

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600**



**Beyond Polarity:  
Campus-Community Radio and  
New Relations of Power in Radio Broadcasting Policy in Canada**

**Lisa Monk**

**A Thesis  
in  
The Department  
of  
Communications Studies**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts at  
Concordia University  
Montréal, Québec, Canada**

**June, 1997**

**© Lisa Monk, 1997**



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Acquisitions et  
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file Votre référence*

*Our file Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-44893-2

**Canada**

## **ABSTRACT**

**Beyond Polarity:  
Campus-Community Radio and New Relations of Power in Radio Broadcasting Policy in Canada**

*We're linear thinkers on a spherical planet*  
Guys at the Library, Halifax Folk Duo

The first part of this study examines the academic and official (CRTC) discourse regarding the regulation of radio broadcasting in Canada from the 1920s to the present. It examines the limits of earlier historical frames through which radio broadcasting policy has been explored. It introduces Foucault's model of study and frame of analysis termed governmentality. The second part is an ethnographic examination of specific policy, programming and operations of campus-community radio station CKUT-FM (Montréal), and, as a related object, the policies and interventions of the National Campus-Community Radio Association (NCRA). It provides a critique of campus-community radio itself, and of the complex term, community. The third part is a detailed exploration of governmentality. This term refers to the process of thinking about, and practising government. One of its main components is the study of power relations. Conclusions are formulated in terms of future research and policy intervention in the area of FM radio regulation.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:**

**Thanks to my family: Norah, Steve, Della, Stephen, and Mary-Jo  
for teaching me to think, to learn, and to persist.**

**Thanks again to the same people for love and support.**

**Thanks to my friend, Keiko Mukai, for favours rendered in the preparation of the thesis.**

**Thanks to my supervisor, Kim Sawchuk, whose constant encouragement, and dedicated  
attention to the work was my foundation.**

**Thanks to thesis committee members, Paul Theberge and Marty Allor, for helpful  
critiques, and to Sheelagh O'Neil for long-distance administration.**

**Thanks to Adam,  
for patience and love, during my preoccupied days.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
PART I.....	1
<i>Preamble:</i> .....	1
<i>Introducing Foucault and FM Radio History</i> .....	7
PART II.....	11
<i>Methodology – Gathering Information I - Theory and Policy:</i> .....	11
<i>Methodology: II - Ethnography and Participant Observation:</i> .....	12
PART III.....	17
<i>Justification of Research</i> .....	17
<i>Research Site:</i> .....	18
<i>Personal Involvement:</i> .....	19
PART IV:.....	24
<i>Introduction to Campus-Community Radio</i> .....	24
<i>Spatial Materiality of CKUT-FM:</i> .....	24
<b>CHAPTER ONE:</b> .....	<b>31</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	31
<i>Radio Naming and Government Practices</i> .....	32
<i>FM Radio Overview</i> .....	33
PART I: TERMS THAT BIND.....	37
<i>Outlining “Dominant” License Types</i> .....	37
<i>Campus-Community Radio as Specific License Type</i> .....	38
<i>Commercial and Public Radio</i> .....	43
PART II: REVIEW OF BROADCASTING POLICY.....	45
<i>Creating Public and Private Spheres : Regulation and Control</i> .....	45
<i>Public Property – Administering the Territory:</i> .....	46
<i>Critique of Raboy’s Analysis</i> .....	50
PART III: NEW ANALYSIS OF FM POLICY HISTORY.....	51
<i>Population as Datum: Diversity and the FM band</i> .....	53
<i>Participation as Datum: Campus and Community Radio</i> .....	54
<i>The Economics of Radio</i> .....	56
<i>Summation of Dominant Paradigm</i> .....	58
PART IV: BEYOND OPPOSITIONAL POLITICS: THE NCRA AND NEGOTIATION.....	59
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b> .....	<b>64</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	64
CKUT-FM - A CASE STUDY.....	66
<i>Part I: Club Radio to Licensed Broadcaster</i> .....	66
<i>Part II: Operations and Policy</i> .....	68
<i>Policy and Programming Landscape:</i> .....	72
<i>Spoken-Word Policy:</i> .....	75
<i>Spoken-Word Programming:</i> .....	75
PART III: ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY.....	76
<i>Participation and Power Relations</i> .....	76
<i>Complexities of Identity and Community</i> .....	78
<i>“Community” Radio</i> .....	81
<i>Comparing Community and Campus-Community Stations</i> .....	82
PART IV: SALTER’S CRITIQUE OF COMMUNITY RADIO AND PARTICIPATION.....	84
<i>“Unthinking Localism”?</i> .....	87
PART V: LIMITED TRANSFORMATION WITHIN A TEMPORAL SPACE.....	88

<b>CHAPTER THREE</b> .....	<b>91</b>
INTRODUCTION: .....	91
<i>Governmentality as 'Form of Rule' Analysis</i> .....	91
PART I: .....	95
<i>Governmentality and Power</i> .....	95
<i>Governmentality, Radio Regulation and Policy</i> .....	98
<i>Toward Negotiation</i> :.....	100
PART II: .....	102
<i>Fraser's Critique of Foucault</i> .....	102
PART III: .....	105
<i>Struggle and Competition in Radio Formats</i> .....	105
<i>Specific Intervention</i> .....	106
PART IV:.....	107
<i>Effects of Governmentality Model on Participatory Radio</i> .....	107
<i>Chapter Summation</i> .....	109
<b>SUMMATION</b> :.....	<b>110</b>
<b>FUTURE RESEARCH</b> :.....	<b>114</b>
<b>REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>116</b>



## **INTRODUCTION**

### ***Part I***

#### **Preamble:**

At the end of the course-work component of the MA program, I knew I wanted to prepare a thesis that would involve both ethnographic research and theoretical analysis. I thought that the ethnographic data would add important original material to the knowledge base of academic writing and regulatory policy in the field I was most interested in, namely, radio broadcasting. Because I have long been involved in a type of radio called campus-community, and since, in 1992, only two years prior to my initial research stage, campus-community type radio was created as a distinct licensing category by the CRTC, I concluded that it was timely to focus on this type of FM broadcasting.

I found that there is little information published about campus-community radio, or about its evolution, history and transformations. My initial literature search turned up no work on the operations, conditions of license, mandates or programming of campus-community

radio. I think that creating a document from the inside out is an important epistemology, as I say in the Introduction of the thesis. So, I went forward with the idea of participant research to document a case study of CKUT-FM at McGill University. I chose CKUT-FM because it is the only English language campus-community station in the Montreal area with an FM broadcast license (although it broadcasts in other languages as well).

In the Introduction, I outline my methodology and explain my background and research position. I also clarify the reasons why I think CKUT-FM is an appropriate place to conduct the case study research, as well as the analysis of its internal documentation. We visit the station to get a sense of what its like there, and how it operates. I also introduce the model of critical analysis I chose to examine the history of radio broadcasting policy in Canada. (I will comment on this momentarily.)

I also decided to undertake this research because it is important to me, as a long-time campus-community radio programmer and committee member, that this type of radio be self-critical -- answering, or at least being aware of, concerns of listeners and members and thereby continually responding to the space in which it operates. So, the work was beginning to be simply a case study of a particular station with critical analysis of how well the station fulfilled its mandate of open access and programming. However, as I proceeded with the initial research on the very recent history of campus-community radio as licensed FM broadcasters, my focus expanded. I found that many stations belonging to

the umbrella organization, the National Campus-Community Radio Association, (NCRA\*) whose mandate is to serve the needs of socially, culturally, politically and economically disadvantaged groups in society), the evolution of campus-community radio as licensed FM broadcasters is a significant moment in the history of radio broadcasting and radio regulation in Canada.

I investigated this hypothesis by positioning its history within the context of the history of radio broadcasting policy in Canada. So, my initial thesis proposal was based on the examination of the literature pertinent to the history. However, as my research progressed, I found that the chronological telling of history would not allow for the idea of shifts in knowledge and ideas that inform the historical events themselves. Foucault's idea of genealogy better suited my historical review. I did not want to repeat the history as it is chronicled in other texts, but I wanted to comment on the shifts in how the government practices governing at certain periods of time, and how these practices are influenced by the goals and ideas of how to govern, and what to govern that preceded them. Therefore, my historical review follows Foucault's notion that history is a series of series, rather than a strict chronological review of events. This genealogical method is also useful in exploring the context, or climate in which policy and regulation are created.

---

\* The NCRA was formed by member stations in 1985 to provide a support and information sharing network. Its formation was a response to the growth of campus and community radio from a loose collection of closed-circuit members stations, and to promote the interests of groups underrepresented in mainstream media. It also lobbies the CRTC for license changes. Cited in NCRA/ANREC inf. sheet (1987). NCRA. P.O. Box 4400 Fredericton, N.B. E3B 5A3

Within this historical review, the literature in current academic discourse by scholars such as Marc Raboy which I outline in Chapter One, raises questions about access to the development of regulatory policies themselves by the many constituents that compromise the public. In his history, Raboy points out that the government regulation of aerial space was an attempt to maintain state control over the public space - to mold public opinion in the direction of a national consciousness. He concludes that the Canadian broadcasting policy makers missed the opportunity to include voices of farmers, women, rural people, French Canadians, and labor and that these were marginal to the concern of nationalism and national broadcasting policy. In Chapter One, I also explain the historical context of the government motivation at the time. So, Chapter One follows the dominant paradigm of questioning government motivation and shows how this approach pits the people's need against the goals of the state and reiterates the important insights that participation in government policy is crucial to the idea of a democratic government.

As my research on this history progressed, I became increasingly frustrated with the polar model of agency and power. I knew that there must be another way to look at the history in order to show how negotiation among the rulers and the ruled could allow agency and alter bi-polar models of power. At this point in my research, I spoke with my supervisor and she suggested that I read more work on government and power. I pointed out that Jody Berland's (1990) work on radio and the state had mentioned the word governmentality, but did not fully investigate the significance of the term to radio broadcasting policy and regulation in Canada. So, I thought that this effort would also add

some original work to the literature. After reading The Foucault Effect, (Gordon *et. al.*, 1991) and having previously read his work on power and knowledge (1980) I determined that Foucault's work and model of analysis would be a better model to examine the history of policy and the workings of campus community radio than were the earlier model I just mentioned. Later in Chapter One, and in the Introduction, I explain why I think this model is better. It allows me to break apart the bipolar approach to understanding power evident in the state theory models.

I investigated this hypothesis with literature review comparisons and analysis of CRTC regulatory and policy documents. I thought it important to show that radio can reinvent itself in co-operation with, and perhaps, despite the official license types currently in place. At this juncture, I ground my hypothesis with a continuation of my case study of CKUT-FM in Chapter Two. I detail the station's operations, programming and internal documents and Promise of Performance as a condition of license. Along with the study, I discuss the role of the NCRA in lobbying the CRTC and working with its agents to reclassify campus-stations to campus-community stations -- a license type which more accurately represents what the stations actually do. I describe these activities using CKUT-FM as an example, and also say that not all of these stations are the same. In fact, they create their own programming based on the needs and interests of the listeners and constituents in the communities they broadcast.

As I progressed with my case study, I received comments from the thesis committee that challenged whether I was painting too rosy a picture of the actual operations at stations. This coincided with my reading of Jean Ogilvie's (1983) thesis in community radio in Quebec. She reviewed the work of Liora Salter (1980) and presented Salter's analysis based on her phrase, perspectives in conflict, as it applies to Salter's analysis of community radio stations CO-OP Vancouver. I began to realize that my work should also provide a critique of the station, and of the term which helps define its license classification and operations -- community. In chapter two, I provide an analysis of the complex term community. I conclude that it is the perspectives in conflict, or the relations of power and struggle for identity within the stations themselves that help form their identity. This lead me back to Foucault's notion of power as multifarious.

In Chapter Three, I examine Foucault's work in more detail and explain why his approach to understanding relationships among the rulers and the ruled is more relevant. I also provide a critique of Foucault's ideas on power, especially as it pertains to his discourse. I use the work of Nancy Fraser (1989) who says that Foucault's use of words such as subjugation and dominance contradict his premise that power is not a polar thing -- some people do not have power over the rest of the people. I address Fraser's critiques and re-examine Foucault's model. Finally, I pose questions about the future of FM radio in the midst of impending Digital Audio Broadcasting. The introduction of this new technology will once again challenge government in terms of determining how the FM band will be regulated -- who will be heard, and who will not.

### **Introducing Foucault and FM Radio History**

Allor and Gagnon (1994) provide an excellent exploration of Foucault's (1991) term, and model of analysis, called governmentality. They explicate his dense work and conclude that it "focuses precisely on the relations between the 'art of governance', the administrative apparatus of the state, and the elaboration of knowledge formations productive of the distinctions within the people or citizenry" (Allor and Gagnon, 1994, 3). It refers to how people think about governing, and, more precisely, of how the meaning and practice of government are understood and explained by historians and theorists of power.

Foucault is a theorist of power. But his work breaks apart the dichotomous bipolar reading of power endemic amongst theories of power and government. Such theories focus primarily on issues relating to the legitimacy of the government, and by extension, the amount of power the citizens have, or don't have. Foucault thinks that power is not something we have, but rather that it exists in all situations, institutions, relationships and organisations. He also thinks that it is continually negotiated. Therefore, his paradigm reconfigures theories of power, and I think, dismisses as irrelevant, an examination of a bipolar relationship between the rulers and the ruled. He does this by presenting a 'rationality of government' based on participation. Colin Gordon (1991) describes Foucault's 'rationality' as:

a way or system of thinking about the nature and practice of government capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable, both to its practitioners and those upon whom it was practised (Gordon, 1991, 3).

This distinction about government as a set of practices is crucial in terms of my research on the regulation of radio broadcasting in Canada from the 1920's to the present. As I explain below, during the introductory research and literature review, it became apparent to me that Foucault's is the most appropriate theoretical model in which to examine the subject. I think this becomes most apparent with an investigation the specifics of campus community radio, and the ways its users pushed its regulation to the forefront of Canadian FM policy.

Because there has been little academic work published about campus-community radio, what it is, and how it fits into the overall history of FM radio in Canada, I began to ask questions hitherto addressed only briefly with respect to the practice of FM regulation (Girard, 1993). I wondered why there weren't more of these types of stations licensed by the Canadian Radio Television Telecommunications Commission (CRTC). I asked who had the power to determine what types of stations would be licensed, and questioned the history of this policy. I wondered if there were political reasons why campus-community radio received the minority, rather than majority, share of the public airwaves?

My initial work followed the manner of thought and critical inquiry established in the dominant paradigm of state theory (Raboy, 1990, Ogilvie, 1988). Within this frame, political resistance is characterised in a system of binaries and oppositions as coming from one source, the people, against the state. For instance, Marc Raboy, examining the history



of FM broadcasting policy in Canada, discusses the “Missed Opportunities” of the Canadian government to include a multitude of experiences in the writing of policy. His thesis posits that the political agenda of the government in the 1920’s, in an effort to develop a national identity separate from that of the US, and to maintain control over Canadian aerial space, did not account for the notion of a heterogeneous populous. Instead, ‘the people’ such as “French Canadians, rural Canadians, those in the outlying regions, labour, women and farmers were at best marginal to its [the state’s] concerns, except insofar as its support was needed”(Raboy, 1990, 18). \*

I asked myself whether this model, while vital to the study of the politics of unequal relations of power within Canadian broadcasting policy development, would lead me to any opportunity to move beyond the restraints of oppositional politics. My work at campus-community stations CKDU-FM in Halifax and CKUT-FM in Montreal (described later) had demonstrated for me an alternate route to understanding relations of power - the programming I produced with volunteers was ‘political’ insofar as it was engaged in provocative and exposé type of reportage based on the desire to create awareness of inequalities within the economic and state spheres, it was not necessarily reactive. The station was a space where social struggles, political opinion, ethnic and independent music sounds and stories are articulated and broadcast from a *melange* of perspectives. I began to see that if campus-community radio were to be examined within the state-theory model, constituents would be struggling against policies already in place rather than creating new

---

\* Because Raboy’s work is so important to my own awareness of the topic, and for its own sake in raising necessary questions about state-centered political practices, I revisit the frame of historical analysis of policy in Chapter One.

rules and policies. Thus, reaction, rather than proaction, would still be the focus of my study. This is not to say that I think that conflict is undesirable; on the contrary, it is essential to change. However, I became frustrated with a model that took an imbalance of power\* as a given. As I mentioned earlier, these questions focused on the legitimacy of government as a form of rule, rather than on the practices of governing. This former analysis is limited for two main reasons: First, it “pre-supposes that power resides solely in the state or economy” (Fraser, 1991, 18). This relegates the political act of resistance to state and economic spheres; Second, it does not engage the concept that resistance is cultural phenomena -- occurring anytime, anywhere (Foucault, 1980, 142).

As I examine in the thesis, the idea of power, as linked to resistance, is re-worked. I understand it as a multi-layered relationship of activities and influences, rather than as an instance of necessary confrontation and contestation among or between two poles. The reworking of the notion of power as a non-binary concept (and practice) is not an attempt to contradict nor minimise the impact and reality of dominant structures and institutions of government. Rather, it is a means of distinguishing the idea that there are struggles for power in all organizations and in all relationships. If this is so, then power is not static and bipolar - it is multifarious. This is good news. It creates an opportunity to work within structures and within organizations to reorient power, rather than expending energy fighting against them. The exercise of struggling against external organizations and structures in an attempt to gain power becomes redundant. So, I experienced a transition

---

\* The idea of power is complex as I explain further in Chapter 3. For my purposes here, I simply mean those who have authority to make decisions, and those who do not.

in focus. It became more important to me to find a means of exploring shifting relations of power, and of understanding power relations in a new way. The thesis revisits state theory model of power and critiques its limitations. I think that both the method I describe below, and the theory I detail with regard to power, policy, and governing, can move beyond the binaries evident in the aforementioned perspectives.

