# Chapter 12

# Tourism and Media Studies 3.0

Toby Miller

University of California, Riverside, USA

## ABSTRACT

The term "social media" generally refers to the multi-point creation and distribution of electronic communication. It is understood in opposition to broadcasting. This chapter explains the history of media studies as a means of comprehending these newer media in the context of tourism. They need to be studied in the light of existing media, even as we seek a new form of truly interdisciplinary work that brings existing approaches together. Taking its agenda from social movements as well as intellectual ones, and its methods from social sciences and humanities, Media Studies 3.0 should focus on gender, race, class, sexuality, sustainability, and pleasure across national lines—an apt setting for those working on tourism.

*Keywords*: Media studies 1.0; Media studies 2.0; Media studies 3.0

## INTRODUCTION

The term "social media" generally refers to the multi-point creation and distribution of electronic communication. It is understood in opposition to broadcasting (though the notion that the most popular pastime worldwide now and in the last century should be other than "social" is bizarre). This chapter explains the history of media studies, which may be of value for

1   comprehending these newer social media in the context of tourism. This
2   chapter discusses the social media in the light of their defunct, venerable,
3   and middle-aged counterparts.
4      Across history, media studies have been dominated by three topics:
5   ownership and control, content, and audiences. Approaches to ownership
6   and control vary between neoliberal endorsements of limited regulation by
7   the state to facilitate market entry by new competitors, and Marxist critiques
8   of the bourgeois media for controlling the sociopolitical agenda. Approaches
9   to content vary between hermeneutics, which unearths the meaning of
10  individual texts and links them to broader social formations and problems,
11  and content analysis, which establishes patterns across significant numbers
12  of similar texts, rather than close readings of individual ones. Approaches
13  to audiences vary between social psychological attempts to correlate
14  audiovisual consumption and social conduct, and critiques of imported
15  audiovisual material threatening national and regional autonomy. These
16  three components, fractured by politics, nation, discipline, theory, and
17  method, are embodied in what is called here Media Studies 1.0 and Media
18  Studies 2.0. These two formations cover a new Media Studies 3.0, and offer
19  some examples of how the media and tourism intersect in the contemporary
20  moment.

## TOURISM AND MEDIA STUDIES

### Media Studies 1.0

Media Studies 1.0 derived from the spread of new media technologies over
the past two centuries into the lives of urbanizing populations and the
policing questions that this posed to state and capital: What the effect on the
public of these developments would be and how they would vary between
those with a stake in the social order versus those seeking to transform it. By
the early 20th century, academic experts had decreed media audiences to be
passive consumers, thanks to the missions of literary criticism, distinguishing
the aesthetically cultivated from others, and psychology, distinguishing the
socially competent from others (Butsch, 2000, p. 3). The origins of social
psychology can be traced to anxieties about "the crowd" in a suddenly
urbanized and educated Western Europe that raised the prospect of a long-
feared "ochlocracy" of "the worthless mob" (Pufendorf, 2000, p. 144) able
to share popular texts. In the wake of the French Revolution, Edmund
Burke was animated by the need to limit collective exuberance via restraint

