

Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly

<http://jmq.sagepub.com/>

Licensing Journalists in Latin America: An Appraisal

Jerry W. Knudson

Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly 1996 73: 878

DOI: 10.1177/107769909607300408

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jmq.sagepub.com/content/73/4/878>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication](#)

Additional services and information for *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jmq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jmq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Dec 1, 1996

Downloaded from jmq.sagepub.com by guest on January 28, 2013

[What is This?](#)

LICENSING JOURNALISTS IN LATIN AMERICA: AN APPRAISAL

By Jerry W. Knudson



The issue of professionalization of journalism and therefore of how to achieve professional standards has been of concern to journalists and to the general public for many years.¹ In Latin America, one attempt at professionalization – the development of the colegio – has garnered some praise and has raised concerns about government control. Probably no issue in recent years concerning the Latin American press has aroused greater opposition or misunderstanding in the United States than the system whereby anyone must have a university degree in journalism and/or be a member of a colegio – a professional association – in order to practice journalism. Despite recent Supreme Court decisions in the Dominican Republic and Costa Rica against obligatory licensing by their colegios of journalists, the institution is gaining headway in Latin America as a whole. Opponents maintain that the colegio system imperils freedom of the press. But others assert it raises professional standards and increases salaries. The author of this study notes that colegios frequently uphold freedom of expression under dictatorial or military regimes, and that opposition by publishers to colegios seems to be based on economic rather than “free press” grounds.

No issue in recent years concerning the Latin American press has aroused greater opposition or misunderstanding in the United States than the system whereby anyone must have a university degree in journalism and/or be a member of a *colegio* – a professional association – in order to practice journalism.

Newspaper editorial writers and the Inter American Press Association (IAPA) maintain that the *colegio* system imperils freedom of the press. But others assert that as long as governments do not administer them, *colegios* are as democratic and independent as the American Medical Association and American Bar Association which set standards – with licensing – for their professions without governmental interference.

Despite adverse court rulings in two cases (noted below), *colegios* have been increasing in number in Latin America – not decreasing. In 1973, eight nations had the *colegio* system, or variations of it, whereas in 1993 the total was thirteen – Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela.² Some were inactive, but they remained on the books.

Professionalization in Latin America is growing on all fronts. Some 60,000 journalists serve a total of 420 million people. Schools of journalism – frequently called faculties of “social communication” – burgeoned from 13 in 1950 to almost 250 by 1992.³ Advocates believe the setting is right for the establishment of *colegios*.

The word *colegio* cannot be translated exactly. It is neither a guild (*gremio*) nor labor union (*sindicato*). Nor can the Latin *collegium* suffice because it was used by the Soviet *kollegya* or group in which each member had approximately equal power and authority. To complicate matters further, private secondary schools in Latin America are also called *colegios*.

Despite the recent expression of concern, *colegios* of journalists in Latin America are not new on the scene. When “The Third World and Press Freedom” conference was held at the Edward R. Murrow Center of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University in 1977, *colegios* were not perceived as threats or even mentioned, although the system had operated in Brazil for thirty-three years and less time in seven other countries.⁴

One misconception about *colegios* is that they are organizations only for journalists. On the contrary, a check of the 1993 telephone directory for the metropolitan area of San José, Costa Rica, revealed fifty-six professional *colegios* – ranging from librarians to veterinarians. Before establishing *colegios*, journalists were not recognized as professionals and thus were ineligible for pensions and other benefits.⁵

Although some Latin American publishers would deny it, one impetus behind the *colegio* movement is to raise salaries for journalists – which have been abysmal – by restricting the labor market to university journalism graduates. Throughout the region newsmen and women have had to hold down two or three jobs – sometimes with conflicts of interest – to make ends meet. Thus they are vulnerable to bribes, which go by various names in different countries, such as *mordidos* (“bites”) in Mexico or *chivos* (“goats”) in Argentina, but are as commonly accepted as tipping in the United States. Many journalists expect to be paid by their sources to get favorable news into the media or to keep unfavorable news out. *Colegios* hope to end this practice.