## *Part II*

### **Methodology -- Gathering Information I - Theory and Policy:**

I agree with Salter (1980) that an attempt to forward the goals of participation and access must include an examination of the terms in a real situation as an assessment of their validity. As she warns, the problems of perspectives in conflict are important to a critical examination of community and campus-community radio. As I discuss in Chapter Two, Salter points out the concern that when “those involved are co-opted by their new found legitimacy [as policy-makers, for example, or as station managers], the participatory critique becomes an instrument of conservative, not radical politics” (Salter, 1980, 108).

In addition to the type of self-criticism that Salter describes, I think the research must also follow the approach put forth by Tony Bennett (1992). In his article “Putting Policy into Cultural Studies,” he requires the scholar to “identify political relations specific to different regions of culture and develop specific ways of engaging with and within them” (Bennett, 1992, 27). By examining cultural practices from the point of view of their interaction with, and within, relations of power, I show the political relevance of both the work at

stations on a day to day basis, and, more broadly, of intervention into FM policy regulation. This type of criticism is important for me because I think broadcasting policy is a form of “social management” (Bennett, 1992, 26). Participation in this management, from my perspective, is the opposite of top-down political practices. I think these theories of self-analysis and participation of the researcher are best put into practice with the ethnographic research method as detailed below.

### **Methodology: II - Ethnography and Participant Observation:**

As I said, I chose the ethnographic research method because I think it is important to portray how the station defines itself, and to compare this with external definition. This “thick description” (Geertz, 1975, 25) of a cultural site focuses on an interpretation of data in search of meaning rather than an “experimental science in search of law”(Ibid). The research for the case study in this thesis was carried out at radio station CKUT-FM in Montreal in June, 1994. I observed the daily operations of the station, and conducted interviews with staff and volunteers. However, I bring to the study over 10 years experience in all aspects of campus-community radio broadcasting. The thesis draws on years of entanglement in the area. This experience is outlined later in the thesis. I also draw on my current involvement as show host and Spoken Word Representative at CKUT-FM.

My research position as participant observer will also include the examination of primary source material from CKUT-FM. I reference this material as I cite it in the paper.

Primary source material from the station includes policy statements, license application documents, promises of performance, internal committee reports and oral interviews. I also look at playlists and program logs to gauge the diversity of the programming. Finally, I describe how CKUT-FM sounds. I will not necessarily analyse specific programs, but will comment on the eclectic format and electronic spaces that community groups and music programmers are afforded. This analysis of sound is an important part of understanding how the personality of the station is created, and how the eclectic format at once challenges the homogenising effect of flow in commercial radio, and puts borders, known as slots, around community programmes and music genres. As Bryan Zuraw, former Music Programming Director told me, there is an interesting homology between CKUT-FM and society: “We have our own space on air but are constrained by the institution of the station. Community groups may have some time on air, but after that, it seems they are forgotten.” One of the matters that an exploration of sound deals with is that of the constraints and benefits of shifting musical and community borders. The cultural research method compliments the idea of transition.

By taking seriously the information I gather, the new knowledge from inside campus-community radio (which adds to an examination of how this type of radio operates, and contributes to the FM goal of diversity on the air [CRTC, 1983]), and the process of consultation, my work attempts to alter the ways in which radio broadcasting policy has been examined, namely, from an administrative, top-down perspective.

As I interpret the information I gather, I realise that my observations are not necessarily the same as another's. My work is informed by both a personal goal and a philosophical perspective -- the need of cultural theory and politics to concern themselves with:

the production and placing of forms of knowledge - of functionings of truths - that can concretely influence the agendas, calculations, and procedures of those entities which can be thought of as agents operating within, or in relation to, the fields of culture concerned (Bennett, 1992, 22).

My case study research acts as a corrective to the situation described by Ogilvie (1988) whereby academic analysis of the political and social history of broadcasting policy in Canada, as well as research by Federal bodies such as the Department of Communication, have "neglected specific institutional contexts of funding, planning, management, and format" (Ogilvie, 1988, 10) which make the approach actual. Significant research by means of the participant observation method offers the change to locate specifics thereby diminishing the possibility of abstractions or generalisations created through so-called 'expert knowledge' becoming tools for control or power. Thus case study work is informed by Edward Said's (1990) idea that generalisations or abstractions not only allow certain people to create a reality such as 'radio is a means of nation building', or, 'FM radio is a commercial enterprise', but that they are also useful for keeping other knowledge out of the discourse. This is because the social authority of the author is usually more important to creating an abstracted truism than is the truth, in varied contexts, of what has been said. In order to avoid this situation of top-down power relations, we must study texts and statements in relation to their affiliations with

institutions, offices, agencies, nations, races and genders. That is, to interweave generalities with specifics.

I posit that the dominant paradigm of historical policy commentary in this field has allowed for neither specific knowledge, nor the cultural studies approach to understanding policy as described above. My work documents the history of this campus-community radio, and adds to the knowledge base of FM radio broadcasting policy.

Just as the notion of culture has undergone change, so too has the idea of government. I follow Foucault's notion that practices of government are "multifarious" (Foucault in Gordon, 1991, 91), and that what matters is not questions of the legitimate rule or form of government as in the public/state theories of government, but rather, the questions regarding how government is practised. This means government should not recognize class, race, gender or background as criterion for the rules and laws it creates. In the art of government, the task is to establish continual references in all directions, from all areas and peoples.

However, this goal is interrupted by the problem of naming and the development of terminology as a tool of power over. Take for example, the terms, "community" and "campus-community radio". These types of radio provide involvement for groups by way of access to technology and space on air. But questions arise as to what degree

**“communities” are actually creating themselves on air insofar as the concepts about community and the needs of different people within groups are diverse.**

**Thus I began asking critical questions about the homogenous assumptions invested in the words community and public. I asked not only who constitutes the public and what factors constitute community, but also which historical circumstances have determined these definitions. I began to understand that the terms ‘community’, and ‘public’ are complex. Therefore, an examination of the complexities of these terms is crucial to understanding how they operate within the FM radio broadcasting policy landscape in Canada. To what degree, I wondered, is it true that each so-called subculture, community, local "imposes its own structures, its own rules and its own hierarchy of values" (Hebdige, 1979, 84). Is there only one Black community, or women's community? Is this community homogenous or heterogeneous?**

**The process of naming also relates to practices of governing. Both Bennett and Foucault, in varied instances, focus on the idea that concepts, people, and forms of rule are in constant transition -- influenced and shaped by a variety of relations. Because of the governmentalization of the domain of culture, it is necessary to "question specific practices of government" ... to “improve the circumstances and possibilities of the constituents in question” (Bennett, 1992, 32).**



In my case, this is achieved through focused work in the service of specific cultural group - campus-community radio. Bennett (1992) says the idea of shaking up cultural studies is to ground theory with a concrete example or specific model. This effort “connects specific institutional conditions which determine the forms of calculation of those agents with an identifiable capacity to influence practices” (Bennett, 1992, 31). I think my work contributes to the understanding of the practices of campus-community radio. As such, enables, to some degree, a more knowledgeable intervention into FM radio regulation policy.

### ***Part III***

#### **Justification of Research**

The outcome of a project is often influenced by the research approach. I believe it is important to create a means for participation, negotiation, and intervention in government, and policy making. This mind-set drives my efforts in this paper. The focus of my research project is inspired by both personal and academic interest in campus-community type radio.

On a personal level, the justification for my research stems from my long-term involvement in campus-community radio, both on and off the air, which I detail later in the Introduction. I have been a volunteer and employee at campus-community stations CKDU-FM in Halifax and CKUT-FM in Montréal where I worked in announcing, planning, production. I have come to respect the work of campus-community stations to

open the airwaves to a wide range of voices, perspectives, sounds and experiences -- in other words, to practice participatory communication. The goal is to provide "access to the airwaves by non-professionals considered under-represented by the traditional mass media", and "is seen as an important correction to an inherent imbalance in mass media content" (Ogilvie, 1983, 1). Moreover, both stations I worked at located themselves ( in terms of the type of events and concerts they supported) as cultural sites in the larger urban community.

In terms of my academic research, I claim that campus-community radio is a distinct media practice and event. As an ideal, campus-community radio is a unique form or style of radio operation, ownership, management and programming. My objective is to extrapolate the complications of this claim. It is important to challenge my experiences and assumptions, and to explore the degree to which the aforementioned goals and practices are actually carried out at stations.

#### **Research Site:**

My initial research shows that CKUT-FM is an appropriate vehicle for discussing the following topics: the institutional context of campus-community radio; its funding; its internal structure; its promise of performance (POP) with the CRTC; and its committee structure. All these aspects add to the formation of the station's identity, which as I said, changes according to where the station is located, and the variety of people who are involved. Isolating these areas in a specific case study helps to define campus-community radio in a particular locale. This local distinction is important because it is often ignored in

terms of setting an agenda for the larger project of campus-community (as well as community radio) and its relationship to the place in which it operates.

Now that I have outlined my research position, I situate my initial bias which, as I discuss later, has been influenced by the research I present in the thesis. Specific relations and experiences may result in specific engagement. Therefore, I describe where I came from as a means to understand my research efforts in FM broadcasting policy.

**Personal Involvement:**

Since 1987, when I started as an apprentice volunteer show host for a morning magazine current affairs show at CKDU-FM in Halifax, I have participated in, and followed the development of, campus radio in Canada. Not all campus stations are licensed FM broadcasters, they are not all community oriented, they do not all have the same mandates. During my time attending national conferences of the NCRA, I found that some stations are more politically engaged than others. Some are more concerned with the development of independent music, or with the inclusion of local perspectives on news and events in remote areas where fewer FM stations exist.

Campus-community stations with which I have been involved are licensed FM broadcasters that use and serve community members in developing and receiving programming. For example, at CKDU (FM since 1985), I hosted a one hour current affairs program for three years (1987-1990). The goal on my show, and of the station in general, was to decrease the distance between sender and receiver - to provide a

possibility of answering back. To fulfil this goal, I interviewed local artists performing or exhibiting in local artist-run centres, women seeking funds for shelters for victims of violence, organisers and workers against racism at the Black United Front, academics writing on legal aspects of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, singers, writers, travellers and people from all walks of life. Their experiences engage and illuminate the specific events of the day from a perspective different than that being broadcast by the CBC or commercial radio. Also, they could, through their very presence on the air, bring listeners a sense of closeness to the subject.

However, it becomes difficult to answer back when we consider the degree to which opinion and action are “controlled by authorities who organise and control channels of such action, the mass has no autonomy from authorised institutions which penetrate the mass” (Mills 1956, 320). While I explore this problem later in the thesis, it sets the tone for my frustration in regards to engagement and intervention into policy at specific levels of radio regulation, and at a general level, of social policy and the bias which informed government practice.

Once I recognised that the knowledge I had gained working in the area could help illuminate the topic, I began to explore the options of approaches available to me. As I mentioned earlier, the approach taken will determine the aspects to be emphasised, and those left out. I determined that the study of the history of FM broadcasting policy in Canada would provide a useful frame for analysis about where campus-community radio

fits in the context of regulation and space on the public. I discovered that the political authority of the Canadian government influenced the way in which FM radio would be developed, regulated, and licensed. Following Raboy (1990) this became my first area of exploration -- my hypothesis that the development of radio policy had delegated campus-community and community radio to the margins of the FM landscape, and in a pejorative sense of the word, as an alternative or third sector of FM broadcasting (sectors one and two being commercial and CBC radio).

My work as current affairs director had shown me that campus-community radio is more than what it may be perceived to be by some listeners. It is more than a space for difficult and trouble making left wing rebels. Although the programming can be politically engaged, it is not necessarily only a radical space where programming reacts against the *status quo*. I considered campus-community radio to be proactive in initiating change through awareness of issues and education. For example, from 1988 to 1990, I worked with community groups such as the Black Cultural Centre, the Ecology Action Centre, and the Lester Pearson Institute of International Development to create 15 and 30 minute programs. Volunteers from these organisations, from campus groups, community associations and loosely defined "special interest groups" participated in the process of radio production. I identified this as a means of reorienting relations of communicative power - demystifying reporting, editing, announcing and production by participating in the these tasks.

My work at CKDU was motivated by the vague yet pervasive sense that injustice in society (poverty, discrimination, violence) was in some way connected to the relations of power apparent in the control of mass media. I supported the political mandate of the station and the NCRA. Member stations are committed to serving the "needs of socially, culturally, politically and economically disadvantaged groups in society" (NCRA, 1987) through the initiation of programming from these groups. Campus-community radio seeks to recapture the original intention of FM radio as a service to listeners. As described in the Broadcasting Act of 1968, section 2 (d), programming "should be varied and comprehensive and should provide reasonable balanced opportunity for the expression of differing views on matter of public concern" (Statutes of Canada, 1976-68, 204). Our aim was to use both the spokespersons of everyday life and their stories to compliment and add to the news of the day and in doing so, challenge ears of the listeners - to engage the listener in a new way of hearing radio content and form.

In terms of thesis research, my first reaction to what I perceived as a belittling of these efforts in terms of policy and regulation was frustration. I thought a look at the history and changes at a specific station would illuminate the mutations of functions and use of radio. My case study work eased me into exploring the first moment of transition. Changes in the many spheres of radio, including sounds, styles, formats and licensing, means that changes are occurring on many spheres all the time. The case study started out as an exercise to gather specific information to show the many dimensions of campus-community radio. Perhaps I didn't realise it at the time, but in preparing the study, I was

reacting to something I thought I couldn't control or change - the lack of licensed FM community broadcasters.

Throughout the course of my time at CKDU-FM, and later at CKUT FM Radio McGill in Montréal, many struggles occurred over determining the most important function of campus-community radio. Each volunteer and Executive Staff member seemed to have his own understanding of what the stations were meant to do, to be. Therefore, I could have followed the framework which pits one view against another. However, I realised the potential to explore campus-community radio as a cultural site housing a diverse group of music hosts, news people, activists and members of the local community's many communities. Rather than merely act out against the FM formats already established, campus-community radio intends to be democratic and diverse - and inclusive rather than exclusive in content, form of rule, and organisational structure. The intention is not to keep the constituencies out of the operation of the station. The question remains, can they ever rid themselves of issues of power?

Now that I have outlined my research agenda, I turn to the second part of the cultural studies approach -- the introduction of a specific cultural site.

***Part IV:***

**Introduction to Campus-Community Radio**

The sounds and formats of public and private radio may be familiar to the reader, because these types of stations enjoy the majority of space on the FM band (See Table 1, Chapter One). However, some may not have tuned in to the sounds and structure of campus-community radio. To provide for the discrepancy of knowledge, I visit the research site at Montréal radio station, CKUT-FM, which I introduce as a distinct type of broadcaster, and a cultural site.

During the time of my research and observation of CKUT-FM radio McGill in June, 1994, the station office and studios were located in the basement of McGill University's Shattner Student Union Building on MacTavish Street in Montréal. Since that time, the station has moved to a larger space on University Avenue. What follows are my specific observations made over a period of four days. I should add that I was a volunteer at the stations from 1992-1993 and this experience may influence my observations.

**Spatial Materiality of CKUT-FM:**

The door to the main public space, covered in stickers advertising independent local music such as "BLISS" and women positive symbols, and other local stations like Country 600, is wide open. Inside the door sits the traffic manager, dressed in casual clothes, who absently yet efficiently directs phone calls, people, and mail.



The space itself is small and crowded. Second-hand tables, chairs and desks occupy the room which functions as a volunteer lounge, newsroom and directory of local information in the arts, cultural events, political rallies, and music. The openness of the space invites rather than restricts perusal of press releases and Public Service Announcements sent in from various groups in the area.

These papers, hung neatly on clipboards on the wall, are sources for reporters, producers and announcers, and provide a journey through the local news, current affairs and cultural events that are usually not marked by so-called mainstream, or mass consumed and broadcast news of the day. For example, we are invited by McGill to attend a lecture entitled, "Extinguishment or Aboriginal Sovereignty". I also read about a workshop on "Positive Approaches to Living with AIDS", and about a dance and benefit called "African Dynasty: Music, Laughter and Fun".

Other walls of the main area support posters that usually change from week to week, or month to month, as new activities arise. Community groups and staff add to the collage of local, national and international events awareness. For example, I see an invitation to the *Notre Dame de Grace* area Intercultural Festival, a promotion for the film, "Vues D'Afrique", and a colourful splash on paper announcing an album release by the band, Groovy Aardvark. Even not knowing who this band is, I sense that it's not run of the mill. One of my favourites is black on blue photo of a member of Soul Kitchen, saying we're "goin' out way past suppertime."

The ambience of the place suggested diversity, and a disinterestedness in the "office" profile usually envisioned and experienced upon entering a place of work in the corporate or business world. Amid the magazines such as "Covert Action Quarterly", "Geist" (a Canadian magazine of ideas and culture featuring articles such as 'Mothers Underground' about the difficulties of mothers living in poverty), and "Serai" (local new arts and communities), many kinds of people entered, worked, read and talked. The aesthetic is accentuated by, but not limited to, an attitude of idiosyncrasy expressed through dress and manner. One volunteer, dressed in warm, old pants, and carrying a second hand suitcase chats on the phone. I ask him where I could locate a programming guide, and he says, "over there somewhere" pointing to a pile of local newspapers. When I can't find one, he suggests I try looking outside in the tray which stocks them. But he is not interested, overall, in my pursuit.

