

## Chapter 1

### OVERVIEW AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### 1.1 PURPOSE

Much of social science is based on observing phenomena and making so called "objective" conclusions. Next, theories are developed which are used to understand and explain the world and its inhabitants and to lay foundations for further research. However, most of this research in the U.S. is seriously deficient, in that it either does not question or tacitly accepts the basic nature and assumptions of Western capitalist society and the power structures which support it and which provide the mechanisms for social control. Without the description and function of the American power structure the nature of the world cannot be clearly ascertained; and without such a picture, social science theory and research is sadly incomplete, even irrelevant in our complex society.

This dissertation is an attempt to lay a foundation for

research into social science, particularly regarding the mass media. I will try to describe the American power structure and to ascertain the place and role of the mass media within it. It is very a difficult task for many reasons. First, complete information is not easy to find. Secrecy is a very important part of the maintenance of power and control. Second, social scientists generally do not seem desirous of studying the subject. Third, the super-rich and powerful do not wish that the American people discover how the system is run. And, fourth, the subject is very complex, requiring vast interdisciplinary knowledge.

There are two other reasons for writing on this subject. Assuming that the information contained herein is disseminated more widely, it can serve to open the eyes of the American people as to how their economic and political system really works and the role the mass media play in this. Next, it is hoped that by pointing out the availability of the public access channels of the cable television systems in the country, people might be able to confront the power of the Establishment media monopoly and communicate more directly with each other, thereby democratizing the media to some extent and effecting some degree of delegitimation of the traditional media in the process.

This does not mean that all the relevant information and all the definitive answers are here. But this dissertation does provide a framework within which we can better understand U.S. history, contemporary events and the people who are the primary actors. I believe that, after reading the following pages, world events will make more sense.

## 1.2 RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

There are many aspects of the nature of the American power system and the mass media within it which will be explored, and the following propositions will be used as guides during the course of this dissertation:

1. There is a ruling class in the United States which has a disproportionate amount of the country's wealth and income and which strategically places a disproportionate number of people in the prime political and economic decision making positions in the nation.
2. This ruling class maintains its control over the country through economic, political and social

institutions, using its own members as well as others it selects as key decision makers, forming what could be termed the American "Ruling Cartel."

1. Control over the nation's economy is effected mainly through the giant Rockefeller-Morgan insurance companies and transnational banks in an intricate web of mechanisms such as stock ownership, interlocking directorates and control of corporate debt.
2. Political control is maintained primarily through covert and semi-covert political organizations (such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bilderbergers and the Trilateral Commission), and overt organizations and structures such as the U.S. Executive Branch, regulatory agencies, the Federal Reserve System and the police, military and intelligence organizations.
3. Ideological hegemony over the masses is sustained through Ruling Cartel control of the mass media and of the education and idea development systems.
4. The prime people in the Ruling Cartel are aware of the twin problems of the contradictions of capitalism and

its incompatibility with democracy, and that therefore they must constantly be vigilant to the struggles of the people which could undermine Cartel control and the profitability of the system.

5. The mass media are also owned and controlled by the Ruling Cartel through the use of the same methods as are employed with the other major large business institutions.
6. The U.S. mass media perform two basic power functions: the maintenance of Ruling Cartel hegemony and the legitimation of the system in the eyes of the people. This is accomplished through the following:

1. The true nature and operation of the U.S. power system are hidden and obfuscated.
2. Through censorship and distortion of data only a narrow range of opinion and information is presented (corresponding to the range of "legitimate" democratic activity allowed within the existing two-party system), or, if any information is presented counter to the existing system, it is done in a distorted and uncomplimentary fashion.
3. Alternative ways of organizing and running society are either not provided or are scorned

or dismissed out-of-hand.

