In *Imperialism, Media, and the Good Neighbor*, Professor Fred Fejes of Florida Atlantic University traces and analyzes United States shortwave broadcasting policy towards Latin America during the 1930s and 1940s. While the majority of the book consists of a narrative explanation of this policy, based chiefly on documentary research, to me the book's primary interest is the attempt by the author to integrate the private broadcaster/government rivalry within the modern framework of "Media Imperialism", defined by Fejes as "the process by which modern communications media have operated to create, maintain and expand systems of dominance and dependence on a world scale." (1) For Fejes, communications represents one of a number of factors used by the United States in an integrated way to fashion hegemony over Latin America, and he finds the process whereby shortwave broadcasting was used in this respect not only interesting in its own right, but also illustrative of global United States foreign policy approaches following World War II.

The relatively short book is divided into six chapters: an introduction, which outlines the "revisionist" perspective outlined above; a background chapter, which traces the expansion of United States economic and military interests in Latin America and the Caribbean from the 1880s to the beginning of the FDR era; three substantive chapters which detail United States shortwave broadcasting policy toward Latin America, chronologically from its inception in the 1920s to the end of World War II; and a short conclusion and postscript tying the analysis to media imperialism.

Clearly any nation's mass communications system cannot be fully understood outside of the nature of the economic and political system within which it operates. This is as true of the American media system as any other, and to assume that there is no correlation between American mass media and a capitalist economic system, with a government in part directing and regulating that economic system, is nonsense. However, the theory of media imperialism goes far beyond this, suggesting at least collusion, if not conspiracy, between the government and private enterprise in achieving and maintaining United States hegemony over Latin America.

How well then does Fejes' case study of United States shortwave broadcasting policy fit the theory of media imperialism? The author certainly creates the appropriate milieu in which media imperialism would be expected to operate by examining early American business and government policy with respect to the cable (telegraph), radio, wire service, and advertising industries. However, with respect specifically to shortwave broadcasting, it appears to me that Fejes has chosen an area of media endeavour which is not especially well explained by a theory of media imperialism.
For example, during the developmental phase of shortwave broadcasting, Fejes comments that there was explicitly no "larger political purposes in mind" (60) on the part of the commercial broadcasters and that the government only began to see an application of shortwave broadcasting to international politics in Latin America in the mid 1930s, after the Germans had initiated an impressive program of their own. More telling, however, is that Fejes' detailed account of industry-government antagonism during the late 1930s and continuing well after the outbreak of World War II in 1939, demonstrates convincingly that both government and industry policy in the United States was clearly reactive to Germany's use of shortwave broadcasting to reach audiences in Latin America.

There is no question that once the United States entered World War II, and the government took effective control of the communications industry, that the mass media (as well as other segments of the United States population) joined wholeheartedly in the war effort. Also, I have no difficulty with the proposition that World War II shortwave broadcasting to Latin America served as the model for the post World War II Voice of America.

However, on the basis of Fejes' own evidence, it seems to me difficult to sustain the thesis that American shortwave broadcasting either saw itself or actually served as part of the cement holding the United States Latin American commercial empire together. My own conclusions, based on the reading of Fejes' three substantive chapters, are as follows: (1) once it became clear that there were little commercial return on shortwave broadcasting, American private networks did very little except to actively resist the creation of a government owned broadcast facility; (2) that when prodded by the government (which was concerned primarily with Nazi Germany, not Latin America), private broadcasters did increase shortwave service to Latin America, but that this consisted largely of replays of domestic programming; and (3) that not until actual United States entry into World War II did overt propaganda concerns become incorporated into American shortwave broadcasting. These conclusions may possibly fit a theory of media imperialism; however, they seem to be adequately explained by virtually total societal mobilization behind the war effort.
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No clear principle unifies this work apart from a negative injunction: treatment of specific texts and all the tools of textual analysis shall be left at the door. Since the majority of film scholars have a primary interest in textual analysis, the Current