Efforts by *colegios* to raise salaries have worked in some instances. In Brazil, for example, which approved the first *colegio* of journalists in 1934, pay for staff writers rose from \$10 to \$20 a month in 1935 to \$50 to \$100 a month in 1945. Even allowing for inflation, this is a substantial increase.⁶

Rodolfo Audi, head of the Argentine Federation of Press Workers, pointed out in 1990 that his 18,000-member organization founded in 1957 was the strongest press union in Latin America and thus there was no need for a *colegio* in Argentina.⁷ On the other hand, Díaz Rangel, president of the Latin American Journalists Federation (FELAP), based in Mexico City with 50,000 members, conceded that traditional trade unions have been divided and ineffective.⁸ Thus FELAP in 1987 sought to create a common front with the existing *colegios*, but the effort failed.⁹

Survey

This brief survey is based largely on informal questionnaires sent to cultural attachés or press officers in the Washington, D.C., embassies of the twenty traditional Latin American republics and thirteen English-speaking Caribbean countries, followed up with letters and, in some cases, telephone calls. The results are as varied as the nations themselves, but discernible patterns seem to emerge.

Only two countries so far have declared obligatory *colegio* statutes unconstitutional. These include the Dominican Republic in 1989 after six local newspapers challenged the law, later replaced by one with voluntary membership and no degree required.¹⁰ It is not surprising that the Supreme Court of the Dominican Republic in its fifteen-page decision did not cite the advisory opinion of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) which unanimously ruled in 1985 against compulsory licensing of journalists in Costa Rica, which will be discussed in detail below.

Numerous Latin American intellectuals regard the Organization of American States and its dependencies – including the IACHR – as creatures of the United States. Despite juridical equality, they feel that the OAS has been dominated by the North American republic. As Arthur P. Whitaker wrote, “Save in the political realm, the record of that experience [United States-Latin American relations] is largely one which is held together either by the common ties of the Americas with Europe or else by the covers of a book.”¹¹

Perhaps because these two cases were *sui generis*, they seem to have had little effect on the rest of Latin America where lawmakers, of course, decide on their own realities. Venezuela on 22 December 1994 extended and reinforced the *colegio* law of 1973 requiring that all practicing journalists be registered with the national *Colegio* and hold a communications degree.¹² The IAPA urged President Rafael Caldera to veto the bill, but he pointed out that it was adopted unanimously by both the deputies and senators.¹³

In Brazil, a decree-law of 1979, incorporated in the new Constitution of 1988, makes it obligatory to be a journalism graduate in order to work as a journalist, but this is “not enforced by large newspapers which can afford legal fees and fines,” said Carlos Lins da Silva, U.S. correspondent for *Folha de São Paulo*, Brazil’s largest newspaper.¹⁴

Other countries are also considering adopting the *colegio* system. Journalists in Guatemala have been pressing for one since 1988, which was considered in Congress in 1991.¹⁵ In Bolivia, where a *colegio* was debated as early as 1972, one was established in 1986 – without obligatory or degree requirements – but with the specific mission to obtain such compulsory membership.¹⁶ Even in Argentina, where there has never been an obligatory system and where only two universities offer courses in journalism but no degrees, there is now some consideration for starting a *colegio*.¹⁷

Other countries have followed the Brazilian example of simply requiring a journalism degree but not obligatory membership in a *colegio*, but this leaves open the question of who would enforce this step toward professionalization. In Paraguay, the 1992 Constitution leaves it squarely in the hands of the government with the provision that the law “shall determine the professions requiring a university degree for their practice.”¹⁸ The latest development came in Paraguay when the Chamber of Deputies on 16 November 1995 rejected a bill that would have provided for licensing.¹⁹

Chile has had bitter experience in this regard. The *Colegio*, founded in 1956, was demoted to the status of *gremio asociacional* (guild) by dictator Augusto Pinochet in 1981, an action which challenges Mary Gardner’s statement, “The [Chilean] *Colegio* has protested in one form or another every decree the military government has issued limiting freedom of the press, but little evidence exists that the government has taken it seriously.”²⁰