Because I have been involved in this type of radio for so long, I didn't expect a warm reception. However, other volunteers I have worked with have been surprised and even irritated by this lack of help. Most offices and public places pride themselves on being helpful and polite. But I realise the place as a cultural site, and as such, an example of the coming together of diverse and multitudes of experiences not necessarily matched by my own notions of what a station should be. The visual aesthetic then, is representative of the overall feeling of individuality within a communal space.

Amid this feeling of disheveledness however, is a perceptible sense of efficiency and purpose. This same ambience flows throughout the work spaces allocated for the staff, the record library and the production studios. However, these later spaces are accessible only to programmers or to those who work with the production department. Although access to the main area is unlimited, access to the music holdings and studios is monitored by staff. (The fear of theft and misuse of equipment is the impetus for this restriction.) New volunteers attend training and orientation sessions.

The music library is accessed through a passage in which is located the station manager's office, reel-to-reel and turntable audition stations, and the technical directors space. This passage is open, however, and many volunteers use the equipment to prepare programming. The music library contains a enormous and vast array of CD, albums and tapes. It has been organised in specific categories congruent with those required by the CRTC for the filing out of playlists and program. Each programmer is introduced to the library system. A variety of genres from hip hop to bluegrass, reggae to jazz, rock to classical and a large holding of local and independent (not on a major label, or not signed at all) music can be found in the library.

The music library is the gateway to the Master Control Room (MCR). This is the main live-to-air booth. At CKUT-FM, the MCR is a small but efficiently designed space. It is, however, a hot and not always comfortable space. Upon entering the MCR, one finds to the right, the soundboard which is control centre for all programmers sending out sounds

from the two turntables, CD players, tape decks, Otari reel-to-reel tape decks, mic and cartridge machines. The broadcast signal is monitored here, as are the on air sounds.

During a training session for the soundboard and equipment in the MCR, I found that the soundboard can become as sophisticated or as simple as the requirements of the programmers demand. By pushing a green button at the bottom of a slot wired to the specific equipment, and pushing the slider up to the required level, one can become a broadcaster. However, getting to know the intricacies of the mechanics of or going from one piece of equipment to another, or broadcasting two or three sounds at once takes a bit of practice. Most of the equipment is well- maintained and of good quality. Since so many people use the equipment, it must be both durable, and easy to use.

Time spent in the MCR involves managing many tasks. Programmers must answer, requests by phone, organise "live reads", or required material such as promotions and Public Service Announcements. However, most people who do shows enjoy the creative energy of designing (programming) and broadcasting their unique blend of music and ideas. I also notice that many hosts and co-hosts engage the listeners as if they were in the room with them. Rather than refer to the listeners as "the audience", programmers use the personal pronoun "you". Some examples of statements I heard are as follows: "You may have heard this band when they first started out." "If you like what I'm playing, let me know, give me a call." "I don't know about you, but think the time has come for radical action in terms enforcing of the payment of artists fees to independents".

There is a sense of intimate connection and casualness which reduces the distance between the programmer and the listener. The idea of broadcasters as stars or as professionals with special talent is reduced - programmers are regular people, with individual personalities. For example, Grace\* is a woman from Prince Edward Island who moved to Montréal to study French. She volunteers at the station as a programmer on "Hersay" because she is interested in addressing the concerns of women such as pay equity and discrimination. Other people like Karen, who spends a lot of time at the station, seem lonely and in need of acceptance. The point is, CKDU-FM programmers are not programmed -- they create their own shows based on their own tastes and interests.

However, not all volunteers are music or spoken-word programmers. Some prefer to work as reporters, producers or production assistants, and spend time recording interviews, voices for promotion and station ID carts, editing tape and mixing sounds in the production studio. The studio is equipped with a 16 track recording and mixing board, multi-track tape reels, turntable and mics. (Some say all this equipment is unnecessary.) Here all pre-produced sounds are conceptualised and arranged. The studio is used mostly by volunteers and staff who have been trained in the intricacies of the board. It is also used to record interviews and for this purpose, a small room is set up adjacent to the studio. One of the benefits of learning and participating at a station such as CKUT FM is that the staff make strange and potentially difficult experiences seem commonplace and attainable. For example, the use of a mic is not an everyday experience

for most people. And according to Zuraw, many new programmers are a bit shy. But at the practice sessions, volunteers create demo tapes, and play them back to listen to mistakes and presentation style. Also, the trainers assume that each person has the potential to be a good host -- so any insecurities soon dissolve.

Having spent time in all the spaces at CKUT-FM, I have become aware that all its interrelations in staff, sounds, management and community outreach signal its identity as transitional, in a state of flux, or temporary. The continual changes in the programming, the elected and appointed representatives to the committees and Board of Directors who steer the station, the paid staff and the volunteers, change how the station sounds, its goals as a local broadcaster, and its areas of focus in the Montréal community. Each new person who becomes involved with the station changes its personality and identity.

Based on these observations, as part of the thesis I claim that campus-community radio is more complicated than a simple label, such as "alternative" would allow. I show that while the partial goal of CKUT-FM is to provide a variety of music and information, it is not necessarily in competition with other formats. I examine the complexities of campus-community radio, and comment on how stations define themselves. To put this study in context in terms of the broadcasting spectrum the policies which governed its development, I turn to the first part of the review of the history of radio broadcasting policy in Canada.

---

\* Names have been changed

## **CHAPTER ONE:**

### ***Introduction***

The government of Canada took control over the airwaves with the establishment of the Radio Telegraph Act of 1905 (Bird, 1988). This was a new area of management and regulation. How would the government practice governing? Would the government solicit input from Canadians, or would the government practice regulation by decree?

While the history of broadcasting policy in Canada has been well chronicled and analysed through many perspectives, which I outline and critique in this chapter, I offer a fresh approach based on two of Foucault's main areas of work: genealogy and governmentality. I use Foucault's genealogical method, (1972) whereby history is not understood as a chronology of events, but rather a "series of series" and periods in time which flow into one another, throughout the thesis. Therefore, when I use the word genealogy, I am referring to Foucault's usage. In this chapter, I explore of the development of FM broadcasting policy in Canada, and the dominant academic frame through which it has been analysed.

Also, I follow Foucault's (1991) understanding of how to interpret and analyse history and culture. Like Nancy Fraser (whose critique of Foucault is found in Chapter 3), I think that his method ushers in a "break from semiology and structuralism which analyse culture in terms of signs and systems ... and seeks to

see culture as practices (Fraser, 1989, 19). Within this frame, interpretation rather than textual analysis is key insofar as Foucault argues, and I agree that “cultural practices are instituted historically and are therefore contingent, ungrounded except in terms of other, prior, contingent, historically instituted practices” (Ibid., 19).

### **Radio Naming and Government Practices**

It follows that if a practice changes, then how it is called will also change. My work brings out the problems of definitions with respect to the naming and normalisation of dominant radio types. These are not natural dominants. Rather, so-called experts have determined how radio will be called, and regulated. This is problematic when we consider the transient possibilities of terminology itself, as well as the idea that the practice and process of naming, and the conditions of the naming, has negated the participation of a variety of perspectives and voices. It is important to review this process as part of our historical review of campus-community radio in the broadcast policy landscape.

It is equally important to reiterate the implications of the power analysis explained in the introduction, and to add to it. If power is not state-centred or linear, but rather capillary and relational, and if “power is instantiated in mundane social practices, and relations, then efforts to dismantle or transform the regime must address those practices and relations” (Fraser, 1989, 25). In terms of my topic, the



practices and relations have to do with how FM radio has been defined within this regulatory framework.\*

### **FM Radio Overview**

According to the CRTC (1983,1), the FM radio band was originally opened to offset the commercial, and often repetitive, format of AM radio. It was to be "developed in such a way as to contribute to a more varied program service which will compliment and enrich services already available from existing stations" (CRTC, 1983, 1). A shift in government priorities from the heterogeneous nation-building in the 1920's (Raboy, 1990) to the recognition of a diverse population in the 1960's resulted in government intention to use FM radio as a 'public' space delivering a multitude of expression relevant to the people. According to Jeff Whipple\*, former President of the NCRA, since the main goal of privately-owned commercial stations is to make a profit, and the goal of public broadcasters is to reflect Canada to Canadians, there were to be no commercial FM licenses awarded. The concern of the government at the time was that commercial FM broadcasters would not provide enough diversity in format. As I said in the

---

\* For a comprehensive look at the chronological history of radio in Canada, see: Bird, Roger. (ed). 1988. Documents of Canadian Broadcasting. Carleton University Press. Ottawa. and Ogilvie, Jean (1983). Community Radio in Quebec: Perspectives is Conflict. Chapter One. MA Thesis McGill University. Montréal.

\* We had various conversations in this regard during the fall on 1994.

Introduction to the thesis, the ideal was that the FM band would deliver the type of service and programming set out in the Broadcast Act (1968).\*

The intentions of the Act, to open the FM band to a diversity of sound, is interpreted in different ways by commercial and non-commercial interests.

Commercial FM owners argued that 'diversity' could simply mean a melange of music formats and foreground or spoken-word material related to the music. But, according to John Feihl\* of the CRTC, even today, many commercial FM stations find ways to manipulate the programming requirements so that foreground material and "non-hit" music is played during late hours when listenership is at its lowest.

On the other hand, community and public broadcasters maintain that the idea of diversity extends beyond the mix of musical genre. In a broader sense, it refers to the varieties of peoples within the Canadian population. Following this logic, FM radio should reflect the expressions of this diversity of Canadians (Ogilvie, 1988).

The challenge of the government with respect to FM broadcasting regulation, was, and continues to be, to balance diverse needs. Before going further, it is important to state that my bias turns in favour of the community broadcaster, as I stated in the thesis Introduction. I do not defend this bias here.

---

\*The Broadcast Act has been updated in 1985 and in 1991 to include new provisions for educational and community programming. See "Broadcasting Act" in Statutes of Canada, 1991, Chapters 38-39, pp. 120-121 (Queens Printer, Ottawa, 1991).

\* John Feihl is a broadcast analyst with the CRTC. We spoke by phone in July of 1996.

I think FM radio has not yet reached its potential to function as a means of expression for groups and individuals, rather than simply fulfil its technological use as a broadcasting medium. According to the findings presented by Jean Ogilvie, listeners in Québec however, can access more community and campus-community stations than can listeners in other parts of Canada (Ogilvie, 1988) A new way of thinking about radio as a vehicle of expression requires a new approach to defining the use of the medium. For example, rather than claim that the use of radio is technological -- to broadcast a signal from sender to receiver -- I think that its use is to allow Canadians to broadcast and receive diverse ideas, sounds and informations. (As I will show, FM radio was intended to fulfil that use.)

I think commercial broadcasters conceived radio in a linear manner (sender to receiver) whereas community type stations, because of the access offered to community members where receivers are also senders, recreate the use of broadcasting as method of circular, or two-way communication. I propose that the two main terms central to the debate over the regulation of FM radio are diversity and access. The debate continued throughout the 1970's and culminated in the writing of the new Broadcast Act in 1982. Recommendations for the new Act were inspired by the aforementioned determination to use FM as a public space, and by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms established as part of the 1982 Constitution Act (CA) (Bird, 1988, 722).

One recommendation sets out that the “right of access of all Canadians to the Broadcasting System should be confirmed” (Ibid., 741). The CA guarantees freedom of expression and equal access within reasonable limits. Interpretation of the word access is varied, however. Commercial broadcasters, for example may claim that access refers to their right, as Canadians, to use the technology. On the other hand, public and community type stations argue that access refers not only to the use of the technology, but also to the financial resources required to operate a station. Access based on economics will limit the number of community type stations on the air. The current CRTC figures for Originating (or re-broadcasting) stations charted below show that the community broadcasters have legitimate concern.

Originating FM stations are as follows:

Campus-community	26	Community A	27
Instructional	04	Community B	26
Commercial	201	Public (CBC)	56
Native (Northern)	150		

Table 1

This table shows that the majority of licensed stations in the Canadian South are privately or publicly owned, and conform to specific formats (discussed momentarily). While there is a variety in the types of music private FM stations

broadcast and in types of shows CBC airs, there is little evidence of a diversity of radio formats.

For example, one station may broadcast rock while another plays easy listening. The official regulator of radio broadcasting currently provides definitions of the terms used to categorise the various types of Canadian FM radio broadcasting licenses (CRTC, 1991), as commercial, public, and community (various classifications). This illustrates the success of intervention of the third type into the official discourse. However, this is a relatively new category compared to the early history of the development of FM radio as public or commercial. Before reviewing this history, we should become familiar with the types of licenses currently awarded by the CRTC, and thereby better understand the terms used throughout.

### ***Part I: Terms That Bind***

#### **Outlining “Dominant” License Types**

The terms which classify the types of FM licenses awarded by the CRTC are distinguished by both the administrative or practical functioning of the stations, and by the mandate or mission statement that guides the overall orientation of the operations. The CRTC (1991,8) has devised a glossary of radio terms which outlines types of licenses. Generally, it describes three types: CBC FM stations which are owed and operated by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation;

Commercial FM stations (also known as Independent FM License) operated on a 'for profit basis'; and Special FM Stations. The third type incorporates a variety of classifications including: community, campus-community (recent license type --see Chapter Three), and native undertaking which are all participatory in format and owned and operated by a not-for-profit organisation.

My focus on campus-community radio is not an attempt to minimise the importance of other participatory formats. Ogilvie (1988), and Salter (1980) have provided detailed work on the success and failures of community stations. A thorough examination of Native stations is beyond the scope of this thesis. And since I think campus-community radio has been successful in changing license classification from campus to campus-community, I use this type of radio as a model for my discussion of shifts in practices of government in regulating the FM band.

### **Campus-Community Radio as Specific License Type**

Various components and conditions of license characterise campus-community radio.

According to the CRTC (1992, 25), such a station is not formally associated with broadcasting courses as an instructional station would be. The training of professional broadcasters is not the station's primary objective. Rather, stations licensed in this category are characterised by the CRTC (1992, 3) in a similar way as is the definition of community stations. Both community and campus-community stations are owned by a

non-profit organisation. They are operated, managed, and, as I mentioned, provide programming produced primarily by volunteers.

In community radio, these volunteers are members of the local area in which the station broadcasts. Of course, in campus-community radio, both students and community members comprise the volunteer roster. Finally, both these types of radio are required to provide access to volunteers and to reflect the 'special interests' of the local market in which they broadcast. However, not all stations which are campus-based offer access to the members of the larger community. Campus-based stations which primarily operate as a training site for students are classified by CRTC as instructional campus stations. They are usually affiliated with a broadcast journalism school.

The above general description is based on specific CRTC criterion which define how stations are called and then licensed. The Commission retains the definition of the role and mandate of community radio based on six elements:

- the type of corporation and ownership;
- participation of volunteer workers in management;
- membership;
- local information;
- diversity of programming;
- diversity of funding.

Campus-community stations are also required to provide similar information these areas to the CRTC as a condition of license. But these stations must also demonstrate to the

CRTC upon application for license how they differ from community stations which may already be licensed in the same area. They may address this through reference to six (6)

other areas, namely:

- level of student involvement in membership, on the Board of Directors, management and programming of the station;
- technical coverage of the station;
- languages of programming;
- orientation of spoken-word and music programming;
- access policy;
- the extent to which the station intend to reflect the campus and the community.

I discuss these general criteria with examples from CKUT-FM in the case study later in the paper, and briefly below. They are listed here as means of showing the type of station I mean when I refer to campus-community, and to show that the CRTC insists on classifying radio stations under specific license types.

Although the CRTC classifies radio types, and awards licenses according to the primary criteria of ownership, stations are also distinguished legally through the differences in “Promise of Performance” (POP), written by the licensee either as a group or independently. The POP is a condition of license, and describes the content and format of the programming, and the operations of the stations. As I said, only a certain number of licenses in a particular market will be issued. Therefore, POPs must be distinct, and the application must prove that the market can support the station (in terms of ad revenue for commercial stations, and listenership dollars for non-profit stations). The POP distinguishes the aesthetic differences in sound and format.



Many campus-community radio stations carry similar POPs insofar as they all broadcast music programmed by individual hosts with individual tastes, as well as a large portion of spoken-word programming produced by community and student volunteers (CKUT-FM POP, 1994). The content on CKUT-FM for example, is diverse and includes pop music, rock, traditional, country, jazz, as well as music from Africa, the Caribbean, Greece, Ireland and around the world. The station also broadcasts a wide variety of independent Canadian music released only on cassette, and not available on a label. Programmers and hosts are not professional broadcasters. Therefore, they do not alter their voices to fit the norm of the trained radio announcer we hear on many commercial stations. Some hosts, such as the host of "Flipped Out", alter their voices to create radio characters to entertain or engage the listeners. The way the person talks on the air is the same as the way they talk off the air. Delivery of the music and information is sometimes stilted, mix-up, or fumbled. Over 50 shows are broadcast every week, and no one show is the same. The casual radio listener tuning into to CKUT-FM, or almost any other campus-community station, will not be able anticipate what will be heard.

For example, a sample CKUT-FM listener survey (CKUT-FM Unpublished, 1994,1), reports that one listener's favourite sounds in music and spoken-word include:

the BBC news, world music and intellectual shows, interviews with people like Noam Chomsky, anything non-corporate, "West Indian Rhythms", friends in New York rapping and being interviewed by Genius and Tanya Daley [of the show, "Little

Groove”]; gospel, subterranean jungle, “Native Tongue” and “Bluegrass Ramblings”.

Spoken-word programming is generated from community groups (I provide more detailed analysis of programming later in the paper). News sources include spokespersons commenting on events occurring outside the popular news of the day, and on popular news from a different perspective. Campus-community radio can generally be counted on to provide intimate and pertinent discussion about issues close to the lives of the listeners. For example, one listener was moved and thankful when “hearing an AIDS awareness spot about 30 minutes prior to my late lover’s confirmation to me that his HIV status had become fully active AIDS” (CKUT-FM listener survey, 1994). The programming then, the sounds of the stations, are a major influence upon the creation of meaning. Volunteer music programmers, reporters, newsreaders, producers, record librarians, committee members comprise the main body of ‘staff’. The paid staff administer the smooth running of the station.

