

Reviews

Democratic Communications: Formations, Projects and Possibilities. By James F. Hamilton. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008, 335p. (cloth, \$80.00) ISBN-10: 0739118668; ISBN-13: 9780739118665

Understanding Alternative Media. By Olga Guedes Bailey, Bart Cammaerts and Nico Carpenter. Maidenhead UK and New York: Open University Press and McGraw Hill, 2008, 196 p. (paperback, \$54.95) ISBN-10: 033522210; ISBN-13: 9780335222101

The Alternative Media Handbook. By Kate Coyer, Tony Downumt and Alan Fountain. London and New York: Routledge, 2007, 352 p. (paperback, \$34.15) ISBN-10: 0-41535965-1; ISBN- 13: 978-0-415-35965-8

During the past decade or so the category of “Independent/Alternative Media” has slowly become accepted as (1) existing at all and (2) a legitimate object of study – a functioning media subsector – in the field of Communication research.

On the one hand a string of books and articles have accomplished three benchmarks. First, they constructed a series of theoretical frames that valorize independent alternative media. Second they provided a tableau of case studies showing varied and continuous operation of these media refuting a previous era’s conclusion that they were always and only linked to and dependent upon transient social movements. And last, they offered a range of accounts uniting previously perceived disparate initiatives into an inter-related category confirming Raymond William’s early estimation that resistance formations would always appropriate media forms and technologies for alternative information and culture production (Atton, 2004, 2003a, 2003b, 2002a, 2002b, 1999; Coudry and Curran, 2003; Downing et. al., 2003a, 2003b, 2001,1995,1984; Duncombe, 1997; Hackett and Carroll, 2006; Halleck, 2002; Hamilton and Atton 2001; Hamilton, 2000; Kidd, 2003a, 2003b; Murphy, 2005, 2004,1994; Rodriguez, 2001; Streitmatter, 2001).

On the other hand new developments in quantifying the impact of Independent/Alternative media on society as a whole have over turned the chronically inappropriate market based data collection models to show that, while small in size, the ‘sector’ has an influence far larger (Clarke and Van Slyke, 2006).

On the whole these dual developments have tended to influence theoretical debates inside post-graduate academia or served to bolster claims for foundation support to working media organizations. But have these important findings filtered to the place where the vast majority of people study Communication?

Most people who connect with the study of Communication do so as undergraduates. For most undergraduates the “frame” for understanding what makes up

the field of Mass Communications is delivered in the classic introductory course variously titled, “Introduction to Mass Communication; Introduction to Mass Media.” That introductory course and its text book define for students the map of media activities in politics, economics and society.

The generic ‘Introduction to Mass Media’ course has become so ubiquitous that a virtual textbook ‘sub-sector’ has evolved. Two typical books in this genre are ‘Introduction to Mass Communication, Fifth Edition (Baran, 2008) and ‘Media and Culture: An Introduction to Mass Communication (Campbell, Martin and Fabos, 2009/10). These books, supported by their various CD/DVD/Web page appendages, have become the de-facto ‘Canon’ of the range of media and communication activities in society.

Independent/alternative may have become an established category of analysis in the sphere of research and practice, but has it seeped into the mainstream canon of mass communication studies?

The Baran textbook is 516 pages and includes chapters highlighting perspectives ranging from “Communication and Culture” (reflecting the mainstream nod to Critical Cultural Studies) through media industry surveys, theories, regulations, and global media. ‘Alternative’ media are mentioned in five instances throughout the whole book – dispersed and unconnected with no sense of size, category of actions and impact: blogs (not necessarily ‘alternative’); the early Native American press; a paragraph summarizing all the American alternative news weeklies from the 1960s to 2003; a paragraph on ‘commuter’ newspapers; a passing un-contextualized mention of the American Internet critical news distributor *Alternet* without highlighting its influential founder Don Hazen (Hazen and Winokur, 1997). There are no content listings under ‘Independent Media.’”

The Campbell et. al. textbook is 513 pages and includes the now accepted ‘nod’ to critical perspectives, a standard set of media industry surveys, and a discussion of “media and democracy.” Again, ‘alternative’ is mentioned in four cases, dispersed, unconnected and without any discussion of social/political impact – even in the section on media and democracy: three paragraphs on alternative political magazines from left to right between the 1960s and 2008; two pages on non-commercial and ‘alternative rock’ radio (not necessarily alternative as defined by the scholars mentioned above); a brief survey of the history of minority community newspapers; a one page profile of I.F. Stone. The word ‘Independent’ is used only in relation to feature films and a TV channel.