1 on popular passions (1994, p. 122). He was not alone, then or now. Consider
2 the opening line of Baroness Orczy's famous adventure tourism novel of the
3 Terror, *The Scarlet Pimpernel*: "A surging, seething, murmuring crowd of
4 beings that are human only in name, for to the eye and ear they seem naught
5 but savage creatures, animated by vile passions and by the lust of vengeance
6 and of hate" (2009, Kindle Locations, 10488–10489). Elite theorists from
7 both right and left emerged across the 19th century, notably Pareto (1976),
8 Mosca (1939), Le Bon (1899), and Michels (1915). They argued that newly
9 literate publics were vulnerable to manipulation by demagogues. Even Mill
10 spoke of "the meanest feelings and most ignorant prejudices of the vulgarest
11 part of the crowd" (1861, p. 144). The founder of the "American Dream,"
12 the Latino James Truslow Adams, regarded "[t]he mob mentality of the city
13 crowd" as "one of the menaces to modern civilization." He was particularly
14 disparaging about "the prostitution of the moving-picture industry" (1941,
15 pp. 404, 413). These critics were frightened of socialism, democracy, and
16 popular reason (Wallas, 1967, p. 137). With civil society growing restive, the
17 emergence of radical politics was explained away in sociopsychological
18 terms rather than political-economic ones. The psy-function warmed itself
19 by campus fires, far from the crowding mass. In the United States, Harvard
20 took charge of theorizing, Chicago observing, and Columbia enumerating
21 the great unwashed (Staiger, 2005, pp. 21–22). Tests of beauty and truth
22 found the popular classes wanting, and helped promulgate the idea of the
23 newly literate and suddenly enfranchised being bamboozled by the
24 artistically shameless and unscrupulously fluent.
25   The US Payne Fund studies of the 1930s investigated the impact of films
26 on what a gaggle of sociologists labeled "'superior' adults" (this expression
27 referred to "young college professors, graduate students and their wives")
28 versus children from juvenile centers. Researchers wanted to know, "what
29 effect do motion pictures have upon children of different ages?" especially
30 on people defined as "retarded." These pioneering scholars boldly set out to
31 discover whether "the onset of puberty is or is not affected by motion
32 pictures" and what they called "The Big Three" narrative themes: love,
33 crime, and sex (sound familiar?). They pondered "demonstrations of
34 satisfying love techniques" to see whether "sexual passions are aroused and
35 amateur prostitution … aggravated" by the screen, gauging reactions
36 through "autobiographical case studies," questionnaires asking whether
37 "All Most Many Some Few No Chinese are cunning and underhand," and
38 "skin response," as measured by psychogalvanometers attached to young
39 people in cinemas and hypnographs and polygraphs wired to them in their
40 beds (Charters, 1933).

1 　The Payne Fund studies birthed seven decades of obsessive social-
2 scientific attempts to correlate youthful consumption of popular culture with
3 antisocial conduct, scrutinizing audiences in terms of where they came from,
4 how many there were, and what they did as a consequence of participating
5 (Miller, 2009). In 1951, Smythe wrote of this effects research, "[e]verybody
6 seems to be doing it, especially those who are best qualified by virtue of
7 the fact that 'they wouldn't have a television set in the house'" (2004, p. 318).
8 Bob Dylan remembers the 1960s in Greenwich Village not only because
9 he was singing in coffee shops but as a time marked by "Sociologists …
10 saying that TV had deadly intentions and was destroying the minds and
11 imaginations of the young—that their attention span was being dragged
12 down." The other dominant site of knowledge Dylan encountered was the
13 "psychology professor, a good performer, but originality not his long suit"
14 (2004, pp. 55, 67).
15 　Just such purveyors of normal science continue to cast a shadow across
16 that village, and many others. The pattern is that when cultural technologies
17 and genres emerge, young people are identified as both pioneers and victims,
18 simultaneously endowed by marketers and critics with power and vulner-
19 ability. They are held to be the first to know and the last to understand
20 the media—the grand paradox of youth, latterly on display in the digital
21 sublime of technological determinism, as always with the super-added
22 valence of a future citizenship in peril (American Academy of Pediatrics,
23 Council on Communications and Media, 2009). New genres and technol-
24 ogies are accompanied by concerns about extreme distinctions among
25 generations. The latest manifestation of this anxiety can be found in much
26 pop-intellectual work that divines the existence of "digital natives"
27 (Tapscott, 2009).
28 　Concerns about supposedly unprecedented and unholy risks deriving
29 from new media recur with each major technological and generic innovation.
30 Damnation was sure to follow cheap novels during the 1900s, silent then
31 sound film of the teens and 1920s, radio in the 1930s, comic books from the
32 1940s and 1950s, pop music and television in the 1950s and 1960s, satanic
33 rock and video cassette recorders of the 1970s and 1980s, and rap music,
34 video games, the Internet, and sexting since the 1990s.
35 　The satirical paper The Onion (2005) cleverly mocked these interdepen-
36 dent phenomena of moral panic and commodification via a *faux* study of the
37 impact on US youth of seeing Janet Jackson's breast in a 2004 Super Bowl
38 broadcast. Something similar in conventional tourism research can be seen
39 into social media, which warns corporations about how to avoid negative
40 responses and encourage positive ones, lest the herd-like public turn against