In contrast to this melange of sound produced and programmed by a wide range of people in the community, commercial stations program a specific genre of music all day long. They establish a listenership who know what they’ll hear when they tune in (rock, pop, easy listening, oldies, country), campus-community radio broadcasts a broad range of material which appeals to a broad listenership over the course of the broadcast week, although many programs appeal to specific listeners. For example, stations may broadcast an all-female artist show in between a dance music show and an

environmental activist program. According to Sarah Toy\* , the stations broadcast material considered relevant to the lives of the listeners. Since each station is run by the members of the area in which it is located, local content is a high priority.

Station management encourages reporters and programmers to deliver unique shows to the listeners. For example, Bryan Zuraw\* , the former program director of CKUT-FM, says programs should try to introduce new sounds and ideas rather than mimic the style, focus, sound, and content of commercial radio. In this way, listeners expand their tastes, and learn to listen to radio rather than using it only as a background sound.

### **Commercial and Public Radio**

In contrast to campus-community radio, commercial radio stations generally sound the same in terms of the flow from song to song, with commercial breaks. Stations use the same format all day long, all week long. Listeners know what they will hear when they tune in to a particular station. Commercial radio tends to broadcast more major label artists and creates, in collaboration with record companies, “hits” or singles off a recording that are selected for maximum repetition. Commercial radio announcers tend to “pull” their voices, creating a booming authoritative and upbeat mood. The fast pace of commercial radio reflects, or perhaps sets the tone for, commercial lifestyles. Consumerism, the buying and selling of goods, services, music and lifestyle, I

---

\* I interviewed Sarah Toy, production assistant at CKUT-FM, about why she listened to the station rather than commercial radio. I also asked for her opinion about why other people tune in. The interview was conducted at the station in June of 1994.

\* I interviewed Zuraw for this work at CKUT-FM on June 28, 1993.

think, is the driving force behind commercial radio. It serves, and perhaps creates, the tastes of the listeners insofar as it filters what the listeners will hear.

For example, on station Q104 in Halifax whose slogan is, "The Home of Rock and Roll", songs are played in between commercial spots, weather checks, and announcer jokes and patter. When listening to commercial stations, I feel exhausted by the flow of quick movement from sound to sound, without time to really listen. The general patter of the radio personality engages the listener as a member of consumer culture, as part of their 'market'. Listeners hear more advertising -- 15% of the broadcast week -- compared to 4% on campus-community and zero on CBC (CRTC, 1991, 3).

Public radio (CBC) programming, I think, attempts to speak to the knowledge of the listeners -- it assumes a certain level of awareness. The extent to which it is successful is a matter of opinion. As the official national broadcaster, the CBC attempts to provide Canadians a look at themselves through its information, entertainment and talk-back programming. However, access to the generation of story ideas, and production of programming is limited to CBC employees, whereas, in community type stations, material is generated and broadcast by people in the community itself. At CKUT-FM volunteer programmers produce and broadcast the majority of the programming (some material such as ads and newscasts are produced by the station staff). So, for example, members of the Montreal Caribbean community air a show called "Caribbean Profile" -- a mix of music and news relevant to that community.

Because there are more types of people in a community than there are in the CBC offices, community radio broadcasts more diverse programming. The specifics of the stations diverse programming are discussed in Chapter II.

Having described the types of radio on the air, I turn to a review of the history of the development of dominant radio types. I begin in the era before the evolution and licensing of community type stations. Here, I review transitions in types, and the ideals which formed their emergence and categorisation.

### ***Part II: Review of Broadcasting Policy***

#### **Creating Public and Private Spheres : Regulation and Control**

Radio broadcasting developed in Canada as public or private types. It's use and function was, and is, created and maintained through legislation. As we have seen, the categorisation is based upon ownership, and was created by the government in an effort to regulate the airwaves.

Actual regularly scheduled programming began in Canada on May 20, 1920. (Bird, 1988, 112). Radio station XWA (later CFCF in Montréal) broadcast the first radio program intended for the public. This was a commercial station. It broadcast material from both Canada and the US. But the Canadian government was concerned about both the messages and the function of the new medium --its potential to become simply an advertising mechanism. To curtail the 'self-interest'

of private broadcasters undermining the public space (Ibid., 112), the government of MacKenzie King sought to bring the licensing of radio broadcasting under state control.

As Marc Raboy (1990, 18) points out, the development of AM radio as a mass communication medium was regarded by the government in the 1920's as an extension of issues of control over physical and aerial territory. Within the mélange of radio needs and desires of all Canadians, and the will of the federal government to create a national consciousness, the function of radio broadcasting as a communications technology was sublimated by the government at the time as a tool of political and economic strategy. This first effort of governmental control marks the era where the diversity of the land, the geographical diversity and breadth, was homogenised. This does not mean that the government necessarily sought to disregard the importance of difference, but rather, the goal of unification was intended to bring the regions into the federation.

#### **Public Property -- Administering the Territory:**

In 1928, MacKenzie King's government appointed a commission headed by John Aird to examine Canada's broadcasting situation and to "make recommendation to the government as to the future administration, management and control and financing thereof" (Ogilvie, 1988, 13). Essentially, the report concluded that "the interests of the listening public in Canada could be adequately served only by some

form of public ownership, operation and control” (Ibid.,13). But the state takeover of radio did not result in the creation of stations for various groups in various locals to communicate locally and among each other. The following outlines the priorities of the government at the time.

After some debate regarding government interference in the private broadcasting sector, Prime Minister R.B. Bennett, in a "Speech in support of Bill 94 on radio broadcasting" delivered to the House of Commons on May 18, 1932, states quite clearly the nationalist vision for the use of radio:

... this country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian sources, free from foreign interference or influence. Without such control, radio broadcasting can never become a great agency for the communication of matters of national concern and for the diffusion of national thought and ideas, and without such control, it can never be the agency by which national consciousness may be fostered and sustained and national unity still further strengthened (Bird, 1988, 112).

Thus, the Broadcasting Act was passed in 1932 creating the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission to coordinate “all broadcasting in the public interest” (Ogilvie, 1988, 14). As Jody Berland states: “Public interest” referred to the preservation of separate (i.e. not American) public sphere by a national public ownership of its communication channels: “the ‘natural’ disposition of the market to neglect remote or marginal groups of citizens unable to constitute a proper market had proven the necessity to affirm and defend public control, universal access and social equity in radio broadcasting” (Berland, 1990, 16).

In 1936, the national network was still only reaching less than half the population. So, “a committee was appointed under parliament to report to the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC). They recommended that a public corporation modelled more on the lines of the BBC replace the CRBC. This move suggests the strategic continuation of a colonial connection and influence in Canadian politics” (Ogilvie, 1988, 13).

Debates ensued in the House of Commons regarding sole government jurisdiction over the what would become the CBC (Ogilvie, 1988, 14). Because “radio and television systems were primarily devised for transmission and reception as abstract process, with little or no definition of preceding content” (Williams, 1991, 227), the Canadian government was poised to use radio as a means to “mold public opinion in the direction of a national consciousness ... to formulate social goals, to give direction the national will, and thus to give cohesion to Canadian society” (Raboy, 1990, 19).

While the threat of American take over of the airwaves, and of the commercialisation of public space was a concern, it is questionable whether a market has a natural disposition, and whether, had radio been set up to serve and be used by these ‘marginal groups’, public space would have taken a different shape as regional, rather than national. But since the main concern of government at the time was based on the administrative function of control over the territory, the idea of public interest had little



to do with the consideration of the many voices that constitute the public. Rather, harnessing the airwaves became a fundamental means of forwarding the nationalist vision.

As Jody Berland says, “broadcasting is in part about the constitution of space; in establishing territory, there was sound long before there were fences” (Berland, 1991,10). By controlling the licensing of radio broadcasting, the government could regulate not only what went over the air, but also who would have access to the production and dissemination of information. Thus, the private take over of public space may not have been the only impetus for government intervention in broadcasting. Looming larger on the political landscape was a vision of creating a nationalist, as opposed to individual or regional, mind set among Canadians. As Marc Raboy (1990, 19) explains:

The political context of the 1920’s also indicates why it was so important that radio be used to transmit values such as national unity. While the radical political and social movements such as the United Farmers were developing mass membership bases with strong regional roots, the traditional élite, through its ‘voluntary associations’, sought to maintain its hegemony through a national communications network.

Indeed, according to Raboy, “Canadian nationalism was dominated by urban, English-speaking, central Canadians” (Raboy, 1990,18).

### **Critique of Raboy's Analysis**

Raboy frames his analysis of broadcasting policy based on what he interprets as the lack of participation of a diversity of Canadian voices in determining policy. He focuses on the power struggle of regionalism and federalism and their political relationship to the regulation of radio broadcasting. If Raboy is correct, the massing of the Canadian public is an example of the taken for granted notion that members of an externally defined public, gender, or class share a sense of belonging based on certain particulars only, and particulars not necessarily highlighted by the individual member.

Since the government claimed regulation over the airwaves as public space, radio became political. Listeners were not participants in the programming decisions. The technological function of the medium to join all parts of the physical territory was a more important agenda than the development of relevant programming. The implication of this is that the "institutions and processes of public communication are themselves a central part of the political structure and process" (Garnham, 1986, 37).

I think Raboy and Garnham both offer important analysis about access to the creation of broadcasting policy and regulation. However, they are limited by the focus on bipolar paradigm which looks at power as hierarchical -- some have power and some don't. For my purpose, Raboy's work brings out, for me, and perhaps unintentionally by him, a means to draw out the complexities of defining,

or creating terms. Terms are not neutral. They are created according to certain political perspectives of the time. Going further one can begin to “detach the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time (Foucault, 1988, 122). If this is so, then despite the fact that the terms and formats of public and private radio occupy the majority of radio space, they are terms only. They become invested with meaning by the “social authority of the author[s]” (Said, 1983, 149).

Raboy writes about the initial stages of broadcasting policy, the period roughly between 1920-1960. This period marks, for me, the first recognisable epoch of what Foucault refers to as a “rationality of government” (*op. cit.* p.7). Raboy’s historiography presents an opportunity to recognise a specific moment in the review of radio broadcasting policy in Canada -- a moment when sovereignty was key. This is important because by recognising this priority or ‘datum’ influencing government strategy, we can conclude that as datum changes, so does policy. Change then, becomes an integral part of examining policy not as static and continuous, but in a state of flux.

### ***Part III: New Analysis of FM Policy History***

With the introduction of the Broadcast Act in 1968, and the opening of the FM band however, I think there is evidence of a second shift whereby the regulation of the airwaves was based on the rationale of maintaining a sense of community, and at the

same time, discouraging the mass media marketplace from dissuading discussion.

Section 2 (d) of the Act states that:

**programming provided by the Canadian Broadcasting System should be varied and comprehensive and should provide reasonable, balanced opportunity for the expression of differing views on matters of public concern (Statutes of Canada 1967-1968, 204).**

And, while the Act does recognise, in a minimal way, the differing needs of listeners in section 2 (g) part (i) which calls for a “balanced service of information, enlightenment and entertainment for people of different ages and tastes” (Ibid., 204), it does not specify the degree this will be accomplished by broadcasters. So, it can be interpreted in such a way as to not serve all the tastes that exist.

However, the point here is that this second moment in the history of radio broadcasting policy is, within the framework of governmentality, a shift in the rationality of government which isolates “population as datum” (Foucault, 1991, 103). This means that the idea of government emphasis shifts from maintaining control over land (which Foucault would refer to as ruling rather than governing) to assessing the needs of the people and managing the resources for them. (I explain this further in Chapter Two.) To draw out the details of the scene in Canada at the epoch of this shift, and until the 1970’s when community and campus stations began to receive licenses, I turn to the work of Jean Ogilvie.

### **Population as Datum: Diversity and the FM band**

Although still operating within the poles of the people against the state, Jean Oglivie (1988) provides a well documented history of the shift in policy which opened up a new means of considering the abstract 'diversity'. This shift, for me, echoes Mills' insight in relation to publics and mass society as a "movement from little powers to concentrated powers and an attempt at monopoly control" (Mills, 1956, 304). The question is, even if the population is once again consulted, to what extent do relations of power actually change?

According to Jean Oglivie (1988), the 1970's spawned a more liberal (rather than conserving and preserving the nationalist vision alone) view of Canadian 'diversity'. It is possible that this idea of diversity was spearheaded by new government initiatives and policy on multiculturalism. As a major focus in the 1970's multiculturalism policy must have affected broadcasting. In the 1970's the CBC developed and operated community radio stations (broadcast mainly on low-power am bands). "This time, programming would be originated and produced within the community." This effort was known as CBC Access. A growing number of locally owned and operated stations were licensed in small locales from Arctic Bay N.W.T. to Vancouver B.C. CFTL FM in Big Trout Lake, Ontario, received a license in August, 1973 and broadcast to the area at 60 watts.

The purpose of the organisation was to “provide first local broadcasting service to Big Trout lake in both the Cree and English languages -- to share information and artistic expression within Big Trout Lake and amongst communities in Northern Ontario (CBC, April, 1974, 4 ).\* But the programming had clear priority even on these access stations, and the corporation determined “which programs must be broadcast locally, and when the local supplementary service can be on air” (Ogilvie, 1988, 21). As she insightfully concluded, the access by local populations to the airwaves was still limited by CBC guidelines, and moreover, the radio facility still “operates within a centralised corporate structure” (Ibid., 21).

#### **Participation as Datum: Campus and Community Radio**

During this time, university campuses across the country were home to closed-circuit radio stations. New CRTC license category of Special FM license would include the approval of an application for broadcast license filed by a campus station at Winnipeg, Manitoba on June 27, 1975. In this, the first decision to license a campus station, the CTRC states its recognition about the importance of diversity on the air: “Many of the different sectors of social life cannot find a place on the national service or the private commercial outlets. It is for this reason that Commission has been willing to develop new models for different voices” (CRTC, June 27, 1975, 4).

---

\* CBC was also thought to create a sense of community, especially through the farm radio forums - a value that “closely related to the nationalist policy of the CBC” (Ogilvie, 1988, 20).

This occurrence marks the third shift in the history whereby the regulators are made to appreciate, in the form of the application for license that the Canadian Broadcasting System should include another sector to complement public and commercial sectors. Neither served specific interests and needs of local communities and communities within these communities. Granting FM licenses to campus stations would begin to address these needs in the areas where campus stations recruited volunteer programmers from the larger community.

By 1975, the CRTC had licensed student or campus radio stations in Waterloo, Quebec City, and Ottawa recognising (with interventions and briefs submitted by student stations) that: "Diversity and comprehensives of programming is one aim. Accommodation of different 'voices' in a community is another"(CRTC June 27, 1975, 3).

This third shift also marks an important era whereby participation in the writing of policy (via license application and approval) and the operations of radio by the listeners becomes viable. With the intervention by campus and campus-community stations into the broadcasting system, there develops a new means of understanding the use and function of radio. Radio can be used not only as a linear means of transmitting information, but as a vehicle of self-expression by users (senders) who are also part of the community of listeners (receivers). In this sense, campus and community radio are tools for expression and information for individuals and groups in society. In this way,

I think, radio functions as a democratic means of communication. By this I mean the sharing back and forth of ideas, information, and artistic output rather than merely its production and dissemination by those not necessarily informed as to the relevancy of issues and tastes of the listeners they purport to serve.

### **The Economics of Radio**

The new uses for radio, as I have said were introduced into policy through intervention by campus and community radio groups. It is important to consider why these interventions were successful during the 1970's and later into the 1980's. Certainly, the hard work of the station staff and volunteers played a paramount role in the lobby for licensing of student stations -- as did the aforementioned shift in government rationale toward participation and diversity in the Canadian Broadcasting System. However, from a pragmatic perspective, it makes sense to realise that broadcasting "regulation has been to part of a radical rhetorical shift in governmentality which now more explicitly aligns itself with global capital" (Berland, 1990, 16). Diversity, then, shifts emphasis from a melange of voices to the diversification of the marketplace.

To investigate this scenario in terms of the regulation of campus-community radio, I spoke with Jeff Whipple of the NCRA (*op. cit.*, pg. 26). He says that the licensing of community and campus-community stations was beneficial to the stations themselves, but potentially detrimental to the overall mandate of diverse programming on the FM band. Whipple claims that with licensed FM broadcasters carrying out this mandate,



commercial stations on the FM band would not be pushed as hard to provide diverse programming. Indeed, as I mentioned at the beginning of the paper, FM radio has become to a large extent, commercial radio with a space at the end of the dial for community and public channels. While I do not think the rhetoric of diversity on the airwaves is insincere, this type of analysis points out that it would not have been achieved in a less diversified economic era.

Access is also an economic issue. As Lucy Audette\*, an Information Officer at CRTC in Montréal told me, licensing of radio is not a matter of policy per se its rather an economic issue. Licenses are awarded according to who can afford to operate a station (except for CBC). The amount of money needed to operate a station varies. If the physical space is free, the operated would only have to budget equipment purchase, transmitter service, library holdings and staff. Potentially, a group could raise the money necessary for start up, but would have to arrange for collateral. If the station operators can fund the station capital and operations costs, the main obstacle to broadcasting would be the securing of a license. So, it is a matter of opinion as to whether the financial obstacles rank higher than the political obstacles of creating a space on the dial for new stations.

