

7-1-2013

# Community Radio in Political Theory and Development Practice

Ericka Tucker

Marquette University, [ericka.tucker@marquette.edu](mailto:ericka.tucker@marquette.edu)

---

Published version. *Journal of Development and Communication Studies*, Vol. 2, Nos. 2/3 (July-December 2013): 392-420. [Permalink](#). © 2013 Development Media Consulting. Used with permission.

Ericka Tucker was affiliated with California Polytechnic University at the time of publication.

*Journal of Development and Communication Studies*,  
 Vol. 2. Nos. 2/3, July-December, 2013. ISSN (Online): 2305-7432. <http://www.devcomsjournalmm.org>.  
 © *Journal of Development and Communication Studies*, 2013.

---

## *Discussion paper*

# Community Radio in Political Theory and Development Practice

Ericka Tucker (PhD)

*Department of Philosophy, California Polytechnic, Pomona, California, USA. Email: [eltucker@csupomona.edu](mailto:eltucker@csupomona.edu)*

### **Abstract**

*While to political theorists in the United States ‘community radio’ may seem a quaint holdover of the democratization movements of the 1960s, community radio has been an important tool in development contexts for decades. In this paper I investigate how community radio is conceptualized within and outside of the development frame, as a solution to development problems, as part of development projects communication strategy, and as a tool for increasing democratic political participation in development projects. I want to show that community radio is an essential tool of democratization and democracy outside of the development frame. To do so, I will bring out the conceptual and structural dimensions of community radio through examples of existing community radios, both those which are independently created and those which have been created as development projects. These structural and conceptual elements provide community radio the potential to realize the goals of development practice while avoiding characteristic pitfalls. These ‘pitfalls’ of development are also pitfalls of democratization and democracy in existing democratic states, and include: depoliticization, limited participation, particularly of marginalized groups.*

**Key Words:** *Community media, community radio, empowerment, refugee radio, democracy, development, communicative democracy*

---

### **Introduction**

In political theory, community radio provides an alternative conception of democratic participation and deliberation, crucially providing a tool for increasing public deliberation and communication. In community radio stations citizens and non-citizens can develop their political understanding and work to bring their problems to the attention of the larger public. In this way, community radio provides a communicative democratic answer to the problems of both development and of contemporary democratic theory. In the first part of the paper I will set out the normative conception of ‘community radio’, that is, what it is supposed to be and what its characteristic aims and goals are. I will then set out how it has been employed in development projects, and how it has been

seen as a solution to what we might think of as first and second order development problems. We can think of first-order problems as the political, social and economic problems that development is supposed

to solve, e.g. poverty, women's empowerment. Second-order problems are those problems created by development actions and programs themselves, e.g. depoliticization. In the second part of the paper, I bring the discussion of community radio into the debates over the place of communication and deliberation in democratic practice. I propose, given the discussion of the first section, that community radio has characteristics that can solve problems of depoliticization, participation, and lack of public deliberation identified by democratic theorists as problems in developed democratic states.

## **Community Radio and Development**

### **Key Concepts in Community Radio**

*"[People] live in a community by virtue of the things they have in common; and communication is the way in which they possess things in common."* (Dewey, 1966, 4-5)

### **Defining Community**

What is 'community'? Is it a geographical entity, a cultural group, or a political entity? In the quotation above, philosopher John Dewey suggests that community is something that is created through communication. Through discussion with our neighbors, fellow citizens and those with similar interests, cultural values, or religious beliefs or shared challenges we create 'community'. In our current world, we tend to talk about large scale, global, international communications via the Internet or satellite television. Community radio is small. With the advent of low power community radio stations in the United States, which broadcast at between 10 and 100 watts, community radio is getting even smaller. As such, it may seem a medium irrelevant for large democracies and for projects seeking large-scale development. How can such a small way of communicating produce any sort of appreciable outcome in a world dominated by larger media, larger concerns, global communities?

The manner in which we communicate creates different sorts of communities. In one on one conversation we can achieve dialogue, whereas when we watch television or listen to the radio, in most cases, we are consumers of rehearsed information. Community radio stands in between, as a medium where we can achieve dialogue without face-to-face. By facilitating dialogue community radio, more than any other type of broadcast medium, creates community. I will argue that community radio stations, or community radios as they are often referred to, are still relevant, and are enormously powerful -- not in spite of, but because of their size -- for creating strong and democratic communities in both the developed and developing world. In this paper, I will engage in the somewhat bloodless task of outlining the concept of community radio -- how it is theorized, how it is used in practice, and how it can be used as a useful tool for avoiding characteristic problems of development projects based on its theoretical and structural norms. However, at base, community radio is a medium that allows for us to engage in conversation and dialogue that comes closest to an ideal of public deliberation, and that each of the conceptual elements that I will analyze work together to create this important tool for human development.

### **What is community radio?**

The 'community' in the case of community radio, generally refers to a geographical area over which the signal of that radio can be heard. Geography, however, is not sufficient to make a radio station a community radio. Community radio is properly realized when a radio station broadcasts for a diverse geographic community, understanding that a variety of different ethnic and social groups live in that geographical area, that there may be imbalances of power within that 'community' and that the airwaves on a community radio station should be opened to those members of communities who are not heard on other media. In South Africa, the Independent Broadcasting Authority, IBA, distributes community radio

licenses both to “geographical communities” and to “communities of interest,” (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001, 173) for instance stations like the Moutse Community Radio station, which was started by women, but which is run and owned by the community, women and men included. In the United States, Low Power FM (LPFM) and Local Community FM (LCFM) licenses can be obtained by community organizations, defined as non-profit corporations, which have been in operation for more than one year. (FCC, 2003) In some cases, community radio stations are started in order to create or develop a community out of what might be an unaffiliated settlement of people. Community radio stations often double as community centers, and since they publicize community events and act as a forum for public debate and community members’ self-expression, they help create, sustain, and define the community.

The normative political theories of community radio are remarkably consistent, from UNESCO manuals on how to set up community radio projects (Tabing, 2002) to community radio station mission statements in the US to the definitions of community radio given by community radio practitioners around the world. (AMARC, 2008; KBOO, 2013; WRFG, 2013; NFCB, 2013, Prometheus, 2013) In this section I will outline some of the main features of community radio stations, all of which form the core of the normative conception of community radio.

### **Access**

Community radio stations exist to provide access to the media, access to public information, and access to a public forum to groups and individuals who have not previously had such access. This principle is often conceptualized as providing an opportunity to hear the voices of the voiceless, for those who generally cannot be heard in public forums. By access, community radio stations generally mean that they provide time and space for all members of the community to speak, to discuss issues of social, political, and economic importance, and to hear voices of dissent or of marginalized peoples.

### **Participation**

Community radio stations are supposed to be maximally participatory. They are supposed to encourage participation of local citizens in all elements of their operation, including management, planning, education and production.

### **Training**

Maximal participation is made possible by the existence of extensive training, both in terms of content and radio production and engineering, and in the physical maintenance of the community radio equipment. Training is supposed to provide community members with the ability to operate their station, and to allow them to go on the air and express their views, interacting with other members of their community. Most community radio stations have a ‘community building’ or ‘educational’ mission, and many stations see their training programs as empowering and educating community members. (KBOO, 2013; KAOS, 2013, WRFG, 2013; NFCB, 2013)

### **Not-for profit**

Community radio stations are not-for-profit entities. They may receive funding from businesses, or they may have fundraisers and sales in order to increase their funding, but the proceeds from such commercial ventures must go to the station itself, or to any community foundation that runs the station to be used for projects related to the station and education. (NFCB, 2013; FCC, 2013; AMARC, 2013a).

### **Community owned**

The ideal of a community radio station is that it is started, operated, and owned by the community, which it serves. Very few community radio stations are totally community owned, and may receive financial support from IGOs, NGOs, local or national governments. One way that the community owns their community radio stations is through community run non-profits, community-elected boards of directors, and the creation of a membership-subscription service. (NFCB, 2013)

### **Volunteer run**

Community radio stations are non-for-profit, and they generally have a large staff of volunteers. Because community radio stations are supposed to be maximally participatory, it is important that they be run by a large number of people representing the community that they serve. Stations differ in the number of volunteers and the roles they play in the organization. Volunteers may maintain the station, build the station, produce and host programs, or manage the station. Having paid staff members does not usually conflict with being run by volunteers.

### **Local**

Most community radio stations have as one of their programming principles, a requirement to play local music, to support local artists and cultural producers, and to focus on local public affairs and news. Although this does not prevent international, regional or national coverage of news, and the playing of music from outside the community, the importance of supporting the local community, and of programming about and for the local community is a goal of community media. (KBOO, 2013, KAOS, 2013, WRFG, 2013; NFCB, 2013)

### **Community Radio vs. Public and Commercial Media**

Community Radio differs from public or national media and commercial media in the following ways: public media are often run by governments, and so are not independent, as community radio stations seek to be. Public media are understood as the voice of a benevolent authority, giving information to the public. Public media are also seen as professional media, with paid staff, professional reporters, while community media are normatively supposed to be run by the community members, which it serves. Commercial media are different from both public and community media in that they are run in order to make money. Public and community media may have commercials or underwriting from business sources in order to operate, but they are generally not profit-driven enterprises. In contrast to public and commercial media, community radio practitioners generally see community radio as 'grassroots' and 'participatory' as against the public service-commercial model, which Louie Tabing has called a model of "Profit, Propaganda, Power and Privilege." (Tabing, 2002)

### **Benefits of community radio**

I will set out what theorists and activists identify as the benefits of community radio, and then go into more detail about how this works in terms of particular projects.

