KG Tomaselli
A Shepperson

State of the discipline: South African Communication Studies in the 1990s.

Keyan G Tomaselli is Director and Professor at the Programme in Culture, Communication and Media Studies at the University of Natal, Durban. Arnold Shepperson is a researcher in the Programme.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article is adapted from a report prepared for the National Research Foundation's series of "State of the Discipline" reviews. The objective was to review the state of communication studies with special emphasis *on* research performance and training at higher education institutions. Given the debates which took place over the role of journalists and media in the apartheid era (see, for example, Skjerdal 1998), and some comment about the mobilization of communications theory during that period (Tomaselli and Louw 1993; Teer-Tomaselli 1993), we will outline some of the historical factors that may have impacted on th*e field* since the events of the early 1990s. Occasionally, we will use the blanket term 'JMC' to refer to the broad field of journalism, media and communication teaching and research. On other occasions we refer to 'JMC practitioners' as applying to both academics and professionals in the field. Our theoretical grounding is covered in Appendix 2 to the NRF Report (Shepperson 2001), and develops a pragmatic analysis of JMC as academic and professional institutions.

'Communication studies', for the purposes of this review, broadly includes communication and mass communication studies, intercultural communication, journalism, development communication and development support communication. Organisational communication is not included here, although many vocational study institutions offer this as 'Communications' to their students. 'Media studies' generally refers to that field of study that claims to intervene critically in media theory and practice, viewing communications textually and committing its programmes to academic instead of vocational expertise. In line with institutional developments which have evolved out of the latter, 'media theory', for the purposes of this report, refers to that trajectory of post-structuralist or neo-pragmatist media analysis taught in literature departments.

In the following section, we discuss some of the problems we encountered with method. Thereafter, we will discuss the theoretical issues that arose from the NRF brief, with a particular focus on the status of media and communication research in relation to C.S. Peirce's approach to the sciences. Next, we review some of the responses to our research; on the basis of these we will then discuss some of the recommendations we were able to produce. Our conclusion will offer some areas for discussion in relation to the possible scientific bases that distinguish the different aspects of JMC theory and practice.

2. A NOTE ON METHOD

The principal sources for this report are a series of questionnaires administered to journalism and mass communication (JMC) academics, both in South Africa and internationally, and to South African tertiary institutions. Institutions were first

approached between December 1986 and February 1988, and the results form the basis of a published analysis (Tomaselli and Louw 1993). A second, open-ended, internet survey was conducted in early 1999. Most of the replies to the latter came from overseas respondents, scholars who have worked in South Afric*a on topics relating to communic*ation studies in the country. Requested hard data on course enrolments during 1999 was not forthcoming, however.

*A*dditional information came from a third questionnaire, administered by Arnold De Beer for his paper co-written with Keyan G. Tomaselli (1999). Various drafts of the original material published on the basis of th*e* first questionnaire (Tomaselli and Louw 1993) were circulated to respondents for comment. Where possible, the reactions and comments are largely retained in this report. Further sources include *comments received on the* various drafts of De Beer and Tomaselli (2000), and comments offered in response to additional dialogue on the final NRF report.

Inevitably, this report reflects its authors' own paradigmatic emphases and academic experiences. We have tried to reflect as many positions and voices as possible, however. But the single most pressing problem with the NRF project was the general lack of response from those approached under that brief. Although we did receive some detailed and very considered responses from individual South African scholars, the overall response was not what could have been expected. Anticipating some later discussion, this response might suggest that we had overestimated the willingness of respondents to answer the internet survey of 1999. Clearly, the enormous volume of e-mail that can appear on a senior academic's screen every morning can lead to questionnaires being buried under other priorities; in his response, Graeme Addison went so far as to quip that *"blerrie vraelyste"* (bloody questionnaires) clog up the research potential of the internet. On the other hand, the response of international scholars, given their previous personal and professional commitments to South African communications studies, suggests that internet-based research can go forward in a suitable forum. We will return to the topic in our conclusion.

Given the nature of South African JMC development, Pieter Fourie's response to the original 100 page Report circulated to the JMC community offers a welcome broader perspective from South African communication scholars. Fourie, while alert to political issues, does not consider them primary:

> However, in general it [the report] runs the risk of being a one-sided perspective in which the practice of a discipline is evaluated mainly in terms of its political involvement and its contributions mainly in terms of exposing, analysing and interpreting, or not exposing, analysing and interpreting "the role of communication

in [South Africa's] oppressive past". It becomes a document about preferred paradigms and the discussion of paradigms amongst academics, or the lack thereof in South Africa, with the purpose of pointing a finger to those who have not emphasised the critical paradigms. Evaluating the practice of a discipline can and should involve more than a reflection on its political involvement, even in a politicised country such as South Africa.

We will not address this issue in the present document, because it would require more analysis than the NRF research warranted. Indeed, a 69 page Appendix that merely outlined a theory based on South African experience accompanied the Report. However, for the present purposes we will approach the findings of the report from the point of view of how the relatively short history of South African academic JMC may have affected practitioners' accessibility to the scientific potential of their field.

However, there is a very clear relationship between the three disciplines - journalism, media studies and communication studies - which we will treat as *presuppositional* in essence. There are in fact three ways in which JMC inquiry can order these presuppositional relations, but for the purposes of this report we will treat *journalism* as basic, *media* as presupposing journalism, and communication as presupposing both. This relationship is based on C.S. Peirce's (1902-1903) classification of the sciences, and simply means that *communication* presupposes a *medium*, which in turn presupposes some manner of representation. Thus communication must account both for its medium and what is represented. Media study does not assume communication, but must account for a representation. Finally, every representation *is what it is,* irrespective of the medium in which it asserts itself, or of whether communication has in fact taken place (see Shepperson 2001).

At each level there are clearly presuppositions proper to the practice and theory of journalism, media and communication, respectively. These we will discuss in the body of the report as they arise from the research. In general, however, we will treat each dimension of JMC as potentially a fully scientific area in its own right, which on the same basis as Peirce (1998: 371-397) used, presupposes an *ethic* (a theory of right action) which in turn presupposes an *aesthetic* (some theory of what is right in its own sense). As a preliminary comment on the research, it is fairly clear that the *general* relationship between journalism, media and communication has historically not received the same attention as has the *specific* relations between practice, ethic and aesthetic. We will consider this phenomenon in more detail in our conclusion.

3. FINDINGS OF REVIEW

We considered our findings from the point of view that although reality, following Peirce (for example, 1992: 83–105; 1998: 209), is "independent of what you or I think", the *institutions* of inquiry into knowledge and reality are products of their history (political and social). South Africa's JMC institutions, and their practitioners, form part of a fractured social and political past that inevitably shaped the ways these institutions and intellectuals carried on their business. In part, this is an outcome of the political control of education that characterised the apartheid and pre-apartheid governments, which is one reason why a political concern with paradigm is important.

