

"Henry Jenkins is the 21st century McLuhan."
— Howard Rheingold, author of *Smart Mobs*



CONVERGENCE CULTURE

WHERE OLD AND NEW MEDIA COLLIDE

HENRY JENKINS

Convergence Culture

This page intentionally left blank

Henry Jenkins

Convergence Culture

Where Old and New Media Collide



New York University Press • *New York and London*

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS

New York and London

www.nyupress.org

© 2006 by New York University

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jenkins, Henry, 1958–

Convergence culture : where old and new media collide / Henry Jenkins.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-8147-4281-5 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 0-8147-4281-5 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Mass media and culture—United States. 2. Popular culture—United States.

I. Title.

P94.65.U6J46 2006

302.230973—dc22

2006007358

New York University Press books are printed on acid-free paper,
and their binding materials are chosen for strength and durability.

Manufactured in the United States of America

c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

p 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction: “Worship at the Altar of Convergence”: A New Paradigm for Understanding Media Change	1
1 Spoiling <i>Survivor</i> : The Anatomy of a Knowledge Community	25
2 Buying into <i>American Idol</i> : How We are Being Sold on Reality TV	59
3 Searching for the Origami Unicorn: <i>The Matrix</i> and Transmedia Storytelling	93
4 Quentin Tarantino’s <i>Star Wars</i> ? Grassroots Creativity Meets the Media Industry	131
5 Why Heather Can Write: Media Literacy and the <i>Harry Potter Wars</i>	169
6 Photoshop for Democracy: The New Relationship between Politics and Popular Culture	206
Conclusion: Democratizing Television? The Politics of Participation	240
Notes	261
Glossary	279
Index	295
About the Author	308

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

Writing this book has been an epic journey, helped along by many hands. *Convergence Culture* is in many ways the culmination of the past eight years of my life, an outgrowth of my efforts to build up MIT's Comparative Media Studies program as a center for conversations about media change (past, present, and future) and of my efforts to enlarge public dialogues about popular culture and contemporary life. A fuller account of how this book emerged from the concerns of *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1991) and was shaped by my intellectual growth over the past decade can be found in the introduction to my anthology *Fans, Gamers, and Bloggers: Exploring Participatory Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 2006).

Given that history, it is perhaps appropriate that my first set of thanks goes to the students of the Comparative Media Studies program. Each and every one of them has had an impact on my thinking, but I want especially to identify students whose work significantly influenced the content of this book: Ivan Askwith, R. J. Bain, Christian Baekkelund, Vanessa Bertozzi, Lisa Bidlingmeyer, Brett Camper, Anita Chan, Cristobal Garcia, Robin Hauck, Sean Leonard, Zhan Li, Geoffrey Long, Susannah Mandel, Andrea McCarty, Parmesh Shahani, Sangita Shresthova, Karen Lori Schrier, David Spitz, Philip Tan, Ilya Vedrashko, Margaret Weigel, and Matthew Weise. You are what gets me up in the morning and keeps me working late into the night. In particular, I want to thank Aswin Punathambekar, who was the best possible research assistant on this project, not only digging up resources but challenging my assumptions, and continuing to remain dedicated to the project long after he had left MIT to begin his doctoral work at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

I also want to thank the members of the Comparative Media Studies staff who supported these efforts in countless ways: R. J. Bain, Jason Bentsman, Chris Pomiecko, Brian Theisen, and especially Susan Staple-

ton, whose cheerful disposition and calm resourcefulness always prevented impending disaster, and who supervised the proofing and fact checking of this project.

I also want to give a shout out to Philip S. Khoury, Kenan Sahin Dean, School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences at MIT, who has always been in my corner as we have struggled to make this program fly and who gave me time off to pursue this project. My research has also been supported through the three chairs the dean has provided me: the Ann Fetter Friedlaender chair, the John E. Burchard chair, and the Peter de Florez chair.