- Community radio is a democratizing tool, encouraging participation and involvement in local affairs, political and social.
- Community radio provides access to the media to communities and groups that have previously not had such access.
- Community radio increases the political and social power, knowledge, and experience of those who participate in it.
- Community radio offers communities opportunity for self-expression.
- Community radio creates and sustains political community through its role as participatory public forum. Community radio stations are a forum for the discussion of community problems, and thus are spaces where community problems can be described, interpreted, analyzed, mobilized around and solved. Community radio creates a public, and a public sphere, where one had either withered or had never existed before. (Calhoun, 1991; Maiava, 2002; Myers, 1995; Lang, 2002; Kumar, 1994; Ross and Rolt, 2005; Prometheus, 2013)
- Community radio can inform listeners and participants and can focus on local issues. Community radio mobilizes listeners and participants. (Prometheus, 2013b)
- Community radio stations can serve as spaces for dissent and opposition.

- Community radio stations can empower marginalized groups, giving them skills in political communication, helping them develop support networks, and programming for their needs (linguistic, health, social, and cultural).
- Compared to other media, in terms of cost of setting up a station and the cost of a receiver, radio is inexpensive.
- Through training, community radio stations provide participants with valuable skills, in terms of self-expression and political communication, which can empower them. Training people to use and to fix basic radio equipment is a standard practice of community radio stations.

### **Diversity in the Community Radio Model**

Although there is a remarkable similarity in the way that community radio is theorized around the world, and in different particular projects, community radio stations themselves are quite diverse in the way that they operationalize what it is to be a community radio station. In this section, I will outline the ways in which community radio stations differ.

#### **Level of participation and community management**

Some stations are run entirely by volunteers, some have paid staff, and some have professional journalists. The range of management setups for community radio stations is rather large, from being run by member elected boards, community foundations, paid staff, all-volunteer staff and management, to being run by NGOs or by church groups or church central committees.

#### **Level of community ownership**

The goal of most community radio stations is to be self-supporting, although few reach that goal entirely. Other sources of funding include governments, non-governmental organizations, churches, international governmental organizations, and community funds. Many community radio stations receive their funding from listener-subscribers. Depending on the kind of funding source community radio stations are understood as more or less independent, and more or less community owned.

#### **Origins**

Some are started as development projects, some are started at the grassroots level by local political, social, or religious groups who see the need to get their message out, and some are started by community radio activists and supporters, seeing a need for community discussion and participation in political communication in their communities. (Gray, 2002)

#### **Programming**

Normatively, community radio programming should be created by and for the community that it serves. Although most community radio stations follow this model, there is always some mixed programming. Music, talk, public affairs, and public information are staples of community radio stations. Community radio stations created by development projects also tend to have a high-volume of programming content created by development organizations. This development content runs the gamut from dramatic soap-operas to public service announcements on topics including public health (AIDS, Malaria, etc.), anti-violence programs, gender issues, children's rights, notices of development projects in the area, etc. Community radio stations also support distance education projects, by broadcasting educational courses.

#### **Size**

There are a number of ways that the size of a community radio station could be measured: in terms of listenership, volunteer membership, subscriber base, range of signal, or in terms of the power of their station's signal. Although all of these variables vary widely among community radio stations, it is worthwhile to outline some of the differences. In the Philippines, the Community Audio Towers

project, consisting of towers built with large cones, a PA system, and a microphone, broadcast (although the technical term is narrowcast) to around 4,000 people in 6 communities, at a range of 3 miles. Whereas in Portland, Oregon, KBOO Community Radio broadcasts at 250,000 watts with multiple translators to a listenership of 70,000, with an annual budget of \$900,000.

### **Networks**

Community radio stations, which are almost universally small-scale operations, cannot by themselves shape international or even national regulations. So, how can the contributions of small community radios reach the larger public? How can small radio stations lobby for regulatory protections, the importance of non-profit community broadcasting licenses that are necessary for their survival and for the expansion of community radio as a form of political and development communication?

A variety of international organizations have taken up the task of not only starting and supporting community radio stations and participatory media organizations, but also creating networks of community radio stations. These networks then advocate for community radio broadcasters at international meetings and conferences where communications legislation and policy is developed. These organizations include: UNESCO's Communication Initiative, and AMARC (World Association of Community Broadcasters). Started in 1983, AMARC, "is an international non-governmental organization serving the community radio movement, with nearly 3000 members and associates in 106 countries. Its goal is to support and contribute to the development of community and participatory radio along the principals of solidarity and international cooperation" (AMARC, 2005). One network of radio stations, the Feminist International Radio Endeavour (FIRE), was born as a short-wave radio programme by and about women for all in 1991 but in 1998 became an international radio programmed broadcast in the short-wave radio station Radio For Peace International, located on the campus of the University for Peace in El Rodeo, Costa Rica (AMARC-WIN, 2013). Another important network is the Women's Radio Fund which works "to reinforce the socially inclusive ethos of the community radio sector, and promote access to the media by minority, women and disadvantaged groups" (AMARC, 2013b). The Women's Radio Fund started in 1987 and is supported by the Global Fund for Women. These organizations support the work particularly of community radio projects. These international NGOs, networks, and associations are involved in the important work of international lobbying for regulations which support community radio, and they are also instrumental in creating networks between community radio stations, allowing them to share information, programming content, funding sources, and best practices. Organizations like UNESCO also survey and sometimes fund research projects that document the impact of community radio and participatory media of various sorts.

Although the community radio ideal is locally based, maximally participatory community involvement, the current geopolitical configuration and the importance, especially for poor countries, of the international sphere and international decision-making, requires international networks as well as IGOs and international NGOs to support the work of these very small and local activities. Further, because of the close operation of many of these organizations with local community radio stations and projects, such networks promote the active engagement of small local projects with other projects as well as promote familiarity with the international scene, and introduce these local voices into the international debate over communications and development policy. Community radio networks allow for communication between small radio projects; thus, they allow local justice to contribute to global justice. (Held, 1995, 2003, 2005; Holden, 2000)

### **Community Radio and Marginalized Voices**

Local voices, marginalized populations, and their priorities, and problems need to be heard in developing and in developed countries. Community radio is a form of participatory media with the power to reach

and include these marginalized voices. In this section, I will describe the ways that community radio can reach and reach out to marginalized peoples, including groups that are rural, poor, illiterate, in a linguistic minority, refugees, and women. In this section, I will set out how community radios can serve as conduits for information and media for expression of the views of marginalized communities.

### **Rural dispersed populations**

Radio has the power to reach people in rural settings, people who may not meet or converge in any other place. Much of the population of Africa is rural, and this has been pointed out as a challenge for development projects. (Sachs, 2005) Radio already plays a significant role in political communication in many African countries. In “Media in ‘Globalizing’ Africa: what prospect for democratic communication?” Arthur-Martin Aginam writes, “Radio broadcasting remains the most popular form of mass communication in sub-Saharan Africa. This is particularly so, given that the vast majority (about 80 percent) of the population lives in rural areas. Also, given the relative cheapness of the medium, the low level of functional literacy (about 50 percent), and the prevalence of multilingual states combine to give radio its preeminent status among other forms of mass communication.” (Aginam, 2005, 125) Similarly, Sandip Das notes that in India, radio reaches 90 percent of India’s population. (Das, 2003) The debate over the relevance of community radio in such circumstances is thus quite different from that of states with urban populations. In these contexts, radio is the primary medium through which political and development communication is possible.

There are a number of development projects which use community radio to reach dispersed rural populations, including: Kutch Mahila Vikas Sangathan, a rural women’s radio project in Gujarat (Aginam, 2005, 96) Radio Huayacocotla, in Mexico, the ‘Voice of the Peasants’ operates on short-wave bands to reach peasants in rural areas. (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001; Vargas, 1995) Radio Chaguarurco in Ecuador helps empower dispersed rural peasants by airing peasant complaints about landlord and commercial exploitation. In the words of the listeners of the station:

“The authorities, institutions and merchants are more democratic. Before it was easy to abuse a campesino, charge higher prices, or steal material intended for public works in the communities. Now when there is an abuse, everybody hears about it on the radio. The radio serves as a sort of guardian in the democratic game. The radio has served to let us share experiences and problems. People from communities tell about their experiences on the radio, and this helps the others see the process — solutions to everyday problems are shared. The radio is contributing to the valorisation of our culture, our music, our way of speaking. These programmes are generating renewed pride in our own culture.” (Dagron, 2001, 157)

### **The Poor**

The poor rarely have a voice in commercial media. Although the poor are often discussed in terms of the ‘problem of the poor’, the voices of the poor, and the discussion of the problem of poverty in the words of the poor is rarely heard on such media. Community radio, with its focus on participation particularly of marginalized voices, invites the poor to contribute and to participate in community radio. In Portland, Oregon, at KBOO Community radio, a regular program on the homeless, ‘Hole in the Bucket’ encourages the participation of local homeless organizations and individuals, providing training on interviewing techniques and radio production to homeless and formerly homeless volunteers. In Atlanta, Georgia, WRFG Community Radio’s “Class Chronicles” program is run by a collective of poor people and community activists who tackle issues of interest to the poor and focus on the political aspects of poverty. Many community radio stations are created to serve the poor, specifically. The above mentioned rural community radio stations are examples of such stations. Radio Kwizera in Tanzania focuses on issues of poverty and powerlessness, Radio Mampita & Magneva in Madagascar focus on community building in poor areas, with a strong emphasis on the participation of poor people in the creation of programming.



(Gumucio-Dagron, 2001: 204) Radio Izcanal in El Salvador is an example of a radio station that is completely owned by its community, and was started by a small community of poor refugees in Nueva Granada. (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001: 119) In the Philippines, the Tambuli Radio Network calls itself the “voice of the small community for the development of the underprivileged.” (Gumucio-Gumucio-Dagron, 2001:207) Its twenty radio stations serve mainly impoverished and remote communities.

### **Illiterate populations and linguistic minorities**

In many areas of the world, there are many spoken languages, and large numbers of illiterate or semi-literate people who cannot absorb information through written media. In these places, there may not be the resources available for television, and so radio has an important role to play. As a low-cost aural medium, it can be a tool of political communication by and for illiterate peoples. Further, community radio stations can broadcast in more than one language, providing programming in the many spoken languages of the community, thus it can be used as a tool to serve linguistic minorities.