However, we must also acknowledge that many practitioners made choices among the available options, based on a greater or lesser commitment to the practical development of new JMC professionals, or in the pursuit of their professional activities. They worked to train and educate journalists; public relations, marketing and advertising practitioners; propagandists or communications and media researchers; in the best ways possible under the circumstances. That these choices required people to work within the structures of the time must therefore be accepted as a factor, as must be the tendency for the 'public' (in terms of the available student body) to have reflected the demographics of separation and the politics of resistance and co-option that accompanied this. One point worth making about this caveat, though, comes from one of the respondents to De Beer's questionnaire, Alex Holt, who noted that

> One must be careful that "legacy of apartheid" thinking does not get in the way of objective assessment, creative utilisation of our many experiences and resources, and movement forward rather than regression. In fact, course content and research topics at some of the best JMC schools in South Africa was *(sic)* calculated to destroy apartheid: does this also amount to a "legacy of apartheid" in some way? Diversity of approaches amongst different JMC schools in South Africa should not be seen as a problem but rather as a very valuable resource that is likely to enrich and stimulate the field; uniformity leads to stagnation and contraction. What is needed is greater team spirit and altruism for the sake of developing excellence in the field.

In general, then, it is to be expected that in the short period since 1994 many practitioners' responses to our research would have been based on their experience within their institutions, and upon the experiences of the institutions themselves.

Universities and technikons had to operate within the shifting statutory frameworks of the period, and have had to respond not only to any major demographic changes but also to the changes in the statutory environment. The new statutes place less of a

burden on institutions that previously sought to resist the oppression of apartheid, but place on them a shift (in teaching and research programmes) from resistance to critique that demands different relationships between them, the state, and their constituency (students, industry, and the broader social realm).

Historically, it is also the case that some JMC departments or schools were perceived – justly or unjustly – as supportive of the apartheid *status quo*. It arguable whether or not such institutions actually had policies that explicitly stated that there work was to be of this nature. What was clear to many, however, was that curricula and research appeared not to take sufficient account of the social and political environment within which students and teachers interacted, and into which graduates entered the journalism and media professions. Whatever the actual situation, such institutions and practitioners have equally had to accommodate shifts to a different set of student, state and constituency relationships.

In finding that the responses to our various inquiries demonstrated a *lack of objective historical perspective,* therefore, the qualifier 'objective' in this sense does not mean 'measurable' or 'materially effective' in the sense that is traditionally used in the social sciences. Rather, we use it in the sense of 'logically qualified' so as to take account of one's participation in, or close proximity to, events that are (or may be seen as) historically important. All this means, in effect, is that responses to requests for self-evaluation require reflection on one's own conduct within and/or relationships towards the events or processes that have been carrying on around one's life. The reality of one's relation to the historical environment, in other words, has facets, and it usually takes more than our own lifetimes to find, explore and describe all these facets. This we also consider from the point of view of JMC as a *field of inquiry*, in which there can be found a historical community of those whose findings form the basis of present teaching and inquiry. The present generation of South African JMC academics and professionals, therefore, occupy a pragmatic space in the transition between their historical forebears and an indefinite future community of related practitioners. What makes this relationship into a community is that for its members, JMC constitutes the "total principal industry of a social group, whose whole lives, or many years of them, are consecrated to inquiries to which they are so devoted as to be drawn to every person who is pursuing similar inquiries, and these inquiries conducted according to the best methods so far found out" (Peirce, MS 655: 16).

Unfortunately, the various JMC institutions' lack of response to requests for curriculum materials and publications meant that evaluation must largely rest on the impressions obtained from the responses to the questionnaires. Seen in this light, the responses showed different levels of objectivity concerning respondents' conceptions of the state

of the discipline. Indeed, in the next section we discuss the problem of just how little consensus there was on just what constitutes the discipline. For the present, it is clear that South African practitioners who did return the questionnaires frequently had very different ways of understanding their profession, compared with their foreign counterparts.

From Leicester University in the United Kingdom, for example, Chris Paterson commented that to the outside observer of the South African JMC environment, the field appears somewhat closed in upon itself:

> … the effort and resources dedicated to publication and research across SA communications programs is admirable and results in good international visibility (perhaps a necessary consequence of sanctions era isolation), but seems extreme to the outsider, who must suspect a consequent lack of resources going to basic JMC education at the graduate and post graduate levels.

It would thus appear that the discussions we present to the outside world could be a reflection of the self-ascribed 'insider conflicts' that marked the last decades of apartheid intellectual politics, in the sense that there is something *uniquely South African* about the problems and their solutions. As Australian academic Frank Morgan noted in his comment, "the real need is for new and relevant foci, rather than orthodox uniformity." This is echoed off a different issue in Mark Deuze's comment from The Netherlands: "another focus in research I am missing in SA is cross-national comparison; esp. relevant since the issue of 'multiculturalism' or 'polyethnicity' is so relevant for Europe these days, international comparative JMC research is called for and SA can play a leading role therein."

Deuze highlights the lack of any equivalent by South African scholars of the kind of work done by Americans like Louise Bourgault (1995) and James Zaffiro (1991, 1998), for example, or Africans like Francis Nyamnjoh (1999), that brings South African JMC into a comparative perspective with the JMC of its neighbours in southern, central and eastern Africa. There clearly is no reason to conceptually isolate South African media and journalism from that of the rest of Africa, as if the former operates in a different category of JMC compared with the latter. It seems more likely that JMC experiences and developments in other countries undergoing crises of democracy could draw on the South African experience.

Responses by South Africans appear to minimize the actual consequences of four decades of increasingly ineffective education on the majority of prospective JMC students and trainees. Although many JMC intellectuals and academics take some cognizance of the

'dumbing down' inherent in the apartheid state's educational policy and provision for black people generally, they frequently avoid confronting the more recent negative after-effects of the 'no education before liberation' resistance strategy in the 1970s and 1980s. The former, as a state policy, tended to affect an older generation than that which the latter has formed.

The first generation of black school-leavers which entered the JMC education system around 1994 as the previous admission policies were dropped, would appear to have had a far more ideological intellectual approach to their prospective profession than their trainers. They had frequently spent years, even decades, in resistance media and communication, many having entered the field because of the training offered by NGOs like the Film and Allied Workers Organization (FAWO, now the Open Window Network) and the Durban Media Trainers Group. These organizations' approaches were strongly influenced by the work of theorists of the South American media 'underground' like Paolo Freire and Armand and Michele Mattelart. With the effective demise of the NGO education sector as a result of the new state's post-1994 political economy, the old divide between 'mainstream' and 'resistance' JMC would seem to have all but dissolved.

Under these circumstances, one would therefore have to accept Pedro Diederichs's questionnaire response that the basis of JMC teaching remains rooted in libertarian concepts like "freedom of speech, news reporting, language ability, fairness, frame of reference, an open mind and general education." But Diederichs does go further to raise a very live issue in the global JMC when he further accepts that South African academics and practitioners must – and have begun to – accommodate the need for "news angles with cultural differences." But the bulk of the newer generation of JMC students tend to view their prospective qualification from a considerably less ideologically-driven viewpoint than did their predecessors immediately following the end of apartheid. Diederichs's comments may sound almost anodyne in relation to some of the media issues raised by political actors (see contributions to Makgoba 1999), but they do reflect awareness of the reality of the new student generation. To some extent, then, it might be considered arguable that too concentrated a focus on cultural transformation of the media sector fails to engage student needs: critical media studies could therefore find that analysis and theory learned in opposing apartheid is not relevant as a critical context for a new kind of JMC student or industry.