This book emerged from many, many conversations with Alex Chisholm on long drives, early morning waits at airports, and meetings with potential sponsors. While Alex was not always patient with my foolishness, he vetted and refined almost every concept in this book; he taught this humanist how to speak the language of business and, through this process, how to become a better analyst and critic of contemporary media trends. I am also deeply indebted to Christopher Weaver, who co-taught our “Popular Culture in the Age of Media Convergence” seminar with me on multiple occasions, bringing our students (and myself) into direct contact with leading figures in the media industry and sharing frontline experiences that complemented and complicated my theoretical perspectives. I would also like to single out Kurt Squire, my faithful squire and sometimes writing collaborator, who has helped me to appreciate what games can teach us about the current state of our culture. Finally, I should acknowledge all of those who participated in the joint Initiative Media/Comparative Media Studies research project on *American Idol* that forms the basis for chapter 3 of this book: in particular, Alex Chisholm, Stephanie Davenport, David Ernst, Stacey Lynn Koerner, Sangita Shresthova, and Brian Theisen.

I was blessed to be able to have the readers and editors of *Technology Review* as another sounding board for my ideas as they took shape. In particular, I want to thank the fine folks who have edited my “Digital Renaissance” column through the years: Herb Brody, Kevin Hogan, Brad King, and Rebecca Zacks. I also want to sing the praises of David Thorburn, Brad Seawell, and the MIT Communications Forum. For several decades, the Communications Forum has brought leading media figures to campus, providing the right context for exploring ideas about where our media is going and how it is impacting public life.

Early conceptualizations of this book passed before two literary

agents, Elyse Cheney and Carol Mann, who hoped to make me into a commercial nonfiction writer. They were sufficiently frank and discouraging enough to send me running back to the world of the university press, but in the process, they taught me some new tricks that, I hope, have made this book much more readable. Maybe someday . . .

I am grateful for the many people who were willing to be interviewed for the book or who helped me to get in touch with key people I needed to interview: Sweeney Agonistes, Chris Albrecht, Marcia Allas, Mike Alessi, Danny Bilson, Kurt Busiek, ChillOne, Louise Craven, Mary Dana, Dennis Dauter, B. K. DeLong, David Ernst, Jonathon Fanton, Keith Ferrazzi, Claire Field, Chris Finan, Flourish, Carl Goodman, Denis Haack, Hugh Hancock, Bennett Haselton, J. Kristopher Huddy, Stacey Lynn Koerner, Raph Koster, David Kung, Garrett Laporto, Mario Lanza, Heather Lawver, Paul Levitz, John Love, Megan Morrison, Diane Nelson, Shawn Nelson, Dennis O'Neil, Chris Pike, David Raines, Rick Rowley, Eduardo Sanchez, Sande Scoredos, Warren Spector, Patrick Stein, Linda Stone, Heidi Tandy, Joe Trippi, Steve Wax, Nancy Willard, Will Wright, Neil Young, and Zsenya.

I also want to thank a host of friends and intellectual colleagues who offered me just-in-time advice and encouragement: Harvey Ardman, Hal Abelson, Robert C. Allen, Todd Allen, Reid Ashe, W. James Au, Rebecca Black, Andrew Blau, Gerry Bloustein, David Bordwell, danah boyd, Amy Bruckman, Will Brooker, David Buckingham, Scott Bukatman, John Campbell, Justine Cassell, Edward Castranova, Josh Cohen, Ian Condry, Ron Crane, Jon Cropper, Sharon Cumberland, Marc Davis, Thomas DeFrantz, Mark Dery, Mark Deuze, Kimberly DeVries, Julian Dibbell, Peter Donaldson, Tracy Fullerton, Simson L. Garfinkel, James Gee, Lisa Gitelman, Wendy Gordon, Nick Hahn, Mary Beth Haralovich, John Hartley, Heather Hendershott, Matt Hills, Mimi Ito, Mark Jancovich, Steven Johnson, Sara Gwenllian Jones, Gerard Jones, Louise Kennedy, Christina Klein, Eric Klopfer, Robert Kozinets, Ellen Kushner, Christopher Ireland, Jessica Irish, Kurt Lancaster, Brenda Laurel, Chap Lawson, Geoffrey Long, Peter Ludlow, Davis Maston, Frans Mayra, Robert Metcalfe, Scott McCloud, Grant McCracken, Jane McGonigal, Edward McNally, Tara McPherson, Jason Mittell, Janet Murray, Susan J. Napier, Angela Ndlanis, Annalee Newitz, Tasha Oren, Ciela Pearce, Steven Pinker, Warren Sack, Katie Salens, Nick Sammond, Kevin Sandler, Greg Shaw, Greg Smith, Janet Sonenberg, Constance Steinkuehler, Mary Stuckey, David Surman, Steven J. Tepper, Doug Thomas, Clive

