

Historical trajectories of entanglement and ignorance

German, French, and Brazilian communication studies in dialogue

Stefanie Averbeck-Lietz, Lisa Bolz & Otávio Daros

Introduction

International research is one of the major *buzzwords* in career strategies and research projects, but this does not mean that communication studies have therefore become more “cosmopolitan” in a normative sense of openness for different or even unknown traditions. Various factors such as (mutual) ignorance and isolation can—in part—explain dynamics that we observe today: when speaking about “international research,” often only a certain type of international research is taken into consideration (i.e., comparative project-based research relying on third-party funding). International career paths work well within the Western European and US-American spheres, but hardly beyond. We therefore suggest taking a close look at some of the results of international ignorance and isolation as well as at the lack of transnational academic crossings. This article is a first attempt to write the history of the field of communication studies from a cosmopolitan perspective, while the communities under analysis have been and remain more or less disconnected from each other.

Our aim—not least based on personal experiences as researchers in all three contexts of German, French and Brazilian research—is to show that a concept such as “cosmopolitanism” challenges not only the epistemological and methodological perspectives of communication studies but also its social shape. Who did research with whom about what (e.g., in journalism research or media system research), and was this from a more national perspective or a more inter- or transnational one? What role do language barriers play (Simonson et al., 2022), what role national historical, political, and economic contexts of communication studies (Löblich & Scheu, 2011), not least the policies and politics regarding the universities as organizational and institutional bodies for a cosmopolitan turn?

The inter- and trans-nationalization of the field of communication studies will be regarded from the viewpoints of three national research communities: Germany, France, and Brazil. We also ask if there are relations between them. Again, we state that there exists a certain “German isolation” from France (Averbeck-Lietz et al., 2019) and Brazil

(Averbeck-Lietz, 2023; Ganter & Ortega, 2019; Richter et al., 2023). Until today, this German isolation seems to be deeply rooted in the historical and political context of German Zeitungswissenschaft (newspaper studies) during 1933 and 1945 and the difficult re-establishing of Publizistikwissenschaft (studies on public communication) after 1945 (Klein, 2006; Kutsch, 2010, 2023; Löblich, 2010; Scheu, 2012; Wiedemann, 2012).

Writing the history of the discipline is a kind of memory history (Scheu, 2023). Memory is selective and, in the sense of the sociology of knowledge, related to social, cultural, and generational positions—such are often nationally framed and, even more, related to one's own academic environment. Thus, our assumption is that remembering the history of communication studies in each of the countries under focus is somehow different and disconnected from each other, even if there may be common traditions with regard to the traveling of ideas and persons. We aim to reveal both the entanglements and the disconnections to support future international research, taking into consideration today's lack of mutual recognition and knowledge about diverse academic traditions, which often hinders international research teams (Volk, 2021).

Even though international comparisons have advantages in helping us to better understand differences, we do *not* want to impose a frame for comparison.¹ Instead, we want to emphasize and understand the (lack of) international and cosmopolitan dynamics within the broader field of communication studies. Why does “border crossing” (Wessler & Averbeck-Lietz, 2012) fail in the domain of research?

We want to contribute to the study of both the international perspectives and influences in Germany, France, and Brazil (the idea of the international), as well as the history and the structure of the academic discipline (the social configuration of international work; see Averbeck-Lietz & Löblich, 2017). Why focus on these three countries? While German communication studies have their roots in the first third of the twentieth century, the French and Brazilian academic disciplines were founded much later. French communication scholars are working internationally, but less within the Euro-American sphere, and at the same time, the structure of French academia favors French publications and career paths. Brazilian communication studies meanwhile have had a strong orientation toward international research, especially in its beginnings, gaining influence from including but not limited to German and French scholars. Despite a strong academic and intellectual exchange with France, Brazilian scholars still struggle today regarding international recognition on a horizontal level.

In respect to Germany, we highlight the roots of the early internationalization before 1945, which had an impact on the post-1945 period in the Federal Republic of Germany, also known as West Germany. France is a near neighbor of Germany and their interrelations are relevant to examine, especially as there seems to be a lack of broad understanding between those two countries in comparison with other neighboring countries, such as Switzerland, Austria, or the Netherlands. Brazil, the third country of our case study, has allowed us to have another perspective as there have been relatively few exchanges between Germany and Brazil after 1970, while there has been much more exchange and scientific influence between France and Brazil, countries that share some

1 For a comparative approach regarding concrete research fields under international comparison, such as public opinion research or reception analysis, see Averbeck-Lietz & Löblich (2017).

intellectual traditions. The three authors of this article come from German, French, and Brazilian backgrounds, while all have transnational knowledge in and about each of the three countries.

Our aim is to delve into international exchanges and transnational knowledge circulation that go beyond what is often perceived in Germany, which has a strong Anglo-Saxon approach to communication studies (Koivisto & Thomas, 2007) and therefore often excludes other perspectives. In the first part, we want to examine an unknown or forgotten part of German international communication history. Usually, the epistemological turn during the 1960s and then a new orientation toward American communication studies are put forward (Löblich, 2010), but there is still an undiscovered chapter of German international communication research before 1945 that overlapped with colonial studies. In the second part, we explain international research practices from a French point of view. In 2023, the USA-based journal *History of Media Studies* published a special section on (lacking) French–German communication research.² We want to explain why French scholars might lean toward certain international practices and cooperation rather than toward others. In the third and last part, we depict some intellectual exchanges and influences between Germany and Brazil as well as between France and Brazil—two academic interrelations that differ from each other. Taking into account a Brazilian perspective in international research is not common and underlines the limitations regarding the horizontalization of internationalization.

The authors of this article cannot argue from a systematic research project or commonly selected sources; this article has to be seen as a step in the direction of cosmopolitan research to understand entangled histories being connected and disconnected at the same time (Löblich & Averbeck-Lietz, 2016). Certainly, the German “case” is in fact not a case “for” but an exception: Nazi newspaper studies were supportive of the state and, at least in Germany, they were “forgotten” or even silenced, thus representing blind spots in the collective memory of the field of modern communication studies (Duchkowitsch et al., 2004).³ To the best of our knowledge, we are able to show for the first time that beyond propaganda research, one of the research objects of National Socialist newspaper studies was indeed international media but it was structurally embedded into the Nazi ideology and its colonial aims.⁴ This was the burdened background of establishing new connections between Germany and other countries after 1945.

2 See <https://hms.mediastudies.press/volume-3---2023>. The special section deals with the lacks and some entanglements in political communication, media system research, media and cultural studies, and journalism research. Lisa Bolz authored the chapter on journalism studies.

3 In March 2024, on the occasion of the National Congress of the German Communication Association (DGPK) at the University of Erfurt, this Nazi past was again a topic for various reasons, not the least of which was to inform the youngest generation of researchers about and encourage further research on it.

4 This article focuses on media mapping on the African continent; for South Eastern European research embedded into the Nazi ideology, see Heinelt (2003) and Höpken (2021).

Germany: An internationalization before 1945 hindering international cooperation after World War II

The strong social science quantitative orientation, which has national German peculiarities (Löblich, 2010), particularly when compared with France and Brazil, and the organizational, theoretical, and methodological separation between *communication* and *media* studies in German universities (Wagner, 2023), was often not very compatible with international research during the twentieth century. One may think of cultural studies and their sluggish adaptation in Germany (Schwer, 2005; Tröger & van den Ecker, 2023), especially Latin American cultural studies, which remain largely unknown with their approach of empowerment and objects of study such as popular culture and inequality (Massmann, 2004; Rüdiger & Escosteguy, 2017). Such transnational lines only opened up from the 1990s onward with the adaptation of cultural studies in Germany (Hepp et al., 2015). In recent decades, critical (Güney et al., 2023) and normative approaches (Karmasin et al., 2013; Zillich et al., 2016) as well as inter- and transnational (Wessler & Brüggemann, 2012) and comparative research (Pfetsch & Esser, 2014; Thomaß, 2013) have been established in German-language communication studies, the latter predominantly in media system and journalism research and often based on standardized methodologies, while the comparative focus is (still) relatively restricted to Anglo-American, US-centered communication studies and research (Koivisto & Thomas, 2007; Richter et al., 2023).

If we want to understand the German case, we have to keep in mind the position of German *Zeitungswissenschaft* as an international outlaw after 1945, while the Nazi newspaper studies via certain actors' constellations built continuities during the 1950s and 1960s in German academia and journalism (Hachmeister, 1998; Kutsch, 2006, 2023). Recently, Francisco Rüdiger (2019) revealed the Nazi past of German newspaper studies to the Brazilian public through work with primary sources.

Again, more hidden, there is a history of newspaper and radio studies prefiguring international media system research. It is contextualized by a "combination" of colonial, imperial, and national socialist perspectives, again hindering neutral international perspectives after 1945 and cosmopolitan ones even more.