7. Control of the mass media is maintained through, (a) concentration of ownership at national, regional and local levels; (b) through political activity in Congress, in the courts and in the Federal Communications Commission; and (c) the nature of the mass media being capitalist enterprises with the attendant requirements of profits, ratings and advertisers.
8. Specific methods used to limit information and opinions are gatekeeping, agenda setting, kingmaking, bias and censorship, including self-censorship of suitably socialized staffs.
9. Press and political activity of an alternative nature are either crippled or maintained in a position of non-threatening influence through a combination of economic starvation, police and political repression, and a lack of direct access to a mass audience.
10. The interconnectedness of the above propositions is shown by the final proposition:
  1. Economic power is the basis for political power.
  2. Economic concentration of ownership and control

- is the basis for concentrated political power.
3. Concentration of ownership of the mass media facilitates content control.
  4. The capitalist nature of the mass media system also limits the range of possible discourse in the media.
  5. Mass media control causes content to be distorted, biased and censored, producing a limited range of information which is aimed at supporting and legitimating the system and continuing Ruling Class hegemony.

### 1.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

#### 1.3.1 AN OVERVIEW OF THEORY

Every people is governed by an elite, according to Pareto (Garson 1977, 32-36)<sup>1</sup>. Yet, the power structure in nations has not been the subject of exhaustive analysis as has other aspects of human social behavior. Most of these studies have been purely theoretical. There has been considerable data produced in the U.S. which could be used for the study of the U.S. power structure, but the material has rarely been employed in an attempt to formulate a

comprehensive description of the power structure, and these studies have been made only in the last half of the Twentieth Century.

Perhaps the earliest writing on power comes from the 14th Century Arab, Ibn Saud. The earliest work which had the greatest impact in the West was that of Machiavelli (Skinner 1981). He was the first to make a completely amoral, realistic description of how a strong leader should run his state, using all his nakedly brutal power to achieve his ends. But he also wrote about how a pluralistic republic could best be organized and run so as to preserve freedom and maintain a vigorous government and body politic. Finally he noted the tensions which developed when powerful rulers and nobles would try to maintain their positions and privileges while the people struggled against being dominated.

With the rise of capitalism Marx offered a new perspective on the use of power: economic determinism, indicating that it is the economic nature of capitalism, and the capitalist ownership class which controls the system, which provide the basis for power and the people who run the economic-political system. The state is run and for their benefit and it is their ideas and culture which are hegemonic.



Lenin (Menshikov 1969) developed Marx' ideas further, making them more complex and introducing empirical observations about the nature of the capitalist ruling class, such as information about the Rockefellers and Morgans in the U.S.. He argues that the capitalist state's democratic political forms are a manipulatable facade shielding a repressive core controlled by the ruling class. Therefore, true democracy cannot be achieved within such a structure.

At the turn of the century and into the 1920s Thorstein Veblen (1948), an economist but drawing from all fields of study, contributed to both economic theory and power studies. Particularly important was his Theory of the Leisure Class which links his economic and political thinking. It describes the way the upper class (of the business-power group) lived and conspicuously displayed its wealth. He then shows how the lower classes identified with the upper class and tried to emulate it, thereby producing social cohesion and control. Veblen's Absentee Ownership comprehensively describes the business system and its use of power.

Also, in the early 1900s various federal governmental investigating bodies--particularly the Pujo Commission (US Congress 1913)--Supreme Court Justice Brandeis (1914) and

the proponent of the Trust System, John Moody (1904), looked at the U.S. economic system empirically, showing how, through stock ownership and interlocking directorates, the U.S. economy was controlled by an integrated, cooperating economic elite. These data, however, were not used as a basis for a framework to show the total economic-political system in the country.

Meanwhile, non-Marxist political theorists began formulating a position labelled "elite theory," which stated that, regardless of the type of political or economic system which is extant, a few powerful people still would run things. Some of the contributors to this approach, such as Mosca and Pareto, used the theory to glorify the elites as the ideal medium to keep the state out of the hands of the dumb, crude masses (or the scoundrel demagogue around whom the populace would rally.) Ironically, Mosca and Pareto were warm supporters of Mussolini.

American supporters of the elite theory tried to inject a small degree of democratic influence into the process. Although Ortega y Gasset advised against democratic participation, he called for the elites to be democratically influenced by the needs of the masses.

Schumpeter was less democratic: the role of the citizens should simply be to accept their elite leaders, who

needed to be insulated from the masses. Elections should be between competing sets of elites which in turn would govern with a minimum degree of accountability.