KBOO in Portland, Oregon, provides programming in English, Russian, Hindi, Spanish, Portuguese, and Arabic. Mexico’s Radio Margaritas, is part of a network of community radio stations in Mexico serving over 20 ethnic groups in total, and has a transmitter of 4000 and covering an area of 20,000 square kilometres. (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001:74.) Radio Margaritas alone reaches as many as nine different ethnic groups, programming is done in the languages of Tojolabal, Tzeltal, Tzotzil and Mam. Radio Zibonele in Khayelitsha, Cape Town, South Africa, trains illiterate volunteers on how to produce a radio broadcast and to use radio equipment, empowering them to get their voices heard in their communities. (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001: 139)

### **Refugees**

Refugees are populations which are concentrated in a particular area or camp, or resettlement area, but for which the term ‘community’ is often somewhat strangely applied, due to the ‘temporary’ nature of their grouping. In recent years, refugee camps have persisted well beyond any notion of temporary, and the need for community building and civil society structures within such camps has been identified. In 1995, Radio Kwizera was started in Ngara, Tanzania, a town bordering Burundi and Rwanda. (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001:163). The radio station was started by the Jesuit Refugee services, and is supported by a number of IGOs and NGOs, including: the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Red Cross, Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA), World Food Programme (WFP), Oxfam, Réseau pour le développement soutenable (REDESOS), UNICEF and Atlas. With a focus on peace building, refugee relocation, and reconciliation, the radio station provides 90 hours of programming each week to 250,000 refugees and the local population of Ngara and Kibondo, which is developed mostly by NGOs, but also includes the participation and training of refugees. Sagal Radio, a refugee-run community radio station in Clarkston, Georgia (USA), broadcasts in Afaan-Oromo, Karen, Somali, Amharic, Swahili, Bhutanese, and English for the large and diverse community of refugees resettled in Clarkston.

### **Women**

Women, as such, are rarely considered to make up a social group. Although their level of interaction and joint action with other women varies cross-culturally, in many places, women are often isolated from other women or are not socialized to cooperate with other women, or see themselves as members of a group based on gender. While women may not see themselves as members of a gender based group, many of the structures and problems of developing (and developed) nations affect women *qua* women. One of the insights in development literature in the last 20 years has been the fact that development and globalization differentially affect men and women. (Rives and Yousefi, 1997; Nussbaum, 1999 and 2000; Sen and Nussbaum, 1993; Sen, 2000; Chow, 2003; Goetz, 2003; Kabeer, 2005, UNFPA, 2005; OECD 2010; Khader, 2011; UN Women Watch, 2009; WHO 2008, 2009; CARE, 2012; Shiva, 2002, 2005; Sen, 2005;

Glenzer, 2005; Young, 1999, 2000, 2007; Mukherjee, 1995; Nussbaum and Glover, 1995; Martinez and Glenzer, 2005; Mason and Smith, 2003) Women without political power or organizational support from other women similarly affected by these projects/trends cannot effectively call for political redress for these issues by themselves. By organizing in groups similarly affected by a host of issues, women gain numerical power. (UNRISD 2000; Glenzer 2005; Harcourt, 2006; Peters and Wolper, 1995)

Section J of the *Beijing Platform for Action* (developed at the 1995 Beijing conference on women) attends to issues of women and the media. (Beijing Platform, 1995) The major concerns about women in the media expressed in the Beijing Platform for action are the following: 1. stereotyped portrayals of women in the media which are harmful to women and girls' self-image, 2. the lack of access of women to media sources, and the lack of women's participation at all levels of media production, direction, and ownership, 3. the opportunities that media offer women for empowerment. The Platform suggests that, "Women should be empowered by enhancing their skills, knowledge and access to information technology." (J.237) One of the strategic objectives should be to, "Increase the participation and access of women to expression and decision-making in and through the media and new technologies of communication"(J.1) Access to and participation in the media are seen as ways to increase women's social and political power. Although the strategies of the Platform are not limited to community or to participatory media, we can see how participatory media would enhance women's participation, and how having local community radio stations would increase both women's access and their participation in media.

Community radio provides another way to understand women's political participation. (AMARC-WIN, 2013) Increasing women's political participation is one of the Millennium Development Goals and has been interpreted as increasing women's representation in governing bodies, although this has been criticized as tokenism, and it has been challenged that the women in these governing bodies are not consulted or equal members. (U.N., 2005; Wood Wetzel, 2004; Parpart, 2002) Community radio stations started by women or women's groups within community radio stations can increase women's political participation in some of the following ways: increases participate in public debate, to set the terms in local/community media, creates opportunities for leadership and decision making, creates forums for discussions of women's political issues and for women's response to political decisions. Community radio participation develops individual self-expression, speaking, argument, and writing skills, all of which are necessary for political participation in a democracy. International networks of women's radio organizations bolsters the international access and power of small local radios and women's collectives in radio. Women can also learn a variety of skills including, technical skills/radio engineering, reading/writing/news editing and reading skills, radio show production techniques, and collective decision making strategies. (Jallov, 1996) Through distance education and other educational programs, which can reach women in their homes, community radio can aid in the promotion of women's education. According to the World Bank, "Another cost-effective means of reducing schedule conflicts for women is distance education, which generally revolves a combination of radio and correspondence techniques. Radio (or sometimes television) is used for transmitting classroom instruction in all subjects, and students supplement this with the use of textbooks and self-paced workbooks...Evidence suggests that self-study schools can reduce costs by at least 20 to 30 percent while opening access to girls." (World Bank, 1994, 44)

- There have been a number of grassroots and development projects focusing on increasing women's access and participation in community media. In "Women on the Air: community radio as a tool for feminist messages" Birgitte Jallov writes about the use of community radio by feminist groups in Europe in the 1960s and 70s. She identifies the following as key reasons that community radio was a tool for feminists, how it worked to empower women:

- Community radio increased the visibility of women and women's experiences on the airwaves, countering stereotypes of women in the media. (Jallov, 1996, 203)
- It gave women place on 'public stage' and an "avenue for involvement in public sphere." (Jallov, 1996, 203) Jallov writes, "Community radio has provided an ideal opportunity for women to get on the air and contribute women's voices and perspectives to public debate." (Jallov, 1996, 205)
- Participation in community radio allowed women to express themselves, empowering them to make changes in their lives: "Realizing women generally are not free to make crucial decisions in their lives, the women working in the stations attempt to organize the experiences of individual women into a collective unit of experience. By letting women speak for themselves, the individual experiences are transformed into a collective understanding of their life situation. Such understanding can contribute to further choice and action." (Jallov, 1996, 203)
- The training they received allowed them access to better opportunities: "The training activities are used to help young city girls formulate employment options and to consider other lifestyle alternatives than those offered by traditional role models." (Jallov, 1996, 205)

Moutse Community Radio in Moutse Mpumalanga Province, South Africa, was started in 1997 by a group of rural women who had been mobilizing around issues of water shortages, and other community needs. (Jallov, 1996, 205) Lahliwe Nkoana, one of the founders of the station reports, "Moutse Community Radio Station (MCRS) was born of many years of our community struggle. During those years, the rural, mostly female community campaigned for rights to water, education, health care, electricity, democracy and an end to polygamy which discriminated against rural wives." (Gumucio-Dagron, 2001: 172) Moutse focuses on women's empowerment and community development, and although women initially ran the station, they have opened up training, management, and production positions to men in the community. KBOO community radio in Portland Oregon has a women's caucus and two women's collectively run public affairs groups which produce 5 hours of programming on local, national, and international women's issues. Each collective is made up of different women from different ethnic, political, social and geographic backgrounds. Each collective produces programs of interest to different communities of women. The women's collectives also train their own members, engage in outreach to include young women and women from immigrant and minority groups, homeless women, and women on public assistance to participate in the creation of programs. KPFK Community Radio in Los Angeles has two women's collectives, which produce two programs: Feminist Magazine and the Radio Insurgencia Femenina.

### **Community Radio and Development – Participation and Information**

Participation and information are two crucial aspects of development projects. A lack of participation on the part of the beneficiaries of a development project can break the project. Also, when possible beneficiaries of a development project are not informed about the project, or are not informed about its benefits, the project may also fail. So, development projects must have a communications strategy. But why should this strategy include participatory communications like community radio? How does community involvement in the media enhance development objectives?

In development literature, community media is viewed as both an opportunity to foster political and social participation, and as a method of pushing information to populations who they are working with. This second model is the one on which the most empirical research has been done, and I would like

to look at the results of this work. How has it been used as a development strategy? Broadly, there are two main ways that community radio is seen as a tool for development:

- The participatory strategy is a tool to promote democratic participation. Participatory programs encourage local people to become involved and participate in their communities, thus becoming participants in a newly democratic culture, building skills and working with others in their community to define and solve local problems.
- The information-diffusion strategy, where community radio is used as a tool for communicating development related information, such as health, social policy, and environmental messages. Often these two are combined, with the second being the primary communications agenda for development organizations.

### **The Participatory Strategy**

While even mainstream development projects often understand the role of network building and community building which are outcomes of strategy 1, we could say that strategy 1, the participatory strategy, or the participatory potential of community radio is linked to a grassroots movement for 'participatory development' in which local communities are encouraged to join together to define their communities problems, rather than the top-down approach of traditional development projects.

While many development projects, and the entire development framework, has been criticized as 'depoliticizing', participatory community radio projects bring the politics back into development, by encouraging local interpretations and priorities in terms of social, economic, and other policies. The political nature of community radio stations, while seen as a benefit to the anti- or participatory development theorists, can be a problem for local stations, like that of the Bolivian miner's radio stations, whose last broadcasts were of gunshots as the military took over their stations by force in 1980. What is the relation between politics and community radio participation? Democratization is the link. When local populations work together and take power upon themselves to interpret their reality, to identify and to solve their own problems, they take the power that was wielded by others onto themselves, creating a new structure of power. The radio station itself, as the site of this knowledge production, itself becomes a contested site for power.

