John O'Shaughnessy & Nicholas Jackson O'Shaughnessy

PERSUASION IN ADVERTISING

MEDIASPACE

MediaSpace explores the importance of ideas of space and place to understanding how we experience media in our everyday lives. Essays from leading international scholars address the kinds of spaces created by media and the effects that spatial arrangements have on media and cultural forms. Case studies focus on a wide variety of subjects and locales, from in-flight entertainment to the personal stereo and mobile phone, from the electronic spaces of the Internet to the shopping mall and 'smart car', and from the work culture of the dot.com boom to the performance rituals of reality TV.

   MediaSpace contains both theoretical overviews and a geographically diverse selection of current research. Of primary interest within media and cultural studies, it will also prove necessary reading for geographers, sociologists and anthropologists concerned with issues of space and media.

Editors: **Nick Couldry** is Senior Lecturer in Media and Communications at the London School of Economics and Political Science. He is the author of *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*, *Inside Culture* and *The Place of Media Power: Pilgrims and Witnesses of the Media Age*. **Anna McCarthy** is Associate Professor of Cinema Studies at New York University. She is the author of *Ambient Television: Visual Culture and Public Space*.

COMEDIA
Series Editor: David Morley

MEDIASPACE

Place, scale and culture in a media age

Edited by
Nick Couldry and Anna McCarthy

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

Cover photograph: *Remote Connection* by Andy Kropa, 2001

CONTRIBUTORS

Fiona Allon is Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Centre for Cultural Research, University of Western Sydney, Australia. Her doctoral thesis, 'Altitude Anxiety: Being-at-home in a Globalised World', is currently being considered for publication. She has taught media theory and cultural studies at the University of Technology, Sydney; the University of Western Sydney; Goldsmiths College, University of London; and the Georg-August University, Göttingen, Germany. She has published widely in media studies and cultural studies books and journals.

Mark Andrejevic is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Iowa University, USA. He recently completed his doctoral thesis at the University of Colorado, Boulder, on the role of surveillance in reality-based television programming, and his research interests include the productive role of surveillance in the digital economy, the cultural geography of new media, and the critical analysis of popular culture. His article, 'The Kinder, Gentler Face of Big Brother: Reality TV in the Era of Digital Capitalism', is forthcoming in the journal *New Media and Society*.

Clive Barnett is Lecturer in Human Geography at the University of Bristol, UK. His current research includes work on cultural policy in the European Union and South Africa, on social movements, media and mobilization in South Africa, and on discourses of African post-colonialism. Forthcoming publications include *Spaces of Representation: Geographies of Media, Communication and Democracy* (Edinburgh University Press) and *Geographies of Democracy*, edited with Murray Low (Sage).

Göran Bolin is Assistant Professor and Head of Department of Media and Cultural Studies at Sodertorns Hogskola (University College), Sweden. He has headed several research projects since the 1990s, and current work includes projects on Swedish entertainment television and global media landscapes. His books include *Moves in Modernity* (Almqvist and Wiksell, 1992) and *Youth Culture in Late Modernity* (Sage, 1995), both edited with Johan Fornas.

Michael Bull is Lecturer in Media Studies at the University of Sussex. He is the author of *Sounding Out the City: Personal Stereos and the Management of Everyday Life* (Berg, 2000) as well as numerous articles on audio media and social space.

John T. Caldwell is Chair of the Department of Film, Television and Digital Media at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is the author of *Televisuality: Style Crisis and Authority in American Television* (Rutgers University Press, 1995) and the editor of *Electronic Media and Technoculture* (Rutgers University Press, 2000), and has written articles in many leading journals. He is also a prolific television and video producer, and has won a number of awards for his productions, which include *Freak Street to Goa: Immigration on the Rajpath* (1989) and *Amor Vegetal: Our Harvest* (1998).

Nick Couldry is Senior Lecturer in Media and Communications at the London School of Economics and Political Science. He is the author of *The Place of Media Power: Pilgrims and Witnesses of the Media Age* (Routledge, 2000), *Inside Culture: Reimagining the Method of Cultural Studies* (Sage, 2000) and *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach* (Routledge, 2003). He has also written numerous articles on media, space and symbolic power. He has been interested in the theoretical interconnections between media and space since the beginning of his research.

Arlene Dávila is Associate Professor of Anthropology and American Studies at New York University. She is the author of *Latinos Inc.: Marketing and the Making of a People* (University of California Press, 2001) and *Sponsored Identities: Cultural Politics in Puerto Rico* (Temple University Press, 1997). She is also co-editor, with Agustin Lao, of *Mambo Montage: The Latinization of New York* (Columbia University Press, 2000).

Nitin Govil is Assistant Professor of Media Studies at the University of Virginia. He is the co-author of *Global Hollywood*, where he wrote on the history of international film copyright and contemporary cultural policy, and is currently co-authoring a study of the contemporary Indian film industry. He has also written on the globalization of Asian multimedia labor, race and US television, broadband television technology, and science fiction and the city.

James Hay is Associate Professor in the Department of Speech Communication, the Graduate Program in Cultural Studies, the Unit for Criticism and Interpretative Theory and the Unit for Cinema Studies at the University of Illinois–Champaign–Urbana. He is the author of *Popular Film Culture in Fascist Italy* (Indiana University Press, 1987) and editor of *The Audience and its Landscape* (Westview Press, 1996), as well as the author of numerous essays about media and social space.

Anna McCarthy teaches in the department of Cinema Studies at New York University's Tisch School of the Arts. She is the author of *Ambient Television:*

Visual Culture and Public Space (Duke University Press, 2001) as well as numerous articles on television and media. Her current research examines corporate activism and other forms of social advocacy in early television sponsorship.

Shaun Moores is Reader at the Centre for Research in Media and Cultural Studies, University of Sunderland, and Visiting Professor of Communication at La Sapienza, University of Rome. He is the author of *Interpreting Audiences: The Ethnography of Media Consumption* (Sage, 1993) and *Media and Everyday Life in Modern Society* (Edinburgh University Press, 2000). His next book, provisionally entitled *Media/Theory: A Thematic Introduction*, will be published by Routledge.