Weber developed the elite theory further by analyzing the sociological nature of power. He concluded that the people from the dominant groups tend to form "collegial bodies" where consensus is reached, adjustments are made, conflicts are resolved and bodies are established to supervise the operation of the political economy.

In the U.S., Lasswell wrote several books about power and elites, but these were all of a purely theoretical nature containing interesting insights, but mainly irrelevant to the task of bringing to light the who-what-where-when-how and why of power in the U.S.. Lasswell (1958) did make an analysis of the use of symbols and ideology used by the dominant elites to keep the masses under control. But, again, this was theoretical.

Meanwhile, economists were addressing the question of control of the corporation. With the destruction of competitive capitalism and its replacement by a system of giant combinations and trusts as the dominant economic institutions, the answer to the question "who controls?" acquired great importance. Earlier, Marx (Menshikov 1969) said that, with the development of the joint-stock company,

management would become divorced from both ownership and financial control and that the financiers would become dominant. Tawney believed that the managers--the creative force in the corporation--would not tolerate exploitation and domination by the financial controllers, and they would achieve ascendancy. Berle and Means (1932) also were alarmed about the revolution which had come to capitalism: the divorce between ownership and management in the light of the amassing of the great concentration of wealth and economic control. They also showed that through various legal devices and stock ownership, corporations could be controlled by management. Burnham agreed that the managers had become preeminent, an assertion echoed later by Galbraith (1968) who argued that the real power lies with the managers and technical staffs, because they have the technological knowledge and ability. The boards of directors are therefore anachronisms and impotent.

This led to further studies by economists trying to indicate how many of the largest corporations are management-controlled, director-controlled or family-controlled. Making an arbitrary cutoff point of stock ownership percentage, they try to estimate which corporations fall into which category, and then they draw conclusions about the control of the U.S. corporate system

at large. Lerner (1966) is a good example of such an author. Herman (1981) is the latest to use this method. These writers invariably come to the conclusion that ownership is not very concentrated and that most of the industry in the U.S. is management-controlled.

Others have taken a more comprehensive approach, using not only stock ownership, but also family ties (occasionally), interlocking directorates and relationships with other economic institutions. The Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) studies of the 1930s and 1940s are preeminent (Thorpe and Crowder 1941; US Congress 1941; Securities and Exchange Commission (1941); Sweezy (1939); Chevalier (1969); Fitch and Oppenheimer (1970a, 1970b, 1970c; and Lundberg (1968, 1975, 1976) also made contributions. John Blair (1972) made a comprehensive study of economic concentration. The Congressional investigations in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly those of Representative Patman (US Congress 1963a, 1963b, 1963c, 1966b, 1967a, 1968), Senator Muskie (US Congress 1973, 1974c, 1977) and Senator Metcalf (US Congress 1978b, 1978c), are continuations of the tradition of the studies at the turn of the century. These show the domination of the economy by a few giant institutional investors.

An approach to studying power which gained great

popularity in the 1950s was called group theory, which evolved into the pluralist theory. Started by David Truman in 1951, it claimed that politics was a result of the activity of special interest groups bargaining and applying pressure on the governmental process. By compromise and accomodation, the various groups would be able to achieve some of their goals. Pluralism gained its main adherents in the political science community. This approach specifically eschewed elite theory and either ignored or downplayed the importance of economics. Dahl (1961) is the prime pluralist, especially for community power studies. Rose (1967) wrote a book using the pluralist perspective in an analysis of power in the U.S. at the national level.

What is obvious by now is that we have been talking about researchers observing and theorizing about two phenomena: economic control and political control. No one had looked at both together in a comprehensive way at the national level, particularly from the total sociological point of view. Yet, studies of community power had been conducted using this method, starting in the 1920s by the Lynds (1929, 1937). It is in the studies of the local power structures that elite and pluralist theories received their earliest, most comprehensive analyses, with the sociologists on one side espousing the elite approach and the political

scientists using the pluralist perspective (Hawley and Svara 1972). Hunter's (1956) book on Atlanta is the classic from the elite point of view, and Dahl's (1961) study of New Haven is the best of the pluralist perspective.

