INTRODUCTION

Media, Democracy, Human Rights, and Social Justice

Sue Curry Jansen

Media activism and critical media studies have always addressed social justice issues. Activists work to redress perceived inequities in media access, policies, and representations, while critical media scholars combine teaching, research, and publication with advocacy for democratic media, institutions, and representational practices.

Because most channels for public communication in democratic societies are now dominated by messages produced by commercial media, advertising, and public relations, media activism and critical media studies seek to expand the range and diversity of information, interpretive strategies, and resources available to the public. For example, critical media studies challenge government and market censorship of media and culture; oppose concentrated ownership of media; challenge representational practices that stereotype, marginalize, or "symbolically annihilate" minority views, cultures, groups, or individuals;[1] proactively promote broad access to media resources and media-making skills; encourage development and wide distribution of alternative media; document, publicize, and urge action to counter domestic and global digital divides; use media technologies to expose abuses of power; and develop and promote policy positions to advance social justice.

Critical media researchers pioneered efforts to document and challenge the roles media play in facilitating and rationalizing global inequalities in the distribution of power relations and resources. Many critical media scholars were, for example, advocates of the New World Information Order: the movement, sponsored by the nonaligned nations in the United Nations in the 1970s and early 1980s that promoted a more equitable distribution of global information resources.[2] Some media scholars advocate for recognition of "the right to communicate" as a fundamental human right.[3] Critical media scholarship and

activism also operate at local levels in community media projects; these may, for example, involve instruction in media literacy and production with the objective of providing underresourced people with the communication skills and technologies that they need to tell their own stories and stake their own claims for social justice.

Yet critical media scholarship has remained marginal to the interdisciplinary academic field formally designated as social justice studies; social justice studies, in turn, frequently lack adequate theories of media and communication. Greater mutual exposure can enrich both approaches. For example, in his recent, magisterial statement of his comparative theory of justice, *The Idea of Justice*, economist Amartya Sen sees the removal of barriers to free and open discussion, the development of the right ("capability") to communicate, and the institutionalization of an "unrestrained and healthy media" (to give "voice to the neglected and disadvantaged") as essential prerequisites to the pursuit of human justice and security.[4] Despite this foundational claim, even Sen does not offer a theory of media and devotes only three pages directly to the topic. Clearly, both social justice scholarship and activism and critical media scholarship and activism can benefit from greater mutual exposure.

We do not pretend to offer a synthesis of the two areas of inquiry. Our objective is more modest: to offer a provocative collection of essays, which we believe can be useful in starting a long-overdue conversation between the two fields.

Social Justice Scholarship and Activism

Social justice scholarship is, by definition, interdisciplinary and practice oriented, combining academic research and pedagogies with efforts to improve the life chances of marginalized people, communities, and causes. Its intellectual powers are amplified by drawing on the combined knowledge resources of multiple disciplinary lenses; its effectiveness as practice is frequently enhanced by developing applied aspects of this knowledge in partnerships with diverse coalitions of concerned parties.

Whether motivated by intellectual conviction, civic responsibility, ethical imperatives, religious ardor, or loyalty to kin or kind, social justice scholarship shares a common value system rooted in empathy. This value orientation is expressed in the relationship the researcher establishes with the people or practices she studies. At the turn of the twentieth century, the German sociologist Max Weber described that relationship as *verstehen* or sympathetic understanding.[5] More recently and much more expansively, feminists have framed the relationship in moral terms as practicing an "ethics of care."[6] Martin Luther King Jr.'s concept of "the beloved community," which functioned both as a hopeful vision for the future and as a description of an interactional ideal among

civil rights activists, takes this ethic out of the academy (and gospel) and into the streets.[7]

Maintaining sympathetic understanding and putting an ethics of care into practice requires activists and scholars to engage in ongoing reflection about the challenges, responsibilities, relationships, and processes involved in representing the lives of others.[8] The scholar must surrender the hubris of the expert and, in so far as possible, become an empathetic partner in the work of the communities and projects she or he seeks to advance while, at the same time, remaining constantly alert to the fragile character of these partnerships. Partnerships formed with and on behalf of marginalized people, cultures, or causes produce moral, ethical, and methodological tensions that require social justice scholars to, in the words of social documentarian Robert Coles, continuously "interrogate" their own "locations": the dispositions, motivations, and expectations they bring to their inquiries and activism as well as the obligations they incur to the people they advocate for and study.[9] These partnerships also require recognition that some boundaries between people may be impermeable and that good intentions do not necessarily produce good outcomes. In short, social justice scholarship and activism can be a risky business. Moreover, its overt value commitments, in contrast to the less visible, naturalized value commitments of dominant research paradigms, makes social justice scholarship a ready target of opportunity for hostile critics of the approach.[10]

Social justice studies, as presently constituted, grew out of the social movements of the 1960s. In the United States, they were extensions of social activism, especially the civil rights movement, the war on poverty, the peace movement, the women's movement(s), as well as broader movements against cultural imperialism and for human rights and global justice. Initial academic arguments for social justice studies were grounded in negation: critiques of claims to value neutrality by the social sciences and analytic philosophy that exposed the unrecognized race, gender, and class biases of established paradigms within academic disciplines and applied forms of expertise.

Social justice scholarship generally embraces the "new history," which recognizes that knowledge is socially constructed and value oriented. The new history seeks to expand the range of knowledge into areas previously neglected or underrepresented by traditional academic disciplines. That is, its mission has been to discover and recover repressed voices and ideas from the past, as well as to create and legitimate opportunities for the views of underresourced peoples and perspectives to be expressed, disseminated, and heard. Realizing this mission usually requires openness to alternative pedagogical approaches, which decenter authority, including feminist approaches and pedagogies that draw on or are inspired by Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.[11]

The appearance of John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* in 1971 and the many critiques and refinements it inspired served as a second impetus to the development of social justice studies. The most influential philosopher of the second half of the twentieth century, Rawls affirmed the centrality of justice studies to political philosophy, moral theory, law, and public policy. His philosophy of justice as "fairness" established that the capacity to develop a moral character is a sufficient condition to be entitled to equal justice, and, in turn, his theory provided criteria for assessing the failures of contemporary democratic institutions and nation states to achieve justice.[12]