Is there a disconnect here? There is a two decade spread of substantial research establishing existence of a significant Independent/Alternative media sector that is diverse, has multiple connections to constituencies and can be shown to have a significant impact upon politics and society. But there is also a Mass Communication studies canon that hardly recognizes the whole sector, mentions bits and pieces of the sector in minute individual profiles and ignores the evidence of media activism, investigation and social/political impact.

If one is to take the generic text books at face value the average Communication/Media undergraduate will come away from a standard introductory survey course with absolutely no idea that Independent/Alternative media exist. Far from knowing the rich histories, case studies, activist profiles and ground breaking theo-

retical frames offered by the recent scholarship, undergraduates will be led to believe that the very mainstream media which the nod to ‘critical’ communication studies problematizes are the de facto permanent reality. TINA: There Is No Alternative.

If we, within the scholarship of Independent/Alternative media, are convinced to accept that the body of research during the past two decades establishes our object of study within the Communication Studies canon, is it not time to begin judging new contributions from the perspective of how they contribute to the ‘popularization’ of the sector in the undergraduate canon? In that spirit this essay focuses on three recent and substantial contributions to the field of Independent/Alternative media studies looking for a way that the material might be used to open a space in the undergraduate canon.

In *Democratic Communications: Formations, Projects, Possibilities* (Hamilton, 2008), author James F. Hamilton draws on many years of research and experience to produce a book that is both thoughtful and challenging within the scholarship of Independent/Alternative media. The work appears to be a major watershed in a long discourse on the field (Hamilton 2000; 2001). The book starts with a useful preface about definitions: What is ‘alternative’ anyway? This is a perennial debate in the field of Independent/Alternative media scholarship. Hamilton warns that a current trend to a structuralist focus upon “alternatives” which prioritizes social networking and textual analysis can miss out on historicizing the conditions that have made the current media initiatives possible. He fruitfully broadens definitions of the field beyond the specifics of texts, structures and technologies to forms and modes of democratic communication striving towards ‘cultures of truth.’

To that end Hamilton provides a section on the histories of “alternative” media that reaches back into early modern England. Borrowing a leaf from the neo-Gramscian school, and drawing heavily on the work of Raymond Williams, Hamilton posits the emergence of “alternatives” as part of a complex competition by social forces seeking to maintain or contest hegemony through social, economic and political ‘markets.’ He maintains that the field and the competitors are a shifting tableau of social groupings where alliances may shatter and re-attach in different directions depending on the flow of power in the ‘markets.’

Establishing the “market centric” frame Hamilton surveys recent and current communication initiatives driven by philanthropic, community and intellectual/cultural dissent from capitalism and its negative effects. In the conclusion of the book Hamilton weighs the possibilities for emerging democratic communications. He focuses on the current spike in speculation about consumer generated content: The ‘Prosumer.’ And he finishes with a discussion of the integrated ‘movement’ towards the democratization of mainstream communication and the surge within media education towards critical teaching: media literacy.

This book is a substantial contribution to the scholarship of Independent/Alternative media. It is clearly aimed at researchers in the field and post graduates studying the field. It adds new complexity to the debates on field definitions and brings an important and refreshing note of historicism to current trends in research.

In *Understanding Alternative Media* Guedes et. al. are trying the bridge the gap between the academic scholarship of the field and the undergraduate canon. Writ-

ing for the Open University Press in the United Kingdom, they have opted for an outline that provides a theoretical introduction followed by a range of case studies. They propose four categories in which to place 'alternative' media. The first is media servicing a community, which can be space or place based. The second is media which are predicated upon offering a different set of data and narratives to the perceived dominant or mainstream media. The third are media which see themselves facilitating the operation of civil society. Drawing on Downing (who drew on Deleuze and Guattari) the fourth is seen as "rhizomic," and serving two purposes: "to express opposition vertically and to build networking laterally" (page 25).

The authors begin their case studies by describing a Brazilian film which told the story of a community radio station started in a poor community in 1980. According to the authors, though the film is romantic and stereotypical, in its depiction of the history of the station each of the four categories of Alternative Media are demonstrated. There follow eight more case studies, two each illustrating the four categorizations.

Two case studies focus on community media. The first surveys community access radio in a range of nations and concludes that, although policies at the UN level and in nations with strong public broadcasting traditions advocate community involvement, on the whole community run radio is not facilitated by state or civil structures. The second case addresses 'diasporic' media, which in itself provides challenges for the concept of 'Alternative' media. The chapter is a literature review of studies on how diasporic media are perceived and used. The conclusion is that diasporic media are used to negotiate past, present and future identities across spaces.