1   a particular company or resort (González, Gidumal, & López-Valcárcel,
2   2010; Pan, Xiang, Law, & Fesenmaier, 2011; Xiang & Gretzel, 2010). The
3   audience must be controlled as if it were an unruly mob of 19th-century
4   socialists. This anxiety and desire for surveillance has particular force when
5   the social media are identified as causal agents, or at least facilitators, of
6   child sex tourism (George & Panko, 2011).
7     Effects studies suffer all the disadvantages of ideal-typical psychological
8   reasoning. They rely on methodological individualism and fail to account
9   for cultural norms, let alone the arcs of history that establish patterns of text
10   and response inside politics, war, ideology, and discourse. Each laboratory
11   test, based on, as the refrain goes, ''a large university in the Midwest [of the
12   United States],'' is countered by a similar experiment, with conflicting
13   results. As politicians, grant-givers, and pundits call for more and more
14   research to prove that the media make you stupid, violent, and apathetic—
15   or the opposite—academics line up at the trough to indulge their contempt
16   for popular culture and their rent-seeking urge for public money. Media
17   Studies 1.0 rarely interrogates its own conditions of existence—namely,
18   governments, religious groups, business leeches, and the media themselves
19   account for social problems by diverting blame onto popular culture. It
20   takes each new medium and genre as an opportunity to affirm its omniscient
21   agenda (Miller, 2009).
22     Whereas effects research focuses on the cognition and emotion of
23   individual human subjects via observation and experimentation, another
24   way of considering audiences looks to the customs and patriotic feeling
25   exhibited by collective human subjects, the grout of national culture. In
26   place of psychology, it is concerned with politics. The media do not make
27   you a well- or ill-educated person, a wild or self-controlled one. Rather, they
28   make you a knowledgeable and loyal national subject or a *naif*, ignorant of
29   local tradition and history. Cultural belonging, not psychic wholeness, is the
30   touchstone of this model. Instead of measuring responses electronically or
31   behaviorally, it interrogates the geopolitical origin of popular texts and the
32   themes and styles they embody, with particular attention to the putatively
33   nation-building genres of drama, news, sport, and current affairs. Adherents
34   hold that local citizens should control television, for instance, because they
35   can be counted on to be patriotic in the event of war. Many nations prohibit
36   foreigners owning TV licenses. The United States is a prominent example.
37     In addition to audience research and cultural policy, Media Studies 1.0
38   also includes political economy, which focuses on infrastructure rather
39   than audiences, and critical theory, which is concerned that the audiovisual
40   sector turns people away from artistic and social traces of authentic

1   intersubjectivity and toward control of individual consciousness. Both
2   work from the *nostrum* that the media are all powerful. Political economy
3   is more policy oriented and political in its focus on institutional power.
4   Critical theory is more philosophical and aesthetic in its desire to develop
5   modernism and the avant-garde. They began as one with lamentations
6   for the triumph of industrialized cultural production and the loss of a self-
7   critical philosophical address. The two approaches are also linked via a
8   distaste for what they deride as mass culture. Because demand is dispersed
9   and supply centralized, the media supposedly operate via an administrative
10  logic. Far from reflecting already-established and -revealed preferences of
11  consumers in reaction to tastes and desires, they manipulate audiences
12  from the apex of production. Coercion is mistaken for free will, and culture
13  is one more industrial process subordinated to the dominant economic
14  forces within society. It seeks a maximum of standardization and a
15  minimum of risk. The only element that might stand against this leveling
16  sameness is said to be individual consciousness. But that consciousness has
17  itself been customized to enable efficient media production (Adorno &
18  Horkheimer, 1977).
19
20  *Media Studies 2.0*
21
22  For Media Studies 2.0, popular culture represents the apex of modernity. Far
23  from being supremely alienating, it embodies the expansion of civil society,
24  the first moment in history when political and commercial organs and
25  agendas became receptive to, and part of, the popular classes; when the
26  general population counted as part of the social, rather than being excluded
27  from political-economic calculations. At the same time, there was a lessening
28  of authority, the promulgation of individual rights and respect, and the
29  development of intense but large-scale human interaction (Hartley, 2003;
30  Shils, 1966). This perspective has offered a way in to media audiences
31  that differs from Media Studies 1.0 and its faith in the all-powerful agency
32  of the media. For in Media Studies 2.0, the all-powerful agent is the audience.
33  It claims that the public is so clever and able that it makes its own
34  meanings, outwitting institutions of the state, academia, and capitalism that
35  seek to measure and control it. In the case of children and the media, for
36  example, anxieties from 1.0 about turning Edenic innocents into rabid
37  monsters, capitalist dupes, or mental Americans have been challenged by a
38  new culturalist perspective. This formation has animated research into the
39  generic features and intertexts of children's news, drama, action-adventure,
40  education, cartooning, and play and how children distinguish between

fact and fiction and talk about the media as part of social interaction (Buckingham, 2000).