These specific JMC problems have arisen alongside, and possibly as a result of, the broader shifts in tertiary education. These kinds of developments include, for example, the flight of students from the historically black universities (HBUs), and the state's steady rationalisation (which for Historically White Universities is usually tantamount to a reduction) of the subsidy system. This change in the 'intellectual demographics'

of the tertiary student population does not always get the recognition it deserves. What help does it offer properly qualified black students from poorly developed rural areas that have never had movie houses, when they must analyse movies made for American and European audiences for whom a visit to the cinema theatre is an option among many other possible entertainment options? In many cases, this would seem to be the outcome of a sort of 'bandwagon effect' engendered by the fluidity of the information technology field. Some literary scholars, taking the work of new technology theorists (e.g. Castells 1996) as a message that *literature* is undergoing a paradigm shift, see 'media' as a way to accommodate these supposed changes. To meet the demands of the 'new technology,' therefore they offer "flashy-sounding 'Journalism and Communication' modules to attract fee-paying students, without sufficient consideration of the potential oversupply of undertrained graduates and the effect this will have on both news output and professional remuneration" (Shepperson, response to internet questionnaire).

4. A CONTEXTUALIZING DEBATE: KEITH WINDSCHUTTLE VERSUS MEDIA THEORY

These developments do have an influence on the ways that JMC educators view their subject-matter. Journalism teachers and professionals may take it somewhat amiss when media studies academics or researchers present critical appraisals of their work; by the same token, the media studies sector may equally be taken aback when communications academics or researchers call critical methodology into account. Although the NRF report dealt with South African JMC education and training, a notable recent example of this kind of situation was the exchange in *Ecquid Novi* between Australian historian and media commentator Keith Windschuttle (1998; 1999) and several South African interlocutors (Tomaselli and Shepperson 1998; Shepperson and Tomaselli 1999; Strelitz and Steenveld 1998). Although this exchange took account mainly of South African trends, using these both to concur with and object to Windschuttle's arguments, the topic itself and the attendant controversy has a longer provenance. Indeed, the polemic took on quite an edge in Australia, leading to media studies-based reviews of the affair that attempt largely to reduce Windschuttle's criticisms to examples of the very writing they criticise (Hodge 2000).

Effectively, the debate that Windschuttle brought to *Ecquid Novi* begins with two strands in the Australian intellectual fabric: the influence of philosopher David Stove, and the reaction to the so-called Sokal Hoax. Stove was a somewhat iconoclastic analyst of the philosophy of science, who took a highly polemical stance against what he saw as the "irrationalism" in Humanities Faculties. Windschuttle has nailed his colours to the mast of Stove's campaign, to the point of setting himself up as a radical 'dissenter' against historians' accounts of Aboriginal marginalization and oppression (see Kimball 1997). The Sokal affair (which has more direct relevance for the present research)

occurred when physicist Alan Sokal (1996a) had an article, purporting to provide evidence from the physical sciences for radical postmodernist cultural relativism, published in the journal *Social Text*. Directly after the release of the issue in which the article appeared, Sokal (1996b) published a detailed rebuttal of his own article in the journal *Lingua Franca* in which he "revealed" the incapacity of media and cultural studies intellectuals to dissociate their internal debates from the wider issues of scientific communication.

Sokal's first article was a parody of one kind of trendy leftist discourse, predominant in the US and with adherents in other countries. Sokal's claimed (1996b) objective was to demonstrate that the attempt to develop a radical social critique from the sociology of knowledge and certain approaches in the philosophy of science, is to privilege a kind of irrationalism that actually does no good for the progressive democratic project. For the purposes of the present article, we have gone into some detail on this matter in order to clarify some of the issues that arise from the responses to our inquiry. Principally, as we have already noted, there are differences between the conceptions of journalism, media and communication that do not always get the respect they deserve; and, secondarily, the heat generated by the exchanges between Windschuttle and his critics has to some extent masked the broader need to locate *critical* JMC inquiry objectively within the field.

In many responses to different questionnaires, there is evidence that some practitioners are aware of the need to distinguish the parts of the sector, while others approach the sector as unitary but suffering from being divided. Eve Bertelsen noted in later correspondence that academic JMC had become too focussed on short-term results, to the detriment of the longer-term issues that a critical dimension brings:

> A case needs to be made for media studies being a developed and constituted field of academic study with a considerable literature and established (if contested) ways of doing things. The general attitude tends to be rather laissez-faire, with curricula made up of whatever modules already happen to be institutionally available. While this may answer the need to redirect staff into an area which promises growing student numbers, one has to ask what sort of training this will issue in. If 'media studies' is understood as the academic scrutiny of media culture, institutions and products, and 'journalism' as hands-on vocational training, then it is crucial to identify the core curriculum needs in each of these areas and develop them in a systematic and cumulative way to ensure optimal cross-reinforcement throughout the degree.

In general, South African JMC historically had a relatively low profile at institutions like Wits and Natal, unlike at Rhodes, Potchefstroom, RAU, UNISA and elsewhere, where communication and journalism studies have become well established, incorporating professional, academic and critical elements more or less equally. Where the latter institutions had independent departments teaching JMC, much as do the various technikons around South Africa, media studies at Wits had long been a sub-division in the Drama Department and had not incorporated journalism as a component.

In the technikons, journalism and media are generally taught as professional or vocational courses. As Diederichs points out, research or theory is aimed at bolstering this approach. However, Graeme Addison noted in response to the internet questionnaire that in non-academic JMC bodies like the Institute for Advanced Journalism (IAJ) and Independent Media Development Trust (IMDT),

> … most of the important work is not classical research or academic theory at all. It is in-service training for government departments, unions, corporates and NGOs – call it RDP stuff, to help newcomers to mass communication understand their role. Many come from backgrounds in politics, NGO work, and trade unionism.

The reality of JMC thus involves more than either journalism or media, or journalism or communication, or media or communication, but elements of all three fall under the rubric of one leading requirement. In their responses to the same question, some academics were aware of the need to maintain some element of pluralism in the JMC field, but most, like Johannes Froneman, did not care to elaborate further: "… we should stop trying to force all aspects of the field into a unified discipline". Others, as noted earlier of Alex Holt, did offer some elaboration as noted above in the discussion on method. Yet again, Izak Minnaar of Potchefstroom took the approach that to speak of "Journalism, Media and Communication" as a whole was something of an anachronism:

> Isn't "mass communication" as part of the description of the study field a bit old hat for the reality of communication options in the information age? The very fact that the study field is still called "jmc" indicates to me that it has lost (some?) relevance for the practitioners who are struggling to adapt their old mass communication habits to fit the technology that makes communication possible with both "audiences of one" and defined groups – based on the ability of members of these audiences to select content and interact in a structured way with the content providers.

Minnaar's comment arguably reflects a general shift in communications studies away from a trend of subsuming all Humanities and Social Sciences inquiry philosophically under a single "megadiscipline" (Maras 1998). This was a trend, drawing on the teachings

of logical positivism, the early Frankfurt School's critical philosophy, and Deweyan communications studies of the 1940s and 1950s (Hardt 1993), that has thankfully subsided (if only to become the fashion in cultural studies).

