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Abstract
This article focuses on two issues with regard to the policy debate on the regulation of access of communication systems. The first issue deals with the concepts that are commonly used in communication policy with regard to the regulation of ‘access’, i.e. universal service and public service. The article then goes on to challenge the validity and usefulness of these concepts in the new communications environments. The analysis points at many shortcomings in this respect. Attention is focused consequently on what communication policy in a networked society – or information society – should take into account. Here the main argument is that communication policy has to shift from media policy to social policy. What this means for regulating access, and its two main concepts, will be briefly outlined.
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INTRODUCTION

The central topic of this article is the question: what kind of future communication policy is needed in Western Europe in relation to access? To address this, two issues with regard to the present policy debate on the regulation of access to communication systems are dealt with.

The first issue is concerned with the concepts commonly used in communication policy debates with regard to the regulation of ‘access’ (section 1). In particular this addresses two most important ideas: ‘public service’ and ‘universal service’. The usage of these will therefore be analysed (section 2).

The second issue covers the applicability of these concepts to the new communications environments being created. Or to put it slightly differently: are ‘public service’ and ‘universal service’ as valid as they were with regard to regulating communication goals and have they, as is often presumed, the same usefulness in view of the problems and challenges that new information and communication technologies raise within the perspectives of an evolution to an information society?

The concept of the information society is used in its broadest possible sense. Being aware of its problematic and ideological character, however (see Garnham, 1998), this article defines the information society along the lines of the High Level Group of experts from the EU:

The information society is the society currently being put into place, where low-cost information and data storage and transmission technologies are in general use. This generalisation of information and data use is being accompanied by organisational, commercial, social and legal innovations that will profoundly change life both in the world of work and in society generally. (Soete, 1997: 11)

This definition indicates already why, as will be outlined, communication policy in the communications environment created by both this new information and communication technologies needs a broader, and even interdisciplinary approach, compared with the past.

In this context, as will be demonstrated in section 3, the traditional concepts of communication policy reveal their (many different) shortcomings with regard to their applicability, validity and usefulness.

The article will end by offering (section 4) some reflections on what should be taken into account by a communication policy in a networked society – or information society. The main argument will be that communication policy has to make the significant shift from media policy to social policy. What this means for regulating access and how this will lead to a necessary redefinition of universal service and public service will also be briefly outlined in terms of future research perspectives.
WHY AND HOW REGULATING ACCESS?

It is quite generally accepted, or at least assumed (e.g. McQuail, 1992) that in general a well-balanced communication system, involving effective policy with regard to access, must offer:

• a reflection, throughout its communication system, of the diversity of a given society;
• the possibility for its citizens to express their values and beliefs; and
• diversity of choice between media (a real choice must be available between different newspapers, library systems, televisions and so on) and within the system as a whole (different media have to be present and available).

This objective was expressed when the Amsterdam School for Communication research (which concentrates on ‘access’ as one of its main research topics) was launched:

The main goal of communications policy is free and equal access to a social communications system that diversely provides for the information and communication needs in society. (Van Cuilenburg, 1997: 10)

This way of framing the agenda indicates that the debate on access is very much linked, at least in Western Europe, to the one on pluralism and that underlying both concepts is the idea that a plural and accessible system must also be affordable. In fact the debate on access revolves around three interrelated sub-areas and involves three distinct sets of questions: how accessible, plural and affordable must a communication system be in order to be desirable?

The virtue of such a functional definition of a good or balanced communication system lies in its usefulness irrespective of the nature of the media involved. Indeed, it can be applied to the old media system and in fact most of the existing policy debates are centrally concerned with access to the communications system offered by radio, television, the press, the telephone and sometimes even libraries.

But such a definition can also be applied to newly distributed forms of old media like electronic news media, different types of pay TV and in particular the recent ‘really’ new media, based on effective interactivity, like e-mail, world wide web-based applications, which are the result of all kinds of different emerging electronic communications protocols and devices and which are mostly internet- (or IP to be more precise) based. This distinction between ‘old’, ‘new’ and ‘newly distributed’, as developed in Burgelman (1995), is not intended for epistemological purposes, but is only meant, as will be seen, to clarify some problematic points with regard to the consequences for policy.
The regulation of a communication system, and regulation in Western Europe is that part of the policy activity upon which this article focuses, has always emerged as a focus of debate and activity when a society felt that one or more of these criteria underlying ‘access’ were endangered. The main driver for regulatory intervention has, to a large extent, been the feeling that a disturbance in the communications system would have as a consequence the perception of an imbalance of the communication system in relation to the three primary criteria.