Looking at alternative media as countering a perceived mainstream two chapters focus on blogs and the second Iraq war, and the media of ethnic/religious minorities. The first, a brief content analysis, speculates that blogs can be a very accessible counter to hegemonic news narratives but also represent a shifting space between 'alternative' and 'mainstream' ideological formations. The second, a single case study of a minority newspaper, questions the common assumption that if a media organization is 'commercial' it is therefore not 'alternative.'

Illustrating the third category, media facilitating operation of civil society, one chapter profiles two Internet organizational mailing lists and forums while another reports on the Landless Rural Workers' Movement of Brazil and its media: a newspaper, a magazine, radio programs and a web site. The first, a content analysis, proposes that the Internet provides tools to bring people together in ways that facilitate better institutional self-organization but have a down side of anonymity. The second, a social movement profile, places the media of the organization in the context of the physical communication of direct action.

For 'Rhizomic' media the authors chose two case studies: a web page that facilitates the exchange of radio content; and culture jamming on the Internet where the individual and group actors play with, re-design and doctor cultural totems to provoke civil debate and action. The Rhizomic aspect of the radio content exchange is seen as the ability of local content producers to be catapulted onto a global networking stage. The same results are claimed for moving culture jamming to the Internet.

This book is a clear attempt to start popularizing years of Independent/Alternative media scholarship. It simplifies detailed and important theoretical discussions developed and maintained by Hamilton, Downing, Atton and many others. It attempts to make the definitions concrete with case studies which are short, direct, and tightly linked to the definitional categories. It has a chapter by chapter list of further readings directing a student and instructor to deeper analyses of the field.

With *The Alternative Media Handbook* Coyer et. al. have organized a comprehensive survey backed by overviews of theory and history, concluding in a set of recipes for people ‘doing it themselves.’ As in each of these books, the authors start first with definitions. Like Hamilton, they begin with Raymond Williams’ foundational assertions about the possibilities of new media technologies being ‘appropriated’ to make content quite different from that offered by a hegemonic social network. Then they turn to Atton’s categorizations for an Alternative media sector, to Rodriguez’s and her notion of citizens not only voting but taking communicative action, and finally again to the Rhizomic concept.

There are four chapters that provide a range of historical case studies: radio; alternative film and video; alternative press; The Web. Each draws on initiatives from various parts of the world. The case study aspect of this book offers surveys of Independent/Alternative practice circa 2001-05. The chapter on ‘Radical Journalism,’ has a useful introduction by Chris Atton and provides case studies mostly focused on Indymedia—the Indymedia Centers, IMCs. The chapter on ‘Experimental Forms,’ focuses on re-visioning television content. There is a chapter which surveys ‘citizen’ access to public media. Another chapter addresses the constant issue of how to get radical content: by negotiating through mainstream media or creating parallel media? Similarly to the book by Guedes et. al. there is a section of culture jamming.

Five more survey chapters deal with the impact of ‘new’ technologies, the organizational issues of media development, relations between community producers and audiences, student media, and media activism. Although each has its merits and is a contribution to scholarship in the field, the part of the book which sets this collection apart from others is its third and concluding section ‘Doing it yourself.’

The section opens with some guiding suggestions about starting or joining an alternative media initiative. Then it takes readers through a range of production possibilities, and how to do them in radio, video/TV production, websites, blogging, print publishing, zines, and culture jamming while giving tips on fund raising.

Looking at these three books together there is no denying that the sub-field of Independent/Alternative media studies has come of age in academic research. These contributions show in their own way that there is a shared theoretical framework - even an increasingly agreed definitional categorization of what ‘alternative media’ are. As in many collections published in the past 20 years, each contribution here provides case study material further establishing the ‘permanent’ nature of ‘resistive’ communication and cultures. In effect, they hammer home the arrival of Independent/Alternative media as a lasting and legitimate object of serious research.

But what about the undergraduates? Amongst them, these three books provide more than 800 pages devoted to the survey/explanation of a significant area of me-

dia practice, shown to be growing in social, cultural and political force just about everywhere in the world. Compare this to the brief content analysis offered above on the Independent/Alternative media sector inside the two sample text books. Unfortunately, the disconnect appears to continue.