5.   CATEGORICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF JOURNALISM, MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION

One way to clear up the discipline's subject-matter is to consider the relation between 'media' and their 'messages' as a function of the possibilities on offer in a given infrastructural, regulatory, and pragmatic environment. At the infrastructural level, the very concept of a 'medium' entails some kind of material means that is placed *between* two parts of a communication process. These can range from the railways and industrial canals of nineteenth century England, to the airlines, freeways, and cable or wireless transmission spectra of the twenty-first century global community. Thus a newspaper must not only have the means for its printing in order to exist; it must also have the means to distribute its products to every potential reader. Is it thus unexpected that the names of many early newspapers incorporated railway-schedule standards into their names? One finds many English-language papers using *Post*, *Mail*, and *Express* as names, reflecting the scheduling of the rail services originally used to get them from point A to point B. The point is that what a newspaper prints is not itself *media*, but a form of *representation* proper to the production and distribution schedules of mass-produced reading material (see Williams 1965).

The newspaper as we know it was rather limited in its circulation by the lack of what can best be thought of as *mass courier services*. Raymond Williams (1965: 182-3) notes that early in the nineteenth century a paper like *The Times* had a circulation of about three thousand, mostly confined to the immediate area around London. With the establishment of the steam railway with its scheduled services and mass-transportation capacity, and the insight that compact steam engines could drive printing presses (Williams 1965: 187; 197-200), the more or less individualistic production capacity of the essayist, pamphleteer and diarist soon fell behind the capacity of railway mail and express schedules to distribute it. Journalism as we understand the activity here, therefore, covers that specific class of writing that is fit for such methods of distribution that enables reports to be generated in a form and at a rate suitable for distribution *en masse* on a frequent, regular, and routine basis. Already this suggests a presuppositional relation, in that for modern journalism to have originated historically, there had to be some infrastructural basis for news and advertising.

Now all this may make some sense historically, but one will rightly want to see evidence that this relationship has an impact theoretically. To come back in more detail to our

reading of Peirce, we must turn to his conception of a presuppositional classification of the sciences. This is a concept to which Peirce returned with some frequency toward the end of his career, although he begins to consider the relation between different sciences as early as 1866 (MS 357). From about 1890, however, he returned to this topic frequently to make the case for philosophy and logic as sciences in their own right (a position he had obviously absorbed from his early reading of Immanuel Kant, at age 16). It must be stressed that for all that Peirce insisted on the scientific nature of philosophy as research-based or inquiry-driven forms of conduct, he does not conform to the later conception of the *Positivist* philosopher associated with the Vienna Circle and its inheritors.

As far as the present article is concerned, there is no material in Peirce's manuscripts that would in fact provide original source material. As Robin (1967) has pointed out, Peirce's classificatory schema for the sciences made provision for the "ethnology of social development." However, none of the manuscripts deals with this topic in any manner as far as can be seen to date. We have thus taken something of a leap of faith in our State of the Discipline Report, and proceeded on the basis that it is possible to elaborate a validly pragmatic and semeiotic ethnology of social forms based on Peirce's methodology and logic (Shepperson 2001). Briefly, Peirce considered the sciences broadly in line with Auguste Comte's positivism, but did not follow the latter's tendency to exclude topics (for example, theology) from the ambit of inquiry. Like Comte, Peirce classified sciences in a presuppositional order, such that more recondite fields of inquiry like mathematics, say, provided the principles for the less elaborate topics, while the latter provided the instances or exemplars for the former (Peirce 1998: 35, 458).

What this ordering of the sciences suggests for Peirce is that there is an order of discovery and an order of learning. The order of discovery proceeds from the descriptive to the general, and the order of learning is pursued from the general to the descriptive (Peirce, MS 655: 19f). If we tabulate the order of the sciences, then, the general classification will be as shown in Table 1 (adapted from Peirce, MS L75). Reading the table from left to right, the different braches of science (mathematics, philosophy, special sciences) proceed from the most general to the more particular, while under the special sciences each sub-branch proceeds from the general through the classificatory to the descriptive. From the top down, the higher the level in the table a sub-branch is located, the more general will be the level of law, classification or description of the field of inquiry. For example, under the physical sciences, Optics and Electrics depend on the different forms of elasticity and energy transfer classed under Elaterics and Thermiotics, which in turn draw their principles from dynamics in general. It is of more than passing interest that Peirce places Mathematics at the very beginning of the classification of the sciences, and this is largely the result of his understanding that

> … all mathematical reasoning is diagrammatic and that all necessary reasoning is mathematical reasoning, no matter how simple it may be. By diagrammatic reasoning, I mean reasoning which constructs a diagram according to a precept expressed in general terms, performs experiments upon this diagram, notes their results, assures itself that similar experiments performed upon any diagram constructed according to the same precept would have the same results, and expresses this in general terms. This was a discovery of no little importance, showing, as it does, that all knowledge without exception comes from observation (Peirce, MS L75, Memoir 4, Draft C).

It is also worth noting, in addition to this stress on observation, that Peirce also considers mathematical reasoning as the basis of all *abstraction*. In effect, he suggests that even at the most metaphysical or hermeneutic of levels of science, the manner of thought must derive from the capacity for abstraction – and generalization – that is inherent in the shift from everyday thinking to mathematical thinking (cf. Peirce 5.234-236). Thus a text-based critique of philosophy would never the less need to demonstrate a disciplined habit of abstraction and generalization from the given in order to derive the most bang for the critical buck. This habit of abstraction, however, begets its discipline from the mathematical ability to draw diagrammatic models of the conceptual, logical, logical and narrative relationships of the subject-matter, and to express these in general terms.

Table 1. CS. Peirce's Classification of the Sciences (adapted from the 1902 Carnegie Institution Application, MS L75)

Theoretical Science								
Sciences of Research								
Mathematics	Philosophy		Special Sciences					
	Phenomenology		Psychical (Human and Social) Sciences			Physical Sciences		
	Normative Sciences	Aesthetics	*General*	*Classificatory*	*Descriptive*	*General*	*Classificatory*	*Descriptive*
		Ethics	General or nomological psychology	Linguistics	Biography	Dynamics	Crystallography	Astronomy
		Logic		Critics (critique)	History	Elaterics and Thermiotics	Chemistry	Geology
	Metaphysics			Ethnology	Archaeology	Optics and Electrics	Biology	
Sciences of Review, or Synthetic Philosophy (Humboldt's *Cosmos*; Comte's *Philosophie Positive*)								
PRACTICAL SCIENCES, or ARTS								

For the present article, we once again stress that Peirce provided no detailed classification of the social sciences as we know them. It is clear enough that many of the Psychical Sciences like Linguistics, Ethnology, History, Biography, and so on, are the subject-matter of academic departments in most modern University Faculties of Humanities or Social Sciences. But the is no suggestion that the various branches of Sociology, Communications Studies, Media studies, and so on, would readily fall into place in this schema. The Appendix prepared for the NRF State of the Discipline Report followed Peirce's (MS 655) description of discovery, to offer first a descriptive account of JMC, then an attempt at a classificatory listing of JMC, and finally proposing a general analysis of the institutional social realm of which JMC must be a part (Shepperson 2001). Thus the way we considered the responses to our various inquiries has built on the conclusion that Journalism is the practical embodiment of a form of descriptive inquiry in the social realm. Our conception of Media inquiry therefore draws on instances and examples of journalism to offer a form of Classificatory inquiry; and finally we treat the field of Communications as a general or nomological science in the spirit of Peirce's classification.