The words ‘felt’ and ‘perceived’ are used deliberately here to illustrate that contrary to the functional definition just given, the regulatory process with regard to accessibility is always subjective, because the concepts used are more or less normative.2

Indeed, whereas in the 1950s most West European societies, on the grounds of pluralism, would probably never have accepted that less than five communication groups would control the majority of their national media, oligopolic control of the market is today a fact. More importantly, such concentration is perceived less and less, certainly by policy makers, as a problem and if it is seen as a problem then this is mainly seen in terms of anti-competitive behaviour (Pauwels, 1998).

Here is another example to illustrate the extremely normative dimension of this debate. Since World War II, broadcasting policy in most West European countries has shifted from the vision that a state monopoly is the best guarantee for a balanced and diverse audio-visual range of services, to the vision that only a competitive market, with some marginal corrections, can guarantee this (Atkinson and Raboy, 1997). Indeed this debate has shifted quite dramatically over the last 20 years. Twenty years ago, for example, arguments about whether public service broadcasting should accept advertising or not dominated the agenda; today it is hardly a topic in the policy arena at all. The debate on the future of public service broadcasting is nothing more, currently and in most cases, than a debate on whether or not a certain country should have (at least) one public service channel available and in what way it should be financed.

Both examples illustrate the way communication policy for access is made operational, and also the degree that policy debates are determined by time and are thus dynamic in nature. But they are also context dependent and thus subject to certain social, economic and political forces. In the examples just given, it is the changing vision on what should be cultural policy (‘educating or not’) and the role of the state (‘player or supervisor’), as well as the precarious position of state budgets (deficits), that explain the change towards an acceptance of oligopolistic control of the market as the niche market role of the public broadcaster (Burgelman and Pauwels, 1992).

In examining the ways in which the concepts informing communication policy have developed to regulate the normative goals defined, attention
should be given to the way in which this process has been both incremental and self-reflexive, and to its time and context specificity.

PUTTING THE DOMINANT CONCEPTS OF COMMUNICATION POLICY WITH REGARD TO THE REGULATION OF ACCESS INTO PERSPECTIVE

I am suggesting that when the time comes to address imbalance in a communication system, policy makers in Western Europe have mostly fallen back, implicitly or not, on the concepts of ‘public service’ and ‘universal service’.3

Indeed both concepts were and still are used heavily by policy makers to enforce, at a certain time and context, a desired type of organization of their communication system in a more accessible/plural/affordable way. Since commercial broadcasting was perceived as only accessible to commercial interests, most post-war governments enforced a public service monopoly because that was regarded as being the best guarantee for an open and diverse broadcasting system. Since the telephone was only accessible and affordable to the rich and urban elite, most West European governments decided, after World War II, to enforce a monopolistic universal service telecommunications system.

Though there are more regulatory concepts (e.g. privacy) and though the arguments are a bit more complicated than can be stated here, I concentrate on these two and the arguments that underpin them, because one can find them popping up again and again in relation to the present debates related to the information society (Burgelman, 1997a, b).

Moreover they tend to be used in interchangeable ways. These can be explained by the ongoing convergence of transmission networks. Indeed, the type of the network is increasingly less relevant to the type of service being offered over it. Broadcast signals can these days easily be transmitted by copper cables and telephone calls can easily be handled by a coaxial cable.

And it is this convergence which explains why in policy circles, e.g. the EU, every possible problem with regard to access in the future information society is a priori anticipated by the notion of public service and universal service.

What, then, of the danger that the information society will be a dual one, as one might deduce from the uneven take-up of the internet? No problem, a universal service fund or a universal service obligation will solve the problem, so that it will be to the benefit of all. And what should a problem arise for the diversity of the information society, as a result of the ongoing oligopolization and sectorial integration in all types of media and hardware sectors? No problem, public service is there to secure high-quality content and a balance between specialized and popular programming.
More generically one can say that whatever problem is anticipated or occurs in the three dimensions of access, EU policy discourse and research with regard to the information society, these two ideas tend to be the fallback positions.