Faith in the active audience can reach cosmic proportions. It has been a *donnée* of 2.0 that the media are not responsible for anything. This position is a virtual *nostrum* in some research into fans, who are thought to construct connections with celebrities and actants in ways that mimic friendship, make sense of human interaction, and ignite cultural politics. Media Studies 2.0 commonly attacks opponents of commercial culture for misrecognizing its capacity to subvert patriarchy, capitalism, and other forms of oppression. The popular is held to have progressive effects, because it is decoded by people in keeping with their social situations. The active audience is said to be weak at the level of cultural production, but strong as an interpretative community. All this is supposedly evident to scholars from their perusal of audience conventions, web pages, discussion groups, quizzes, and rankings, or by staring at screens with their children. Consumption is the key to Media Studies 2.0—with production discounted, labor forgotten, consumers sovereign, and governments there to protect them.

Cybertarian technophiles, struck by the digital sublime, attribute magical properties to contemporary communications, and cultural technologies that obliterate geography, sovereignty, and hierarchy in an alchemy of truth and beauty. Cybertarians see omniscient, omnipotent audiences outwitting the efforts of capital, the state, and parents to understand and corral them. The new-media *savants* who construct the latter model routinely invoke precapitalist philosophers, dodging questions of state and capital by heading for aesthetics (Cogburn & Silcox, 2008). A deregulated, individuated media world supposedly makes consumers into producers, frees the disabled from confinement, encourages new subjectivities, rewards intellect and competi-tiveness, links people across cultures, and allows billions of flowers to bloom in a post-political cornucopia. It is a kind of Marxist/Godardian wet dream, where people fish, fornicate, film, and finance from morning to midnight. At such moments, one can say that what Eagleton (1982) sardonically named The Reader's Liberation Movement is in the house. In his survey of this work, Mosco rightly argues that such "myths are important both for what they reveal (including a genuine desire for community and democracy) and for what they conceal (including the growing concentration of communica-tion power in a handful of transnational media businesses)" (2004).

In tourism, the aggregated effect of collective knowledge via social media that is associated with personal recommendations of destinations is a good example of these claims (Popescu & Grefenstette, 2011). Such findings excite 2.0 advocates, as per the unseemly way that tourism experts egged on by

1   social media salivate over wealthy foreigners; a typical instance is the
2   discourse of Chinese consumers liberated from the state (Arlt & Thraenhart,
3   2011). Such sanctioned greed is some distance from research that illustrates
4   how the social media function as surveillance-and-control devices in places
5   as diverse as China and Australia (Qiu, 2007) or the World Privacy Forum
6   proposing that people are in a "one-way mirror society," where power
7   accretes to corporations through the supposedly even-handed tool of
8   interactivity (Dixon, 2010).
9     The fundamental dilemma for adherents of Media Studies 2.0 is this: Can
10  fans or tourists be said to make rational evaluations of core questions of
11  social justice such as labor exploitation, patriarchy, racism, climate change,
12  and neo-imperialism—or in some specifiable way make a difference beyond
13  their own selves—when they interpret TV unusually, each other about
14  romantic frustrations, play pirated versions of Scrabble on Facebook, or
15  take a cruise based on amateur recommendations?
16    Has the society gone too far in supplanting the panicky Woody Allen
17  nebbishness of 1.0 ("I'm kind of bothered that … ") with the Panglossian
18  Pollyanna nerdiness of 2.0 ("Cool stuff")? Keen, a lapsarian prophet of the
19  Internet, argues that the new landscape is abuzz with noise and ignorance
20  rather than subtlety and knowledge (2007, p. 12). He sees a dreary world of
21  constant clatter and frenzied imagery denaturing aesthetics in favor of
22  uninterrupted stimulus. This is no 2.0 utopia! Postrel, then editor of the
23  libertarian *Reason* magazine and later a *New York Times* economics
24  journalist, wrote a *Wall Street Journal* op-ed welcoming 2.0 as "deeply
25  threatening to traditional leftist views of commerce … lending support to the
26  corporate enemy and even training graduate students who wind up doing
27  market research" (1999).
28
29  *Media Studies 3.0*
30
31  One needs more *frottage* between Media Studies 1.0 and 2.0, breaking down
32  the binary between them. Media Studies 1.0 should register struggle, and 2.0
33  should register structure. Currently, 1.0 draws one's attention to audience
34  inoculation and corporate control, but leaves out productive labor and
35  environmental implications. Media Studies 2.0 uptakes and responses, but
36  again marginalizes these key topics. Media Studies 1.0 misses moments of
37  crisis and hope, presenting a subject-free picture of structure but no agency,
38  other than psychological response, shareholder maximization, and manage-
39  rial rationality. Its nationalistic cultural policies often deny the banality of
40  protected cinema, the futility of quota-driven television, and the partiality