### **The Information-diffusion strategy**

The information diffusion strategy uses community and other media to broadcast content that is developed by NGOs or development organizations on health, education, and social issues. The information-diffusion strategy has probably been the most popular use of community and other forms of media used by development projects. Most of the empirical research on community radio and development measures the impact of particular information-diffusion strategies. (Important exceptions include Spitulnik Vidali, 1996 and 2002) This literature suggests that using community radio as a communication strategy is essential to any successful project. (Feek, 2005)

### **Community Radio and Development Problems**

Community radio has been used as a development tool, and many theorists and practitioners of community radio believe that community radio and participatory media in general have the potential to 'solve' some of the problems with traditional development. (Haugerud, A. and M. Edelman, 2005; Okome, 2003; Munck, 2000; Mohanty, 2003; Mills and Lewis, 2003; Fisher and Ponniah, 2003) In this section I will look at critiques of development, outline the problems that they identify with development, and show how community radio as an element of development can solve these problems.

### Problems with Development

One of the dangers of any development project is depoliticization. In *The Anti-Politics Machine* James Ferguson argues that part of the ‘anti-politics’ development paradigm involves a strategic misunderstanding of local context and the political situation that sustains inequality and poverty, and thus that it undermines its goals of ‘eliminating poverty’ by inadequate attention to the problems which cause poverty. Ferguson’s classic statement on development as an ‘anti-politics machine’ is the following: The development paradigm creates its own discourse which constructs an area as a particular kind of object of knowledge. Ferguson writes that development:

“creates a structure of knowledge around that object. Interventions are then organized on the basis of this structure of knowledge which, while ‘failing’ on their own terms, nonetheless have regular effects, which include the expansion and retrenchment of bureaucratic state power, side by side with the projection of a representation of economic and social life which denies ‘politics’ and, to the extent that it is successful, suspends its effects. The short answer to the question of what the ‘development’ apparatus in Lesotho does, then, is found in the book’s titles: it is an ‘anti-politics’ machine,’ depoliticizing everything it touches, everywhere whisking political realities out of sight, all the while performing, almost unnoticed, its own pre-eminently political operation of expanding bureaucratic state power.” (Ferguson, 1990, xv)

In Ferguson’s view, focus should shift from development to empowerment. “Since it is powerlessness that ultimately underlies the surface conditions of poverty, ill health, and hunger, the larger goal ought to be empowerment.” (Ferguson, 1990, 279-280) A shift to empowerment language does not yet provide an answer to the most important questions, or make ‘empowerment’ a solution for ‘development’. “The question of the subject, the actor who is to do the ‘doing’ still remains completely unspecified.” (Ferguson, 1990, 280) I take this to be a concern with how people gain political power, sustainable political power. On Ferguson’s view, people’s lives improve and they gain the things that they need from struggle. Women and women’s movements have gained power when they joined together, organizing for a common cause or for mutual empowerment, organizing and becoming parts of groups of women which aim for women’s empowerment are traditionally powerful tools for empowerment. Ferguson cautions suspicion when approaching larger international bodies as fostering real political change. “Organizations like the World Bank, USAID, and the Government of Lesotho are not really the sort of social actors that are very likely to advance the empowerment of the exploited poor.” (Ferguson, 1990, 285) There is no reason why the international community, or the power elite in poor countries should really be working for the improvement of poor peoples lives. Thus, development efforts have less to do with the needs of the poor than they do about furthering objectives like social control, or expanding markets, extending spheres of influence. Such interventions assume an all-powerful benevolent development agency, but in reality the interventions are always “interested and partial.” (Ferguson, 1990, 280) For Ferguson, this is not necessarily the outcome of a grand conspiracy, but rather the result of a process that attempts to depoliticize what is an inherently political matter – why some people have more power than others. Poverty is not a technical problem; it cannot be solved through technical means.

Like Ferguson (although outside of the development paradigm) Jürgen Habermas is also concerned with the depoliticization of political culture by bureaucracy. For Habermas, a key element of political empowerment is the ability to define and interpret one’s environment and political situation. (Honneth and Joas, 1991; Dews, 1992) The power to define is the power to identify problems and work towards their solution. Habermas is concerned with what he calls ‘the administered society’, the bureaucratic apparatus that sees the social world in terms of problems to be solved, by experts who are able to define both the problems and the solutions.

### **Community Radio as a Solution to these Development Problems**

Community radio offers promising solutions to the following set of problems: 1. Community radio provides a means of political participation for beneficiaries of development projects, 2. Community radio functions as a development tool that does not encourage depoliticization, 3. Community radios can intervene into the international globalization of media resources that will become a huge problem for developing countries in the coming years. Depoliticization is a negative consequence of development. Unlike depoliticizing development projects, community radio aims to support and create a politicized public, which means a public in Habermas' sense – a group of people engaging in the process of communicative reason, active in public debate, creates a 'public', which can make a political process. (Habermas, 1990) Unlike the development anti-politics machine, community radio at its best is a politics machine, a counter-hegemonic knowledge machine. Community radio provides a solution to the problem of how to operationalize empowerment that does not undermine the political nature of 'empowerment'. Citizen participation and community identification of problems, rather than bureaucratic problem identification and management are keystones of the community radio model. Community radio is an instrument for constructing and uncovering community knowledge about the problems of different groups in that community. Community radio is communicative action in process. It facilitates the making and dispersion of local knowledge through community participation and creation of programs. Further, it can be a tool for organizing and informing groups.

Community radio stations are tools for the kind of development that seeks to empower local people to define and to solve their own problems, to build their community's capacities from within. Empowerment radiates outward from community radio stations. Members join, become aware of other projects in their community, build connections with others, leave the radio station for these other projects, encourage others to try their hand at broadcasting. Also, power builds upon power in the realm of democratic participatory communication. As individuals unused to having power learn to use the power at their disposal, the technology as well as the power to represent and analyze their situations, they become more powerful, and less likely to accept interpretations or policies which do not agree with their understanding of their historical, social, and political moment.

### **International Normative Political Theorizing about Community Radio**

Currently, in a variety of international legislative and regulatory agencies, including ITU, WTO, and organizations of the UN like UNESCO, the future of international communications policy is being shaped. There exists a large body of international theorizing on the importance of participatory media, and the need to encourage legislation and regulation on a national and international level to encourage such media organizations. It is worth highlighting some of these statements of the importance of community broadcasting. Although theorists of community radio argue that thinking on a micro level can solve more problems than macro-level thinking about development, they are, for the most part, also well aware, that in the current geo-political situation, it is no longer possible to focus solely on the local, or on local media in particular. Macro-level thinking which affects the local is already happening, whether one would like to take part or not, and so any organization focused on small scale communications projects must be aware of the discussions about media and communications on a national and international level. Broadcast media are subject to national and international regulation, because of the public nature of the airwaves, and the need for regulation to determine how the spectrum is divided. Further, the existence of powerful large transnational media corporations has led to the development of international regulations that favor such corporations over local and national media. These developments on the international scene have led to a great deal of normative political theorizing about the role of media in the global world, how it should be regulated, etc.

There has been much theorizing about the power of community media on the international level, as a tool to fight against the hegemony of global commercial media. Several international normative political tools, the African Charter on Broadcasting, the Windhoek declaration, and the MacBride reports, as well as country reports, like India's Joshi report, have argued the importance of local, community, participatory media in creating a just global public sphere. (Joshi, 2002; Warnock, 2007) In this section of the paper I would like to review some of this literature, particularly those statements which include some place for community media. In addition to global threats to community radios around the world, there is also something like a worldwide movement to increase democratic participation through the use of community radio, and no discussion of community radio would be complete without a discussion of this international aspect. Two documents in particular -- the African Charter on Broadcasting and the MacBride Commission Report, "Many Voices, One World" -- outline directions that national and international media should follow in reforming communications policies.

The African Charter on Broadcasting, "Final Report: Ten Years On: Assessment, Challenges, and Prospects." (3-5 May 2001 Windhoek) presents arguments for the importance of freedom of expression, diversity, the need for 3 tiered media, public service, commercial and community, increasing the level of participation in decision making and finally, an expansion of non-profit community broadcasting, "Community broadcasting is broadcasting which is for, by and about the community, whose ownership and management is representative of the community, which pursues a social development agenda, and which is non-profit." (UNESCO, 1991)

In "Many Voices, One World", the MacBride commission on the future of communications policy suggested the following changes to international media structure and policy:

1. They called for a democratization of the media:

"Our conclusions are founded on the firm conviction that communication is a basic individual right, as well as a collective one required by all communities and nations. Freedom of information -- and, more specifically the right to seek, receive and impart information -- is a fundamental human right; indeed, a prerequisite for many others. The inherent nature of communication means that its fullest possible exercise and potential depend on the surrounding political, social and economic conditions, the most vital of these being democracy within countries and equal, democratic relations between them. It is in this context that the democratization of communication at national and international levels, as well as the larger role of communication in democratizing society, acquires utmost importance."

2. They called for the recognition of a right to communicate:

"Communication needs in a democratic society should be met by the extension of specific rights such as the right to be informed, the right to inform, the right to privacy, the right to participate in public communication -- all elements of a new concept the right to communicate. In developing what might be called a new era of social rights, we suggest all the implications of the right to communicate be further explored."

3. They identified the importance of communication, not only as a system of political and public information, but for development and education:

"Communication is not only a system of public information, but also an integral part of education and development."

4. They identified marginalized groups and emphasized that communications policy should be made with the needs of these groups in mind:

"Attention should be paid to the communication needs of women. They should be assured adequate access to communication means and that images of them and of their activities are not distorted by the media or in advertising...The concerns of children and youth, national, ethnic, religious, linguistic minorities, people living in remote areas and the aged

and handicapped also deserve particular consideration. They constitute large and sensitive segments of society and have special communication needs.”

5. They called for an increase in local, participatory media projects:

“Utilization of local radio, low-cost small format television and video systems and other appropriate technologies would facilitate production of programs relevant to community development efforts, stimulate participation and provide opportunity for diversified cultural expression.”

