

*Community Media Review* 25:2 (Summer 2002): 20-23.

Re-thinking 'Access':  
Cultural Barriers to Public Access Television

by Bill Kirkpatrick

*"In stratified societies, unequally empowered social groups tend to develop unequally valued cultural styles. The result is the development of powerful informal pressures that marginalize the contributions of members of subordinated groups both in everyday contexts and in official public spheres."*  
Nancy Fraser<sup>1</sup>

Introduction

In this article I would like to address what I see as a disconnect between the *principles* of public access and the *philosophy* of public access. On the one hand is the founding principle of free speech -- democracy of the airwaves, everybody's channel, *your* voice can be heard, etc. On the other, there is a dominant philosophy of civic participation in the marketplace of ideas that values a particular kind of political speech and certain notions of quality over others -- with the result that "bad" or "fringe" or "vanity" programming is devalued and denigrated. Thus you can read George Stoney, in the summer 2001 issue of *Community Media Review*, who talks about "irresponsible" users with their "thoughtless self-indulgence . . . wasting everybody's time" (29) or you might have read the description of the panel on controversial programming at the 2001 conference in Washington, D.C., describing certain producers who are a "menace to access" and must be "defeated." It is not quite, it seems, everybody's channel after all. Instead, we find a gap where the principle of open access doesn't quite meet the philosophy of civic participation.

There are several possible ways of bridging this gap. Stoney's solution is to ease away from first principles, tolerating self-indulgence while applying persuasion and pressure on producers to conform to certain kinds of speech. Today, I will take the other approach, and argue that we instead need to ease away from privileging certain forms of political speech, not in order to say that anything goes, but in order to understand the politics inherent even in

apparently "trivial" programming. In other words, before we back away from open access, let's look at why so-called "bad" programming is considered bad, and whether there isn't in fact a lot more good in such programming than we realize.

### **The Case of *Metromen***

I started thinking about this issue a few years ago when I was cablecasting at my local public access station in Madison, WYOU. During my shift, we had a program called *Metromen* that consisted of a group of highschoolers basically sitting around talking to their friends who called in, interspersed with segments in which they pretended to wrestle in the style of their WWF heroes. Now, there is probably a show like this (or close enough) on just about every access station around the country: unprofessional, undisciplined, and politically unfocused.

However, what I found most interesting about this show was not the content per se, but the role it came to play in the politics of the station. On the one hand, there were complaints from the public about the occasional swear word or off-color reference that popped up, and the show was used by then-provider TCI and certain municipal leaders to try to strangle public access in Madison. But there were also pressures coming from the producer and staff at WYOU to make the show more "serious," more "issue-oriented," more like the original political vision of public access. The teens could dabble in wrestlemania and have their fun, but there should be some "real content" to the show -- "teen issues" and the like. In short, they officially tolerated the teens' self-indulgence while pressuring them to conform to more civic forms of speech: essentially Stoney's preferred solution.

### **Making *Metromen* "Responsible"**

In some ways, these pressures to make the show more "responsible" may have been in the best interests of the station, toning down controversy during a period of franchise renegotiation. But at the same time, this episode sheds light on some of the values and ideals that continue to underlie the philosophy of access -- values and ideas about culture, democracy, speech, and society that work to either privilege or suppress certain kinds of speech, modes of

expression, ideas, and speakers. Through myriad subtle and not-so-subtle ways, both visible and invisible -- the raised eyebrow, the disparaging comment, the selective lack of enthusiasm for a given production -- we who are involved in public access are also gatekeepers, part of the forces that limit or enable the principle of open access. As Fraser noted in the epigram of this article, there are powerful informal pressures that help close off access to the media, and we must recognize our participation in that process.

Therefore, while public access practitioners have done an outstanding job of reducing technological and financial barriers to accessing the public sphere of politics, there remain *cultural* barriers to media participation that we need to better address. So first I will talk a little bit about traditional notions of the public sphere, and some of the cultural barriers that these notions fortify. Then I will discuss another way of looking at the public sphere and consider how this second model might help address some of these cultural barriers, adjusting the fit between our principles and our philosophies.