If the Chilean *Colegio* posed no threat to the regime, why was it downgraded? Moreover, after Pinochet seized power in 1973, the *Colegio* was denied permission to hold a national meeting for six years. Today in Chile,

historically one of the most sophisticated democracies in Latin America, membership in the *Colegio* is optional, but one does need a journalism degree to work in the field.²¹

In Nicaragua, another country undergoing profound change in recent years, the National Assembly is considering a voluntary *Colegio de Periodistas*, but a university degree in journalism would be required.²² Ironically, for those who would defend democracy, the Nicaraguan Journalists Association, composed of publishers, opposes the bill "because it would permit Sandinista journalism to control the leadership of the organization through their greater numbers."²³

The Honduras statute is obligatory, with the exception of sportswriters – an exception also made in the original Costa Rican law. In Honduras students with 60 percent of their coursework completed may be granted a provisional license to work until they graduate.²⁴

Proponents of the *colegio* system also argue there is no infringement on freedom of expression since columns of the newspapers are still open to *colaboradores* (guest columnists) and letter writers. This is significant in Latin America where intellectuals, far from shunning newspapers, have long considered it both an obligation and honor to write for them, presaging the Op-Ed pages in the United States.

Nor have there been any abuses of press freedom in Ecuador since the inception of its *Colegio* in 1968, not surprising for a country selected as the site of CIESPAL (International Center of Advanced Studies in Communication for Latin America) which has done much to upgrade professionalism in the region.²⁵ Even in revolutionary Cuba, where after 1959 the Union of Cuban Journalists (UPC) replaced the obligatory *Colegio* founded in 1935, one must have a degree in journalism – or equivalent experience – to work in the field. One must pay twenty pesos to become a member of the UPC, which also is required.²⁶

Structure of the *colegio* – and especially its relationship to the government – has been resolved in various ways. In Bolivia journalists must register with the Ministry of Education, a formality which is the only connection with the state. In Haiti the press decree of 1987 requires journalists to have a university degree and be reaccredited each year in the obligatory Association of Journalists of Haiti to insure continued professional competence.²⁷ Peru has the unique arrangement whereby its *Colegio* is paid for by an assessment on newspapers, which raises serious questions about possible governmental control.²⁸

Journalists in Panama, which is considering repealing its obligatory / degree provisions, have come up with perhaps the best solution: that credentials to practice journalism would be conferred by a council of representatives of the schools of social communication and press associations.²⁹

Proponents of the *colegio* system argue that it raises the standards of journalism since each individual association has the means to enforce mutually agreed upon codes of ethics or conduct. In Chile, for example, elected regional councils of the national *Colegio* can give private warnings, public censure, a fine 100 times the member's dues, six months suspension, or expulsion.³⁰ Such formal actions are rare, however, as peer pressure within the *Colegio* generally brings about corrective measures.

Colegios also serve educational purposes, organizing seminars for their members. In Bolivia, for example, the Association of La Paz Journalists, which has strived since 1972 for an obligatory *Colegio*, has held conferences

on such vital topics as petroleum and the national economy, and denationalizing Bolivian industries.³¹

Costa Rica

It was in Costa Rica, however, where the *Colegio* system, established in 1969, went on trial in the court of U.S. public opinion. The case of Stephen Schmidt, who lived there from 1970 to 1980 and worked as a reporter after 1974, brought wide attention because he was an American and because Costa Rica had hemispheric respect for the long stability of its democratic institutions.³²

In 1983 the *Colegio* brought legal action against Schmidt because it did not recognize (at that time) the degree in journalism (*licenciatura*) he had earned from the private Autonomous University of Central America in San José. Nevertheless, he was reporting for the weekly English-language *Tico Times* and *La Nación*, both of the capital. According to Richard Dyer, publisher of the *Tico Times*, four Costa Rican journalists had been barred from the *Colegio* by 1994 and were sued by that organization for continuing to practice journalism, but their situation received little attention.³³

