communications media as we see ourselves. And to make the further distinction that communications media vary from country to country just as languages and vocabularies may be expected to be different.

I am indebted to the publisher of the Manchester Guardian for the suggestion—in fact, hypothesis—that American communications media divide the socioeconomic pyramid differently from the media in England.

In America, with its presupposition that "all men are created equal" (and continue that way), the newspapers, radio, and TV cut vertically through the pyramid. It is an article of our political faith that the man at the bottom of the pyramid must have access to the same quality of information as the man at the top.

The English are not so sanguine. From BBC to the Guardian, the English cut across the pyramid. The Times and the Guardian for the folk at the top of the pyramid; the Express for those in the middle; and the News of the World to titillate the vulgar sensibilities of those whom England's educational system has deprived of the potential from which curbstone statesmen are made.

Diagrammed, it would look like this:

You can see that whether we call it audience, market, or public, the press reflects the social structure in which it must exist. We hope, therefore, that when the press or other media are criticized for failing to live up to proper standards, our academic friends will realize those standards may not be accurate for that particular social structure in which these communications media exist.