Susan Ossman is Visiting Professor of Anthropology at the Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University. She trained as an anthropologist at the University of California, Berkeley. She is the author of *Picturing Casablanca* (University of California Press, 1993) and *Three Faces of Beauty: Casablanca, Paris, Cairo* (Duke University Press, 2002), and the editor of *Miroirs Maghrébins* (CNRS, 1998).

Jeremy Packer is Assistant Professor of Media and Film Studies at Pennsylvania State University. He is co-editor of *Governing the Present: Foucault and Cultural Studies* (forthcoming, SUNY Press) and has published articles on safety, mobility and communications.

Lisa Parks is Assistant Professor of Film Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. She is the author of *Cultures in Orbit* (Duke University Press, forthcoming) and co-editor of *Planet TV: A Global Television Studies Reader* (NYU Press, forthcoming).

Andrew Ross is Director of the American Studies Program and Professor of Comparative Literature at New York University. His most recent book is *No-Collar: The Humane Workplace and Its Hidden Costs* (Basic Books, 2002). His other books as editor and author include *The Celebration Chronicles: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Property Value in Disney's New Town* (Ballantine, 1999); *Real Love: In Pursuit of Cultural Justice* (New York University Press, 1998); *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade and the Rights of Garment Workers* (1997, Verso); *Science Wars* (Duke University Press, 1996); *Microphone Fiends: Youth Music and Youth Culture* (Routledge, 1994); *The Chicago Gangster Theory of Life: Nature's Debt to Society* (Verso, 1994); *Strange Weather: Culture, Science and Technology in the Age of Limits* (Verso, 1991); *Technoculture* (Minnesota, 1991); *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (Routledge, 1989); and *Universal Abandon? The Politics of Postmodernism* (University of Minnesota Press, 1988).

Mimi White is Professor of Radio–TV–Film at Northwestern University. She is the author of *Tele-Advising: Therapeutic Discourse in American Network Television* (University of North Carolina Press, 1992) and co-author, with James Schwoch and Susan Reilly, of *Media Knowledge: Readings in Popular Culture, Pedagogy, and Critical Citizenship* (SUNY Press, 1992).

INTRODUCTION
Orientations: mapping MediaSpace

Nick Couldry and Anna McCarthy

> Through every human being, unique space, intimate space, opens up to the world.
> (Rilke, quoted in Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, 1969: 202)

> We live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another.
> (Foucault, 'Of Heterotopias', 1986: 23)

This book is an interdisciplinary project that brings together work in media and cultural studies, drawing on geographical theories and spatially articulated methodologies. Linking the chapters is the proposition that media, particularly electronic media, and the social processes that shape our perception and use of space are allied phenomena. In these links, we can read the complexity of contemporary social life. One could almost call media and space the *obverse* of each other, necessarily connected but, as Foucault says, 'irreducible to one another'. Hence the term 'MediaSpace'. As electronic media increasingly saturate our everyday spaces with images of other places and other (imagined or real) orders of space, it is ever more difficult to tell a story of social space without also telling a story of media, and vice versa.

There are, however, no easy symmetries. The spatial orders that media systems construct and enforce are highly complicated, unevenly developed and multi-scaled. In this respect, the development of electronic media is a spatial process intertwined with the development of regimes of accumulation in capitalism. 'Rather than creating a homogeneous space of operation,' notes television historian Michael Curtin, 'communication technologies have made capital more mobile and hence even more sensitive to the differences between places' (2000: 52). This flexible and fractured spatial order, in turn, through its silent regulation of media flows, affects the terms on which media narratives can matter, where, and to whom, even if the implicit spatiality of media is hard to recognize in the 'space' of the media text.

Together, the chapters in this volume fill out, both in theory and in case studies, a conceptual realm we call MediaSpace. MediaSpace is a dialectical

concept, encompassing both the kinds of spaces created by media, and the effects that existing spatial arrangements have on media forms as they materialize in everyday life. Like cyberspace, the kind of space defined by this concept is a curious, multidimensional one. It is on the one hand resolutely material, that is, composed of objects (receivers, screens, cables, servers, transmitters) embedded in particular geographical power structures (Ross, Dávila) and reflective of particular economic sectors in capitalism (Govil, Caldwell). On the other hand, as is evident in the commonplace antinomy that makes the image the opposite of 'reality', media – especially electronic media – take on spectral, evanescent characteristics that seem to remove them from the material plane of existence (Sconce 2000). The concept of virtuality belongs to this anti-concrete sense of spatiality, as it is premised on the idea that electronic media create an experience unmoored from the physicality of the body, of work and leisure spaces, of the environment (Miller and Slater 2000; McCarthy 2002). Virtuality and its cognate ideologies embody fantasies of escape from the material world and its messy realities, but of course this escape is premised on the ever-increasing consumption of material resources.[1] MediaSpace, then, at once defines the artefactual existence of media forms within social space, the links that media objects forge *between* spaces, and the (no less real) cultural visions of a physical space transcended by technology and emergent virtual pathways of communication. It is also expanding too. We can no longer ignore what Thrift and French (2002) call the 'automatic production of space' through software, a condition of spatialized governance in which media and space quite literally merge in architectural infrastructure. As they note, information relay and coding systems on which media technologies rely are increasingly incorporated into everyday places, from elevators to locks to generators, shaping the movements and behavioural options of the citizenry in social space (Thrift and French 2002: 314, 317).