In brief, the solution was not to treat JMC as warranting a separate classification of sciences. Instead, the strengths and problems of South African JMC has prompted something of a rethink about how a classification of the social sciences might look through the lens of Peirce's post-Comtean system. The original classification of 'Psychognosy' or the 'Psychic Sciences' tends to lean more towards the Humanities than towards what might be seen as disciplines in the contemporary Social Sciences. However, if History, Biology, and Archaeology are the descriptive level of the psychological sciences, one might begin to look at where a possible classification of the social sciences might serve to locate JMC more accurately as a professional and academic endeavour. This would, if one sticks to a Peircean approach, considering what would constitute the JMC component of, respectively, General Sociology, Classificational Sociology, and Descriptive Sociology. We would propose, therefore, that something like the general layout of Table 2 may be the starting point for clarifying the academic and professional status of JMC:

Social Sciences (Sociognosy?)		
General	Classificatory	Descriptive
General ethnology of Social Development (Robin, 1967). Will include the theoretical place of communication as basis for JMC.	Quantitative Sociology	Qualitative Sociology
	Demographics	Political Economy
	Social Anthropology	Economic History

Table 2. Suggested order of the Social Sciences, derived from Peirce's principle of presuppositional ranking of the sciences. Media Studies would generally draw on the shift from the classificatory aspect of social anthropology to the descriptive methods of Qualitative Sociology, thus accounting for the dual statistical and critical trajectories that media studies can take.

Thus, in considering the responses to our research, some of the responses would confirm the placing of journalism among the practical sciences, with others suggesting that the profession be viewed as a descriptive science. Media studies, on the other hand, could fall into either of the descriptive or classificational categories depending on whether the form of inquiry entails qualitative or quantitative methods, respectively. We would suggest that further inquiry will indicate that communications is likely to fall into the orbit of General Sociology, given that Peirce ultimately came to see logic as a form of controlled communication without which the special and practical sciences could never improve.

6.   CONSIDERING THE RESPONSE

The overall impression we thereby obtained from the NRF project was that South African JMC is strong at the descriptive level, with a broad-based journalism training sector somewhat lacking in engagement at some levels, but on others being highly effective. In considering JMC at the classificatory level, however, we encountered some difficulty. Clearly, from the remarks of the respondents, JMC practitioners in South Africa do not always have a clear conception of what the subject-matter of their inquiry or teaching is. This is not to say that practitioners don't know what they're doing; instead, it is to suggest that on the whole we are not sure whether the subjects we teach or the topics we research belong in the practical, professional, academic, or critical realms of action.

Even at the level of day-to-day reporting, journalists are often at a disadvantage if they find themselves having to report on topics that require writing about special knowledge because the media writing for such topics is not seen as a news management problem as well as a news writing problem. In a recent Ministry of Health research project, it was noted that although the newspaper press coverage of HIV/AIDS in South Africa was relatively comprehensive given the number of newspaper titles in circulation, there was little evidence that papers had taken on specialist writers and sub-editors to handle to subject. Most large metropolitan titles had staff health reporters, but a majority of stories were sourced either from wire services or from statements by government, industry, or public-relations sources (Shepperson 2000: 12). Given the projected persistence of the AIDS epidemic, for example, it would make sense if both academic JMC and the media industry approached reporting on it by establishing specialist in-service HIV/AIDS reporting courses, on the one hand, and setting up specialist AIDS desks in the newsrooms, on the other. After all, most titles can find sufficient advertising income to run full-time motoring supplements; there seems no compelling reason to deny that the same approach would not work when adopted for a full-time AIDS desk (Shepperson 2000: 15-16).

The issue at hand is that to classify the HIV/AIDS issue as a health reporting topic is to privilege a certain approach to the epidemic, thereby either subsuming all other approaches under the one rubric, or marginalizing others. This is not necessarily a fault, given that a smaller independent title like the *Natal Witness* does not command the resources of titles within the Times Media or Independent Newspapers groups. On the other hand, even where specialist news services like Health-E, SAfAIDS, and AEGIS can supply topic-specific material it never the less makes news more compelling if local stories about local people are provided by local reporters in addition to the wire material. We want to suggest, given the basis of our analysis, that the present media environment is an accurate reflection of the education and training environment from which practitioners come. Because practitioners in the latter context are in general unsure of the intended goals of their work, graduates enter the former and in time organize their work on the basis of their training; in time, practice in the industrial side of JMC begins to conform with the norms (or the normative confusions) absorbed from the training environment. To make sense of this, then, requires that we glance at how efficacy in a practical business like reporting or distribution, for example, depends on clear categories absorbed in training.

On the other hand, it does not follow from this that simply getting clarity in the JMC education sector will have any immediate comparable effects on the JMC industrial sector, or on the practices of professionals in the broader sector. In the long run, however, there are some aspects of present-day JMC that the profession and the academy

may be able to address in ways that do not end up imposing a one-size-fits-all model of journalism, or media study, or communication research on the region. The first has to do with clarity on what are the *research topics* of the different aspects of broader JMC. We have already noted how language and literature departments are appropriating aspects of JMC as a means of marketing Humanities faculties. This has not occurred out of the blue, however. Experience with reviewing Ph.D proposals for the former Centre for Science Development (CSD) shows that with some exceptions, the quality of research proposals received during the late 1990s are indicative of a far more serious state of affairs than the problems being faced because of opportunistic appropriation by other disciplines (see Tomaselli 2000). A perusal of proposals suggests that 'media studies' and 'media theory' proposals are considered by a wide range of multi-disciplinary Advisory Committees. Conventional 'communication studies' proposals, on the other hand, were usually forwarded to the Committee on Psychology and Communication. Of the proposals received there, psychology proposals by far outstripped those from communication.

While this suggests that the JMC community at large receives unequal consideration at the level of research evaluation, some responses to the questionnaire lead us to the conclusion that the situation is somewhat more threatening. Mary Papayya of East Coast Radio, in her comments on one of the questions in Q3, remarked that "… fly by nite journalism institutes are degrading the fabric of our field and must be eradicated quickly. There should be more control and criteria about who is qualified to teach journalism and whom not." The establishment of these commercial institutions is greatly facilitated if the formal education and training sector is itself fragmented and uncertain of its conceptual and professional foundations.

The rise of the fly-by-night journalism and media institutions mirrors the broader situation in the universities and technikons. Drawing on glamorous television soap-opera images of sexy young television crews solving the world's problems in sixty minutes, such schools are hardly distinguishable from the university Faculty Dean who approves the setting up of a "sexy" (Teer-Tomaselli Q3) marketable media and/or communication major on the grounds that 'anybody can take on this sort of stuff.' The commercial operators make their profits and run, at worst; in the academy the new courses draw in students and consequently fill out the department's or faculty's FTE quota. Aside from the influence of dot.com economics in the post-Thatcher era (see Tomaselli 2000: 87-88), we suggest that this situation is also a long-term consequence of the lack of defined JMC research review procedures or bodies within national research bodies like the CSD, and latterly the NRF.

While we therefore do not support the notion that JMC is a professional field that is subject, like medicine, to national professional control, it is clear that there is insufficient clarity within the field generally – including within the corporate media sector – about what criteria should govern JMC. As Papayya comments further:

> Based on the tons of applications I have received in KZN the major problem is the inability of radio journalists to write for the medium. All too often graduates are unable to write entry level English, can't communicate properly or haven't a clue about what makes news and what doesn't. Perhaps the curriculum/teaching matter, at local institutions need to be looked at. Also to take it further and offer those who correspond in a different mother tongue the ability to be taught in that language.