Schmidt won the case against him in the lower court, but its decision was reversed in 1983 by the Costa Rican Supreme Court, which issued a three-month suspended sentence (the maximum penalty for illegal practice of a profession was three years imprisonment.) At the time, Carlos Morales, president of the Costa Rican *Colegio*, said the ruling "doesn't limit freedom of expression because the law allows people to write opinion and commentary."³⁴

Costa Rica, however, voluntarily submitted the matter to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights – a consultative body of the Organization of American States – which in a split decision upheld the *Colegio's* right to license journalists. At the behest of the IAPA, the government of Costa Rica then sought an advisory opinion of the higher Inter-American Court of Human Rights which ruled unanimously in 1985 against compulsory licensing of journalists in Costa Rica.³⁵

Briefly, the Court based its decision on Article 13 of the American Convention on Human Rights, which entered into force on 18 July 1978, and provided, "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought and expression. This right includes freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, in print, in the form of art, or through any other medium of one's choice."³⁶

The seven-member Inter-American Court of Human Rights ruled that Law 4420 of 22 September 1969, Organic Law of the Association of Journalists of Costa Rica, was incompatible with Article 13 of the Convention because the law "prevents certain persons from joining the Association of Journalists and, consequently, denies them the full use of the mass media as a means of expressing themselves or imparting information."³⁷

Oscar Ariás, president of Costa Rica (1986-1990) and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1987 for his mediation in the El Salvador civil war, established a commission to study the Court's advisory opinion. He stated, "society feels better if it knows journalists are university graduates whose competence and responsibility are watched over by a body created and operated by a [*colegio*] 'without intervention or interference by political bodies or government authorities.'"³⁸

Colegio members in Costa Rica also defended the law, such as María Eugenia González, treasurer and member of the board of directors, who

declared it has raised the level of salaries, and "there is no influence whatever of the government in the *Colegio*."³⁹ She added that degrees from private schools had become acceptable and that Schmidt was admitted into the *Colegio* after the IACHR decision, but he did not return to Costa Rica.

In 1995 in a more significant decision, the Costa Rican Supreme Court ruled unanimously in the case of sportswriter Roger Ajún Blanco that Article 22 of the Organic Law of the *Colegio de Periodistas* violated both Article 7 of the Costa Rican Constitution and Article 13 of the American Convention on Human Rights. The *Colegio* Article 22 prescribed, "The particular functions of a journalist may only be performed by registered members of the *Colegio*." Article 7 of the Costa Rican Constitution grants international treaties precedence over ordinary law. The Supreme Court pointed out, however:

This ruling does not judge or cover the legitimacy of the existence of the Costa Rican *Colegio de Periodistas*, nor does it make reference to the profession of journalist... Instead, the obligatory licensing of journalists is illegitimate only when it impedes... the free expression and use of the public communications media in service of anyone trying to seek, receive and impart information of any type.⁴⁰

Another misconception of the *colegio* system is that it is the brainchild of UNESCO planners, but it was actually in place in some countries long before UNESCO came into being. Moreover, early efforts toward journalism education were geared to the *colegios* in Argentina and Brazil in the 1930s.⁴¹

In the nonbinding Act of Chapultepec of 1945, however, signatory hemispheric nations pledged to protect and encourage freedom of the press in their respective nations.⁴² Subsequently, UNESCO held a conference in Chile in 1961 on "The Development of Information Media in Latin America," followed by meetings in Colombia (1974), Ecuador (1975), and Costa Rica (1976). The final report of the latter, known as the Declaration of San José, was to be a fulcrum for debate in the years ahead. The two key provisions of the final report stated:

That it should be the joint responsibility of the State and the citizen to establish plans and programmes for the extensive and positive use of communication media within the framework of development policies.