### **Access and the Public Sphere**

So let's start with the public sphere. Central to theories of democracy is the idea that there must be a way for citizens to come together to discuss issues of common concern so that public opinion can be formed and democratic decisions can be made. The "place" where this happens is the public sphere. Perhaps the most influential ideas about the public sphere were formed by a German philosopher named Juergen Habermas.<sup>2</sup> Habermas argued that the ideal public sphere would be one in which social status could be separated from public debate: we should, in effect, *pretend* to all have the same status and social power so that we can debate as equals. The way that this would work in practice is that public debate would be "rational-critical" debate -- logical, unemotional, reasoned, deliberate, and politically focused.

While Habermas himself may or may not be a familiar figure, there is a version of such ideas that is more common. This is the metaphor of the "marketplace of ideas" that is so central to First Amendment theory. The idea here is that we have free speech in a democracy -- a free

market of ideas -- and that the best idea will ultimately be the one that wins out. Through rational dialog, we as a society can form public opinion about how to govern ourselves. In this philosophy, power is seen to reside in the ideas themselves, not in the speaker, the speaker's status, or the mode of communication: good ideas will drown out bad ideas.

### **The Public Sphere and the Marketplace of Ideas**

The marketplace of ideas metaphor of the public sphere has been very influential in the history of public access, and almost every key work refers to it in some form or another.<sup>3</sup> In fact, it is hard to even imagine having public access without thinking in these terms, because what public access offers first and foremost is access to this supposed marketplace of ideas: historically it has been about creating a public sphere to which all citizens have access, bringing about that Habermasian ideal in which not just the rich and powerful can go on television but even ordinary citizens can have their voice heard, so that the best ideas win out.

It is clear that this metaphor has gotten us a very long way, and I have nothing but respect for those who pioneered and continue to struggle on behalf of this ideal. But I also hope to point out where the limits are -- how this philosophy of access can get us only so far. If public access is about access to the marketplace of ideas, then the barriers that it must confront are primarily financial and technological. Specifically, to gain access to the airwaves, you have to have the financial means and the technical know-how to get your message out. That's why public access is free (or virtually free) to its users; that's why there's such a strong emphasis on equipment and technical training; that's why outreach is so important to bring in representatives of various groups: We're building a public sphere to which social status is no barrier. It doesn't matter how rich you are or how well educated or what language you speak; public access will guarantee you entry into that ideal public sphere. And thanks to this vision, public access has had enormous successes over the past thirty years.

### **Valuing Rational-Critical Speech Forms Over Others**

It follows from this that, because we are trying to bring about a particular ideal public

sphere, certain kinds of speech are valued over others. Specifically, we tend to value the civic, rational-critical modes of speech -- the public affairs shows, town meetings, "arts and culture," etc. -- over more populist speech, rude speech, vanity programming, etc. So in the example of *Metromen*, there was pressure to spend less time wrestling (which is not considered civic speech) and more time discussing so-called teen issues, ideally in a kind of rational-critical form of discourse that rarely overlaps with the teens' own preferred way of speaking. In other words, the producers of this public access show were asked to enter the public sphere not on their own terms, but on the more restrictive terms of the ideal rational-critical public sphere. Another example comes from the Alliance discussion list a while ago: The thread was about call-in shows, and one participant emphasized the need to screen the callers so that, for instance, you don't have someone screaming obscenities at the mayor. In other words, it is perfectly acceptable to discuss denying access to those who do not conform to what we deem "acceptable" or "quality" speech.

