

JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Interdisciplinary Reflection of Contemporary Society

VOLUME 11

SEPTEMBER, 2005

NUMBER 2



KAMLA-RAJ ENTERPRISES

(Publishers since 1933)

DELHI, INDIA

Visit our Website: www.krepublishers.com

Press Freedom: A Conceptual Analysis

I. Bayo Oloyede

*Department Of Mass Communication, Moshood Abiola Polytechnic, Abeokuta,
Ogun State, Nigeria*

E-mail: bayooloyede2003@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS Press liberty; origin; meaning; problems

ABSTRACT This historical - research paper attempts a general exploration of press freedom as a concept. It inquires into the origin and general perception of the liberty of the press at evolution and into its different contemporary notions in the three broad socio-political systems of the world. It finds out that since press freedom originated under libertarianism in post-1688 England, various attempts have been made to conceive and implement, in the 'interest' of society, what the authors of the efforts perceived as the 'ideal' or 'true' variants of the concept. The paper concludes that since the structure of the press, including its freedom, is always determined by the socio-political structure, an ideal press freedom that will be equally enjoyable by or beneficial to all members of the society, irrespective of socio-political class, will always be difficult, if not impossible, to perfectly, effectively conceive, much more implement.

INTRODUCTION

Regardless of the ideological differences in the various socio-political systems of the world, press freedom – a logical extension of man's inalienable freedom of expression – is today a universal phenomenon. Globally and ideally guaranteed by Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is enshrined in the constitution of almost all countries with written constitutions and customarily observed by societies, exemplified by Britain, which have no written constitution.

But how and from where did the concept evolve? What denotations are generally attached to the term *ab initio*? How is press freedom perceived in various socio-political systems? What are the problems associated with evolving an ideal variant of the concept? This analysis attempts to answer these corner-stone questions with a view to a broad understanding of the subject.

Original and General Perception

Although the modern press began in Belgium in 1605 (Altschull, 1984) and Sweden is generally believed to be the first country in the world to constitutionally ordain press freedom (Moemeka, 1978), the idea of the freedom of the press first evolved as a component of the libertarian social philosophy which originated in England after the Revolution of 1688 (Siebert et al., 1956).

Between the early 1620s when the first English "newsbooks" and "corantos" appeared in

London (Harris, 1978) and the 1688 political sidelining of the British monarchy, authoritarianism both as political and press philosophies reigned supreme. Under the authoritarian system of the time:

Truth was conceived to be, not the product of the great mass of people, but of a few wise men who were in a position to guide and direct their fellows. Thus, truth was thought to be centered (sic.) near the center of power. The press therefore functioned from the top down. The rulers of the time used the press to inform the people of what the rulers thought they should know and the policies the rulers thought they should support (Siebert et al., 1956).

The monarch or government had absolute power and control over ownership, content and use of the mass media. Criticism of the political machinery and officials in power through the mass media was forbidden and the press existed chiefly to support and advance the policies of the government in power and to service the state (Siebert et al., 1956.) and therefore had no freedom. By 1688, with the overthrow of monarchical authoritarianism in Britain however, libertarianism as a political and press system took over, and with it the concept of press freedom.

The libertarians believe that man is a thinking, independent and rational animal, capable of deciding between the good and the bad and between the good and the better when faced with alternative choices. As expounded by Siebert, Peterson and Schramm (1956), under libertarianism:

Man is no longer conceived of as a dependent being [as in the authoritarian system] to be led and directed, but rather as a rational being able to discern between truth and falsehood, between a better and worse alternative, when faced with conflicting evidence and alternative choices. Truth is no longer conceived of as the property of power. Rather the right to search for truth is one of the inalienable natural rights of man... [And] The press is conceived of as a partner in the search for truth.

The three authors further underline the basis of press freedom at evolution under libertarianism:

In libertarian theory, the press is not an instrument of government, but rather a device for presenting evidence and arguments on the basis of which the people can check on government and make up their minds as to policy. Therefore it is imperative that the press be free from government control and influence. In order for truth to emerge, all ideas must get a fair hearing; there must be a "free market place" of ideas and information. Minorities as well as majorities, the weak as well as the strong must have access to the press... (Siebert et al., 1956).

There are other major ingredients of press freedom under libertarianism. One is the assumption of the presence of a multiplicity of voices on public issues at all times.