Even among those who do not find language a problem, entrants to the field are not, as Graeme Addison comments, always 'hungry' enough to knuckle down to the rigours of professional training:

> I took two photojournalism students with me on an adventure assignment. They couldn't get up before the sun, they did not prepare properly by studying magazines containing adventure pictures, so the results were disappointing … The point is that students like these are funded as of old by relatively wealthy parents and they simply don't have to prove themselves. In time to come they may have to but I reckon the jobs will be there for them because they come from traditional white liberal backgrounds, and what editor would question that?

Leaving aside the question of JMC entrants' family origins, and any ideology associated therewith, Addison's point is clear: students frequently appear not to appreciate that their chosen field requires application and skills acquisition, which call for more than just approaching their profession as another process of passing examinations.

The point is, quite simply, that in the period following 1994 the JMC education sector has yet to resolve formally some of the tensions that actually sustained it during apartheid but which no longer have quite the same level of relevance beyond apartheid. Before the political resolutions of 1994, media studies did produce work that drew attention to the pitfalls of treating the apartheid JMC environment as the South African norm. The Anthropos *Studies in the South African Media* series was especially noted for this among foreign scholars. Thus Danish media activist Signe Byrge Soerensen noted that the

> The type of analysis contained in the books and in the articles coming out of the CCMS was a result of a mixture of the various traditions within cultural studies (historical materialism, hermeneutics, critical theory, semiotics and some post-

Marxist theory). The early ones were more Althusserian than the later ones, which remained Neo-Marxist in spirit, but toned down the rhetoric a lot and emphasised the documentation of events, actors and positions and the development of policy alternatives rather than the structuralist analysis. All the titles were very well researched empirically. They built on semi-structured qualitative interviews and document studies (see also Soerensen 1998) (Q2).

Although there were sometimes, even frequently, polemical underpinnings to this kind of research (eg Tomaselli, Williams, Steenveld, and Tomaselli, 1986; Tomaselli, Tomaselli, and Muller, 1987), these remarks support findings that journalism training during the 1970s and 1980s did not produce graduates who were uniformly critical or objective about their craft. The corporate sector of that period did not need to rock the boat too severely, and the saga of newspapers like the *Rand Daily Mail* and *Sunday Express* tends to support this. Even in the period after 1994, too radical a media organ can find itself out of business as did the *New Nation* (Switzer and Adhikari 2000).

The overarching problem is that the university system has, as Bertelsen and Morgan point out, appropriated Media, Communications, and Journalism as topics that fall under an essentially Humanities and Arts rubric. The placing of new JMC-Major courses in departments of English or in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities follows a global trend in treating communication-related teaching as literary-interpretive in nature. Yet media and journalism practices require technical and research expertise based in disciplines like ethnography, sociology, economics, information technology and engineering, politics and public ethics, specializations notably lacking in the comparative literature specialists who get to teach JMC in the new courses. The question of teaching staff expertise becomes even more pointed when related to the preparation of practitioners capable of writing and communicating on the increasingly important ecological and environmental field appear to be in short supply (O'Donaghue, response to Q2).

All the foregoing gives some weight to the issues that Windschuttle (1998a; 1998b; 1999) raises in connection with the turn to Media Theory in Australian JMC education. Clearly, many practitioners, both professional and academic, are concerned with the possibility that some of the trends in JMC education will lead to South Africa's media industries not transforming in line with the expectations generated by developments since 1994. Some are concerned that developments are stifling debate, or placing new limits on expression in ways that duplicate the past. Others seem to be of the opinion that changes have already occurred which have adversely affected JMC in the broad sense. Still others look forward to dynamic and positive changes based on developments in the social, constitutional and political arenas.

However, the variety and scope of these different expectations are indicative not of *disunity* in the field, but of the variety and scope of the disciplinary and professional sectors that actually make up the edifice of JMC in general. There was, for example, a noticeable focus on SAQA issues that indicates that some respondents are, in effect, more focussed on "defending their turf" against non-academic or perceived unprofessional interference from statutory institutions, at the expense of taking this intervention as an opportunity for reviewing and building on global best-practice. If the elements or categories that make up JMC are viewed as continuous with each other and not as discrete "properties" to be defended against intruders, things can be handled differently.

The problem is therefore not how to define JMC, but how, now that practitioners no longer need to wear their ideological hearts on their sleeves, to bring South African JMC into world developments from which it had until relatively recently been excluded. As the range of responses to the South African Human Rights Commission's Inquiry into Racism in the South African Media demonstrated, there is much that members of the JMC professions – those who teach, practice, and carry out research – have yet to accommodate in getting to this state. In the following recommendations, we are not attempting to achieve the full integration of South African JMC into the global structure. Instead, we hope to offer some ways that its practitioners can draw on what is available to organize themselves to be able to accomplish that for themselves.

7. CONCLUSION

The issues that were raised in the responses to the questionnaires are indeed important to South African JMC, but never the less must be seen in the broader context of the sector as a global as well as national professional, intellectual and academic field. This means that South African JMC practitioners need to acknowledge that their disciplines are part of, and subject to the stresses being suffered by, a global and technically very rapidly expanding activity. Firstly, South African JMC practitioners need to strengthen the fora within which the discipline "speaks to itself" (Fourie 1997). This could entail an existing structure like SACOMM,, redefining itself around a non-divisive conception of how media, journalism and communication are continuous with each other instead of being mutually exclusive. Otherwise, practitioners in the field could begin a new forum that recognizes the autonomy of journalism, media and communication in the form of constituent sub-sections of a new JMC professional organization.

Whatever the form this new organization eventually takes, it should *not* be constituted in a way that excludes already existing bodies like SANEF, media workers' unions, and other such bodies. The most important thing is for JMC practitioners to speak to each

other directly in some recognized space of discussion and inquiry, and not (as Graeme Addison put it in response to Q3) via *"blerrie vraelyste"* (bloody questionnaires). South African JMC needs, therefore, to take a cue from the disciplines it represents: organisational communication, marketing and advertising, communication, and media and journalism management. The domination of the organisation by academic Heads of Department, as has been the case with SACOMM, needs to be tempered by a more horizontal structure where office bearers see a professional benefit in holding office (tenure, promotion, community service etc.) Students should be incorporated into the new organisation. The new structure should provide a home for a variety of approaches, in which followers of all JMC paradigms feel comfortable.

This necessitates the inclusion of all persuasions of the intellectual side of JMC. Critical approaches to communication studies not normally taught in professionally-oriented departments, like Cultural and Media Studies, should be in a position to interface freely *and willingly* with functionalist, professionalist and other approaches – "a house with many rooms", as Johannes Froneman put it. Although some will hold that any such association should not try to be all things to all people – that it should be an academic organisation, so as to consolidate and organise a natural constituency – there is no reason why professional organizations and occupational groups (eg SANEF, MISA, PRISA) and non-academic training institutions like IAJ, and their members, should automatically be excluded.

