

Revisiting a panel topic:

Can popular media be exploited as a critical teaching tool?

ELLI LESTER ROUSHANZAMIR, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA-ATHENS

Each August, an AEJMC conference evokes previous meetings. In 2001 the question was posed by a joint panel with the Entertainment Studies Interest Group: Can popular media be exploited as a critical teaching tool? It reminded me of other sessions in which colleagues shared knowledge and experience of participatory pedagogical practices, many of which I've tried to integrate into my classrooms. One example is student journal writing. Inspired by discussion at teaching panels over the years, I've included journal-keeping in my syllabi, incorporating the innovations described by panelists and hoping to achieve their levels of pedagogic success. However, despite my sincere efforts student journals remain a questionable assignment in my own classes. My most recent failure with the journal assignment, however, led to an unexpected and fruitful insight regarding the use of popular culture artifacts within a critical pedagogy.

In my Fall 2000 Advertising & Society class, and according to a set of

guidelines, goals, and outcomes, students kept journals. And, along with other assignments, I required that students view a series of movies, many of which only tangentially "dealt with" advertising. As part of their journal, students were to describe the plot and then to ponder those vague relationships. The films included: *King Kong*, *A Face in the Crowd*, *Sweet Smell of Success*, *North by Northwest*, *Wag the Dog*, and *How to Get Ahead in Advertising*. Students generated a request list: *Truman Show*, *Kramer vs. Kramer*, among others.

The series was personal, highly idiosyncratic and while "advertising" played a role in each film (in some sense) the connections really weren't all that obvious even to me. Frankly they were films that I think are excellent and important. My reasons for requiring the films had more to do with the recognition that students generally lack any systematic exposure to film than with the films' absolute relationship with our subject matter. Yet, given the assignment, stu-

dents really pondered the connections, often surprising and enlightening me with their vision and insights.

What I learned—or better yet, remembered—is this: mass communication must be theorized before it can be studied. Each aspect of mass communication—advertising, public relations, journalism, telecommunications, etc.—is one aspect of the whole; and they are absolutely interdependent at all levels of practice. Furthermore, the professional practice (whether news writing, advertising creative strategy, or etc.) is only one part of each class' curricula.

Crucially important is that in each case instructors require their students and themselves to interrogate the object of study and to theorize it, not in terms of industry requirements, but in terms of current and developing scholarship.

Knowledge of industry requirements are a component of our discipline. But those imperatives differ from the imperatives of university classes and

(see popular media on pg. 6)

Inside this issue

Comments from the Chair.....2

Calls for papers2

Tributes to Al Kreiling3

AEJMC panel proposals.....7

Introducing our new officers

MIA CONSALVO, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE

I'd like to introduce the new officers of CCS for the next academic year, and explain briefly what each will be doing for the division, and who best to contact for specific questions or comments.

Ralph Beliveau from the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh is our new vice-head and program chair. Ralph

is responsible for planning the conference program for next year, and he will be attending the winter conference with me in Dallas to schedule CCS sessions. Send your panel proposals to Ralph (see pg. 7), and he'll contact other divisions as needed to work on getting panels co-sponsored (beliveau@uwosh.edu).

(see new officers on pg.6)

Gillespie talk a highlight of conference

MIA CONSALVO, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE

Although it still seems like a blur of activity, I think the Cultural and Critical Studies Division did very well at the 2001 annual conference in Washington, D.C. Our sessions were well attended, and we avoided the painful early morning and late evening time slots for another year. A highlight was the annual presentation of our Professional Freedom and Responsibility award to Marcia Ann Gillespie, editor-in-chief of *Ms.* magazine. Gillespie talked about the daily practical and ideological considerations involved in running a well-known feminist magazine, and challenged us, as educators and critical scholars, to ensure that our work reaches an audience beyond academia. In our question-and-answer session, we talked about the difficulties of



this “translation” problem, but I left feeling more hopeful about ways to shrink this divide.