The libertarians... assumed that in a democratic society, there would be a multiplicity of voices available to, if not actually reaching the public. Let every man who has something to say on public issues express himself regardless of whether what he has to say is true or false and let the public ultimately decide... (Siebert et al., 1956).

This public decision is expected to be reached through the "self-righting process of truth." The self-righting process of truth developed from Milton's (1644) thesis that truth will ultimately drive away falsehood and assert itself in a free and open encounter with falsehood.

Another important component of libertarian press freedom is the absence of state control in the operations of the news media in line with the laissez faire enterprise doctrine or philosophical foundation of capitalism. As put by Schiller (1986):

[T]he proponents of the libertarian theory were against state control and or involvement

in the operation of the news media... [N]ews organizations need to be independent of both government and big business so that it can deliver disinterested accounts of the key sources of power affecting people's daily lives.

A third major ingredient is the emphasis on financial independence of the press. According to Oso (1988):

It [the libertarian theory/philosophy] stresses the financial autonomy of the press. Further, it accepts free enterprise and private ownership of the means of production as guarantees for the attainment of freedom of the press and individual freedom. The government is not expected to compete with or eliminate privately owned media...

McQuail (1987) summarises the basic characteristics of the press and its freedom under libertarianism as follows:

- Publication should be free from any prior censorship by any third party;
- The act of publication and distribution should be open to a person or group without permit or license;
- Attack on any government official or political party (as distinct from attacks on private individuals or treason and breaches of security) should not be punishable, even after the event;
- There should be no compulsion to publish anything;
- Publication of 'error' is protected equally with that of truth in matters of opinion and belief;
- No restriction should be placed on the collection, by legal means, of information for publication;
- There should be no restriction on export or import or sending or receiving 'messages' across national frontiers;
- Journalists should be able to claim a considerable degree of professional autonomy within their organizations.

From the listed qualities, press freedom at its genesis was based on the notion that individuals should be free to publish in the news or mass media whatever they like without interference from government or from other persons or groups. This freedom was seen as an extension of other freedoms, particularly that of free speech and as a palladium for all civil, political and religious rights. Being also a concomitant of commercial freedom, having evolved under a capitalist setting, it was closely associated with

capitalist social organization. Hence, it also implied property rights i.e. the right to profitably own and use media production and facilities. (Omwanda, 1990-1991)

This notion of press freedom influenced the constitutional and legal paradigm of press freedom in the United States as contained in the 1791 *First Amendment* to her 1787 Constitution. It equally served as the foundation for press freedom in all capitalist liberal democracies.

Presently however, press freedom in all countries has come to generally denote the existence of a fundamental and inalienable individual human right to gather, hold, publish or disseminate information and opinions through the news media without let or hindrance. The perception and interpretation of this right nevertheless differ from one socio-political system to another.

Press Freedom in Various Socio-Political Systems

For both theoretical and practical analyses and in spite of the disintegration and other political and economic changes in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), the various countries of the world can still be divided into three broad socio-political systems.

These are:

- (i) the capitalist liberal democracies of North America and Western Europe.
- (ii) the socialist system, and
- (iii) the developing world

Before discussing press freedom in each of these socio-political systems, a theoretical exposition on the relationship between media structure and social, political, economic and cultural factors would be apposite.

Studies in normative media theories have established that the press is a social institution; that its function and character will differ according to the political, economic, social, and cultural structures [broadly the socio-political system] wherein it operates (Ugboajah, 1987). According to Siebert et al. (1956).

The press always takes on the form and coloration of the social and political structures within which it operates. Especially, it reflects the system of social control whereby the relations of individuals and institutions are adjusted.

This is equally true of the nature of press freedom, which is a major part of any mass media

system. A mass media system, notes Hatchen (1974):

is a kind of mirror image of a nation's political and economic structure. Each is sensitive to the other. Newspaper, radio, television and other media do not operate in a vacuum; their content, their reach, their freedom (emphasis mine) and their audiences are determined by the context [the socio-political system] of the nation in which they operate.

In the words of Omwanda (1990-1991):

It is the social system that structures the mass media system which in turn, informs the nature of journalistic practice... the structure of a news media system [including its freedom] is dictated by politics and economics, and to a certain extent, shaped by geographical, linguistic and cultural forces.

