who urge more assistance to newly developing countries in raising living standards and literacy are probably much closer to the heart of the problem.

THIS IS ONLY A PRELIMINARY STUDY of a few of the variables related to national press systems. Many other elements need to be considered: geography, climate, distribution of income and population, leadership and religion, to mention only a few. It is entirely possible, for example, that certain types of religious faith may be more conducive than others to the development of the quality of empathy that is so basic to Lerner's theory. Yet even if religion can be shown to be a decisive factor, there still remains the question of "whether it is the religious theory that has influenced the collective spirit, or the collective spirit that has influenced the religious theory."[35] For countries with religions and cultures as different as those of England and Japan show certain similarities in their systems of mass communication, perhaps because of somewhat similar situations in geography and climate. The possibilities for exciting and fruitful cross-country studies based upon hypotheses like these are almost unlimited.

Of course, the possibilities have always existed. But the rich veins of unmined data are now clearly visible, and there is the light of heuristic theory to beckon the researcher on.

[35] Gieuliano Gaeta, *Si l'histoire de la presse et de la radio dans les temps anciens permet prévoir l'évolution de la presse et de la radio dans les pays neufs* (Trieste, Italy: Editeur E. Borsatti, 1959), p. 15.