establishment, an article of faith with journalists as absolute as interpreting events as part of God's plan was with the ministers.

The book is full of such "never knew that" or "never heard it explained quite that way" pieces. For example, the second essay maintains that the famous John Peter Zenger seditious libel case "was as much a religious as a political or legal phenomenon" because "like the religious awakenings, the Zenger trial reflected the skepticism for human authority felt by ordinary people who possessed a deep faith in the existence of God and truth" (p. 75).

While I will most likely continue to teach the Zenger Case as a landmark step towards press freedom, Nord's interpretation can certainly be woven into the more standard interpretation, as it probably should be.

My personal favorite essay dealt with William Lloyd Garrison and his newspaper, the Liberator. It makes it clear that the famous abolitionist was indeed a journalist although of a different variety than the mainstream penny press editors of the era. Nord places Garrison in the school of "associational" journalism that advocated for organizations or causes. We might view him as parallel to modern editors with pronounced viewpoints such as William F. Buckley, still definitely journalists rather than politicians who dabbled in publishing.

Because Garrison was so fervently hostile to slavery, how many of us are aware that he allowed proponents of slavery to voice their views in his paper? He felt that the best thing for his cause was for advocates of slavery to try to defend the indefensible. From an historical viewpoint, this essay helps clarify the division of American journalism into mainstream commercial and advocacy schools that occurred in the 1830s and 1840s.

A few of the essays are highly empirical such as one that studied the expenditures of working class families for newspapers and other reading material, discovering differences by region and ethnicity late in the 19th century. Southern white mill workers for example, spent far less on newspapers and other print materials than their northern counterparts, while families that lived mostly on the salaries of husbands rather than parents and children spent more. Others compare the way various Chicago newspapers reacted to such things as labor strife and how very different papers all sought community consensus.

All the essays are worth reading but individual interests will probably result in some skimming, as I did. Each essay includes its own lengthy set of footnotes, often running to several pages per essay, but there is no overall bibliography. The book includes an index and a forward discussing the main message of each essay and in some cases its prior publication as an article.

Throughout the book, Nord tries to demonstrate how interwoven newspapers have been with their communities and their readers, even ending with a brief essay on today's community and interactive journalism. The book might make an excellent supplemental reader in a journalism history course although it would never replace a standard comprehensive text.

—Eileen Wirth
Creighton University


For those of us fortunate enough to have known James Carey, who died in 2006, this book provides a wonderful ongoing conversation about topics close to the center of his thinking. For those who did not know him, the book proves a wonderful complement to his own essays and gives a hint to the reasons so many treated him with enthusiasm as well as a bit of frustration. Carey rooted his thought in journalism—or, better, in the functions of a journalism that gave reason to civic engagement. Part of that lay in his history: working class, Catholic, dialogic, conversational. How can we make our social world different? How could we (in the 1970s) break free of an instrumentalism that dominated communication research? How can we better see ourselves and our communication world?

Carey quickly took to Harold Innis' contextual view of communication; in one of Carey's breakthrough essays, he argued that communication serves more as a ritual than as a transporter of ideas, something that he loosely adapted from Innis' distinction between a bias of communication toward place and one toward time. And so he applied what today we call a "media ecology" approach to the telegraph and to history, to journalism (as he highlighted a debate between John Dewey and Walter Lippmann for the soul of journalism in the United States), and to cultural studies, the British approach to which he formed a living bridge.

The essays collected here enter into conversations with Carey, who participated in the original project,
begun in late 2001. The editors wisely choose to let Carey himself provide the bookends to the collection, in lengthy conversations with Lawrence Grossberg. The first walks us through Carey’s biography and the origins of his interests, while the last has him reflect on the eight chapters in between. The reader should not expect a hagiography, as individual writers (most of them one-time students of Carey) take up themes in his work and debate them, rethink them, wrestle with them, tug at them in order to teach us those things overlooked in the typical communication study paradigm. Each of them, as the title proclaims, remains in the ambit of communications and its technologies, transportation, and history.

James Hay revisits Carey’s essay distinguishing a cultural model of communication from a spatial one, updating the distinction and offering a critique of what he calls “spatial materialism” in communication study. Carey lived as a person of his time, so we should not be surprised that his “historicization of the ritual and transmission models of communication also placed communication research within the modern problematic” of political economy and community (p. 33). Tracing this history, Hay looks to the move from spatial materialism to cultural materialism, connecting Carey’s work to the larger movements in cultural studies.

Chris Russill introduces yet another voice to the conversations with Carey: that of Michel Foucault. Calling attention to Foucault’s examination of John Dewey’s idea of the public allows him to bring Foucault into a dialogue with Carey through their common dependence on Dewey.

Jeremy Packer directs our attention to transportation—not the transportation model of communication, but Carey’s bias towards the connection of technologies. Where Carey examined the telegraphy and the railroads, Packer cites automobiles, airplanes, and radio. The model still works in helping us understand material underpinnings of communication.

Gretchen Soderlund picks up the other half of the original equation: ritual. She examines Carey’s approaches by turning them towards communication scholarship, which itself forms a kind of ritual. Her dialogue partners become structuralism and symbolism and her case study one of traffic in women, a set of cultural texts spanning 150 years, from the penny press to the Internet.

Jonathan Sterne takes us back to communication and transportation, asking how they became conceptually separated in the first place. It’s a history both of studies and of theories of communication and society. What we do with communication (and how we think about it) tells us a lot about what kind of society we want (and may well get).

In a wonderful essay, John Durham Peters offers “amends” for shortchanging Carey’s stance on technology and ideology, first articulated in Carey’s essay on the telegraphy; Peters had briefly touched on it in his earlier writings. Here he revisits the essay in depth, leading the reader to understand Carey better and to understand method and metaphor, language and writing, space and time—pretty much the whole universe of communication concepts. It is a fine, an exhilarating, essay and one that demonstrates where Carey could take one.

John Nerone takes us back to Carey’s concern for the public life. It appears in considerations of the 19th century popular press and political parties, and the public sphere they create. How can we think these things now, particularly in light of a newer understandings of the public sphere offered by Jürgen Habermas? Nerone walks us through an historical approach, to get the facts straight before jumping into the modern period. The 19th-century public sphere seems quite different from where we find ourselves.

Finally, Craig Robertson offers another look at communication technology through the lens of an often overlooked and ignored one: the passport. This connection with the state, documentation, and individual identity suggests that seemingly mundane communication decisions have profound consequences for what we take for granted and for how we live our public lives.

As noted before, the editors place the second half of the Carey-Grossberg conversation at the end, giving Grossberg the chance to call Carey’s attention to the various essays and to continue to think aloud about the topics. Carey’s chosen forms of expression remained the essay and the conversation, maybe the latter more than the former. To understand Carey, one needed to hear him talk. This final chapter offers an echo of that.

While each chapter proposes its own argument, more or less well developed, the collection of them drops the reader into a very exciting seminar on communication study and its possibilities. They also remind us of just what Carey could do to our thinking and of the fortunate legacy we have in so many of his students.

The book has a brief index; each chapter has its own endnotes, but no bibliography or reference list.

—Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Santa Clara University
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