The "Africa Books" and articles of German newspaper scientists before 1945

In this chapter, the past of German communication studies can only be marked by a few first case studies analyzing crucial publications dealing with international topics by prominent German scholars. There is an urgent need for deeper research on this type of early international outreaching, but definitely *not* cosmopolitan research.⁵ On the contrary, it is to reveal the "dark side" of internationalization combined with the normalization of racist and national socialist positions after 1933.

5 Until now, there is no systematic research on international media research during the Nazi times. The journal *Zeitungswissenschaft* (*Newspaper Studies*) as the leading journal in the field from 1926 through 1944 would be a first source.

Walter Hagemann's critique of "colonial methods" from the late 1920s and its reframing within Nazi-vocabulary

Afrika ist kein Niemandland mit einigen Millionen intelligenter Arbeitsmaschinen, das man nach Belieben aufteilen und 'entwickeln' kann. . . . Die Emanzipation des Schwarzen wird vielleicht einmal das Ende des weißen Kolonisators sein.⁶ (Hagemann, 1929, pp. 17–24)

Eine Weile schien es den fortschrittsgläubigen Europäern, als ob die Welt weiß geworden wäre und Europa der Kraftmittelpunkt der Weltkugel sein und bleiben werde. Beide Annahmen erwiesen sich als falsch.⁷ (Hagemann, 1943, p. 5)

In 1929, Walter Hagemann (1900–1964), a German journalist, later a founding figure of German Publizistikwissenschaft wrote *The Revision of Colonial Methods in Africa*. It was a critical book on how colonialists handled and abused their power (Hachmeister, 1987, p. 139). Nevertheless, Hagemann's first two books (1928, 1929) on colonial action are not at all free from racial stereotyping, neither from the time typical N*word (he also used the terms *schwarze* [black] and *farbige* [colored] people), nor from asserting the idea of backwardness and "uncivilized" black people (Wiedemann, 2012, pp. 90–97). Hagemann's own attitudes were nationalistic (Hagemann, 1929, pp. 58–59), pro-Catholic and pro-missionary (pp. 31–35), and anti-communist (pp. 24–35).

Hagemann did not write a book on media or communication but about observations of "development" (Hagemann, 1929, p. 17): on black trade unions, racist and classist (in)justice, criminal land "reforms," unequal payment of white and black workers (p. 9), the separation of settlements (the so-called "color bar," p. 76), and on black people who had "no political rights" (p. 10). Hagemann denounced the "theory" of the inferiority of the black race as an ideology fostering abuse (p. 19). He proposed that white African leaders should consider the example of Brazil as a "eine friedliche Lösung der Rassenfrage" ("a peaceful solution for the question of race," p. 2), noting that Brazil was a country where black people had been allowed to vote since 1891.⁸

Hagemann denounced the European powers for using propaganda, structural lies, false promises, and the functional abuse of the Christian religion (Hagemann, 1929, pp. 19, 67), by which he meant the strategic communication, structural, and factual violence causing poverty, illness, and death. He explicitly mentioned the *Vernichtungspolitik* (annihilation politics) and *Ausrottung* (eradication) of the Herero people (p. 37). Ninety-two years later, the German Government declared the Genocide of the Herero a fact. Astonishingly, some pages later in his text, we can read Hagemann's impressions about Togo,

6 "Africa is not a no-man's land with a few million intelligent working machines that can be divided up and 'developed' as desired. . . . The emancipation of the black will perhaps one day be the end of the white colonizer" [Translation by the authors].

7 "For a while, it seemed to Europeans who believed in progress that the world had turned white and that Europe would be and remain the center of power in the world. Both assumptions turned out to be wrong" [Translation by the authors].

8 Hagemann did not mention at all that only literate male citizens who earned a certain income were allowed to vote at that time.

where—in his words—the majority of blacks were “zufrieden” (content) with the German rule, which overall had been “einwandfrei” (flawless) (p. 84).⁹

Concerning African media, Hagemann observed that there were “Eingeborenen-Zeitungen” (with a pejorative undertone: indigenous newspapers)¹⁰ in many regions which were not at all read nor appreciated by the White populations (p. 10), while—referring to South Africa—museums, theatres, cinemas, and parks were forbidden for “colored” people. English dailies like the South African *Cape Times* and the newspapers of Southwest Africa and Kenya were sources used for Hagemann’s books. Yet, it remains unclear how systematically he used the press as a source to develop his argumentation.

During the period of 1938 through 1943, Hagemann wrote another book on Africa, and in some paragraphs, he mirrored the racist and the “völkische” (ethnic) vocabulary of National Socialism (Hagemann, 1943, pp. 58, 105). Not a word on the genocide was included any longer; instead, Hagemann denounced the Herrero for riots. In Hagemann’s words, the German colonies had been “robbed” by other European powers and the League of Nations (pp. 51, 144, 163–168). This was a typical but false German common sense at the time, also very visible in articles of the then leading journal in newspaper research *Zeitungswissenschaft* (Dresler, 1940, p. 522).

Hagemann was not known for using Nazi speech. On the contrary, the regime saw the Catholic, nationalist journalist as an “opponent” of it (Wiedemann, 2017, p. 943). Hagemann (1932) denounced the emerging National Socialist Movement as antisemitic and totalitarian. After the victory of the Allied Forces, Hagemann (1948) wrote the first book in German that analyzed the Nazi media system and its planned propaganda. Nevertheless, during the early 1940s, Hagemann’s tonality changed: contrary to his first book about the African continent from 1929, in his new book (1943), colonialism was no longer opposed. Accordingly, Hagemann’s biographer Wiedemann documented “opportunist” pro-Nazi statements in his writings around 1940. Two years earlier, Hagemann had lost his position as an editor in chief of the Catholic journal *Germania*. It is conceivable that he was trying to write in a more conformist mode to secure his possibilities to gain work (Wiedemann, 2012, pp. 136–146, 2017, pp. 951–954; see also Hachmeister, 1987, p. 157, for more detail).

Two other scholars who—like Hagemann—never became party members of the National Socialist Party (NSDAP) also wrote on Africa: Emil Dovifat¹¹ and Kurt Wagenführ.¹²

9 Which cannot be seen as a historical truth; see Habermas (2016) on German violence in Togo.

10 “Eingeborenen-Zeitung” was the time typical notion often used in the journal *Zeitungswissenschaft* (e.g., see d’Ester, 1937, p. 301).

11 Concerning the controversial debate about Dovifat’s role after 1933, see Pfeiffer (2018). Based on archive sources, Auerbeck (1999, pp. 361–369) argued that he tried to protect his assistant Hans Traub (1901–1943) who had a Jewish background from being expelled from the Berlin Institute of Newspaper Studies. Benedict (1986, pp. 12–14) mentioned that Dovifat was arrested after his speech at a regional Katholikentag (Catholic convention) denouncing the National Socialist race politics in 1934.

12 Karl d’Ester was a professor for newspaper studies at the University of Munich; he visited the African continent in 1936.

The media in Africa: Dovifat, Dietze, and Wagenführ's media mapping from 1942

The first systematic mapping of African media done by a German research team under derogatory terminologies such as "Eingeborenenblätter" (indigenous leaves) (Dovifat, 1942, p. 490) had been realized during the Nazi era by one well-established scholar and two younger researchers: Emil Dovifat (1890–1969), Roderich Eduard Dietze (1909–1960) and Kurt Wagenführ (1903–1987). Dietze wrote a chapter on broadcasting media co-authored by Wagenführ (Dietze & Wagenführ, 1942).¹³ In 1933, the young Wagenführ was expelled by the Nazi administration for his liberal attitudes from his position at the radio station *Deutsche Welle*.¹⁴ Some years later, he held courses at the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik (German School of Politics), a Nazi institution at the time. His topics were the organization and the effects of international broadcasting (Kutsch, 1985, pp. 63–64). After 1940, he taught at the University of Leipzig and its overtly Nazi-friendly institute for newspaper studies. Furthermore, he established a journal and a broadcasting research center affiliated with Dovifat's institute in Berlin (Bohrmann & Kutsch, 1976; Ravenstein, 1983). After World War II, Wagenführ worked for German print and public service media, taught courses in several German institutes for communication studies, and was involved in founding the prestigious Hans-Bredow-Institut of Hamburg (Kutsch, 1985, pp. 388–389; Lerg, 1987), but he was also denied a position in the German Public Broadcasting Station, the NWDR, by the British Controller in 1947 (Munzinger, n.d.).