It was not until C. Wright Mills wrote the Power Elite (1956) that an extensive, comprehensive empirical view of both the economic and political aspects of power in the U.S. was made. Hunter (1959) completed a study three years later which showed that the top economic elites knew each other and worked together when necessary to achieve economic and political goals.

#### 1.4 SPECIFIC CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POWER

##### 1.4.1 MILLS AND THE POWER ELITE

Before C. Wright Mills shocked the Establishment, there had been general speculation about such an elite for many years, but no one had followed up on it. Mills' Power Elite is a ruling group of economic, political, social and military interlocks which is comprised of a few of the most wealthy people and a small number of politicians, celebrities, high corporate executives and top military

officers. This group controls the mainsprings of wealth and power in the country and maintains its control and effects its regeneration in several ways. True democracy is a carefully nurtured myth, leaving the people almost a helpless mass, mere observers of the secondary levels of power--the legislative bodies.

#### 1.4.2 DOMHOFF AND THE GOVERNING CLASS

When the Power Elite caused such a furor, Domhoff (1968) defended Mills. He also wrote other books (1967, 1971, 1979) to provide more empirical evidence than Mills did, and he modified and extended the power elite theory. Domhoff's conclusion is that there is a governing class in the U.S. which is composed of a social upper class which owns a disproportionate amount of the country's wealth, receives a disproportionate amount of the nation's income and contributes a disproportionate number of its members to the controlling institutions and key decision making groups of the country. Domhoff recognizes that our democracy exists within the range of differences of opinion among the members of the ruling class. Indeed, democracy cannot work without such differences of opinion, no matter how narrow. Even though the upper class is not monolithic or omnipotent,



pluralist activity is dominated by members of the American upper class and generally stays within limits set by the ruling class. Although the upper class has its antagonisms--mainly ethnic, religious, and new-rich versus old-rich--it is knitted together by such mechanisms as stockownership, trust funds, intermarriages, private schools, exclusive clubs and summer resorts, various social functions, elite political organizations and interlocking corporate boards of directors.

Whereas Mills pictured the people as an almost voiceless, faceless mass, Domhoff, Weinstein (1968), Aronowitz (1973) and Miliband (1969) see the people as being able to wrest some gains from the ruling class, but only after considerable struggle because they are without primary power to implement their desires or to fulfill their needs directly. Although the ruling class responds to these pressures from below, it still controls the institutions of power, and through a combination of propaganda, cooptation, and force and by providing enough positive responses to the popular ferment, it is able to contain the people's aspirations. Meanwhile, the rulers make sure that their dominant position is not seriously challenged and that whatever gains are made by the masses do not come at significant expense to the controlling elite. The latter

uses any degree of legal and illegal power and force necessary to deal effectively with dissidents, particularly those working "outside the system," i.e., outside of the ruling class range of approved opinion and of the political and economic institutions controlled by the power structure (Wolfe 1973).

The pluralists, particularly Rose (1967), tried to answer the Domhoff-Mills thesis, but the realities exposed by the Johnson-Nixon years caused the prime pluralists to admit that their position was only an illusory goal, not a reality. <sup>3</sup> Additionally, studies such as those made by Knowles (1973) provided incontrovertible evidence of an interconnected power group of upper class individuals and families which, both individually and through their institutions, control the main economic and political institutions in the U.S..

#### 1.4.3 MARXIAN APPROACHES

Meanwhile, the Marxists have been developing their theories of power and the state. There are several varieties. The instrumentalist approach, as represented by Miliband, is similar to that of Domhoff but in a Marxian economic and class perspective. Another analysis is the

4  
structuralist (Gold, Lö and Wright 1975). Adherents to this point of view see the functions of the state as being determined by societal class and economic structures. They say that the state is a medium through which the contradictions of capitalism can be controlled in order to maintain the existence of the state and the system. It is important to the rulers that the working class is atomized and favorably indoctrinated so that the basic capitalist contradictions are not apparent and so that the workers will not develop a unity which could threaten capitalist control. Therefore, the state must function independently to a degree, not just as a simple capitalist tool, because the ruling class itself is not completely united, having factions following their own self-interests which the state must mediate. The degree of state autonomy depends on the degree of internal divisiveness of the ruling class as a whole and upon the nature and degree of the cohesiveness and struggle of the working class. Unlike the instrumentalists, the structuralists have almost eliminated conscious, autonomous action on the part of the capitalist ruling class, because it is forced to handle the continuous situations arising from the basic contradictions of capitalism itself.  
5