Knowing the 'undergraduate Canon' but also the large field of Independent/Alternative media, and facing the need to teach that "intro Mass Comm." course, the best place to start from this new selection of books would be the 'DIY' section of Coyer et. al. The authors say in their introduction that they want to stimulate a conversation between theory and practice. They have made the effort to go beyond the theory/case study format and place the opportunity for students to experience "the alternative" in their hands, ready to use.

This not to say the other two books are of any less merit. Hamilton's work is a serious contribution to the scholarship of the field, offering new analogies and surveys. Guedes et. al. have provided case studies that are very closely linked to the theoretical frames in the field.

But, even with the extended practical introduction offered by Coyer et.al. we are definitely not there yet. On the one hand, the textbook industry and the 'Intro Mass. Comm.' students it serves and/or exploits is a reality facing just about every Media and Communication department in North America. On the other hand there is a plethora of well intentioned scholarly publications of great merit mapping the Independent/Alternative media sector. The trick now will be to find a publishing format in which all of the scholarship is distilled to fit say, the equivalent of a chapter or two in those undergraduate textbooks. Now that the Independent/Alternative media 'field' of study is so surely and firmly established, reaching out to undergraduate courses with simple short primers is the next challenge.

References

- Aatton, Chris. 1999. A reassessment of the Alternative Press. *Media, Culture and Society*. 21(1): 51-76
- _____. 2002a. *Alternative Media*. London: Sage Publications.
- _____. 2002b. News Cultures and New Social Movements: Radical Journalism and the Mainstream Media. *Journalism Studies*. 3(4): 491-505.
- _____. 2003a. Reshaping Social Movement Media for a New Millennium" in *Social Movement Studies* 2(1): 3-15.
- _____. 2003b. What is 'alternative' journalism? *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*. 4(3): 267-273.
- _____. 2004. *An Alternative Internet: Radical Media, Politics and Creativity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Baran, Stanley J. 2007. *Introduction to Mass Communication, Media Literature and Culture, fifth edition*. New York: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Campbell, Richard, Martin, Christopher R., & Fabos, Bettina (2010). *Media & Culture: An Introduction to Mass Communication, seventh edition*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Clark, Jessica and Tracy Van Slyke (2006) "Welcome to the Media Revolution," *In*

- These Times*. July 30 (7).
- Couldry, Nick & Curran, James. 2003. *Contesting media Power: Alternative media in a Networked World*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield
- Downing, John D.H. 1984. *Radical Media: The Political Organization of Alternative Communication*. Boston: South End Press.
- _____. 1995. Alternative Media and the Boston tea Party. In *Questioning the Media*, eds. John D.H. Downing, Ali-Mohammadi and Annabelle Sreberny-Mohammadi, 238-52. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- _____. 2001. With Ford, Tamara Villreal, Gil, Geneve and Stein, Laura. *Radical Media: Rebellious Communication and Social Movements*. London: Sage.
- _____. 2003a. The Independent Media center Movement and the Anarchist Socialist Tradition. In *Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in a networked World*, ed. Nick Couldry. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- _____. 2003b. Radical Media and Globalization. In *The Globalization of Corporate Media Hegemony*, eds. L. Artz and Y.R. Kamalipour. New York: SUNY Press.
- Duncombe, John. 2003. *Notes from the Underground: Zines and the Politics of Alternative Culture*. London: Verso.
- Hackett, Robert and Carroll, William. 2006. *Remaking Media: The Struggle to Democratize Public Communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Halleck, DeeDee. 2002. *Hand Held Visions: The Impossible Possibilities of Community Media*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Hamilton, James. 2000. Alternative media: Conceptual Difficulties, Critical Possibilities. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 24(4): 357-378.
- _____. and Atton, Chris. 2001. Theorizing Anglo-American Alternative media: Toward a Contextual History and Analysis of US and UK Scholarship. *Media History* 7(2): 119-135.
- Kidd, Dorothy. 2003a. Indymedia.org: A New Communication Commons. In *Cyberactivism: Online Activism in Theory and Practice*, eds. Martha McCaughey and Michael Ayers. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2003b. Become the Media: The Global IMC Network. In *Representing Resistance: Media, Civil Disobedience and the Global Justice Movement*, eds. Andrew Opel and Donnalyn Pompper. Westport CN: Greenwood Publishing.
- Murphy, Brian Martin. 2005. Interdoc: The First International Non-Governmental Computer Network. *First Monday: Refereed Journal of the Internet* 10(5) <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1239/1159>
- _____. 2004. Propagating Alternative Journalism through Social Justice Cyberspace: The Appropriation of Computer Networks for Alternative Media Development in the 1990s. In *Appropriating Technology: Vernacular Science and Social Power*, eds. Ron Eglash, Jennifer L. Croissant, Giovanna Di Chiro and Rayvon Fouche. Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- _____. 1994. Addressing Crises Through New Channels in the Post-NWICO Era: Alternative News Agencies and the Computer Networks of Non-Governmental Organizations. *The Journal of International Communication* 1(1): 88-111.
- Rodriguez, Clemencia. 2001. *Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study*