We shall now conceptually examine press freedom in each of the three socio-political systems.

The Capitalist Liberal Democracies of North America and Western Europe

Although press freedom evolved in a capitalist liberal democracy i.e. England under libertarianism {as part of the parliamentary and congressional or presidential systems based on individual liberty and private enterprise (Ugboajah, 1987)}, the notion of press freedom that presently obtains in capitalist liberal democracies the world over is that of the "social responsibility theory of the press".

The social responsibility theory originated in the United States in the 20th century although it can be regarded as an Anglo-American concept (Siebert et al., 1956). It was a composite of ideas developed from the writings of W. E. Hocking, the works of the 1947 United States Press Freedom Commission (Hutchins Commission), the ideas of mass communication practitioners and media codes. It arose in recognition of the fact that the free market (market forces) had failed to deliver the benefits or fulfill the promise of press freedom to public expectations. In McQuail's (1987) account:

...the technological and commercial development of the press [evident in the rise of media monopolies] was said to have led to lower chances of access for individuals and diverse groups, and lower standards of performance [arising from undue influence of advertisers and

from media sensationalism for profit motive] in meeting the informational, social and moral needs of society. It was also thought to have increased the power of a single class [that of news media owners].

At the same time, the rise of the new and seemingly powerful media of radio and film had demonstrated the need for some kinds of public control and means of accountability additional to those appropriate to the long established and professionally organized print media.

The theory therefore stipulates that since freedom carries concomitant obligations, the media of mass communication which enjoy a privileged position, as obtained under the libertarian theory, must assume obligation of social responsibility and if they do not, someone must ensure that they do. It takes the stance that the social roles of the press i.e. enlightening the people, promoting the democratic process, safeguarding the liberties of the individual, etc. should take precedence over its role of servicing the economic system.

It holds that the press should furnish the people with 'good' entertainment only, that is entertainment which does not debase the norms and values of society for profit motive.

It accepts the need for the press as an institution to remain financially self-supporting and independent, but if necessary, it would exempt certain individual media from having to earn their way in the market place and allow some form of control on mass media operations in the 'public interest.' (This is the basis on which the British Broadcasting Corporation is being run as a public trust by the British government.)

Thus although free as in the libertarian era, the following principles are to guide the western media under the social responsibility concept:

Media should accept and fulfill certain obligations to society.

These obligations are mainly to be met by setting high or professional standards of informativeness, truth, accuracy, objectivity and balance;

In accepting and applying these obligations, media should be self-regulating within the framework of law and established institutions;

The media should avoid whatever might lead to crime, violence or civil disorder or give offence to minority groups;

The media as a whole should be pluralist and

reflect the diversity of their society giving access to various points of view and to rights of reply;

Society and the public, following the first named principle, have a right to expect high standards of performance and intervention can be justified to secure the, or a public good;

Journalists and media professionals should be accountable to society as well as to employers and the market. (McQuail, 1987)

The obligations of the press under the social responsibility theory which McQuail talks about here have been spelt out by the Hutchins Commission (1947) as follows:

- (i) providing the public with "a truthful, comprehensive and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning."
- (ii) "serving as a forum for the exchange of comments and criticism."
- (iii) projecting "a representative picture of the constituent groups in the society."
- (iv) being responsible for "the presentation and clarification of the goals and values of the society." and
- (v) providing "full access to the day's intelligence."

The social responsibility theory attempts to reconcile independence and freedom of the news media with their obligations to society. According to Omwanda (1990-1991), it assumes that the news media have useful functions to society especially that of protecting democratic government through the provision of a variety of views and opinions. He contends that while the theory reaffirms the libertarian view of a free and independent press, it also insists that the press must accept its obligations to society, recognize that there are public expectations of standards of performance below which demands for control begin to be made, and accept the notion that media ownership is a kind of public trusteeship and not private franchise. Central to the social responsibility theory; he says, is an attempt to reconcile a set of three divergent principles, i.e. those of individual freedom and choice, of media freedom, and of media obligation to society.

From the foregoing, press freedom in capitalist liberal democracies, such as Britain and the United States, denotes that every individual (citizen and professional journalist) has the right

to freely publish his or her sentiment(s) through the instrumentality of the news media without fear of prior restraint or of arbitrary punishment for whatever is published. Such individuals equally have the right to own any of the news media and to protect the source(s) of their information within the bounds of criminal law.

