

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR MASS COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

Minutes of the Meeting of the International Council

Sigtuna, Sweden

Tuesday & Wednesday 25th & 26th August 1981

1. (a) The President opened the meeting in the presence of:

B. Bhatia	O. Hulten	B. Pavlic
A. Bunzlova	F. Kempers	W. Pisarek
R. Cheesman	O. Linne	G. Robinson
J. Dajani	M. Loeffler	R. Roncagliolo
M. Djordjevic	T. Martelanc	H. Schiller
K. Eapen	W. Melody	T. Szecske
B. Golka	E. Noelle-Neumann	A. Werner
C. Hamelink	K. Nordenstreng	Y. Zassoursky

- (b) Apologies were received from:

F. Balle	A. Edelstein	R. Salinas
J. Bourquin	H. Fabris	P. Sepstrup
M. Chenoufi	F. Fleck	R. Sinha
R. Cole	H. Mowlana	Y. Uchikawa
N. de Camargo	A. Opubor	

- (c) The new members of the Council were welcomed.

- (d) Council unanimously confirmed the practice established over the years that, except in very exceptional circumstances, only the elected members of the International Council could attend meetings of the Council.

2. Agenda

The agenda was accepted, subject to the amendment that Item 13 Revision of Statutes, Organisation, Procedures, etc., should be taken immediately after Item 5.

3. Minutes of the last meeting

The previously distributed minutes of the meeting of the International Council held in Caracas, Venezuela, on the 25th August 1980, were approved and signed as a correct record of that meeting.

4. Business arising from the minutes of 25th August 1980.

- (a) It was reported that the many communications received at IAMCR headquarters indicated that the Caracas conference had been a tremendous success.
- (b) Professor Loeffler had informed the President that owing to heavy work commitments he would be unable to write the history of the association for its 25th anniversary. It was suggested that Jacques Bourquin might be asked to undertake this task.
- (c) Professors Fattorello, Nixon and Osolnik had written to the President thanking the Council and the Association for bestowing upon them the privilege of Honorary membership.

- (d) Tomo Martelanc stated that a report on a round table meeting for which he was responsible at the Caracas conference, and which had been submitted to Peggy Gray, had not been circualted with the other reports. The President undertook to enquire into this.
- (e) In commenting on his absence from the Caracas conference, Yassen Zassoursky stated that he had not been granted a visa by the Venezuelan authorities until it was too late for him to take advantage of this. Nabil Dajani also reported that he too had encountered similar difficulties on the occasion of the meeting of the International Council in Leicester in 1980. Other members, too, spoke of difficulties in this connection, and the President confirmed that a precondition of any meeting of the Association being held in any country was that that country would grant free access to all members of the Association. The Executive Board, Programme and Organizing Committees should be extremely vigilant in this connection.

5. President's Report and Financial Statement

The President reported that many new members had joined the Association over the past year and that, particularly in view of the high quality of the Caracas conference and of the increased activity of some of the larger Sections, he could still refer with confidence to the progress and development of the Association. However, the affairs of the Association were not as satisfactory as might appear at first sight. For example, with regard to membership there were many new members but many 'old' members were not particularly active, and were certainly not consistent in their payment of dues. Approximately 120 individual members and 30 institutions that appeared in the official membership list had not paid their dues for the year 1980. Moreover, members of the International Council did not always set a good example in this connection. Twenty-six members had not yet paid their dues for 1981, neither had eight of these paid in 1980, and two were three years in arrears. Two members of the Council had not even acknowledged their election to it, and only 32 out of 50 had so far provided their CV for distribution to all members of the Association, as agreed at the Caracas conference. Only five members had made any suggestions with regard to changes in Statutes, organization, structures, etc., following several requests, and although this may be seen as an indication of satisfaction with the status quo, it might also be seen as general lack of interest.