While policy makers may have intended the FM band to provide diversity on the airwaves, the condition of license based on ownership required by the CRTC makes

---

\* I conducted a phone interview with Lucy Audette, an information officer at the offices of the CRTC regional office in Montréal on July 28, 1994.

this a difficult feat, for not many communities have the capital to start up and maintain a radio station. Radio became another space to capture markets. Regulatory policy in regards to financial restraints on radio licensees, resulted the second “missed opportunity” for diversity of programming within the Canadian Broadcasting System.

### **Summation of Dominant Paradigm**

These past analyses of radio broadcasting policy have generated important insights into the problems of conflict between separate agendas and goals for the regulation of the airwaves, and the use and function of radio. Specifically, the work of Raboy and Berland have provided an opportunity understand the context and events within the history of policy formation and rhetoric therein. However, I think that their work is structured around the poles of at least two oppositions. The first is the idea of state control itself, of regulation and the idea of open access to the airwaves by groups and individuals. The second is the tension between commercial interests and the goals of government in securing a space on the airwaves distinct from the mass marketing of music and the generation of advertising revenue.

Both these debates are rooted in the varying understandings of the idea of the state itself, and its responsibilities. They assume that the state has essential duties to fulfil. The problem with this paradigm based on opposition is that it does not allow for the modifications of radio itself. By working within a system of opposition, radio becomes re-situated as a static entity as either a vehicle for the creation of national

consciousness, or as a tool of market diversification. This approach assumes, I think, that power is linear or hierarchical. It fails to show the ways in which radio itself changes in relation to externals besides the state, and the ways in which policy shifts through intervention.

What follows is an instance which marks a separation from this approach and shows a means of reordering power from linear to relational. Then, in Chapter Two, I provide a descriptive look at how campus-community radio in format, management and sound provides a specific site for exploring the transitions in transmission; or the changes in how radio practised.

***Part IV: Beyond Oppositional Politics: The NCRA and Negotiation***

Many so-called campus stations were actively involved in the initiation of community programming before the CRTC officially recognised these efforts. During the late 1970's and 1980's as more campus based stations were receiving FM licenses, the stations also began to expand beyond the coverage of student issues and to incorporate the larger community as volunteers in all sectors of programming, production, management. This happened in cities like Halifax (CKDU-FM) because there was no other local station in which community groups could gain access to air-time. Relationships were formed with many communities and groups within the Halifax Dartmouth area.

And according to the NCRA, the CRTC still maintained original categories of license based on the student classification. Stations from St. John's to Victoria were being licensed under this classification. Since their programming and mandates were reflecting the desire to expand programming and access to include the broader community, station employees networked and recognised the need to form an umbrella organisation. This organisation would lobby the CRTC for changes in policy and licensing affecting the campus-community radio stations and their goals. To this end, the NCRA was formed in 1985. This volunteer-run organisation organised annual conferences among sister stations nation wide as a site for learning and sharing, and has in its brief history, acted as a very effective lobby and negotiator with the CRTC.

Jeff Whipple has, until this year been on the Board of Directors of the NCRA and has served two terms as President. He told me about the relationship the NCRA created with Peter Flemming, a recent Director General of Broadcast Policy. The NCRA invited Flemming to attend two annual conferences. He was impressed by the organisation and seriousness of the member stations to provide proactive and diverse programming from all sectors of the community in which they broadcast, and from national and international sources as well. The NCRA became the advocate for campus-community radio at the Commission level, and Flemming, interested in putting back on track the early call for diversity (reinforced by the 1968 Broadcasting Act) gave considerable attention to the NCRA as a viable means of gaining insight into the evolving goals and programming accomplishments of campus-community radio.

Based on a further conversation with Whipple, I learned that in the fall of 1989, John Stevenson, programmer and staff member at CKDU-FM in Halifax, as President of the NCRA presented an oral brief (undocumented by the NCRA) on behalf of the interests of campus-community radio during a CRTC hearing on commercial radio policy. In his presentation, Stevenson outlined the evolution of student radio from campus based to community service. He explained the diversity of programming which includes Jazz music, women's shows, and so on; and reiterated to the commission the CRTC intention for FM to be diverse, rather than commercial only. Stevenson impressed then Chair, Keith Spicer. Spicer approved the NCRA request for a "Policy Review of Student Radio" ( now being called campus-community radio by stations themselves, but not yet a license classification).

In 1990, Spicer met with the Board of the NCRA. Proposals for the review were drawn up by the CRTC and the NCRA responded to these proposals. In 1990, the CRTC executed a national tour of six Canadian cities and their 'student' stations. The CRTC desired an amalgamation of policy regarding campus and student radio. The NCRA's position was that campus stations doing community programming should be called community radio, or, that a third type of license in the campus-community licensing classification be created.

In 1991, the new Broadcasting Act was passed. An important amendment to the Act at Section 2 (i) i, states that programming on the Canadian Broadcasting System should “include educational and community programming” (Statutes of Canada, 1991, 120). I think that this shift in policy was influenced by interventions to the CRTC performed by the NCRA, and by community stations across the country. In terms of policy, campus-community radio was increasingly recognised as an important part of the radio broadcasting sector. And, in April of 1992, after two years of negotiation between the NCRA and the CRTC, this new type of license category and corresponding policy was created.

In the CRTC public Notice 1992-38 called, Policies for Community and Campus Radio, the Commission acknowledges “comments received during the consultations and in the briefs indicated some differences of opinion on the [as above] definition” of community radio. The Commission also notes “the views of certain parties that broadcasters should be allowed to determine how they will operate and what services they can offer to a particular audience” (CRTC, 29 May, 1992, 2).

This intervention into policy, when examined within Foucault’s (1991) model outlined in the introduction, is an example of his rethinking of how power, government and the people relate. To reiterate, instead of thinking about governing in terms of what he calls the legitimacy of either the rulers, or the forms of government, where the questions would be framed in such a way as to contest or expose unequal relations of power among the rulers and the ruled, he suggests that a different

rationality, or way of thinking about the power relations between the government and the governed. His is a productive, not repressive, model -- power is not something we have, but is negotiated through various acts and practices.

While I detail this model in Chapter III, it marks the beginning of a rationale based upon a desire to create a means for participation, negotiation, and intervention in government. In terms of the history of the development of radio broadcasting policy then, I conclude with the aforementioned intervention into policy by campus-community stations, and turn now questions of participation in community and campus-community stations even in the midst of supposed open access.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### ***Introduction***

The history of radio broadcasting policy and regulation in Canada shows that the policy was created without full participation from Canadians in all social strata. Individuals and groups in society, then, have been historically positioned through both government policy informed by particular values of particular times, and by the lack of participation in creating one's own history. I also said that this awareness, coupled with the intervention of groups such as the NCRA, and by campus-community radio stations themselves, ushers in changes in policy and participation in its creation. I cite as these as changes in power relations.

Campus-community radio not only mandates participation in programming and policy-making by disadvantaged groups in society, but also reinforces the notion of determination through self-identification. Claiming this as a new rationality of government (see below), the proceeding case study documents how, according to Zuraw of CKUT-FM, the station provided more access to groups than its original category of campus station required. This occurred even before the CRTC recognised the value of the work in the form of license classification. Zuraw says that "CKUT-FM was called a campus station, but this didn't effect what it did in terms of programming" (Zuraw interview, 1993). Before the CRTC created the license type of campus-community in 1992, CKUT-FM was broadcasting programs produced by, and for, listeners from various communities in the city of Montréal. As well, the station already produced in-house public service



announcements in the areas of human rights, health, housing, education, environment, and education.

As is demonstrated in the upcoming case study, the station takes responsibility for providing access to a variety of points of view, and for educating the listenership on news of the day from an analytical, critical perspective. At CKUT-FM, social change, toward a less stratified society, is an underlying theme guiding the programming and the operations of the station. However, as I said, not all stations take on this mission. As I explain later in the critique, the specific location of the stations, and the kinds of people who participate will determine to some degree, the political and social orientation of the programming.

In this chapter, I continue with my case study of campus-community station CKUT-FM. I participated at the station as a volunteer for two years. In June of 1994, I carried out a week of participant observation, oral interviews and document research. As I mentioned earlier, I have also been entangled with this type of radio in both paid and volunteer positions for over 10 years. I present the study within the frame of Foucault's (1991) rationality of government (*op. cit.*, pg. 2). This model provides a means of examining complexities of administering policy within a specific *melieu*.

This section of my case study has three main parts. The first part is a presentation of CKUT-FM's origins prior to its FM license. The second part outlines the station's organisational structure, internal administration and programming policies, and policies it

adheres to as a condition of license. These three elements work together, and with the content of the programming, in a symbiotic relationship to create the overall personality of the station. The third part of the case study is the interaction of interviews I collected at the station with the main theoretical themes that flow throughout this chapter. The third part of the case study is continual, interactive commentary and critique.

Following the first two parts of the case study, I present an examination of the concept of community itself, which can tend toward a homogenous orientation whereby members are grouped together from the outside without regard to their differences. I then show the differences between campus-community and community type radio, as well as their common goal to provide a voice for many communities of publics. Following this, I examine the concerns of Liora Salter (1980) in terms of limited participation in the midst of perspectives in conflict. Finally, the chapter concludes with an explanation of campus-community radio's new rationality of government.

### ***CKUT-FM - A Case Study***

#### **Part I: Club Radio to Licensed Broadcaster**

According to the station manager incumbent Martha-Marie Kleinhans\*, in 1986

CKUT-FM's move from a closed circuit radio club to an FM station was the result of the efforts of her and her peers to enhance the education of listeners. This education included new approaches to considering then called 'alternative' music as not necessarily subversive, but rather a different kind of sound than heard on mainstream radio. Her goal

---

\* I interviewed Ms. Kleinhans in Montréal in March of 1993.

was to go beyond the ideas of a club. She describes the station before it went FM as “a room down in the student union building -- it was a sofa and few turntables and people hanging out. It was play; playing records backwards and so on. It was called CFRM, Radio McGill” (Kleinhans 1993). Although the attraction of the station to listeners and programmers alike has its roots in the idea of challenging ideas and sounds that are so-called ‘normal’ or ‘real’, she argued in her bid for the job as Manager, as Ogilvie points out, that “the process of planning and producing programs is considered at least as important as audiencing them” (Ogilvie, 1988, 27). Kleinhans’ goal was to “think of every community in Montréal that wasn’t getting a voice now [then] and how we could provide them with a voice (Kleinhans interview, 1993).

While complimenting existing programming and expanding the involvement of the different groups within the city was certainly not new, considering the existence of station *Radio Centre Ville\**, CKUT-FM brought together a broad base of people from all walks of life. As Chris Migone\* , Former Technical Director says:

just the fact that we have over 350 volunteers shows that we’re trying to eradicate the notion of ‘us versus them’ -- of the single transmitter -- certainly the concept of radio as a commercial enterprise where you have to push a certain format. And the idea of format is integral to the idea of radio -- you know, people ask, what format do you have? This projects an homogenized way of looking at the world. They want to fit into that, or reject it . And we [at CKUT] we have a non-format as much as possible (Migone, 1994).

---

\* See the mini case study of this station on pages 78-80

\* I interviewed Migone at CKUT-FM in May, 1994.

This is different than the club atmosphere before going FM when the attitude was self-referential and conversations like in any club, were closed. The license to broadcast went hand in hand with a more broad outlook, and a broader reach of participation.

## **Part II: Operations and Policy**

### **Operations:**

CKUT-FM broadcasts at 5,700 watts on the FM band at 90.3 to the greater Montréal area, parts of Québec and the eastern US. The transmitter and antenna are located on top of Mount Royal. Listeners can also access the signal through cable lines at 70.1.

The station is administered by a non-profit corporation called Radio McGill incorporated. The radio station is owned by the students of McGill University who are also, upon registration as students at McGill, members of CKUT-FM radio McGill. Associate members from the community pay an \$8.00 membership fee. This entitles them to access to training and broadcasting, and to elect a representative to the Steering Committee which administers the station. Community members, however, cannot cast an individual vote on the bylaws of the organisation. Instead, the community representatives vote on behalf of the membership.

There is a slight difference in status between student and community members in terms of voting rights. So, there is the potential for a student referendum to alter the way the station runs. However, the conditions of license would remain the same until such time as

a new license was written and approved by the CRTC. Community members then, have limited access to the overall functioning of station operations. Access is provided through election to operations and programming committees described below. Changes to the bylaws requires a legal notice to that effect advertised in the student newspapers, The McGill Daily and The Tribune. The larger community is informed of potential changes via on-air announcements. Community members may voice their opinions directly to the representative. The Steering Committee is elected by the full membership each year at the Annual General Meeting.

Radio McGill as a corporation (that is, its financial and legal elements) is administered by a Board of Directors (BOD) in charge of the license. The BOD is comprised of the station manager, a representative of University administration (finance) student council representatives, two community representatives, and two representatives from among the programmers at the station. The intention is to ensure that all the members of the station are represented. Also on the Board are representatives from the staff whose presence balances that of the station manager.

The everyday running or management of the station itself is not a part of the duties of the Board of Directors. Rather, the station manager and her committees are responsible for the overall operations and direction of station. At CKUT-FM volunteers are a large part of management structure. Three main committees work to guide and direct CKUT-FM; they are the Steering, Programming, and Finance Committees. The Steering Committee is

comprised of all core and support staff at the station (five full-time and four part-time), and of one elected representative from the (community or student) volunteers of the three main departments of production, music programming, and spoken-word programming.

The Steering Committee administers the overall direction of the station. This includes consultation with its committees, the creation of mandates and policies, and the management of day-to-day operations. Each core staff member from sales, music and spoken-word programming, production and management provide activity reports to the committee members. This group initiates the profile events of CKUT-FM such as co-sponsoring local social, music, and political benefits. It also ensures that the station is a visible and responsive part of the larger community.

The programming committee is comprised of five (5) volunteers elected at the Annual General Meeting. Each of these volunteers a 'community' of volunteers in the following sectors: French; Music; Spoken-word; Community (someone who acts as a liaison between the broader urban community and the smaller station community); and Student. This committee has an interesting structure -- only these elected members have voting rights. So the staff in spoken-word and music programming take direction from the volunteer programming committee. During my participant observation period in June of 1994, and during my tenure as a community representative in 1992, I observed three meetings. I found that discussion over a contentious issue is carried out until a consensus is reached.

The mandate of the Programming Committee is to co-ordinate and oversee all programming. As such, duties of the committee include, as a primary function, to ensure that all categories of programming meet all internal and external requirements. These include: the Promise of Performance, Statement of Principles of Radio McGill (see below), all departmental station policies the rules and regulations of Radio McGill, the original proposals of individual programs, the Broadcasting Act , and other related CRTC documents and policies. The Programming Committee schedules programming and selects show proposals for broadcast.

The Finance Committee consists of the station manger and McGill student finance committee representatives. This committee oversees the financial management of Radio McGill, and reports directly to the BOD. These committees, as I mentioned, are comprised of volunteers who offer a variety of ideas in terms of projects the station supports, both in terms of programming, and external endeavours. Some examples are sponsorships, co-presentation of music, arts, political benefits, cultural events, ethnic community events, and events and activities that are both part of the overall programming sections, as well as and activities not necessarily part of the on air schedule.

CKUT-FM's projected budget for 1994 cites revenues at \$339,263, and, since it is non-profit, its revenue equals expenses. According to sales manager, Louise Burns, the stations collects \$145,000. in student and community membership fees, an advertising

revenue of \$92,000 \* , and the annual listener-supported funding drive generates approximately 45,000. In addition, the station receives a sub-carrier rental fee, periodic employment grants for job development (not for core staff, but for the training of people on Canada Employment and Immigration programs), and revenues from community benefit concerts.

**Policy and Programming Landscape:**

The programming policies at CKUT-FM are working guidelines expanded from the Statement of Principles of Radio McGill arrived at by member and Board discussion. They are developed within the context of other station policies and guidelines such as access and programming policy.

These policies seek to ensure that the vast majority of its programming is community access:

it is assumed and expected that the purpose of community access air-time is to grant air-time to those who are not adequately served by the mainstream media - to provide a voice for the voiceless in addressing issues of concern in specific communities” (CKUT-FM Programming Policies, Unpublished, 1993).

The programming policies are generated to promote understanding of cultures and the issues they face among the larger listening audience and community at large, to represent a wide range of different or differing views within these communities. Thus, “All shows are expected to remain open to input from other members and organisations within their



communities”(Ibid.). I comment on the complexity the concept of community later in the chapter.

At CKUT-FM, overall programming policy guides the specific policies for music and spoken-word programming. Musical policy is explicit. It states that CKUT-FM will not air “any musical material that includes lyrics promoting hatred, discrimination or contempt against an individual or group or class of individuals on the basis of race, national, or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical ability, or sexual orientation”(CKUT-FM Music Policy, Unpublished, 1993). While it may seem today that such concerns are immersed into the popular consciousness as ‘politically correct’ (in itself a parochial term), the practice and principle of promoting hate free music is not very long established. Indeed, it has been the effort of stations such as CKUT-FM and groups such as the NCRA that have influenced and altered the once status quo of majority views as legitimate at the expense of so-called difference.

CKUT-FM music policy is sophisticated however, and also recognises that :

some of the lyrics could be determined as falling within the above clause are used in a manner to expose the audience to such discriminations in order to increase awareness and with the belief that this will facilitate the eventual eradication of these discriminations (CKUT-FM Music Policy, Unpublished, 1993).

The intention of the artist must be considered when policy is interpreted. Music policy concludes that it is the responsibility of CKUT-FM to ensure that each “programmer is

able to judge to the best of her ability whether the artist's usage is compatible with policy and the Statement of Principles" (CKUT-FM Policy Guidelines, 1993), and with CRTC policy.