In focusing our attention on the ways that media forms shape and are shaped by the experience of social space, the chapters in this volume make clear that the politics of media images and economies are not separate from the politics of space. If the latter can encompass a range of issues from racism in city planning to environmental disasters to the oil-fuelled violent crises that destabilize regions, then a spatially aware model of media studies necessarily finds itself taking issues like these into account. Tracking the mobility of media forms in social space leads us to numerous political realities. Some of these are covered by the chapters contained here: the environmental hazards of junked hardware in the Third World (Parks); the intertwining of entertainment dollars with modes of transportation dependent on the geopolitical order that supports US oil interests (Hay and Packer, Govil); the Taylorization of domestic labour through technologies of control (Allon). Academic labour, and the communications tools on which it depends, are not isolated from these realities. The microprocessors in laptop computers, on which so many of us depend, rely on Coltan, a rare ore that is mined in central Africa. As a widely circulated news story from

2001 vividly communicated, Coltan mining has helped fund civil wars and regional terror, as well as the destruction of the natural environment in the Republic of Congo and bordering nations (Harden 2001). This example is only one of many cases in which the West's experience of mediated instantaneity, convenience and mobility is dependent on a hidden spatial order. Virtuality, despite its connotations of diminished dependence on materiality and space, is itself the product of uneven development: the transformations it has wrought in the lives of the middle class in the West are mirrored by material transformations of the basic conditions of existence elsewhere in the world.

As this example suggests, the full recognition of the materiality of space, and spatial relations, does violence to certain visions, themselves perhaps quite comforting, of what media are and what understanding media is. If you doubt this, think for a moment about the difference between the two reflections which head this Introduction: the first is by one of the early twentieth century's greatest poets, the second is by one of the late twentieth century's greatest social thinkers. This difference condenses the historical tension through which modernity comes to terms with the material conditions of its own possibility. It marks out a shift from a vision of interior space as an unbounded, unconditional expanse to a redrawing of the self as a spatial field of multiple, heterogeneous forces and relations of power, of which the 'inner voice' is but one component.

But this shift is never complete. Space, particularly in the traditional concept of place, contains both the possibility of interiority, of wholeness, boundedness and plenitude, and the possibility of remoteness, alienation. When we say that we 'need our space', we are saying simultaneously that we want to retreat to a place that is all our own and that we want to put some distance between another and ourselves. Similarly, as material social relations, media forms encompass the possibility of joining and belonging in the present (this is Benedict Anderson's imagined community) as well as enabling contact with the past, through the circulation of place-based nostalgia and memory. Yet they also create distance (a friend's two-minute mobile phone call during lunch, for example) and anxieties about social control that may distract us from the historical present, in all its dimensions, including the political.

This dialectical sense of belonging and alienation, self and system, is integral to the experience of MediaSpace. Much research on the spatial processes of media is bound up with what Anthony Giddens called 'the fundamental question of social theory – the "problem of order"'. This is the problem of explaining 'how the limitations of individual "presence" are transcended by the "stretching" of social relations across time and space.'[2] Modern media are among the principal means through which a certain type of order has been introduced into large territories (Mattelart 1994). Yet the problem of order is also the problem of *dis*order. MediaSpace may be dominated by ideologies of control and individualized power (Allon, Bull), but, like any complex system, it is constantly under stress through forces of flux, transience and unmanageability (Latour 1993; Govil, White, Moores).

MediaSpace is a thoroughly interdisciplinary concept. A glance at the citations in this volume will communicate the influence of geographical theory on media studies. If nearly two decades ago it rang true for geographers to claim that 'the media have been on the periphery of geographical enquiry for too long' (Burgess and Gold 1985: 1), it still makes sense today for media researchers to return the compliment. Other sites of disciplinary cross-pollination include ethnographic research (both in its original, anthropological, form and as it has migrated to other disciplines in the past ten to fifteen years); urban studies and urban sociology; and cultural studies (by this we mean the type of cultural studies that has been interested in social power and cultural politics outside of their textual manifestations, rather than the type concerned primarily with literary or philosophical questions). This collection brings together media theorists and spatial theorists, sociologists and anthropologists, screen studies and urban studies, political economy perspectives and cultural perspectives. This undisciplined range communicates the fact that the project of defining MediaSpace is far larger than any single discipline.

As our contributors make clear, a geographically informed and spatially sensitive analysis of media artefacts, discourses, and practices reveals forms of inequality and dominance, knowledge and practice that are hidden from other analytical techniques. Understanding media systems and institutions as spatial processes undercuts the infinite space of narrative that media appear to promise; it insists that our object of analysis is never just a collection of texts, but a specific and material organization of space. Media, like all social processes, are inherently stretched out in space in particular ways, and not others. A classic, if now neglected, insight into MediaSpace is Debord's *Society of the Spectacle*, itself inspired by the great social and spatial theorist Henri Lefebvre.[3] Leaving aside Debord's analysis of consumerism, his book makes a fundamental point about the spatial properties of the media that are essential to societies of mass consumption:

> The spectacle presents itself simultaneously as all of society, as part of society, and as instrument of unification. As a part of society, it is specifically the sector which concentrates all *gazing* and all consciousness. Due to the very fact that this sector is *separate*, it is the common ground of the deceived … and the unification it achieves is nothing but an official language of generalised separation.
> (Debord 1983, paras 2–3, emphasis in the original)

However we might want to inflect the details of Debord's argument four decades later, he grasped the contradiction between the (limited) spatial origins of media and the (general, indeed totalizing) claims made by, through and on behalf of media. This gap between media rhetoric and actual spatial organization is but one example of what Lefebvre called 'spatial violence' (1991: 289). Like symbolic violence in Bourdieu's work (Bourdieu 1991), spatial

violence is a gap between representation and material organization that is naturalized out of everyday awareness. It is something we would rather, and generally do, forget. Yet not forgetting this spatial violence inherent to media is the first step in grasping the dynamics of MediaSpace and its territoriality (Sack 1986). Focusing on the levels of spatial structuring and restructuring that media systems produce reveals them as a historically particular organization of the scarce resources to make effective representations of social life (cf. Carey 1989). Media, then, emerge as one of the most important *dis*-placements at work in the relatively centralized 'order' of contemporary societies.

To help us grasp the processes through which MediaSpace is constructed we can diagram the various ways in which *it* has been or might be analysed in media and communications studies.