The next school of thought is the Hegelian-Marxist. It

contains a higher level of abstraction than the other approaches, heavily relying on an analysis of hegemony, legitimacy, consciousness and ideology to determine the nature of capitalist domination of the state and the people. Specific decision making and the sociology of individual incumbents in particular positions and institutions are largely ignored.

Gold, Lo and Wright believe that all the above approaches are inadequate: the Instrumentalist because there is more to the state than the conscious decision making of ruling class office holders; the Structuralist because it does not explain the social mechanisms which produce a class policy that is compatible with the requirements of the system; and the Hegelian-Marxist, because it is too abstract for application to a specific situation and because it does not adequately consider the economic bases of Marxist theory.

More recent attempts at further analysis have been by Offe, Habermas (1973), O'Connor (1973) and Wolfe. They deal in different ways with what they call the legitimation crisis. The capitalist system must have accumulation (basically, producing an increasing amount of capital, or, more simply, increased profits) and legitimation (basically, mass loyalty and acceptance). To maintain security, harmony

and cooperation, the state must perform a mixture of repression and mystification. Being in control of the capitalist ruling class, the state naturally is also of prime significance in fostering accumulation. But because increased accumulation comes at the expense of the people, and because it becomes more and more apparent to the people that the state is not neutral or democratic but actively supports the ruling class, a legitimation crisis appears. People quit believing the myths and start seeing the reality. Ruling class hegemony is questioned.

Offe shows how the various selections processes take place to ensure that capitalist personnel, subjects and decisions are maintained. He looks at times of crisis when the inner mechanisms of the state and system are exposed, showing the contradictions of the system and the way the state handles them. Offe says that the state is incapable of handling all the contradictions as well as the assumption of a continuously growing role in the accumulation process.

O'Connor has developed a more empirical basis for the theory, based on the budget required by the state, particularly in the U.S.. In the accumulation process there are contradictions and incompatibilities among the three basic economic sectors of society: the monopolistic, the competitive and the state. Additionally, the state becomes

embroiled in various political alternatives, not only in trying to handle the above contradictions, but also in containing the struggles of the people. By doing so, the state itself becomes a target of discontent, which, because the state is so deeply involved with the entire economic system, causes the whole system to come under question.

Wolfe attempts to blend the Structuralist and the Hegelian-Marxist traditions. He states that politics is alienated from the people just as work is. There is a basic contradiction between "liberalism," which supports the governmental role in ensuring capitalist accumulation and control, and with "democracy," with its participatory and egalitarian facets. This also leads to the legitimation crisis. Wolfe also believes that the shape of the state is a result of class struggle.

### 1.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THIS DISSERTATION

Each of these approaches has various aspects which seem to be pertinent in developing a theoretical framework for studying the U.S. power system and its mass media. All of them have something to contribute and are correct for

certain aspects of the study of power. Much of the time it is a matter of the micro or macro level and the degree of abstraction on which the analysis is based. It also depends on what part of the world, at what time in history and on what phenomena a particular writer is emphasizing.

The capitalist system must be considered before anything else, because that is the basis for everything else. Marx stated that the capitalist values and structures are dominant (just as "socialist" values are dominant in the Soviet Union). The dominant ruling institutions are capitalist and are controlled by the capitalist ruling class. Hegemony over the masses is maintained through a combination of repression and control over the prime media of knowledge and ideology, rendering anything to the contrary as not legitimate.

The power of the state is used primarily to support the capitalist process of accumulation and legitimation--creating in the masses an acceptance of the system. The primary function is control; with control, all else is much more simple. This is true whether we are looking at the top level of the state or at the stratum of monopolists trying to rationalize their business situations in order to maximize profits and to create a greater degree of certainty.