This right of press freedom is however subject to regulation by the "self-righting process of truth" in "free market place of ideas" and by courts as obtained under pure libertarianism, but more importantly, under the social responsibility concept, by community opinion, consumer action and professional ethics. Invasion of recognized private rights and vital social interests is also forbidden.

In essence, the Western concept of press freedom is built around three main principles:

- i. the prohibition of government interference with the press in the form of censorship or similar prior restraint [although prior restraints are justified under carefully limited circumstances] (Nam, 1983)
- ii. the principles that any restrictions on press freedom must be applied or subject to review by the courts, and that courts alone have the right to impose penalties (Wei, 1970); and
- iii. the principle of completely private ownership of the print news media and a largely private ownership of the broadcast media.

Let us now examine press freedom in the socialist world.

Press Freedom in the Socialist System

Unlike in the capitalist liberal democracies, the perception and definition of press freedom in the socialist world such as Cuba, China, Albania, North Korea, etc. is based on the Soviet Communist theory of the press which developed in the Soviet Union after the 1917 Bolshevik revolution.

Under the theory which evolved from Marxist – Leninist – Stalinist thought, with mixture of Hegel and 19th Century Russian thinking, the chief purpose of the press is to contribute to the success and continuance of the socialist system, and especially to the dictatorship of the party (Siebert et al., 1956).

The Soviet media theory itself derives from the basic principles of "scientific socialism"/communism which are materialistic determinism and class struggle and has the following as its major ideas:

i. First, the working class [the proletariat] by definition holds power in a socialist society, and to keep power, has to control the means of 'mental production.' Thus, all media should be subject to control by agencies of the working class – primarily the communist party;

ii. Secondly, socialist societies are, or aspire to be, classless societies and thus lacking in conflict. The press should consequently not be structured along lines of political conflict;

iii. Thirdly, the press has a positive role to play in the formation of society and the movement towards communism and this suggests a number of important functions for the media in socialization, informal social control and mobilization towards planned social and economic goals;

iv. Fourthly, Marxism presupposes objective laws of history and thus an objective reality that the press should reflect;

v. Fifthly, the general theory of the [socialist] state requires the media to submit to ultimate control by organs of the state and to be, in varying degrees, integrated with other instruments of political life (McQuail, 1987).

The socialist media are, within these limits, expected to be self-regulatory. Thus Article 125 of the Soviet Union's 1936 ("Stalin") Constitution, for instance, guarantees freedom of the press. It states that:

In conformity with the interests of the working people and in order to strengthen the socialist system, the citizens of the USSR are guaranteed by law.

- a. Freedom of speech;*
- b. Freedom of the press; (emphasis, mine)*
- c. Freedom of assembly; including the holding of mass meetings;*
- d. Freedom of street processions and demonstrations;*

These civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communication facilities and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights.

The communists [socialists] conceive that press freedom cannot exist in a system [capitalist] where only the monied classes have access to the mass media (Martin and Chaudhary, 1983). Marxist – Leninist theory holds that the freedom of the press is a delusion so long as capitalists commandeer the better printing establishments

and the largest stores of paper and capital retains its power over the press (Ugboajah, 1987).

In line with this thinking and since the poor – the masses – are in the majority, the proper thing to do to have ‘true’ freedom of the press, according to socialist thesis, is for the government to put the wherewithal for mass communication at the disposal of the masses. Private ownership of the media is therefore proscribed and profit motive is removed from media practice.

For a socialist citizen or journalist then, freedom of the press means freedom from a class, most likely the bourgeoisie; freedom to use the press as an instrument of unity (Okunna, 1990).

Press Freedom in the Developing World

Altschull (1984) notes that in much of Africa and Asia (where we have a large concentration of developing countries), an indigenous press was slow in developing and tended to follow the models provided by colonial rulers. Nam (1983) also submits that the ‘Third World’ has at one extreme some of its countries copying the Western libertarian concept of the press and at the other extreme some countries that consciously model themselves after the Marxist – Leninist concept. While admitting that there are developing countries that fall in between the two extremes, he concludes that “regardless of the ideology of a Third World nation, strong developmental efforts by ruling elites in Third World nations, do not leave much room for a free and independent press in the Western tradition.”