That national communication policies should be conceived in the context of national realities, free expression of thought and respect for individual and social rights.⁴³

This was taken by some to be an endorsement of *colegios* in a sometimes heated rebuttal by U.S. lawmakers and newspaper editorial writers. Rep. Robin Beard (R-Tenn.) added an amendment to a 1981 bill, forbidding any more U.S. funds for UNESCO "If that organization implements any policy or procedure the effect of which is to license journalists or their publications, to censor or otherwise restrict the free flow in information within or among countries, or to impose mandatory codes of journalistic practice or ethics."⁴⁴ The House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved the Beard

The Battle Joined

Amendment, not questioned by the Senate, and President Ronald Reagan signed the measure into law in August 1982. Two years later the United States withdrew from UNESCO.⁴⁵

Scholars have keenly debated the reasons for the collapse of U.S. support for UNESCO and its policies, particularly the licensing of journalists. Leonard R. Sussman has written, "In all the years of acrimonious debates at UNESCO, I believe, there was never a resolution or an official action that assaulted a basic American interest."⁴⁶ On the other hand, Michael J. Farley maintains, "Although this [licensing journalists] is not the direct result of resolutions, UNESCO indirectly sustains or encourages this trend toward licensing and other forms of government control."⁴⁷

Some writers, however, confuse domestic licensing with providing identity cards or armbands to protect journalists. UNESCO never put forth a proposal for *colegios*; many already existed. The UN organization recognized early the impropriety of doing so. In 1980, the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems (MacBride Commission) reported:

It may be wondered whether professional regulations for journalists are desirable.... The multiplicity of social and economic systems existing in the world, as well as the specific needs of individual countries, obviously make it difficult to give either a generally affirmative or an overall negative answer to this question.⁴⁸

Despite the Supreme Court decisions in the Dominican Republic and Costa Rica, there is a growing body of "customary law" which may challenge or at least influence traditional jurisprudence. Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice defines "international custom" as "evidence of a general practice accepted as law." It has also been described as "broad-based state practice."⁴⁹ Third World advocates go further, asserting their "right to communicate." As David A. Cifrino has pointed out, "the growing practice of Latin American countries to impose controls on the news media effectively repudiates claims that customary law prohibits state control of news and information."⁵⁰

The differences in legal systems also must be borne in mind. Hispanic law is marked by legalism, with everything spelled out, while the constitutional approach in the United States is quite the opposite. The Mexican Constitution of 1917, which influenced many other countries in the Third World, raises what Anglos would consider statutory law – precise rights of labor, agrarian reform, and church-state relations – to constitutional level, whereas the Constitution of the United States lays down broad principles designed to be flexible for changing circumstances. Constitutional endorsement of *colegios* of journalists in Latin America therefore carries more weight, but they are also more vulnerable to constitutional changes.

Even more important, Hispanic-Portuguese law generally does not establish precedents as in Anglo-Saxon common law. Each appealed case in Chile, for instance, is decided on its own merits, not on previous decisions. On the other hand, the sanction of law is taken very seriously in Latin America, which helps to explain the origin and growth of *colegios*.

professional journalists are not required to belong to a *colegio* nor get a university degree in their field. Mexico is following the voluntary road to professionalism. In 1992 there were some nineteen schools of journalism in the country.⁵¹

In Uruguay within the more European southern cone of South America, professional status was sought early. In 1898 Uruguayan journalists founded the first newspaper guild designed "to defend the moral and material interest of the members... and to provide mutual protection of the members." The *Asociación de la Prensa* or guild established an ethics committee or "tribunal of honor" to resolve conflicts related to the practice of journalism.⁵² Thus, with a long tradition of professional concern, Uruguay has seen little need for a *colegio* of journalists. Newcomers to the field usually obtain a university degree in journalism because otherwise they must begin at the lowest or apprentice level.

"The debate over whether journalism is a profession, or a craft and calling, is older than any of us," writes Everette Dennis. This debate is the crux of the matter.⁵³ The late James Reston, respected member of the *New York Times*, had this to say on the question: "The doctor affects the physical well-being of his patients; the reporter affects the mental well-being of his readers.... Like the doctor, he has the opportunity to poison them, and the main difference, it seems to me, is merely that the reporter can poison more of them quicker than the doctor."⁵⁴