Several international developments added further impetus to social justice scholarship and activism, including the dismantling of European colonial empires after World War II; the emergence of postcolonial art and literature and critical postcolonial studies; the failure of modernization theory, which dominated development policy in the postwar era; the proliferation of international nongovernmental organizations working for (and against) various causes, including social justice; and the emergence of a global feminist movement and its formal recognition, albeit often without requisite support, by international organizations like the United Nations and the European Union. The end of the Cold War and the subsequent global integration of the world economy, which some critics see as modernization theory reconstituted for a new century, also spawned counterglobalization activism, most notably the 1999 protest against the World Trade Organization in Seattle and Naomi Klein's *No Logo* manifesto.[13]

Less dramatically, but more consistently, social justice commitments and values have for decades guided the international work of various religious groups like the Maryknoll Lay Missionaries, who work to provide basic needs to the poor in Africa, Asia, and the Americas. These varied developments, movements, and forms of activism energized fresh forms of thinking about international social justice. Indigenous groups, movements, writers, scholars, and activists effectively rejected Eurocentric intellectual hegemony. Sen, for example, consistently draws on non-Western, especially Indian, perspectives in developing his theory of social justice; however, it must be emphasized that he does so without rejecting essential Western contributions to the development of freedom of expression. In doing so, Sen avoids the trap of identity politics and develops a cosmopolitan approach that is deeply committed to alleviating human suffering and ameliorating global injustices.

Because of the interdisciplinary character of social justice studies, its varied currents generally flow in similar directions rather than flowing together. With some exceptions, overlap is most directly apparent in footnotes, bibliographies, and anthologies. What the various currents have in common is a shared concern for identifying and ameliorating those social forces and structures that

systematically undermine the life chances and human dignity of some groups or individuals while creating unfair advantages for others.

Deeper Roots of Social Justice Advocacy

Yet the roots of intellectual advocacy for social justice as well as its links to higher education actually run much deeper in North America than this account of the emergence of social justice studies since the 1960s suggests. The Society of Friends (the Quakers) and the Mennonites protested against America's "original sin" of slavery as early as 1688; however, organized efforts to rally public opinion against slavery did not emerge until the 1830s. Using the "mass" media of the day, the abolition movement established a template for social movements in America; it also served as a springboard for the women's suffrage and temperance movements.

Although it is largely forgotten today, the religious "moral awakening" that provided much of the momentum for abolition also inspired educational fervor. This educational awakening led to the founding of colleges in the newly settled states in the Midwest prior to the Civil War to advance learning and spread the gospel, and in some cases the social gospel, to African Americans, women, American Indians, and the poor.[14] Many of these colleges later abandoned their fervor for social justice but residues of these early visions can sometimes still be found in their mission statements. In the late nineteenth century, the social gospel movement—the social reformist efforts of liberal Protestant sects that sought to improve life on earth as opposed to promising the disadvantaged that they would reap their rewards in heaven—expanded its agendas to redress broader social and economic injustices. The social gospel movement also played significant roles in the development of the social sciences in America, especially sociology and historical economics.[15]

Concepts of labor justice emerged in the 1840s in France and England, contesting "wage slavery." The injustices of unequal relations between owners of capital and workers, and the distribution of income and wealth within emerging capitalist institutions, were called into question by communists, socialists, and social democrats, as well as by many religious leaders who also questioned the increasing role that materialism, money, and market relations played in people's lives. The trade union movement was a response to these concerns: seeking to reverse growing concentrations of wealth and power whether by revolution or reform.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, muckraking journalism applied the journalistic imperative to "comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable"—sometimes with more ardor than accuracy. Muckrakers sensationalized the social ills that capitalism and modern urban life spawned by

exposing threats to public health resulting from unsanitary food processing, exploitation of child labor, dangerous working conditions, urban corruption, and the criminal practices of the "robber barons" of the Gilded Age.

Global struggles for social justice and human rights gained public visibility internationally in the years after World War II, in struggles against colonialism and neocolonialism. These struggles are ongoing, as many of the industrial ills that plagued the United States a century ago have been exported to the developing world, where wages are very low, and unions and government regulation of workplace safety nonexistent. Issues of environmental justice, including global warming, are also, by definition, international struggles.

In all of these movements, media and communication—books, newspapers, leaflets, speeches, sermons, manifestos, slogans, and, more recently, electronic media (Internet, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter)—have played crucial roles in organizing social justice movements and rallying mass support for social change. Media exposure is an essential constituent of all successful social movements; in the United States, for example, muckraking and the progressive reaction to it resulted in antitrust legislation, workplace regulations, food safety inspections, and social welfare programs. Media coverage can also, of course, undermine as well as advance social movements.

In reaction to the successes of campaigns for social reform, corporations organized trade organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers to lobby on behalf of their interests. The public relations industry was born to manage public perceptions of corporations and to frame public issues and legislative agendas in ways that advance corporate interests. By the late twentieth century, media institutions and practices had become so central to the operations of global capitalism that debates about media control, access, policy, law, and representational powers are now primary sites of struggles for social justice.

Media Justice: A Gateway Issue

In what has been called the "New Gilded Age," escalating inequalities in income and access to basic resources—adequate nutrition, shelter, health care, basic education, and a living wage—are now at levels that have not been seen in the United States since before the Great Depression.[16] For example, a recent study shows that the United States ranks forty-second globally, behind Cuba and Malaysia, in mortality rates for children under five; as recently as 1990, the United States had ranked twenty-ninth, which was still a very poor showing for the world's largest economy.[17] The life expectancy gap between rich and poor Americans expanded in recent decades.[18] The "life chances" of children born in the poorest countries of the world have also declined dramatically in the last 30

years.[19] Yet with a few significant exceptions, mainstream and corporate media ignore the new social inequality.[20]

Social justice scholars correctly argue that we need a theory (or theories) of social justice.[21] But unless social justice theorists incorporate adequate understanding of the role that media and communication play in struggles for social justice, their theories will neither possess sufficient explanatory power to advocate successfully for the causes they seek to advance nor be able to explain the potent but often hidden forms of resistance that undermine their efforts. As former US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) commissioner Nicholas Johnson points out, regardless of what your primary area of social advocacy may be, media reform has to be your secondary issue.[22] Without a free, open, diverse, and robust media, democratic social change is virtually impossible.

