

LIKE LOOKING FOR THE SOUL IN A TEST TUBE: THE BANAL CORRUPTIONS OF 'MEASURING MAN' IN THE NEW AGE OF PUBLIC MEDIA

Michael Tracey

IZVORNI ZNANSTVENI RAD / UDK 654.1:316.42, 008:316.7(82-4) / PRIMLJENO: 09.07.2015.

ABSTRACT *It has become common place to suggest that the concept and institutions of public service broadcasting (PSB) are being fundamentally challenged by new technologies, new politics and new economics. Out of these challenges, in a kind of noble optimism, has emerged the idea that PSB can be reimagined as public service media, the worth of which can be made measurable and therefore 'accountable.' This article suggests that not only is this likely misplaced, it also masks the fact that what is actually in play is a historically defined struggle over the values that will constitute modernity.*

KEY WORDS

THE PUBLIC, SERVICE, THEORY, MODERNITY, SOUL, HUMAN

Author note _____

Michael Tracey :: University of Colorado at Boulder, College of Media, Communication and Information, Department of Media Studies, USA :: michael.tracey@colorado.edu

THE BANAL DEMANDS OF MODERNITY

It occurs to me that modernity, and in particular capitalist modernity in an age of *laissez faire* economics and deregulation, has all the hallmarks of the sociopath, not just in the sense that it more often than not evidences no sense of empathy for the human consequences of its inhuman actions, but that it also reduces human beings to an 'it', a cipher, a statistic inhabiting a skin, 'things' to be used, abused, manipulated. It is also clear that this is a part of a long, historical process that responds to the demands and needs of the material over those of the nonmaterial, the spiritual, the human. (When the serial killer Dennis Rader, aka BTK for Bind Torture Kill, was asked in his 2005 trial in Kansas City how he went about his craft, he said that he would get in his car, drive around until he saw 'it', a woman he would then choose to stalk and, in his mind, hopefully kill. I am of course grossly exaggerating. No serial killer ever caused the level of mayhem and misery that one can adduce to the global capitalist enterprise.)

Obviously one has in the end to recognize that 'capitalism' is reification, a conceptualization of the multiple acts, of multiple actors. The unfortunate corollary, if the metaphor has any substance to it, is therefore, and unfortunately, that those who attend to its needs and purpose are, whether we wish to or not, whether we are aware or not, whether we care or not, complicit in its acts.

In this essay I am therefore going to suggest that the rise of what have become known as Public Service Media, the latest iteration of what we used to call Public Service Broadcasting, along with the process of 'measuring' culture and cultural performance – a fundamentally dehumanized concept, even if on first blush it seems so innocuous – need to be placed within the context of the arc of a history which, unfortunately contrary to Dr. King, does not always bend towards justice and the benign. Think of wars over resources, the blood-dappled sands of the Middle East, blood diamonds, so emblematic of the ravaging of the lands of sub-Saharan Africa, the exploitation of child labor in south Asia so that we might indulge our whims for cheap fashion, the environmental degradation and cheap labor in the extractions of rare earth minerals that go into the technical gadgets that so consume us. Think of the grotesque greed and concentrations of wealth (according to an Oxfam report the 85 richest people have as much wealth as the poorest half of the world's population.) Think of global poverty. Avert your gaze from these, and so much more blight, and modernity can seem 'likable enough'.

However, I understand that the inherent needs and character of a socio-economic order may not, almost certainly will not, always 'present' – I use the term with its medical connotations, that is, the surface expression of an underlying malignancy – in such dramatic manner, brash and brutal. Rather it will do so in some obvious, even simple and commonsensical way, a moment here, a process there with which no reasonable person could possibly *disagree*. We are seduced by the *obvious* need for some new policy, in the context of this essay, the transformation of one way of thinking about the place and purpose of broadcasting – the shift away from a humanistic perspective – to one which is instrumental and managerial, mechanistic and bureaucratic. One that inevitably demands

that 'worth' and 'value' be calculated, made 'apparent' and, therefore 'accountable', an appropriate term since what is underway is a making of accounts, a balancing of the public check book so that nothing is to go to waste, that there is a demonstrable 'public value', that there are no 'unnecessary' expenditures, all in the making of an actuarial world. It is a kind of barbarism dressed up in a business suit, written down in a managerial manual of 'how to', that makes the world safe for algorithms.