Abraham Flexner, whose 1910 survey of *Medical Education in the United States and Canada* brought sweeping reforms and professionalism to that field, found journalism education in 1930 to be "on a par with university faculties of cookery and clothing."⁵⁵ The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication seeks to set standards today in the United States, as CIESPAL does in Latin America, but the effect on the working journalist is debatable. As J. Edward Gerald wrote in 1963, many believe that "the ethics of journalism and business are in conflict and that journalists must organize to protect themselves against the spirit of the counting room."⁵⁶

Penn Kimball specifies the remedy: "But as long as entry into a career in journalism carries no compulsory period of specialized training, as long as there is no recognized test for the right to practice, journalists will forever be set apart from the ranks of the formal professions."⁵⁷

Conclusions

Do *colegios* threaten press freedom? In the half century or so of some of the older ones, they have frequently been adversaries of abusive governments. Dictators do not need another mechanism to impose their will. Self-censorship through intimidation by government officials is far less visible than punishing individual members of *colegios*. On the contrary, *colegios* have been the staunchest defenders of freedom of the press. As they gain in authority, they might serve as buffer between government and the press – especially in the area of self-censorship, which is the most serious problem facing the Latin American press today.

Moreover, it seems obvious that concepts of press freedom in Western industrial democracies, with three or four centuries of give-and-take between government and press, cannot be grafted wholly or even partly on emerging Third World countries. We consider freedom of the press in the United States to be part of our vital heritage – and rightly so – but this concept seems to carry

over into a worldwide fixation where social and economic conditions may be totally different.

In fact, publishers themselves have tarnished a free and responsible press. In the social and economic Mexican Revolution which began in 1910, for example, conservative publishers loyal to the old regime sabotaged the fragile democratic government of Francisco Madero (1911-1913). They confused freedom of the press with unbridled license and undermined the vulnerable Madero, leading to his overthrow and murder in 1913 and plunging Mexico into four more years of bloodshed.⁵⁸

Again, to cite a more recent example, the rightist Chilean press riddled the duly elected government of Marxist Salvador Allende (1970-1973) leading to his bloody overthrow, all the while mouthing pious slogans about "freedom of the press," and clamping seventeen years of dictatorial rule on Chile under General Augusto Pinochet. In either case, a responsible press nurtured by the *colegio* system might have prevented or at least ameliorated these slides toward authoritarianism.⁵⁹

In conclusion, it must be added that increasing numbers of U.S. observers are at last presenting the other side of the debate along with arguments against *colegios*.⁶⁰ Yet some Latin American publishers cannot disguise their economic motivation in trying to suppress the *colegio* movement. Their opposition to such a renewed system in Brazil, for example, which would force them to pay higher salaries because of a restricted labor market, is transparent. One is reminded of the early days of the New Deal in the United States when some publishers invoked "freedom of the press" to oppose the minimum wage being extended to news vendors.

Latin American journalists protest, however, that their motives are not entirely or even primarily economic. In keeping with their own cultures, as in Bolivia, they want to "dignify and make hierarchical the practice of journalism, enforcing codes of ethics and conduct."⁶¹ As Adriana Núñez, president of the *Colegio* in Costa Rica, said before it was founded "journalists were often pushed around and used by politicians."⁶² Such unsteady first steps toward professionalism should be encouraged, not categorically condemned. And one must always ask not only freedom *from* what – government interference – but also freedom *for* what – the fulfillment of the social responsibility of the press.

Some leading journalists in Latin America insist that, all things considered, government-free *colegios* are necessary to lift their respective countries from the slough of dependency and despair. Publishers alone, for the most part, have not addressed this question. *Colegios* free Latin American journalists from humiliating economic dependency on their news sources. By obtaining higher salaries for their members, these organizations complement other steps toward professionalization, such as the rapid proliferation of schools of social communication in the region. Should such education and membership in the *colegios* be mandatory? Walter Lippmann, America's pre-eminent columnist, answered this question as early as 1919: "How far can we go in turning newspaper enterprise from a haphazard trade into a disciplined profession? Quite far, I imagine, for it is altogether unthinkable that a society like ours should remain forever dependent upon untrained accidental witnesses."⁶³