Dovifat, Dietze, and Wagenführ mainly conducted desk research. However, at least Wagenführ had been on research stays in North Africa and the Middle East from 1933–1934 (Ravenstein, 1983, p. 99). Their database was fuzzy and consisted of statistics from the League of Nations, the *South African Broadcasting Company*, and the BBC. For Dovifat's chapter on the African printed press, a student, Gerhard Steinbrücker,¹⁵ collected secondary data from the collection of the newspaper science institute at Berlin such as the *Handbuch der Weltpresse* (Handbook of the World Press, Bömer, 1937) and from some rare dissertations on press and journalism in "German East Africa" such as the one by Dietrich Redeker (1911–1979) dating from 1937 (Dovifat, 1942, pp. 483, 494–495). Today, Redeker is known as a former journalist for "Rassefragen" (racial issues), deeply rooted in Nazi ideology (Brieden, 2020). Other sources were Adolf Dresler's (1898–1971) articles on colonial media in Africa published in the journal *Zeitungswissenschaft* which served Dovifat without any critical hints as a basis to write his own article. Dovifat's reference author Dresler was the editor of the political journal *Die Oase. Feldzeitung des Deutschen Afrika-Korps*. In 1934, Dresler graduated with a dissertation supervised by Karl d'Estes (1881–1960) at the University of Munich on the Italian press.¹⁶ At that time,

13 Dietze became a prominent sports reporter, during the 1940s, also working for the BBC as a German political correspondent, during the 1950s for the German Public Service Broadcasting. See German National Archive, http://www.bundesarchiv.de/oeffentlichkeitsarbeit/bilder_dokumente/01789/index-4.html.de.

14 See "Wagenführ, Kurt" in Munzinger Online/Personen – Internationales Biographisches Archiv, <http://www.munzinger.de/document/00000004211>.

15 To our knowledge, biographical data are not available.

16 Ten years earlier Dresler's book on Mussolini (1924) reflected differences between fascist and "völkisch"; in another book Dresler (1925) devalued the League of Nations as a capitalist, pro-Jewish organization supporting a "world-finance" system.

Dresler headed the press office of the NSDAP and constantly contributed articles on colonial media, such as the (fascist) Italian and the (Vichy) French press, to the journal *Zeitungswissenschaft* co-edited by d'Ester.

In their two chapters from 1942, Dovifat, Dietze, and Wagenführ wrote in a highly descriptive manner enriched by statistical information about the development of newspapers (languages, ownership, resources, publics) and the very first steps of broadcasting on and for the African continent, including their technical dimensions. Their chapters were edited by the *Kolonialpolitische Amt* (Colonial Political Office) of the NSDAP¹⁷ under the guidance of Franz Ritter von Epp (1868–1946), a former high-ranking military officer in the *Schutztruppe Südwestafrika* (the so-called Protection Force of South West Africa). In this function von Epp had been involved in the murder of the Herero (Wächter, 1999; Zorn, 1959). Dovifat, Dietze, and Wagenführ's collaborating authors (not in their own chapters, but in the book) were situated at the *Reichspost*. The terminology of these authors was highly conformist to the Nazi ideology, categorizing three "types" of technical staff members involved in establishing African telegraphy, postal services, broadcasting, and press: European, Asian and Black workers. The Blacks were seen as "inferior" to all others and stereotyped in a highly dehumanizing way (see Obst, 1942, p. 26).

The two long book chapters of Dovifat, Dietze, and Wagenführ did not include any distancing from colonialism or the neo-colonial ambitions of the Nazi State and/or their editor in chief Franz Ritter von Epp or their collaborating authors from the *Reichspost*. Dovifat, Hagemann, Dietze, Wagenführ, and also d'Ester (1937) used the N* word in the time typical manner. Only Dovifat occasionally put quotation marks: "N*" (Dovifat, 1942, p. 498). Nevertheless, Dovifat confronted the Indigenous population with a common narrative of the "courageous" German colonial "pioneers" ("mutige deutsche Kolonialpioniere"; Dovifat, 1942, p. 493). Dovifat (and/or his student co-writing the article?) saw some African newspapers under "Jewish influence" operating propaganda against Germany (Dovifat, 1942, p. 498). Articles covering the growing South African press and news system while negatively stereotyping the Jewish owners of African media were also published by the journal *Zeitungswissenschaft* (Grünbeck, 1939).¹⁸ In the same journal, Dresler (1940, pp. 524–527) highlighted von Epp's power position with regard to the emerging Nazi colonial politics. Without a doubt, the central journal in the field was read by Dovifat, Dietze, and Wagenführ.

17 Not only Dovifat and Wagenführ worked for the Colonial Political Office but also the former doctoral student of d'Ester, Josef Hardy Krumbach (1910–1972) who personally knew Hagemann and Dresler. Krumbach wrote on African topics serving as an editor in chief of the Nazi journal *Kolonie und Heimat* (Averbeck, 1999, pp. 449–452, 562–563). It remains unclear what impact the personal relationships between the newspaper scholars had for their careers in the context of the Colonial Political Office and related organizations.

18 The Nazi past of Max Grünbeck (1907–1984)—another student of d'Ester—mayor of the town of Friedrichshafen from 1951 through 1977 (Vierhaus, 2011) became a public subject recently. See <https://www.gruene-fraktion-fn.de/home/artikel/antrag-zur-vergangenheit-von-max-gruenbeck/> and <https://www.friedrichshafen.de/buerger-stadt/nachrichten-videos-bilder/alle-nachrichten/detailseite/nachrichten/vor-75-jahren-wahl-des-buergermeisters-max-gruenbeck/>.

Why remember the colonialist view in German newspaper studies?

The abovementioned examples show that we cannot ignore this German past when we want to understand the history of internationalization of German communication studies, which started much earlier than 1945.

Our remembering of the past is selective, ignorant, and even isolated from other European communities of research. We know only a little about their memories of newspaper studies under German occupation when German professors came to build the new discipline in the Czech Republic and Austria (Charvát et al., 2023; Jírák & Köpplová, 2017; Kniefacz, 2008). In France, which had been occupied by the Germany from 1940 to 1944, a discipline of communication studies formally evolved during the 1970s much later than in the Czech Republic or Austria, but research topics such as newspaper history, press law, and journalism research existed since the 1930s, rooted in academic disciplines like history and law (Averbeck-Lietz, 2010; Boure, 2002). Similar roots are found in the academic field of newspaper studies in the Netherlands and Belgium (Hemels, 2017; Van den Bulck & Van den Bulck, 2017). Each of the countries had been under German occupation. Why would have Austrian, Czech, Polish, Danish, Dutch, Belgian, and French researchers welcomed their German counterparts with open arms after 1945? Even if there were some (famous) mediating door openers for German research to get back into the international field during the 1950s and 1960s, such as Henk Prakke (1900–1964), Kurt Baschwitz (1886–1986), Alphons Silbermann (1909–2000), and Paul F. Lazarsfeld (1901–1976), this was not common.

France: International academic milieus beyond the Anglo-Saxon tradition of communication studies

Despite being neighboring countries, France and Germany are quite different regarding communication studies and international perspectives and collaboration within this field of research. German scholars are, for example, very visible within the International Communication Association (ICA) and are frequently published in well-known English-speaking journals. When working internationally, most French scholars are cooperating in other international networks and milieus. In the following, we will take a look at the early days of the International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR) and the often forgotten history of this association, which was founded in France, before considering international barriers as well as international French cooperation, especially toward French-speaking countries and Brazil.

International cooperation and international research within French-speaking countries since the founding of UNESCO's Department of Mass Communication and the early days of IAMCR

Although French communication studies were officially founded in 1974, research within this field in France had been done previously (Pélissier & Demers, 2014). UNESCO founded its “International Institute of the Press and Information, designed to pro-

mote the training of journalists and the study of press problems throughout the world" (Hamelink & Nordenstreng, 2016) in 1946, setting two primary goals: "establishing training centers for journalists and founding an international organization for the promotion of scientific research on mass communication," (Hamelink & Nordenstreng, 2016) and it additionally published the series *Reports and Papers on Mass Communication*. Important for the further development of the institutionalization of research regarding communication and journalism was the 1956 conference at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris (Hamelink & Nordenstreng, 2016), where a committee was created that paved the way for the later IAMCR. Fernand Terrou (1905–1976), the founding father and first director of the Institut Français de Presse (IFP) at the University of Paris, valued international exchanges and was part of the interim committee that convened the IAMCR founding conference at UNESCO in December 1957. He then became the first president of the IAMCR. It is notable that the early French journalism and communication research was internationally oriented, with Terrou involved in international associations and UNESCO's Department of Mass Communication (Bolz, 2023).