And this is a critical point because, as the examples illustrate, such uses of universal and public service as main regulatory concepts for possible problems with regard to the information infrastructure/networked society/information society are simplistic, formalistic and thus idealistic.\(^4\)

They are simplistic because they assume that the past functionality of these concepts can be extrapolated to the future; that is to say they assume that the same effects can be obtained now as in the past, by applying the same concepts and operationalizations of it. They are formalistic because they assume that these concepts have a dynamic of their own, regardless of the time and context in which they are applied. And they are idealistic, because they assume that the enactment of good laws (measures/intentions/decrees) is enough to implement them.

Historical research shows first of all that the two concepts mean different things: universal service, as applied in telecommunications, is grounded in economic judgements and can be measured, whereas public service, as applied in broadcasting has a more political-cultural dimension and is not measurable. Furthermore universal and public service, as policy aims, emerged as particular technologically informed constructs – scarcity of frequencies in broadcasting or natural monopoly of the network and economies of scale in telecommunications – but they were also the result of political and economical conflicts. The application and implementation of both concepts tended to differ amongst nations and cultures; the different patterns of broadcasting and telecommunications in the US and Europe illustrate this quite convincingly. And, not least, both came into play in a very elitist environment. Indeed, one tends to forget that when public service and universal service were, mostly implicitly, accepted as regulatory concepts in Western European communication policy, the use of most media or of the telephone was limited to the then elite and the then bourgeoisie. The public service provision of broadcasting was a service mainly for the benefit of the well-to-do who could afford to buy a radio-set. Similarly, universal service was universal mainly for those who could, in the first place, afford a telephone. Thus they were, for a long time, mainly confined to business people.

It is therefore a formalistic error to extrapolate both concepts, assuming (simplistically) that they refer to a perfect policy or to a real ‘public’ and real ‘universality’ and that just because they were seen to be relevant once they can be unambiguously and idealistically transposed to the present day.\(^5\)

In this respect, and with reference to the present debates, it is striking again how simplistic or naive the categories ‘market’ and ‘state’ in policy
debates on access are. Most debates, and indeed a lot of research, tends to use this as a dichotomic analytical pair: there is a market way of regulation or a non-market one, inevitably that of the state. According to the orientation of the author, this is then judged good or bad. Here too historical research and detailed analysis has shown that it has never been either the one or the other and that the regulation of the market was never an end in itself but a means. Indeed, public broadcasting was a compromise between a hesitating electro-technical industry in Europe (to go for private broadcasting) and a dynamic political will to control the new means of communication. When, then, following the oil crises of the 1970s, the industrial-based economies of Western Europe went to look for new growth markets in services and media, this coincided with a political will to get rid of the monopolies of the public service channels. Hence, from that point of converging interests onwards, the road was open for liberalization.

In other words, it is idealistic to assume that market models and state models exist in their pure form as ends in themselves. Moreover, both have benefits and negative points depending on what criteria are chosen to evaluate them (efficiency, innovative power, social dimensions and so on). And again, this differs from nation to nation. And what is certainly clear, both need a lot of prior thinking and operationalization. They have indeed no logic of their own.

It follows that though the notion of access as such can be used in a ‘universal’ or diachronic way, just as ‘democracy’ is often used in a universal or a normative way only, the operationalization of it should be subject to context-specific factors as well.

What context, then, needs to be taken into account and how can this serve as a starting point for re-operationalizing the notions of public and universal service in a policy framework?

**COMMUNICATION POLICY FOR ACCESS IN AN INFORMATION SOCIETY: THE CHANGING CONTEXT**

Since universal service and public service are to a large extent a western ‘invention’, it follows that the relevant context is that of the industrial world and, for reasons of clarity and focus, Western Europe. I want to suggest that the key principal characteristic of this context, in post-war western societies, is the welfare state.

Three interrelated changes and dynamics have taken place in these societies:

- a change in policy and related thinking in what is considered to be the optimal balance between affluence and welfare;
- a change in the hitherto unquestioned acceptance of the values underlying social policy in general; and
• a shift in the organization of the relationship between private and public time.

To start with, there has been, especially during the last two decades, a noticeable change in the debate on what used to be thought to be the optimal relationship between the affluent society and the welfare state. Ever since World War II, the more or less consistent policy for the construction of the welfare state in western societies was based on the existence of a ‘social contract’ between the individual and the collective – the state. This relationship tends to be considered as dialectic: the affluent society needs the welfare state, but the welfare state also needs the affluent society. It is a dialectic which created not only a wealthy but also a stable society, judged to be necessary for an innovative economy for the present as well as the future (Ducatel et al., 1997).