These are not isolated examples. In fact, if you read the critics of television such as Robert Putnam, you will frequently find hierarchies of quality established in which shows like *Nightline* that emphasize rational-critical debate are deemed relatively good, while shows like *Jerry Springer* are deemed "trash": not worth watching, possibly even pathological. Such hierarchies are also active in public access, despite the principle of openness and tolerance. In a 1999 article in the *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, Donna King and Christopher Mele argued much the same thing, taking to task prominent writers on access for valorizing "legitimate" public discourse while treating so-called "vanity" or "fringe" programming as an embarrassing waste of time. To the extent that such hierarchies are -- perhaps "enforced" is too strong a word -- *communicated* by those in power at an access studio, they serve to discourage or limit certain speakers and forms of speech from being broadcast.

Now, given enough support and cooperation from the community, the municipal government, and the cable company, we can begin to solve the financial and technological

barriers to access. But these cultural barriers are much more subtle and difficult to solve. They involve re-thinking not just what the access project is, not just our definitions of "quality," but even how democracy itself might work in ways that don't depend on the idealized public sphere or the marketplace of ideas.

### **Hurdling Cultural Barriers to Access**

To repeat: according to the dominant philosophy of access, we should be trying above all to bring about a public sphere in which we pretend that differences do not exist, in which we engage in rational-critical debate, and that we aim for some sort of consensus of public opinion through the marketplace of ideas. We prefer "serious" and "quality" programming on our stations, and at best merely tolerate programs that don't conform to our definitions of those virtues. I would argue, however, that a rational mode of politics is not the only way society works. Public opinion is not expressed only through the official realm of politics and civic speech, and social relations are not negotiated only through public policy. I would suggest that opinions about society are just as valid when expressed through marginalized forms of speech, perhaps even more so, but -- and this is key -- we need to learn to read this speech for what it is, for its political content. Furthermore, resistance to the existing social order, which is an important contribution to the public sphere, often takes forms of speech that are themselves opposed to that order. In such cases, rational-political debate, civic speech, propriety, and obvious relevance (obvious to the mainstream and relevant to the mainstream, that is) give way to oppositional and resistant forms of speech. *And those forms are just as valid as any other.* Instead of further marginalizing them, we must try to see them as resistant politics in a resistant package.

An analogy might be helpful here. When Public Enemy raps about racial tension and conditions in the inner cities, a large segment of mainstream society will reject it as atonal garbage, as so much irritating noise: profane, obscene, devoid of musicality, etc. While I disagree with such characterizations, the important thing is that the same message of

oppression and unrest, wrapped up in a polite documentary, with the bad words bleeped out and the conventions of documentary dutifully followed, is much more likely to win our approval as honest, hard-hitting political speech. Why? Because it is a form of speech that *we* understand, that *we* are comfortable with, that submits to the mode of politics that *we* like -- and if that form doesn't speak to the producers or their intended audience, then the problem must lie with them, not us. It is, according to this all-too-prevalent view, not our fault for misunderstanding the political speech in a rap song, but *their* fault for not encoding that political speech in the form *we* desire. In point of fact, Public Enemy's music contributed significantly to the public sphere in articulating opposition to racial oppression, in helping the dispossessed make sense of their lives, and in resisting the social relations that contribute to the unspeakable conditions of the inner city. The barriers of understanding that lead many to miss this fact are purely cultural.

### **Political Potential in All Forms of Speech**

To return to public access, to call something "fringe" or "vanity" programming is to dismiss the speaker because we don't understand the speech -- whether or not we are even being spoken to. Instead of valorizing rational-critical debate, the realm of "official" politics, the public affairs shows, the "arts and culture" shows, and the earnest documentaries, we need to understand and appreciate the political potential in *all* forms of speech. So in the example of *Metromen*, we have a show that isn't devoid of politics, and it doesn't need to be "corrected" by injecting "teen issues." It is, in fact, all about teen issues: issues of identity as they try on different personas; issues of inclusion and exclusion as they negotiate friendships and social networks through the medium, obvious issues of sexuality and masculinity, and issues of resistance to adult authority and control as they use *their* language, pursue *their* interests, and mobilize *their* cultural artifacts like wrestling and rap music to challenge their subordinated social position. To call them irresponsible and self-indulgent means that we want them to resist power using power's tools instead of their own. By recognizing their contribution to the public sphere,

however, we can begin to close the gap between our principles and our philosophy. If we question the taste hierarchies born of our commitment to the civic definition of politics, then we can begin to confront the cultural barriers that impinge on the principle of open access.