Thompson, Sherry Turkle, Fred Turner, William Uricchio, Shenja van der Graaf, Jesse Walker, Jing Wang, Yuichi Washida, David Weinberger, Pam Wilson, Femke Wolting, Chris Wright, and Eric Zimmerman. I should note that the separation between this list and the previous one was relatively arbitrary since many in the first list are also friends and offered advice and encouragement.

And last but hardly least, I want to thank Henry Jenkins IV, who has always made intellectual contributions to my work but who was central to the development of chapter 2 of this book, helping to connect me with the leaders of the *Survivor* fan community; and Cynthia Jenkins, whose partnership in all matters, personal and professional, fannish and scholarly, is valued more than I can (or often do) say.

Parts of the introduction appeared as "The Cultural Logic of Media Convergence," *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Spring 2004; "Convergence? I Diverge," *Technology Review*, June 2001; "Interactive Audiences," in Dan Harris (ed.), *The New Media Book* (London: British Film Institute, 2002); "Pop Cosmopolitanism: Mapping Cultural Flows in an Age of Media Convergence," in Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco and Desiree Baolian Qin-Hilliard (eds.), *Globalization: Culture and Education in the New Millennium* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); and "Welcome to Convergence Culture," *Receiver*, February 2005. The material in this chapter was presented at the New Media Conference, Nokea, the Humlab at Umea University, the New Orleans Media Experience, and the Humanities Center of the University of Pennsylvania.

Parts of chapter 1 appeared as "Convergence is Reality," *Technology Review*, June 2003. This material has been presented at Georgia State University and Harvard University.

Parts of chapter 2 appeared as "War Games," *Technology Review*, November 2003; "Convergence is Reality," *Technology Review*, June 2003; "Placement, People," *Technology Review*, September 2002; "Treating Viewers Like Criminals," *Technology Review*, July 2002; "TV Tomorrow," *Technology Review*, May 2001; "Affective Economics 101," *Flow*, September 20, 2004. Material from this chapter has been presented at Georgia State University, MIT, ESOMAR, and the Branded Entertainment Forum.

Parts of chapter 3 have appeared as "Chasing Bees without the Hive Mind," *Technology Review*, December 3, 2004, "Searching for the Origami Unicorn" (with Kurt Squire), *Computer Games Magazine*, December 2003; "Transmedia Storytelling," *Technology Review*, January 2003; "Pop Cosmopolitanism: Mapping Cultural Flows in an Age of Media

Convergence," in Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco and Desiree Baolian Qin-Hilliard (eds.), *Globalization: Culture and Education in the New Millennium* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004). Material from this chapter has been presented at Northwestern, the University of Wisconsin, Georgia State University, MIT, Electronic Arts Creative Leaders Program, and IT University of Copenhagen.

Parts of chapter 4 have appeared in "Quentin Tarantino's Star Wars: Digital Cinema, Media Convergence, and Participatory Culture," in David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins (eds.), *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003); "When Folk Culture Meets Mass Culture" in Christopher Hawthorne and Andras Szanto (eds.), *The New Gatekeepers: Emerging Challenges to Free Expression in the Arts* (New York: National Journalism Program, 2003); "Taking Media in Our Own Hands," *Technology Review*, November 2004; "When Piracy Becomes Promotion," *Technology Review*, August 2004; "The Director Next Door," *Technology Review*, March 2001. Material from this chapter has been presented at the Society for Cinema Studies Conference, the MIT Digital Cinema Conference, and the University of Tampiere.

Parts of chapter 5 have appeared in "Why Heather Can Write," *Technology Review*, February 2004; "The Christian Media Counterculture," *Technology Review*, March 2004 (reprinted in *National Religious Broadcasters*, October 2004); "When Folk Culture Meets Mass Culture" in Christopher Hawthorne and Andras Szanto (eds.), *The New Gatekeepers: Emerging Challenges to Free Expression in the Arts* (New York: National Journalism Program, 2003). Material has been presented at Console-ing Passions and The Witching Hour.