In his 2007 *Communication Revolution*, Robert W. McChesney strongly affirms Johnson's claim, but he also pushes the argument for critical media scholarship and activism a step further. Drawing on his experience with the media reform group Free Press, McChesney points out that media reform can be a "gateway issue": a first issue that can draw new people into public life, citizen activism, and wider struggles for social justice. Further, he contends—and we heartily agree—that the "fates of media reform and social justice research are intertwined. They will rise or fall together."[23]

Framing Media Activism

Recent efforts to make media reform a first issue and to mobilize media activism into a viable social movement have had limited success in the United States.[24] The use of the Internet as an organizing and mobilizing tool is transforming how social movements are constituted and defined. Online organizing by groups like Free Press in the United States has, for example, been successful in mobilizing the support of millions to petition Congress and the FCC in opposition to policies that would have allowed further concentrations of media ownership. Activism on behalf of net neutrality has attracted support on a similar scale.

In *Remaking Media* (2006), Robert Hackett and William Carroll identify a number of framing devices that have been used in attempts to capture the diverse energies, priorities, issues, and commitments of media activists, including (1) free press and freedom of expression, a frame that implicitly draws on the values of the First Amendment and emphasizes the values of mainstream political liberalism; (2) media democratization, a frame that highlights democracy's deficits and emphasizes participatory democracy, the role of informed citizens, and the responsibility of the press to serve the public interest; (3) the right to communication frame, which emphasizes the importance of communication in relation to other human rights and is most often invoked by activists

working in international contexts; (4) the cultural environmental frame, which borrows its trope from the environmental movement and targets toxic cultural fare by opposing the global homogenization of commercial media and market censorship and by advocating for fairness, gender equity, diversity, and democratic decision making in media ownership, employment, and representation; and, finally (5) media justice, which is relatively new and has special resonance in the United States and among minorities. According to Hackett and Carroll, "This frame re-positions the project as one of social justice in a world organized around global capitalism, racism and patriarchy, and directly connotes the need for alliances, even integration, with other social movements."[25] The justice frame is synthetic and inclusive, not only broadly encompassing the concerns of the other frames, but also very intentionally linking to and drawing on historical struggles for social justice and civil rights, including struggles for racial, class, gender, and sexual justice.[26]

In an comprehensive 2007 review of the literature on media activism, Philip Napoli points out that the multiplicity of frames reflect not only the broad range of issues that motivate participants as well as the movement's international reach but also the lack of consensus within the movement.[27] Frames matter. They create collective identities, mobilize, and focus the energies of participants in social movements. Criticism within various factions of the movement voiced dissatisfaction with early framing efforts, claiming they fostered parochialism and misunderstanding. For example, in developing countries, some international media activists view democracy as a loaded word: it can be "a Trojan Horse for capitalist imperialism," according to Aliza Dichter of the Center for International Media Action.[28] Moreover, Hackett points out that within media-policy discourse, market liberals interpret media "democratization" as deregulation and privatization of media.[29] Napoli contends that the media justice frame has developed in response to a general dissatisfaction with more established frames and that the term "justice" is deliberately chosen to link media advocacy to wider struggles for justice and social inclusion.[30]

Our emphasis on the qualifier *social* in social justice is intended to signal solidarity with primary struggles for the creation of *social institutions* that promote human equality, dignity, and fairness. That is, we see media transformation as a necessary, but far from sufficient, condition for creating a just society.

The Social Justice Frame

In embracing the social justice frame for media advocacy, we are not, collectively or individually, endorsing every cause that adopts or co-opts that banner, although we do endorse free and fair access to communicative opportunities for all, in the spirit, though not the letter, of Jürgen Habermas's valiant attempt to

articulate ideal standards for democratic communications.[31] We posit no exclusive claims in framing media advocacy within a social justice frame, nor do we recognize or seek to impose any tests of ideological purity on those who may share it. Too often media reform coalitions have been fractured by internal ideological divisions. While divergent views do need to receive fair hearings, coalitions are always fragile and, by definition, sites of limited agreements: strategic goals need to be kept in sight.

Academic study of social justice and media reform are relatively recent developments. In contrast, activists have a long history of involvement in struggles for media justice in the United States. The activism of the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ (UCC) in the 1960s is generally regarded as the benchmark for the beginning of the contemporary media reform movement.[32] Martin Luther King Jr., in a meeting with one of his Northern supporters, Everett Parker (founder of the UCC's Office of Communication), complained that television stations in the South were not covering the civil rights movement or news of the African American community more generally. In 1963, the UCC petitioned the FCC to revoke the license of WBLT in Jackson, Mississippi, for failing to serve the public interest of its audience, which was about 50 percent African American. The FCC denied the petition, claiming that only companies, not the public, could challenge a license. The UCC took the case to the US Court of Appeals, which found in its favor, establishing the precedent that allows members of the public, either groups or individuals, to petition and hold standing before the FCC and other regulatory agencies. This ruling was crucial to the future of critical media activism addressing broadcasting practices in the United States.

Robert Horwitz sees the UCC effort as a revival of the broadcast reform movement of the 1930s, in which media reformers argued that commercialization of broadcasting runs counter to the spirit and values of a democratic society, and advocated, unsuccessfully, for a nonprofit and noncommercial broadcasting infrastructure in the United States; McChesney has written the definitive history of that struggle.[33] Other scholars have located much earlier precedents for media justice activism. Dan Schiller identified efforts as early as 1894–1919 by trade unions, civic reformers, and academics directed at the development of telephone service infrastructure, calling for universal service and municipal ownership.[34] In my own work, I have uncovered resistance to the emergence of the public relations industry in the early twentieth century by such notables as John Dewey, Walter Lippmann, Upton Sinclair, and Senator Robert LaFollette Jr.[35] Organized labor's advocacy on behalf of "listeners' rights" in the post–World War II era has been chronicled by Elizabeth Fones-Wolf.[36] There are undoubtedly other initiatives that await historical recovery.