Nam is, perhaps, right in his submissions on press freedom in the developing countries. Many ‘Third World’ studies [and political leaders and even some journalists] insist that because of the glaring need for rapid socio-economic development and national integration or cohesion in the developing countries, developing countries’ news media differ from those of the other two socio-political systems in their basic functions which are to promote social stability and development (Omwanda, 1990-1991). As succinctly expressed by Altschull (1984):

To the struggling, insecure nations of the advancing world [his preference for ‘developing’ or ‘Third World’], abstract principles of press freedom are less important than the viability of their nations.

Kenyan journalist and publisher, Hilary

Ng’weno, (1968) puts it more graphically:

The challenge to the press in young countries is the challenge of laying down the foundations upon which future freedoms will thrive... [A] nyone who has lived or travelled widely in Africa, Asia or Latin America cannot fail to be appalled at the enormous amount of poverty, illiteracy and disease that are to be found everywhere. Under some of the conditions in which Asians, Africans and Latin Americans live, it will be sacrilegious to talk about press freedom, for freedom loses meaning when human survival is the only imperative principle on which a people lives.

Given this portrait, the concept of press freedom prevailing in the developing world is that of development media/development journalism theory. According to Kunczik (1988), the term development journalism first cropped up around 1967 to define a notion of journalism according to which reporting of events of national and international significance should be constructive, in the sense that it contributes positively to the development of the country concerned. Its main focus should not be on day-to-day news but on long-term development processes.

Development journalism/media theory advocates positive functions for the news media to further national development, promote political and cultural autonomy and allow for participatory communication structures, which enable grassroots involvement in media production and management. To the extent that development is the main agenda of the ‘Third World’, journalists are supposed to subordinate their freedoms to the pursuit of development goal. (Omwanda, 1990-1991)

McQuail (1987) gives the main principles of development media theory as follows:

- (i) Media should accept and carry out positive development tasks in line with nationally established policy;
- (ii) Freedom of the media should be open to restriction according to (1) economic priorities and (2) development needs of society;
- (iii) Media should give priority in their content to national culture and language;
- (iv) Media should give priority in news and information to links with other developing countries which are close geographically, culturally or politically;
- (v) Journalists and other media workers have

rights/ freedoms as well as responsibilities;
 (vi) In the interest of development ends, the state has a right to intervene in, or restrict, media operations and devices of censorship, subsidy and direct control can be justified.

From the foregoing, press freedom in the developing world is conceived and defined in accordance with the collective developmental purpose of society. The individual's right to publish his or her sentiments in or through the news media is recognized and protected as in the western tradition provided such sentiments do not run counter to developmental goals of society as perceived by sometimes elected but mostly self-imposed political leaders. The right to own and operate, majorly, the print news media is also guaranteed within the same bounds. Of course, censorship, prior and post, and direct control by government are considered legitimate where the government feels that the press is about to or has transgressed. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, one of the most passionate defenders of liberty in the developing world, states must be "armed with the authority to deal with" dangerous language [and by logical extension, content] in the press. "We cannot", he said, "imperil the safety of the whole nation in the name of some fancied freedom which put an end to all freedom"(sic.) (Altschull, 1984).

In spite of the prevalence of these seemingly lofty defenses or explanations for developmental journalism or theory of press freedom in developing countries however, critics of press freedom suppression in the socio-political system, particularly in African countries, are not impressed. Many of them contend that curbing press freedom is not the panacea for socio-political stability and national development. With over-flowing examples of instances where African political leaderships have restricted the freedom of the African press when the latter attempted to expose their wrong-doings, the critics hold that:

...the African press is controlled by the government for the fear that a free press will readily unearth the staggering proportions of graft, ineptitude, lack of accountability as well as the corruption, mismanagement, bribery, roguery and official stealing inherent within the ruling bourgeoisie class. (Ogbondah, 1994)

Toward a Better Press Freedom

Since press freedom conceptually evolved,

great efforts have been expended to conceive and, in some cases, implement what their respective authors perceive as the 'ideal' variant of the concept i.e. a kind of press freedom that could be equally or almost equally enjoyed by or beneficial to all members of particular societies irrespective of individuals' socio-economic standing, or one that is best suited to a particular socio-political system. Two of such landmark efforts are particularly remarkable – the post 1917 Marxist - Leninist - Stalinist redefinition of press freedom culminating in the socialist view of the concept and the work of the 1947 U.S. Commission on Freedom of the Press (Hutchins Commission) yielding the social responsibility view. Both efforts were, notably, directed at removing the perceived imperfections of a purely libertarian press freedom which can be broadly summarized as lack of access to the press by those (and they are usually in the majority) who lack the economic means, misrepresentation of society through unrelenting purveyance of unrepresentative though dominant view(s) of society and base sensationalism.

