Bridging Practice and Theory:
`White Papers' in Public Access Cable Television

John W. Higgins

Associate Professor
Menlo College
Department of Mass Communication
1000 El Camino Real
Atherton, California  94027  USA
Email: jhiggins@mediaprof.org

President, Board of Directors
San Francisco Community Television Corporation
San Francisco, California   USA

This paper is available on-line at:
http://www.mediaprof.org/

Bridging Practice and Theory:
`White Papers' in Public Access Cable Television

Abstract

The practice of public access cable television in the U.S. offers a rich source of experience in implementing notions of democracy, freedom of speech, and grassroots media. Access practitioners seek to place these experiences within larger theoretical frameworks, such as those provided by the academic community.

This paper details the "White Paper" sessions at the national conferences of the Alliance for Community Media (ACM), a practitioner organization promoting the use of community media outlets. White Paper sessions focus on a single presenter posing a self-reflexive aspect of community media philosophy, with extended discussion among session participants. The critical exploration of access philosophy and practices by access practitioners and academics is framed within notions of praxis and the roots of critical/cultural studies.

Bridging Practice and Theory:
`White Papers' in Public Access Cable Television[1]

> *We were small-format, grassroots video makers . . . and it is hard to explain what a cultural buzz there was around all that in the mid-to-late seventies.  We were experimenting with video, local cable channels, citizen participation, and video art and were as full of righteous energy, and ourselves, as any dot com scene today.*  (Fred Johnson 1999, 153).

**Puppet show in the park, Dayton Ohio USA, summer 1975:**

*Merkle the Wizard and Harry the Hare have a problem with the local electric company, Dayton Power and Light (DP&L).  The company has raised rates, affecting the low income inhabitants of the park.  As they deal with issues surrounding the problem, the puppets discover the power of working together against the utility company.*

*Together, the kids in the park scream and yell on cue at the appropriate places in the show, as the stage walks among the audience.  I peer through the fabric screen and pick my way carefully through the crowd  as I perform, the puppets either dancing animatedly on my hands or waiting for an entrance in the "green room": hanging on a belt around my waist.  The stage fits over my head and body; the stage frame is covered with a loosely woven burlap that allows me to see out but prevents the audience from seeing "the man behind the curtain."  The stage and the performance are connected to a tradition of socially-conscious street theatre performances shared by cultures around the world throughout the ages.[2]*

---

[1] This paper draws from my experiences with community radio and public access cable television since 1974, and my current position as President of the Board of Directors for the San Francisco Community Television Corporation (CTC), the non-profit organization overseeing Access San Francisco, the public access channel and facility for the city.

[2] See the essay "Politics and Puppets" on the Night Vision Puppets web site for a description of the troupe's performance at the U.N.'s bicommunal 50th Anniversary Celebration in the "Green Zone" of Nicosia.  http://www.nightvisionpuppets.org

*The puppet show and the live bluegrass music that follows are merely opening acts this evening.  They help to draw and entertain the large neighborhood crowd until the sun sets and the main act can begin: a multi-media slide and sound show produced by the local media collective, Media House, organized by film makers Julia Reichert and Jim Klein.  The show is the result of weeks of interviews with residents of the neighborhood -- on front porches, in back yards, the parks, the streets, the places they work and live -- regarding the negative impact of DP&L's rate increase on their lives, and possible ways to organize against the increase.*

*The collaboration this evening (and other evenings) by various individuals and groups within the progressive community of Dayton and Yellow Springs was facilitated in part by connections made at the local community-based radio station, WYSO, owned by Antioch College.[3]  The events stemmed from a basic desire to change the world, connect with like-minded people in building a sense of "community," resist against corporate injustice and complicity by local elected officials . . . and have fun doing it.  Like others engaged in similar activities around the world in that time period of the 1970s[4] we were aware to varying degrees of notions of liberation emanating from our own and other communities.  But whether or not you had read the works or heard the ideas explicated, the global aether was permeated with a sense of impending social change and the necessity for individual commitment and collective action.*

---

[3] Antioch College's role in the emergence of community-based video is discussed by Antioch's Robert Devine (2001) and Boyle (1997), who notes the college's participation in one of the earliest alternative video groups, TVTV.

[4] See Boyle (1997) and Halleck (2002) for personal and culturally-based media histories of the era. Youngblood (1970) provides a perspective from within art and activism; Shamberg and Raindance (1971) embody the philosophy of the video movement of the period.