Like the UCC, other religious groups have had keen interest in media. Because many of these efforts have been paternalistic, overtly censorious, or both, historians of media reform have tended to ignore them. Secular connotations of media reform, advocacy, and justice in the United States have derived, implicitly or explicitly, from First Amendment precedents and are therefore rightly biased in favor of a free and open media. Yet, as the late George Gerbner, founder of the Cultural Environment Movement, often said, "media activism makes strange bedfellows."[37] In my view, the contributions—for better or worse—of religious groups to media advocacy warrants greater scrutiny by media historians.

One direct offshoot of the Catholic Church's twentieth-century encyclicals on social justice that requires our own acknowledgment here is the pioneering attempt of some members of the Communication Department at Loyola University in Chicago to establish a social justice emphasis or track in their curriculum: Lawrence Frey, W. Barnett Pearce, Mark Pollock, Lee Artz, and Bren Murphy have documented the challenges and pitfalls of such ventures.[38] Elsewhere, I have described in extensive detail my differences with the Loyola group's approach, which builds on speech communication rather than a sociological paradigm.[39] While our own approach emphasizes social-structural, institutional, and political economic analysis of communication, the Loyola group's original efforts and the subsequent support of social justice initiatives and publications by some of its members, especially Frey, warrant recognition for its courage and tenacity. In sum, the editors openly embrace the social justice frame for media activism, scholarship, and teaching precisely because it provides an umbrella broad enough to encompass the efforts of Parker and Frey, as well as Johnson, McChesney, Nichols, and a broadly heterodox mix of others. The merits of all such efforts must, of course, be subjected to rigorous and critical conceptual, methodological, and ethical scrutiny.

Media and Social Justice: A Rationale for Teaching and Scholarship

The mission statement of the Media and Communication Department at the editors' institution, Muhlenberg College, a small liberal arts college, embraces commitments to social justice based on the following rationale. It meets the criteria Sen establishes for social justice; that is, it is a position based on public reasoning that can be sustained reflectively when subjected to critical scrutiny by those who recognize First Amendment legal precedents and international human rights agreements.[40] We share our rationale as one among many possible rationales for this kind of work:

Social justice is a normative term.[41] Attempts to define it are almost invariably contentious: like democracy, it is an "essentially contested term."[42] That is, diverse groups may agree that social justice is desirable, but they frequently disagree about what it is and how to achieve it. The pragmatic solution to this impasse [for us] has been to define social justice plurally and contextually by taking into account the specific histories, legal traditions, social institutions, and cultural values in which claims to social justice are made.

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution privileges communication, freedom of speech and freedom of press, and it prohibits overt political censorship. Academic study of communication took root within this context. The first university departments dedicated to the study of communication were established in the United States. As a result, freedom of expression has been a normative value of communication scholarship since its inception.[43]

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ratified by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, lent moral force to claims for a global "right to communicate." Article 19 of the Declaration states, "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression: this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers." This expansion created the foundations for human rights scholarship, activism, policies, and the development of international laws. It also helped foster a renewal of interest of justice studies, and generated new inquiries into the nature of deliberative democracy and communicative ethics.

The study of media and communication within a liberal arts context requires recognition of these developments and engagement with the intellectual contributions and controversies they inspire. Because communication and information are fundamental sources of power, the right to communicate is increasingly recognized as the fundamental human right upon which other rights depend.[44] It includes rights to participate in public communication (the right to voice), rights to fair representation in and by media, and rights of access to media and media-making technologies.[45]

What this means from a practical curricular perspective is that the study of media and communication from a social justice perspective requires critical scrutiny of media and communication industries, institutions, policies, processes and representational practices. A social justice approach models ethical practices in media making by embracing pedagogies that respect both the human dignity and the communication rights of others. That is, it seeks to equip students with the conceptual tools necessary to monitor how effectively contemporary media industries and public communication practices are facilitating the right to communicate, and it encourages them to engage in communication practices and media making in ways that realize and expand this right.[46]

These values were modeled for us by the life of our late, revered colleague, James D. Schneider (1939–2005), to whom this book is dedicated.

Comforting the Afflicted and Afflicting the Comfortable

Contributors to this volume examine struggles for media justice from a critical perspective. All the authors have been involved in movements for social justice as citizens, scholars, teachers, activists, or as media makers, and many of them are acknowledged leaders in the field.

As we have seen, media activism is a heterogeneous enterprise with diverse politics, agendas, and strategies. The same can be said of the contributions to this volume. For that reason, readers, including the editors of this volume, will not agree with every claim put forth in the following chapters, nor should they if they endorse the premise put forth in the next chapter: that progress toward global justice requires thoughtfulness, reflexivity, and ongoing criticism. Despite their heterogeneity, these chapters have in common an intentional positioning within a social movement frame that insists on a link between media justice and social justice: the strong conviction that you cannot have one without the other.

The first section examines *Frameworks* for transforming media to create conditions that have the potential to advance democratic participation and promote social justice.

Cees Hamelink's "Global Justice and Global Media: The Long Way Ahead" sees the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the international community after World War II as a crucial moment in the human struggle for just social arrangements. He examines the role of global media in the subsequent efforts to realize human rights aspirations and finds that media, as currently configured, are more of an obstacle than an asset, explaining in some detail why news media are ill-equipped to cover human rights. While Hamelink acknowledges that valuable proposals for transforming the media have been put forward by activist scholars, he maintains that they have not yet led to significant changes in the global mediascape. Nevertheless, he cautions against despair, seeing the struggle for human rights as a very long one: a struggle for the development of reflexivity over thoughtlessness. In Hamelink's view, the pursuit of global justice is a long evolutionary process, which will include many setbacks as we slowly make our way through the fog to a destination that is not yet clear.

The conversation with DeeDee Halleck, "Video Activism as a Way of Life," reflects on Halleck's more than five decades of activism around media and social justice issues. Filmmaker, educator, and activist, Halleck has been relentless in her commitment to exploring the possibilities of new media as tools for democratic community action and expression—from community radio to public access television to digital satellite broadcasting. An early advocate for alternative community media, Halleck is at the heart of many major grassroots media initiatives. She is cofounder of Deep Dish TV—recognized as the first national,

grassroots satellite network—and the founder of *Paper Tiger Television*, a public access cable series and volunteer video collective. Halleck's work has inspired video artists and media activists around the world. Her reflections on the successes of media and social justice movements in the past provide critical insights for understanding the potential of mobilizing new media tools for ongoing and emerging social justice struggles in both localized and globalized contexts.