MediaSpace: five levels

Seemingly the most straightforward stage in the process of connecting media and space, geography and media analysis, is:

Level 1: studying media representations

This topic has generated much writing in geography[4] and media studies,[5] on media images of local, national and global space (Anderson 1983; Jameson 1984; Harvey 1990; Bruno 1993). But it is *only the first* stage of analysing MediaSpace, because it is limited in what it can say about the spatial dimensions of the media process itself. True, broadcast media (relatively speaking) give us 'de-spatialized' access to other places (Thompson 1993: 187). Media images and narratives are so liberally scattered across space that the spatially differentiated process that scatters them matters little for some purposes. Nonetheless, the past twenty years of audience studies, as well as our increasing sense of the global variations of media flows, make it increasingly clear that de-spatialized analysis of spatial images and texts alone can only go so far.

It would be quite wrong, however, to give the impression that all the stories at Level 1 have already been told. New stories are constantly calling to be told about the representations of national space in the Internet, the representations of social space through mobile communications, and so on; new stories, too, about how the contradictions between representations of space and place in different media are played out and reworked. Thus, as we show in this book, Level 1 continues to be highly relevant to the analysis of MediaSpace, even if the media in question extend far beyond the familiar panoply of television, radio and the press.

Increasingly, we have wanted to know more about the various places where media images are received, the very specific places where those images are produced, and the differentiated grids along which those images are distributed. This takes us to the next two levels of thinking about MediaSpace:

Level 2: the study of how media images, texts and data flow across space and, in so doing, reconfigure social space

This kind of work is concerned with the overall spatial and social configuration that results from a particular medium. A good example is the much-analysed situation of television linking certain types of places to certain other types of place, and leaving other places outside the network in the process. However, work on this level does not necessarily specify one singular set of processes or spatial effects. Rather, it is site-specific in its attention to local determinations. It is a kind of analysis with which anthropologists have been particularly concerned (see, for example, Wilk 1994; Abu-Lughod 1997; the essays in Abu-Lughod et al. 2002). In bringing the local into contact with various elsewheres, media are often seen as destroying regional specificity. This may sometimes be the case; however, ethnographic work on this mediation of contact suggests that a wider range of syncretic outcomes is possible.

Level 3: the study of the specific spaces at either end of the media process, the space of consumption and the space of production

If Level 1 addresses the question of spatial representation, Level 2 indicates the impossibility of treating media 'texts' as a-spatial forms. Level 3 intensifies this move away from textual interpretation, focusing on media as social processes as well as technologies and 'content'. These processes *extend beyond* the text and into the worlds of media institutions and organization. They encompass every-thing from the market research that precedes the image, to the production studio, to the editing suite to the broadcasting mast to the television set to the living room, bar or airport lounge where the image is received.

Implicit, however, in our insistence on complicating Level 1 (media repre-sentations of space) with Levels 2 and 3 (reconfigurations of space through media and the detailed spaces of media production and consumption) is an issue that cannot be addressed at any of those three levels: the question of scale. Scale is a difficult concept to define. The word *scale* is a complex and highly abstract noun that expresses a number of different kinds of proportional rela-tions, from the comparative size of physical phenomena to the mathematically calculable relationship between an object and its representation. Scale shapes the kinds of decisions we make in analysing the empirical world, and it is a concept around which a number of ready-made critiques have emerged. Micro-level analyses, for example, are always open to the charge that they fail, in the words of one historian, 'to link the microsocial and the macrosocial, experi-ences with structures, face to face relationships with the social system or the local with the global'. Without these links, the argument goes, micro-analysis leads to 'an acceptance of a fragmented world view rather than an attempt to make sense of it' (Burke 2001: 116–17). By contrast, some sociologists have insisted on the absolute primacy of microscopic interactions, even over the

macro-operations that other sociologists see at work (for example, Shotter 1993; see also Garfinkel 1967). A similarly axiomatic understanding of the priority of one scale of analysis over another can be found in the entrenched, conceptually exhausted clash between 'cultural studies' and 'political economy' (Garnham 1996; Grossberg 1996).

In media studies, the methodological issues raised by scale lead researchers to link specific questions of the geographical dimensions of media technologies, images and institutions to larger questions about processes of change (and explaining change), or patterns of meaning (and interpreting meaning). Ideally, the site-specific operations of media are in a dialogue with macro-level theories. When we try to analyse the way in which media have causal impacts, we cannot ignore the content of the representations which media as spatial process (Levels 2 and 3) put into circulation. But since those representations include representations of space (Level 1), we need at some point to try to integrate all three levels in order to grasp the scale on which media are involved in the changing dynamics of social life. We are unlikely, of course, to arrive at simple answers.

We can therefore define the next level on which MediaSpace can be analysed as:

Level 4: the study of the scale-effects, or complex entanglements of scale, which result from the operation of media in space

To illustrate what we mean by this, we can draw an analogy from Deirdre Boden and Roger Friedlander's (1994) account of 'the compulsion of proximity' in modern, complex, dispersed social worlds. In their schema, communication at a distance enables countless forms of co-ordination without people being physically present with each other. The result, they argue, is not to make co-presence less important for all purposes, since certain forms of co-presence (for example, with those at principal nodes of the stretched-out networks in which our lives are caught up) acquire particularly intense meaning. On the one hand, executives fly across the world to meet each other, fans gather from large distances to be in the presence of a celebrity. On the other hand, those who live far from the 'nodes' (Janelle 1991) of the global capitalist economy experience ever more intense forms of disconnection. Instead of space and place being simply reduced by modern forms of co-ordination at-a-distance, they are made more complex. In other words, we are caught in increasingly complex entanglements of scale, acting out through the patterns of our lives what Doreen Massey (1994: 149) memorably calls 'the power-geometry of time-space compression'.[6]

This suggests a final, fifth level of analysing MediaSpace. For, if the fourth level is concerned with the actual entanglements of scale engendered by mediated forms of social co-ordination, the fifth level is concerned with how we experience these entanglements, and, in short, live them:

Level 5: studying how media-caused entanglements of scale are variously experienced and understood in particular places

Many things may happen at this level. We may disguise entanglements of scale, pretending they do not exist; or we may integrate them so intensely into our everyday lives, that in certain respects they become taken-for-granted, or naturalized. We may give reasons for this or that organization of space;[7] or we may translate our awareness of them into more formal patterns of ritual or play or transgression. Clearly, Levels 4 and 5 closely overlap.