**Video performance in the street, Barranquilla Colombia, May 19, 2003:**

*A group of local musicians have finished playing to people gathering in the street, braving the occasional rain shower.  Representatives of a liquor company are passing out free shots of rum.  I am transfixed by the images flickering across the huge screen erected in the street.  A video program is being projected that documents a history of the avenue and the surrounding neighborhood, a day in the life of the people in the neighborhood as they talk about their lives and their dreams for the future.*

*The program is one of a series, produced by Grupo Creativo Los Buenos Muchachos (the Good Guys Creative Group), a local media production group.  The screening fiesta is "Ciudadarteria" (city artery) an event held regularly in neighborhoods throughout the city.  My visit to the community screening is a part of the schedule for a conference convening in Barranquilla: a group of activists, practitioners, academics, and policy leaders engaged in community-based, grassroots media around the world.[5]*

*Chills run up and down my spine as I am transported back twenty eight years to the summer time community-based performances in Ohio.  In Barranquilla this evening, I am not watching just another video program in a group party setting; rather, I am witness to the essence of participatory, community-based, grassroots, "alternative" media.[6]*

〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜〜

We dance back and forth between action and reflection, consciously or unconsciously negotiating "praxis," Brazilian educator Paulo Freire's (1970/1989) continually renewing cycle of practice informed by critical reflexivity, spiraling to expanded consciousness, re-directed action,

---

[5] The occasion in Barranquilla was the third meeting of the group, OURMedia/NUESTROSMedios May 19 and 20, 2003.  See http://www.ourmedianet.org for information and conference papers.

[6] At least one other participant in the conference noted a connection between the community street screening and similar events in New York: on a panel the next day, long-time media activist and Paper Tiger founder DeeDee Halleck connected the evening's screening with similar instances of street screenings in New York City in the 1960s.

and beyond.  In a previous work I have reflected on my personal connection with Freire's work, albeit unknown to me, at an early age (Higgins 1997).  If Freirean ideals are imprinted on one's consciousness at an early age and she is unaware of how thoroughly integrated they are into her belief system and world view, is she acting in a "conscientized" manner when she follows lifetime issues of liberation, empowerment, and social justice?  How conscious must our critical reflection be?  If Freire's work, spreading like ripples on a pond, unknowingly touches us through the tender hegemony of an underground culture of egalitarianism, social justice, community organizing, exuberance and individual service, what is the nature of our actions when creating puppet shows, television and radio programs, and other media-based programs that dealt with issues of power inequalities and social justice?  In other words, to what degree must we be aware of the underlying theoretical framework to our social actions in order to be considered conscientized?

These are the more personal questions of empowerment buried beneath a previous discussion regarding the nature of social change, where I noted that:

> the nature of Freirean empowerment and societal change [is] a process that begins with individual and collective transformation, and . . . unreflective actions may play a role in initiating this metamorphosis.
> . . . the process of social change is immensely complex and involves a dialectic relationship between the individual and the collective . . . This rich interplay between individual and collective is more helpful in understanding the nature of societal change than the hierarchical model with a concentration on radical social action.  (Higgins 1999, 637-638)

The study from which this excerpt is drawn focused on volunteer community producers at a public access cable television facility in the U.S., comparing their experiences with the long standing tenets of the community television movement globally, and U.S. public access cable television.  The study concluded that participation in community television is best understood from within the framework of *process,* providing the potential for social change and action.  Similar results have been reported in a study of access producers by King and Mele (1999, 608) who conclude that "the process of media production itself is politically transformational."  These

studies provide empirical support for the position of authors engaged in public access who

argue that community television is best framed as a process providing the potential for social

change and action (Devine 1992, Johnson 1994); and that the traditional framework of

broadcast television programs and audiences is not helpful in understanding community-based

television (Aufderheide 2000; Devine 1992).[7]

> "Communications technology does <u>not</u> automatically solve
> problems.  The use of media for animation purposes is
> <u>process</u> rather than <u>task</u> oriented.  The process of a
> community forming associations, formulating and articulating
> concerns, forging public discourse, achieving consensus and
> restructuring power relationships is probably more significant
> than the programs themselves, and certainly more significant
> than the technology used to accomplish these processes."
> (original emphasis; Bob Devine 1992.)