The MacBride report, and the NWICO conferences that promulgated this report were rejected by the US and Britain, which shortly thereafter left UNESCO. (Hackett and McChesney, 2005; Hamelink, 2003) The U.S. in particular, home to a strong commercial media and proponent worldwide of this media, rejected the requirement to support community or participatory media, which would compete with US media corporations. After the US and Britain rejected the NWICO statements, the international climate for media democratization cooled, with governments lacking the “political will”<sup>5</sup> to take on these challenges. The current debates on international communications policy are less focused on democratization of the media, and more focused on technological issues. As Anriette Esterhuysen writes on the Declaration and the Platform for Action developed at the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) convened by the International Telecommunications Union (ITU):

“Often [the WSIS] Declaration and Action Plan contradict one another: the principles expressed in the Declaration are not always carried through to the proposals in the Action Plan. As Sally Burch points out, “the first article of the Declaration affirms ‘our common desire and commitment to build a people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society, where everyone can create, access, utilize and share information and knowledge, enabling individuals, communities and people to achieve their full potential in promoting their sustainable development and improving their quality of life...’. But in its first article, the Plan of Action limits this vision to ‘promoting the use of ICT- based products, networks, services and applications’ to achieve development goals.” (O Siochru, 2005, 310)

This deflation of the goals of democratization of the media in the international community is palpable, and the general feeling of community media groups after the WSIS meeting was one of marginalization, disappointment.<sup>6</sup> There seems to be a disconnect between groups which believe democratization to require no participatory structures in governance or in media, for whom indirect participation, like voting, is paradigmatic of citizen participation, versus groups who are active in promoting participatory media like community radio who argue that development of public information, and the participation of local communities in creating an understanding of their problems and developing solutions from their own analysis of their problems.

These worries go to the heart of questions about the role of democracy in the world, and the role of media in a democracy. (Shapiro and Macedo, 2000; Young, 2000, 2007; Pateman, 1970; Chatterjee 2008) Community radio theorists have argued that there can be no democracy without participation, and that participation must happen at all levels of society.(AMARC, 2008) It may appear that in the current international order, that participation and democracy have been separated, and further that the role of media in a democracy is understood in such a way that ‘participation’ is less important than the kinds of technologies used for development goals. I have surveyed arguments so far which suggest that development goals cannot be reached without participation, and participation cannot be achieved without

---

<sup>5</sup> Latin American & Caribbean Women's Open Letter to WSIS on Gender Equality & The Information Society Signed by the participants in the Seminar, “Women Subverting the Exclusive Information Orders.” (San José, Costa Rica, 28 September 2005)



a communications strategy. In the next section of the paper, I will turn to the question of community radio in the larger theoretical issues of the role of media in a democracy.

### **Community Radio and Democracy**

Community radio addresses two main concerns of political theory, and democracy theory: the role of participation, and the role of information. Political communication is necessary for modern democracy, where the community under consideration is larger than a village. However, what kind of communications system democracy requires depends on how one understands 'democracy'. The community radio movement comes out of theories of democracy for which participation is a key element. Without participation of local people in the political or social process, no just, peaceful, political process can take place. There are competing theories of democracy, however, and it is important to understand how different development views, and different political scientific theories of democracy suggest differential solutions.

Within the community radio literature, there are at least two recognizable theories of democracy, transformative and radical. (Barber, 1994; Sousa Santos, 2005; Young, 2000; Fishkin, 1991; Ghai, 2001; Mouffe, 1992; Benhabib, 1996; Benhabib, Shapiro and Petranovic, 2007; Hendley 1993) Radical democracy theorists argue that the key element of a democracy is participation by a large percentage of the population, particularly those marginalized populations whose voices might not be represented in a majoritarian or elite system. Transformative democratic theorists agree with the radical democratic theorists that participation is important, but they argue that this participation must take place in all socially important institutions, and not just in political processes. However, for a theory of democracy for which large-scale participation is not a key element, participatory or local media will not be a priority.

Community radio activists and theorists argue that participation is a key element of democracy. In order to have a participatory democracy, a particular kind of media is necessary, namely one that includes participatory citizen and community controlled media. In the United States context, community radio, and the radical democracy theory that supports it, exists within a larger political context where liberal representative democracy is powerful. In the United States, which has a history of primarily commercial media, community radio stations and participatory media in general, are seen as external to systems of power and media, they have an outsider status, and see themselves as serving "underserved" populations, providing a "voice for the voiceless." With these competing norms of democracy, one that encourages participation, and one that encourages stability, we must fight for a participatory model.

### **The Role of Media in a Democracy**

There is not just one, but many roles that media must play in a democracy, including: problem construction/identification for informed decision making, identification of the range of solutions for those problems, acting as a forum for public debate, and as outlet for groups to get their concerns heard, as a force against government corruption, exposing abuses of power, and identifying community needs, so that these can be addressed by decision makers. Media reformers in the U.S. and worldwide argue that some systems favor some groups, and particularly that the current system of laws and regulations of media in the U.S. serve elite corporate interests more than the interests of the common citizen, and further, that our current commercially dominated media depoliticize citizens, make them into passive, apathetic consumers rather than active participants in the democratic process.

In *The Virtuous Circle*, Pippa Norris investigates charges that problems in the media have contributed to declines in democratic participation in Western democratic countries. She argues that rather than being the cause of declines in participation, media outlets can contribute to increasing mobilization and participation of those who are already politically interested, and seem to have no negative effects on those who are already politically engaged. Rather than focusing on the media as the cause of problems of

democratic participation, she suggests that there are other ‘ills of the body politic’ that are more pressing and more direct causes of apathy and de-politicization.

Norris argues that the ‘media malaise’ thesis forwarded by radical and deliberative democratic theorists, which suggests that mass media (commercial media) discourage political participation, is unsupported by empirical evidence. Rather, Norris argues, the empirical evidence on the relation between political participation and communication shows that those who are already politically active or participating in the political process benefit from the current system of commercial media, and those who are not politically active do not. A virtuous circle is formed between those who are politically active already and the news media which sustains their participation, leaving those who are uninterested in politics to pursue their own interests, occasionally checking the excesses of those in power through indirect participation, voting.

One needs a theory of democracy, however, to be able to read this evidence as positive with respect to democracy, and the theory of democracy that Norris uses is that of Joseph Schumpeter. For a Schumpeterian theory of democracy, participation on a large scale is not only unnecessary, it is discouraged. (Schumpeter, 2008) Ruling should be left to the elites, and the masses should be kept out of governing and busy keeping the economy growing, and attending to their personal interests. Large-scale democracies are technocratic problems to be solved by experts, in Schumpeter’s view. Elections are the main form of participation, and serve to check any gross excesses by the elite. Different conceptions of democracy yield different versions of what kind of press is important. In Schumpeter’s democracy, framed as it is as a bulwark against socialism, only those involved in governing and with an economic stake in the political process need to be informed. Schumpeter, not Chomsky, was the originator of ‘manufacturing consent’ as the purpose of a functioning media system. A particular kind of political communication apparatus is necessary to sustain this kind of political system. This kind of political communications apparatus’s aim would not be to encourage popular participation, but rather through propaganda and persuasion to ensure stability, to check governmental excesses, and to “manufacture consent.” (Herman and Chomsky, 1998)

Norris writes that while there has been widespread fear that newspaper subscriptions would decline, this has not been the case. In the U.S. context this has been the case, and newspaper circulations have been declining in absolute numbers since 1990, according to *State of the News Media 2004* Report, “Circulation began dropping at the rate of 1 percent every year from 1990 to 2002. By 2002, weekday circulation of U.S. newspapers had dropped 11 percent in 12 years.”<sup>7</sup> Norris identifies the following “contemporary challenges to democracy” (Norris, 2000, 20) as real ills in the body politic which she argues we need to understand in order to correctly diagnose the problem of civic disengagement: “In Russia, widespread corruption and political instability threaten to undermine electoral gains, In America, the sea of special interest money in politics and the unending campaigns, combined with legislative do-nothingism, fail to serve the public well. In the European Union the lack of transparency and accountability in the policy-making process and the increasing power and scope of EU institutions are leading to a worrying disconnect from the European public. Ethnic conflict, violence, and poverty continue to plague many emerging democracies in Africa. Worldwide, women’s voices continue to be underrepresented in the decision-making process.” (Norris, 2000.) Norris is not alone in this finding. (Kerr et al., 2004; Malhotra et al., 2002; Narayan, 1997; Mohanty, 2003; Ravi et al., 2004; World Bank, 1994) Norris argues that if we stopped blaming the news media and turned our attention to the problems themselves, we would be better off. Whose job is it to direct our attention to the problems themselves? Where ‘our attention’ is not just the attention of academics, but of the citizenry at large? Answer: the news media’s. This is the role of the news media. Norris’ list of problems suggests that while media or news

<sup>7</sup> *State of the News Media 2004*: An annual report on American Journalism  
[http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/narrative\\_newspapers\\_audience.asp?cat=3&media=2](http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/narrative_newspapers_audience.asp?cat=3&media=2)

coverage are not the sole causes of these problems, they could support the causes, and a restructuring of media may be part of a solution to these real problems.

Media reform activists in the US have argued that the problem with the US media is multiple: it is commercialized and sensational, there is little or no respect for the public interest, shows are of poor quality, have terrible images of women and minorities, encourage fear, are biased, fail to report long-term issues. (McChesney and Nichols, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c; McChesney, 1999) Although many of these are problems of content, there are also structural problems. Structural issues include ways that access to the media is handled by government policy that created the media, which affects this content, and affects the ability of different groups to access the media. Media reformers have solutions to the 'media problem' that they call structural reform. This means, that they want to change institutions, structures, laws, regulations to change the way the media operates. This is sometimes put in terms of 'regulation' vs. 'deregulation'. Then there are those who like regulation, and those who like deregulation. Any media system we have would have some sort of regulation.