Elsewhere, we have both argued in more detail that whatever the (political, economic, rhetorical) forces that encourage us to think about media in more totalizing ways, it is more productive to think of media, as with all spatial processes,[8] as complex co-ordinations of presences and *absences* (see Couldry 2000; McCarthy 2001). The chapters in this book produce and build on flexible conceptual schemes that attend to both, and their interrelation. Part One of the book explores the theoretical implications of this point in various contexts.

Shaun Moores' chapter draws sympathetically, yet critically, on Joshua Meyrowitz's thesis that television leaves us with 'no sense of place' (Meyrowitz 1985). While accepting that Meyrowitz's question is a good one – how do media affect our sense of what interactional situation we are 'in'? – Moores insists that any simple narrative of the collapse of place falls far short of understanding how we actually use and live with media. Instead of the reduction of place and space, it is more plausible to think of what Scannell (1996) has called the 'doubling of place'. Media as we use them, Moores argues, multiply the situational interconnections that are possible between places, and this process is as relevant to the whole range of electronic media (from the telephone to the Internet) as to broadcasting. As in his previous work,[9] Moores is concerned to develop more subtle accounts of how the resulting spatial complexities are understood and negotiated by us as social agents. Moores illustrates the complexity of what is at stake through three contrasting vignettes. First, the interruptions to normal social and spatial routine effected by media events (Dayan and Katz 1992), such as the television coverage of the funeral of Princess Diana in 1997. Second, the non-eventful, indeed taken-for-granted, interweaving of online and offline situations in which Internet users routinely engage. Third, and finally, the competing definitions of 'situation' that arise when mobile phone users prioritize the multilocal private 'space' of their phone conversation over the unilocal 'public' space of the train carriage. The emerging picture is not, then, the collapse of place – indeed, our reasons for travelling to distant places to which media connect us have increased, not diminished – but instead the more subtle integration of our interactions with other places and agents into the flow of our everyday practice and experience.

Lisa Parks' chapter, 'Kinetic Screens', examines the question of mobility within a materialist analysis of the interface in the World Wide Web. Considering the interface as a kind of place and as a metaphoric vehicle, she complicates attempts to describe web navigation simply as electronic nomadism

or space–time annihilation. Parks analyses how a variety of web applications and websites place the user in multiple senses. Software that allows users to trace the virtual pathways through which their data travel makes the abstraction of the Internet into a set of technologically linked physical sites, allowing users to make sense of electronic communication in visual, concrete and geographically specific terms. The result is a sense of 'trajective movement' that resonates with the intricate social pathways mapped by geographers like Torsten Hägerstrand. Importantly, Parks points out that attempts to visualize web use in spatial, concrete terms are forms of *literacy* education in the new medium of cyberspace, encouraging a reading practice based on a broader view of the spatial language of the web which contrasts with the ideas about virtual mobility and language that are put into circulation through various translation programs. Although they promise a sense of 'linguistic liquidity', such programs also suggest that knowing more than one language is unnecessary in the electronic world of interfaced communication. A host of managerial imperatives are contained within this universalist dream, and Parks points out the various ways that difference is both affirmed and negated in the linguistic projection of a global culture. Her chapter concludes by looking at how activism around uneven development, technology-driven global capitalism and environmental disaster are aided through the web's promise of mobility. Websites devoted to tracking the movement of obsolete computers from the West to the Global South reveal the commodity status of the computer and its place in international circuits of exchange and exploitation. These interfaces provide users with a 'way of accessing the political economy of the web in visual and geographic terms as it brings the material relations between computers, bodies, movements and territories into bold relief'.

The materiality of media objects and the physicality of electronically mediated communication raise the question of how media theory looks from the perspective of contemporary *spatial* theory. From the viewpoint of a geographer and spatial theorist, Clive Barnett explores this question through the specific lens of competing assessments of modernity's media-enabled political spaces. Barnett's aim is to move beyond accounts of the spatiality of 'mediated public culture' that conceptualize space merely as *a gap* bridged by media. For all their different insights, the critiques by Dewey, Innis and Williams of the mediated spatiality of modern democracies all fall prey, Barnett argues, to this problem. Instead, he suggests that we need both a more subtle account of how new spaces of sociality are being opened up by media-in-use *and* to pay closer attention to the simultaneous production of new material infrastructures which underlie media developments. For this Barnett turns to David Harvey and Doreen Massey's accounts of the spatial landscapes of contemporary capitalism, and the spatiality of commodity exchange of which the flows of media commodities are just one part. The result, Barnett argues, drawing on his research into the politics of post-apartheid South Africa, is to force us to rethink the *scale* (or the set of interconnected scales) on which such central normative concepts as the

public sphere should be applied. In post-apartheid South Africa, for example, we cannot understand the scale and content of local and national politics without grasping the transnational networks on which many South African campaigners draw for resources and the context of their actions. The result is a more complex appreciation of the 'communicative spaces' that contemporary media 'produce'.

However, it would be a mistake, as we argued earlier, to believe that the pressing issues for the analysis of MediaSpace relate only to scale and how it is lived (Levels 2–5). At the same time it is necessary to rethink what is happening on Level 1, media's representations of space. Mimi White's chapter makes this point powerfully by inviting television theorists to rethink the standard ways they have understood (or rather, neglected) how television represents space and its own relation to space. White offers a radical re-reading of the traditional notion that television is above all a process of 'liveness'. She argues that this prioritization of *time* not only distorts many of the complexities and unevennesses of televisual 'live' time, but also neglects those many (probably more frequent) occasions when television offers itself to us primarily as connection *across space*. Indeed, even in those cases where others have thought the discourse of liveness predominant (for example, when CNN claimed to offer 'live' reporting from the Gulf War in 1991), what mattered more was space: the claim to link viewers through the reporter right to the place where (or near where!) the war was taking place. Less important than the temporal status of such televisual moments (quickly transmuted from 'live' present to 'history') is the claim of television to connect us to distant places. This feature of television's discourse is as important, White argues, in banal forms of television as in moments of crisis and media events. Shopping channels that show things to buy, or programmes which show the weather or traffic in other places, efface a detailed sense of temporal connection in favour of a spatial sense of being somewhere else. From this perspective, television needs to be reconnected to the history of what Tom Gunning (1986) calls the 'cinema of attractions', that is, the *trans-spatial* or *inter-spatial* spectacle which modern electronic media make possible.