### The Emergence of Public Access

Community-based, public access cable television channels emerged in the U.S. in the

1960s and 1970s, [8] in keeping with a tradition of global social activism, participatory democracy

and electronic media projects throughout the early to mid 20th century around the world.  These

projects, in turn, were built on the work of radical film makers and photographers in the early

part of the 20th century and follow a history of radical protest and grassroots media.  From

demands that radio be devoted to shared communication among people (Brecht 1930/1983) to

community based radio stations based on local social movements in the 1940s, as in Bolivia

and Berkeley, California, these projects around the world provided a framework in which to

---

[7] Clemencia Rodriguez (2001) proposes renaming "alternative media" as "citizens' media" to better reflect expanded notions of power and democracy.  Although *Fissures in the Mediascape* does not include discussions related to these topics emerging from the U.S. public access movement over the past decade, the work reflects the access movement's attention to the suitability of the process model when exploring community-based media projects.

[8] For academically based histories regarding the emergence of public access cable television in the U.S., see Engleman (1990), and Linder (1999).  Insider views are provided by Bednarczyk (1986, 2001)

visualize the emerging technology of portable video equipment for the creation of community-based programs in the 1960s.

Boyle (1997) identifies two contrasting perspectives within alternative video in the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s: guerrilla television and community or grassroots video.  The former, associated with Michael Shamberg's Guerrilla Television (1971), was not aligned with leftist politics or a political movement.  Guerrilla television was focused on product -- developing the hardware of portable video as a viable medium and distributing programs to wider audiences (Boyle, 1997, p. 34).  In the end, guerrilla television groups faded away or became absorbed by the mainstream media industries.

In contrast, community/grassroots video groups stressed participation by community members in creating their own programs and reflected a "process" over polished "product" orientation (Boyle, 1997, p. 34).  This faction of the alternative video movement was primarily responsible for the establishment of cable access facilities, was actively engaged in political struggle, and continues to be the driving force behind the survival of these outlets today.  The endurance of the community/grassroots video groups is tied to their emphasis on the larger process of social change and the use of video as a tool within this context, rather than on the technological toys themselves, as characterized by the guerrilla television group.

Alternative media projects might be based on the implementation of particular theoretical principles; more often than not they are extensions of local solutions to particular problems and issues that might then be framed within theory at appropriate moments.  If there is no theoretical connection at some point to a bigger picture or link to a larger social movement, the project will likely fade away.  The on-going interplay between action and reflection regarding the nature and practice of community television can be traced within the discourse of the U.S.-based community television practitioner organization, the Alliance for Community Media (ACM).

## The NFLCP/ACM

Formed in 1976 as the National Federation of Local Cable Programmers (NFLCP) and renamed in 1992, the Alliance grew from an internship program with local cable systems as developed by George Stoney and Red Burns of New York University's Alternate Media Center, drawing from Stoney's work with the National Film Board of Canada's "Challenge for Change" program using film and video for social change (Bednarczyk 2001; Stoney 2001).[9]  The Alternate Media Center's program successfully placed interns with cable companies across the U.S., to utilize access channels and develop facilities that became neighborhood meeting centers, based around community media.  These interns, in the parlance of the development discourse, became "animateurs" -- "social animators" -- "change agents."  They fostered structures and practices based on group-held interpretations of representative democracy. Together with activists, artists, and visionaries around the world, they shared a vision of a more equitable society run less from the centralized positions of corporate and governmental power; and more from the grassroots -- where everyday people had more of an impact on their day to day lives and the direction of the human race.

By the mid 1970s, the Alternate Media Center's interns found themselves accompanied by a growing number of interested individuals and groups intent on using media as a tool with which to change society.  The NFLCP was formed by these social and media activists to share experiences, promote the use of community access channels and facilities, and lobby for community access to a variety of distribution channels and the democratization of media systems.  Publication of the *Community Television Review* (*CTR*, renamed the *Community Media Review, CMR*) soon followed, to share ideas and help strengthen the bonds of community within the group.  Over the years, the *CTR/CMR* and other publications concerned

---

[9] See also <u>Wide Angle</u> 21.2 (March 1999): "A Festschrift in Honor of George Stoney."

with grassroots democratic media have reflected the maturing of the NFLCP/ACM and the

community media movement's basic philosophies.[10]  In particular, the *CTR/CMR* indicate an

evolution from pure idealism and naiveté . . . to more robust ideologies, grounded in both theory

and practice.