Parts of chapter 6 have appeared as "Playing Politics in Alphaville," *Technology Review*, May 2004; "Photoshop for Democracy," *Technology Review*, June 2004; "Enter the Cybercandidates," *Technology Review*, October 2003; "The Digital Revolution, the Informed Citizen and the Culture of Democracy" (with David Thorburn), in Henry Jenkins and David Thorburn (ed.), *Democracy and New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003); and "Challenging the Consensus," *Boston Review*, Summer 2001. Material was presented to gatherings of MIT alumni in Houston and San Francisco, the MIT Communications Forum, Nokea, and the Humlab at Umea University.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction: “Worship at the Altar of Convergence”

A New Paradigm for Understanding Media Change

Worship at the Altar of Convergence

—slogan, the New Orleans Media Experience (2003)

The story circulated in the fall of 2001: Dino Ignacio, a Filipino-American high school student created a Photoshop collage of *Sesame Street*'s (1970) Bert interacting with terrorist leader Osama Bin Laden as part of a series of “Bert is Evil” images he posted on his homepage (fig. I.1). Others depicted Bert as a Klansman, cavorting with Adolph Hitler, dressed as the Unabomber, or having sex with Pamela Anderson. It was all in good fun.

In the wake of September 11, a Bangladesh-based publisher scanned the Web for Bin Laden images to print on anti-American signs, posters, and T-shirts. *Sesame Street* is available in Pakistan in a localized format; the Arab world, thus, had no exposure to Bert and Ernie. The publisher may not have recognized Bert, but he must have thought the image was a good likeness of the al-Qaeda leader. The image ended up in a collage of similar images that was printed on thousands of posters and distributed across the Middle East.

CNN reporters recorded the unlikely sight of a mob of angry protestors marching through the streets chanting anti-American slogans and waving signs



Fig. I.1. Dino Ignacio's digital collage of *Sesame Street*'s Bert and Osama Bin Laden.

Fig.I.2. Ignacio's collage surprisingly appeared in CNN coverage of anti-American protests following September 11.



depicting Bert and Bin Laden (fig. I.2). Representatives from the Children's Television Workshop, creators of the *Sesame Street* series, spotted the CNN footage and threatened to take legal action: "We're outraged that our characters would be used in this unfortunate and distasteful manner. The people responsible for this should be ashamed of themselves. We are exploring all legal options to stop this abuse and any similar abuses in the future." It was not altogether clear who they planned to sic their intellectual property attorneys on—the young man who had initially appropriated their images, or the terrorist supporters who deployed them. Coming full circle, amused fans produced a number of new sites, linking various *Sesame Street* characters with terrorists.

From his bedroom, Ignacio sparked an international controversy. His images crisscrossed the world, sometimes on the backs of commercial media, sometimes via grassroots media. And, in the end, he inspired his own cult following. As the publicity grew, Ignacio became more concerned and ultimately decided to dismantle his site: "I feel this has gotten too close to reality. . . . "Bert Is Evil" and its following has always been contained and distanced from big media. This issue throws it out in the open."¹ Welcome to convergence culture, where old and new media collide, where grassroots and corporate media intersect, where the power of the media producer and the power of the media consumer interact in unpredictable ways.

This book is about the relationship between three concepts—media convergence, participatory culture, and collective intelligence.

By convergence, I mean the flow of content across multiple media platforms, the cooperation between multiple media industries, and the migratory behavior of media audiences who will go almost anywhere in search of the kinds of entertainment experiences they want. Conver-

gence is a word that manages to describe technological, industrial, cultural, and social changes depending on who's speaking and what they think they are talking about. (In this book I will be mixing and matching terms across these various frames of reference. I have added a glossary at the end of the book to help guide readers.)