of who is chosen to create national images and appear in them. Media 2.0 misses forms of domination and exploitation, presenting an institution-free picture with agency but no structure, other than fan creativity and reader imagination. Further, both 1.0 and 2.0 are doggedly tied to nativist epistemologies that must be transcended. The nativism is especially powerful in the United States, the United Kingdom, and their academic satellites such as Israel and Australia, where effortless extrapolations from very limited experience support totalizing theories and norms, due to the hegemony of English-language publishing and scholarly links to the warfare, welfare, and cultural bureaucracies. The following remark (paid for by Vodafone) encapsulates 2.0:

> Mobile phones have become affective technologies. That is, objects which mediate the expression, display, experience and communication of feelings and emotions. … They are an extension of the human body … building and maintaining … groups and communities. (Lasén, 2004)

This will not do. Thankfully it is challenged by a remark that could come from 3.0—funded by a nongovernment organization of Mexican electronics workers:

> The increasingly faster and more versatile computers, appealing mobile phones, high-definition TVs, Internet, tiny music players, ingenious photo cameras, entertaining games consoles and even electronic pets give us the idea of a developed, pioneering and modern world. It is indeed a new era for many; but the dark side of this prosperous world reveals a very different reality, that far from taking us to the future, takes us back to a darker past. (Centro de Reflexión y Acción Laboral, 2006)

Media Studies 3.0 is as much about experiences as technologies or institutions. The media color the world. They give it meaning; and the process is reciprocal. The sounds, stories, and pictures that *are* the media—whether social or antisocial—actually come from people. Old stories from oral traditions become commercial narratives. Letters to the editor tell newspapers what interests their readers. Audience measurements and focus groups instruct producers on which TV shows are likely to succeed and why. Fans become creators as they write zines that in turn become story ideas.

1   Marketers trawl street fairs, clubs, and fan sites to uncover emergent trends.
2   Coca-Cola hires African Americans to drive through the inner city selling
3   soda and playing hip-hop. AT&T pays San Francisco buskers to mention
4   the company in their songs. Street performance poets rhyme about Nissan
5   cars for cash, simultaneously hawking, entertaining, and researching.
6   Subway's sandwich commercials are marketed as made by teenagers.
7   Cultural studies graduates become designers, and graduate students in
8   New York and Los Angeles read scripts for producers and pronounce on
9   whether they tap into audience interests.
10  Semiotics textbooks that critically deconstruct commercial culture adorn
11  advertising executives' bookcases. Precariously employed part-timers prowl
12  the streets with DVD players under their arms to ask target audiences what
13  they think of trailers for upcoming movies, or while away their time in
14  theaters spying on how their fellow spectators respond to coming attractions.
15  Opportunities to vote in the Eurovision Song Contest or a reality program
16  determine both the success of contestants and the profile of active viewers
17  who can be monitored and wooed. In all these instances, audience creativity
18  is important. It informs and frightens producers, simultaneously offering
19  them leads on stories and trends and daunting them with its changeability
20  and friskiness. End-user licensing agreements ensure that players of
21  corporate games online and contributors to official discussion groups about
22  film or television sign over their cultural moves and access. Such topics
23  frequently elude 1.0 and 2.0. They do not fit those models.
24  Studying tourism through the media and vice versa must blend ethno-
25  graphic, political-economic, and aesthetic analyses in a global and local
26  way, establishing links among the key areas of cultural production around
27  the world (Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and the Middle East) and
28  diasporic and dispossessed communities engaged in their own cultural
29  production. Media 3.0 needs to be a media-centered version of area studies,
30  with diasporas as important as regions. It must be animated by collective
31  identity and power: how human subjects are formed and experience cultural
32  and social space. Taking its agenda from social movements as well as
33  intellectual ones, and its methods from economics, politics, communications,
34  sociology, literature, law, science, medicine, environmental studies, anthro-
35  pology, history, and art, Media Studies 3.0 should focus on gender, race,
36  class, sexuality, sustainability, and pleasure, across national lines—an apt
37  setting for those working on tourism.
38  One can gain some tips on doing this from the history of theorizing
39  culture. It has usually been studied in two registers: via the social sciences
40  and the humanities—truth versus beauty. Culture has been a marker of