Even though today many French scholars do not participate in the big international conferences for different reasons (financial, career strategies, different methodological approaches, etc.), there are laboratoires de recherche (research laboratories) and individual scholars who actively look for international affiliations, as seen, for example, with the ICA French Chapter, established by four research units in 2024: Crem (University of Lorraine), Cimeos (University Bourgogne Franche-Comté), Cresat (University of Haute Alsace), and Elliadd (University of Franche-Comté, Technological University of Belfort-Montbéliard) (see Raichvarg, 2024).

Various reasons prevent French scholars, especially young scholars, from participating in big international conferences or publishing internationally and therefore being visible in the Anglo-Saxon community. Aspects such as language, concepts, and career (strategies) function as barriers: French is still the major publication language, and within the French communication studies community, French communication journals are more visible than English-speaking journals. When aiming for an academic career in France, it is therefore more important to have published in French journals than in English-speaking journals. Furthermore, methodology is another major difference compared with German communication studies. The Anglo-Saxon approach in communication studies is mostly theory-oriented with a quantitative approach. French communication studies have their roots in literary studies, with Robert Escarpit (literary studies scholar), Jean Meyriat (documentation scholar), and Roland Barthes being the founding fathers (Averbeck-Lietz, 2010, pp. 353–364; Jeanneret & Ollivier, 2004). The methodological approach is mainly qualitative and less influenced by some major theories. These differences can be complementary, but it is often complicated for French scholars to get into conferences such as ICA or into major English-speaking journals due to specific selection criteria that rarely ever tolerate different approaches. Accordingly, only a few French scholars take part in international associations (ICA, ECREA, IAMCR). In addition, French academia is structured differently in comparison to that of Germany. Whereas, in Germany, scholars meet annually at a national conference and at thematic section conferences, French communication studies organized in the

Société Française des Sciences de l'Information et de la Communication (SFSIC) are less structured around thematic sections that are comparable to ICA sections.

Due to the different histories and cultures of the academic discipline, different languages, and different cultural heritages, some authors who are internationally often read and cited are less known and cited in France and vice versa. To give some examples from the French–German context, Niklas Luhmann's work has considerably shaped a part of German communication studies, but only some of his texts have been translated into French (Bolz, 2023). Whereas Pierre Bourdieu's theory on cultural and economic capital seems to be more cited by German communication scholars, his text on television (Bourdieu, 1996) is more read in France (Benson & Neveu, 2005; Krämer, 2023; Péliissier & Demers, 2014; Schäfer, 2004). In general, critical theory is more read within French communication studies than in the German discipline (despite major authors being German). Such different concepts within both academic disciplines lead to different perceptions of certain research objects, with journalism being one example that is seen slightly differently in both countries (Bolz, 2019).

These dynamics create different citation milieus (Averbeck-Lietz et al., 2019) regarding certain authors, theories, and concepts, and they oblige, for example, young scholars to decide in which community they want to be more visible. Even though it is not easy to get a permanent academic position in France, French academia is still more appealing for young French scholars than other university systems where scholars have to work for several years on non-permanent contracts before being able to apply for one of the sought-after professorships—the German system is particularly unforgiving as many talented postdocs have to leave academia and change careers in their 40s. At French universities, the *maître de conférences* positions are permanent and internationally comparable to associate professorships. “Internationalization” and “international profiles” might officially be selection criteria during recruitment processes, but in reality, the candidates have spent a lot of time in French academia before being appointed to an academic position.

France and Germany, despite being neighboring countries, are far from each other when it comes to cooperation and co-working in communication studies (Averbeck-Lietz et al., 2019). The international relations of French communication scholars are more oriented toward some French-speaking countries, especially Belgium and Canada, as well as some other countries, depending on personal connections, relationships, and institutional funding opportunities. The opportunities provided by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) shape the research landscape. Big research projects such as Médias19 and ANR's Numapresse, in which Canadian journalism history researchers were involved, are quite visible in a research landscape that is not (yet) exclusively structured by large, funded research projects. The absence of a language barrier enables easy international cooperation, especially between France and Belgium or between France and French-speaking Canada (even with binational calls for projects).

Even though there are strong links between France and other French-speaking countries such as Belgium or Canada, only limited cooperation exists between France and French-speaking African countries within communication studies (the UNESCO chair *Pratiques journalistiques et médiatiques. Entre mondialisation et diversité culturelle* (Journalistic and media practices. Between globalization and cultural diversity) situated at the University of Strasbourg regularly works with scholars from African countries),

the influence is rather unidirectional. The (history of the) entanglement of the media field—with a French impact in the past on the media system in North Africa—is not mirrored by academic interests. France has a quite different history with regard to (de-)colonialization than Germany, and much stronger relations to the Global South, especially Maghrebian Universities (Hammami, 2005; Idelson, 2023). Concepts in racism studies and “alterité” were relevant earlier than in Germany (Averbeck-Lietz, 2018), which did not for a considerable time understand itself as an “immigration society.”

The gap between French and German communication studies has been mentioned and explored by several researchers from both countries (Averbeck-Lietz et al., 2019; Bolz, 2019; Hubé, 2020). Some rare French–German cooperation exists within this field but remains the result of the personal commitment of certain scholars, such as the members of the organization committee of the French–German–Suisse PhD congress held at Mulhouse (France) and Basle (Switzerland) in 2019, which was organized by the three national research organizations: the DGPuK, SFSIC, and SGKM. At the same time, there are other more stable international milieus within communication studies that work, such as the exchanges between France and Brazil, in this field of research.

International cooperation beyond language barriers: The case of French–Brazilian academic exchanges

International exchanges and collaboration are quite diverse within French communication studies; thus, we want to closely examine these French–Brazilian academic exchanges. Even though there is no significant exchange between the two countries, some individuals have had a huge impact on French–Brazilian knowledge transfer, and the mutual influence is worthwhile to look at.

Regarding Latin America, there are epistemological and milieu connections, some of which were via forced emigration from Latin American dictatorships to Paris during the late 1960s and 1970s, with Armand Mattelart and Eliséo Verón being two highly influential scholars who came from Latin America to France (Averbeck-Lietz, 2010, pp. 414–446; Massmann, 2004). In 2018, an issue of the French journal *Communication & langages* was even dedicated to Verón and his work “between the worlds” (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2018). Much stronger is the link the reverse: in Brazil, for example, many leading professors in communication studies were “trained” by Michel Maffesoli at Sorbonne University, such as Vera Veiga França (Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais), André Lemos (Universidade Federal da Bahia), Juremir Machado da Silva (Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul), and Luiz Claudio Martino (Universidade de Brasília).

Beyond personal connections, there are common milieus between France and Brazil. Critical approaches are valued much more in France and Latin America, especially as Brazilian communication studies have been influenced by the Frankfurt School and French theories (Rüdiger & Escosteguy, 2017). Major French sociologists, such as Jean Baudrillard, Edgar Morin, and Dominique Wolton, are important in Brazilian research and teaching. However, the French–Brazilian connections go beyond shared theoretical references. Today, many young Brazilian scholars do their PhDs in France and thus contribute to a growing French–Brazilian academic milieu. The personal interest and investment of communication studies professors, such as Nicole D’Almeida, Denis

Ruellan, and Fabio Henrique Pereira, remain indispensable for the exchanges and collaboration in this field of research. But today, too, French–Brazilian exchanges are common in different research areas, such as organizational communication research (Paris Rego de Souza, 2017) or journalism studies with the trilingual journal *Sur le Journalisme, About Journalism, Sobre Jornalismo*, or the Brazil–France–Francophone Belgium Journalism Research Network (Bolz, 2023).

These examples underline that beyond the Anglophone tradition, there are other cultures of exchange and other international citation milieus that shape the field of communication studies. Often, the most important links have been made by influential individuals, but looking at today's research landscape, it is clear that the French–Brazilian milieu goes well beyond the work of some outstanding professors. Even though the language barrier remains for many, the gain within such an active international community is to learn about different traditions and value them for themselves to put cosmopolitan communication studies into reality.

Brazil and Latin America: Diversification of references in the formation of the regional field and challenges of internationalization

France and Germany were the academic traditions that served as a parameter for the creation of Brazilian universities in the first half of the twentieth century. Although the institutional organization of the Universidade de São Paulo (1934) took the Universität zu Berlin as a reference, the Universidade do Rio de Janeiro (1920) followed the Napoleonic model of higher education. Both Brazilian institutions were formed intellectually, notably by the French intelligentsia (Paula, 2002). Among the professors who were part of the so-called French missions at the Universidade de São Paulo were the historian Fernand Braudel (1902–1985), the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009), and the sociologist Roger Bastide (1898–1974) who worked in Brazil for nearly two decades and was recognized for his study of Afro-Brazilian religions (Bastide, 1960/1978).