In "Media and Democracy: Some Missing Links," Nick Couldry looks at youth and public engagement through the lens of storytelling and its limits. The unequal distribution of media resources generates profound injustices, inflicting "hidden injuries" to self-esteem and self-recognition. Without the ability to share with others accounts of what we feel, remember, think, and propose, democracy itself is rendered anemic. Among other consequences, he contends, the lack of effective access to mediated forms of self-expression opens up a gap between engagement and recognition: talk about public issues is rarely linked to action or even to its promise. Couldry argues that we need broader and more sensitive ways of evaluating whether participatory media projects effectively redress the injustices they identify. He maintains that youth media initiatives, which provide access to symbolic resources, are laudable efforts, but they are not enough. For all the potential of new media and digital tools of media production, distribution, and social networking, what is at stake, in the end, is democracy—effective democracy. Couldry maintains that using media tools to change young people's opportunities to be recognized and heard will only succeed on a wider scale if government and other formal authorities act as if young people and young people's accounts of their lives matter.

Jessica Clark and Patricia Aufderheide's "A New Vision for Public Media: Open, Dynamic, and Participatory" acknowledges that public broadcasting, newspapers, magazines, and network newscasts have played a central role in US democracy, informing citizens and guiding public conversation. However, they point out that the top-down disseminating technologies that supported these media are being supplanted by an open, many-to-many networked media environment. They ask, what platforms, standards, and practices will replace or transform legacy public media? They examine in some depth the answers that are already emerging out of a series of media experiments taking place across legacy and citizen media. After taking a hard look at the "first two minutes" of Web 2.0 experimentation, Clark and Aufderheide conclude that the crucial initial step is to embrace the participatory: that is, the feature that has been most disruptive of current media models. Multiplatform, open, and digital public media will be an essential feature of truly democratic public life as we move forward. They will be media both for and by the public. But, Clark and Afterheide conclude, this will not happen by accident or for free. If we are going to have

media for vibrant democratic culture, we have to plan for it, try it out, show people that it matters, and build new constituencies to invest in it.

The second section of this volume, *Collaborations*, explores the potential as well as the challenges involved in creating community partnerships in struggles for media and social justice.

In their chapter, "Sustaining Collaboration: Lessons from the Media Research and Action Project," Charlotte Ryan and William Gamson reflect on their long-running collaboration with social justice activists at the Media Research and Action Project (MRAP) at Boston College. Since the mid-1980s, MRAP has served as a space for collaboration between social movement scholars and policy advocates to the mutual enrichment of both activism and scholarship. Still, MRAP has faced a number of challenges, which Ryan and Gamson explore in the form of a conversation about the project's two constituencies. Aspects of academic culture push fast-track research achievable in a summer, they observe, and thereby minimize relation building. Activists may be alienated by the "secret language" of scholarly jargon and feel pressure to claim early and exaggerated victories rather than share mixed or disappointing outcomes. In addition, chronic funding shortfalls and the labor involved in seeking funds to mixed results can prove demoralizing. Community-university partnerships, in short, usually involve three- or four-way negotiations among community-based organizations, universities, funders, and, sometimes, government agencies. Despite shared goals, each social location has competing agendas, constituencies, timetables, standards, budgets, and space limitations. These factors complicate collaboration. Ryan and Gamson offer lessons from the MRAP experience and highlight the many rewards of joint work for all involved.

Nina Gregg's contribution, "Media Is Not the Issue—Justice Is the Issue," provides a close analysis of several community-based efforts to address media justice in central Appalachia, with a focus on projects supported by the Appalachian Community Fund (ACF), a social justice foundation. ACF, along with a partner organization, convened a Southeast Media Justice Conference in February 2007. The conference was designed as an opportunity for social justice organizations in the Southeast and Appalachia to explore issues of media control, to expand their understanding of media justice, and to share with each other examples of the work already happening in the region. ACF subsequently awarded competitive media justice grants to four community organizations in 2007 and to five community organizations in 2008. Examining several media justice projects, the chapter explores what media justice means to activists in rural Appalachian communities and how they are organizing to challenge media control, develop alternative media institutions and channels, and increase the voices of marginalized communities through analysis, strategy, and skills. Rural media justice organizing offers a perspective on media and social justice that

differs significantly from the familiar focus on concentration of media owner-ship and federal communication policy.

In their chapter, "Detours through Youth-Driven Media: Backseat Drivers Bear Witness to the Ethical Dilemmas of Youth Media," Lora Taub-Pervizpour and Eirinn Disbrow examine the assumptions of media scholars, community media educators, and media activists who understand youth media as a vital space of media resistance. Media made by young people is a realm of media practice where it is possible for youth to intentionally adopt positions as media producers. In these acts, young people are seen to confront the deep, proliferat-ing, and pernicious ways in which corporate mass-mediated culture constructs and exploits young people as consumers. In assuming the stance of media maker, it is widely believed that young people acquire agency and engage in acts of resistance. While the authors position their work in solidarity with media researchers whose scholarly activity attempts to fortify youth media-making programs, they also examine the social, cultural, and political-economic forces that shape and constrain the possibilities of young people's media production. Taub-Pervizpour and Disbrow draw on long-term research conducted within a youth media program involving low-income, urban minority teens to suggest the need to scrutinize the particular ways in which marginalized youth and adult media educators collaborate in cultural production, including attending to the relationships and contexts in which young people conceptualize, research, and make media. They remind readers that new digital media technologies are not inherently democratic and argue that merely placing them in the hands of young people, marginalized by class, race, language, or gender, is not intrinsi-cally oppositional.

Mari Castañeda's contribution, "*¡Adelante!*: Promoting Social Justice through Latina/o Community Media," examines the ways that Latina/o community media promote social justice not only in Latino communities but also within the broader landscape of US civil society. Her chapter analyzes broadcast and print media examples from across the country and the US-Mexican border that demonstrate the important role of such Latina/o community media in creating social change through media justice. Latina/o media in the United States have a long tradition of emphasizing community needs and social justice in their cov-erage of education, politics, culture, and economics. Community media have consistently committed their access to newsprint and the airwaves, observes Castañeda, to addressing pressing issues that affect Latino populations in direct and indirect ways. The rising backlash against Latino immigrants, the shifting US demographics, and the inequities that Latinos continue to experience are issues that make the coverage by Latina/o community media even more critical, especially since they make visible communities that are voiceless and denigrated in mainstream English-language media.