1 differences and similarities in taste and status, as explored interpretatively or
2 methodically. In the humanities, cultural texts have long been judged by
3 criteria of quality, as practiced critically and historically. For their part, the
4 social sciences have focused on religions, customs, times, and spaces, as
5 explored ethnographically or statistically. Thus, whereas the humanities
6 articulate differences through symbolic norms (e.g., which classes have the
7 cultural capital to appreciate high culture and which do not), the social
8 sciences articulate differences through social norms (such as, which peoples
9 cultivate agriculture in keeping with spirituality and which do not)
10 (Benhabib, 2002; Wallerstein, 1989). This distinction feeds into the Cartesian
11 dualism separating thought from work. It assumes that humans have two
12 distinct natures: the intelligent and the corporeal. One is focused on action,
13 the other on reason. That binary has dominated media studies, posing
14 oppositions of society versus economy and audience versus meaning. It
15 haunts 1.0 and 2.0.
16    For all its sticky origins in Cartesianism, this bifurcation and silencing of
17 labor and culture cannot and should not hold. Historically, the best critical
18 political economy and the best cultural studies have worked through the
19 imbrication of power and signification. Blending them can heal the fissure
20 between fact and interpretation, the social sciences and the humanities, and
21 truth and beauty, under the sign of a principled approach to cultural
22 democracy. Grossberg recommends ''politicizing theory and theorizing
23 politics'' by combining abstraction and grounded analysis (1997). That
24 requires a focus on the contradictions of organizational structures, their
25 articulations with everyday living and textuality and their intrication with
26 the polity and economy, addressing production, consumption, and social
27 stratification. Half a century ago, Smythe studied TV texts as ''a group of
28 symbols'' that ''serve as a medium of exchange between the mass media and
29 the audience.'' He recognized that analyses of infrastructure and content
30 must be supplemented by accounting for the conditions under which culture
31 is made, circulated, received, interpreted, and criticized: ''The produced
32 program is … more than the sum of the program ingredients'' because it is
33 encrusted with ''contextual and explicit layers of meaning'' that emerge
34 during its creation and consumption (1954, p. 143).
35    Relevant work toward 3.0 is already underway. Rajagopal notes that
36 because the television, the telephone, the Internet, the neoliberal, and the
37 outgoing tourist are relatively new to India, ''markets and media generate
38 new kinds of rights and new kinds of imagination … novel ways of
39 exercising citizenship rights and conceiving politics'' (2001). For Winocur
40 (2002), women's talkback radio in Latin America since the fall of US-backed

1   dictatorships has offered a simultaneously individual and social forum for
2   new expressions of citizenship in the context of decentered politics, emergent
3   identities, minority rights, and gender issues—a public space that transcends
4   the subordination of difference and the privileging of elite experience. Mosco
5   (2004) starts from the power of mythology then "builds a bridge to political
6   economy" in his investigation of neoliberal *doxa* about empowerment,
7   insisting on "the mutually constitutive relationship between political
8   economy and cultural studies" as each mounts "a critique of the other."
9   One can note similar intent animating such innovations as Sarai, the
10  Free Software Foundation, and the Alternative Law Forum—exemplary
11  instances of Media Studies 3.0 in formation. They blend internationalism,
12  political economy, ethnography, and textual analysis, and resist the binarism
13  of 1.0 and 2.0.
14      The art world can incarnate this approach in its critical views of tourism.
15  For instance, Amsterdam's urbanscreens.org uses electronic billboards as
16  public space to encourage active citizenship, as do Ars Electronica of Linz
17  and Melbourne's Federation Square. Artists draw attention to personal
18  multimedia messaging services and corporate occupancy of public space by
19  placing passersby on billboards, as per Zhang Ga's Times Square *People's*
20  *Portrait*, for all the world a throwback to Judy Holliday's moment of
21  celebrity in the classic Hollywood film *It Should Happen to You* (George
22  Cukor, 1954), when she buys advertising space in Columbus Circle to   AU :1
23  promote herself.
24      Anderson and Wolff (2010), lapsed sacerdotal zealots of the new media
25  from *Wired* magazine, say the web is dead because social networks and
26  software applications are supplanting the old fantasy of an open frontier
27  with a new hegemony of a few institutions. Schiller (2007) challenges social
28  media enthusiasts to query the way that economic inequalities fuel new
29  consumer needs, as people rush to purchase inferior services at high cost. In
30  the United States, for instance, the decline in governmental oversight of
31  the media since World War II has diminished the quality and regulation of
32  competition, allowing telecommunication companies to exploit the need
33  for connectedness in times of fragmentation.
34
35
36  CONCLUSION
37
38  To understand media infrastructure, it is necessary to address technological
39  innovation, regulation, labor, ownership, control, and environmental impact,
40  utilizing ethnographic, political-economic, scientific, and public-policy