Over the past two and a half decades, the contents of the *CTR/CMR* were concerned

primarily with the techniques of access operation: the "how-to's" of managing the facility,

training, negotiating franchise agreements, effectively utilizing volunteers, etc.  Organizing and

lobbying efforts on behalf of community media were discussed.  Often there were references to

a widely accepted access notion, such as  "an individual's right to say what she or he wants."

These notions -- the underlying belief system of access, drawing from traditional pluralist

assumptions about the nature of power, democracy, and freedom of speech -- were rarely

probed . . . until around the late 1980s.

<div align="center">The <em>CTR/CMR</em> and White Papers</div>

Around this time, the NFLCP/ACM went through a vigorous period of critique,

questioning basic access concepts.  The reevaluation was reflected through the pages of the

*CTR/CMR*, scholarly publications, and "White Papers" presented at access national

conferences.  Critically informed access philosophers such as Bob Devine, Fred Johnson,

Patricia Aufderheide, Andrew Blau, Dirk Konig, and DeeDee Halleck, among others, reflected

concerns with unproblematic assumptions of early access philosophies, and posed new

interpretations regarding the significance of access within a shrinking realm of public discourse

and reformulated notions of power, politics, and community.  The publications matched periods

of attention at national conferences on White Papers -- single presentations by long-timers in

the access movement addressing philosophical issues in community media with extended

---

[10]  These philosophies are detailed in Higgins (1999); this section includes material adapted from Higgins
(2001, 2003).

discussions.  The presentations led to on-going discussions regarding the nature of access and

the future direction of community media.

Over time, White Paper sessions at the national Alliance conferences faded in the mid

1990s.  The format was revived for the 2001 national conference, where 50 people

enthusiastically participated in the discussion following access newcomer Bill Kirkpatrick's

dynamic presentation, "`Re-thinking 'Access': Cultural Barriers to Public Access Television"

(Kirkpatrick 2002).  In his presentation, Kirkpatrick challenged George Stoney's criticism in the

*CMR* (Stoney 2001) of vanity-based programmers.  Kirkpatrick argued that the cultural aspects

of media forms and resistance should be recognized.  The overwhelmingly positive response by

participants to the session led to three sessions for White Paper sessions in 2002; these

attracted approximately 50 to 75 people to each session engaged in spirited discussions about

access philosophy and practices.  The sessions were coordinated with articles in the summer

2002 issue of *The CMR,* "Re-Thinking Access Philosophy."  Only one of the 2002 sessions

followed the traditional White Paper format of a single presenter. The 2003 Alliance conference

reflects a return to basics: a single White Paper session, with a single presenter and extended

time for discussion, is scheduled for the conference.[11]

Typically, White Paper presentations are chosen by competitive submission of essays;

authors are asked to address a philosophical or self reflexive aspect of access in a manner that

is accessible to a general audience of media practitioners and interested parties, including

academics.  Topics may pertain to any area of access, but are expected to address more

philosophical aspects of public, educational, or governmental access/community

media/alternative media, democratization of the media, self-reflexive analysis of basic access

---

[11] The ACM conference is scheduled for July 9-12, 2003 in Tacoma Washington.  See the Alliance
website: http://www.alliancecm.org.
    The White Paper Call for Papers and Essays, as well as papers from previous White Paper
sessions and articles from the "Rethinking Access Philosophy" issue of the  *CMR (*summer 2002) are
available on the White Paper website: http://www.mediaprof.org/acmwhitepaper.

tenets, access and activism, international community media, etc.  Specific foci of interest

change each year; in 2003 submissions are preferred that focus on global issues surrounding

community-based, alternative media (e.g., the World Summit on the Information Society and the

role of civil society in national and global movements toward the democratization of

communication), or compare the tenets and traditions of US community media with alternative

media in other parts of the world.  Papers and essays submitted for the White Paper sessions

are evaluated according to their importance to the practice and philosophy of community-based

media; contribution to the knowledge base of community media; interest to an audience of

access practitioners, academics, activists, and other involved groups; conceptualization; and the

clarity of presentation.  The session is expected to include a significant amount of interaction

with session participants.  Papers are often published in the *CMR*.