It is highly questionable that the state functions with the independence that the Structuralists claim. It is true that the state must contend with the populace at certain levels and in certain institutions, but most of the state apparatus is run by and for the capitalists and is either only slightly influenced by the people or is totally outside of the reach of the masses. Some of this is covert; some occurs overtly but without sufficient publicity or public knowledge, so that it operates in a semi-covert fashion; some functions are by law directly unreachable by the public; (fn)and other government operations, although ostensibly open to public influence are heavily stacked in favor of the capitalists. The greatest degree of seeming independence of the state occurs when the government is the arena for the struggles of factions within the ruling group itself and in the attempts of the rulers to handle the contradictions within the system, particularly the basic incompatibility between capitalism and democracy.

I will emphasize the instrumentalist approaches of Domhoff and Miliband, because that is where the real world operates and where the main gap lies between myth and relevant theory. It also is the main area where the greatest amount of empirical data must be developed and synthesized. It is from this analysis that we can see the



system at work.

There also is activity of a pluralist nature which goes on every day at a circumscribed, lower level of authority and control, but always under the watchful eye of the power structure at each level of activity. This is tolerated (even when opposed) by the ruling class and power elite at the local and national levels so long as it does not get into areas of basic control and direction and so long as it does not represent a serious, or potentially serious, challenge to the bases of the American capitalist system.

This pluralist activity is indispensable to the ruling class because it saves it the time and effort of performing some of the less significant, day-to-day details of the running of a complex society. Of prime significance is that it is a good way to focus the attention of the American people away from the basic centers of control and onto the noisy sideshow of lower levels of authority. It acts as a display piece to show the people that they do, indeed, live in a democratic society, thereby perpetuating the myths. It also is of significance in that, to realize any gains at all, the people must struggle mightily at this lower level of power, thereby dissipating time and energy which could be used for achieving more basic and permanent change. And, finally, it provides some of the mechanisms, not only

through which the differences within the capitalist class can be resolved, or at least accomodated, but also where the economic and political spoils can be fought over and divided by the capitalists themselves.

In all these functions the mass media play a critical role: setting the limits of "responsible" and "legitimate" debate; hiding the realities of how the country is run and the bases for the rulers' powers; focusing on the pluralistic activity in government; perpetuating the myths, including the one that the media are the watchdogs of the system; downgrading or ignoring the potential powers and some of the successful struggles of the people; not providing positive information about alternative ways of establishing and running a just, humane society; and, finally, hiding from the public the true ownership and control of the media themselves and their real function within the power structure.

#### 1.6 METHODOLOGY

The study of power in the U.S. must be accomplished in an eclectic manner--fitting this study from this field with that study from another discipline, trying to put together

the most accurate picture possible. Therefore, the methodology utilized in this dissertation is mainly historical, seeing what has been said by many writers who used many methods. The sociology of leadership approach, which is used extensively by Domhoff, is relied on to a considerable degree.

Relevant information was sought in all fields which have touched on the subject: government, economics, sociology, history, communications and law. The sources range from professional journals to popular "men's magazines," from the Left Wing press to the Right Wing press, from the business press to small publications of local activist groups and from written sources to television programs--all the while keeping in mind the various theoretical approaches. I have tried to analyze the information and to synthesize the data into a comprehensive picture of what the American power structure seems to be and the place and role within it of the mass media. It is only after this has been accomplished that relevant theory development can begin. Without this large first step, we are working in a vacuum.

### 1.7 SUMMARY OF DISSERTATION MATERIAL

The main body of the dissertation contains a description of the American power structure, the place and role of the mass media in it and the nature and potential of an alternative communications medium--public access cable television. Chapter II provides an in-depth assessment of the economic, political and mass media bases of the American power structure. It starts with a description of the degree of economic concentration of ownership and control which exists in the U.S. today, showing the dense and complex interlocked nature of the system through such mechanisms as interlocking directorates, activities of the financial institutions, law firms and accounting companies, control of stocks and corporate debt and upper class family alliances. The results of this economic control are found in the concentration of the distribution of wealth and income in the country: the same individuals, families and institutions which are at the top of the controlling stratum of society also are the prime economic benefactors of the system.