1 research. To understand content, one must address production and under-
2 take content and textual analysis, combining statistical and hermeneutic
3 methods. To understand audiences, ratings, uses-and-gratifications, effects,
4 active-audience, ethnographic, and psychoanalytic traditions, combining
5 quantitative and qualitative measures should be standard.

6     Two examples that use 3.0 can be used to show the relationship between
7 the media and tourism. They concern major tourist spots thematized in
8 films. Each involves environmental destruction and popular responses to
9 corporate malevolence. They blend older and newer media in artful ways
10 appropriate to 3.0.

11     Much of Fox Studios' *Titanic* (Cameron, 1997) was shot in the Mexican
12 village of Popotla. During the making of the picture, the national film studio
13 Churubusco was renovated and a National Film Commission established,
14 with satellites across the country providing *gabacho* moguls trips in
15 governors' helicopters, among other services. Restoring Mexico to the
16 Hollywood map gained the film's director Cameron the Order of the Aztec
17 Eagle from a grateful government. *Titanic* was, in this context, a screen
18 testimony to the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement/Tratado de
19 Libre Comercio, which has seen offshore film and television production in
20 Mexico increase thanks to easy shipment of technology, especially for low-
21 budget shoots. Studio owner Rupert Murdoch approvingly cited the number
22 of workers invisibly employed in making the film:

24         this cross-border cultural co-operation is not the result of
25         regulation, but market forces. It's the freedom to move
26         capital, technology and talent around the world that adds
27         value, invigorates ailing markets, creates new ones.

29 Meanwhile, local Mexican film production spiraled downwards, from 747
30 titles in the decade prior to the agreement/tratado to 212 the following
31 decade (Maxwell & Miller, 2006; Miller, Govil, McMurria, Maxwell, &
32 Wang, 2005, pp. 164–65).

33     There is a cruel irony to this liquid globalization of cultural labor: the
34 cost of the film could have provided safe drinking water to 600,000 people
35 for a year. People submerged in the credits to *Titanic* (or not listed at all)
36 supposedly benefited from the textualization of a boat laden with wealthy
37 tourists and *lumpen* steerage that had been sunk by invisible ice and business
38 bombast 80 years earlier. During filming, Popotla was cut off from the sea
39 and local fisheries by a 6-feet-high and 500-feet long movie wall, built to
40 keep citizens away. Fox's chlorination of surrounding seawater decimated

1   sea urchins, which locals had long harvested, and reduced overall fish
2   levels by a third (Kushner, 1998; Miller et al., 2005, p. 165). Today, Popotla
3   is promoted as a destination for smiling foreigners eager to see where
4   their favorite drowning sequences were shot at the charmingly named
5   "Foxploration" (http://www.bajatours.org/about_rosarito_beach; http://
6   www.rosaritoinn.com/foxtour.htm).
7     Such arrogant despoliation has not gone unanswered. In collaboration
8   with artists like Jim Bliesner, the Popotlanos decorated the wall with rubbish
9   to ridicule the filmmakers, and adopted the rallying cry *mariscos libre* (free-
10   dom for shellfish). (Photographs are available at rtmark.com/popotlaimages.
11   html.) This nifty environmental critique has largely eluded journalistic
12   and scholarly analysis. Ars Electronica awarded the Popotlanos a prize for
13   "symbolic low-tech resistance to real high-tech destruction" that was in
14   keeping with the movie's textual—if not industrial—class politics. But the
15   award was a fraction of the money Ars Electronica gave the film's producers
16   for their innovative special effects. Resistance has come from groups
17   using social media to pose as officials from the World Trade Organization
18   to underscore the damage done to livelihoods and the environment. The
19   Popotlanos' view of Cameron's putatively green, pro-indigenous, anti-
20   imperialist *Avatar* (2009) is not on record, but their town is currently vilified
21   by the likes of *The Washington Times* as a site for "illegals" seeking to enter
22   the United States (Coombe & Herman, 2000; gatt.org/popotla.html;
23   Kushner, 1998; *Popotla vs. Titanic*, n.d.; Sekula, 2001; Spagat, 2010).
24     Cameron acknowledges the need to change filmmaking in light of the
25   ecological crisis. He is quick to point out that "*Avatar* was an enormous
26   battle film that took place in a rainforest but was 100% C[omputer-]
27   G[enerated]" (Cheney, 2010; quoted in Miller, 2010). When he castigated the
28   Pacific Northwest for extracting oil from tar sands, the *Edmonton Sun*
29   editorialized in best un-Canadian fashion "James Cameron is a Hypocrite"
30   for working in California, where energy comes from power companies that
31   use coal from elsewhere (*Edmonton Sun*, 2010).
32     Three years after *Titanic*, Fox made *The Beach* (Boyle, 2000), where a
33   modern-day Asian Eden suddenly turns nasty for jaded tourists. Like the
34   earlier film, it starred the environmental moralist Leonardo DiCaprio
35   (Biggs, 2000). *The Beach* was shot in Maya Beach, part of Thailand's Phi Phi
36   Islands National Park. Natural scenery was bulldozed because it did not fit
37   the company's fantasy of a tropical idyll: sand dunes were relocated, flora
38   rearranged, and a new strip of coconut palms planted. The producers paid
39   off the government with a donation to the Royal Forestry Department, and
40   campaigned with the Tourism Authority to twin the picture as a promotion