Traditionally this ‘social contract’ guaranteed:

• the Right of Labour, by pursuing complete and lifelong employment; by providing collective labour agreements and so on (level 1);
• the prevention of poverty, by providing minimal income and various types of social aid (level 2);
• the protection against social risks, for example the social and medical security system (level 3); and
• the promotion of equal chances by providing cheap but high-quality education and culture (level 4).

For many reasons – the rise of new conservatism, the pressures of financial capitalism, the economic recession since the oil crisis of the 1970s and all kinds of technological innovations – an increasing strain has been put on this social contract to a point where it is seen by many to be losing its legitimacy.

This can quite clearly be seen in relation to the following trends:

• full employment has increasingly been questioned as a defensible social objective. It has been replaced by the idea that we will have ‘to learn’ to accept 30 percent under- or unemployment in Europe;
• the prevention of poverty, one of the welfare state’s first achievements, is radically hindered by all kinds of cuts or by privatization (e.g. charity);
• the social security system, which functioned as welfare society’s social safety net and which, together with a guaranteed minimal income, also enabled those on the lowest incomes to participate in
the consumer society, is also threatened by a policy of cuts and withdrawal of support; and

- the promotion of equal chances is seriously threatened, even though seldom explicitly stated, by the progressive privatization of education, cultural provisions, media, etc.

For the purposes of this article it is important to note that communication policy is traditionally situated on the fourth level of the social contract. However, it is clear (see e.g. Mansell and When, 1998: 6–19 and 256–63) that in an information society or network-based economy, communication policy will also be vital in the other levels: job creation tends to be more and more information based (levels 1 and 2); telemedicine is increasingly gaining ground as a routine in the health sector (level 3); and so on.

The questioning of the rebalancing mechanism that was called the social contract goes together with the fact that for the first time since World War II, the best regulating mechanism is considered to be a minimally regulated market, in particular with regard to the information society.

It is important to note here that solidarity, an essential assumption in the post-war reconstruction and the metaphor for the collective citizenship model which has held for over three decades in Western Europe, has been increasingly replaced by an individualistic utilitarian citizenship model which raises questions like: What is the cost of disease? How many unemployed can we afford? Aren’t pensions a luxury of the past? Should people take care of themselves instead of the state? In other words the ‘what can I get out of it?’ attitude (Elchardus, 1994; Galbraith, 1992).

This links to the second main change against which the debate on the future of the welfare state in the information society has to be seen: the shifts in the values underlying social policy in general.

A first shift is the one from cultural paternalism, whereby quality is considered a rare good that has to be offered to as many people as possible, to post-modernism where, since quality is whatever the consumer decides, it is therefore not scarce at all.

In broadcasting, for example, this shift is expressed, in Western Europe, in the abandonment of the public broadcasting model in favour of commercial models. These two policy options can be clearly polarized as: ‘the “state” knows what is good for the viewer’ versus ‘everything is quality and the viewer is independent in his/her choice’.

The second shift tends to be identified with what has been regarded as the crisis of western culture (Morin, 1987). It is a rather philosophical debate pointing to the feeling among many people (especially the intellectuals) in western societies that their societies are no longer following a ‘grand social’ project and that by consequence meaningful world-views
guiding such a project are missing. This might explain the increasing reliance on thorough and ‘proven’ values and norms like language, race, religion and other forms of cultural fundamentalism; not to mention the revival of superstition; from beliefs in the pyramids as healers, or the effectiveness of over-speaking to the dead, to seeing the Book of Genesis as the only explanation for the creation of life (Levy, 1994).

Finally, when thinking about the welfare state in a context of an information society, a third global change has to be mentioned: the shift in the organization of time and space, more precisely in the relationship between private and public time (or life) (Ariès and Duby, 1990: 13–126).

Though a good deal can be said about the transformation of time and space, an example can be given by looking at labour and how information and communication technologies change the way labour is organized in time and space.

The history of labour, and its organization, is characterized as a permanent evolution distancing itself completely from the private (home) as it moves into the public domain, where it gets organized according to standardized and usually highly formal procedures (nine to five, etc.). Indeed the whole societal system of social organizations like labour unions, political constructs like collective bargaining of labour conditions, and even the way in which educational systems are conceived and constructed has emerged on the basis of this fundamental shift.