NOTES

1. Lucy Maynard Salmon, *The Newspaper and Authority* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1923), 466.
2. The eight countries in 1973 were Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela. Jerry W. Knudson, "Licensing Newsmen: The Bolivian Experience," *Gazette* 25 (1979): 166-67; Ricardo Trotti, freedom of the press coordinator, IAPA, "The Press and Society: Journalism by Degrees," 1993, 1.
3. Fernando Reyes-Matta, "Journalism in Latin America in the '90s: The Challenges of Modernization," *Journal of Communication* 43 (summer 1992): 82.
4. For results of the conference, see Philip C. Horton, ed. *The Third World and Press Freedom* (NY: Praeger, 1978).
5. Susan Holmberg, "The Protection and Licensing of Journalists: A Global Debate," *International Communication Bulletin*, spring 1987, 27.
6. I. Del Villar, "Río Front Page," *Inter-American*, September 1945, 13.
7. Rodolfo Audi, interview by author, Buenos Aires, 10 July 1990.
8. Díaz Rangel, interview by author, Caracas, 26 July 1988.
9. IAPA, *Updater*, January 1987, 6.
10. Dario Suro, deputy chief of mission, Dominican Republic embassy, letter to author, 6 November 1995.
11. Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Western Hemisphere Idea: Its Rise and Decline* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954), 176.
12. John Wade, "Menacing Signs in Venezuela," *IPI Report*, September / October 1995, 26-27.
13. Rafael Caldera (speech given to IAPA, midyear meeting, St. Petersburg, FL, 28 March 1995), 18.
14. Carlos Lins da Silva, telephone interview with author, 15 November 1995.
15. *IAPA News*, April 1988, 10-11, and April 1991, 8.
16. Marcelo de Urioste, counselor, Bolivia embassy, telephone interview with author, 1 November 1995.
17. Atilio Agostino, assistant press attaché, Argentina embassy, telephone interview with author, 28 September 1995.
18. Federico González, Paraguay embassy, telephone interview with author, 18 October 1995.
19. IAPA, *Conclusions and Country-by-Country Report*, midyear meeting, Committee on Freedom of the Press and Information, San José, Costa Rica, 19 March 1996, 18.
20. Mary A. Gardner, "Role of the Colegio de Periodistas in the Journalism of Chile" (paper presented to the annual meeting of AEJMC, East Lansing, MI, 1981), 33.
21. Patricio Powell, secretary for cultural affairs, Chile embassy, letter to author, 13 March 1992.
22. Dr. Guillermo Rothschiuh, dean, faculty of sciences of communication, Universidad Centroamericana, Managua, letter to author, 15 November 1995.
23. Quoted in IAPA, 51st General Assembly Caracas, 14-18 October 1995. Report of the Committee on Freedom of the Press and Information, "Nicaragua."
24. IAPA, "Press Freedom in the Americas," *1994 Annual Report*, 97.
25. Jaime Barberis, political officer, Ecuador embassy, telephone inter-

view with author, 27 September 1995.

26. José Luis Ponce, Cuban Interests Section, telephone interview with author, 28 September 1995.

27. Lionel Laviolet, press officer, Haiti embassy, telephone interview with author, 27 September 1995.

28. Louis Edward Ingelhart, *Press Freedoms* (NY: Greenwood Press, 1987), 381-82.

29. IAPA, Committee on Freedom of the Press and Information, midyear meeting, 28 March 1995, 14.

30. *Estatutos del Colegio de Periodistas de Chile* (Statutes of the Journalists' Colegio of Chile), 1981, 43.

31. *Ultima Hora* (La Paz, Bolivia), 13 October 1978 and 23 November 1981.

32. Stephen Schmidt, Washington, D.C., telephone interview with author, 29 November 1995.

33. Richard Dyer, interview with author, San José, Costa Rica, 3 January 1994.

34. Quoted in "Costa Rican court sparks debate over free press," *Christian Science Monitor*, 15 June 1983, p. 5, col.1.

35. *IAPA News*, February 1986, 1-2.

36. *International Legal Materials*, Current Documents, 9:4 (July 1970), 679.