Some of the concepts and issues explored through White Papers and the pages of

*CTR/CMR* during various periods of reevaluation included fascinating discussions regarding:

- The shift in First Amendment interpretations away from the *individual* right of a speaker

  to the *collective* right that ideas be voiced and heard;

- Movement away from the notion of "one person, one vote," based on unfounded

  assumptions of equal power in the society;

- A shift away from the notion of "first come, first served," based on how this concept helps

  to maintain existing inequalities of power in society;

- The importance of access within the concept of the "public sphere" (the realm where

  people are able to discuss items of public importance);

- Access is best conceptualized as a *process* involving community dialog rather than as a

  *product* involving polished "TV" programs, mass audiences, or technological toys;

- The many meanings of "community" -- not all of them warm and fuzzy -- and how the

  definitions impact concepts of public access;

- Media education as a means of "reading" and interpreting the world within notions of power and social change;

- The impossibility of political "neutrality" on the part of community media and access facilitators ("political" in the framework of power rather than partisan politics);

- The manner in which training methods are political, in that they force people to view the world through a particular cultural/perceptual "lens";

- The political nature of seemingly apolitical cultural expression;

- Attempts by mainstream media to portray "camcorder commandos" as threats to individual privacy.

<u>The Oasis of White Paper Sessions</u>

What is so attractive about the White Paper sessions and the critical discussions of access philosophy to long-time participants?  Perhaps it's because after someone has been involved in community media facilitation (or any activity, including that of academia) for a while, it is easy to burn out on the day-to-day "doing."  Access facilitators are political agents of social change, helping social movements better utilize the tools of media.  This is harder to keep in mind when focused on the day-to-day activities that keep access operating.  The need for "how-to" information that can be applied to immediate problems within the access environment often dictates that thoughts about the bigger picture be closed off until a more convenient time.  White Papers offer that supportive space in which to revisit the "big picture" of access within the broader context of global social movements and activist ideology; the long history of alternative media shows that a grassroots medium can survive and flourish only if linked to and nourished by accompanying social movements . . . and a context that places community media as just the tool -- not the ends in itself.

For academics, too, White Papers provide an opportunity to connect with practitioners and test theory grounded in the day-to-day practice of community organizing through media

facilitation – a relaxed space outside the competitive framework of the conference typical of the academic industry.

White Papers offer an oasis of thought and reflection, an opportunity to slow down and engage in the "processing" of community media and our personal contribution: Who are we? Why do we do what we do?  How might we do it better?  What are the philosophies behind community media, and how are the day-to-day practices supporting these philosophies?  What assumptions underlying the philosophies have changed for each of us personally -- or for the movement?

From this interplay of action and introspection emerges a re-directed, re-vitalized access participant philosopher, as well as re-focused access philosophies and practices.  The process is effective for producers, staff, board members, administrators, academics, policy-makers, activists -- in short, for all the constituencies that make community television in the U.S. a vibrant, exhilarating practice.

Through this process we hope to cultivate more philosopher practitioners from the worlds of academics and practice, to nurture an intellectual culture of reflexivity.  The "how" is helpful in establishing an effective practice; the "why" is necessary in evaluating one's own practice, making appropriate corrections, and moving forward.  Praxis, the connection between practice and reflexivity that sees an on-going interplay between the two, is particularly significant for individuals and organizations engaged in the process of social change, whether they are operating from the spheres of academia or community media.

<u>Connecting Access with Critical Media Studies</u>

In "The Trouble with American Cultural Studies," Alan O'Connor describes critical cultural studies as an area wedded to progressive social change and radical action (1990).  He argues that North American cultural studies has been stripped of its political aspects, and has become yet another area of mere academic study that is shut off from the public world in an "ivory tower."  Contemporary cultural studies in the United States, O'Connor argues, "is being

sponsored by scholars who rarely have any connection to existing political and cultural movements and are somewhat surprised that might even be possible" (1990, 105).  To help redirect U.S. cultural studies, O'Connor's recommendations include focusing attention on the cultural/critical studies tradition of Latin America, and further research in alternatives to mainstream media.

O'Connor's directive to attend to the Latin American critical tradition stems from a recognition of the impact this rich body of work has had on North American critical studies.  His focus on alternative, community-based, participatory media -- a practice long established in both Latin and North America -- identifies the unique opportunity this vibrant movement offers both critical scholars and practitioners: a blending of practice and action -- "praxis."[12]

In the thirteen years since O'Connor's analysis, cultural studies and communication and media studies have continued to neglect engagement with grassroots, alternative media and communication practices, based on critiques provided by Kellner (1995), Couldry (2002), and Rodriguez (2002).  Instead, scholars from critical cultural studies and media studies have become increasingly divorced from their roots -- the reality of the lived experiences of everyday people.