The session with Gillespie was our best-attended event, with approximately 70 people present. Other well-attended sessions included our four-way joint poster session held with the Advertising, International, and Communication Theory and Methodology divisions. I thought the coming together of different divisions created a larger audience for our own work, allowing people who normally don’t go to CCS events to see some of our best work. I’d like to continue the joint poster session next year, and also continue the practice of having “roving respondents” comment on individual papers.

Another suggestion to float by you: should we have some sort of award for the CCS member who creates the best poster for any of our poster sessions during the conference? I think that might

encourage presenters to be more creative in depicting their work, and would also recognize someone who has gone above and beyond in creating an attractive, informative display.

New Business

There are a few issues I’d like to bring up for general discussion this year. The first was discussed briefly at the business meeting: the fact that there seem to be no by-laws in existence for our division. I’ve talked with several members about this, and Chad Dell from Monmouth University has agreed to help research this problem and propose ideas and solutions at next year’s business meeting. Thanks, Chad!

Next, while scheduling the best paper presentations for this past conference, I discussed with our past chair, Frank Durham, of the University of Iowa, that we might need to separate our business meeting from our best paper presentation.

(see division on pg. 5)

Calls For Papers

Journal of Communication Inquiry:

Special Issue: Articulating imagination, memory and community: The role of communication and media.

Deadline: February 15, 2002

The *Journal of Communication Inquiry* welcomes original submissions on the role of communication and media outlets in the creation, sustenance, and representation of an imagined community within national, cultural, political economic and societal contexts.

(from pg. 2)

Such submissions may include, but are not limited to, works that address popular music and geography, cultural negotiations of borders, journalism and regional and national identification, advertising and consumption, images and notions of gender and beauty, representations of immigrants, refugees and the

(see paper calls on pg. 5)

Cultural & Critical Studies Division 2001-2002

Head

MIA CONSALVO
University of Iowa

Vice-head and program chair

RALPH BELIVEAU
Univ. of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

Secretary

KAREN RIGGS
Ohio University

Research/Program chair

ALISON PLESSINGER
Butler University

Graduate Student Liasons

MICHELE STACK
University of Toronto

CARLA SANTOS
Penn State University

Teaching standards

WARREN BAREISS
Butler University

Professional freedom and responsibility

MARY LYNN YOUNG
Univ. of British Columbia

ALISON PLESSINGER
Butler University

Newsletter Collective

ELFRIEDE FURSICH
Boston College

MELINDA ROBINS
Emerson College

Division web site <http://www.arches.uga.edu/~hamilton/ccs/>

Classifying popular culture:

Albert Kreiling on meaning and social groups

JOLI JENSEN, UNIVERSITY OF TULSA

In preparing these remarks, I reviewed my Kreiling file—a painfully inadequate collection of course notes, mimeographed papers, rough drafts of assignments, and a few syllabi, now also containing, sadly, e-mails from Bernard Timberg about Al's death, and the evocative memorial booklet prepared by Johnson C. Smith University.

I know that Al Kreiling's views on popular culture defined and shaped my own, and that I have spent many years wrestling with the readings he assigned [at the University of Illinois], the claims he made in response to them, and my own emerging take on both. I know that I have continued to engage with him about these issues over the intervening years, but only in my mind and work—regrettably, but characteristically, he and I had spoken little since I was his student at Illinois, in the late 1970s.

There is only fragmentary evidence of my 20+ years of engagement with Al's ideas in my Kreiling file—reminding me of how difficult it is to record or reconstitute even the most
(see *Kreiling on meaning*, pg. 4)

Jensen was one of the participants on a panel at this year's convention honoring the late Albert Kreiling as the former chair of the Qualitative Studies division. Kreiling was professor at Johnson C. Smith University and earlier at the University of Illinois. The panel, which was chaired by Linda Steiner from Rutgers University, also included tributes by James Carey, Columbia University and Bernard Timberg, Johnson C. Smith University. We reprint Jensen's comments in which she discusses Kreiling's perspective on the study of popular culture and how culture constitutes identity and social membership.