These theoretically oriented articulations of the problems of mobility, temporality and modernity that find expression in various media forms raise the question of how the lived experience of space is organized through media. The chapters in Part Two take up this question in a range of locations and technological configurations. In 'The Marketable Neighborhood', anthropologist Arlene Dávila examines the competing efforts of artists, activists and marketers to brand the neighbourhood of East Harlem, New York, with images that seek to define the historically Latino identity of the neighbourhood in particular ways. As the forces of gentrification encroach upon East Harlem, murals depicting Latino culture, history and politics increasingly coexist alongside advertising images that harness commodity messages and projections of consumer identity to the idea of community and neighbourhood. What is at stake here is control

over commodification of the intangible and evanescent forms of everyday expe-rience – waiting, shopping, moving between work and leisure. The marketers' increasing interest in addressing Latino consumers takes into account commu-nity values in their visual interpellation of the gentrified 'other', aggressively privatizing outdoor space in East Harlem by cutting deals with property-owners and shopkeepers. Dávila shows how conflicts over who succeeds in defining the space of East Harlem are made visible in the ways that residents, shopkeepers, muralists and marketers approach outdoor surfaces. Her thoughtful and compli-cated approach to urban space as a location where commerce and community mingle, and where the contradictions within capitalist networks of commodifi-cation become visible, illustrates the value of an eye-level, visual account.

If our appreciation of media representations of specific spatial communities needs to be both more wide-ranging and more fine-grained, as Dávila argues, we must also, as the anthropologist Susan Ossman shows in her chapter, be prepared to think about the lived relations of MediaSpace in places that media research has not explored. Drawing on her pioneering ethnographies of beauty salons in France and North Africa,[10] Ossman demonstrates the complexities of how transnational circulations of images of the 'beautiful woman' flow through, yet are also renegotiated, in a diverse range of places. This diversity can be understood, she argues, through a three-way contrast. First, there are the 'proximate salons' where it is social links to the surrounding neighbour-hood that are prioritized as media images of fashionable styles are taken up in discussion by members of a small, face-to-face community. In a second type of 'elite salon', imported discourses about beauty are negotiated in a very different way through private discussions between the styling artist and the rich indi-vidual client. In the middle is a third type of 'fast salon', where the individual's relationship to wider discourses of beauty is mediated through branded repre-sentations (of the salon, its products and styles), which short-circuit detailed individual negotiation in favour of a pre-legitimated menu of style choices, captured in media images. The result is to increase our appreciation of the diverse ways in which an apparently homogeneous media flow (behind which lies a powerful global beauty products industry) is reworked into very different spatial 'situations' in particular locations, differentiated by the variables of class, wealth and ethnicity.

Andrew Ross examines the media dynamics of gentrification from a different perspective, tracing how the 'dot.com bubble' of the 1990s created crises in urban land, property and labour markets as the urban terrain of artists, and the artists themselves, as cultural labourers, were recruited by the new media economy. New 'no-collar' workers found themselves included in a monied movement to occupy and gentrify urban space, underwritten by venture capital-ists and large corporations. Ross situates this development within the broader history of gentrification struggles, focusing on the city of San Francisco and the varieties of bohemia that emerged and were discovered on its streets. In exam-ining how lease laws and rental customs aided the displacement of the

underclass in favour of artists who would eventually find themselves struggling for footing, Ross demonstrates that media industries are far from placeless. Rather, in his account of the rise of Silicon Alley in New York, he shows the value of metropolitan studies as a framework for approaching media organizations. The rise and fall of the media sector as a 'humane workplace' is interwoven with old stories of urbanism and new stories of reckless finance and speculation. The artists who served as worker-residents in the now downsized cyber-bohemias of American cities are not as mobile as the capital that produced them, nor as flexible. New media capitalism encourages the collapse of borders between work and play, between financial districts and so-called slums. As this chapter demonstrates, the utopian ideal of borderlessness and hybridized professional identity is a fantasy that media workers remaining in the no-collar sector can no longer afford.

Göran Bolin addresses another dimension of the managerial structuring of work and leisure in his architectural exploration of the role of television screens in Solna Centrum, a shopping mall outside Stockholm, Sweden. Drawing on long-term ethnographic and observational research, he examines the functions of television as a device for managing vision and bodies in space, situating the shopping mall television set within broader histories of consumer architecture. Bolin examines how cinematic ideals of spectatorship are thematically and structurally encoded in the space of the mall, and demonstrates how consumption creates continuities between televisual image regimes and earlier ones within the space of the mall. Bolin's detailed typography of screen functions and their implications for consumer culture studies opens out into a theoretical understanding of the general meaning of moving images and media use in consumer settings. Promoting consumption and policing theft, television screens are part of a broader system of administrative rationality, defined in Frankfurt School terms as capitalism's penetration of the life spheres of individuals. His account emphasizes the contingency and fragility of such systems, however, as '"instrumental space" … [which confronts] the social and expressive logic of the lifeworld, with its insistence on needs that lie outside of the economic rationality'.