Commercial media have commercial objectives. In the U.S. context this is particularly important as U.S. media has been primarily commercial since the beginning of broadcast regulation, and throughout its history, U.S. regulations have been changed to allow more public and non-commercial media in order to temper the influence of commercial news media, with its focus on profit rather than the public interest. The structural transformation of the media in the U.S. following the Telecommunications Act of 1996 may not have been as well publicized and available to Norris in 2000 as they are today. Large scale corporate consolidation of the news media, following the lifting of ownership caps in radio, television, and radio, have had effects on the range of voices and points of view available. Meanwhile, the proliferation in the number of media outlets available and the extension of the airwaves in the development of the digital spectrum have eroded the arguments that supported U.S. regulation requiring fairness and requiring that equal time be given to events and issues of societal importance (Fairness Doctrine, Equal Time Provision). Similarly, the argument that governments should financially support public or community media has been undermined by the argument that there are plenty of sources of information available to consumers, and that it is unfair that the government support some over others. After the Telecommunications Act of 1996 women's participation in the media has dropped, and minority ownership of radio and television stations has plummeted. (Arnold, 2007; Braunstein, 2000; Stavros, 2003; Turner, 2007; Turner and Cooper 2006; Wexler, 2005). In the wake of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, structural changes in media ownership rules dramatically affected minority and women-owned stations in the United States. Structural changes created by this piece of legislation negatively affected the possibility for strong small radios like community radios, but its wide-ranging effects show the power such regulations can have. By exempting the media from its responsibilities here, Norris seems to remove the news media from the decision making process; however, in mass democracy, the news media has a huge role in framing the decisions to be made, in identifying social and political problems.

The media may not cause these problems, but they are related to the problems and could counteract these problems if they were of a different kind. A strong and critical press could counter corruption in Russia. This is acknowledged by corrupt leaders who have sought to silence the press in Russia. The problems of 'legislative do-nothingism' could also be tempered with a strong, critical, and independent press. The 'seas of public interest money' flow from the same corporations which either owns the news media, or supports news media with substantial advertising revenue. Thus, there is a lack of will on the part of news organizations to consistently critique structural and long-range problems of governance. As the conventional critique suggests, because news media focus on events rather than processes, campaigns rather than regular governance issues, news media cannot draw attention to these 'real' problems that Norris identifies. Norris's book is a testament to the fact that our expectations of the role of media in democracy have diminished. The early founders of the United States had higher expectations and loftier goals for the news media, seeing it as a foundational element of the democratic

process. However, just as Norris suggests, there have been counterarguments to this argument that media is required for democracy. (Norris, 2002; Schumpeter, 2008; Lippmann, 1993, Dryzek, 2002; Fishkin, 1995).

The view of political communication that I am presenting, with the aim of encouraging a participatory, citizen controlled community media, and the view of democracy which requires this kind of political participation is very different from a Schumpeterian theory. Thus, the ‘virtuous circle’ that Norris lauds where elites inform one another and keep the masses in ignorance is not a positive result on my theory of the importance of participation and level of information in political communication. Habermas presents a theory of democracy and communication that is important both for emerging democracies and historical democracies, since the issue of pluralism and competing values exists for both, at the national and at the international level. At the national level, almost every nation on earth includes populations with varying ethnic backgrounds, political and social ties, either due to immigration, refugees, post-colonial national boundaries which were in some cases drawn to include multiple ethnic groups. This diversity has produced violence but also has created circumstances that require political solutions that acknowledge the reality of this diversity. At the international level, where representatives from different states must work together to develop international law and policy, diversity of opinion, historical background are simply operating conditions which cannot be overlooked. For Habermas, political communication must play a role in mediating this diversity of modern society.

Traditional societies could rely on a normative consensus that regulated behavior, and institutions that compelled conformity, but the pluralism of modern complex society offers a range of views and frameworks that multiply opportunities for dissent. Because of the complexity of the discourses making up modern society, we need a normative standard from which to evaluate them, to make decisions, to come to consensus, to coordinate action, and to effect social integration in a non-coercive way. Social theorists have understood societies as wholes made up of parts, as organizations or associations to which individuals belong, but for Habermas, such theories of societies are untenable. In place of them he understands societies, or the ‘lifeworld’, to be “constituted from a network of communicative actions that branch out through social space and historical time” which live off of “cultural traditions” “legitimate orders” and “socialized individuals.” (Habermas, 1998, 80) Thus, societies cannot be understood in terms of individuals exclusively, as individuals are just one of the types of things which make up the social world. Of its parts, none is ontologically prior, as Habermas writes, “culture, society, and personality mutually presuppose one another.” (Habermas, 1998, 80) For Habermas, modern societies are integrated socially, through shared norms, values, etc., administrative powers and economic systems. Language is used for multiple purposes, transmitting information, creative uses, and, that which is most important for Habermas, coordinating action. Habermas writes that, “Language itself supplies the primary source of social integration.” (Habermas, 1998, 17) For Habermas, democracy is the paradigmatic form of legitimate political will formation, and requires public discourse for its legitimacy.

Although an extensive exegesis and interpretation of Habermas theories of the public sphere, the role of political communication in democracies remains beyond the scope of my investigation, I want to at least flag the importance of Habermas’s suggestive work for the philosophical project of talking about the political communication needs of democracies, and the idea of local community media within national and international networks as democratic spaces, both training grounds for political participation and important forums for public discourse. For Habermas, democracy is the paradigmatic form of legitimate political will formation, and requires public discourse for its legitimacy. What are the political communication needs of democracies? Can local community media within national and international networks function as democratic spaces, both training grounds for political participation and important forums for public discourse? This appears to be a question about individual will to communicate their interest, but also has important suggestions for communications policy, for example, a requirement to allow public debate, and to structure the terms of public debate in such a way that all interests (or the

interests of all) are represented. This suggests that there must be avenues, public media, open to the public not just publicly financed through which individuals could get their views heard. In other words, communicative freedom of citizens seems different than freedom of speech, and seems to suggest something along the lines of a 'right to communicate'.

The developing world and the developed world have communication needs and problems. In the developed world, apathy, sensational journalism, lack of participation in government questions the future of democratic participation. In the developing world, incursions from the global media threaten new democracies abilities to inform their citizens and create democratic modes of communication, which could bolster newly democratic governing practices. There is a crisis of participation and creation of democratic spaces within new and old democracies. This is a problem of political communication and of democratic theory. In Western democracies, and in newly democratizing countries, citizens need practice at participation. We must develop strong norms and theories that support a participatory and publicly accountable media in order to keep democracy functioning. Democracies in the developing world and developed democracies share the need for communicative democratic media, locally, nationally and globally to sustain themselves as democracies. (Archibuggi, Held, and Kohler, 1998; Tucker, 2013).

### **“Community radio, what is it good for?”**

Opubor (2000) asks: “If community radio is the answer, what is the question?” Since community radio stations seem to be at least partial solutions to the development problems of communication and depoliticization, as well as globalization problems (the erosion of public discourse, democratization due to global media) the range of places where community radio stations would be effective is rather large, from being useful in most-developed to developing countries. The similarities between a community radio station in Atlanta Georgia, and one in Rural Guatemala are amazing, despite the obvious differences. In both settings, people who were marginalized and who had little access to technology before on a daily basis become more familiar with technology, gain skills in self-expression and in political and civic understanding, gain confidence in their ability to communicate with others, and recognize that they are powerful through the radio station, and through this community connection.

One does not once and for all give the voiceless a voice; there are always new groups and new people who are going to be marginalized in the world system, in national policies, and in local communities. Community radio stations are for them, and they must be supported as part of a development strategy on the national and international level. Making a place for community radio as a 'third tier' in a national or global communications policy regime recognizes that community radio has been understood as important, in fact essential for the development of sustainable world in the era of globalization. Community radio stations in the United States can be understood as a 'third tier' of broadcasting, where the other tiers are public service (NPR, PBS) and commercial broadcasting. Community radio stations, unlike the other kinds of media prevalent in the US, are focused on community participation and involvement. They aim to provide a 'voice for the voiceless'. In support of this goal, they actively reach out groups that are underrepresented in or underserved by existing media, including: the poor, homeless, immigrant groups, youth, linguistic, sexual and racial minorities, and women. Because of the international dimension that I have tried briefly to bring out, this 'third tier' of media, community media, need to create strong international networks to share their success and to work for international and national legislation to protect participatory community media. Some such organizations already exist, but particularly in the US there is seemingly little connection between these international groups and individual community radio stations in the US. AMARC, the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters, routinely gives updates on Community Radio stations worldwide, but rarely on community radio stations in the United States. The isolation and lack of networking of community radio stations in the United States may be why some are failing.

## Conclusion

Discussions of community radio stations in the developing world, in the United States and in Europe echo a similar refrain: where there is community radio, there is community involvement which can enhance community's capacity to act as a strong check against government and corporate power, which can mobilize citizens around community problems and provide a forum for developing solutions to those problems. The individuals who come to engage in community radio build not only their skills but also their community. My experience in community radio has shown me that community radio stations have the potential to create strong and vibrant democratic political cultures and are themselves vibrant democratic spaces. I have seen how individuals who volunteer at such stations build their skills, and their capacities as people and as citizens, becoming more involved in their communities and more confident in their lives.

By presenting a normative ideal of community radio -- what it is supposed to be, and how it has been theorized -- I hope to have set out an account of what community radio is for what followed: a seemingly kaleidoscopic presentation of what questions community radio may answer. Theories of participatory democracy suggest that more participation than just voting is necessary of the citizen of a democracy. A healthy democracy requires citizens that are engaged, vigilant, and well informed. Community radio stations provide such possibilities for citizenship and democracy. In new democracies, or in transitional societies and situations community radio stations can help develop a participatory democratic culture. In established democracies with a mixed media, such participatory media can serve as a third-tier, with public service and commercial media, to continuously inject the voices of the marginalized into the public debate, thus speaking to the needs of the poor, immigrants, and other marginalized groups.

Critiques of development suggest that development projects fail because they fail to understand the political situation of the country or the area in which they are operating and from a lack of participation or awareness of what they are doing and why it is important or useful to the population it is supposed to benefit. I have argued that community radio in particular and participatory media in general, can have a role to play in a different kind of participatory development. Community radio stations are political. This can be a benefit and a challenge, but it is an inherent part of what they are, they have the power to change political configurations by providing a space for people to discuss and organize. Community radio stations are forums where people in a community may not only solve, but more importantly define their own community problems. In their information-diffusion role, community radios can inform large numbers of people of news and information in the community, including development projects and goals, which can even be disseminated in dramatic forms.