Remembering Al Kreiling

JOHN J. PAULY, ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

The public details of his life are simple enough. Al Kreiling was 57 when he died in June 2000. He was head of the Qualitative Studies Division in 1984-85. He finished his doctorate at Illinois in 1973, then taught in the College of Communications there until 1978. He taught at Fordham University from 1978 to 1981, Southern Methodist University from 1981 to 1983, Georgia Southern University from 1983 to 1984, and at Johnson C. Smith University from 1984 until his death. Al was on my dissertation committee (I graduated in 1979), and we were officemates at Fordham from 1979 to 1981.

The man himself was another story. As Jim Carey mentioned at the AEJMC session, Al could be blunt with his friends. But they lived with his eccentricities, in part because he was so passionately loyal to them (especially to his students), and in part because he was such a brilliant and odd person to know. If you were a stranger, Al would treat you with the elaborate graciousness of a traditional middle-class WASP. If you were his friend, he would tell you what he thought about your behavior or ideas—sometimes directly, in a joking way, sometimes obliquely, in a slightly mocking way. In those early days, at least, he loved to play against type, breaking his veneer of reserve with wickedly ironic comments and bellowing laughter. Exasperating, yes, but often entertaining, and always illuminating.

Al was an inspiring teacher. In the 1970s he made cultural studies exciting to study. In his comments, Jim Carey spoke movingly about Al's work on the black press, which is too little cited today. But Al's intellectual obsession, by the late 1970s and early 1980s, was with cultural style. He took his cue from Georg Simmel, Max Weber, Kenneth Burke, David Riesman, and the Chicago School rather than from Talcott Parsons or Stuart Hall. Al steadfastly argued that shared expressive style marks groups more decisively than professed beliefs or values. For him, cultural studies reasserted the importance of style over structure. He urged his students to take seriously the richly symbolic forms of group life. In a sense, he imagined himself writing a theory of the American middle class. He wanted to explain how a group that looks structurally uniform—in its income level and class position—could produce sensuously diverse forms of culture. Like Tom Wolfe, Al was fascinated with the spectacle of middle-class Americans constantly remaking themselves. Even his work on the black press explored how race news spoke to the middle-class aspirations of the African-American community.

Al energetically promoted the work of the Qualitative Studies division. He, like Cliff Christians, John Soloski, and Ted Glasser, helped create the robust intellectual tradition that CCS continues today. Al articulated the cultural studies turn in the division (which had, in its origins, been a mix of renegade impulses, including ethics, cultural criticism, and aesthetics). He generously shared his intellectual gifts with his students, and opened doors for their careers. My own intellectual life would have looked very different without Al's influence. Even those of us who found him frustratingly difficult will remember him with great tenderness and love.

Kreiling on meaning and popular culture

(from pg. 3)

profound of intellectual and emotional encounters. Kreiling's work had a deep and defining impact on me; what follows is a thin, partial, and in a term I first heard used by AI, a burlesqued honoring of that impact.

The Kreiling perspective on popular culture was developed against all perspectives that saw cultural forms as products of something OUTSIDE of communication—his stance was against all perspectives that tried to explain culture by connecting it to power, or to economics, or to psychological predispositions. Kreiling saw communication as a primary and irreducible category: to quote him directly: “the distinctive feature of man is his capacity to cast up and interpret his own experience and the world about him in symbolic forms. Rather than a second hand copy of the real world, the realm of these symbolic forms is the real world to man” (Kreiling, “Summary of Major Positions on Popular Culture, p. 1).