Much of the recent literature about PSB, whether from scholars, broadcasters or in public policy documents engages one very basic question: how to re-imagine PSB in an age which in terms of technologies, political and economic practices and cultural appetites is so very different from that moment in the 1920s that gave birth to what would become the most significant global idea about the nature and purpose broadcasting and the largest set of broadcast institutions. This was inevitable since broadcasting is but one institution and practice within a larger reimagining of global life amid an effort to make it, and every other institution, comport to the needs of 'the market'. No nook, no cranny, no-one can escape the flood.

One of the singular consequences of that reimagining, has been the rise of the concept of Public Service Media along with a sense, usually emanating from individuals and governments who in reality were, and are, less than enamored with the very concept of 'public service', that the worth of such institutions was not self-evident, that indeed they should 'prove' their right to be. I suspect that it is the latter demand that in the long term will prove to be the most critical. It is not uninteresting in this vein that the volume of papers from the 2012 RIPE (Re-visionary Interpretations of the Public Enterprise) conference were published in a book with the title, *The Value of Public Service Media* (Lowe and Martin, 2014). The editors describe on the dust cover the theme of the book this way:

The worth of public service media is under increasing scrutiny in the 21st century as governments consider whether the institution is a good investment and a fair player in media markets... (The institution) must evidence its economic value, a concept defined by commercial logic, while delivering social value in fulfilling its largely not-for-profit public service mission and functions. (Lowe and Martin, 2014)

It is important to note that the idea of PSM, and the proof of worth, applies not just to new digital platforms, but also, perhaps most importantly, directly to the doings of the major public service broadcasters who – it is claimed by some – are not a 'fair player in media markets.' It is equally clear that the traditional public broadcasters are in the cross-hairs precisely because they embody in their very existence and practice a way of thinking about the place of communication within society that political and economic elites believe is redundant in a *Laissez Faire* Age or, and this is a fascinating contradiction because if they were redundant they would not be a problem, are dangerous behemoths who stand in the way of the final triumph of the LFA.

This is not lost on many senior figures in public broadcasting who emerged in the 1990s and beyond as managerial shape-shifters. In (telling and always reusable) comments in a speech in January 2003, Mark Thompson, who at the time was chief executive of Channel

Four in the UK and would become Director General of the BBC in May 2004, asked whether the old song that had traditionally sung the virtues of public service broadcasting would be able to “work its magic again?” In answering his own question, he said:

...to me, the (Communications) Bill and the arrival of Ofcom (the new UK regulator) have crystallized something which has been apparent for some time now: which is that regulators and policy-makers are increasingly finding themselves having to weigh the benefits and dis-benefits (sic) of public service provision quite forensically, almost numerically, against the interests – and pressures – of the private sector. (Thompson, 2003)

This is an interesting, though extraordinarily troubling, point. He is suggesting that what is happening – and I do not disagree – is that an institution which everyone accepts is imbued with values that are hard, if not impossible, to pin down in language, let alone an algorithm, is nevertheless faced with the need to articulate itself numerically. Would it be a stretch to suggest that the logic which is unfolding here is that if there is something – a value, a principle, a moral commitment, a creative idea – that cannot be represented numerically then its continued viability will be called into question?

Thompson continued in his address:

The problem with the traditional public service song is that, no matter how much passion and conviction you bring to the performance, it's just too woolly and abstract to be measured against anything else. And if it can't be weighed properly, in the end it won't be valued properly. The dominant language of the new regulators is going to be the language of economics, competition and public policy rather than the historic language of public service broadcasting, which is the language of culture and high culture at that. If we want to develop public service broadcasting as a cultural force in this environment, we have to find arguments and evidence which make sense in this new language... (Thompson, 2003)

It is in this context that societies now seek to evaluate the ‘performance’ of public broadcasters and public service media with such concepts as ‘public value’, ‘ex-ante tests’, and the ‘three-step test’ and that we see the sometimes tortured efforts of scholar and policy maker alike to make them meaningful. This is perhaps a more radical departure from traditional practices than is immediately apparent. In his 1924 book John Reith had this to say – I’ve used this before and I do so again because it is profound, utterly relevant and profoundly expressive of what might be called original intent:

In almost all other lines of business it is possible to tell pretty accurately whether one's efforts are meeting with success or not. There is usually some unit of measurement available. It may be tonnage output per week, or comparative weekly costs, or a dozen other equally satisfactory tests, around which one can build one's comments, complimentary or otherwise, at the weekly staff conference. I should be grateful to anyone who would suggest a really reliable criterion for this business. I cannot find one. (Reith, 1924: 205)

The mood today, as PSBers face the digital revolution, the dominance of market economics and the attendant sense of the need for accountability, especially when public funds are in play, has less and less tolerance for such attitudes which are seen as lofty and elitist, as exemplified by Thompson’s comments. The demand now is for some kind of metric that will justify continued support for PSB/PSM. Of particular significance has been the emergence of the idea of ‘public value’ (PV), not exactly the most exquisitely

defined concept. Richard Collins, who has written at great length about this new age of 'accountability' observed: "'Public value' can mean many things ranging from a user centered 'what the public values,' to a producer centered 'what's good for the public?'" This includes both the competition and value for money centered doctrine of the 'father' of public value management, Mark Moore" (Collins, undated). The latter reference is to Mark Moore's 1995 book, *Creating Public Value* which Collins defines as "canonical." Given the definitional uncertainties the Grail of those, who bow to the new objective realities, is to seek a means by which one can measure performance and sustain something of the historical purpose of public service broadcasting. Of that uncertainty, however, one might conclude that if a concept can mean different things to different people it probably is not much of a concept.

There is perhaps a sense that all this is relatively new and, in a way, it is given relatively recent public policy and scholarly interest in the concepts of PSM, PV and 'performance measures.' The most developed and energetic organization engaging these issues, RIPE (www.ripe.org), held its first conference in only 2002. By the end of 2015 the organization will have published seven volumes, with articles chosen from many more papers presented at its biannual conference, with multiple iterations on PSB/PSM and performance measures. There are numerous other works that can be cited, all in their own way grappling with new demands made of public media (to name a few: Born, 2003; Collins, 2006; Coppens and Saeys, 2006; Donders and Pauwels, 2010; Hargreaves-Heap, 2005; Hastings, 2004; Radoslavov and Thomass, 2010).

What I want to argue here, however, is that while specific policy articulations may be relatively new, the ideology within which those policies are embedded is not. In fact, when one looks at the policy developments around PSB/PSM over, say, the past two decades what can be seen is the breaking through of forces which had been held at bay for decades. This is why I find the constant need to return to Reith, not because of some rheumy-eyed nostalgia, but because within him and his creation was and is the very essence of the debate which is now in play.

In Reith's view, indeed in the view of many commentators, an appropriate aesthetic of life could only be achieved if certain modern tendencies were held at bay. It is for this reason that he was brutal in his denunciation of the idea that economics, profit, materialism should drive broadcasting because of his conviction that not only would they debase standards, they would undermine the core project of using broadcasting to better human ends. On 15 June 1952, he wrote an article for *The Observer* called "The Force of Money," which was an attack on the idea of commercial broadcasting in which he declared: "It is the BBC and its friends who are fighting to preserve the freedom of the ether; Lord Wooton, the lord chancellor, Mr. Profumo (they were calling for the creation of commercial television) and his associates surrender to the brute force of money." Towards the end of 1953 the government had published its proposals for commercial television. In another piece in *The Observer*, 22 November 1953, responding to the government's plans for commercial television, called "The Precedence of England" he argued that the

champions of commercial television were “trying to promote commercial interests under the guise of Miltonic precepts and at the cost of the country’s precedence.”

In a House of Lords debate about the introduction of commercial television into Britain he denounced it “as one of the most deplorable, shocking and subversive actions in British political history...” and referred to “the incredible evil (...) of putting the ether at the power of money (...)” and, seeing it as pestilential threat, compared the introduction of commercial television to the introduction into Britain of “smallpox, the bubonic plague, the Black Death (...)” (Reith, 1962, column: 227).

So here is the rub. I am suggesting that public service broadcasting was historically, and consciously so, a buttress against the calculative and material forces of modernity. It is that battle which is being waged and lost right now. This not a new battle, however, in that the central concern of 19th century social theory and of many thinkers in the 20th was precisely about the intrusiveness of the calculative nature of *Kapital* in human affairs and a mechanistic and materialistic interpretation of the imperatives of modernity. All else is shoved aside, filed away, placed in the closet.