Programming policy is also further divided into specific categories pertaining to music and spoken-word. The station is mandated, by its own policies and by the negotiation of these policies with CRTC policy, to explore all kinds of music. These can often include texts of artists exploring the "most difficult facets of human experience and behaviour, for example, addiction, slavery, insanity, mass murder, hatred, torture" (Programming Policy Guidelines, 1992). CKUT-FM believes that artists often act as the emotional catharsis of our society and as such have the right to be heard" (Ibid.). As Bryan Zuraw told me, the station does not try to give listeners only what they want, but what needs to be said, and heard. In this sense, the station and its programmers act as provocateurs of the *status quo*.

The station broadcasts over 100 music shows including: "West Indian Rhythms", "underground Sounds", "FolkRoots/FolkBranches", "DrasticPlastic", "Jazz Amuk", and "Soundings". Its sounds cover the range of genres including rock, country, songs of protest, humour and satire, music hall and vaudeville, popular arrangements of classical, jazz or folk songs, international pop songs, traditional classical, opera, improvised and 'authentic' jazz, traditional folk songs, blues, gospel and international folk (CKUT-FM

Programme Guide, 1994). The station's programming interjects an element of music as more than entertainment into the listening sphere.

**Spoken-Word Policy:**

Station policy states that producers and programmers must strive to incorporate

unrecognised sources with particular emphasis or focus on that which is local in origin.

Spoken-word material must not promote hatred, stereotypes, abuse or offence. (CKUT-FM Promise of Performance, Schedule, 20.4, Part III, Section 5, 1994). Since the mandate of the station includes the provision to listeners, services unavailable (in content and form) on other stations, the Spoken-word policy restates the overall mandate in terms of non-music programming :

CKUT-FM does not advocate the censorship of mainstream or popular culture [*sic*] but if the station's resources are given over to non-alternatives, then such a deviation must not supersede or interfere with the success of our mandate (Ibid.).

**Spoken-Word Programming:**

The terms 'spoken-word' refers to all categories of programming that are neither music based, nor ads or sponsorships spots. Spoken-word includes: news with little or no interpretation, sports, event listings, background or 'enrichment' which includes coverage of issues and events not given adequate coverage by commercial media, and programming produced by specific community groups. Each week, 16.5 hours of CKUT-FM's programming is devoted to open format public and community affairs shows. These hours

are divided into three shows which incorporate news, feature interviews, reports, listings, and analysis in 'beats' such as local (socio-economic and political happenings and their relevance), environment, health, arts, and women.

CKUT-FM also features a total of 26.30 hours (or 21% of the broadcast week) of focused spoken-word programs produced by community volunteers who choose their own topics, do their own research, produce and operate their shows live. They are responsible to the programming committee (Ibid.). Some of these shows include: "Queercorp", "Hersay", "*Le Complex de Javex*", and Literature Montréal.

### ***Part III: Analysis and Commentary***

#### **Participation and Power Relations**

Campus-community radio is only alternative if defined in relation to a so-called dominant or mainstream approach to broadcasting. They are no longer burdened with a label that pits them against other formats. Rather, they are what they do: Stations "provide a forum where interest groups can talk about their issues among themselves, but also for other communities -- other audiences and can so foster understanding" (Zuraw interview, 1993).

But there is also evidence of contention among and within groups who produce programming at the station. Specifically, Zuraw notes that there are debates within the groups about how shows should be constructed. However, CKUT is set up to foster broad listening and encourages programmers to remember the potential listenership, and

not just their community. Rather than seeing this as a necessary failure, David Ackerman\* of radio station CIUT-FM at the University of Toronto says that the realisation of conflict or disparate views is what keeps the programming on the edge. Stations do not see themselves as necessarily trying to achieve a constant listenership, but rather a listenership that is as diverse in terms of taste and listening habits. While a station such as CKUT-FM provides the opportunity to speak to one's "own cultural condition" (Zuraw, 1993), they also function as a places where groups communicate with each other. They are "bases and training grounds for agitation activities directed toward wider publics" (Zuraw, 1994).

To carry over an example I mentioned earlier, on CKUT-FM, the program "Caribbean Profile" is hosted by people living in Montréal who are Caribbean. They play music and announce news and events relevant to the Caribbean community in the city. But they do it within a certain patter and form of expression. The style and content of the program is an expression of a certain voice. The announcer has a patter delivered in a very relaxed and friendly manner. He brings the community together literally by inviting guests on the show, and by conducting live phone interviews with people in Jamaica and other parts of the Caribbean. The announcers also uses expressions that have specific meaning to listeners from the Caribbean. These are only a few ways in which the group achieves participation on the airwaves -- they are not forced to alter their mode of expression to suit a dominant form.

---

\* I spoke with David Ackerman by phone on June 14, 1994

So far, I have presented an outline of the ways in campus-community radio is defined: First, through official CRTC discourse and license requirements; second, through the views of the NCRA, music programmers and staff. These instances of exploring the identity of campus-community radio all have a common ground for me, which is that campus-community radio must be self-identified, and it must be done in relation to other institutions and discourses rather than in opposition to other radio formats. This approach erases what I consider to be a false dichotomy -- a power relation whereby definition is achieved by the so-called dominant marginalizing formats as alternative, in a pejorative sense. In broadcasting then, groups no longer necessarily need to be included into a predetermined format, but can create their own.

### **Complexities of Identity and Community**

It is important to recognise that defining from within does not mean that a self-referential identity is created without relation to other influences. Rather, it is the multi layers of relations that contribute to the identity. As in other types of communities, such as geographical, ethnic, cultural and musical, the identity of CKUT-FM is constantly re-shaped. This occurs because of the continually changing specifics of programming and individual input from the diverse membership. Neither the identity of the station, nor its 'personality' is static.

As Bryan Zuraw says of CKUT-FM, "The station itself is a community of its own -- distinct from various communities that participate. It develops its own culture -- but it has a sense of commitment or common purpose that people care about" (Zuraw, 1993). As

we know, the station broadcasts programming produced by various communities within the local area the station serves. By promoting input from other voices within a particular group, CKUT-FM recognises that communities are not homogeneous, and that one perspective cannot and should not be seen as a full reflection or representation of a certain group. The policy also states that: “Members of various communities must be able to work without compromising their beliefs or convictions. At the same time, they must acknowledge a broad range of opinion on any given issue” (CKUT-FM Programming Policy, Unpublished, 1994). Policy then, recognises the complexity of demands and perspectives and also recognises that negotiation about what to broadcast is a central element to the participatory orientation of the stations programming agenda and broader mandate.

So, the concept of community is complex. It has many meanings and is understood in a number of different ways. Because the study of the idea of community is almost a discipline unto its own, I do not recite all the many ways in which the term has been analysed and explained.\*

Exploring the many ways in which the idea of community has been understood fits more concisely with the overall theme of my thesis. To take an example from radio, the word community may have specific meaning as a reference to “interest groups-- pure interest bonds such as theatre, literary, or as historical and cultural bonds in ethnic communities, or

---

\* For a current, critical discussion on the problems of community by design or by decree, see: Anderson, Benedict, Imagined Communities, Verso, (London, 1991)., and the Cohen text I cite herein.

women's community, gay community and so on." (Zuraw, 1993). The point here is not that the station satisfies all interests all the time, or even that the station itself as an institution doesn't experience moments of hierarchical power arrangements among the staff, Board and volunteers. That these may occur is exactly the point. The struggle for identity is in part how the identity is formed. The identity of individuals within the different community groups may also be in conflict with the overall goals of the group in much the same way that members' varied experiences and relationships to the community help them make sense of what it means to them (Cohen, 1985, 12).

As Cohen explains, the approach to the study of community as well as the term itself is in a continual state of flux. His cultural approach to understanding the concept of community is distinct from what he calls the 'old school' of sociology which tends to define community in a structural way - as a morphology: Members have

something in common which each other which distinguishes them from other groups. This approach recognizes a boundary as desirable and obvious. Alternatively, a cultural [my emphasis] examination of community takes as a premise the idea that not all boundaries, and not all the components of any boundary, are so objectively apparent. They may be thought of, rather, as existing in the minds of their beholder (Cohen, 1985, 12).

I concur with the cultural studies approach, as I explained in the thesis introduction. The content of this passage by Cohen is important -- and so is the subtext. His model enables us to understand the transitions (and therefore, fluidity) of community as a theoretical concept, and as a dynamic, rather than static, entity.



### **“Community” Radio**

This shift in understanding the concept of community is illustrated, I think, by the efforts of campus-community stations, as I said, and also by community radio stations such as Montréal’s *Radio Centre-Ville*. A case study of the station (Girard, 1993) is useful to repeat here. The station broadcasts local content programming to the Montréal area in seven languages, and is operated primarily by volunteers from diverse ethnic communities in the city. It provides a space for groups that do not have air-time on mainstream radio. However, the management of the station has never purported to be either democratic, or consensus-oriented.

Neither is the impetus behind the development of a diverse format to promote belonging or incorporation. According to its co-founder Hyman Glustein, its specific mandate was to act as “counter-culture radio, defending citizen’s rights” (Girard, 1993, 51). Glustein says that broadcasting information was more important than was developing an internal democratic structure or electoral process. Therefore, he explains that “a small group of un-elected people could run it and do whatever they felt was best” (Ibid., 51).

*Radio Centre-Ville* proceeded to infuse the majority anglophone and francophone language and cultural spaces within the city of Montréal with the voices and ideas of a multitude of allophone populations. Through the programming of the station, listeners in Montréal hear allophone languages such Greek, Italian, and Arabic. By including the voices of a multitude of

populations that co-exist in the larger urban community, the idea of legitimate dominant cultures is challenged.

Because the point of view of the programmer, regardless of her ethnic grouping, determines how the show sounds, and the kinds of information broadcast, the shows do not necessarily pretend to represent a whole community. In this way, *Radio Centre Ville* is different from other community stations -- it houses a wide variety of ethnic groups, each with their own distinctive voices, and it does not impose any overall format or mandate upon the groups. (The CBC-run community stations mentioned in Chapter One failed to account for diversity inside the community in which it broadcast). Like CKUT-FM, *Radio Centre Ville* provides a space for contention among members of the same groups in terms of what kinds of programming is most relevant to the groups. The struggle for power of self-identification resides within the group -- and it is the struggles and their outcomes which continually reshape the identity.

### **Comparing Community and Campus-Community Stations**

Distinctions can be found in types of community and campus-community stations

depending on location. (One can tune into a private station in Edmonton or St. John's and hear the same kinds of sounds). I think both radio types highlight differences based on the views and tastes of the station owners. By analysing practices of governments, and in this model, radio station management, the rationality behind the goals can be understood. The reasons for certain station operations is not only an important study of communication policy, but also a sociological study of changing cultural patterns acting on these goals.

I propose that what the station does as a condition of license influences what the station is. For example, in Halifax, no independently owned community stations exist. Recognising the need for broad community access to the airwaves to balance the domination of mass media content, the student (campus) station at Dalhousie applied for an FM licence as a campus station, and in 1985, the station began broadcasting to the greater Halifax area. Were there more community stations licensed at the time, this license application may not have been approved by the CRTC.

In Québec, there are over 40 community stations operating(Oglivie, 1988). But in Montréal, there was no English community station until Radio McGill applied for, and received, a license to broadcast as CKUT-FM. It is important here to understand that differing contexts, and needs, and experiences form the station, and its relationship to listeners in both content and form. As Bruce Girrard (1992, 9) points out:

Urban community radio stations in North America tend to be more culturally and/or politically engaged and serve communities that are outside the 'mainstream' because of their language, race, cultural interests or politics. In contrast, rural stations tend to be more in tune with the community, although the majority of a remote community often has little in common with the 'mainstream' images.

Commercial stations, as I said in Chapter One, must have a certain percentage of local content, and promote events in the community. But the majority of sounds are not created in relation to the specific broadcast area they serve. This means that communities are

receiving sounds and information not created by the community itself. The implication of this, I think, is the recreation of a homogeneity. Conversely, stations owned, operated, and formatted by those in the broadcast area, simply by virtue of their content and co-operative management, illustrate the counter-point, which is diversity.

In terms of differences of stations, I have discussed three points: One, that differences in format are indicators of differing goals and rationale, or reason for existing (profit motive, education motive, etc.). Two, that recognising different rationale as a talisman of cultural studies rather than type of license itself relocates the study from administrative to critical. Three, that the examination of practices illustrates the mutability of rationale and goes beyond a polarised debate, albeit critical, of which practice is more legitimate than the other. My particular bias in relation to this effort turns in favour of a progressive politic in which access and participation to the ownership and practice of broadcasting is essential. Although I discussed problems of participation earlier in the Chapter, it is important to take seriously the concerns of Liora Salter (1980) whose work outlines the problems of “a monolithic view of collective identity” (Salter, 1980, 106).

#### ***Part IV: Salter's Critique of Community Radio and Participation***

In her analysis of participation at CO-OP radio in Vancouver, Salter uncovers important issues relevant to any study of community radio. Specifically, she articulates a theory of “perspectives in conflict” which operate within the management and membership of stations themselves. She outlines two main perspectives which I reiterate here. The first

is participation “linked to an analysis of power relations. Those who hold a participatory perspective argue all levels of decision-making in current industrial societies takes place without reference to those affected” (Ibid., 107).

She further states that the goal is participation, but it may be recognised that experiments in community or worker participation may not succeed in altering power relationships. Her study finds that decision making is structured and institutionalised within a system of power relationships. This is not always the case, but it is important to monitor. Salter expresses the dynamics of the problem quite clearly. She says:

the mere inclusion of the citizen, student, or worker on a planning or management board does not, in itself, alter the patterns of decisions that will eventually be made about work-place, university or community relations. Nonetheless, the demand for participation, even if only in representation, can have a radical effect, if the political activity that emerges from the ensuing conflict exposes the full dimensions of power-in-operation (Salter, 1980, 107).

This participatory critique echoes C. Wright Mills. It is a critique of both “established institutions and of pluralism which fails as radical when power relations are repeated or not recognised. Under those conditions, the participatory critique becomes an instrument of conservative, not radical, politics” (Ibid., 108).

Salter’s recognition of relative participation is an important step in moving beyond the place where pluralism (as on radio space) is seen as enough of a participatory measure.

Broader participation would include the licensing of more community stations, and would

and de-homogenise the concept of public airwaves. Bryan Zuraw at CKUT concurs. He says “the reason stations like CKUT exist is because the CRTC doesn't give out enough licenses. For example, the Caribbean community should have their own station” (Zuraw interview, 1994). This measure would certainly expand the diversity of the airwaves, but may not eradicate the problems discussed earlier, of homogenisation of the concept, and actuality of community.

Salter's second perspective is called “process, linked to an argument about the inherently alienating conditions of mass society” (Salter, 1980, 108). The points discussed earlier in the comparison between commercial and community radio fall into Salter's category of the process argument. It reinforces the notion of a one-way communication flow based on the argument that of there is no chance for response, and that the media, like other corporate structures, are part of the problem. The process perspective involves conflict of its own in the analysis of community radio. On the one hand, community radio projects are considered pluralistic. On the other hand, these models are understood as positive means of creating a two-way communication flow. The later position cites community radio as important in that “it functions as an alternative form of social organisation, such as a media forum, or as a centre for new forms of personal relationships”(Ibid., 108). This approach to determining what is meant by communication finds a relevant model in the examination of radio broadcasting technology as a tool of two-way communication.

### **“Unthinking Localism”?**

I think that CKUT-FM is more than its promise of performance. Rather, it is a cultural site analogous with the larger society in which it exists. Campus-community radio creates a space for the dislocated if viewed in relation to mass market radio formats which offer neither varied content nor access to format development. However, within community media, there is a problem of the public becoming a “concept of aggregation” (Salter, 1980, 110). Because community media attempt to “constitute a forum for full and equitable representation of all interests” (Ibid., 110) under-represented in mainstream media, they operate in terms of those whose interests have been excluded. However, she warns against the alternative which she calls “unthinking localism” (Salter, 1980, 111).

This term refers to the classification of communities of localities by externals such as region, neighbourhood, and workplace. The danger is that “issues that extend beyond the boundaries of the “community” are not considered community issues” (Salter, 1980, 111). She concludes that “community control masks the internal conflicts within and between communities and the complexities of issues that stimulate political activity across territorial boundaries (Ibid., 111).

Salter’s warning is a testament to my concerns and echoes those of others writing on the future of community media. For example, Jan Drijivers (1992) outlines certain conditions which would retain early aims of local and regional radio in Europe - that is policy that goes beyond community of national boundaries and develops an “emerging European

consciousness” (Drijivers, 1992, 199). One of these conditions is the urging of producers and listeners to look beyond their own “geographical and cultural horizons ... to avoid ... provincialism and eurocentrism“ (Ibid., 199).

***Part V: Limited Transformation Within a Temporal Space***

Just as communities are diverse, one radio show cannot purport to represent the diverse needs and views of people who position themselves as part of any kind of community. For example, on one of my trips to CKUT-FM, I happened to be sitting in the common area with two men working on a show called “The Homo Show”. The two men provided insights about the extent to which the show can, or should ‘represent’ the ‘Queer community’ in Montréal. They had different reason for doing the show. One said he was at CKUT-FM because it provided “an opportunity for queer culture, to advance a queer culture agenda.” While the other man agreed with this purpose overall, he suggested that “there is certain clique mentality among programmers, and in the so-called “community”.

He said, for example that the same people who produce the “Homo Show” also work with the women who produced “Dykes on Mics”. They are the same group who organise the Gay Pride Day, write magazine articles, and generally act as the public face of gay and lesbian activism and culture. This can be problematic in that the “culture that emerges is insular.” However, if only certain people do get involved, the culture tends to be formed by the interests and perceptions of those people. And because of the diverse ideas and



experiences of the members, they very rarely meet or agree on what should be produced. It ends up being a very individually run effort.