The third section, *Power Struggles*, examines specific efforts to push back against structures of dominances within media and cultural institutions by using media, media critique, or both to challenge attempts to silence or marginalize alternative voices and practices.

In her chapter, "Feminism and Social Justice: Challenging the Media Rhetoric," Margaret Gallagher unpacks the paradoxes of the progress of feminism. Acknowledging that the international women's movement has made significant progress since 1970 as is evident by the fivefold increase in the number of women serving as heads of government in the twenty-first century, Gallagher nevertheless points out that no country has yet achieved gender equality. In fact, gender gaps in health, economic, and political participation have actually expanded in 43 countries since 2008; however, mainstream media narratives routinely suggest that the women's movement has achieved its objectives and is no longer relevant. In many of these narratives, there is an explicitly negative critique of feminism as a social movement. Gallagher maintains that challenges to the feminist movement have become increasingly sophisticated and resistant to criticism, as feminism has become part of the cultural vocabulary that media narratives draw on. With few exceptions, the feminist discourse that mainstream media invokes is conservative; emphasizing individualism and consumerism, it fits perfectly within the grammar of neoliberalism. Incorporation of feminist ideas into media discourses that serve to deny the politics of feminism as a social movement makes the pursuit of social justice for women especially challenging today. Gallagher examines how this discourse works in specific contexts, including advertising, policy, access to information and communication technologies, and media reform. She identifies new strategies that are necessary to open up spaces for women's agency in the new media environment, arguing that what is actually needed today is wide-scale social transformation of media in which women's rights and women's "right to communication" are respected and implemented.

Brian Martin's contribution, "Defending Dissent," identifies some enduring struggles involving defamation laws as well as the new opportunities that the Internet has opened up for resisting attempts to suppress dissent. Media organizations constantly face threats of lawsuits, which lead them to avoid stories that may make them vulnerable to legal action. Individuals, especially individuals who express controversial views that challenge powerful people or organizations, may also face legal threats or action, which have the effect of inhibiting free speech. As president of Whistleblowers Australia, Martin created a website, "Suppression of Dissent," where whistleblowers and others could tell their stories and post supporting documents. He shows how the Internet can be used to evade defamation threats by ensuring that the material is widely circulated, so that legal action—rather than hiding the material—actually makes it more

widely known. In essence, he argues, the Internet can serve as a "defamation haven," analogous to tax havens. He describes the forms of resistance that are most effective in evading suppression and defending dissent. This experience also led to his research on how to make censorship backfire so that it would damage censors instead of their intended targets. Martin sees the Internet as a new arena for resisting suppressions of free speech, but one with quite a different topography than the traditional venues. He argues that the ground is tilting toward free speech, but that it is important to know how to take advantage of the opportunities.

In his chapter, "Software Freedom as Social Justice: The Open Source Software Movement and Information Control," John L. Sullivan maintains that free, open source software (FOSS) advocacy can be increasingly characterized as a broader movement for social justice. He tracks the emergence and development of FOSS efforts such as the GNU/Linux operating system and the GNU Public License (GPL), noting that advocacy of open source software has expanded beyond the relatively small community of software programmers to encompass a larger group of nonexpert users and related organizations. Sullivan shows that the interests of FOSS advocates have begun to merge and overlap with the interests of the free culture-digital commons advocates in the past half-decade, with increasing cross-fertilization across these two groups. These issues more closely align the current aims of FOSS with other digital rights initiatives, suggesting the emergence of a larger umbrella movement for cultural and software freedom on the horizon that advances social justice efforts.

In "Watching Back: Surveillance as Activism," Mark Andrejevic explores the appropriation of monitoring technologies by social activists who turn the surveillance cameras back on the authorities as a means of holding them accountable to public scrutiny and the legal system. He focuses on the work of I-Witness and the Glass Bead Collective, both based in New York City. The two groups assemble amateur and professional videographers to monitor public rallies, marches, and other politically oriented demonstrations in order to document abuses by law enforcement agencies. They have had success in getting charges dropped against activists and others who were arrested and charged on false pretenses, but they have also been targeted by the authorities, most notably during the 2008 Republican National Convention in St. Paul, Minnesota. Andrejevic explores both the democratic political potential of techniques of reflexive surveillance—activists filming themselves in order to document police abuse—as well as the potential drawbacks of the approach.

The last section, *Media Justice*, examines struggles for justice in media policy, foundation funding of research, and media reform efforts themselves using historical analysis as well as ethnographic and experiential knowledge of activists doing media democracy work and monitoring media censorship.

Christina Dunbar-Hester's chapter, "Drawing and Effacing Boundaries in Contemporary Media Democracy Work," profiles a movement that emerged in the wake of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and that seeks to change the media system in the United States. The movement developed in light of such factors as a regulatory environment favoring national broadcasting networks and corporate media consolidation, embedded practices of community media production and pirate radio, Indymedia and the transnational "antiglobalization" movement, and the emergence of "new media" including the Internet. Dunbar-Hester maintains that due to the heterogeneity of participants in the movement and the way in which it overlays other, related social justice agendas, the media democracy movement represents a diverse, even chaotic field of activism. She identifies key sites of intervention, including radical activist, reform, and academic agendas based on ethnographic research on low-power radio activists and the groups with whom they interact. The chapter also examines the difficulties involved when diverse groups, who nominally share the same goals of democratic social change through critique, seek to collaborate.

In his chapter, "From Psychological Warfare to Social Justice: Shifts in Foundation Support for Communication Research," Jefferson Pooley compares and contrasts the Ford Foundation's recent foray into media research and policy reform with earlier interventions by American foundations. As with the previous initiatives of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, Ford's recent efforts have been linked to its wider public policy goals. The difference is that Ford's objectives, for the first time, largely align with those of social justice activists. In other words, Ford's $20 million outlay from 1998 to the present has supported—rather than thwarted—media and social justice campaigns. Pooley traces this remarkable shift by comparing earlier foundation interventions (Rockefeller funding in the 1930s and Ford's programs in the 1950s) with Ford's collaborative grantmaking to media academics, activists, and policy researchers over the last decade. He argues that Ford's recent activities challenge overly rigid assumptions made by the large critical literature on foundations, social science, and the status quo.