In the world of media convergence, every important story gets told, every brand gets sold, and every consumer gets courted across multiple media platforms. Think about the circuits that the Bert is Evil images traveled—from *Sesame Street* through Photoshop to the World Wide Web, from Ignacio's bedroom to a print shop in Bangladesh, from the posters held by anti-American protestors that are captured by CNN and into the living rooms of people around the world. Some of its circulation depended on corporate strategies, such as the localization of *Sesame Street* or the global coverage of CNN. Some of its circulation depended on tactics of grassroots appropriation, whether in North America or in the Middle East.

This circulation of media content—across different media systems, competing media economies, and national borders—depends heavily on consumers' active participation. I will argue here against the idea that convergence should be understood primarily as a technological process bringing together multiple media functions within the same devices. Instead, convergence represents a cultural shift as consumers are encouraged to seek out new information and make connections among dispersed media content. This book is about the work—and play—spectators perform in the new media system.

The term, participatory culture, contrasts with older notions of passive media spectatorship. Rather than talking about media producers and consumers as occupying separate roles, we might now see them as participants who interact with each other according to a new set of rules that none of us fully understands. Not all participants are created equal. Corporations—and even individuals within corporate media—still exert greater power than any individual consumer or even the aggregate of consumers. And some consumers have greater abilities to participate in this emerging culture than others.

Convergence does not occur through media appliances, however sophisticated they may become. Convergence occurs within the brains of individual consumers and through their social interactions with others. Each of us constructs our own personal mythology from bits and fragments of information extracted from the media flow and transformed

into resources through which we make sense of our everyday lives. Because there is more information on any given topic than anyone can store in their head, there is an added incentive for us to talk among ourselves about the media we consume. This conversation creates buzz that is increasingly valued by the media industry. Consumption has become a collective process—and that's what this book means by collective intelligence, a term coined by French cybertheorist Pierre Lévy. None of us can know everything; each of us knows something; and we can put the pieces together if we pool our resources and combine our skills. Collective intelligence can be seen as an alternative source of media power. We are learning how to use that power through our day-to-day interactions within convergence culture. Right now, we are mostly using this collective power through our recreational life, but soon we will be deploying those skills for more "serious" purposes. In this book, I explore how collective meaning-making within popular culture is starting to change the ways religion, education, law, politics, advertising, and even the military operate.

Convergence Talk

Another snapshot of convergence culture at work: In December 2004, a hotly anticipated Bollywood film, *Rok Sako To Rok Lo* (2004), was screened in its entirety to movie buffs in Delhi, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Mumbai, and other parts of India through EDGE-enabled mobile phones with live video streaming facility. This is believed to be the first time that a feature film had been fully accessible via mobile phones.² It remains to be seen how this kind of distribution fits into people's lives. Will it substitute for going to the movies or will people simply use it to sample movies they may want to see at other venues? Who knows?

Over the past several years, many of us have watched as cell phones have become increasingly central to the release strategies of commercial motion pictures around the world, as amateur and professional cell phone movies have competed for prizes in international film festivals, as mobile users have been able to listen into major concerts, as Japanese novelists serialize their work via instant messenger, and as game players have used mobile devices to compete in augmented and alternative reality games. Some functions will take root; others will fail.

Call me old-fashioned. The other week I wanted to buy a cell phone

—you know, to make phone calls. I didn't want a video camera, a still camera, a Web access device, an mp3 player, or a game system. I also wasn't interested in something that could show me movie previews, would have customizable ring tones, or would allow me to read novels. I didn't want the electronic equivalent of a Swiss army knife. When the phone rings, I don't want to have to figure out which button to push. I just wanted a phone. The sales clerks sneered at me; they laughed at me behind my back. I was told by company after mobile company that they don't make single-function phones anymore. Nobody wants them. This was a powerful demonstration of how central mobiles have become to the process of media convergence.

You've probably been hearing a lot about convergence lately. You are going to be hearing even more.