Cultural products are, in Kreiling's terms again, “public dramatizations of meanings, models for conduct and orientation to the world shared within a social group...they furnish us ideals for our actions and tell us how to feel in the kinds of situations we regularly encounter in our society.” (Kreiling, Summary, p. 2) A symbolic approach to culture seeks to analyze cultural products as “constructed by members of a society as a way of understanding common experience.”

For AI, a “symbol” was something we use as a vehicle for conception, and he was more aware than most that “we do not invent the symbolic forms we use to cast up our experience, but rather we take them over from the social groups to which we belong.” (Kreiling, Summary, p. 2) Culture, for Kreiling, was a shared, social system: he was taught all of his students to be deeply aware of the ways in which cultural forms create and sustain group membership.

Culture, Identity and Social Membership

The second aspect of Kreiling's

For AI, study of the media was always the study of the ideas, values and beliefs that sustain membership in social groups.

work on popular culture that I want to highlight is his focus on how cultural forms create and sustain racial and social identity. For AI, study of the media was always the study of the ideas, values and beliefs that sustain membership in social groups. Much of his scholarly work is about the ways in which cultural products like newspapers, and television, and intellectual positions, define and sustain identity, connection and status.

When he studied the black press for his dissertation work, it was in relation to the creation and maintenance of black social identity. (Albert Kreiling, *The Making of Racial Identities in the Black Press*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1973; see also *The Rise of the Black Press in Chicago*, *Journalism History* 4:4, Winter, 1977-78). In 1984, he explored Ida B. Wells' arguments for her understanding of late 19th century black experience, locating them in a rich history of moral argument. (Albert Kreiling, *Ida B. Wells' Appeal to International Opinion To Stop Southern Lynching*, AEJMC, Florida 1984). His symbolic approach deepens and complexifies our understanding of Well's work. Unlike other historians who have located her work as part of a compliant or submissive black self help tradition, Kreiling understood her call for black self help as part of a “turn toward race as a moral symbol,” “a benchmark for identity,” as “a central element in a style of life she and others militants sought to build, promote and defend for the race.”

When Kreiling turned his attention to claims about the role of television

in society, he was exploring social criticism as a cultural product, and asking what values and beliefs are being cast up, and what memberships sustained, through the varieties of complaints about media influence. In two very different versions of a paper called “Television in American Ideological Hopes and Fears” (Remarks to the American Studies Association Meetings, 1979 and an essay submitted to *Qualitative Sociology*, February 1981) he considers “the ideological frameworks or outlooks that various social groups have brought to bear in interpreting for themselves the meaning and workings of television in American life.” (1979, p. 1) He ends his analysis of the three major positions he finds by saying “*the media become metaphors for the society and for the social groups whose visions of themselves and of their worlds are dramatized in their media productions.*” (1979, p. 15, my emphasis).

That, in a nutshell, was the Kreiling perspective on media criticism, a perspective I absorbed and turned into my first book. Like all too many students, I only vaguely realized how much of my perspective had come from him. Something happened between the 1979 and 1981 versions of that paper. It became much more of a critique of the emerging New Class: modern professionals, the group that most academics end up belonging to, whether we like it or not. In his later work, and conversations, the emerging New Class and its products came to represent for AI almost all that was wrong with contemporary life. In this second version of his paper, Kreiling considers television as a cultural form that widens but thins the social connections that can be made in and through it. His final sentence is that television “can provide only flimsy bonds for the vast and vague status worlds and the shallow consumer communities it serves.”

Kreiling's work on media and popular culture, in the early 1980s, became more oriented toward the inadequacies of contemporary cultural products (see Kreiling on pg. 7)

Calls for Papers

(from pg. 2)

building of national and regional communities and identities in new nation states and regions, such as those of the former Eastern Europe and the Balkans.