It is possible to suggest that ICT can simply turn back the clock and bring labour back again into the private sphere (e.g. through telework). This is very appealing, of course, but it has enormous side-effects on the social, political and other organizational constructions just mentioned. Take, for example, the structure of the school system. This follows the hours of labour and one of the main problems of labour flexibility as a result of introducing ICT is that families will, in all likelihood, have great difficulties organizing their time to fit into the schools’ timetable.

TO WHAT DEGREE ARE THE EXISTING REGULATORY MECHANISMS/CONCEPTS OF COMMUNICATION POLICY ADAPTED TO AN INFORMATION SOCIETY?

How, then, do these trends fit into the debate on communication policy? On the one hand it is clear that it is not only the traditional parameters of the social contract which are under pressure, but also the assumptions (social cohesion, etc.) on which they were based. Moreover, this coincides with quite a dramatic change, made possible by new information and communication technologies, in the organization of time and space and the societal institutions that are based on that. On the other hand, the communications sector has also an enormous impact on, and hence is
essential for, at least three of the four parameters of the social contract (where it used to have an impact on just one level).

The communication sector is thus no longer ephemeral to the context in which, since World War II, the welfare state has been organized, but is central to its further development. It is precisely within and against this radically changing societal context that the debate on the regulation of access should be positioned.

Once one acknowledges the changing context of communication policy, it follows that universal service and public service should be fundamentally redefined (and not just re-applied) and re-operationalized (and not just extrapolated).

On the one hand, with regard to a redefinition, this is because both concepts, in their traditional applications, focus solely on one level of the social contract (level 4) and the ‘revolution we are living through’ is effective on all four levels. Tele-medicine, for example, is access dependent. And if policy wants to avoid a dual medical or social security system this will have to be accounted for. Simple minded notions of universal service do not address this at all.

Furthermore, the enforcement and operationalization of these regulatory concepts has been sector specific until now too, mostly indeed applied and relevant to broadcasting only. In the case of public service this was done by a special tax: the license fee. In the case of universal service the installation of monopolies and the allowance of cross-subsidization were for a long time the preferred enforcement mechanisms in most Western European countries.

The question raised, however, is whether, given the changes outlined, communication policy can still limit itself to sector specificity. Or to put it more rhetorically, whether it is enough, in an emerging communication world characterized by abundance (which is not the same as quality) and segmentation of use, to say that a public service policy consists of offering only one public service channel? And is it enough, in a world where access to the internet, or more generally to a global network, will be so vital, to limit universal service policy to the provision of a phone within the reach of three kilometres of a habitation (which is the ITU definition of access)?

POLICING ACCESS IN THE INFORMATION SOCIETY: TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED AND CROSS-SECTORAL APPROACH

Clearly, in an information society scenario communication policy can not limit itself to traditional and classical issues of diversity in media and equal access to telephony. Nor can it be sufficient, as it used to be, to restrict communication policy to the provision of access to media alone.

If that were so, policy would be irrelevant since competition as such provides for more and more media channels and cheaper and cheaper access.
This is why dominant policy discourse, which only focused on ICT as media channels, is intrinsically correct: the more competition the bigger the range of services (e.g. satellite television), the cheaper the transmission (e.g. internet) and so on. It also explains why in policy circles the issue of self-regulation of the communications sector is so consistently promoted.

If this is applicable only to the questions concerning content and quality available on these cheaper premises, and the capacities needed to facilitate this content, then the dominant discourse becomes immediately problematic.

But the rethinking should go much further. The communication sector itself is becoming the ground on which the four levels of the social contract will increasingly be elaborated, and hence the ground on which the debates on labour, education and democracy will develop. And therefore communication policy cannot avoid being considered in a cross-sectoral way and has to be seen as part of the overall framework from within which social policy is conceived.

How far this rethinking can or must go and how this relates to economic policy, welfare policy and even international relations is a topic requiring considerable research and debate. Recent work (Blackman, 1998; Mansell and When, 1998) is beginning to address this, but it must be clear that the debate is only beginning (see several contributions in Calabrese and Burgelman, 1999). Related to this is the problem that if such cross-sectorality is accepted, how should such a ‘new’ cross-sectoral communication policy be operationalized and enforced?