When they returned to Europe and the generation of Brazilian academics trained by them came to replace them in their chairs, the area of communication studies did not yet exist in Brazil. Therefore, despite the marked Franco-European influence on the development of social sciences and philosophy in the country (Merkel, 2022), it cannot be said that the Brazilian field of communication was based on the same foundations. From the end of the 1940s into the beginning of the 1960s, there were a few undergraduate courses in journalism that operated in an improvised way within the philosophy faculties, without forming their own intellectual project. In any case, they served as embryos for the experimental schools of communication, when they opened in universities such as São Paulo, Rio Janeiro, and Brasília, in the mid-1960s (Marques de Melo, 1974).

Communication studies emerged in Brazil and other parts of the world largely as a result of the international action of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the bipolar context of the Cold War (Wagman, 2016). In South America, there were times of coups and military dictatorships that, in addition to censorship, torture, and other forms of violence, imposed changes on the State. In Brazil, one of these reforms took place in 1968 in the context of higher education,

when the US-American university organization model began to be progressively adopted (Paula, 2002). Paradoxically, however, on an intellectual level, the period was marked by waves of ideological criticism against North American imperialism, making Marxism a larger current within the humanities, including in communication and journalism studies (Rüdiger & Daros, 2022).

CIESPAL and a common project for communication education in Latin America

Created as annexes to the philosophy faculties, the first undergraduate journalism programs in Brazil not only lacked infrastructure for professional training but also didactic material for teaching basic subjects about the press. Books of a theoretical or practical nature on journalism by both Brazilian authors and by translators of foreign authors into Portuguese were rare. Meanwhile, in Spanish America, the translation of Emil Dovifat's work, *Periodismo* (1937/1959), was already circulating and free from any ideological discussions about his role in Nazi newspaper studies.

In fact, journalism schools in Latin American countries under Spanish colonization were greatly informed by Spain, a country with its own theoretical tradition of journalism. Spanish-speaking countries have historically shared many references, including in terms of bibliography. Brazil, on the other hand, did not benefit from its linguistic proximity to Portugal in this sense, as the field of communication developed there late (Ribeiro, 2011).

The change in this development framework in Brazil and other Latin American countries occurred through the Centro Internacional de Estudios Superiores de la Comunicación para América Latina (CIESPAL), which first promoted the area of journalism and then guided its conversion to communication. The center's headquarters were established in the city of Quito, Ecuador in 1959, and for decades, it was the main meeting point for Latin American scholars (Daros, 2023). For these and other reasons, it can be speculated that the emergence of the field of communication in Latin America as a whole occurred in a more unified way compared to other parts of the world (Waisbord, 2014).

In the first years, the center basically operated under the following dynamic: hiring North American and European professors to teach Latin American journalists and academics, who spent time in Quito usually as UNESCO scholarship holders. In this initial phase, which can be called pre-critical, the Ford Foundation was also an important financier of the actions, under the mediation of Raymond B. Nixon (1903–1997), who replaced the French Fernand Terrou as president of the IAMCR. This articulation reinforced the tendency to benefit visiting professors from the USA and the translation of works into Spanish by such scholars as Wilbur Schramm, Paul J. Deutschmann, Ralph O. Nafziger, and David Manning White. Among the French, the spokesperson was Jacques Kayser (1900–1963), deputy director of the IFP and also a member of the IAMCR.

However, from the 1970s onward, there was a progressive departure from the North American zone of influence, as it began to count on substantial support from the German social-democratic foundation Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES), as well as eventually from Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS) and the Radio Netherlands Training Centre (RNTC). The assumptions of mass communication research became the target of objection among Latin American scholars, who, before claiming their own tradition of thought, made

great use of German critical theory and French semiology to denounce the strategies of North American cultural and media imperialism, as did Luis Ramiro Beltrán, Armand Mattelart, and others linked to CIESPAL (Daros, 2023; Massmann, 2004).

Among the Brazilians who arrived at the center as lecturers in the 1960s and 1970s, names such as Danton Jobim, Luiz Beltrão, and Décio Pignatari stand out, all of whom were pioneering figures in the field of communication and information in Brazil. Many others would find opportunities for specialization there before becoming or consolidating themselves as regional leaders in the area: José Marques de Melo, Cremilda Medina, Christa Berger, Doris Fagundes Haussen, Raquel Paiva, etc. Ultimately, however, generations of academics who helped to highlight the emergence of critical awareness and the change in the role played by CIESPAL over the decades have moved from North–South cooperation to the promotion of South–South cooperation, despite the numerous challenges faced by countries in the region.

Intellectual influences from France and Germany on Brazilian scholarship

While intellectual exchange with the USA tended to be labyrinthine, marked by ups and downs (Daros & Rüdiger, 2022; Simonson et al., 2022), a friendly and stable relationship was established with France and its intelligentsia. One of the milestones of the Franco–Brazilian exchange occurred in the context of the Brazilian military dictatorship (1964–1985), a time when doctoral programs were rare in Brazil, but there was a demand for qualified personnel to fill teaching vacancies in schools and departments that were opening in universities across the country.

France was the priority destination of an intelligentsia that, as a rule, rejected the USA due to its association with South American military governments. As a critic of the regime, the case of José Freitas Nobre is representative: a journalist and politician, in addition to being one of the first communication professors at Universidade de São Paulo, he received a doctorate in law and information economics from Université de Paris, under the supervision of the French professor Terrou. His departure from Brazil to Europe was, not by chance, at the end of the 1960s, the period of greatest repression and violation of human rights by the Brazilian regime.

Whether for political or other reasons, a considerable part of the current list of senior researchers in communication and cultural studies in Brazil migrated at that time to Paris for training: Renato Ortiz completed both his master's and doctorate degrees at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), under the supervision of Edgar Morin and Roger Bastide; Antonio Fausto Neto also received his doctorate at EHESS, but under the supervision of Jacques Perriault; and Muniz Sodré and José Luiz Braga completed both their master's and doctorate degrees at Université de Paris, with Maurice Mouillaud as their advisor.

Exchanges with French academia remained high even after Brazil's re-democratization, resulting in the construction of strong and long-lasting Brazilian–French milieus. This helps explain why philosophers and critical theorists, such as Guy Debord, Jean Baudrillard, Jean-François Lyotard, Paul Ricœur, Roland Barthes, Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, Edgar Morin, Bruno Latour, Dominique Wolton, and others, were

more present in communication studies in Brazil than North American social scientists, from the tradition of empirical mass communication research (Daros, 2021).

The figure who most probably brought together Brazilian researchers for training was the sociologist Michel Maffesoli, disciple of Gilbert Durand and professor at the Université de Paris. Under his supervision were some of the academics who have played a leading role in the process of consolidation and expansion of communication studies in Brazil over the last three decades, including Vera Veiga França, Luiz Claudio Martino, Jurmir Machado da Silva, and André Lemos. These scholars helped disseminate many of the key concepts in Maffesoli's work, such as everyday life, imaginary, and sociality.

This intellectual collective, in general terms, sought to oppose the Frankfurt School's legacy of criticism of ideology and the culture industry, introduced in Latin America by the works of communication scholars such as Antonio Pasquali (Sanchez Narvarte & Komissarov, 2019), but particularly in Brazil, largely thanks to the initiative of Gabriel Cohn (1971). However, with notable exceptions, the main one being Francisco Rüdiger (2004), most Brazilian communication theorists who adhered to German critical theory separated themselves from the tradition over time.

The main example is that of Ciro Marcondes Filho, who was supervised by Dieter Prokop at Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, who was notable for studying the phenomena of communication and journalism under the categories of commodity, ideology, and domination in the 1980s, replacing them with problematics of postmodernity in the 1990s. After 2000, he reinvented himself as a communication theorist based on the philosophy of Edmund Husserl and his phenomenological followers: Emmanuel Levinas, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and others (Daros, 2022).

On the other hand, Francisco Rüdiger (2019, 2020) not only maintained his interest in the theoretical tradition represented by the Frankfurt School but also expanded and diversified his themes of study based on new connections with German scholarship. As an intellectual historian, he rescued the heritage of *Zeitungs- und Publizistikwissenschaft*, presenting an unprecedented systematization on the topic to the Brazilian public. Also, among German journalism theorists, the best-known name in Brazilian academia has been Otto Groth (1875–1975), whose work was translated by Liriam Sponholz (Groth, 1960–1972/2011).

Another theoretical link between Germany and Brazil was created by Norval Baitello Junior, who received his doctorate at the Freie Universität Berlin under the supervision of Ivan Bystrina and became a specialist in cultural semiotics and media theory in Brazil, being an interlocutor of the work of German professor Harry Pross (Baitello, 2005). Still, the main reference for semiotics among Brazilians is probably Charles Sanders Peirce, whose main interpreter in Brazil among communication scholars is Lucia Santaella, in many of her works in partnership with the German linguist and semiologist Winfried Nöth (Nöth & Santaella, 2007).