Mickey Huff and Peter Phillips's chapter, "Media Democracy in Action: Truth Emergency and the Progressive Media Reform Movement," critiques the tendency of mainstream media to marginalize, through ridicule or inattention, major stories and story angles that fall outside a narrow range of acceptable media discourse. They discuss the process by which some stories and interpretations earn respectful treatment from corporate media, while others do not, by drawing on over a decade of experience at Project Censored, which labors each year to publicize the stories that the mainstream press ignored. Examples from Project Censored's book series, along with reflections on the project's evolution, inform Phillips and Huff's argument that activists and scholars need to

creatively redefine what journalists establish as legitimate news. They conclude that mainstream media is contributing to "a truth emergency," which undermines the viability of democracy.

Notes

1. "Symbolically annihilate" appears in George Gerbner, "Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions," in *Media Content and Controls*, ed. George Comstock and Eli A. Rubenstein, vol. 1, *Television and Social Behavior* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1972), 44.

2. Sean MacBride, *Many Voices, One World: Report by the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems* (Paris: UNESCO, 1980).

3. "The right to communicate" movement has been active since 1974, when UNESCO launched its formal work in this area. UNESCO has no means of enforcing this right, but several international organizations have passed nonbinding resolutions that have established a "common understanding of the rights to communicate," which often includes a course of action. For a summary of these resolutions, see the Right to Communicate Group, "The Right to Communicate," http://www.right tocommunicate.org. See also Cees Hamelink, this volume; Hamelink has been one of the leaders of this initiative.

4. Sen's effort both builds on and departs from John Rawls's theory of justice. Sen's approach could be accurately described as a theory of social justice because his approach is nontranscendental and comparative, focusing on how people actually behave, rather than justice as an abstract ideal, with a primary focus on meeting basic human needs and human rights: hunger, medical neglect, poverty, torture, injustices based on race and gender exclusions, and so on. Sen's approach seeks more justice than currently exists rather than perfect justice. Despite only brief attention to media and media freedom, Sen's approach incorporates many communication-related ideas and assumptions, including communication competence ("capability"), criteria for public reasoning (which overtly recognizes some kinship with Habermas's work), and more, all of which warrant unpacking—so much so that I dare to read it as a communication theory as well as an approach to justice. Amartya Sen, The Idea of Justice (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), 336–37.

5. Max Weber, *From Max Weber*, ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946). Weber's contemporaries, Wilhelm Dilthey and Georg Simmel, pushed the concept of sympathetic understanding even further than Weber; still, Weber is cited here because his concept has much broader currency in contemporary social science discourse.

6. Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).

7. After the March on Montgomery in 1966, King, who was deeply impressed by the diversity of the marchers, described their solidarity: "As I stood with them and saw white and Negro, nuns and priests, ministers and rabbis, labor organizers, lawyers, doctors, housemaids and shopworkers brimming with vitality and enjoying a comradeship, I knew I was seeing a microcosm of the mankind of the future

in this luminous and genuine brotherhood." Martin Luther King Jr., *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community*? (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 9, quoted in Kenneth L. Smith and Ira G. Zepp Jr., "Martin Luther King's Vision of the Beloved Community," *Christian Century*, April 3, 1974, 361–63, http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=1603.

8. Elizabeth Barret offers a profound exploration of the moral dilemmas involved in representing the lives of others in her film, *Stranger with a Camera*, a film produced by Appalshop and KET Public Television, 2000.

9. Robert Coles, *Doing Documentary Work* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

10. At the most basic level, value commitments violate the normative ideal of objectivity. Add advocacy for social justice, and controversy is, and perhaps should be, inevitable. See Ronald L. Cohen's introduction to *Justice: Views from the Social Sciences* (New York: Plenum Press, 1986), 1–10, for a brief but informative discussion of social justice as a contested concept.

11. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970).

12. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971). It is impossible to identify all the activists and scholars associated with social justice studies, but in addition to Rawls and Sen, some prominent contributors are Bruce Ackerman, Brian Barry, Seyla Benhabib, Joe Feagin, Andrew Kuper, Martha Nussbaum, Thomas Nagel, Thomas Pogge, and Thomas Scanlon.

13. Naomi Klein, *No Logo: Taking Aim At the Brand Bullies* (New York: Picador, 2000).

14. For an eloquent, thought-provoking discussion of this educational movement, see Marilynne Robinson, "A Great Amnesia," *Harper's*, May 2008, 17–21. While many Protestant denominations were involved in this movement, of special interest from a social justice perspective were the liberal Protestant sects who sought to improve life on earth as opposed to promising the poor that they will reap their rewards in the next life. They preached a social gospel that supported settlement houses for immigrants, social services, and good works.

15. Sociology, for example, was largely conceived in the United States as a form of applied Christianity; in the view of the social gospelers, theology attended to the first commandment while sociology addressed the second, focusing on labor injustices and the other pathologies of industrialization and urbanization. Similarly, historical economics was posited as counter to classical economics and laissez-faire and exposed the inequitable distribution of surplus value produced by labor. To our ears, this may sound like vintage Marxism, but it was largely a homegrown response to the rapid development and national expansion of capitalism in the post–Civil War era. See Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865–1915* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940); and Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

16. For an exhaustive statistical analysis of escalating social inequality in the United States, see Larry M. Bartels, *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton University Press, 2008). See also Joe E. Feagin, "Social Justice and Sociology: Agendas for

the Twenty-First Century: Presidential Address," *American Sociological Review* 66, no. 1 (2001): 1–20.

17. J. T. Rajaratnam et al., "Neonatal, Postneonatal, Childhood, and Under-5 Mortality for 187 Countries, 1970–2010: A Systematic Analysis of Progress Towards Millennium Development Goal 4," *Lancet* 375, no. 9730 (2010): 1988–2008.

18. In 1980, the gap was 2.8 years; by 2008, the gap had increased to 4.5 years. Robert Pear, "Gap in Life Expectancy Widens for the Nation," *The New York Times*, March 23, 2008, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/23/us/23health.html#.