- of Citizen's Media*. Cresskill NJ: Hampton Press.
- Streitmatter, Rodger. 2001. *Voices of the Revolution: the dissident press in America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. 1974. *Television; Technology and Cultural Form*. London: Fontana.
- _____. 1973. Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory. *New Left Review* 82: 5-16

Brian Murphy
Department of Communication Studies
Niagara University

Democratic Communications: Formations, Projects and Possibilities. By James F. Hamilton. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008, 335p. (cloth, \$80.00) ISBN-10: 0739118668; ISBN-13: 9780739118665

The intersection of readily available high quality digital video cameras and non-linear video editing software with Internet websites such as YouTube/Google Video and countless blogs has created unprecedented opportunities for individuals to create and share media products. Some people might think this explosion of media making potential is the gateway to democratized media and a major new tool in the arsenal of media reform. James Hamilton is not so sure. In his new book, *Democratic Communications: Formations, Projects and Possibilities* (2008), James Hamilton cautions us about accepting a “vanguard perspective” that “fetishizes media products” while “decontextualizing the processes of their making” (p. 13). Hamilton is responding to what he sees as “essentialism” and “technological determinism” in much of the emerging scholarship on alternative media. Instead, Hamilton has produced a “cultural and historical investigation of the formative conditions of practice relied upon by the dominant and the oppositional” (p.15). Drawing on extensive and interdisciplinary references and tracing a sweeping historical arc, Hamilton has written the most comprehensive theoretical analysis of the intellectual foundations of democratic communications.

Dividing the book into three parts – *Market Formations*, *Struggling Against the Market* and *Toward New Formations*, Hamilton begins by reaching back to early modern England and the precursors to capitalism. A recurring theme is the notion of truth and how credibility and authenticity are established through media. Hamilton begins by tracing the complexities of “providentialism” as a source of religious authority and social control. By going back to the 15th century, Hamilton reveals the long legacy of complex social formations that have been used “to challenge the dominant as well as the oppositional” (p.36). By the 1600s, “rationalist empiricism” emerged along with new concentrations of economic and political power,

offering people new forms of knowledge about the natural world, at the same time that data “unsullied by human intention” became the celebrated form of truth. These two cultures of truth are argued to be central forces in shaping modernity and the rise of capitalism and serve as historical markers pointing to the enduring influence of religion and markets that both enable and constrain possibilities for change.

In the second section, *Struggling Against the Market*, Hamilton details the power of markets to rationalize opposition. Bringing us in to the 20th Century, Hamilton unpacks the tensions embodied by a series of social reform media projects, revealing the adoption of “forms of professionalism which work against democratic practices” (p.97). The process of professionalization - “defined as the social production of expertise and the resulting social and cultural division between experts and lay people” (p.97) - is noted for its influence on news, objectivity and the construction of truth through an increasingly corporate media system. Hamilton argues that the social reform media with the most thoroughly professionalized workforce (i.e. WGBH Boston) are consistently the most financially stable and the largest recipients of private grant money with the result being “an instrumentalist view of the purposes of a social movement and the devaluation of (unmanaged) popular participation” (p.112).

Hamilton then works to problematize popular conceptions of localism and many of the formative assumptions behind community media projects. FCC policy and the struggle over low power FM become sites where localism is said to reduce community to isolated, geographically bounded entities, unconnected from larger social processes that “bring about the needs and problems in the first place” (p.141). In as much as localism is central to the dominant liberal critique of consolidated media, Hamilton reminds just how conceptually limited this idea is and how continued emphasis on geographically bounded communities serves to fragment a diverse interconnected network. A second major concern for Hamilton is the rise of “critical modernism” and the resulting ubiquity of spectacular market capitalism. Although he acknowledges the potential for protest movements to mimic corporate media and draw on the immediacy of spectacular imagery to attract audiences, he also notes “a corresponding skepticism toward the mimetic claims of representation” as a common response to the daily barrage of advertising, propaganda and image saturated hyper reality.