The media industries are undergoing another paradigm shift. It happens from time to time. In the 1990s, rhetoric about a coming digital revolution contained an implicit and often explicit assumption that new media was going to push aside old media, that the Internet was going to displace broadcasting, and that all of this would enable consumers to more easily access media content that was personally meaningful to them. A best-seller in 1990, Nicholas Negroponte's *Being Digital*, drew a sharp contrast between "passive old media" and "interactive new media," predicting the collapse of broadcast networks in favor of an era of narrowcasting and niche media on demand: "What will happen to broadcast television over the next five years is so phenomenal that it's difficult to comprehend."³ At one point, he suggests that no government regulation will be necessary to shatter the media conglomerates: "The monolithic empires of mass media are dissolving into an array of cottage industries. . . . Media barons of today will be grasping to hold onto their centralized empires tomorrow. . . . The combined forces of technology and human nature will ultimately take a stronger hand in plurality than any laws Congress can invent."⁴ Sometimes, the new media companies spoke about convergence, but by this term, they seemed to mean that old media would be absorbed fully and completely into the orbit of the emerging technologies. George Gilder, another digital revolutionary, dismissed such claims: "The computer industry is converging with the television industry in the same sense that the automobile converged with the horse, the TV converged with the nickelodeon, the word-processing program converged with the typewriter, the CAD program converged with the drafting board, and

digital desktop publishing converged with the linotype machine and the letterpress.”⁵ For Gilder, the computer had come not to transform mass culture but to destroy it.

The popping of the dot-com bubble threw cold water on this talk of a digital revolution. Now, convergence has reemerged as an important reference point as old and new media companies try to imagine the future of the entertainment industry. If the digital revolution paradigm presumed that new media would displace old media, the emerging convergence paradigm assumes that old and new media will interact in ever more complex ways. The digital revolution paradigm claimed that new media was going to change everything. After the dot-com crash, the tendency was to imagine that new media had changed nothing. As with so many things about the current media environment, the truth lay somewhere in between. More and more, industry leaders are returning to convergence as a way of making sense of a moment of disorienting change. Convergence is, in that sense, an old concept taking on new meanings.

There was lots of convergence talk to be heard at the New Orleans Media Experience in October 2003. The New Orleans Media Experience was organized by HSI Productions, Inc., a New York–based company that produces music videos and commercials. HSI has committed to spend \$100 million over the next five years, to make New Orleans the mecca for media convergence that Slamdance has become for independent cinema. The New Orleans Media Experience is more than a film festival; it is also a showcase for game releases, a venue for commercials and music videos, an array of concerts and theatrical performances, and a three-day series of panels and discussions with industry leaders.

Inside the auditorium, massive posters featuring images of eyes, ears, mouths, and hands urged attendees to “worship at the Alter of Convergence,” but it was far from clear what kind of deity they were genuflecting before. Was it a New Testament God who promised them salvation? An Old Testament God threatening destruction unless they followed His rules? A multifaced deity that spoke like an oracle and demanded blood sacrifices? Perhaps, in keeping with the location, convergence was a voodoo goddess who would give them the power to inflict pain on their competitors?

Like me, the participants had come to New Orleans hoping to glimpse tomorrow before it was too late. Many were nonbelievers who

had been burned in the dot-com meltdown and were there to scoff at any new vision. Others were freshly minted from America's top business schools and there to find ways to make their first million. Still others were there because their bosses had sent them, hoping for enlightenment, but willing to settle for one good night in the French Quarter.

The mood was tempered by a sober realization of the dangers of moving too quickly, as embodied by the ghost-town campuses in the Bay Area and the office furniture being sold at bulk prices on eBay; and the dangers of moving too slowly, as represented by the recording industry's desperate flailing as it tries to close the door on file-sharing after the cows have already come stampeding out of the barn. The participants had come to New Orleans in search of the "just right"—the right investments, predictions, and business models. No longer expecting to surf the waves of change, they would be content with staying afloat. The old paradigms were breaking down faster than the new ones were emerging, producing panic among those most invested in the status quo and curiosity in those who saw change as opportunity.

Advertising guys in pinstriped shirts mingled with recording industry flacks with backward baseball caps, Hollywood agents in Hawaiian shirts, pointy-bearded technologists, and shaggy-haired gamers. The only thing they all knew how to do was to exchange business cards.