Horizontalization of internationalization and its limitations

It can be said that in recent years, there has been a process of horizontalization of international relations. If, in the initial decades of the field, foreign professors came to Brazil to teach and Brazilian researchers went abroad to obtain training, this dynamic, with-

out having changed completely, is much more complex today. This is because projects in the form of partnerships have increasingly emerged aiming at mutual collaboration between scholars of different nationalities, with common research interests. An example previously mentioned is *Sur le Journalisme*, *About Journalism*, *Sobre Jornalismo*, a multilingual journal that brings together editors from France and Brazil, as well as Canada, Belgium, and Argentina.

There are large comparative global projects such as the Worlds of Journalism Study (WJS), which, although based in Europe and the USA, have been developed with a concern for inclusion of researchers of as many nationalities as possible. However, it must be admitted that, exceptions aside, Brazilians and other scholars from developing countries are practically absent from the boards of projects that claim to be global and from journals that claim to be international. This organizational aspect implies less representation in the production of knowledge, marginalization of non-Western theoretical frameworks, low acceptance of works that are not based on Anglo-Saxon sources, etc. (Ganter & Ortega, 2019; Goyanes, 2020).

In Brazil, advances in the institutionalization of internationalization have historically occurred through the federal government's funding agencies, such as the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) and the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), which have programs in partnership with the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD). But we see that there is much to be done to achieve effective results and to have true equity in intellectual exchange between countries, that is, for Brazilian and Latin American research to have an impact on international scholarship commensurate with the influence that Western Europe and the USA have had on the development of the global field (see also Cazzamatta in this book).

Conclusion and outlook

In Germany, international perspectives in research extend back to the early days of communication studies—but they were not at all cosmopolitan. This is a memory that has been forgotten or even silenced today, like National Socialism was and still is in so many parts of German society and academia. It took a long time for German research to come back to international science milieus, which in our estimation must be taken into account if we regard German communication studies today. Currently, German communication studies is based on a methodological turn in the 1960s, when North American approaches had an impact on German communication research and when empirical research methods replaced the former normative approaches (Löblich, 2010). International publications and careers are important to those who want to succeed in German academia, but today's perception of "international" is often a limited one and considers mainly the German-speaking countries, the USA, the UK, Australia, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia. Big international conferences of the ICA or the European Communication and Research Association (ECREA) are valued higher than smaller ones—regarding the nationalities that are represented in such conferences, German academics are usually among the top three (Scharkow & Trepte, 2024, p. 24) and publications that are not English or German

are very rarely cited within German academia. When promoting international research and cooperation, one must keep in mind that the German international perspective is only one among other perspectives (Richter et al., 2023).

Another perspective on international research is the French one, as French communication studies are more oriented toward the French-speaking community, especially those of Canada and Belgium, with scattered international cooperation regarding certain topics. The structure of French academia (French being the major language in terms of recruitment process, citations milieus, etc.) and the perspective of being able to get a permanent position in France often lead young scholars to stay in France, and strict selection criteria that do not apply to the French academic culture of communication studies often prevent scholars from attending big international conferences such as ICA or getting into the most well-known English-speaking journals within the field of communication studies.

International work and international perspectives in research projects are often qualities that are sought after, but a closer look reveals that the different international perspectives need to be close enough to each other methodologically and theoretically that certain kinds of international visions are not neglected or excluded. The methodological differences, the different citation milieus, and the language barrier between France and Germany are significant factors that make a regular French–German exchange difficult that goes beyond the personal commitment of a small number of scholars.

The exchanges between France and Brazil are more common, and the French–Brazilian milieu is an interesting case study. Even though the influence of French scholars is more important in Brazil than vice versa, some Brazilian scholars have had a huge impact on French academia within the field of communication studies. Today, there are regular exchanges between France and Brazil and scholars who travel between both countries, as well as established French–Brazilian academic projects such as conference cycles or journals.

These positive outcomes and exchanges cannot and should not mask the fact that many research projects take into account data and information from Brazil or other countries from the “Global South,” but without Brazilian scholars, for example, being on important boards or editorial committees and the like. This underlines the differences between decolonization and cosmopolitan approaches. Working internationally should mean knowing, accepting, and integrating different points of view and different ways of working (Milke & Yin, 2022). When reflecting on the different dynamics regarding international perspectives, this could mean questioning one’s own (imagined) “international community” or the constraints in terms of recruitment processes.

Cosmopolitanism is thus conceptually developed in this chapter in the context of the history of communication studies in order to question diverse traditions, their connected and disconnected paths, and their (normative) views. It is assumed that science per se functions transnationally (“Traveling of ideas,” Said, 1983), but the reality shows that this is not arbitrary and takes place along disciplinary, social, historical, economic, (science-)cultural, and (science-)political conditions (Averbeck-Lietz & Löblich, 2017; Löblich & Scheu, 2011; Simonson & Park, 2016). Cosmopolitanism needs openness but also knowledge about other (diverging) perspectives and, not least, an awareness of the

lack of cosmopolitanism. This article aims to strengthen such an awareness on the basis of mutual dialogue between different traditions and communities of scholars.

References

- Averbeck, S. (1999). *Kommunikation als Prozess: Soziologische Perspektiven in der Zeitungswissenschaft 1927–1935*. LIT.
- Averbeck-Lietz, S. (2010). *Kommunikationswissenschaft in Frankreich: Der epistemologische Diskurs der Sciences de l'information et de la communication 1975–2005*. Avinus.
- Averbeck-Lietz, S. (2018). Intercultural communication in France. In Y. Y. Kim (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of intercultural communication* (pp. 1093–1101). Wiley Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicco082>
- Averbeck-Lietz, S. (2023). On (missing) links between German, Latin American, and French mediatization research: Reflections on diverse research milieus and their traditions. *Matrizes*, 17(3), 241–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v17i3p241-272>
- Averbeck-Lietz, S., & Löblich, M. (2017). Kommunikationswissenschaft vergleichend und transnational: Eine Einführung. In S. Averbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich: Transnationale Perspektiven* (pp. 1–29). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-18950-5_1
- Averbeck-Lietz, S., Bonnet, F., Cordonnier, S., & Wilhelm, C. (2019). Communication studies in France: Looking for a “Terre du milieu”? *Publizistik*, 64(3), 363–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-019-00504-3>
- Baitello, N., Jr. (2005). *A Era da Iconofagia: Ensaios de Comunicação e Cultura*. Hacker.
- Bastide, R. (1978). *The African religions of Brazil: Toward a sociology of the interpenetration of civilizations* (H. Sebba, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1960)
- Benedict, K.-U. (1986). *Emil Dovifat: Ein katholischer Hochschullehrer und Publizist*. Mathias-Grünwald-Verlag.
- Benson, R., & Neveu, E. (2005). *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*. Polity Press.
- Bohrmann, H., & Kutsch, A. (1976). Rundfunkwissenschaft im Dritten Reich. *Studienkreis Rundfunk und Geschichte*, 2(2), 14–20. https://rundfunkundgeschichte.de/assets/RuG_02_2.pdf
- Bolz, L. (2019). Recherches sur le journalisme en France et en Allemagne, un dialogue impossible? Regards croisés sur des méthodologies et des développements divergents. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rfsic.7702>
- Bolz, L. (2023). Journalism studies and journalism education in France and in Germany. *History of Media Studies*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.32376/d895aoea.b732c99f>
- Bömer, K. (Ed.). (1937). *Handbuch der Weltpresse: Eine Darstellung des Zeitungswesens aller Länder* (3rd. rev. ed.). Armannen.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Sur la télévision: Suivi de l'emprise de journalisme*. Raisons d'agir.