37. *Human Rights Law Journal* 7 (1986). Decisions and Reports. Text of the decision on 13 November 1985 by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, 93.

38. Quoted in Kyu Ho Youm, "Licensing of Journalists under International Law," *Gazette* 46 (1990): 120. See also Leonard R. Sussman, "The Mandatory Licensing of Journalists: The Decision of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights," *Journal of Media Law and Practice* 7 (October 1986).

39. María Eugenia Gonzáles, interview with author, San José, Costa Rica, 10 January 1994.

40. *Supreme Court Eliminates Licensing of Journalists*, Text of the Unanimous Verdict of the Constitutional Chamber of the Supreme Court of Costa Rica, 9 May 1995 (San José, *Tico Times*, 1995), 5, 18.

41. Jerry W. Knudson, "Journalism Education's Roots in Latin America Are Traced," *Journalism Educator* 41 (winter 1987): 22.

42. Margaret A. Blanchard, *Exporting the First Amendment, The Press-Government Crusade of 1945-1952* (NY: Longman, 1986), 362-63.

43. UNESCO, Intergovernmental Conference on Communication Policies in Latin America and the Caribbean, *Final Report*, part four, San José (Costa Rica), 12-21 July 1976.

44. C. Anthony Giffard, *UNESCO and the Media* (NY: Longman, 1989), 34.

45. L.R. Sussman, "Information Control," *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science* 34 (NY: Academy of Political Science, 1982), 184.

46. Leonard R. Sussman, "Who Did in UNESCO?" in Giffard, *UNESCO and the Media*, xiii.

47. Michael J. Farley, "Conflicts over Government Control of Information - The United States and UNESCO," *Tulane Law Review* 59 (1985): 1080.

48. Sean MacBride, *Many Voices, One World* (NY: Unipub, 1980), 237.

49. Karen D. Kraemer, "Freer Expression or Greater Repression? UNESCO and the Licensing of Journalists," *COMM/ENT, Hastings Journal of Communications and Entertainment Law* 7 (fall 1984): 65-66.

50. David A. Cifirino, "Press Freedom in Latin America and the Emerging International Right to Communicate," *Boston College Third World Law Journal* 9 (1989): 141.

-
51. Joaquín González-Casanova, minister for cultural affairs, Mexico embassy, letter to author, 12 March 1992.
52. Benjamín Fernández y Medina, *La imprenta y la prensa en Uruguay* (Montevideo: Imprenta de Dornaleche y Reyes, 1900), 55-57.
53. Everette Dennis, *Reshaping the Media: Mass Communication in an Information Age* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989), 69.
54. Quoted in Penn Kimball, "Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?" in *The Professions in America*, Kenneth S. Lynn (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 245.
55. Abraham Flexner, *Universities American English German* (NY: Oxford, 1930), 160.
56. J. Edward Gerald, *The Social Responsibility of the Press* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), 173.
57. Lynn, *The Professions in America*, 246.
58. Jerry W. Knudson, "The Press and the Mexican Revolution of 1910," *Journalism Quarterly* 46 (winter 1969): 760-66.
59. Jerry W. Knudson, "The Chilean Press during the Allende Years, 1970-73," Council on International Studies of the State University of New York at Buffalo, *Special Studies* 152 (1986): 90.
60. See, for example, Ricardo Trotti and Bill Williamson, "Should Journalists Be Required to Belong to Colegios and Have University Degrees?" in *Communication in Latin America: Journalism, Mass Media, and Society*, ed. Richard R. Cole (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1996), 105-112; Jon Vanden Heuvel and Everette E. Dennis, *Changing Patterns, Latin America's Vital Media* (NY: The Freedom Forum Media Studies Center, Columbia University, 1995), 69; and Michael B. Salwen and Bruce Garrison, *Latin American Journalism* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1991), 48-50.
61. Knudson, "Licensing Newsmen: The Bolivian Experience," 163.
62. Quoted in Heuvel and Dennis, *Changing Patterns*, 69.
63. Walter Lippmann, *Liberty and the News* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995), 71.