

ORIGINS OF MASS COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH DURING THE AMERICAN COLD WAR. BY TIMOTHY GLANDER. MAHWAH, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS, 2000. PP. 237.

Reviewed by Jennifer L. Manlowe

The past century has seen serious progress in the analysis and understanding of the history of education. Anthropologists, linguists, psychologists, sociologists, historians, literary critics, philosophers, and researchers in communication and media studies have all had something to say in regards to the most viable ways to approach the study of education and *read* its various effects in society.

Until recently, according to educational historian Timothy Glander, the history of communications and media studies research has been written almost entirely from within the field of communications studies, and, as a result, has tended to refrain from asking troubling foundational questions about the origins of the field or to entertain how its emergence shaped educational discourse during the post-World War II period. Glander claims there are very particular reasons for this parochial view. He writes,

I think there are some fairly obvious reasons for this, having to do with the natural tendency of people to simply accept the dominant values and practices that guided their own education and eventual assimilation into a field. When one becomes acclimated to the governing worldview, it becomes difficult to ask about fundamental purposes, or even to see such questions as meaningful and important. (pp. ix).

Glander's focus in this study is grounded in primary source material of scholars who have examined the effects in education of mass

communications research and its intellectual origins in 20th-century America. His work, much like John Dewey's *Experience and Education* or *Democracy and Education*, critiques "intellectual paternalism" and sees such a development in education as resulting from two war-related events. First, giving the communication controllers the benefit of the doubt, like Dewey, Glander argues that the war itself created in leadership a profound fear with respect to what is appropriate knowledge for the masses. Dewey wrote, "The fact which stands out is that the war has generated an atmosphere of safety first regarding all facts (sic) knowledge of which stimulates social change" (Dewey, 1918). Second, the war "increased the prior centralization" of the developing communication technologies, and this created the physical apparatus by which intellectual paternalism could thrive.

Glander uncovers a paradox: By mid-century, mass communications researchers had become recognized as experts in describing the effects of the mass media on learning and other social behavior. However, the conditions that promoted and sustained their authority as experts had never been adequately explored. Glander's study lifts the rug on this tautological error by analyzing the ideological and historical forces which gave rise to, and shaped, mass communications research.

Glander's book is divided into seven chapters with a bibliography and an index. The seven main chapters address primarily a textual critical audience. In Chapter one he explores education and propaganda and the debates that occurred between the two world wars. In Chapter two various forms of "the coming of age" of media research is explored. Chapter three focuses on the social ideas of American Mass Communications according to their experts. He examines the biographies of such key figures in the field of American education as Henry Barnard, Booker T. Washington, William T. Harris, Francis Parker, G. Stanley Hall, Edward L. Thorndike, John Dewey and others, for insight into what was deemed as socially "necessary, possible, and desirable" and how these were translated into their various educational practices and programs. Glander argues that "these educators were not fully aware of the social philosophy their educa-

tional work reflected" (73). Chapter four focuses primarily on the mass communications research of Paul F. Lazarsfeld and the Bureau of Applied Social Research with an eye toward moral dilemmas facing propaganda exposure. Chapter five is entitled, "Wilbur Schramm and the Founding of Communication Study. It makes an especially strong argument for mass communications research at the university level.

Chapter six borrows from a 1962 essay entitled "The Universe of Discourse in Which They Grow Up" by Paul Goodman (1911-1972). Instead, its title is "The Universe of Discourse in Which We Grew Up" and in this section, Glander explores the history of critically reading the impact of the media on U.S. cultural life, conformity in thought, values, and behavior. The book concludes with chapter seven in what I see to be the most critical acts in the book, its tough questioning on par with John T. Gatto. Glander asks: "To what degree have educational institutions come to function merely as 'auxiliary engines for the forces of mass society,' or to what degree have they come to function autonomously and in opposition to the demands of the mass society? Where do the dominant educational issues of the day originate and for what reasons, and how do these educational issues relate to the personal troubles and problems encountered by classroom teachers? How are teachers and schooling portrayed in the mass media, and whose interests are served by this portrayal? How does the notion of the mass society relate to the despair that accompanies almost any discussion of public school reform? How is the notion of a mass society reflected in the continued centrality of standardized achievement, intelligence, and psychological tests; the dominance of behavior modification techniques in classroom practice; and the prevalence of schools without any clearly discernible educational philosophy or purpose beyond one's own efficient administration?" (214).

Glander's work presents a deeply thought-out analysis of an overlooked aspect of education and communication. He claims, "they should never be examined as separate [fields] because they are in-

extricably linked via theory and practice." Educational philosophers from Socrates to Chomsky have recognized this and have sought to make this relationship clear. According to Glander, "Education and communication cannot be separated, although our present academic arrangements make believe that they can be so partitioned" (x). Glander works to tell part of the story of how and why this division occurred, what occasioned this partition, and how the emergence and ascendance of the new field of communication affected educational matters in the 20th century. Glander's aim is "to recover an understanding that posits the essential connection between education and communication." He is able to do so primarily by showing the history of this intersection through individual biographies of significant leaders in the communications field and the larger historical context in which they lived and worked.

Altogether, Glander's *Origins of Mass Communications Research During the American Cold War* offers a fresh analysis of the factors that gave rise to communication study and research on university campuses. He argues that such factors are as complicated as those factors shaping the United States in the 20th century. His is not the last word in an ongoing debate over the role mass media can have in shaping the opinions (knowledge) of an emerging mass society but it is certainly a word worthy of giving thoughtful attention.

Long Island University

SOURCES CITED

John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997) [1932].

_____, *Experience and Education* (New York: Touchstone Press, 1997) [1938].

_____, "The New Paternalism." *The New Republic*, 17 (21 December 1918), pp. 216-217.

John T. Gatto, *A Different Kind of Teacher: Solving the Crisis of American Schooling* (Berkeley: Berkeley Hills, 2000).

Jennifer Marlowe