John Caldwell's analysis of the explosion of spatial metaphors and structures in contemporary media production illustrates the value of combining close observational analysis with the study of media organizations. His analyses of the *mise en scène* within which production work takes shape as a professional culture examines how unspoken relations of power and economic status are encoded in work environments across a variety of industrial spheres. Caldwell argues that spatial languages and practices in the industry minimize the competitive nature of the business and its labour exploitation, constructing locations for work and professional networking that emphasize utopian ideals of collaboration, collectivity and creative autonomy. Discourses of new technology underwrite this promise by making the spatial mobility of such activities as editing and sound design seem effortless and endless. The ritual

spaces of trade conventions work to create a sense of community between antagonistic sectors of the industry, translating relations between customers into images of rational enterprise even as open conflict demonstrates the inadequacy of such images. Spatialized accounts of industrial relations allow media producers a sense of control over the rapidly changing and uncertain economic environment of media work, Caldwell argues, maintaining boundaries between ranks, sectors and firms as the changeable logic of the industry threatens to render such boundaries irrelevant. Caldwell's analysis illustrates how, at the same time as our appreciation of both the multilayeredness of MediaSpace relations and their local variety is deepening, we are confronted time and again by the need to grasp *new configurations* of MediaSpace. Technological and industrial changes continue to put media into and in between spaces from which they were previously absent. The chapters in Part Three each analyse a different aspect of this process.

Mark Andrejevic analyses the way in which private space is increasingly being transformed into potential 'public space' – indeed, '*publicity* space' – through the spread of webcam technology into private homes. Drawing on a detailed study of the discourses of the so-called webcam 'movement' – people who 'expose their lives part-time' for pleasure, status and/or financial gain – Andrejevic points to an unholy triangle of power relations that connects reality television, Bill Gates' vision of the 'fully documented life' (cf. Allon's chapter), and the emerging surveillance-based rationalization of the online economy. Audience analysis has no purchase on webcam broadcasting practice, which is more 'many-to-few' than 'one-to-many'. What matters instead are the new parameters of amateur media production which are, however, poorly understood through popular myths of an interactive, democratic 'revolution'. Instead, through a detailed discussion of the discourses of webcam users themselves, Andrejevic shows that what is at stake here is not the expansion of participation in mediated public space, but the incorporation of once private space ever more effectively into *workspace*: a 'digital enclosure' in which surveillance is not only the universal precondition, but increasingly rethought as an opportunity for self-promotion. Far from being a crude imposition of power, this new incarnation of MediaSpace is reflected in how the individual now understands and enacts her/himself as a responsible and willing agent in an ever-expanding space of spectacularized commodification.

James Hay and Jeremy Packer's chapter extends this dialectic between (private) leisure space and the (public) spaces of work and governmentality – between 'democratization' and surveillance – through a meticulous analysis of the long-standing history of incorporating 'media' into regimes of mobility. They connect the rhetorical landscape of the United States post-9/11 (the marketing of the Segway Human Transporter in winter 2001, extensive use of cars as carriers of political messages, and the current Bush administration's FreedomCAR project) with the history, prehistory and genealogy of the 'smart' car in modernity. Their subtle and historically rich analysis shows how the

notion of 'auto-mobility' has always spliced together discourses of mobility with those of the 'free' but governable self. The 'intelligence' of the media-enhanced automobile is inseparable from a whole communication infrastructure (linking radio, cameras and other media) of which the vehicle is only one relay-point. At the same time, amplifying the argument of Andrejevic, Hay and Packer show how this communication (and surveillance) infrastructure is translated into new forms of driving practice and drivers' self-understanding, particularly discourses of technologically enabled 'safety' and 'responsibility'. From this perspective, 'auto-mobility' (and its cognate 'mobile self') emerge as both central to modernity's strategies of centralization and distance-management and as requiring a rethinking of the very notion of 'mediation' (if conceived simply as the way media link autonomous points of the media process). Instead (cf. Barnett's chapter), Hay and Packer insist on the need for a more integrated account of how new (essentially mediated) technologies of the (mobile, responsible, regulable) self have emerged.

Fiona Allon's chapter, 'Smart Living in the Absolute Present', traces the production of a particular kind of mediated spatiality – the networked space of the 'smart house', as imagined particularly by Microsoft's Bill Gates – to consider the wider implications of mediation for the spatial organization of social life. Against the hyperbolic claims about the 'time-space compression' of the Information Age, she argues that a more nuanced and detailed spatial logic is actually at work: not the loss of annihilation of space or the end of a sense of place, but new kinds of places, spatialities and temporalities. The 'smart house' is presented as a mode of living characterized by simultaneous connectedness and separation, heightened privacy and public engagement, mobility and inertia. A significant locus of both production and consumption, the networked house is a strategic arena in the emerging system of media and information capitalism. Allon locates the history of the smart house within a *genealogy* of technologized domesticity in which media technologies enable a 'friction-free' subjectivity. The archetypal friction-free subject, Bill Gates, replaces the housewife of the post-war modern kitchen with the technocratic figure of the (masculine) knowledge class. This new domestic subject is the ideal consumer and producer of 'the promise of technologies to enable individual empowerment and connectivity, while simultaneously enhancing surveillance, isolation and control'.

Nitin Govil's chapter, 'Something Spatial in the Air', examines another tele-visualized space, one in which media functions include, but are not limited to, surveillance, isolation and control. Govil's original and wide-ranging analysis of the industrial, regulatory and textual practices that comprise the in-flight entertainment industry traces the role of media in the constitution of *Airspace*, both as a regulatory and geopolitical phenomenon and as an experiential arena marked by the confluence of consumer-oriented practices (branding), leisure and work itineraries, and the security and immigration initiatives of individual states. Govil notes that: 'Abstracted from the geopolitics of locality, but dependent

upon their reproduction, blunting at every moment the very corporeal tactility of movement, but embracing its representation in the globalized logic of consumer mobility, the in-flight experience articulates the drama of travel in a space that can hardly be considered "neutral".' In examining the production of the space of in-flight entertainment, Govil locates media systems for tracking flight and for alleviating boredom within modern histories of geography, histories in which aviation has played crucial political and epistemological roles. The paradoxes of air travel – its contradictory imbrication of stillness and extreme velocity, its intertwining of leisure and national security, its costs and its industrial uncertainties – find their way into the media texts and systems that are built into the chairs on which we sit.