Recognising this “limited transformation within a temporal space”<sup>\*</sup> helps, rather than hampers, the understanding of the complexity of change. “Transition is tough- it can be uncomfortable because some people will not have the same power they once had” (Ackerman, 1994). On a broader level, the struggle for dominance for certain societal structures and the corresponding political ideologies between people holding diverse values within a particular culture is at the forefront of the debate over boundaries. As Stuart Hall (1981, 234) points out:

The important fact then, is not a mere descriptive inventory - which may have the effect of freezing popular culture into some timeless descriptive mode, but the *relations of power* which are constantly punctuating and dividing the domain of culture into its preferred and residual categories.

Those stations that follow the guidelines of the NCRA recognise that the group is not only an effective lobby, but its efforts are an example of working within the system to alter relations of power. This occurs in two main areas: within the broadcasting sector, whereby stations defines themselves from within, rather than against the ‘mainstream’; and within programming of campus- community radio itself. Because campus-community radio is participatory, drawing on an eclectic array of volunteer programmers, and broadcasting a wide variety of sounds in half hour to two hour slots, its operations and sounds are in a continual state of flux. The somewhat paradoxical constancy of change

---

<sup>\*</sup> Dr. Kim Sawchuk coined this phrase during our discussions about this thesis in 1994.

creates personality and identity for many campus-community radio stations. As David Ackerman of CIUT-FM told me, “the main thing we have going for us is change” (Ackerman, 1994). While some shows and staff are around for long periods of time, high turn over is more common than not.

The efforts of many stations are driven by a philosophy of ethnic, gender and cultural diversity. Some use ‘resistive’ or oppositional politics, and some have moved forward. That is, they maintain the same programming focus, but they confidently position themselves and their sounds not merely as an alternative to mainstream media, but rather as necessary components of the public airwaves. In this sense, resistance is more than reaction to what is already in place - formats, policy, and value systems - its strength comes through proactive intervention into both the history and the present practices of ‘normalisation’ wherever it is found.

At this juncture, I move beyond the criticisms of limited participation. The question is no longer whether CKUT-FM and other community stations practice all their objectives all the time. Rather, I take this as a given, and as an integral part of the idea that power is about relationships, and struggle. A new means of understanding governing, and indeed, a better question, is: How can the idea of government be restated based on the idea of struggle? This is explored next in Chapter Three.

## CHAPTER THREE

*Everything changes, every fact wears some disguise*

James Keelaghan, My Skies, Green Linnet Records (Danbury, 1993)

### *Introduction:*

#### **Governmentality as 'Form of Rule' Analysis**

Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (1991) provide excellent coverage of Michel Foucault's complex and multidimensional work on governmentality. His work is distinct from the broad body of work in "classical political philosophy, in its central concern with the legitimate foundations of political sovereignty and political obedience ... [and] ... the best government. Governmentality is about how to govern" (Gordon, 1991, 7), and in terms of my work, how to administrate. As I said in the thesis Introduction, Foucault's idea of governmentality is also explored by Allor and Gagnon (1994). They say that it focuses on the practices of government as "an analysis of the actions within the state (laws, ministries, regulations) and 'at a distance' from it the organised and disorganised fields of government interventions" (Allor and Gagnon, 1994, 3).

Two common themes then are the practice of government, and intervention. I use Foucault's work to re-frame previous chapters in specific and general ways. Specifically, it applies to different levels of governmentality. These include: how campus-community radio stations govern themselves, how its lobby, the NCRA practices government as a

means of intervention to the CRTC, and how programmers help to create diverse programming policy at the stations. Broadly, it applies to the manner in which one comes to understand what governing and government means. Asking how government is practised is a means of investigating “the ways power is exercised” (Foucault, 1991, 7) under specific forms of rule. This in turn, allows a new analysis of power relations from unidirectional to multidirectional. Foucault articulates a shift of emphasis from why and whether the state has ‘legitimate’ power over, to how the governed can intervene.

This sets up a new approach to examining broadcasting policy and its ensuing disregard for the diversity of the population. Rather than understanding the implications of the policies as implying a disdain for incorporating diversity, I look at it in a new way - namely, based upon a certain notion of what governing meant. Foucault’s work brings out nuances in the study of government not fully examined in the state theory models of power relations which I outlined in Chapter One. I will quote his definition of governmentality at length and then proceed to comment. Governmentality encompasses:

1. The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its **target, population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security;** (my emphasis)
2. The tendency which, over a long period and throughout the West has steadily led toward the pre-eminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, etc.) of this type of power which may be termed government, resulting, on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of *savoirs* (Foucault, 1991, 102).

In this complex working of ideas about forms of government and power, Foucault's method and content are unique. His approach disposes of the idea that the history of government can be understood based solely on certain events at certain times. Instead, his epistemology is based on shifts. Hence, his history, rather than chronology, recognises the "historical movement that overturns the constraints of sovereignty in consequence of the problems of choices of government" (Foucault, 1991, 101). In turn, this shift "brings about the emergence of population as a datum, as a field of intervention and as an object of governmental techniques" (Ibid., 103).

This sentence is more fully understood with a look at the meaning of the word *savoir*, mentioned above. It is used to "designate a type of discourse" ... in which it acts as an exchanger mediating between the analytico-programmic levels of the sciences and the exigencies of direct social intervention" (Procacci, 1991, 156-57). This means that:

Whereas a science begins with the invention of an object of analysis ... based on an abstraction from the real as the starting point in which it develops its own project of reality, a *savoir* relocates the object thus scientifically delineated within a field of relationships in which the instruments of the scientific project are forced into contact with all the, inertia and opacity which the real displays in its concrete functioning (Ibid., 157).

The idea of *savoir* is used in the analysis of government and rule -- relating elements external to each other. "The object of *savoir* is no longer a ... scientific object, ... but an object upon which intervention is possible" (Ibid., 157). A shift in *savoir* influences the practices and emergence of certain forms of rule.

My examination of diversity in programming, in licensing, and of the economy, is framed with the notion that “In contrast to sovereignty, government has as its purpose not the act of government itself, but the welfare of the population” (Foucault, 1991, 100). And, as I said in Chapter One, an important historical shift relevant to radio in Canada finds a parallel in a moment described by Foucault as the shift from the idea of sovereignty and its corresponding goal of control over territory to the idea of “government” of the people. In terms of my work, the implications of this are that the shifts we see in policy and in practices of government (hearings, changing licenses) are neither the “teleological outcomes of either the progress of liberal rationality, nor the power relations of capital and class” (Allor and Gagnon, 1994, 5). The need for diversity on the airwaves is the result of understanding how new information, as well as the ways in which information is organised, acts on changes in policy. Foucault explains that shifts in ideas about what government is, characterise emergent policies. His model allows me to locate certain historical shifts in how the writing of policy is informed. So, like Allor and Gagnon (1994), the “key epistemological commitments linking this work to that of Foucault lie in a focus on conjectural historical study and in the analysis of relations between discursive and institutional levels”(Allor and Gagnon, 1994,4) of power in the creation of policy.

Foucault’s ideas about shifts in forms of rule or management are important for specific analysis (FM radio policy), because they highlight a most encouraging idea; the notion of change itself - that government forms, relations of power, and the ideas which govern their

emergence, are fluid, not static. The focus shifts from questions of the legitimacy of government (to write policy and control the airwaves) as a object of study, to practices of government -- as part of that practice is the opportunity for intervention. (Gordon, 1991, 7).

It is at the juncture between two spheres, the point of transition between concepts of state and the ensuing practices of government that, following Foucault (1991), I reopen the analysis of broadcasting regulation. According to Gordon (1991), Foucault says that state theory which has purported "... essential properties and propensities of the state .. to grow and swallow up or colonise everything outside itself... (Gordon, 1991, 4) is wrong. He says, on the contrary, that the state has no essence! Rather, "the nature of the institution of the state is a function of changes in *practice* of government, not the converse" (Ibid., 4). If there is no such thing as the state *per se*, then we can move beyond analysis of structure as the point of entry into the important questions of representation and equality both on the air, and in the boardroom. But before returning to the analysis of governmentality and FM broadcasting policy, it is important to comment on the transition in the concept of power itself.

### ***Part I:***

#### **Governmentality and Power**

With Foucault, we need not repeat an oppositional arrangements evident in earlier frames which tend to characterise those with power (the governors) and those without (the

governed) and necessarily leaves one in a lesser position. Rather, we can ask to what extent the idea of negotiation through the malleability of forms and instances of power, people can reclaim a stronger means of agency.

Foucault suggests that “relations of power are interconnected with other kinds of relations (production, kinship, family, sexuality) for which they play at once a conditioning and conditioned role” (Foucault, 1980, 142). This means that the usual way of thinking about power in a binary way, the dominated and the dominator, is reworked. The quality which characterises relations of power, and the forms of knowledge which influence our thinking about power relations, is, in effect, responsible for the move from binary to “multiform production of relations of domination” (Ibid., 142). This logic maintains that power relations are not static, but interactive, or elastic. Power is not something we have. As Fraser interprets Foucault, “power is better conceived as a complex, shifting field of relations in which everyone is an element” (Fraser, 1991, 29).

Fraser says that Foucault contradicts himself, however, because he identifies specific agents such as “social sciences ... with the forces of domination” (Ibid., 29). But I think Foucault makes it clear that just because no-one has power, it does not necessarily follow that there are no dominant social structures or positions: “the fact that power is held by no-one does not entail that it is equally held by all. People and groups are positioned differently within it” (Foucault, 1980, 142).



There are still relations of power evident within the theory of governmentality. The state still has the greater authority and ability to determine laws and policy, but we see an opening for negotiation, of altering, through the very possibility of relations, rather than polarity, in the way government is practised. Foucault reorients polarisation of power over by focusing on strategies -- negotiating a place, and identity within the systems and structures and recreating them and their logic as participatory, not dominating. Moreover he looks at power relations and struggles within all organisations. This is what breaks apart polarity.

While this idea of negotiation may at first seem to not do much to change the established order, it is important to be clear about the idea that there are no relations of power without resistance -- and that resistance is formed at the point where power is exercised (Foucault, 1980, 142). This means that the act of resistance is still necessary for the altering of the processes, practices and policies of institutions. However, resistance, as I mentioned before, is not characterised as coming from one source, but rather, as occurring all the time and in many ways and places. The political act of resistance is expanded to the sphere of culture -- not simply the economic and political realm as conceived topographical in the Marx base-superstructure model. Resistance is conceived of as an "Agonism" - a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyses both sides into permanent provocation" (Foucault, 1990, 5).

I have made two main points here: One, that through an historical review, we can distinguish the specific administrative procedures employed to regulate radio broadcasting in Canada from the 1920's onward. We can also distinguish moments within this history when practices of government changed. Two, I have established that negotiation can reorient relations of power. Now I turn to examine how these ideas apply to the governmentality of FM radio broadcasting.

### **Governmentality, Radio Regulation and Policy**

That the licensing of campus-community radio occurred at all was a necessary but not sufficient condition of lobbying by station staff for diversity on the airwaves, and the state goal of privatisation or diversification of the economy (Berland, 1990, 16). However, it was a shift in governmentality not only regarding the economy, but also the way government governs (inclusive or hegemonic for example) that is the necessary condition for altering power relations. The government still has control, but not autonomy - because power relations have changed. Therefore, I think there must be a more complex reason for the licensing changes at a certain time. Why didn't the government license or develop community-type radio originally as a 'norm'? Why did the government decide to regard lobby groups and interventions as important? These questions can only be answered more completely by the study of shifts in forms of rule.

The use of the process of affecting regulation shows how to use negotiation, and new evidence to reorient the power in operation in the logic of regulation and licensing.

Stations can change licensing to suit their needs. As I said, Foucault's idea of governmentality generates an over-riding theme of fluidity, of change. But he challenges the notion that one form of rule simply replaces another. Rather, the change from sovereignty, as a form of control over territory and principality, to 'the art of government' or, "the conduct of conduct - a form of activity aiming to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some person or persons"(Gordon, 1991, 2), transition is gradual and complex. The two forms are linked -- and shaped by new interventions acting on the form of rule and its *raison d'être*. Thus, he draws forth a method of understanding the social, and the civil, or the 'state' as a relationship in which the two influence and form each other, rather than as a binary where they are in contest for authority. Recognising both how the idea of intervention becomes a component of government, and how interventions themselves can influence form and *savoir* are integral thematic to Foucault's work on government and power.

I concur with both Foucault's method and his frame of reference or model of analysis. They provide a means to focus on the idea of change through negotiation, rather than on change through opposition. This is not only more productive, but it also provides a chance to learn. I think that the act of opposing is less challenging than the act of negotiating. Almost anyone can challenge, but the skill of achieving results through negotiation is more sophisticated. By this I mean that the person who learns to achieve results generally has had to think, and to prepare, to become informed. Whereas the

person who merely challenges may also be informed, but being informed is not necessarily a condition of the opposition.

**Toward Negotiation:**

With the emergence of campus-community radio, I think there develops a new language of articulating the relationships among and within the civil, state, public, and private spheres of society. Changes in policy and the transitions in radio licensing categories highlight the notion of intervention into relations of power and knowledge bases which inform them. The idea of power as a non- binary concept is neither an attempt to make light of, nor to erase, the impact and reality of dominant structures and institutions of governance, or of economic and political issues. Rather, it is a means of opening up our ability to work within these structures, rather than only against them, and thereby reorienting relations of power.

As with the internal management of CKUT-FM, and its external relations with the CRTC, government as a concept and practice requires awareness of the dynamism of needs and their relationship to one another. Foucault draws on La Perrier's idea that when explaining the nuances of governing, we are aware that one governs "men [*sic*] in their relations, their links, their imbrication with those other things..." (Foucault, 1991, 93). The idea of imbrication is central to Foucault's idea of power in governing as multidimensional and multidirectional. Imbrication means layering -- or layers and their relation to one another.

The idea of layers redefines the real to include culture and communication, and is counterpoised to the notion of static and absolute forms of power. Things in society could be resources, work, climate, housing, art, media and so on. At CKUT, the ‘things’ such as needs of community members, the listeners, the membership and owners, the Promise of Performance, the internal policy, are governed in relation to each other, rather than only against the CRTC, for example. The point is not necessarily what these things are, but that they are neither in opposition, nor static. It is important to recognise that if one is made to seem to have a higher priority than the other, then one is not practising government, but rather a top-down form of power over. To govern, then, means to recognise the complex: to “reckon with all the possible events that may intervene” (Foucault, 1991, 94).

By focusing on government as “activity or practice”, and by coming to know ways of governing, “what the activity consists of” (Gordon, 1991, 3), rather than on the standard effort of questioning mainly the legitimacy of government institutions, a method of creating agency is recognised. This may seem a large claim. And Foucault’s theories and methods are not without critics. I turn now to explore the reasons why Nancy Fraser (1989) thinks Foucault is irresponsible in both method and content.

## ***Part II:***

### **Fraser's Critique of Foucault**

The most important implication of Foucault's work for me, and for Nancy Fraser, is that

he:

provides the empirical and conceptual basis for treating such phenomena as sexuality, the family, schools, psychiatry, medicine, social science and the like as *political* phenomena. This sanctions the treatment of problems in these areas as *political* problems. It thereby widens the arena in which people may confront, understand and seek to change the character of their lives (Fraser, 1989, 26).

However hopeful and positive Foucault's notion of modern power as a capillary may be, Nancy Fraser objects on many levels to his "bracketing of a normative framework" (Fraser, 1989, 18). She says Foucault assumes that his "account of modern power is both politically engaged and normatively neutral" (Ibid., 19). On the one hand, by "revealing the capillary character of modern power and thereby ruling out crude ideology critique, statism and economism ... Foucault rules in a politics of everyday life" (Fraser, 1989, 26). But she questions his lack of exploration of the modern liberal framework of power relations based on the legitimate and illegitimate exercise of power.

Fraser contends that Foucault cannot simultaneously rule out the repressive hypothesis and the liberationist political orientation it supports which makes "illicit" speeches and acts into forms of revolt, and the radical normative framework which substitutes "repression versus liberation" for "legitimacy versus illegitimacy" (Ibid., 26). She says that since he uses words such as domination, subjugation, and subjection in his own work, and since

these words, to make sense, must have counter-points in words such as freedom, autonomy and independence, he cannot be free of a normative framework. The words he uses have a “normative force [which] seems to depend upon tacit appeal to the notions of rights, limits and the like” (Fraser, 1989, 30).

She goes on to say that if the liberal framework has not been suspended in Foucault’s writing, then he is “caught in an outright contradiction, for he ... tends to treat that framework as an instrument of domination” (Fraser, 1989, 30). Further, according to Fraser, he fails to appreciate the degree to which the normative is embedded and infused “throughout the language at every level, and despite himself, he is forced to make use of modes of description, interpretation and judgement formed within the modern Western normative tradition” (Ibid., 31).

I agree with Fraser that Foucault’s ideas are difficult to understand, and, from a structuralist point of reference, to accept. Is it ridiculous to suggest that, given economic and social, racial and gender disparity that power is actually a negotiable, intangible concept? Do people really have agency? These tough questions for me are answered in the affirmative. And I think the reason for this depends on how one looks at the work. I read Foucault hoping for a means of articulating the frustration I have with us-against-them dialectics, as I explained earlier. Both Fraser and Foucault seek means of analysing power. The difference lies in their approaches.

While Fraser (1989) seeks to look at specific speech acts as her object of study, Foucault suggests in his use of the word *savoir* that it is the relations of specifics that re-order the object. Fraser points out that we still must use specific language to get our message across, and that words have connotative meanings that we may associate with certain frames of reference. This is Foucault's other main point, I think. His genealogy represents the diverse systems of knowledge that have, at different times and places, informed the broad body of work and analysis on issues of government, power and control.