- Boure, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Les origines des sciences de l'information et de la communication : Regards croisés*. Presse Universitaires de Septentrion. <https://doi.org/10.4000/communicationorganisation.2797>
- Brieden, H. (2020, September 6). *Dr. Dietrich Redeker: Vom Fachjournalisten für Rassefragen zum Heimatschriftsteller*. Radioflora. <https://radioflora.de/dr-dietrich-redeker-vom-fachjournalisten-fuer-rassenfragen-zum-heimatschriftsteller/>
- Charvát, M., Jírák, J., & Köpplová, B. (2023). Studying media in the Czech Republic: Past and presence of Czech media studies. *Publizistik*, 68(1), 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-022-00768-2>
- Cohn, G. (Ed.). (1971). *Comunicação e Indústria Cultural*. Nacional.
- d'Ester, K. (1937). Streiflichter auf afrikanisches Nachrichten- und Pressewesen. *Zeitungswissenschaft*, 12(5), 288–307.
- Daros, O. (2021). French theoretical and methodological influences on Brazilian journalism research. *Media, Culture & Society*, 43(8), 1553–1564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443721999936>
- Daros, O. (2022). A critical tribute to Ciro Marcondes' new communication theory. *Communication Theory*, 32(1), 173–178. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtab004>
- Daros, O. (2023). CIESPAL and the development of education and research in communication in Latin America. *Studies in Communication Sciences*, 23(1), 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.24434/j.scom2023.01.3334>
- Daros, O., & Rüdiger, F. (2022). Paradigm shift in mid-twentieth century Brazilian journalism: A negative dialectics of decoloniality? *Journalism Studies*, 23(13), 1703–1720. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2022.2083004>
- Dietze, E. R., & Wagenführ, K. (1942). Das Rundfunkwesen in Afrika. In E. Obst (Ed.), *Post- und Fernmeldewesen: Das Rundfunkwesen. Das Zeitungswesen* (pp. 435–482). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Dovifat, E. (1942). Das Zeitungswesen in Afrika. In E. Obst (Ed.), *Post- und Fernmeldewesen. Das Rundfunkwesen: Das Zeitungswesen* (pp. 483–518). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Dovifat, E. (1959). *Periodismo* (F. Blanco, Trans.). UTEHA. (Original work published 1937)
- Dresler, A. (1924). *Mussolini*. Hammer.
- Dresler, A. (1925). *Der Völkerbund der Weltfinanz: Ein Warnruf an Deutschland*. Hammer.
- Dresler, A. (1940). Die deutschen Kolonien und die Presse. *Zeitungswissenschaft*, 15(10), 514–528.
- Duchkowitsch, W., Hausjell, F., & Semrad, B. (2004). *Die Spirale des Schweigens: Zum Umgang mit der nationalsozialistischen Zeitungswissenschaft*. LIT.
- Ganter S. A., & Ortega, F. (2019). The invisibility of Latin American scholarship in European media and communication studies: Challenges and opportunities of de-Westernization and academic cosmopolitanism. *International Journal of Communication*, 13, 68–91. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/8449>
- Gomez-Mejia, G., Le Marec, J., & Souchier, E. (2018). Verón entre les mondes. *Communication & Languages*, 196(2), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.3917/comla1.196.0009>
- Goyanes, M. (2020). Editorial boards in communication sciences journals: Plurality or standardization? *International Communication Gazette*, 82(4), 342–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048518825322>

- Groth, O. (2011). *O poder cultural desconhecido: Fundamentos da ciência dos jornais* (L. Sponholz, Trans.). Vozes. (Original work published 1960–1972)
- Grünbeck, M. (1939). Union von Südafrika: Auflösung des Schlesinger Konzerns. *Zeitungswissenschaft*, 14(5), 331–333.
- Güney, S., Hille, L., Pfeiffer, J., Porak, L., & Theine, H. (Eds.). (2023). *Eigentum, Medien, Öffentlichkeit: Verhandlungen des Netzwerkes Kritische Kommunikationswissenschaft*. West-end. <https://doi.org/10.53291/9783949925092>
- Habermas, R. (2016). *Skandal in Togo: Ein Kapitel deutscher Kolonialherrschaft*. S. Fischer.
- Hachmeister, L. (1987). *Theoretische Publizistik: Studien zur Geschichte der Kommunikationswissenschaft in Deutschland*. Volker Spiess.
- Hachmeister, L. (1998). *Der Gegnerforscher: Die Karriere des SS-Führers Franz Alfred Six*. C.H. Beck.
- Hagemann, W. (1928). *Gestaltwandel Afrikas*. Germania.
- Hagemann, W. (1929). *Die Revision der Kolonialmethoden in Afrika*. Aschendorff.
- Hagemann, W. (1932). Faschismus als europäisches Problem. *Zeitschrift für Politik*, 31, 306–318.
- Hagemann, W. (1943). *Uns ruft Afrika! Reiseskizzen*. Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Hagemann, W. (1948). *Publizistik im Dritten Reich – ein Beitrag zur Methodik der Massenführung*. Hansischer Gildeverlag.
- Hamelink, C., & Nordenstreng, K. (2016). Looking at history through the International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR). *IAMCR website*. <https://iamcr.org/node/3578>
- Hammami, S. (2005). Les sciences de l'information et de la communication dans le monde arabe : Réflexions sur les difficultés d'émergence d'une discipline. *Revue Tunisienne de communication*, 1(45), 7–42. https://archivesic.ccsd.cnrs.fr/sic_00001746
- Heinelt, P. (2003). 'PR-Päpste.' *Die kontinuierlichen Karrieren von Carl Hundhausen, Albert Oeckel und Franz Ronneberger*. Karl Dietz.
- Hemels, J. (2017). Die Anerkennung und Entwicklung der Kommunikationswissenschaft in den Niederlanden. In S. Averbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich: Transnationale Perspektiven* (pp. 53–92). Springer VS.
- Hepp, A., Krotz, F., Lingenberg, S., & Wimmer, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbuch Cultural Studies und Medienanalyse*. Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-19021-1>
- Höpken, W. (2021). *Wissenschaft – Politik – Biografie: Die deutsche Südosteuropaforschung und ihre Akteure am Beispiel von Franz Ronneberger*. De Gruyter Oldenbourg.
- Hubé, N. (2020). À la recherche d'une universalité du journalisme: La *Journalistik* allemande. *Revue Française des Sciences de l'information et de la communication*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rfsic.9269>
- Idelson, B. (2023). Les sciences de l'information et de la communication en terrains indiano-céaniques: Entre déterminisme digital et approche distanciée des concepts. *Communication*, 40(1). <https://doi.org/10.4000/communication.17088>
- Jeanneret, Y., & Ollivier, B. (2004). Les SIC en perspective. *Hermes*, 38(1), 86–88. <https://doi.org/10.4267/2042/9429>
- Jírák, J., & Köpplová, B. (2017). Zur Entwicklung der Kommunikationswissenschaft in der tschechischen Universität und Gesellschaft. In S. Averbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunika-*

- tionswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich: Transnationale Perspektiven (pp. 239–271). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-18950-5_9
- Karmasin, M., Rath, M., & Thomaß, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Normativität in der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-19015-0>
- Klein, P. (2006). *Henk Praxke und die funktionale Publizistik: Über die Entgrenzung der Publizistik- zur Kommunikationswissenschaft*. LIT.
- Kniefacz, K. (2008). *Zeitungswissenschaft in Wien 1900–1945: Die Institutionalisierung im Kontext der deutschsprachigen Fachentwicklung* [Diploma thesis, University of Vienna]. <http://doi.org/10.25365/thesis.1046>
- Koivisto, J., & Thomas, P. (2007). *Mapping communication and media research: Germany* (Research reports 6). University of Helsinki.
- Krämer, B. (2023). How German communication research discovered Bourdieu but missed his potential for the study of (populist) political communication. *History of Media Studies*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.32376/d895a0ea.7ec13efb>
- Kutsch, A. (1985). *Rundfunkwissenschaft im Dritten Reich*. K.G. Saur.
- Kutsch, A. (2006). Verdrängte Vergangenheit: Darstellungstechniken und Deutungen der Fachgeschichte im “Dritten Reich” in den Personalien der Publizistik. In C. Holtz-Bacha, A. Kutsch, W. Langenbucher, & K. Schönbach (Eds.), *50 Jahre Publizistik* (pp. 73–112). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Kutsch, A. (2010). Die Entstehung des Deutschen Zeitungswissenschaftlichen Verbandes. *Jahrbuch für Kommunikationsgeschichte*, 12, 121–144. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20852787>
- Kutsch, A. (2023). Die drei Anläufe zur Gründung der Publizistik. *Publizistik*, 68(4), 519–529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-023-00817-4>
- Lerg, W. B. (1987). Kurt Wagenführ und die Rundfunkkunde. *Studienkreis Rundfunk und Geschichte*, 13(4), 393–398.
- Löblich, M. (2010). *Die empirisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Wende in der Publizistik- und Zeitungswissenschaft*. Herbert von Halem.
- Löblich, M., & Averbek-Lietz, S. (2016). The transnational flow of ideas and histoire croisée with attention of the cases of France and Germany. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 25–46). Routledge.
- Löblich, M., & Scheu, A. M. (2011). Writing the history of communication studies: A sociology of science approach. *Communication Theory*, 21(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1/j.1468-2885.2010.01373.x>
- Marques de Melo, J. (1974). *Contribuições para uma pedagogia da comunicação*. Paulinas.
- Massmann, A. (2004). Von “Kommunikation für Entwicklung” zur “cultura mediática”. *Publizistik*, 49(3), 275–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-004-0072-6>
- Merkel, I. (2022). *Terms of exchange: Brazilian intellectuals and the French social sciences*. University of Chicago Press.
- Miike, Y., & Yin, J. (Eds.). (2022). *The handbook of global interventions in communication theory*. Routledge.
- Munzinger. (n.d.). *Kurt Wagenführ*. <https://www.munzinger.de/search/go/document.js?id=00000004211>