Please direct inquiries & manuscripts to the guest editor Mirerza González-Vélez, University of Iowa: Journal of Communication Inquiry School of Journalism University of Iowa W 615 Seashore Hall Iowa City, IA 52242 U.S.A. (319) 335-3341 jci-editor@uiowa.edu

Journalism

and Mass Communication Quarterly: Special Issue: The Mythological Role of Journalism

Deadline: December 1, 2001

Journalism continues to struggle to find and retain its sense of purpose and place. Insight and understanding might come from a surprising source: myth.

Journalism and Mass

Communication Quarterly invites papers for a special issue on "The Mythological Role of Journalism." Papers can draw upon a rich history of scholarship that includes the work of Roland Barthes, Marshall McLuhan, Gaye Tuchman, James Carey, Stuart Hall, Mircea Eliade, Joseph Campbell and many others. In

the spirit of this tradition, scholars can use a variety of methodological perspectives to explore social, cultural, and political connections between news and myth or other forms of long-enduring stories.

All queries and submissions (please send four copies) for this special issue should be directed to: Linda Steiner, Associate Editor, Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly Department of Journalism Rutgers University 4 Huntington Street New Brunswick, NJ 08903 732-932-8567 lsteiner@scils.rutgers.edu

Crossroads in Cultural Studies Tampere, Finland, June 29 - July 2

Speakers will include Henry Giroux, Akhil Gupta, Anu Kantola, David Morley, Janet Wolff, Shunya Yoshimi, Ming-Bao Yue

The mission of the conference is to provide an open forum for all topics that interest the diverse international cultural studies community; to make contacts, exchange views and gain inspiration from each other. We encourage international participation from different countries, disciplines and cultural backgrounds, and from a wide range of

C&CS News seeks your contributions

With deadline upon us and the Sept. 11 tragedy already resulting in an avalanche of commentary, we would like to invite you to contribute to this newsletter. We especially welcome longer contributions and commentary that aren't usually a part of traditional publishing outlets. Graduate-student contributions are encouraged.

Editors will get in touch with authors before publishing any materials.

Copy deadline for the Winter issue is *Dec. 18*.

To talk over ideas or suggestions for the newsletter, please contact either editor:

- Elfriede Fursich, fursich@bc.edu (617) 928-1105, or
- Melinda Robins, melinda_robins@emerson.edu, (617) 824-8814.

We look forward to hearing from you.

research areas. We especially encourage you to send us session proposals. Visit our web site at <http://www.crossroads2002.com>

Division no longer 'small'

(from pg. 2)

tations in the future, as our need to discuss business matters has generally extended beyond the 10 minutes usually left at the end of the presentations. I don't want to give these papers shorter time slots, so I'm proposing (as Bonnie Brennan, of the University of Missouri, also mentioned at our business meeting this year) that next year we have a trial run of a one-hour business meeting, and then a separate best paper panel where top faculty and student papers can be given the time to tell us about their research, and time to engage fully with the audience in discussion and debate.

Finally, I know that many of us in CCS feel that our division in AEJMC is the only place where we can really engage with like-minded people in terms of theoretical and methodological issues. And I think that in the past, we've considered ourselves a "small" division, in numbers at least. But I did some checking with AEJMC headquarters recently, and learned that as of the end of August 2001, we have 311 members. Of the 17 divisions in AEJMC (that does not include interest groups), the average membership is 325. And, of the 17 divisions, we are no. 8 (tied with the ethics division) in

terms of membership. If we ever did refer to ourselves as "small," that time is now over. Our theoretical and methodological ways of approaching research are popular with graduate students, and that popularity is beginning to be reflected in overall membership in AEJMC. I'd like us to shift our conceptions a bit, then, as we consider that we are no longer a "small" division, and our ideas and methods are gaining in reach and influence with every year. So—have a great semester, and please email or call me if you'd like to discuss any of the issues, ideas, or questions that I've raised above.

Popular media as teaching tool

(from pg. 1)

teachers are on the front line of resistance to the increasing corporatization of higher education. The classroom is as much a part of the “real world” as the newsroom or the board room, and as such one of the few places in that real world where free intellectual exchange holds high value.