None of this is to suggest that development agencies have a genuine interest in political change in poor areas, that they have any interest in upsetting the balance of power in rural communities or elsewhere, or that a political democratic solution will be of interest to development agencies. I remain ambivalent about the nature of development as it has been practiced historically, and as it is currently practiced. The fact of the matter is that development agencies and development projects exist. If they are to be successful in anything they do, they need a communications strategy, and if they choose community radio then they have given the community a tool that they can use perhaps against the grain of development paradigm by bypassing the aforementioned development problems. Community radio stations are great tools for creating democracy in communities through creating the communication, organizational, political-informational and technical skills of their members, whether they be cones affixed on a tower, powerful AM or FM stations, or shortwave stations reaching across the globe. I hope this paper can also serve as a call to research. The strongest evidence for the power of community radio as a development tool is in its information diffusion role. However, I believe the strongest element of community radio is its participatory nature. More empirical research on this topic is necessary.

Although it would be unwise to see community radio in particular, and participatory media in general as a panacea for the world's problems, its role and promise as a way to inform and enhance the participatory nature of politics in particular locations and the possibility of networks of such community media organizations should not be overlooked. In the frame of international politics, community radio stations and participatory media in general allow us to re-conceptualize civil society as not just the sphere of economics, but as a genuinely participatory sphere which must both be built by the community, and build community. Through networking, community media organizations can build an alternative global public sphere which may one day act as a third tier of media, constantly injecting the voices of the marginalized peoples of the world in the international sphere.

## References

- Aginam, A. M. (2005).  
 “Media in ‘Globalizing’ Africa: what prospect for democratic communication?”. In Hackett, R. and Y. Zhao. *Democratizing Global Media: one world, many struggles*. Oxford, U.K.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- AMARC. (2008).  
 “Citizens Empowerment and Good Governance through Community Radio in Western Africa. Legislative and Policy Frameworks Compilation of Documents for an Action Research to Remove Barriers and Increase Social Impact of Community Radio.” AMARC, Africa, World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters Africa
- AMARC . (2013a).  
 “About AMARC, The World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters.” Accessed July 2013, from: <http://www2.amarc.org/?q=node/5>.
- AMARC. (2013b).  
 March 8, Women's International Day. Retrieved July 2013 from:  
[http://march8.amarc.org/index.php?p=The\\_History\\_behind\\_March\\_8&l=EN](http://march8.amarc.org/index.php?p=The_History_behind_March_8&l=EN)
- AMARC-WIN (2013)  
 “What is AMARC-WIN?” Accessed 17 July 2013 from:  
<http://win.amarc.org/index.php?p=home&l=EN>
- Archibuggi, D., D. Held, and M. Kohler. (1998).  
*Re-imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Arnold, J.R. (2007).  
*The Telecommunications Act of 1996: Effects on Local Radio and Television Programming and the Public Interest*. Dissertation. Wayne State University, UMI=3295983.
- Bachrach, P. (1992).  
*Power and Empowerment: a radical theory of participatory democracy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Baehr, H. and A. Gray. (1996).  
*Turning it On, A Reader in Women and Media*. London: Arnold Publishers, Ltd.
- Barber, B. (1994).  
*Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
- United Nations Organisation (UN). 1995. “Beijing Platform for Action.  
 Accessed 22 July 2013, from:  
<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform>.
- Benhabib, S. (1996).  
*Democracy and Difference: contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Benhabib, S., I. Shapiro and D. Petranovic. (2007).

- Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press
- Braunstein, Y. M. (2000).  
 “The FCC's Financial Qualification Requirements: Economic Evaluation of a Barrier to Entry for Minority Broadcasters,” 53 *Fed. Comm. L.J.* 69, 88-89
- Briones, L. (2009).  
*Empowering migrant women: why agency and rights are not enough*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Calhoun, C. (1991).  
*Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- CARE. (2012).  
 “Reaching New Heights: The Case for Measuring Women’s Empowerment.” Retrieved July 2013, from: [http://www.care.org/getinvolved/iwd/images/CARE\\_IWD\\_2012.pdf](http://www.care.org/getinvolved/iwd/images/CARE_IWD_2012.pdf).
- Chatterjee, D. (2008).  
*Democracy in a global world: human rights and political participation in the 21st century*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers
- Chow, E. N. (2003)  
 “Gender Matters: Studying Globalization and Social Change in the 21st Century.” *International Sociology*, September, Vol 18(3): 443–460
- Cook, T. and P. Morgan. (1971).  
*Participatory Democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Canfield Press
- Das, S. (2003).  
 “Radio days in Indian villages.” Retrieved 13 July, 2013 from <http://www.infochangeindia.org/features145.jsp>.
- Delli Carpini, M. X. (2005)  
 “Mediating Democratic Engagement: The impact of communications on citizen’s political involvement in political and civic life.”. In L. Kaid (ed.). *Handbook of Political Communications Research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers
- Dewey, J. (1966).  
*Democracy and Education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Free Press
- , (1927).  
*The Public and its Problems*. Denver, CO: Swallow Press
- Dews, P. (1992).  
*Autonomy and Solidarity: interviews with Jurgen Habermas*. London: Verso.
- Dube, L., E. Leacock, S. Ardener. (2005).  
*Visibility and power: essays on women in society and development*. Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2002).  
*Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Esterhuysen, A. (2004).  
 “Whose ‘information society?’” *Alliance*, Vol 9, No 1, March 2004.
- FCC .(2005).  
 “Low Power FM” Retrieved July 2013, from: <http://www.fcc.gov/lpfm>
- Feek, W. (2005).  
 “Towards the MDGs.” *The Communication Initiative*, May 2005. Retrieved July 2013, from: <http://www.healthcomms.org/pdf/MDGs-Feek-May05.pdf>.
- Ferguson, J. (1990).  
*The Anti-Politics Machine: ‘Development’, depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, F. (1993).



- "Citizen Participation and the Democratization of Policy Expertise: From Theoretical Inquiry to Practical Cases." *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 26, 165-87
- Fisher, W. F. and T. Ponniah. (2003).  
*Another World is Possible: Popular Alternatives to Globalization at the World Economic Forum*. New York: Zed Books
- Fishkin, J. (1991).  
*Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Fishkin, J. (1995).  
*The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Ghai, Y. (2001).  
"Human Rights and Social Development: Toward Democratization and Social Justice." UNRISD Democracy, Governance and Human Rights Programme Paper, No. 5, October, 2001
- Glenzer, K. (2005).  
"Of Structures and Scraped Coconuts: Findings from the Meta-Evaluation Component of the Strategic Impact Inquiry on Women's Empowerment," Impact Measurement and Learning Team, August 2005. Atlanta, GA: CARE International
- Gray, H. 2002.  
"WRFG's History In Progress: an interview with Harlon Joye" *Just Peace*, July 1993 (edited February, 2002). Accessed July 2013, from: <http://www/wrfg.org>
- Gumucio-Gumucio-Dagron, A. (2001).  
*Making Waves: Stories of Participatory Communication for Social Change*. New York, NY: Rockefeller Foundation.
- Habermas, J. (1998).  
*Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Habermas, J. (1990).  
*Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press
- Hackett, R. A. and McChesney, R. W. (2005).  
"Beyond Wiggle Room: American Corporate Media's Democratic Deficit, its Global Implications, and Prospects for Reform," in R. Hackett and Y. Zhao. *Democratizing global media: one world, many struggles*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers
- Hamelink, C. (2003).  
"Statement on Communication Rights" presented at the World Forum on Communication Rights. Dec 11, 2003. [www.communicationrights.org](http://www.communicationrights.org).
- Haugerud, A. and M. Edelman (2005).  
*Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers
- Harcourt, W. (2006).  
"The Global Women's Rights Movement: Power Politics Around the United Nations and the World Social Forum." Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper no.25, August 2006.
- Held, D. (2005).  
*Debating Globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press
- (1995).  
*Democracy and the Global Order: from the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- (2003).

- The Global Transformations Reader: an introduction to the globalization debate.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press”
- Hendley, S. (1993).  
 "Liberalism, Communitarianism and the Conflictual Grounds of Democratic Pluralism," *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, Vol. 19. No.3-4, 1993, 293-316.
- Holden, B. (2000).  
*Global Democracy: Key Debates.* New York, NY: Routledge
- Honneth, A. and H. Joas. (1991).  
*Communicative Action.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Howard, R. and Rolt, F. (2005).  
 "Radio talkshows for peacebuilding: a guide." Washington, D.C. and Brussels, Belgium: Search for a Common Ground.
- Jallov, B. (1996).  
 "Women on the air: community radio as a tool for feminist message" in Helen Baehr and Ann Gray. *Turning it On, A Reader in Women and Media.* London: Arnold
- Kumar, K. J. (1994).  
 "Communication Approaches to Participation and Development: Challenging the Assumptions and Perspectives," in *Participatory Communication: working for change and development.* London, U.K.: SAGE Publications
- Joshi, P. C. (2002).  
*Communication and National Development.* Dehli: Anamika Publishers and Distributors, Ltd.
- Kabeer, N. (2005).  
 Gender equality and women's empowerment: a critical analysis of the third Millennium Development Goal. *Gender and Development* Vol. 13, No. 1
- Kerr, J., E. Sprenger, and A.Symington. (2004).  
*The future of women's rights : global visions and strategies.* New York, NY: ZED Books
- Khader, S. (2011).  
*Adaptive Preferences and Women's Empowerment.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Lang, S. (2002) .  
 "Local political participation and citizen participation" in P. Maarek and G. Wolfsfeld (eds.) *Political Communication in a New Era: a cross-national perspective.* New York, NY: Routledge
- LACW.(2005).  
 "Gender Equality & The Information Society," Latin American & Caribbean Women's Open Letter to WSIS (2005) signed by the participants in the Seminar, "Women Subverting the Exclusive Information Orders." San José, Costa Rica, 28 September 2005)
- Lippmann, W. (1993).  
*The Phantom Public.* Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers
- Malhotra, A., S. Schuler, and C. Boender. (2002).  
 "Measuring Women's Empowerment as a Variable in Development." World Bank Workshop on Poverty and Gender: New Perspectives, June 28, 2002.
- Maiava, S. 2003.  
 "When is Development not 'Development'? Recognizing Unofficial Development (or Practising Post-Development)." *Contesting Development: Pathways to Better Practice.* Massey University, Palmerston North, N. Z.: Aotearoa New Zealand International Development Studies Network
- Martinez, E. and Glenzer, K.(2005).  
 'Proposed Global Research Framework for CARE's Strategic Impact Inquiry on Women's Empowerment'. Atlanta: CARE USA.
- Mason, K.O. and Smith, H. (2003).