Even if membership of the academic organization remains limited, at the very least an internet userlist should be established so that interested professionals, academics, and students can talk to each other. A moderator might be required to manage the discussion, but this should not be confused with *control* of discussion. A fine example of this kind of discussion forum can be found at the Peirce-L discussion forum hosted at http://members.door.net/arisbe. An even more vibrant use of the internet can be found at http:arXive.org, where a pre-publication archive database originally set up at the Los Alamos National Laboratory provides a forum that archives submissions automatically for accessing by peers. A second userlist of all known communication scholars could then be developed for public relations and development purposes, thus making organizational and research communication available to their respective communities while also recognizing that these communities are not identical (even if membership overlaps significantly). The latter list can be developed on the basis of an audit, to find out who is teaching communications, media and PR. This would include the private sector, which currently has more students than the public universities and technikons. Strategic plans and proposals should be circulated for discussion on a userlist The web page should become a clearing house for all the SA journals via the publication of contents pages with links to their respective home pages.

Secondly, the research shows that special attention needs to be paid to JMC qualifications in respect of research, education and training. The sector needs unambiguous guidelines about what constitutes valid JMC education and training. Some of the mushrooming `media and communication' offerings in university language and literature departments are very strong on purportedly critical knowledge, but do not by virtue of this prepare graduates as professionals in any established corporate, NGO, or professional JMC enterprises. By the same token, there is no guarantee that the purportedly practical grounding in journalism offered by dot.com style media training companies will enable graduates to distinguish between genuine accounts of events, spin-doctoring, and outright news hoaxing. Any such guidelines must also give due recognition to well-established in-house and in-service training programmes, many of which give hands-on learning experiences that far exceed the on-again off-again experience that students get with campus newspapers or faculty newsletters.

There is some room to consider JMC education as a graduate-level endeavour, instead of as an undergraduate university degree or technikon diploma course as is customary at present. Although the present research did not focus on this aspect of the status of JMC education, other research indicates that undergraduate degrees need to be structured in ways that empower the kind of post-graduate learning and research that equips graduates for the requirements of specialist reporting, such as on the HIV/AIDS pandemic (Shepperson 2000). Thus to structure JMC education as an Honours-level and higher qualification would be to open the profession up to more already-qualified and experienced graduates who can become dedicated and competent science, technology, health, political, legal and other journalists.

Thirdly, and given the growing statutory and academic discourse of interdisciplinarity, JMC inquiry must distinguish between interdisciplinary *research* projects that bring together specialist researchers from disciplines, and 'interdisciplinary' undergraduate *teaching* courses that provide limited and highly selective readings of disciplines to ingenuous undergraduates who themselves possess no specialized disciplinary training. Partial exposure to the broader tradition of sociology through a single-term "sociology of media" second-year module cannot introduce media studies undergraduates to the complexity of a field that covers Comte, Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Tönnies, Mead, Parsons, Habermas and Giddens. Indeed, these might constitute a minimum representative tradition upon which sociologists draw. At the very least, therefore, JMC researchers must endeavour to open up their activity to include the relevant specialists from other fields. The object of research is to pursue a line of inquiry to its logical conclusions, and these conclusions may well form the premises of not only further lines of inquiry, but also of subsequent teaching curricula. The point is that the conclusions of inquiry are always subject to revision, but the subjects presented in student curricula are not presented in this light.

Our conclusions are not based on whether JMC intellectuals and academics need to present a consensual front in some imagined conflict with other disciplines. Instead, we have proceeded on the understanding that vocational, professional, and critical branches of the field must recognize the general continuity of their specializations within a *broader social activity* of information and communication. Each branch may thus take conflicting viewpoints about specific aspects of JMC theory and practice, but the general constitution of the field must be to work toward a greater grasp of the *broader unity* of social information and communication. Within such a general longer-term information and communication environment it becomes possible for the broader public to recognize when information is newsworthy and not merely as spin-doctoring.

The South African JMC studies sector is moribund, or even in any danger of immediate collapse into that state. The number and variety of centres is indicative of a robust tradition, one that like all traditions, however, must face up to the stresses of adaptation to different external circumstances. But it remains imperative that the sector avoids the pitfalls of megadisciplinarity, the tendency for every Arts or Humanities Faculty to appropriate the terms 'Media' or 'Communication' as catch phrases for attracting fee-paying students. The short term gains from increased subsidies will not survive changes in the subsidy formulae, especially if these change from registration-based funding to graduation-based funding. Although there is little indication that such a change is imminent, the tendency we noted for every institution to dress up cultural studies versions of literary criticism as 'media and communication' is of some concern. Although doing this may, on the face of it, give JMC a higher profile, the intellectual, professional and research focus becomes blurred and the field loses its specificity. Yes, there is always a need for greater inter-disciplinary research, but this should not translate into neglect of subject-focussed teaching. The former is of great benefit not only to JMC practitioners, but also to practitioners from other fields who engage in such research. The latter is little less than an ethical commitment to the students, who can not be expected to become capable of interdisciplinary work if they have not in themselves come to the forms of intellectual and communicational self-control entailed by the very concept of a Discipline.

Notes

1. The reference is to the Robin Catalogue number for the relevant Peirce manuscript. Although the original MSS are now finally housed in suitable premises in the Houghton Library at Harvard University, there are xeroxed copies of the microfilmed copy of the originals, housed at a number of centres globally. The manuscript copies used for the present research were kindly provided by the Institute for the Study of Pragmaticism (ISP) at Texas Tech University, Lubbock TX, United States of America. A transcript of the MS has been lodged with ISP.

2. This is not entirely factual. Since 1997 there has been a series of Political Economy of the Southern African Media workshops, in which African, Caribbean, and European scholars in the critical tradition have developed a series of comparative studies. The Proceedings of the first of these meetings have been worked up as a collection (Tomaselli and Dunn 2002). The most recent of these meetings took place at the University of Natal, Durban, in April 2002.

3. There may be some added value if one treats HIV/AIDS in a presuppositional manner, as we have used Peirce in looking at JMC. We could suppose that every instance of illness, like the opportunistic infections of full-blown AIDS, constitute a clear case for *medical* intervention. However, to minimize the risk of getting infected in the first place, we can say that medicine is that determinate instance of dealing with a breakdown in *hygiene* of a sort. Thus the approach to (say) condom use is a matter of sexual hygiene, the breakdown of which is presupposed when one gets some STD infection. Finally, both medicine and hygiene are presupposed by a conception of *Health*, a kind of general theory of being well. From a JMC point of view, then, we could see reporting on the use of antiretroviral drugs as (1) a medical affair for the purposes of treating PWAs; (2) a hygiene issue in MICT; and (3) a health issue in general in respect of the side effects of their use.