The concomitant of the above could be seen in the financial position. The last half yearly statement from the Swiss bankers of the Association indicated that in June 1981 the Association had approximately Sfr.49,000 in balance. On the surface this appeared to compare favourably with the 1980 figures (Sfr.45,000); 1978 (Sfr.43,000); 1976 (Sfr.32,000); 1974 (Sfr.17,000), but this could be misleading, and perhaps the more relevant figures were those which showed that the excess of receipts over payments in the two years from 1978-80 were Sfr.1,841, from 1976-78 Sfr.10,000 and from 1974-76 Sfr.14,000. Moreover, total receipts from membership subscriptions were lower in 1980 than in 1979; this again not unconnected with the inconsistency in payment of membership dues. Quite a number of members maintain their membership, but skip a year in the payment of dues.

The general increase in the Association's activities, programmes, etc., obviously led to increased costs and this, coupled with general inflation, meant that there was a very real danger of the Association not being able to support even its present relatively modest programme. If one took into account the cost of the "hidden support" from Peggy Gray and colleagues at the Centre for Mass Communication Research, University of Leicester, (not including overheads or the work of the President)

the estimated annual cost of the Association would be in the region of Sfr.55,000 (60% of this falling under the heading of hidden costs). In view of what was said above about irregularities of payment it is difficult to give even a reasonably precise estimate about income, but so far in 1981 (two thirds of the year) income from subscriptions was Sfr.24,000. Past experience suggests that most subscriptions are paid in the first part of the year so it is unlikely, in the absence of additional measures (see below), that the income from this source will exceed Sfr.30,000 in 1981. This, in real terms leaves a considerable deficit, and although the President assured the Council that the Leicester Centre would do its utmost to continue to serve the Association as it had done in the past, he reminded them of the increasing difficulties in this connection stemming from the current financial crisis in British universities.

Following extensive discussion it was decided to set up a sub-committee (Hamelink, Melody, Dajani, & Noelle-Neumann) to examine the financial position of the Association in the light of the above report, and then report back to the Council. Following an adjournment, the sub-committee reported back as follows:

- (i) That an ad hoc or standing finance committee, possibly the same as the committee just set up, should share with the President and the Association's officers the responsibility of improving the financial situation of the Association.
- (ii) Distinguishing between internal funding and external funding, the sub-committee made the following recommendations:

Internal funding

- (a) Members of the International Council and Executive Board who have not paid their annual dues by May in any year should receive a reminder at that time and then, if they fail to pay their dues within a two month period (i.e. the end of July) they should be suspended from the Council.
- (b) A paid-up membership list (and/or list of defaulters) should be published annually.
- (c) Members of the Association, particularly members of the Executive Board and International Council, who are institutional members should be encouraged to take out individual membership as well.
- (d) A re-admission fee should be charged for lapsed members equal to the amount not paid in the lapsed year(s).
- (e) Life membership should also be encouraged, say at ten times the cost of current annual membership.

External funding

- (a) Every effort should be made to attract new members to the Association, particularly from those countries where IAMCR was not represented.
- (b) In connection with the 25th anniversary, a special booklet or brochure should be prepared outlining the history, aims, intentions, programmes, etc., of IAMCR, and sent to an approved list of governments, institutions

(international and national), business enterprises, prominent individuals, for a once and for all contribution to a special IAMCR fund. Hopefully the income from this fund (interest) would enable IAMCR to meet its annual commitments and perhaps even support new ventures. It was suggested that the President might work with the Finance Committee to prepare such a document and plan its distribution.

- (c) The Council welcomed the recommendations from the Finance Sub-Committee and thanked the members for their positive and constructive suggestions, made in such a short time. It was agreed in principle to accept the recommendations, but the President and officers would need to consider them in the light of Statute requirements and possible cost.
- (d) It was also agreed to rigorously enforce the lapsation rule, and to provide all members of the International Council with a list of countries not represented in IAMCR so that they can take the necessary action, which would also help with regard to Status A with UNESCO. Members of the International Council should also do all in their power to obtain financial support for the Association from external sources.

6. Preparations for the 1982 Conference

The President reported to the International Council on the work of the Programme Committee, giving particular attention to the several serious problems stemming from the fact that our French colleagues had still not been able to make a firm decision about the time and place of the 1982 Conference.