As represented on the panels at the New Orleans Media Experience, convergence was a "come as you are" party and some of the participants were less ready for what was planned than others. It was also a swap meet where each of the entertainment industries traded problems and solutions, finding through the interplay among media what they can't achieve working in isolation. In every discussion, there emerged different models of convergence followed by the acknowledgment that none of them knew for sure what the outcomes were going to be. Then, everyone adjourned for a quick round of Red Bulls (a conference sponsor) as if funky high-energy drinks were going to blast them over all of those hurdles.

Political economists and business gurus make convergence sound so easy; they look at the charts that show the concentration of media ownership as if they ensure that all of the parts will work together to pursue maximum profits. But from the ground, many of the big media giants look like great big dysfunctional families, whose members aren't speaking with each other and pursue their own short term agendas

even at the expense of other divisions of the same companies. In New Orleans, however, the representatives for different industries seemed tentatively ready to lower their guard and speak openly about common visions.

This event was billed as a chance for the general public to learn first-hand about the coming changes in news and entertainment. In accepting an invitation to be on panels, in displaying a willingness to “go public” with their doubts and anxieties, perhaps industry leaders were acknowledging the importance of the role that ordinary consumers can play not just in accepting convergence, but actually in *driving* the process. If the media industry in recent years has seemed at war with its consumers, in that it is trying to force consumers back into old relationships and into obedience to well-established norms, companies hoped to use this New Orleans event to justify their decisions to consumers and stockholders alike.

Unfortunately, although this was not a closed-door event, it might as well have been. Those few members of the public who did show up were ill-informed. After an intense panel discussion about the challenges of broadening the uses of game consoles, the first member of the audience to raise his hand wanted to know when *Grand Theft Auto III* was coming out on the Xbox. You can scarcely blame consumers for not knowing how to speak this new language or even what questions to ask when so little previous effort has been made to educate them about convergence thinking.

At a panel on game consoles, the big tension was between Sony (a hardware company) and Microsoft (a software company); both had ambitious plans but fundamentally different business models and visions. All agreed that the core challenge was to expand the potential uses of this cheap and readily accessible technology so that it became *the* “black box,” the “Trojan horse” that smuggled convergence culture right into people’s living rooms. What was mom going to do with the console when her kids were at school? What would get a family to give a game console to grandpa for Christmas? They had the technology to bring about convergence, but they hadn’t figured out why anyone would want it.

Another panel focused on the relationship between video games and traditional media. Increasingly, movie moguls saw games not simply as a means of stamping the franchise logo on some ancillary product but as a means of expanding the storytelling experience. These filmmakers

had come of age as gamers and had their own ideas about the creative intersections between the media; they knew who the most creative designers were and they worked the collaboration into their contract. They wanted to use games to explore ideas that couldn't fit within two-hour films.

Such collaborations meant taking everyone out of their "comfort zones," as one movieland agent explained. These relationships were difficult to sustain, since all parties worried about losing creative control, and since the time spans for development and distribution in the media were radically different. Should the game company try to align its timing to the often unpredictable production cycle of a movie with the hopes of hitting Wal-Mart the same weekend the film opens? Should the movie producers wait for the often equally unpredictable game development cycle to run its course, sitting out the clock while some competitor steals their thunder? Will the game get released weeks or months later, after the buzz of the movie has dried up or, worse yet, after the movie has bombed? Should the game become part of the publicity buildup toward a major release, even though that means starting development before the film project has been "green lighted" by a studio? Working with a television production company is even more nerve wracking, since the turnaround time is much shorter and the risk much higher that the series will never reach the air.

If the game industry folks had the smirking belief that they controlled the future, the record industry types were sweating bullets; their days were numbered unless they figured out how to turn around current trends (such as dwindling audiences, declining sales, and expanding piracy). The panel on "monetizing music" was one of the most heavily attended. Everyone tried to speak at once, yet none of them were sure their "answers" would work. Will the future revenue come from rights management, from billing people for the music they download, or from creating a fee the servers had to pay out to the record industry as a whole? And what about cell phone rings—which some felt represented an unexplored market for new music as well as a grassroots promotional channel? Perhaps the money will lie in the intersection between the various media with new artists promoted via music videos that are paid for by advertisers who want to use their sounds and images for branding, with new artists tracked via the web that allows the public to register its preferences in hours rather than weeks.