Two examples can be adduced to illustrate this. The first relates to tele-medicine. Any decision to apply and enforce universal service or access in an internet environment – a defensible option from the point of view just outlined – only via the sector itself (e.g. via a universal service fund) will tend to favour the incumbent telecommunication operators and hence make fair competition problematic (Mansell, 1993). It is quite clear that if tele-medicine is important, then access to it cannot be paid by the operators as such. However, someone will have to pay for the very expensive, technical and demanding networks a tele-medicine environment needs. This suggests that the debate on communication policy with regard to tele-medicine should also be a debate on redirecting social and medical policy.

The second relates to public policy for the internet. Applying and enforcing public service in a world of networked abundance clearly means being active beyond the classical distribution platforms like cable or satellite, but also on the net as such. Given the emerging importance of push technologies, which are in fact a networked model of broadcasting, and the successful ones at least are moving in that direction (Uzan and Fontaine, 1998), it seems reasonable to argue that public service obligations should be relevant here too. Or to push the argument further and by looking at the trend where costs of access to the internet will continue to fall, probably
down to 150 Euro a year (Dimech and Turpin, 1998), one can argue that the main policy problem here will shift from access, as such, towards the question of access to a quality network or quality content.

The question arises consequently of the relevance (compare the history of library policy in industrial societies) of public service policy to web sites, search engines or portal sites. However, if action on this level should be considered, it is clear that financing it either by subscription or by yet another license fee will be absurd and probably counterproductive. This too provides a major challenge for research.

CONCLUSION

This article started from the question of whether existing concepts in communication policy in relation to access can be applied as effectively as in the past, now that we are in the new environment of the information society. First, it was observed that ‘public service’ and ‘universal service’, the two main concepts, have no logic on their own, but are contextually determined and sector specific. Then it was argued that the transformation towards an information society is not only transforming the media or creating new distributed media, but is also transforming firms, economics, governments and the way people live.

This suggests that the context within which communication policy has to be applied is changing radically. It now encompasses the traditional domains of communication policy, but also stretches out to a global or regional policy framework (for example, the social contract) within which most West European countries have been constructed since World War II. This, in turn, implies that since communication policy has up till now traditionally been sector specific and mainly devoted to access in media matters or to the telephone network, regulating access in an information society should be pushed into these newly emerging and converging directions.

Not taking the outlined contextual shifts into account means that the regulation of access could indeed be limited to supervising fair competition and favouring marginal market intervention. If the source of concern is only the media and or access to the phone (or the net), than indeed a minimalist regulatory approach could be seen to be enough.

If, however, the contextual shifts outlined above are taken into account, then this will be inadequate. We are faced, instead, with an unavoidable and radical rethinking and an equally important re-operationalizing of the concepts of access and, even more, of general communication policy as such.

Notes

1 This article is the result of two previous papers (Burgelman, 1997c, 1998) and the research for it is part of an ongoing interuniversitary project ‘Research &
interdisciplinary evaluation of the information society: networks, usage and the role of
the state’, funded by the federal institute for science policy (DWTC). The views
expressed in this article are those of the author and do not represent those of the EU.
2 For a good example see the publications of the Euromedia Research Group (1986,
1992, 1998); for an American classic example, see De Sola Pool (1983).
3 This section draws on Burgelman (1997a) which is an extensive overview of post-
World War broadcasting and telecommunication policy and related research in Western
Europe. This article offers a lot of empirical references upon which the more
analytical remarks here are based. It won’t be repeated here. For a book length
illustration of this analysis see Burgelman et al., (1995).
4 See Burgelman (1997a, b) for an elaboration of this point as well as a synthesis of the
literature.
5 The same decontextual use is e.g. made quite often of Habermas’ work on the public
sphere, which was indeed an idealized construction of a very elitist empirical reality
(see Dahlgren and Sparks, 1993: chapter 1).
6 See the different overviews of communication policy in Western Europe, Eastern
Europe and North America in Corner et al., 1997.
7 Based on the analysis of Group of Lisbon (1994). The literature on this topic is of
course much more developed.
8 Though this was not the focus of this article, it is quite clear that the same analytical
reasoning could be applied to other continents or even the world. See the excellent
holistic approach – communication policy as a mix of infrastructure, capabilities and
skills – offered by Mansell and When (1998).
9 See Van Cuilenburg and Verhoest (1998). For extreme but intrinsically correct,
minimalist approaches, see the various OECD policy documents with regard to
technologies and media policy (including electronic commerce).
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