The International Council (25 members were present), whilst recognizing the difficulties, expressed its grave concern at this uncertainty at such a late stage - never before had we been so far behind in our arrangements. Invitations to speakers (again an unprecedented delay), translations, applications by members for travel funds and their general arrangements would all be adversely affected. Following a lengthy discussion in which several possibilities, including emergency measures and changing the venue to another country were considered, the President was asked, as a matter of great urgency, to visit France at his earliest possible convenience and take whatever steps (including direct approach to government and UNESCO, if considered appropriate) to expedite conference planning and arrangements. Because of the urgency and the time factor, the President was empowered to take whatever decisions he considered necessary, without prior reference to the International Council or Programme Committee. This even included change of venue, which he would discuss with Cees Hamelink who had undertaken, as an emergency measure to explore the possibility of holding the conference in the Netherlands, providing he was suitably briefed before the end of September. It was generally regretted that at the insistence of the French organizers the conference would have to be held in September and not late August as was the custom.

Despite these emergency measures, however, it was emphasized that it was still the intention of the Association to ensure a successful conference in France on the occasion of its 25th anniversary, and the Council asked French colleagues, in their absence, to do their utmost to bring this about.

The International Council discussed conference matters, both generally and more specifically, with regard to the proposals for the 1982 conference. There was some discussion about the structure of the afternoon sessions on the first day, and the split into English and French language groups, as approved by the Programme Committee at its Paris meeting. Other bases for divisions, e.g. themes, sub-topics, etc., were considered more appropriate, and the members of the Programme Committee

present at the Council meeting readily recognised how their task of filling the chair and discussant slots had not been made any easier by the language division. Choice had been "artificially" restricted. The disproportionate distribution of those attending the Conference between the two language groups might also cause problems. It was appreciated, however, that it was probably too late to do anything about this (unless the Conference was held in another country, when changes could be made), but the President was asked at least to keep the matter in mind.

It was emphasized that it was important to invite all members to submit papers to Sections before the December deadline. Section heads obviously had a responsibility here.

It was suggested that there was some ambiguity in the conference theme. Was the emphasis on Communication in Democracy or on Democratization of Communication? On the whole it seemed that both aspects could be adequately covered.

After the Council meeting those members of the Programme Committee present at Sigtuna, whilst recognizing the problems, decided in principle to keep to the original plan. All other general organizational matters as decided at the Paris meeting were accepted, although some of these could only be finalized when the date and place of the Conference had been fixed. There was a general feeling in view of the increasing activity and consequent demand on the timetable by Sections that workshops, etc., should be kept to a minimum, and that wherever possible "proposers" should be encouraged to link up with Section programmes. To facilitate this the next and further Presidential letters should contain as much Section information as is available. However, where necessary provision would still be made for ad hoc groups, and there would still be the possibility of spontaneous formation of round tables, luncheon discussion groups, etc. There was a request for Spanish interpretation facilities in at least the meetings on Technology, International Communication and Political Economy. This was thought to be "even more essential than French"! But it was pointed out that the cost of additional interpretation facilities might be prohibitive for the French organizing committee.

With regard to the speakers, discussants, etc., for the main sessions on the first day of the Conference, the Programme Committee presented to the Council a provisional list which had been compiled from the many names which had been proposed in accordance with the conventional criteria of record of scholarship, relevance of research interests and publications to the Conference theme, and disciplinary and geo-political representativeness. The proposals were accepted with the comments that

- (a) there was no Asian representative, although Asia was the location of several interesting experiments in communication and democracy.
(The Programme Committee had considered this problem without being able to solve it from the names proposed).
- (b) it might be worthwhile inviting a "star speaker" to open the Conference, or to contribute to the main sessions. Dr. Soedjatmoko (Indonesia, Rector U.N. University) and Dr. Oloo Aringo (Minister of Culture in the Kenyan Government) were suggested, but the Programme Committee decided to take no action for the time being although it was recognized that special provision may have to be made for a French speaker.