Michael Bull's concluding chapter explores how two other mobile media technologies (the personal stereo and the mobile phone) have quickly and radically transformed our experience of the boundaries between private and public space in the contemporary city. Bull's account starts from Simmel's (1950) fundamental insights in the early twentieth century into individuals' strategies of privacy through stylistic self-differentiation. There is an essential continuity between Simmel's classic insights and the way that mobile media (which allow us to carry our preferred music and private conversations as we move) facilitate the individualization of the city's soundscape. Drawing on both his book-length study of the personal stereo[11] and more recent interviews with mobile phone users (including users of car phones: cf. Hay and Packer's chapter), Bull develops a rich account of how urban space is being aestheticized and privatized, extending Richard Sennett's (1994) earlier insights into the erosion, or at least transformation, of public space. As Bull makes clear, we cannot understand such processes through simple condemnation. For there is a dialectic between, on the one hand, the new spaces of personal intimacy which media enable in the midst of overcrowded public spaces and, on the other hand, the larger-scale impacts of such spatial diffraction on the character of public space as a whole. Your nonplace[12] is my intimate space, and vice versa. The wider consequences of this process of individualization are, Bull concludes, inherently ambiguous and unstable.

Collectively, the chapters in this volume argue that once we think media and space, communications theory and spatial theory, *together*, we cannot avoid addressing complex interrelations of scale and ambiguities of consequence. While the study of historical dynamics is essential (as many of the following chapters show), it must be articulated with close studies of the spatial specificities of culture and infrastructure. Further, while 'new media' are an essential part of what we research, no simple narrative of sudden transformation or imminent liberation can capture the historical depth and spatial reach of the 'mediascapes' (Appadurai 1990) which we inhabit and on which we ceaselessly reflect. On the contrary, as Henri Lefebvre, a theorist of both space and representation, noted, it is precisely the *ambiguities* of place, scale and culture onto which we must retain our hold.

Acknowledgement

Notes

1 See Robins (1997), for a thorough deconstruction.
2 Giddens (1984), p. 35.
3 For analysis of the tense relationship between Lefebvre and the Situationists (including Debord), see Highmore (2002), pp. 137–42.
4 Jackson (1985); Anderson and Gale (1992); Carter (1987); Daniels (1993); Duncan and Ley (1993); Kobayashi and Mackenzie (1989).
5 Higson (1994); Morley and Robins (1995).
6 See also Zukin (1992); Smith (1993).
7 On the importance of people's 'reason-giving accounts' of space and place, see Agnew (1987), p. 231.
8 Hagerstrand (1975), p. 7; Pred (1986), p. 25.
9 Moores (1996).
10 Ossman (2002).
11 Bull (2001).
12 Auge (1994).

Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, L. (1997) 'The Interpretation of Culture(s) after Television', *Representations* 59 (Summer): 109–34.

Abu-Lughod, L., Ginsburg, F. and Larkin, B. (eds) (2002) *Media Worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Agnew, J. (1987) *Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society*, Winchester, MA: Allen & Unwin.

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.

Anderson, K. and Gale, F. (eds) (1992) *Inventing Cultures: Studies in Cultural Geography*, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Appadurai, A. (1990) 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy', in M. Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture*, London: Sage.

Auge, M. (1994) *Nonplaces: Towards an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, London: Verso.

Bachelard, Gaston (1969) *The Poetics of Space*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Boden, D. and Molotch, H. (1994) 'The Compulsion of Proximity', in D. Boden and R. Friedland (eds), *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bruno, G. (1993) *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map: Cultural Theory and the City Films of Elvira Notari*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bull, M. (2000) *Sounding Out the City*, Oxford: Berg.

Burgess, J. and Gold, J. (eds) (1985) *Geography, the Media and Popular Culture*, Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Burke, P. (ed.) (2001) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Carey, J. (1989) *Culture as Communication*, Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Carter, P. (1987) *The Road to Botany Bay: An Essay in Spatial History*, London: Faber and Faber.

Couldry, N. (2000) *The Place of Media Power: Pilgrims and Witnesses of the Media Age*, London: Routledge.

Cresswell, T. (1996) *In Place/Out of Place*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Daniels, S. (1993) *Fields of Vision: Landscape, Imagery and National Identity in England and the United States*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dayan, D. and Katz, E. (1992) *Media Events*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Debord, G. (1983) *Society of the Spectacle*, Detroit: Black and Red.

Duncan, J. and Ley, D. (eds) (1993) *Place/Culture/Representation*, London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1986) 'Of Other Spaces', *Diacritics*, 16(1): 22–7.

Garnham, N. (1995) 'Political Economy and Cultural Studies: Reconciliation or Divorce?', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(1): 62–71.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grossberg, L. (1995) 'Cultural Studies vs. Political Economy: Is Anybody Else Bored with this Debate?', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12: 72–81.

Gunning, T. (1986) 'The Cinema of Attractions: Early Film, its Spectators and the Avant-Garde', *Wide Angle*, 8(3–4): 63–70.

Hägerstrand, T. (1975) 'Space, Time and Human Conditions', in A. Karlqvist, L. Lundqvist and F. Snickars (eds), *Dynamic Allocation of Urban Space*, Farnborough: Saxon House.

Harden, B. (2001) 'The Dirt in the New Machine', *New York Times*, 12 August, Section 6: 35.

Harvey, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Highmore, B. (2002) *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory: An Introduction*, London: Routledge.

Higson, A. (1994) *Waving the Flag: Constructing a National Cinema in Britain*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, P. (1985) *Maps of Meaning: An Introduction to Cultural Geography*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Jameson, F. (1984) 'Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', *New Left Review*, 146.

Janelle, D. (1991) 'Global Interdependence and its Consequences', in S. Brunn and T. Leinbach (eds), *Colllapsing Space and Time: Geographical Aspects of Communication and Information*, London: HarperCollins.

Kobayashi, A. and Mackenzie, S. (eds) (1989) *Remaking Human Geography*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Latour, B. (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Oxford : Blackwell.

Massey, D. (1984) *Space, Place and Gender*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mattelart, A. (1994) *The Invention of Communication*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McCarthy, A. (2001) *Ambient Television*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

—— (2002) 'Cyberculture or Material Culture? Computers and the Social Space of Work', in 'Screens', special issue of *Etnofoor* (Antropologisch-Sociologisch Centrum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands).

Meyrowitz, J. (1985) *No Sense of Place*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.