In the final two chapters of the book, Hamilton uses case studies to provide greater detail about an emerging “market radicalism” that is challenging “productive relationships that have constituted communications industries in the West for 150 years” and at the same time “serves as the primary means by which progressive projects are reincorporated into the dominant” (p.201). From citizen journalism to user-generated content, new forms of media participation are emerging and Hamilton examines these practices in the context of market forces that in many ways create these new possibilities and at the same time work to contain them. Hamilton takes up a familiar political economic position when he emphasizes the potential negative market forces embodied in the advertising driven, for-profit efforts such as Current.com. By highlighting the negative influence of market forces, Hamilton disabuses any utopian dreams of an alternative media revolution and instead details the complexities and contradictions embodied in numerous

for-profit businesses that rely on the free labor of individuals contributing user-generated content.

Having spent the better part of the book detailing the history of English speaking democratic communications, Hamilton makes the unlikely choice of going all the way to Korea to document *OhmyNews*, as a model of citizen journalism and commercial media business. While this is a highly popular and influential organization among the Korean media, the historical and cultural formations outlined in the previous chapters do not appear to easily graft on to the Korean case. Hamilton then briefly compares the Korean example with a few sites in the US, noting an expanding focus on a business model that emphasizes harnessing the power of user-generated content as a new form of commercial media. This model is seen as capital's attempt to contain market radicalism and rationalize the potential influence of increasingly democratized media production. After detailing all the ways that markets are working to contain the possibilities of these new media projects, Hamilton offers some limited hope when he describes "such projects and the provisional openings they assert maintain the possibility of a continued democratic extension and remaking of media practice" (p.221).

In his final chapter, Hamilton makes linkages with media literacy and the need for critical education. Hamilton takes us back to U.S. migrant labor camp newspapers from the 1930s Dust Bowl years to explore Raymond Williams' conception of direct autonomous communication. As a way out of the dead end academic debate about whether or not these newspapers lived up to the theoretical ideal posited by Williams, Hamilton seeks to "historicize direct autonomous communication rather than essentialize it" (p.245). This new level of analysis allows us to see these newspapers as embodying detailed evidence of a struggle, "not simply as the transparent expression of a unified culture outside history" (p.246). Cultural forms of association rooted in social and historical processes, coupled with the availability of technology are said to create the possibilities of participatory democratic media. Hamilton concludes this chapter with a critique of the dominant trends in media literacy, noting a predominant emphasis on an "inoculation paradigm" where students are taught how to interpret and resist the onslaught of advertising as opposed to how to teaching students how to use media as a means of expression and collaboration. Instead of teaching students to create media that would result in larger systemic reform, much of the current media literacy discourse is said to teach students to "decode" media, yet another example of a piece meal response to the dominant presence of corporate media.

Throughout this text, Hamilton provides careful analysis that builds a dense theoretical argument, sometimes at the expense of detailing the culturally specific, historically rooted, technologically enhanced democratic media projects he ultimately seeks to advance. Though he makes it clear he is not attempting to ask reality to fit the theoretical formulations of Williams or others, Hamilton spends a great deal of time negotiating the limitations of democratic communications projects and explaining how they do not fully realize any number of theoretical ideals. In an explicit attempt to resist technological determinism, Hamilton avoids the significant technological changes that are accelerating a whole host of cultural and material practices that are operating within the limitations and confines of a for-profit media

system. This slow (and maybe reformist?) pace of change is largely avoided, often replaced by what can feel like a grand vision of social change. Hamilton is not interested in the technologies or “organizational and capital necessities” and instead wants to focus on “the more crucial task of producing new, open forms of collaboration and collective composition through which new kinds of social movements and new kinds of institutions and politics can arise” (p.234). The tensions between reformism and radical restructuring echo across many academic debates and Hamilton is clearly committed to keeping his eye on the big prize. Instead of scanning the horizon for “new kinds of social movements,” Hamilton might consider the social movements that are currently experimenting with new democratic media possibilities, albeit within the confines, cracks and complexities of a market system. Similarly for Hamilton, the somewhat reactionary trope of market determinism – a more nuanced base superstructure argument - seems to taint all media where people get paid as somehow compromised. While Hamilton goes to great lengths to unpack the cultural formations that shape alternative media projects, there is recurring attention to the barriers, limits, and compromises found in the case studies. Despite these obstacles, Hamilton closes with a call for democratic media to transcend the confines of media effects, persuasion and movement messaging and instead seek to harness the power of inspiration as a way toward a more utopian democratic communication.

*Andy Opel
School of Communication
Florida State University*