19. The concept of "life chances," originally coined by Weber, is used by Brian Barry to illustrate the way that deliberate policy choices—what he calls "the machinery of social injustice"—made by rich countries and international institutions like the International Monetary Fund can have devastating effects on the life chances of people in poor countries. See Barry, *Why Social Justice Matters* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005); and Feagin, "Social Justice and Sociology."

20. A notable exception is the *New York Times*'s Nicholas Kristof, who apparently has carte blanche to cover stories of his own choice and focuses primarily on social justice issues. See *Reporter*, directed by Eric Daniel Metzgar (HBO Documentary Films, 2008).

21. Barry, *Why Social Justice Matters*.

22. Nicholas Johnson, quoted in Robert W. McChesney, *Communication Revolution: Critical Junctures and the Future of Media* (New York: New Press, 2007), 149.

23. McChesney, *Communication Revolution*, 158, 220. McChesney's entire book presents a compelling argument for the interdependence of critical media scholarship, media reform, and social justice.

24. The media reform movement has had greater success in some other nations, such as Canada. See Robert A. Hackett and William Carroll, *Remaking Media: The Struggle to Democratize Public Communication* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

25. Hackett and Carroll, *Remaking Media*, 79.

26. Ibid.

27. Philip M. Napoli, "Public Interest Media Activism and Advocacy as a Social Movement: A Review of the Literature," McGannon Center Working Paper Series, Fordham University, 2007, http://fordham.bepress.com/mcgannon_working_papers/21.

28. Aliza Dichter, quoted in Hackett and Carroll, *Remaking Media*, 79.

29. Robert A. Hackett, "Taking Back the Media: Notes on the Potential for a Communicative Democracy Movement," *Studies in Political Economy* 63 (2000): 61–86, cited in Napoli, "Public Interest Media Activism."

30. Napoli, "Public Interest Media Activism."

31. That is, we salute Habermas's quest but recognize the limits of its idealism in a mediatized world.

32. Robert B. Horwitz, "Broadcast Reform Revisited: Reverend Everett C. Parker and the 'Standing Case' (*Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. the Federal Communication Commission*)," *The Communication Review* 2, no. 3 (1997): 311–48.

33. Horwitz, "Broadcast Reform Revisited"; and Robert W. McChesney, *Telecommunications, Mass Media, and Democracy: The Battle for the Control of U.S. Broadcasting, 1928–1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

34. Dan Schiller, "Social Movement in Telecommunications: Rethinking the Public Service History of U.S. Telecommunications, 1804–1919," in *Communication, Citizenship, and Social Policy*, ed. Andrew Calabrese and Jean-Claude Burgelman (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999), 137–55.

35. Sue Curry Jansen, "International Public Relations: Neo-liberal Fixer and Diplomat without Portfolio," in *Propaganda and Public Persuasion in Liberal Democracies: Political Economy and Culture*, ed. Gerald Sussman (New York: Peter Lang, forthcoming).

36. Elizabeth Fones-Wolf, *Waves of Opposition: Labor and the Struggle for Democratic Radio* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006).

37. George Gerbner, communication with the author.

38. Lawrence R. Frey et al., "Looking for Justice in all the Wrong Places: On a Communication Approach to Social Justice," *Communication Studies* 47, nos. 1–2 (1996): 110–27; and Mark A. Pollock et al., "Navigating between Scylla and Charybdis: Continuing the Dialogue on Communication and Social Justice," *Communication Studies* 47, nos. 1–2 (1996): 142–51. Frey coedited, with Kevin Carragee, two large volumes of reports of social justice studies undertaken by speech communication scholars and activists: *Communication for Social Change*, vol. 1, *Communication Activism* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2007); and *Media and Performative Activism*, vol. 2, *Communication Activism* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2007).

39. Sue Curry Jansen, "Rethinking Social Justice Scholarship in Media and Communication," *Communication, Culture and Critique* 1, no. 3 (2008): 329–34. The review also included a third collection, also written from a speech communication (rhetorical) perspective, Omar Swartz, ed., *Social Justice and Communication Scholarship* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2006).

40. Within Sen's comparative approach, the "impartial stranger"—one who has no vested interest in the outcome of a particular problem—is posited as a mediator. She or he (perhaps most often, they) is not posited to be completely objective nor a transcendent judicious ideal but rather more-or-less the best we fallible humans can hope for in the kind of social worlds we actually inhabit. He borrows the concept from Adam Smith and points out that, unlike contemporary market fundamentalists who claim Smith's legacy, Smith never argued that the market could deliver justice. To the contrary, Smith believed that market theory needed to be accompanied by moral theory. Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, 125.

41. Science itself, it should be noted, is also a normative practice, with established procedures for assessing appropriate observational practices, forms of measurement, standards for assessing validity and statistical significance, and so on. Recent human rights scholarship has articulated public norms for assessing the objectivity of social justice claims within a comparative framework, including the ability of such claims to survive critical scrutiny by "impartial spectators" and the capacity to meet tests of public reasoning. See Sen, *The Idea of Justice*.

42. W. B. Gallie, "Essentially Contested Concepts," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56 (1956): 167–98.

43. This does not mean, of course, that all communication scholars have lived up to the demands of these norms. To the contrary, we know that some of the founders of the field paid lip service to them in public even as they were deeply involved in

secret Cold War–era government-sponsored research on techniques to advance the effectiveness of propaganda and psychological warfare. See Christopher Simpson, *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945–1960* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). See also Jefferson Pooley, "The New History of Mass Communication Research," in *The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories*, ed. David W. Park and Jefferson Pooley (New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 43–69.

44. Sen, *The Idea of Justice*; see also Ronald Dworkin, *Is Democracy Possible Here? Principles for a New Political Debate* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

45. See the Center for Communication Rights, http://www.centerforcommunication rights.org.

46. We believe that our rationale meets Stanley Fish's well-known objections to social activism in academe on two grounds. First, liberal arts colleges, especially private colleges, with social justice or religious histories are, by definition, value-oriented; Fish specifically excuses them from his indictment. Second, even Fish presumably does not object to scholarship based on the First Amendment or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the classroom, especially when it is secured, as Sen requires, by public reasoning. See Stanley Fish, *Save the World on Your Own Time* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).