Next is shown the various political organizations which the top power group--called the Ruling Cartel--uses to maintain control and to develop and effect policy. Of particular importance are the Council on Foreign Relations,

the Bilderberg Group and the Trilateral Commission. It is shown that, regardless of which administration is in power in the federal government, the key leaders and decision makers come from the same stratum of society and are generally either filtered through the elite organizations or are already significant participants in them.

The next step in control is in the determination of idea and culture formation. We see how the most significant foundations, think tanks and universities are firmly in Cartel control in an interlocking relationship, not only among themselves, but also with the government, military, the corporate world and the elite political organizations.

The mass media are an integral part of the Ruling Cartel, being owned and controlled in the same way as the other corporate giants. The economic and political relationships of the media with the government and the Cartel organizations are assessed.

In Chapter III we look extensively at the nature of the media ownership. The owners and managers are scrutinized from various aspects, including their place and function in the local power structures. The effects of media concentration in local monopoly and oligopoly situations are analyzed. The role of advertising is also looked at from this perspective, noting the contribution to further

economic concentration when wealthy, powerful corporations can monopolize or dominate the media advertising at the local and national levels, thereby either limiting or destroying competition. Finally, we assess the role of the government--the Federal Communications Commission and other regulatory agencies, Congress, the President, the courts and antitrust activities.

Media content is the focus of Chapter IV. First is a discussion of the role of the media in maintaining ruling class hegemony. Then various corporate and individual sources are described which influence media content, such as profit requirements, corporate structure and decision making. Individual influences on content are also noted. Social control in the newsroom is analyzed, followed by a discussion of bias and censorship. Finally, a macro view of content is made which shows two basic phenomena. The first is that an opinion and information range is presented on the Establishment media which normally corresponds to that found within the ruling class itself. Anything outside of this spectrum is either ignored or slandered as being "radical." The other media phenomenon is that the reality of the US power system is not presented. The elite Cartel organizations and how they operate in society in their total framework are never revealed on television or in the

newspapers or magazines.

Public access to the mass media is the focus of Chapter V. We chronicle the history of the long struggle of people and organizations to gain an audience via the media and the response of the government to these efforts, either by thwarting them or weakening them. Also noted is the governmental role performed by the police agencies, such as in the FBI's COINTELPRO operation against the dissident press. Public access on cable TV is discussed, particularly its revolutionary, experimental nature which could present a potential threat to the existing Establishment media if access is allowed to develop freely and if the people use the new medium to its fullest capability. Realizing the potential of the new medium, attacks are being made on access by politicians, the courts, governmental bodies and the cable industry at both the national and local levels.

Finally, in this chapter an example of an extremely successful access program is noted--a weekly alternative news magazine show in Austin, Texas. The large audience elicited by this program in the city and the positive reaction received, not just in Austin, but in many parts of the country and even in Europe, indicate that a large number of people are eager to receive information which is not found in the traditional media.

Chapter VI is an interpretive section of the material previously presented. The problems of maintaining control of society by the Cartel are analyzed, pointing out the many instabilities in the system and "leaks" in the framework of control where the struggles of the people can fruitfully take place. The divisions and instabilities within the international capitalist system itself also create problems of control. The role of the mass media in the US in maintaining ruling class hegemony is also made difficult by trying to live up to their self-proclaimed myth of being "objective" and performing the role of watchdog of the system and by having to respond to situations and subjects which they and their controllers would prefer to leave alone.

The second half of the interpretations chapter is a review of various theoretical approaches to power and the media in light of the material previously presented. It shows that parts of many theories are relevant, but that the Mills-Domhoff and Marxian approaches seem to be the most useful, particularly when these ideas are formulated by using the material presented in this dissertation. This section mainly indicates that, now that a more thorough and realistic presentation of the American power system and the mass media has been provided, relevant theory making can



begin which can provide us with a truer understanding of the world than the old theories which were based on myth and which had emerged from an empirical vacuum.

The final chapter not only summarizes the main points of the dissertation, it also provides suggestions for comprehensive media strategies for the people to use to challenge the existing power structures in the country.