4. The impact of post-Thatcherite political economy has already attracted our attention in relation to its broader potential effects on higher education. In a paper delivered to the 2000 SACOMM conference, the following analysis was presented, which appears quite prescient when looking at the meltdown of the dot.com sector on New York's Nasdaq index (Tomaselli 2000: 87-8):

> In many respects, and this is not just an interpretive fancy, it [the shift to literary-critical "cultural studies" in JMC] is a real outcome of the Thatcherite "End of Society" thesis. The situation shares the same determinations as the so-called "dot.com" stock market mania. On the one hand, market speculators, often playing with ordinary people's pension fund contributions invested in good faith, chase wholly chimerical capital gains in totally untested high-tech ventures which have hardly any hope of meeting their price-earnings (p-e) ratios. When the bubble deflates, or bursts, then it is not the speculator who suffers: they have already made their commissions. The real victims are countless working people who may have been forced by the shrinkage of social services to invest for pensions that are no longer guaranteed in law.
>
> With the media studies mania, on the other hand, faculty managers are literally speculating with the invested hopes of two generations: that of the students, and that of their parents. Universities are 'investing' in courses with

unrealistically high p-e ratios, so to speak, in the hope that something will become profitable in the future without any record of profitability in the present. To be sure, this is supposed to be the way of the future, with markets determining the fitness (or otherwise) of knowledge to the world. However, the New Market Paradigm (NMP) does away with the concept of Trust: speculators and academics no longer need to be held accountable if their fancied stocks or *epistemes* fail to deliver. That's just too bad, because it's The Market that decides, not people. A generation of pensioners may end up in penury, on the one hand, while a generation of learners could end up unemployable on the other.

References

Bourgault, Louise (1995). Mass Media in Sub-Saharan Africa. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Castells, M. (1996). The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture; (Volume 1): The Rise of the Network Society. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996

De Beer, A.S. and K.G. Tomaselli (2000). "South African Journalism and Mass Communication Scholarship: Negotiating Ideological Schisms", Journalism Studies, 1(1).

Fourie, P. (1997). "The White Paper/Bill on Higher Education and Communication Studies", *Communicare*, 16(2), 99-112.

Hardt, H. (1993). Cririral Communication Studies: History and Theory in America. London: Routledge.

Hodge, R. (1999). "The Sokal 'Hoax': some implications for science and postmodernism." *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 13(2), 255-269.

Kimball, R. (1997). Who Was David Stove? The New Criterion; March.

McQuail, D. (2000) McQuail's Mass Communication Theory – 4th ed. London: Sage.

McQuail, D. (1987) Mass Communication Theory: an Introduction - 2nd ed. London: Sage.

Makgoba, M. (Ed.) (1999). African Renaissance. Sandton: Mafube. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Maras, S. (1998). "Philosophy in the Age of Megadisciplines." *Continuum* 12(2), 197-216.

Nyamnjoh, F. (1999). "African Cultural Studies, Cultural Studies in Africa: How to Make a Useful Difference." Critical Arts 13(1), 15-39.

Peirce, C.S. (1998). The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings (Volume 2 – 1893-1913). Edited by the Peirce Edition Project. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Peirce, C.S. (1992). The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings (Volume 1 – 1867-1893). Edited by N. Houser and C. Kloesel. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Peirce, C.S. (1965). The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vols. I-VI. Edited by C. Harteshorne and P. Weiss. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Peirce, C.S. (1966). The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vols. VII-VIII. Edited by A.W. Burks. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Peirce, C.S. (1910). MS 655: Quest of Quest. Manuscript in Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., USA.

Peirce, C.S. (1902). Manuscript L75: Letter of Application to the Carnegie Institution for Research Funding. Edited by Joseph M. Ransdell. Available online at Arisbe: The Peirce Gateway, http://www.door.net/arisbe/menu/library/bycsp/L75/intro/L75intro.htm

Peirce, C.S. (1866). MS 357: Lowell Lectures on the Logic of Science, Lecture IX. Manuscript in Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., USA.

Robin, Richard S. (1967). Annotated Catalogue of the Papers of Charles S. Peirce. Cambridge, MASS.: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). "A Mathematical Theory of Communication,'' *Bell System Technical Journal*, Vol. 27 (July and October), 379-423 and 623-656.

Shannon, C. and W. Weaver (1949). The Mathematical Theory of Communication. Urbana ILL: University of Illinois Press.

Shepperson, Arnold. (2001). "Realism, Logic, and Social Communication: C.S. Peirce's classification of science in communications studies and journalism." Appendix to K.G Tomaselli, and A. Shepperson. "National Research Foundation: State of the Discipline: Communication Studies." Pretoria: National Research Foundation. Also published electronically at http://members.door.net/arisbe/menu/library/shepperson/JMC-Arisbe.htm

Shepperson, A. (2000). "HIV/AIDS Reporting in South Africa: An analysis of the response of the press." Pretoria: Department of Health. 24 pp.

Shepperson, A. and K.G. Tomaselli (1998). "Rounding Up the Usual Suspects: Truth, reality and experience in cultural studies. Response to Windschuttle (1998)." *Ecquid Novi* 19(2), 97-102.

Skjerdal, Terje (1998). "Mapping the Gap: South African journalists in disagreement over the Truth and Reconciliation Commission media hearings." Durban: CCMS. http://www.und.ac.za/und/ccms/articles/trc.htm

Sokal, A.D. (1996a). "Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity." *Social Text* 46/47, pp. 217-252. Available on Web at http://www.physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/transgress_v2/transgress_v2.singlefile.html

Soerensen, S.B. (1998). Voices and Visions, Public Spheres and Power Struggles – A Study of the Transformation of the Television Broadcasting Sector in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Kommunikation & Internationale Udviklingsstudier, Roskilde Universitetscenter.

Sokal A.D. (1996b). "A Physicist Experiments With Cultural Studies." *Lingua Franca*, May/June, 62-64. http://www.physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/lingua_franca_v4/lingua_franca_v4.html

Strelitz, L. and L. Steenveld (1988) "The Fifth Estate: Media Theory, Watchdog of Journalism", *Ecquid Novi*, 19(1), 100-110.

Switzer, L. and A. Adhikari (Eds) (2000). South Africa's Resistance Press: Alternative Voices in the Lost Generation. Athens OH: Ohio University Center for International Studies.

Teer-Tomaselli, RE. (1993). "The Politics of Discourse and the Discourse of Politics: images of violence and reform on the South African Broadcasting Corporation's news bulletins, July 1985-November 1986." Ph.D dissertation. Durban: University of Natal.

Tomaselli, Keyan G. (2000). "Policing the Text: disciplinary threats and spin-doctoring." *Communicatio* 26(2), 87-92.

Tomaselli, K.G. and P.E. Louw, (1993) "Shifts Within Communication Studies: From Idealism and Functionalism to Praxis - South Africa in the 1980s. *In* B. Dervin and U. Hariharan, (eds.) Progress in Communication Sciences Vol X1. New Jersey: Ablex, 279-313.

Tomaselli, K.G., and A. Shepperson (1999). "ThePoverty of Journalism: Media Syudies and 'Science'." *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 13(2), 237-253.

Tomaselli, K.G., and R. Tomaselli and J. Muller (Eds.) (1987). The Press in South Africa. London: James Currey; New York: St. Martins; Bellville, Cape: Anthropos.

Tomaselli. Keyan G., A. Williams, L. Steenveld and R.E. Tomaselli (1986). Myth, Race and Power: South Africans Imaged on Film and TV. Bellville: Anthropos.

Windschuttle, K. (1997). "The Poverty of Media Theory." *Ecquid Novi* 18 (1), 3-20.

Windschuttle, K. (1998). "New Insights and Old Nonsense: a rejoinder." *Ecquid Novi* 19 (1), 111-115.

Zaffiro, James (1998). The Politics of Broadcasting in Zimbabwe. Johannesburg: Anthropos.

Zaffiro, J. (1991). From Police Network to Station for the Nation: A Political History of Broadcasting in Botswana, 1927-1991. Gaborone: The Botswana Society.