- “Women’s Empowerment and Social Context: Results from five Asian countries.” Retrieved July 2013 from:  
<http://swaf.pop.upenn.edu/sites/www.pop.upenn.edu/files/WomensEmpowerment2Jan2003.pdf>.
- McGrew, A.G. (1997).  
*The Transformation of Democracy?* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press
- Mills, S. and R. Lewis. (2003).  
*Feminist Post-Colonial Theory: An Anthology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003).  
*Feminism without Borders: decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- (2003).  
 “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses”. In Mills, Sara and Reina Lewis (eds.) *Feminist Post-Colonial Theory: An Anthology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Mouffe, C. (1992).  
*Dimensions of Radical Democracy: pluralism, citizenship, community*. New York, NY: Verso
- McChesney, R.W. and J. Nichols, (2003a).  
 “The Battle Over Media Ownership is Far From Over,” [www.commondreams.org](http://commondreams.org), Accessed July 2013, from : <http://commondreams.org/views03/0707-01.htm>.
- McChesney, R.W. and J. Nichols, (2003b).  
 “Standing Up to the FCC,” *The Nation*, June 23.
- McChesney, R.W. and J. Nichols. (2003c).  
 “Media Democracy’s Moment,” *The Nation*, February 24
- McChesney, R.W. (1999).  
*Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communication Politics in Dubious Times*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press
- Mukherjee, C. (1995).  
*Slowly but surely: the story of the women of Kotra*. Mumbai: Comet Media Foundation
- Munck, R. (2000).  
 “Deconstructing development discourses: of impasses, alternatives and politics.” London: Zed Books
- Myers, M. (1995).  
*The Contribution of Local Radio to Democratisation in Mali and Burkina Faso*. Shrivvenham: Disaster Preparedness Centre, Cranfield University
- Narayan, U. (1997).  
*Dislocating Cultures*. New York: Routledge
- NFCB. (2013).  
 Proposed Bylaws. Accessed 4 July 2013, from: <http://www.nfcb.org/PDF/NFCB-bylaws-REVISED051313.pdf>.
- Norris, P. (2000).  
*A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies*. New York. NY: Cambridge University Press
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1999).  
*Sex and Social Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2000).  
*Women and Human Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. and A. Sen (1993).  
*The Quality of Life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Nussbaum, M. and J. Glover. (1995).  
*Women, Culture and Development: a study of human capabilities*. World Institute for Development Economics. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- OECD.(2010).  
 “Atlas of Gender and Development: How Social Norms Affect Gender Equality in non-OECD Countries.” Paris, France: The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Publishing.
- Okome, M. O. (2003)  
 “What Women? Whose Development? A critical analysis of Reformist Feminist Evangelism on African Women”. In Oyeronke Oyewumi (ed.), *African Women and Feminism*. Asmara, Eritrea: Africa World Press
- Opubor, A.E. (2000).  
 If Community Radio is the answer, what is the question. In Kwame-Boafo, S.T. (ed.). Paris: UNESCO
- OSiochru, S. (2005).  
 “Finding a Frame.” In R. Hackett and Y. Zhao. *Democratizing global media: one world, many struggles*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Parpart, J. (2002)  
 “Lessons from the field: Rethinking empowerment, gender and development from a post-post development perspective.” in K. Sauders, ed. *Feminist Post Development Thought Rethinking, Modernity, Postcolonialism and Representation*. London: Zed Press
- Pateman, C. (1970).  
*Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Peters, J. and A. Wolper. (1995).  
*Women’s rights, Human Rights, International Feminist Perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Prometheus Radio Project. (2013).  
 “KPCN - Prometheus and PCUN- building farm worker radio.” Accessed July, 2013 from: [http://www.prometheusradio.org/KPCN\\_barnraising](http://www.prometheusradio.org/KPCN_barnraising)
- Prometheus Radio Project. (2013b)  
 Media Mobilization Project. Accessed July, 2013 from: <http://www.mediamobilizing.org/our-stories/mmpvtv/updates>.
- Raab, M. and J. Rocha. (2011).  
 “Campaigns to End Violence against Women and Girls.” Accessed, July, 2013 from: <http://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/modules/pdf/1342724232.pdf>
- Ravi, R.V., Reddy, V.N., M. Venkataramanal. (2004).  
 Empowerment of people: grassroots strategies and issues. Delhi: Kanishka Publishers Distributors.
- Rives, J. and M. Yousefi (1997).  
*Economic dimensions of gender inequality: a global perspective*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Selver V. and S. Wood. (2000).  
*KPFA On the Air*. [Film] Washington, D.C.: POV
- Sen, A. (2000).  
*Development as Freedom*. New York, NY: Anchor Books
- Sen, G. (2005).  
 “Neolib, Neocons and Gender Justice: Lessons from Global Negotiations.” UNRISD Occasional Paper, no. 9, September 2005.
- Schumpeter, J. (1994).  
*Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Shapiro, I. and S. Macedo. (2000).  
*Designing Democratic Institutions. NOMOS XLII.* New York, NY: New York University Press
- Shiva, V. (2005).  
*Earth Democracy: justice, sustainability, and peace.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press
- Shiva, V. (2002).  
*Water Wars: privatization, pollution and profit.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press
- Sousa Santos, B. (2005).  
*Democratizing Democracy.* New York, NY: Verso
- Spitulnik Vidali, D. (2002).  
 “Alternative Media and Communicative Spaces,” in *Media and Democracy in Africa*, 177-205.
- Spitulnik Vidali, D. (1996).  
 “The Social Circulation of Media Discourse and the Mediation of Communities” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6 (2): 161-87
- Spitulnik Vidali, D. (2002).  
 “Accessing ‘Local’ Modernities: Reflections on the place of linguistic evidence in ethnography”.  
 In B. M. Knauff (ed.) *Critically Modern: Alternatives, Alterities, Anthropologies.* Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Pew Research Center. (2004). State of the News Media.  
 An annual report on American Journalism. Retrieved 10 July 2013 from:  
[http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/narrative\\_newspapers\\_audience.asp?cat=3&media=2](http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/narrative_newspapers_audience.asp?cat=3&media=2).
- Stavros, A.V. (2003).  
*Advances in Communications and Media Research, Volume 2.* Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers
- Tabing, L. (2002).  
 “How to do Community Radio: A Primer.” New Dehli: UNESCO
- Tucker, E. (2013).  
 “The Affective Disorders of the State,” *Journal of East-West Thought*, Special Issue: Crimes Against Humanity and Cosmopolitanism. Volume 3 (2) Summer, 97-120
- Turner, S. D. (2007).  
 “Off The Dial: Female and Minority Radio Station Ownership in the United States. How FCC Policy and Media Consolidation Diminished Diversity on the Public Airwaves. Review of Current Status and Comparative Statistical Analysis. Free Press. Retrieved July 2013, from:  
<http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/8021.pdf>.
- Turner, S. D. and M. Cooper. (2006).  
 “Out of The Picture: Minority & Female TV Station Ownership in the United States Current Status, Comparative Statistical Analysis & the Effects of FCC Policy and Media Consolidation.” Free Press, [http://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/fp-legacy/out\\_of\\_the\\_picture.pdf](http://www.freepress.net/sites/default/files/fp-legacy/out_of_the_picture.pdf).
- UNESCO. (2001).  
 “The African Charter on Broadcasting.” Windhoek. Retrieved July 2013, from:  
[http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/5628/10343523830african\\_charter.pdf/african%2Bcharter.pdf](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/5628/10343523830african_charter.pdf/african%2Bcharter.pdf).
- UNFPA. (2005).  
 “Rights into Action: UNFPA implements Human Rights-Based Approach” Retrieved July 2013, from:  
[http://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/global/shared/documents/publications/2005/rights\\_action.pdf](http://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/global/shared/documents/publications/2005/rights_action.pdf).
- United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). (2000).  
 “Gender Justice, Development and Rights: Substantiating Rights in a Disabling Environment.” Report of the UNRISD Workshop, New York

- Vargas, L. (1995).  
*Social Uses and Radio Practices: The Use of Participatory Radio by Ethnic Minorities in Mexico*. New York, NY: Westview Press
- Wetzel, J. W. (2004).  
 “Capacity Building as If People Mattered: an international human rights approach.” Given as an address at Adelphi University’s Conference: Social Policy as if People Matter, November 11-12, 2004. Retrieved July 2013 from: <http://www.adelphi.edu/peoplematter/>
- Wexler, C.V. (2005).  
 “The Fallout From the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Unintended Consequences and Lessons Learned.” Washington, D.C.: Common Cause Education Fund.
- World Bank. (1994).  
 “Enhancing women's participation in economic development.” Washington, D.C.: World Bank
- World Bank. (2011).  
 “World development report 2012: Gender equality and development”. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Health Organization. (2008).  
 “Gender inequities in environmental health”. 25th Session of the European Environment and Health Committee. Retrieved July 2013 from: <http://www.euro.who.int>.
- Young, I. M. (2007).  
 Global Challenges: War, Self-Determination and Responsibility for Justice. Malden, MA: Polity
- Young, I. M. (2000).  
*Inclusion and Democracy*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Young, I. M. (1990).  
*Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.