Here, then, is an invitation from practitioners and academics engaged in community television, to scholars from various disciplines and approaches: your skills and engagement are welcome – and very much in demand – by practitioners in the world of community media, as well as other grassroots organizations.  Here are just a few ways in which you might help the grassroots group of your choice:

---

[12] Further discussion of the impact of Latin American scholars on alternative media and communication are provided by Huesca and Dervin (1994) and Rodriguez (2001).

- Your research, to provide substance for internal analysis for revising philosophies and practices;

- Your research, to be used as evidence by practitioners to support negotiations with local, national, international regulatory and funding agencies;

- Your research, to provide evidence and support in policy discussions regarding the impact of grassroots communication on the lives of everyday people and democratic society;[13]

- Your inclusion of the grassroots group's viewpoints or grounded experiences in your research and analysis, giving voice to community media advocates and practitioners;

- Your writing and editorial abilities, applied to the editorial board of the publication of the organization;

- Your academic publications, translated into approachable language for the layperson;

- Your analytic abilities, focused on the issues confronting the governing board of directors of the group;

- Your access to students through course content, including guest speakers and field trips, can help bringing fresh perspectives and new ideas to the grassroots group of your choice . . . and a new understanding of the group's aspirations by the wider community.

The public access/community television movement in U.S. is birthing and nurturing a culture of reflexivity, a culture of praxis; an intellectual culture exploring the relationships between what we *do*, what we *know*, and what changes our *knowing* has upon further *doing.* Through White Paper sessions at national conferences of the Alliance for Community Media and the pages of the *Community Media Review,* practitioners, academics, and other parties

---

[13] For an example, the OURMedia website is developing a section "Stories," devoted to ethnographic research/oral histories that provide support for the impact of alternative media projects on people's lives. http://www.ourmedianet.org

engaged with community-based media are cultivating the practitioner philosopher in line with

dynamic interpretations of Freire's praxis.

"When we understand that communication is based on social relationships, we see that our work [in access] is not simply `providing a communication opportunity' in some neutral way.  As community media centers and media makers, our work is as much about furthering public discourse and social change as it is about making programs.  To ignore that fact will only recreate the same old social patterns in a new glitzy electronic space.  Taking a leadership role in media education provides us with 'the real work' to do in our communities, and it can provide us with the conceptual tools and the self awareness needed to do the job."  (Fred Johnson 1994)

Bibliography

Aufderheide, Patricia.  2000.  "Access Cable TV as Electronic Public Space."  <u>The Daily Planet:</u>
       <u>A Critic on the Capitalist Beat.</u>  By Aufderheide.  Minneapolis: U Minnesota P.  121-138.

Bednarczyk, Susan.  1986.  "NFLCP: The Way it Was."  <u>Community Television Review</u>
       (Summer): 19-58.

Bednarczyk, Susan.  2001.  "How the Alliance Began Upstairs at 144 Bleecker St: Recalling the
       Summer of Tough Love."  <u>Community Media Review</u> 24.2 (Summer): 12-15.

Blau, Andrew.  1992.  "The Promise of Public Access."  <u>The Independent</u> 15.3 (April): 22-26.

Boyle, Deirdre.  1997.  <u>Subject to Change: Guerrilla Television Revisited</u>. New York: Oxford UP.

Brecht, Bertolt.  [1930]/1983.  "Radio as a Means of Communication: A Talk of the Function of
       Radio."  <u>Communication and Class Struggle 2: Liberation, Socialism</u>.  (Trans. Stuart
       Hood.) Eds. Mattelart, A., et al. New York: International General.  169-171.

Couldry, Nick.  2002.  "Mediation and Alternative Media, or Relocating the Centre of Media and
       Communication Studies."  <u>Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy</u>
       103 (May): 24-31.

Devine, Robert H.  1990.  "Marginal Notes: Consumer Video, the First Amendment and the
       Future of Access."  Paper presented at the 1990 National Conference of National
       Federation of Local Cable Programmers.  Washington, D.C.  July 26.

---. 1992.  "Video, Access and Agency."  Paper presented at the annual conference of the
       National Federation of Local Cable Programmers.  St. Paul, Minnesota.  July 17.  [an
       edited version of this paper appeared as  "The Future of a Public."  <u>Community</u>
       <u>Television Review</u> 15.6 (November/December): 8-9.  1992.]