These demerits are said to derive from the concentration of press ownership in the hands of a few representatives of "big business" leading towards monopoly, "exaggerated drives for power and profit" and "a common bias" of the large investors and employers (United States Press Freedom (Hutchins) Commission Report, 1947). But in spite of the conception and adoption of the social responsibility concept of press freedom in the capitalist liberal democracies and of the Soviet Communist view in the socialist world, the perceived inadequacies of press freedom as obtained under libertarianism have persisted.

For a majority of the population in the western democracies, the right of press freedom has been fundamentally transformed to the extent that it is often reduced to a right to consume available information, what Hardt calls "the modern dilemma". As put by Hardt (1983):

The inadequacy of information available through traditional media coverage has been illuminated by the development of an underground press during the 1960s in the United States and, most recently, by the establishment of neighbourhood and community newspapers by citizen action groups in Western Europe. Addressing specific local problems and national political issues ignored by traditional media, these publications have represented the

voices of dissent and opposition to official policies. They are evidence of the existence of groups whose views are not reflected in the established media.

As for the socialist press freedom, instead of producing a 'true' freedom of the press in terms of free media access for all citizens, what the soviet-communist press freedom concept seems to have produced is free access for only loyal and orthodox party members. Apart from the problem of access for majority of people in exercising their freedom of the press, the press whether under the socialist or the capitalist concept of press freedom, has continued to propagate and perpetuate dominant ideology (that is the ideas of the politically, economically, socially and the culturally powerful in society) to the neglect of all other ideas, as they structurally must.

Various scholars including Cohen (1962), Peterson (1978), Altschull (1984), Abiola (1986) and Moemeka (1988) have convincingly established the fact that the mass media in all societies, irrespective of socio-political ideology, and inferentially of press freedom concept, propagate and perpetuate dominant ideology.

The mass media, despite their illusion of universal representativeness, are not the voices of the whole people but of chosen people and chosen issues i.e. "selective exposure and status conferral" (Abiola, 1986). Moreover, the latent structure of mass media messages distorts (or selectively presents) reality in ways that perpetuate the interest of the existing power structure (Moemeka, 1988).

In a critical and scholarly appraisal of the three press models of the world i.e. the capitalist, socialist and the advancing world's press systems, Altschull (1984) contends that an independent press does not and cannot exist anywhere in the world; rather the news media are inevitable agents of those forces that wield power in the economic, political, social and cultural environment.

Also in a perceptive institutional review of the criticism of the American media, Peterson (1978) submits that:

...the mass media are not really autonomous but are adjuncts of other orders. Looking back through history, one sees how various dominant institutions, unwittingly or by conscious design, have used the media to maintain and strengthen their power. So it was when the church used the

printing press to reinforce and extend its influence. So it was when the crown held the press of England in thrall. So it is today in ...[the socialist states] where the mass media are an adjunct of the political order, or in the United States where they are an adjunct of the industrial.

Given the above factors, it will always be impossible to conceptually or practically evolve a press freedom that will be equally or almost equally enjoyable by or beneficial to all members of the human race or of a particular socio-political setting irrespective of individual's socio-political standing. Press freedom will always operate preponderantly more to the benefit of the economically, the politically, the socially, and the culturally powerful in society.

SYNOPSIS AND CONCLUSION

This treatise has, in the preceding pages, attempted a general exploration of press freedom as a concept. It has inquired into the origin and general perception of press freedom at evolution and into its different contemporary notions in the three broad socio-political systems of the world.

It found out that since press freedom originated under libertarianism in post - 1688 England, various attempts have been made to conceive and implement, "in the interest of society," what the authors of the efforts perceived as an "ideal" or "true" variant of the concept. Since the press structure, including its freedom, is always determined by the socio-political structure however, an ideal press freedom that will be equally enjoyable by or beneficial to all members of the society, irrespective of socio-political class, will always be difficult if not impossible to perfectly, effectively conceive much more implement.