Max Weber, for example, wrote: “Man is dominated by making of money, by acquisition as the ultimate purpose of his life. Economic acquisition is no longer subordinated to man as the means for the satisfaction of his material needs.” (cf. Gerth and Mills, 1946: 112) He was saying that we had confused a social practice, work, which should properly be used to help us be human, that is as means, with something that was an end in itself, as the world of material smothered the human.

In his study of suicide and modernity Emile Durkheim wrote of how by the late 19th century economic activity, rather than being a means to an end had become the *only* end of individuals and society (Durkheim, 1897).

In his 1903 essay, *The Metropolis and Mental Life* Georg Simmel writes that at the heart of the “metropolis” – a simile for modernity – is the money economy, exchange value. He argued, somewhat presciently, that as capitalism matured – not in an emotional or moral sense, but as an economic formation – and as urban environments metastasized, everything, all modes of living and being, would be reduced to one question: “How much? (...) Man is reckoned with like a number, like an element which is in itself indifferent.” The result is that the modern mind has become ever more calculating: “The calculative exactness of practical life which the money economy has brought about corresponds to the ideal of natural science: to transform the world into an arithmetic problem, to fix every part of the world by mathematical formulas.” (Simmel, 1950: 411-412) This, he suggests, is no more exemplified than by the precision offered life by the growing use of pocket-watches: “Punctuality, calculability, exactness are forced upon life by the complexity and extension of metropolitan existence.” (Simmel, 1950: 413) He writes that the defining characteristic of modern culture is the preponderance of the “‘objective spirit’ over the ‘subjective spirit’” which leaves the individual “a mere cog in an enormous organization

of things and powers which tear from his hands all progress, spirituality, and value in order to transform them from their subjective form into the form of a purely objective life" a condition he terms the "atrophy of individual culture through the hypertrophy of objective culture" (Simmel, 1950: 422).

In an essay on the rise of what has become known as AmaGoogle, Nicholas Carr writes:

In Technics and Civilization, the historian and social critic Lewis Mumford described how the clock 'disassociated time from human events and helped create the belief in an independent world of mathematically measured sequences.' The 'abstract framework of divided time became the point of reference for both action and thought.' The clock's methodical ticking helped bring into being the scientific mind and the scientific man. But it also took something away. As the late MIT computer scientist Joseph Weizenbaum observed (...) the conception of the world that emerged from the widespread use of timekeeping instruments 'remains an impoverished version of the older one, for it rests on a rejection of those direct experiences that formed the basis for, and indeed constituted, the old reality.' In deciding when to eat, to work, to sleep, to rise, we stopped listening to our senses and started obeying the clock. (2007: 5)

In his book, *The Measure of Man* Joseph Wood Krutch (1954) takes to task the mechanistic worldview that he suggests rode in on the back of Darwin, Marx and Freud and, latterly the behaviorist utopianism of B.F Skinner. He claims that each of them saw Man as "nothing but" the product of external forces" (Krutch, 1954: 94). What troubles him is that in this triumph of the notion of externalities something is being lost, what Krutch (1954) calls "moral discourse" values that are vitally important to being human but that cannot be captured by a mechanistic worldview. Krutch (1954) raises the question of how, in a mechanistic/scientific world, one can arrive at value judgments – the conclusion often being that you can't.

He writes that within modernity there

...is an Idol of the Laboratory as well as of the Market Place. And we can escape from the errors which it fosters only if we cease to believe that a thing is obviously an illusion unless it can be measured and experimented with by the same methods which have proved useful in dealing with mechanical phenomena. All we really need to do is recognize and attend to the phenomena of a different sort and among them, especially, the most indubitable of all: namely, to that consciousness and awareness of self which exists vividly and indisputably in each of us, even though attempts to explain and evaluate them baffle the laboratory technician. (Krutch, 1962: 118)

He goes on to argue that the humanists lost the debate to the mechanists in the second half of the 19th century because they insisted on "the existence of the soul," which is manifestly beyond apprehension rather than insisting "on the existence of consciousness" which every waking day we all have a sense of even though it is equally beyond apprehension (Krutch, 1962). He continues:

Tactically, the error thus consisted in resting the case on the maximum rather than the minimum requirements of the debate. It permitted the chemist to say, 'I cannot find the soul in my test tube,' without exposing clearly the fallacy of his argument. If he had been compelled to say instead, 'I cannot find consciousness in my test tube,' the reply would be simple: 'I don't care whether you can find it there or

not. I can find it in my head. Chemistry, by failing to find it, demonstrates nothing except the limitations of its methods... The subjective may be suspect, but it furnishes at least the only possible entry into a realm which may exist only in the mind but which certainly does exist there. (Krutch, 1962: 120-121)