Devine, Bob.  2001.  "33 Years Later: Why Access?"  <u>Community Media Review</u> 24.2: 37-39.

Downing, John, with Tamara Villareal Ford, Genève Gil, and Laura Stein.  2001.  <u>Radical Media:</u>
       <u>Rebellious Communication and Social Movements.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001.

Engelman, Ralph.  1990.  "The Origins of Public Access Cable Television: 1966-1972."
       <u>Journalism Monographs</u> 123 (October): 1-47.

Freire, Paulo.  1970.  <u>Pedagogy of the Oppressed</u>.  Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos.  New York:
       Continuum, 1989.

Halleck, DeeDee.  2002.  <u>Hand-held Visions: The Impossible Possibilities of Community Media</u>.
       New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.

Higgins, John W.  1997.  "Paulo Freire and Social Transformation."  <u>Peace Review</u> 9.4: 571-
       577.

---.  1999.  "Community Television and the Vision of Media Literacy, Social Action, and Empowerment."  <u>Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media</u> 43.4: 624-644.

---.  2001.  "The Praxis of Access: Access and Global Activism."  <u>Community Media Review</u> 24.2 (Summer): 19-21.

---.  2003.  "Living Tolerance: U.S. Public Access Producers and the Practices of "Free Speech."  <u>Community Media: International Perspectives.</u>  Ed. Linda Fuller.  In press.

Huesca, Robert, and Brenda Dervin.  1994.  "Theory and Practice in Latin American Alternative Communication Research."  <u>Journal of Communication</u> 44.4: 55-73.

Johnson, Fred.  1994.  "The Real Work is Media Education."  <u>Community Media Review</u> 17.1 (January/February): 4+.

Johnson, Fred.  1999.  [no title].  <u>Wide Angle</u> 21.2 (March): 152-153

Kellner, Douglas.  1995.  <u>Media Culture: Cultural Studies, Identity, and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern</u>.  London: Routledge.

King, Donna L., and Christopher Mele.  1999.  "Making Public Access Television: Community Participation, Media Literacy and the Public Sphere."  <u>Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media</u> 43.4: 603-623.

Kirkpatrick, Bill.  2002.  "Re-thinking `Access': Cultural Barriers to Public Access Television."  <u>Community Media Review</u> 25.3 (Summer): 20-23.

Linder, Laura R.  1999.  <u>Public Access Television: America's Electronic Soapbox</u>.  Westport, Conn: Praeger.

O'Connor, Alan.  1990.  "The Problem with American Cultural Studies."  <u>Critical Studies in Mass Communication</u> 6.4: 405-409.

Reidel, Bunnie.  2003.  Panel presentation, OURMedia conference.  Barranquilla, Colombia.  19 May.

Rodriguez, Clemencia.  2001.  <u>Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study of Citizens' Media</u>.  Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Shamberg, Michael, and Raindance Corporation.  1971.  <u>Guerrilla Television</u>.  New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stoney, George.  2001.  "The Essential George Stoney."  <u>Community Media Review</u> 24:2 (Summer): 29-31.

Youngblood, Gene.  1970.  <u>Expanded Cinema</u>.  New York: Dutton.

Resources -- Web

**Alliance for Community Media**.  Organization promoting the development and use of community channels in the U.S., particularly public access cable television channels.
www.alliancecm.org

**AMARC**.  French acronym for the World Association of Community-Oriented Radio Broadcasters.
www.web.apc.org/amarc/

**Deep Dish TV**.  The first grassroots satellite network in the U.S.
www.deepdish.igc.org

**Independent Media Center**.  Media activist groups first organized to "broadcast" news and grassroots reports from the WTO meeting in Seattle, November 1999.  The organization has spread around the globe.  Local Indy Media sites are listed on the left hand side of the page.
www.indymedia.org

**Media Alliance**.  Training and advocacy for media activism.
www.media-alliance.org

**National Federation of Community Broadcasters**.  US alliance of stations, producers, and others committed to community-based radio.
www.nfcb.org

**OURMedia.**  An emerging global network with the goal of facilitating a long-term dialogue between academics, activists, practitioners and policy experts around citizens' media initiatives.
www.ourmedianet.org

**Paper Tiger TV**.  "Smashing the Myths of the Information Industry" with alternative video programming.
www.papertiger.org