- Nöth, W., & Santaella, L. (2007). Die Relevanz der Peirceschen Semiotik des Vagen für die Theorie der Kommunikation. In S. J. Schmidt (Ed.), *Die (Un)Möglichkeit der Kommunikation* (pp. 73–96). Peter Lang.
- Obst, E. (Ed.). (1942). *Post- und Fernmeldewesen: Das Rundfunkwesen. Das Zeitungswesen*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111435800>
- Paris Rego de Souza, A. Z. (2017). Une communauté scientifique en construction: La recherche en Communication Organisationnelle, France et Brésil. *Communication & Organisation*, 52, 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.4000/communicationorganisation.5640>
- Paula, M. F. C. (2002). USP e UFRJ: A influência das concepções alemã e francesa em suas fundações. *Tempo Social*, 14(2), 147–161. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-20702002000200008>
- Pélissier, N., & Demers, F. (2014). Recherches sur le journalisme: Un savoir dispersé en voie de structuration. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rfsic.1135>
- Pfeiffer, J. (2018). Emil Dovifat. In M. Meyen & T. Wiedemann (Eds.), *Biografisches Lexikon der Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Herbert von Halem. <http://blexkom.halemverlag.de/emil-dovifat/>
- Pfetsch, B., & Esser, F. (2014). Political communication in comparative perspective: Key concepts and new insights. In C. Reinemann (Ed.), *Political communication* (pp. 87–105). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238174.87>
- Raichvarg, D. (2024, March 1). REACH-ing out: Bienvenue ICA France. *ICA Newsletter*. <https://www.icahdq.org/blogpost/1523657/498383/REACH-ing-Out-Bienvenue-ICA-France>
- Ravenstein, M. (1983). Kurt Wagenführ 80 Jahre. *Publizistik*, 28(1), 98–99.
- Ribeiro, N. (2011). The rise of a new field: Researching communication history in the Iberian countries. *Medien & Zeit*, 26(3), 7–16.
- Richter, C., Grüne, A., Hafez, K., Fiedler, A., Behmer, M., Horz-Ishak, C., Badr, H., Litvinenko, A., Hahn, O., Radue, M., Sarisakaloglu, A., Löffelholz, M., Fengler, S., Illg, B., Hamidi, K., Hanitzsch, T., & Thomaß, B. (2023). Die “tiefe Internationalisierung” der deutschen Kommunikationswissenschaft? Eine Evaluation der Personal- und Forschungsstrukturen sowie der Lehrprogramme deutscher Hochschulen. *Global Media Journal – German Edition*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.22032/dbt.57904>
- Rüdiger, F. (2004). *Theodor Adorno e a crítica à indústria cultural: Comunicação e teoria crítica da sociedade* (3rd ed.). EDIPUCRS.
- Rüdiger, F. (2019). *Síntese de história da Publicística: Estágios reflexivos da ciência da comunicação pública alemã*. Insular. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-25532019344198>
- Rüdiger, F. (2020). *Origens do pensamento acadêmico em jornalismo: Alemanha, União Soviética, Itália e Japão* (2nd ed.). Insular.
- Rüdiger, F., & Daros, O. (2022). Marxist thinking and journalism theory in Brazil. *Rethinking Marxism*, 34(4), 538–557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2022.2139079>
- Rüdiger, F., & Escosteguy, A. C. (2017). Brazilian research in communication: Historical synopsis and reflexive trends of academic work in an emerging country. In S. Averbeck-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich: Transnationale Perspektiven* (pp. 359–383). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-18950-5_14

- Said, E. (1983). *The world, the text, and the critic*. Harvard University Press.
- Sanchez Narvarte, R. E., & Komissarov, S. (2019). Antonio Pasquali y la Escuela de Frankfurt: Lecturas y apropiaciones (1966–1970). *Chasqui. Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación*, 141, 257–274. <https://doi.org/10.16921/chasqui.voi141.3850>
- Schäfer, S. (2004). Journalismus als soziales Feld: Das relationale Denken Pierre Bourdieus als Grundlage für eine Journalismustheorie. In M. Löffelholz (Ed.), *Theorien des Journalismus: Ein diskursives Handbuch* (pp. 321–334). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-01620-5_15
- Scharkow, M., & Trepte, S. (2024). National diversity at conferences of the International Communication Association. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 48(1), 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2023.2261018>
- Scheu, A. M. (2012). *Adornos Erben in der Kommunikationswissenschaft: Eine Verdrängungsgeschichte*. Herbert von Halem.
- Scheu, A. M. (2023). Fachgeschichte und Erinnerungsforschung: Die Beziehung von Fachgeschichte und Fachgedächtnis am Beispiel der deutschen Kommunikationswissenschaft. In C. Pentzold & C. Lohmeier (Eds.), *Handbuch kommunikationswissenschaftliche Erinnerungsforschung* (pp. 391–406). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110629743-018>
- Schwer, K. (2005). “Typisch deutsch?” Zur zögerlichen Rezeption der Cultural Studies in der deutschen Kommunikationswissenschaft. *Münchener Beiträge zur Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.5282/ubm/epub.521>
- Simonson, P., & Park, D. W. (Eds.). (2016). *The international history of communication study*. Routledge.
- Simonson, P., Park, D. W., & Pooley, J. (2022). Exclusions/exclusiones: The role for history in the field’s reckoning. *History of Media Studies*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.32376/d895aoea.ed348eo3>
- Thomaß, B. (Ed.). (2013). *Mediensysteme im internationalen Vergleich* (2nd rev. ed.). UVK. <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838539324>
- Tröger, M., & van den Ecker, M. (2023). Where’s the critique? On the dearth of critical theory in German communication research. *Media Theory*, 7(1), 257–276. <https://journalcontent.mediatheoryjournal.org/index.php/mt/article/view/888>
- Van den Bulck, J., & Van den Bulck, H. (2017). Communication sciences in flanders: A history. In S. Averbek-Lietz (Ed.), *Kommunikationswissenschaft im internationalen Vergleich: Transnationale Perspektiven* (pp. 93–113). Springer VS.
- Vierhaus, R. (2011). Max Grünbeck. In R. Vierhaus (Ed.), *Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie Online*. K. G. Saur. <https://www.degruyter.com/database/DBE/entry/dbe.16-4054/html?lang=de>
- Volk, S. C. (2021). *Comparative communication research: A study of the conceptual, methodological and social challenges of international collaborative studies in communication science*. Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-36228-7>
- Wächter, K.-M. (1999). *Die Macht der Ohnmacht: Leben und Politik des Franz Xaver Ritter von Epp (1868–1946)*. Peter Lang.
- Wagman, I. (2016). Locating UNESCO in the historical study of communication. In P. Simonson & D. W. Park (Eds.), *The international history of communication study* (pp. 71–89). Routledge.

- Wagner, H. (2023). Media studies in Germany in the context of cultural studies and Franco–German cooperation. *History of Media Studies*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.32376/d895a0ea.5644812e>
- Waisbord, S. (2014). United and fragmented: Communication and media studies in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Communication Research*, 4(1), 55–77. <https://journal.pubalaic.org/index.php/jlacr/article/view/61>
- Wessler, H., & Averbeck-Lietz, S. (2012). Grenzüberschreitende Medienkommunikation: Konturen eines Forschungsfeldes im Prozess der Konsolidierung. In H. Wessler & S. Averbeck-Lietz (Eds.), *Grenzüberschreitende Medienkommunikation* (pp. 5–18). Nomos.
- Wessler, H., & Brüggemann, M. (2012). *Transnationale Kommunikation: Eine Einführung*. Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-94190-5>
- Wiedemann, T. (2012). *Walter Hagemann: Aufstieg und Fall eines politisch ambitionierten Journalisten und Publizistikwissenschaftlers*. Herbert von Halem.
- Wiedemann, T. (2017). Surviving in the journalistic field: The Catholic journalist Walter Hagemann's rollercoaster ride during the Third Reich. *Journalism Studies*, 18(8), 943–959. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2015.1099462>
- Zillich, A. F., Riesmeyer, C., Magin, M., Müller, K. F., Pfaff-Rüdiger, S., Rothenberger, L., & Sehl, A. (2016). Werte und Normen als Sollensvorstellungen in der Kommunikationswissenschaft: Ein Operationalisierungsvorschlag. *Publizistik*, 61(4), 393–411. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-016-0286-4>
- Zorn, W. (1959). Franz Ritter von Epp. In O. zu Stolberg-Wernigerode (Ed.), *Neue deutsche Biographie* (Volume 4, pp. 547–548). Duncker & Humblot.