Popular culture provides a wonderful site for critical deconstruction (in the “lay” sense of that term) perhaps in part because students themselves are the experts of contemporary popular culture. When students are required to theorize what popular and culture mean conceptually, they are freed from the dictatorship of common sense and free to think in unexpected ways. Students may explore the challenges posed by a critical perspective when the link of theory and practice,

commonly obscured by hegemonic ideology, is clarified.

The obvious contradictions of the advertising curriculum and my politics and scholarly agenda assure that I continually struggle with my varied commitments: to my department’s approved curriculum, the students’ expectations, needs and preferences, my own scholarship, the broader discipline, (not least,) the citizens of Georgia, and many more. As I read my students’ attempts to comply with the journal assignment, I recognized that I still haven’t constructed the assignment correctly. But, in the students’ explications of what each film had to do with advertising & society, I reconsidered how critical media theory fits into the mix. I was inspired to note that rather than trying to integrate theory and critique into the advertising curriculum, it was efficacious to integrate the required advertising curriculum into the framework of critic

al theory.

In short, critical theory and insights cannot be added on or grafted to the study of mass communication; they form the basis of the curriculum for any teacher with a commitment to critical scholarship. As professors, we can remember to theorize our teaching topics as carefully as we theorize our research and in ways which integrate those topics into the larger critical project. Whatever we teach within the now broadly defined journalism and mass communication curriculum, we must promote our agenda: that journalism itself is a critical practice, one necessary for furthering a social agenda that includes democratic governance by informed citizens. It is incumbent upon us to remember that the guarantees of academic freedom assure that we define the boundaries within our classrooms.

New officers

(from pg. 1)

Alison Plessinger from Butler University is our Research and Program chair. Alison is the brave soul who will receive all papers submitted to the division for next year’s conference, will match them to reviewers and then collate and coordinate the results. Please volunteer to review papers if you haven’t done so already. Paper reviewing always falls at an awkward time of the school year, but the more people we have, the less work for each individual (aplessin@butler.edu).

Warren Bareiss from Austin College is our new Teaching Standards chair. He’ll be putting together panel ideas for next year’s conference that focus on, naturally enough, teaching. If you have specific ideas in that area (practical pedagogy, teaching critical analysis, etc) please get in touch with Warren (wbareiss@austinc.edu).

Mary Lynn Young from the University of British Columbia is our Professional Freedom & Responsibility (PF&R) chair, and has already begun her work by sending out a call for nominations for the election of our next annual PF&R award winner. She’ll also be putting together panel ideas revolving around PF&R, and would be happy to discuss with you just what a PF&R panel entails (mlyoung@interchange.ubc.ca).

Carla Santos from Pennsylvania State University and *Michelle Stack* from the University of Toronto are our new Graduate Student Liaison Co-chairs this year. As such, they’ll be

reaching out in particular to our graduate student members, seeing what they would like to see addressed by CCS in general, and in conference programming. They’ll also be putting together panel ideas, so feel free to get in touch with them if you’d like to be involved in some way in this effort (cas352@psu.edu and stackassociates@home.com).

Karen Riggs, from Ohio University, will serve as our secretary for a term. She’ll be the one taking notes at next year’s business meeting (thanks Karen!) (riggsk@ohio.edu).

Jay Hamilton will continue to maintain the CCS website, and is looking forward to adding to it in various ways over the coming year. Please contact him if you have ideas or contributions for our site (hamilton@arches.uga.edu).

Finally, *Elfriede Fursich* from Boston College and *Melinda Robins* from Emerson College have agreed to take on the duties of putting together the CCS newsletter this year. I am grateful to past newsletter editors Jay Hamilton and Carolina Acosta-Alzuru from the University of Georgia for creating such a wonderful newsletter, and I look forward to working with Elfriede and Melinda on continuing that tradition. That said, if you have content ideas, calls for papers, news to share, or the general urge to write, please let either Elfriede or Melinda know and they will happily give you some newsletter space. (fursich@bc.edu and melinda_robins@emerson.edu).