### **Cultural Barriers Create an Access Disconnect**

Public access is valuable because it fosters democratic participation, yes, but it is also valuable precisely because it is divisive, disruptive, and transgressive -- and even because it is trivial, banal, and inane. As a forum for those lacking in the social and economic power to use other media, public access needs to be defended *especially* for speech that strikes the mainstream as ridiculous or dangerous. We need to review our role in further marginalizing such speech even in the supposedly open forum of access. How do we treat such producers? How do we schedule them? How do we show them that their contribution is (or is not) valued? And how can we overcome our own tastes and prejudices about what constitutes appropriate speech in order to foster a more supportive climate for these producers?

My argument is that cultural barriers help create an unfortunate disconnect between access principles and philosophies, but that there are things we can do and adjustments we can make to help bridge this gap. These means rethinking how the public sphere operates, using a more generous understanding of political speech and the different cultural forms it can take. It means helping producers realize *their* vision, not ours.



## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Fraser, 120.

<sup>2</sup> See for instance *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. While Habermas revised his ideas about the public sphere over the years, this 1962 book remains one of the seminal works in public sphere theory. It should be noted that this book was not translated into English until 1989, and thus was not a direct influence on early public access advocates per se. However, many of Habermas' ideas about democracy and the media were part of a larger school of leftist thought that was influential in the 1960s and 1970s, most notably through the work of Marcuse, Adorno, Horkheimer, and Enzensberger, and it was Habermas who applied these ideas to the concept of the public sphere.

<sup>3</sup> The marketplace of ideas metaphor is highly flexible, and has been invoked on both the left and the right with varied emphasis depending on the ideological position of the speaker. Thus, those on the right tend to erase the question of power in order to use the metaphor to sustain a market-populist ideology, while those on the left make issues of power and status more central in order to highlight disparities in access to the means of communication.

## Bibliography and Works Consulted

- Aufderheide, Patricia. "Public Television and the Public Sphere." *Cultural Studies in Mass Communication* 3 (1991): 168-183.
- Calhoun, Craig. "Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1992. 1-48.
- Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1987.
- . "Popularity and the Politics of Information." *Journalism and Popular Culture*. Eds. Peter Dahlgren and Colin Sparks. London: Sage Publications, 1992.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1992. 109-142.
- Habermas, Juergen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Polity, 1989.
- King, Donna L. and Christopher Mele. "Making Public Access Television: Community Participation, Media Literacy and the Public Sphere." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*. Fall, 1999: 603-623.
- Meijer, Irene Costera. "Advertising Citizenship: An Essay on the Performative Power of Consumer Culture." *Media, Culture & Society* 20 (1998): 235-239.
- Ouellette, Laurie. "TV Viewing as Good Citizenship? Political Rationality, Enlightened Democracy and PBS." *Cultural Studies* 13 .1 (1999): 62-90.
- Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.
- Stoney, George. "The Essential George Stoney." *Community Media Review* 24:2 (Summer 2001): 29-31.
- Young, Iris Marion. "The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference." *Feminism/Postmodernism*. Ed. Linda J. Nicholson. London: Routledge, 1990. 300-323.

### Author Note

Bill Kirkpatrick is a doctoral candidate in the Media and Cultural Studies area of the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Email: [mwkirkpa@students.wisc.edu](mailto:mwkirkpa@students.wisc.edu). He is currently working on his dissertation, which focuses on the cultural dimensions of alternative media.

### Manuscript Note

This article was presented in the White Paper session at the 2001 national conference of the Alliance for Community Media in Washington, D.C. It was selected through competitive submission of essays during the Spring of 2001; authors were asked to address a philosophical or self reflexive aspect of access.

\*end\*