1 for the country. The damaged sand dunes of the region collapsed in the next
2 monsoon, their natural defenses against erosion destroyed by Hollywood
3 bulldozers. Thai environmental and pro-democracy activists publicized this
4 arrogant despoliation, while the director claimed the film was "raising
5 environmental consciousness" among a local population whose appreciation
6 of these things lagged "behind" US "awareness" (Law, Bunnell, & Ong,
7 2007; Miller et al., 2005; Shoaib, 2001; Tzanelli, 2006). Director Boyle
8 heroically announced his intention to "give something back to Thailand" by
9 hiring Thai apprentices but then complained that "[w]e were hauling 300
10 fucking people around wherever we went. And you know how hard it is to
11 learn Thai names. Every lunchtime was like a prime minister's reception"
12 (quoted in Gilbey, 2002). Before the film was released—but no doubt after
13 having had their consciousness raised—the Ao Nang Tambon Administra-
14 tion Organization, the Krabi Provincial Administration Organization, and
15 various environmental groups filed a suit against Fox and local officialdom
16 for contravening the National Parks Act and the Environmental Protection
17 Act. It took seven years, but the Thai Supreme Court found in their favor in
18 2006 (*The Nation*, 2006). The reaction of the "300 fucking people" who were
19 being "hauled around" during production is not on record.
20  The political-economic background to such ecologically destructive
21 filmmaking implicates tourism. Structural adjustment as peddled by
22 neoliberal high priests at the World Bank, the International Monetary
23 Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the sovereign states that
24 dominate them has encouraged the Global South to turn away from
25 subsistence agriculture and toward tradable services, beyond manufacturing
26 capacity and in the direction of human exchange. In much of Southeast
27 Asia, these policies pushed people into littoral regions in search of work.
28 Fish-farming corporations created a new aquaculture, displacing the natural
29 environment of mangroves and coral reefs that protect people and land. The
30 requirement to reconstitute themselves as entertaining heritage sites and
31 decadent tourism playgrounds induced Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia
32 to undertake massive construction projects. They built resorts at the point
33 where high tides lap, attracting more and more workers and decimating
34 more and more natural protection. Areas that had not been directed to
35 remove natural barriers suffered dramatically fewer casualties in the 2004
36 tsunami (Bidwai, 2005; Sharma, 2005; Shiva, 2005). That ugly side to
37 tourism and the media is something 3.0 can specify, engage, and struggle
38 against. Doing so might make for a truly social media.
39
40

# AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

**Disk use**

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

☐ Scanning (parts of) your article    ☐ Rekeying (parts of) your article

☐ Scanning the artwork

**Bibliography**

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

☐ **The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.**

☐ *UNCITED REFERENCES:* **This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section.**

**Queries and/or remarks**

| Location in Article | Query / remark | Response |
|---|---|---|
| AU:1 | The reference "George Cukor, 1954; Cameron, 1997; Avatar, 2009; Boyle, 2000" isare cited in the text but not present in the reference list. Please provide the details or else the reference citation will be deleted from the text. | |