Kreiling on meaning and popular culture

(from pg. 4)

and their associated social bonds, more focused on the beliefs and style of the group with which he was himself uneasily a member—academic types. His work in the early 1980s was about the inadequacies of communication scholarship, intellectual life, and modern experience.

In some troubling ways, I think, he fell prey to a problem he'd identified earlier—"voices of the past attacking a rising future." (TV in American Ideological Hopes and Fears, 1979, p. 15). He found contemporary life distressingly bland, vacuous, and in one of his favorite terms, silly. But in my class notes from the mid to late 1970s I find a fair-mindedness and optimism that is less evident in his later work. By the 1980s, Kreiling sees little to celebrate and much to condemn in modern styles and forms of interaction. (see, for example, "Communication and the New Class," Albert Kreiling, undated, xerox ms.)

Communication as Shared Experience

In his 1970 mimeograph, "A Summary of Major Positions on Popular Culture," distributed to his students at Illinois, Kreiling offers a phrase of tremendous poignancy. On p. 27, using Jacques Ellul, he explores the differences between genuine and spurious culture, arguing that propaganda produces "a false sense of community founded on symbols not deeply meaningful to anyone." He continues: "Rather than dramatizing and dignifying people's deepest feelings, [propaganda] imposes alienated symbols and values. It is a realm of meaningless rituals, vacuous symbols and dead illusions. *Instead of sharing our experiences with others, which is its only true use*, (my emphasis) communication becomes a process of fabricating false images to manipulate others—a cynical exploitation which trivializes men's deepest feelings."

So Kreiling believed, at least in 1970, in the possibility of a genuine form of communication—dramatizing and dignifying people's deepest feelings, in community. He defined com-

munication as the sharing of our experiences with others.

As those of you familiar with AA know, "Alcoholics Anonymous is fellowship of men and women... who share their experience, strength and hope with each other, so that they can solve their common problem, and help others to recover from alcoholism." It is through Al Kreiling's definition of true communication—the sharing of experiences in community—that many are able to recover from alcoholism, to experience fellowship, and to find ways to lead meaningful and satisfying lives. It is painful, of course, to read Al's 1970 definition of what genuine communication is and can be, to believe that forms of it are still available to those who seek it, and to know that it is no longer available to him.

I am grateful to have had this chance to explore Al's work, consider his ideas, and honor their impact on me. Thank you for this opportunity to express my gratitude to him, and my abiding affection for him. May his memory be a blessing.

Call for Panel Proposals

AEJMC

Cultural & Critical Studies Division

Deadline: Oct. 1, 2001

Interested in putting together a panel proposal for the AEJMC 2002 conference in Miami? Now is your chance! Here are the details:

Instructions: In a one-page document, please write an abstract detailing the title and theme of the panel. Explain your concept in terms that logically suggest the four scholars you will list as participants. Also, indicate whether your panel best fits as a research, teaching, or PF&R panel. You

can list potential co-sponsoring divisions, but it isn't required that you contact them.

Some tips: 1. Please indicate in the proposal if you believe the panel would be best programmed as a sole-sponsored panel; 2. Co-sponsoring divisions often (but not always) like to place their share of people on the panel. That's good for attendance and for the deal; 3. Co-sponsoring panels stretches our (CCS) programming budget, also a good thing; 4. Panels co-sponsored by four groups or divisions are called "mini-plenary sessions"

and are not scheduled against in the program. Don't stretch too hard for this one; they're usually dependent on the other groups' interest, which often surfaces at the mid-winter meeting; 4. Not all panels make it.

Please submit proposals to our program chair:

Ralph Believeau
Communication Department
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Oshkosh, WI 54901
beliveau@uwosh.edu