7. The Role of the Programme Committee

The relationship of the Programme Committee to the International Council was discussed, both generally and specifically, with regard to the 1982 Conference - the general principles of the Committee's autonomy and responsibility being the main concern. Conventional wisdom would appear to have it that the Programme Committee, being elected by the General Assembly (on the recommendation of the

International Council) is responsible to the Assembly and reports, as a courtesy and as the situation demands, to the International Council. As Professor Loeffler reminded us, however, the Statutes state that the International Council shall "control the execution of the programmes approved by the General Assembly", and in the present circumstances surrounding the 1982 Conference, it was obviously necessary to refer to the International Council. It was accepted that in future, mainly to assist the Programme Committee in planning the next conference, conferences should be evaluated immediately after their conclusion.

8.

Revision of Statutes, Organization, Procedures, etc. re Conference Assembly and Other Matters

Despite the enthusiasm expressed on these issues at the Caracas meeting, very few members had written constructively. G. G. Robinson introduced a discussion on the above matters within the framework of a paper which she had prepared, and which had been previously circulated to members, and in relation to three or four other papers which members had also seen. The introduction was presented under the following headings:

- (a) Congress Organization.
- (b) General Assembly Procedures.
- (c) Committee Structures and Responsibilities.
- (d) Section Activities.

Following a comprehensive and intensive discussion on these and on the other points raised by the few who had written in which it was accepted that some of the points could easily be incorporated into existing procedures, that others were not particularly relevant, and that others still might require more detailed discussion, and possibly changes in Statutes, it was decided to:

- (a) Recommend certain courses of action to the Programme Committee for immediate implementation for the 1982 Conference/Assembly.
- (b) Set up a sub-committee (Werner, Martelanc, Robinson, Pisarek) to examine all the various issues involved under the general heading "Conference, Organization, Sections, Etc" and report back to the International Council at its next meeting before the Paris General Assembly.

9.

IAMCR Relations with UNESCO

In welcoming the UNESCO observer, Dr Lakshman Rao, the President informed the meeting of the long and serious illness of Wolfgang Seeger. It was unanimously agreed that a letter of sympathy should be sent to Mr Seeger, expressing hopes of his speedy recovery and return to work. The President thanked UNESCO, through Dr Rao, for continued help and cooperation, and sympathized with UNESCO because of the shortage of staff and increasing pressure of work, which sometimes made smooth liaison and cooperation somewhat difficult. The President was in frequent and regular contact with UNESCO and had visited Paris headquarters several times over the past year.

(a) Publications

Dr Rao confirmed that the long awaited Community and Communication publication was finished, but he had not yet seen a copy. It should be published in the very near future. The Foreign Images report was with the Publication Department and should be published early in 1982, and later in that year the Developmental News publication, the first draft of which had been completed by Annabelle Sreberny, would also be published. UNESCO had made a grant of US\$5,000 to support the publication of a Monograph from the Caracas conference, roughly along the same lines as earlier conference monographs, but this subsidy would not meet the full cost of printing and distribution. The Association would need to find an additional sum in the region of US\$3,000 from its own resources. This publication should be ready in March 1982.

(b) i 1982 Conference

The President reported, and Dr Rao confirmed that UNESCO hoped to be in a position to offer some support for the 1982 conference, in connection with a proposed workshop under the general heading of New Communication Technology, Democratization and Developing Countries. IAMCR had been asked by UNESCO to plan a three nation study under the same heading, and a total of US\$6,000 would probably be available for this. Obviously this would not enable any new research to be carried out, and certain reservations were expressed about the feasibility of such an underfunded exercise.

(b) ii

The President informed the meeting that there had been some communication between French colleagues on the Programme Committee and the Office of the Director-General of UNESCO with a view to UNESCO providing more direct support for the 1982 conference (use of buildings, interpreting facilities, etc were mentioned), but there was no firm information about this, either from the President or Dr Rao. The President was asked to clarify the situation as soon as possible.

(c) Research Cooperation Under Actions I and II (see last Presidential letter)

The President was negotiating with UNESCO with a view to IAMCR members carrying out work under Actions I and II. The Council supported this, but noted once more the shortage of funds. Apparently US\$7,500 would be available for Act I and US\$3,000 for Act II. The President would report back when he had further information, and if it was decided to go ahead with the cooperation there would need to be some arrangements for the selection of contributors, etc.