And so it went, in panel after panel. The New Orleans Media Experience pressed us into the future. Every path forward had roadblocks, most of which felt insurmountable, but somehow, they would either have to be routed around or broken down in the coming decade.

The messages were plain:

1. Convergence is coming and you had better be ready.
2. Convergence is harder than it sounds.
3. Everyone will survive if everyone works together. (Unfortunately, that was the one thing nobody knew how to do.)

The Prophet of Convergence

If *Wired* magazine declared Marshall McLuhan the patron saint of the digital revolution, we might well describe the late MIT political scientist Ithiel de Sola Pool as the prophet of media convergence. Pool's *Technologies of Freedom* (1983) was probably the first book to lay out the concept of convergence as a force of change within the media industries:

A process called the “convergence of modes” is blurring the lines between media, even between point-to-point communications, such as the post, telephone and telegraph, and mass communications, such as the press, radio, and television. A single physical means—be it wires, cables or airwaves—may carry services that in the past were provided in separate ways. Conversely, a service that was provided in the past by any one medium—be it broadcasting, the press, or telephony—can now be provided in several different physical ways. So the one-to-one relationship that used to exist between a medium and its use is eroding.⁶

Some people today talk about divergence rather than convergence, but Pool understood that they were two sides of the same phenomenon.

“Once upon a time,” Pool explained, “companies that published newspapers, magazines, and books did very little else; their involvement with other media was slight.”⁷ Each media had its own distinctive functions and markets, and each was regulated under different regimes, depending on whether its character was centralized or decentralized, marked by scarcity or plentitude, dominated by news or

entertainment, and owned by governmental or private interests. Pool felt that these differences were largely the product of political choices and preserved through habit rather than any essential characteristic of the various technologies. But he did see some communications technologies as supporting more diversity and a greater degree of participation than others: "Freedom is fostered when the means of communication are dispersed, decentralized, and easily available, as are printing presses or microcomputers. Central control is more likely when the means of communication are concentrated, monopolized, and scarce, as are great networks."⁸

Several forces, however, have begun breaking down the walls separating these different media. New media technologies enabled the same content to flow through many different channels and assume many different forms at the point of reception. Pool was describing what Nicholas Negroponte calls the transformation of "atoms into bytes" or digitization.⁹ At the same time, new patterns of cross-media ownership that began in the mid-1980s, during what we can now see as the first phase of a longer process of media concentration, were making it more desirable for companies to distribute content across those various channels rather than within a single media platform. Digitization set the conditions for convergence; corporate conglomerates created its imperative.

Much writing about the so-called digital revolution presumed that the outcome of technological change was more or less inevitable. Pool, on the other hand, predicted a period of prolonged transition, during which the various media systems competed and collaborated, searching for the stability that would always elude them: "Convergence does not mean ultimate stability or unity. It operates as a constant force for unification but always in dynamic tension with change. . . . There is no immutable law of growing convergence; the process of change is more complicated than that."¹⁰

As Pool predicted, we are in an age of media transition, one marked by tactical decisions and unintended consequences, mixed signals and competing interests, and most of all, unclear directions and unpredictable outcomes.¹¹ Two decades later, I find myself reexamining some of the core questions Pool raised—about how we maintain the potential of participatory culture in the wake of growing media concentration, about whether the changes brought about by convergence open new opportunities for expression or expand the power of big media.

- [click **Being Miss America: Behind the Rhinestone Curtain \(Discovering America\)** online](#)
- [read Blue Future: Protecting Water for People and the Planet Forever pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [read online **Hand to Mouth: Living in Bootstrap America pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi**](#)
- [read online The Martyred \(Penguin Classics\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [Don't Call It That: A Naming Workbook online](#)

- <http://www.khoi.dk/?books/Fever-Pitch.pdf>
- <http://diy-chirol.com/lib/Blue-Future--Protecting-Water-for-People-and-the-Planet-Forever.pdf>
- <http://interactmg.com/ebooks/Hand-to-Mouth--Living-in-Bootstrap-America.pdf>
- <http://tuscalaural.com/library/The-Martyred--Penguin-Classics-.pdf>
- <http://deltaphenomics.nl/?library/Spirit-and-Place.pdf>