In spite of this reality, the following steps are suggested for ameliorating the identified limitations of press freedom in all socio-political systems. These steps are:

- (i) the democratization of news media ownership and control - a system where professional, labor, community and other groups would own and control the news media in their own interests and that of the society, as the nature of ownership and control play an overriding role in the definition and practice of press freedom;

- (ii) the introduction of a system of state subsidy for the marginal press i.e. the news media owned and operated by minority groups within larger geographical or political macrocosms, as such media largely represents the neglected (unchosen) views in society; and
- (iii) the introduction of a system of public service broadcasting as operated in the British system.

REFERENCES

- Abiola, M.K.O. 1986. "Mass Media and Political Awareness" (pp. 122-134) in N. Etukudo (ed.), *Issues and Problems in Mass Communication*. Calabar: Development Digest Ltd.
- Altschull, J. H. 1984. *Agents of Power: The Role of the News Media in Human Affairs*. New York: Longman
- Cohen, B. 1962. *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton: University Press.
- Hardt, H. 1983. "Press Freedom in Western Societies" (pp. 298-310) in L. Martin and A. Chaudhary (eds.), *Comparative Mass Media Systems*. New York: Longman.
- Harris, M. 1978. "The Structure, Ownership and Control of the Press, 1620 - 1780" (pp. 81-91) in G. Boyce et al. (eds.), *Newspaper History from the 17th Century to the Present Day*. California: Sage Publications.
- Hatchen, W. A. 1974. "Mass Media in Africa" (pp. 90-99) in A. Wells (ed.), *Mass Communication: A World View*. California: National Press Books.
- Kunczik, M. 1988. *Concepts of Journalism: North and South*. Bonn: Friedrich, Ebert - Stiftung.
- Martin, L. and A. Chaudhary (eds.) 1983. *Comparative Mass Media Systems*. New York: Longman.
- McQuail, D. 1987. *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Milton, John. 1644. *Areopagitica: For The Liberty of Unlicensed Printing (To The Parliament of England)*. London.
- Moemeka, A. A. 1978. "Press Freedom: The Swedish Example" (Nigerian) *Daily Times*, Aug. 12 p. 4.
- Moemeka A. A. 1988. "Mass Media and Rational Domination: A Critical Review of a Dominant Paradigm." *Africa Media Review*, 3 (1): 1-20.
- Nam, S. 1983. "Press Freedom in the Third World" (pp. 311-321) in L. Martin and A. Chaudhary (eds.), *Comparative Mass Media Systems*. New York: Longman.
- Ng'weno, H. 1968. "The Role of the Press in a Developing Country." *Paper presented at the IPI Assembly in Nairobi, Kenya*: June 4.
- Ogbondah, C. W. 1994. "Press Freedom and Political Development in Africa." *Africa Media Review*, 8 (3): 20-31.
- Okunna, C. S. 1990. "Freedom of the Press in the third World: Freedom For Whom?" *Nigerian Journal of Mass Communication*, 1(1): 140-149.
- Omwanda, L. O. 1990 -1991. "Sources of Authoritarianism in the African News Media." *Caejac Journal*, 3: 23-40.
- Oso, Lai. 1988. "Press Freedom: Limits of a constitutional Provision" (pp. 45-74) in *Constitution Making and National Development*. Abeokuta: Ogun State MAMSER.
- Peterson, T. 1978. "Why the Mass Media are that Way" (pp. 5-16) in F. Voelker and L. Voelker (eds.), *Mass Media: Forces in our Society*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.
- Schiller, D. 1986. "Transformation of News in the U. S. Information Market" (pp. 41-51) in Golding et al. (eds.), *Communicating Politics*. Leicester: University Press.
- Siebert, F., T. Peterson and W. Schramm. 1956. *Four Theories of the Press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Ugboajah, F. 1987. "Four Options for Press Regulation" *Africa Media Monograph Series*, 3: 129-157.
- United States of America. 1947. *Report of Press Freedom Commission (Hutchins Commission)*.
- Wei, M. 1970. "Freedom of Information as an international Problem" (pp. 305-315) in Heinz - Dietrich Fisher and John C. Merrill (eds.), *International Communication*. New York: Hastings House.