(d) The President reported at length on his general relationships with UNESCO, visits to headquarters, etc., paying particular attention to the February Symposium, the final report of which was still awaited. Dr Rao explained the reasons for this delay.

(e) The Council accepted the recommendation that every effort should be made to work and obtain the necessary support from the IPDC programme, and the President was instructed to make the necessary enquiries.

(f) In general, the Council welcomed the development and extension of the cooperative working relationships with UNESCO, and assured Dr Rao of IAMCR's wish to continue to contribute to UNESCO's communication research programme, hoping that there would be increased opportunity for IAMCR to be consulted even more fully and to work more closely on the programme than in the past.

(g) Other cooperative ventures with UNESCO on Media Education and Media and Ethnicity were also reported.

10. Reports from Sections

Written and/or verbal reports were received from all Sections, with the exception of the History Section. The Council agreed that all information about Section activities, both general and with regard to the 1982 conference, should be sent to Leicester before 10 December, and that all members of the Association should be informed about Section activities as soon as possible after that date.

11. Attendance at Conferences

The Council confirmed the general principle that when IAMCR was asked to send observers, etc. to regional and/or international conferences, and where (as was usually the case) travel subsidies, etc. were not available, then whenever possible the Association should be represented by someone who lived in the vicinity of the conference venue, or who might be attending the conference in another capacity. It was agreed that Roque Faraone would be asked to attend the UNESCO Symposium on Regional and International Mechanisms for the Dissemination and Exchange of Information which would be held at UNESCO headquarters from 27-30 October; that Cees Hamelink would be asked to represent the Association at the 9th Congress of IOJ which would be held in Moscow from 19-22 October; and that either he or Breda Pavlic would represent the Association at the Geneva meeting of the World Federation of United Nations Organisations on the New World Information Order, from 12-17 October.

12. Ratification of New Members

A list of 88 individual and 15 institutional members was approved.

13. Relationship with Other Organisations

(a) There was nothing special to report apart from dates of meetings. It was agreed that whenever possible members should be informed about such dates as early as possible, so that clashes could be avoided.

(b) It was agreed to send a letter of congratulations to Richard Cole on his election to President of AEJ.

(c) A new group (Union for Democratic Communication) was in the process of being formed in the USA. (Most of those associated with this Union were already individual members of IAMCR). The group had enquired about the possibility of establishing some form of relationship with IAMCR. The Council welcomed the development, and asked Herb Schiller to liaise with the group and report back to the next meeting.

14. Future Conferences

The Council accepted with thanks and appreciation the formal proposal from Alice Bunzlova that the 1984 Conference should be held in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where a new conference centre with a capacity of 2,800 had recently been opened. Dr Bunzlova described facilities and preliminary arrangements.

15. Publications

The President informed the Council that he had been approached by Sage Publications who were interested in exploring the possibility of Sage undertaking the publication of an IAMCR journal. A sub-committee (Kempers, Szecsko, Robinson) would look into the matter and report back to the next Council meeting.

16. In the absence of further business, the President closed the meeting with a formal vote of thanks to Olof Hulten and Swedish Radio for its support and hospitality.

[Handwritten signatures and initials] 6/9/82



McGill University

Graduate Program in Communications
Macdonald-Harrington Building

22 July 1981

Dear IAMCR Members:

In his November 1980 letter, President Halloran noted that the General Assembly at Caracas suggested that we examine the appropriateness of the structure, organization and procedures of the Association. He goes on to ask for comments and responses so that he can produce a Working Paper to be presented to the Executive Board and International Council at its next meeting. As you know, these bodies will be coming together August 24 to 26, 1981 in Sweden and it is therefore time to rekindle the discussion on the democratization of our organization.

Let me get the ball rolling by presenting some thoughts which have emerged from discussions with colleagues around the world and asking you to respond to Jim Halloran and to those of us who will be attending the International Council session. My comments, which I intend to present in Stockholm, can be divided into four parts: Congress Organization; General Assembly Procedures; Committee Structure and Responsibilities; and Section Operation.