What Foucault does that is important for me, and for the creation and recreation of policy, is to refuse to work within categories of predetermined systems of knowledge. Rather, he studies how these systems are created, and how information is organised and reorganised within them. He describes, but he does not create empirical instances or statements such as "this is all something is, and it is no more or no less than that". The way I understand it, Foucault refuses the approach of agitation which pits theories against one another for example, or seeks to dismantle an old system in favour of a new one. Stuart Hall has a similar stance in his explanation of the work of cultural studies. Agency and change are achieved by questioning whether critical theory can "connect the different domains of life, politics, economics, theory, practice and thereby working with a metaphor of struggle" (Hall, 1992, 280).



***Part III:***

**Struggle and Competition in Radio Formats**

I think it is important to recognise the difference between working with a metaphor of struggle, and the metaphor of comparison and competition. As I said in Chapter Two, campus-community radio stations such as CIUT-FM in Toronto do not chose to define what they do or who they are in terms of what they are not -- that is, in competition with other formats. Rather, the station struggles everyday to create an environment and programming that serves the needs of the listeners in the broadcast area. As David Ackerman of CIUT says, "We don't want to compete with commercial stations or the CBC because to do that would be like comparing apples and oranges. We know where we stand as 3rd sector" (Ackerman interview, 1994). The mainstream versus alternative debate is no longer the best way to understand the differences among license types. Rather each station struggles for identity and for a place on air. He continues to explain why competition among and between formats and types is not even an issue, except insofar as it's an issue of control. He says:

People should be able to hear news like on CBC or new rock on CHOM, so we don't mind being a compliment to that. We don't see it as pejorative, but as part of what people can choose to listen to -- alternative means choice. This does not erase the fact that the CBC and commercial formats have become standard. The policy in determining this was a policy of control. We [CIUT] are concerned, it seems, with the everyday of radio, but we know what history we're dealing with (Ackerman interview, 1994).

By understanding this history and by working within levels and relations of power, stations are independent. Therefore, they are able to create relevant programming as well as

models of operations. Foucault's model allows an exploration of these mutations of radio. I end the chapter with a look at specific intervention into the creation of FM broadcasting policy, and thereby provide example of Foucault's idea of power an Agonism -- a struggle involving many players on many different levels.

### **Specific Intervention**

Rather than accept the self-imposed autonomy of regulator as 'natural', the National Campus-Community Radio Association (NCRA) and its member stations, seek to affect and intervene in the philosophy of governance with a move from a linear, top-down approach to a horizontal sphere where participation in the development. This effort takes as a first assumption that change in how to govern is possible. This assumption is based on the reality of communally owned and managed radio stations already functioning outside the 'norms' of private and public management styles.

I mentioned that the NCRA has made numerous interventions to the CRTC about how FM licenses are awarded in Canada. The NCRA asks not only for more licensing of community stations, but also, redefines the rationality of government. It asks "who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed" (Gordon, 1991, 6).

As member stations of the NCRA, and as formats, campus-community radio also makes two main interventions into relations of power. It shifts ideas of use -- campus-community radio is used as a participatory model of communication, and as such, alters the technological determinant function of radio as a linear mode only. Transmission, as a

concept of radio definition, is in transition. Its emergence then, effects the transition of how radio has been licensed as either public or private, both of which define ownership rather than use. Thus it acts as an intervention into the dominant uses and political economy of radio as either private enterprise or means of state control, both of which require transmission to be the key element of their function. By reordering the use of radio as a means of communication, of negotiating reality, rather than covering territory, campus-community models, in form and content, signal a reopening of relations of power based on access and negotiation rather than exclusion and opposition.

*Part IV:*

**Effects of Governmentality Model on Participatory Radio**

As we have seen, Foucault's (1991) emphases on shifts and imbrications in governing emphasises power in government analysis based on relations rather than single poles or domains of power. I think this work is akin to Salter's model of understanding community radio as a research site for "perspectives-in-conflict". As revealed at the end of Chapter Two, Participation is linked to an analysis of power relations. Salter's analysis of power in community radio explores the extent to which Girard is correct to claim that "community radio restores radio's vocation as an instrument of two-way communication" (Girard, 1993, Preface).

Girard concedes that people participate in commercial radio through talk shows phone in requests, but are not involved in programming or administrative decisions. This means the

involvement is minimal and not in any way a means of contributing to the overall form or content of the station. There are no members of commercial or public radio, only listeners. On the other hand, community and campus-community radio is comprised of a membership which, both individually, and through member representation, is involved with the running of the whole operation.

I think that communication is the opportunity for interaction between senders receivers, a communion of responses and interpretations. Radio broadcasting as a communication tool has been explored mainly in terms of its technological function; as a medium that transmits to, rather than communicating with, the listeners. There are those with the power to transmit, and those experiencing an over-determined alienation from the technological process and from the concept of communication as a vertical form of transmission over space rather than a circular, 'communal' interaction, which takes time, and which situates the communication in a particular locale. In this sense, broadcasting enacts a power relationship.

How can this relationship be re-defined? Can the actual process of radio production and transmission of ideas and concerns of everyday life serve to not only reconstruct the 'top-down' message orientation of radio as a medium, but also to develop individual power through participation? Listener input adds to the culture of radio as a medium of exchange, rather than one of dictation. An emphasis on the ability for users to define their

relationship to the medium, and to create for themselves a 'reality of participation' ease these concerns.

### **Chapter Summation**

This work has located Foucault's (1991) notion of governmentality as a model for understanding the transitions of thought and government practices with respect to the regulation of FM radio broadcasting. It shows the possibilities of, and means by which, intervention can alter how government is practised, and reorient relations of power. I have shown that radio can be used, and hence and regulated in many ways -- that neither the use, nor the policies which describe and govern that use are static.

Practices of government have been examined in terms of their relation to other institutions and *savoirs*. The degree to which the negotiation will alter relations of power is proportional to the degree to which groups work within the model of relationship. Even taking into account Fraser's (1989) concerns about the real effect of Foucault's model in a stratified society, I think that his perspective provides an opportunity to re-examine former strategies that have been based on direct oppositional politics, and which end in a form of paralysis.

## **SUMMATION:**

I have investigated two important themes in the thesis: First, that the state theory model contends that power relationships are polar. This limits its research scope because it neither accounts for the mutations of radio, nor the relationships among players creating broadcasting policy and regulation. Second, that the area of radio regulation is a site for examining broader issues of governing, power and intervention. I will look at each theme individually.

I have made distinctions between approaches to the study of radio broadcasting regulation in Canada. I have illustrated the concerns of three scholars, Raboy (1988), Berland (1990) and Ogilvie (1988), writing in the so-called dominant public/private paradigm. With varied emphases, they explore questions of public governance as it relates to the use of the airwaves. Questions are raised such as : Why has the government the right to control the space? Who constitutes the public? How are NCRA's various needs balanced? Who has access to the airwaves? Should radio sounds seek to reflect the people to who it broadcasts, or should it be used as means of generating profit revenue? All these critical questions are important with respect issues of government in the areas of control, power, and identity, as I showed in Chapters One and Two.

While these questions are crucial to the study of the policies which govern radio broadcasting, they do not, in themselves, allow for the mutations of radio. They do not

examine the emergence of campus-community radio into the broadcasting sector as an act of intervention into government policy. Thus they are limited in content. And they are also limited in scope. They do not, or cannot, in terms of their focus, distinguish the connection between shifts or movements in forms and practices of government, and the corresponding policy about how FM radio would be regulated and developed. (Although Berland (1990), as I said in Chapter One, mentions governmentality in terms of the global economy and radio regulation, she does investigate the term in itself).

As I explained throughout the thesis, and explore more fully in Chapter Three, that shifts in the ideas and practices of government and rule occur is central to Foucault's work on governmentality. I used Foucault's work because, like the writers I have cited, he has as an alternate object of study -- the problems of identity, control and power. Unlike other scholars, however, he says that these are not static elements formed solely by external forces. Identity is not assigned and contested only in relation to those in positions of authority. Control and power are negotiable because they to are not actually anything in themselves -- they are in continual flux and alter in terms of the relationships with other things.

This is a cultural studies approach (Bennett, 1992) to understanding governing and power. As such, it locates as its main object, the dislocation of the study of the object itself (scientific) in favour of the study of the complexities of influences in which the object is in a relationship with. This in turn leads to the notion that practices of governing are

multifarious. If this is true, then radio regulation can be altered through interventions occurring both inside and outside stations.

Rather than consider the regulation of radio in a negative relation to the 'state', whereby listeners have no opportunity to have their needs met, I have shown the contrary.

Listeners can become broadcasters. They can intervene in policy at CRTC hearings. Even though I said that broadcasting enacts a power relationship between those who send and those who receive, this relationship is not static. In campus-community and community radio, listeners have the opportunity to become producers and participants. Realistically, not everyone who wants to do a show will get on the air. But even though space 'on-air' is limited, it is not closed.

Critics such as Salter (1980) question the degree to which these types of stations actually practice participatory governing and access. Salter points out that the operations of CO-OP radio in Vancouver are plagued by perspectives in conflict. Similarly, the operations of CKUT-FM do not always function according to the mandate of participation. There are instances of "power" struggles. My review of Salter's concerns in Chapter Two concluded with the idea that the practices of stations are influenced by the relationships occurring in and around the station. I also said that it is exactly the "perspectives-in-conflict" that Salter (1980) articulates which characterise the workings and identity of community stations. Were there no conflict, there would be no changes, and only certain kinds of practices would occur.



In terms of the power relationship between broadcasters and regulators, opportunity also exists for negotiation. Given the potential for radio broadcasting to be limited in its use and function because of regulation, there is also great potential, because of regulation (Broadcast Act 1991, CRTC, 1992), for its use and function to serve the population. This is apparent in my case study of station CKUT-FM. As my examination of the lobby to the CRTC for license type change shows, the process of regulation is transactional.

## **FUTURE RESEARCH:**

The FM radio broadcasting landscape continues to undergo changes. As John Feihl of the CRTC told me during our conversation in July of 1996, FM radio is becoming increasingly a means of making money: "It's dollars, and you have to compete in the market".

Because FM radio sends sound waves out further than AM radio, and because more listeners means more sales, Feihl says that up to 40 AM stations have "flipped" to FM in the past five years.

If this is true, then what solution can be proposed? I think that an amalgamation of the CBC funds with public support reorganises the FM community radio system. Canada's broadcasting system requires a diversity of funding sources in order to provide services which meet the needs of Canadians. This diversity of funding sources, I think would help alleviate what Salter refers to as "centralising, controlling bias of media systems" (Salter, 1980, 111).

Scholars and others interested in maintaining radio space as means of two-way communication must concern themselves with the monitoring of FM policy. The opportunity will soon exist, with the introduction of Digital Audio Broadcasting (DAB) for more stations to broadcast on the FM band. Community broadcasters can prepare now to compete for space on air, on for intervening once again into CRTC policy. There is an opportunity to question the practices of government in allocating FM as a money-making venture. There is an opportunity to negotiate for financial support, to alter the

way public funds have been spent on radio broadcasting. There is an opportunity to alter the dominance of commercial radio. These opportunities require hard work.

On a practical level, will the tools of negotiation will be put into practice? On an academic level, the question to explore will focus on monitoring new shifts in regulation and practices of government. Specifically, it will be important to follow the goals set out in the new Broadcasting Act. I refer particularly to Section 3, paragraph (e) which states: each element [my emphasis] of the Canadian Broadcasting System shall contribute in an appropriate manner to the creation and presentation of Canadian programming”.

Moreover, the programming, according to subsection (iii), should “include educational and community programs” (Statutes of Canada, 1991, 120). This kind of programming should be broadcast in all sectors of the system, and not just on “community” or “campus-community stations”.

Secondly, scholars can engage in their work, as I have done, the theory of power as a multitude of specifics involved in relationships with each other, rather than as a concept of control. Questions that require immediate attention are: Will Canada’s radio broadcasting policies be aimed at the commercialisation of the public space as means of leading Canadians into the global economy? Will economics be the message inscribed in practices of government? And if so, are community broadcasters willing to struggle for spaces within that agenda?

## REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Benedict. (1991). Imagined Communities. London. Verso.
- Bennett, Tony (1992). "Putting Policy into Cultural Studies." Cultural Studies, Lawrence Grossberg et. al., (eds). London. Routledge.
- Berland, Jody. (1990). "Toward a Creative Anachronism: Radio, the State and Sound Government." Public Access. Toronto. Public Access Collective. pp. 9-22.
- Carey, James. (1982). Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society. Boston. Unwin Hyman. pp.13-25.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1982). Introduction. Belonging. Manchester. Manchester University Press.
- (1985). The Symbolic Construction of Community. Ellis Horwood Ltd. Chichester.
- CBC. (April, 1974). Community Radio in Canada. Office of Community Radio, Ottawa.
- CRTC. (1975, June 27). Decision CRTC 75-247 CRTC. Ottawa.
- (1986, September 18). Public Notice CRTC 1986-248. Regulations Respecting Radio Broadcasting. CRTC. Ottawa.
- (1991, September 1). Glossary of Radio Terms. CRTC. Ottawa.
- (1991, November 20). CRTC Public Notice 1991-118. Policy Proposals for Community and Campus Radio. CTRC. Ottawa.
- (1992, May 28). CRTC Public Notice 1992-38. Policies for Campus and Community Radio. CRTC. Ottawa.
- (1995, August 2). "Number of broadcasting transmitting and receiving undertakings by geographic area and type as of 31, March, 1995". CRTC Ottawa.
- Dominguez. V. (1987). "Beyond the Salvage Paradigm", DIA Art Foundation, Discussions in Contemporary Culture, No.1. Bay Press. Seattle.
- Drijvers, Jan. (1992). "Community broadcasting: a manifesto for the media policy of small European countries." Media, Culture, Society. London. Sage. pp 193-201.

- Fiske, John. (1986). "Television: Polysemy and Popularity." Critical Studies in Mass Communications. Vol. 3, No. 4.
- Foucault, Michel. (1980). "Power and Strategies". Power/ Knowledge. (Colin Gordon, ed.) Pantheon Books. New York. 141.)"
- (1991). "Governmentality." The Foucault Effect. (Burchell, Gordon and Miller, eds.) University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Fraser, Nancy. (1989). Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Univeristy of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.
- (1993). "Rethinking the Public Sphere -- A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." in Bruce Robbins, ed. The Phantom Public Sphere. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis.
- Freire, Paulo. (1972). The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York. Herder and Herder.
- Garnham, Nicholas. (1986). "The Media and the Public Sphere." Communicating Policies: Mass Communication and the Politcal Process. Peter Golding, Graham Murdoch, and Philip Schlesinger (eds.) Leichester U. Press. Holmes and Meyer. New York.
- Geertz, Clifford. (1985). Interpretations of Culture.
- Girard, Bruce. (1993). A Passion for Radio. Montreal. Black Rose Books.
- Hall, Stuart. (1992.). "Cultural Studies and it's Theoretical Legacies." Cultural Studies, Lawrence Grossberg et. al., (eds). London. Routedge. pp. 277-286.
- Gordon, Colin. (1991). "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." The Foucault Effect. (*op. cit.*).
- Government of Canada. (1968). "Broadcasting Act". Statues of Canada 1967-1986. Chapter 25. Queen's Printer. Ottawa.
- (1991). "Broadcasting Act". Statues of Canada 1991. Chapters 38-39. Queen's Printer. Ottawa.
- Hebdige, Dick. (1979). Subculture: the Meaning of Style. London. Methuen and Co.
- Higgins, C.S. and P.D. Moss. (1982). Sounds real: Radio in everyday life. St. Lucia. University of Queensland Press.

- Innis, Harold. (1951). The Bias of Communication. Toronto. University of Toronto Press.
- Laba, Martin. (1988). "Popular Culture as Local Culture: Regions, Limits and Canadianism." Communication Canada: Issues in Broadcasting and New Technology. Roland Lorimar and Donald Wilson. (eds.) Toronto. Kagan and Woo Ltd. pp. 82-101.
- Mills, C.Wright. (1956). "The Mass Society." The Power Elite. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Minh-Ha, Trinh. (1989). "Difference: A Special Third World Women Issue", in Native Woman Other. Indiana. Indiana University Press.
- Ogilvie, Jean. (1983). Community radio in Quebec: perspectives in conflict. Thesis (M.A.) Montreal. McGill University.
- Procacci, Giovanna. "Social Economy and the Government of Poverty." The Foucault Effect. (*op. cit*).
- Raboy, Marc. (1984). "Radical radio: an emancipatory cultural practice." Border/lines. No. 1, Autumn. pp. 28-31.
- (1990). Missed Opportunities: The Story of Canada's Broadcasting Policy. Kingston. McGill- Queen's University Press.
- Said, Edward. (1983). "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies and Communities." The Anti-Aesthetic - Essays on Post-modern Culture. Hal Foster (ed.) Bay Press. Washington.
- Salter, Liora (1980). "Two Directions on a One-Way Street: Old and New Approaches in Media Analysis in Two Decades." Studies in Communications. Vol. 1. pp- 85-117.
- (1981). "'Public' and Mass Media in Canada: Dialectics in Innis' Communication Analysis." Culture, Communication, and Dependency. William H. Melody, Liora Salter and Paul Heyer. (eds). New Jersey. Ablex Publishing.
- Williams, Raymond. (1974). "The Technology and the Society." Television: Technology and Cultural Form. Schochen. New York.

----- (1991). "Dreamworlds of Consumption." Communication in History.  
David Crowley and Paul Heyer (eds.) Longman. New York.