Congress Organization has been a topic of discussion for a number of years as a result of the remarkable growth of our organization during the seventies. Quite a number of the Position Papers drafted two years ago for Leicester (1979) referred to the need to loosen up the Congress Organization and to provide a more flexible form for the exchange of ideas. In the spirit of these developments:

1) There is a membership movement towards further reduction in the number of formal Plenary Sessions in favor of more Section activities and small group meetings. Perhaps only the Opening and General Assembly sessions should be scheduled without interference, while beginning on the afternoon of Day 1, there could be three to four Parallel Section programs and some small group meetings. All of these would continue until the General Assembly, which usually occurs on Day 3 in the afternoon.

2) The necessity and convenience of a printed program becomes more crucial as Parallel Sessions increase and members seek to determine what attendance choice to make. Recent congresses have attracted increasing numbers of researchers from all over the world who wish to make contact with others pursuing similar research interests. In the Paris congress which will surely attract a record participation, a printed program will clearly be crucial.

3) To encourage the widest participation of members with diverse points of view, Plenaries, as well as Section programs, should be increasingly based on open paper competition. The Plenary competition might be judged by the Program Committee whereas the Sections could appoint panels of judges from its membership representing different geographical areas and points of view.

Postal address: 815 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, PQ, Canada H3A 2K6

... /2

General Assembly Procedures. Recent meetings in Warsaw and in Caracas have highlighted the need to review General Assembly Procedures. Among the suggestions made by participants in Caracas were:

- 1) The need to vote on important matters such as:
 - a) resolutions;
 - b) additions to, or dissolutions of Sections;
 - c) revisions in the fee structure;
 - d) themes for the next congress;
 - e) International Council slates, etc.

In all of the above cases, adequate information of alternative proposals and positions should be circulated to the membership before the congress so that a vote can be taken.

- 2) To be able to vote or ballot, the assembly voting procedure need to be simplified. Proposals here may be to review the differential voting structure of individuals, institutions and national councils, or to utilize cold coded ballots which permit rapid tallying.

Committee Structure and Responsibilities. Though IAMCR's committees have functioned well, the organization's increased size may require that the following issues receive attention:

- 1) Should IAMCR follow the practice of other international organizations and lighten the President's executive load by not requiring him/her to chair every standing committee. Might it be wise to have some of these committees (like the Program Committee or others) chaired by other members of the Executive?

- 2) In the interest of diversifying participation in governing bodies, a single individual should probably not hold two important offices at the same time, especially the offices of Executive Board Member and Section Head.

- 3) The procedure for preparing the International Council's Slate needs further thought in order to give the General Assembly a real choice to vote on, at least two slates need to be prepared by the Executive Committee.

Section Operation. The increased activities and effectiveness of IAMCR sections throughout the past years have added greatly to the congress program. Formal planning and inter-congress progress reports permit Section members to remain in touch in the intervening two years, to hold related sub-meetings, and to prepare for the congress.

- 1) To maintain contact with members it may be desireable to appoint Deputy Section heads for all Sections. These would not, however, sit on the International Council.

2) In order to encourage as many members as possible to participate in Section activities, there should be a pre-congress notification (six months?) of Section themes as well as a call for papers. Sections should have a balanced slate of judges to evaluate papers for the Program.

3) IAMCR needs to concern itself with the question of an optimum number of Sections in order to assess requests for the establishment of new Sections. Though organization flexibility is required to take account of new membership interests, too many different Sections lead to a fractionalized congress program. Criteria and procedures as well as notification period for the creation of new or the closing of old Sections may need re-thinking.

Many other issues can be raised when examining the appropriateness of IAMCR's structure, organization and procedures. The above list is meant to be a starting point for discussion. Please add to this list and let us know your responses and recommendations so that the proposals to the next congress have had the widest input.

Sincerely,



Gertrude Joch Robinson
Assistant Secretary General, IAMCR

GJR/cf