Later in the book he develops this in a way which is directly relevant to the critique here of performance measures or capturing in a metric the 'value' of this or that cultural product:

All the great novels and poems take place in a universe which cannot be understood in 'objective terms' and is meaningful only in the light of preferences based on the assumption that value judgments are valid... the arts represent an attempt to organize human experience in terms foreign to the physical or, for that matter, to all the would be objective sciences, but peculiarly appropriate to the human experiences which elude these sciences. (Krutch, 1962: 225-226)

He might have added here Max Frisch's definition of technology as "...the knack of so arranging the world that we don't have to experience it" (Giraldi, 2015: 9). In short, to say that *something* cannot be apprehended through the scientific method, for example in a 'measurement,' does not inevitably provide a rational basis to claim that it therefore does not exist. In other words, because one cannot find 'the soul', 'consciousness', 'humanity', 'humanness', 'me', 'I', a 'moving experience', in a test tube – an obvious metaphor for realities that can be captured in a calculation – does not make them meaningless mental illusions to be discarded.

This is precisely the flaw in the comments by Mark Thompson earlier, indeed in the whole project of performance measures for PSB/PSM. So I am going to argue that the more ineffable, subtle, felt, implicit, intangible, deep a cultural product or experience the more trying to find a metric for it is precisely like looking for the soul in a test tube.

This is no new debate, no better exemplified than in the collision between the Romantics and the Philosophes of the Enlightenment. The Romantic tradition was that loosely defined period, and mood, in the half century between about 1780 to 1830, and attacked the Enlightenment because it blocked the free play of the emotions and creativity. The philosophe

had turned man into a soulless, thinking machine – a robot... Christianity had formed a matrix into which medieval man situated himself. The Enlightenment replaced the Christian matrix with the mechanical matrix of Newtonian natural philosophy. For the Romantic, the result was nothing less than the demotion of the individual. Imagination, sensitivity, feelings, spontaneity and freedom were stifled – choked to death. Man must liberate himself from these intellectual chains. (Kreiss, 2006)

He adds:

The Romantics concentrated their attack on the heartlessness of bourgeois liberalism as well as the nature of urban industrial society. Industrial society brought new problems: soulless individualism, economic egoism, utilitarianism, materialism and the cash nexus... Higher virtues and social concerns were subsumed by the cash nexus and crude materialism of an industrial society. Artists and intellectuals attacked the philistinism of the bourgeoisie for their lack of taste and their lack of a higher morality. (Kreiss, 2006)

The point is essentially that in thinking about contemporary narratives about public institutions, including broadcasting and new digital platforms, narratives defined by mechanical calculation, we are in effect returning to a very old debate about the relationships between the instrumental reason of modernity and humanistic modernity which sees that we are not 'robots'. The premise is that it is the former that is triumphant and that as a consequence we are losing sight of what it is to be human. So the debate over the reimagining of PSB, the rise of PSM and the urgent demands of political, bureaucratic and managerial elites is not trivial. It is the continuance of a debate that has been ongoing for centuries.

If the argument here is that communication is being refashioned, reimagined, by the continually unfolding social and ideological formations of capitalist modernity it is perhaps incumbent to make the fairly obvious point that it is not the only institution that is so afflicted. In education for example, at every level, there is a growing demand that performance be encapsulated by a metric. In the United States there is an almost pathological demand for 'standardized testing' in which children are subject to many tests during their entire school life – the results of which can be highly determinative of school funding and teacher salary. The obviously problem is that it conceptually means that curriculum has to be devised so that it can be so tested with multiple choice and True/False questionnaires, with the attendant problem of what to do with subject matter – say art, philosophy, critical thinking, literature – that cannot be so readily tested?

In the United Kingdom there has been consternation for some years about the whole direction of higher education and in particular of the way in which it is dominated by technocrats and managerial speak. Writing in the *London Review of Books* the author Marian Warner, who also taught creative writing at the University of Essex – before she was fired – comments: "What have I learned (is) that something has gone wrong with the way universities are being run. Above all I have learned that not everything that is valuable can be measured." (Warner, 2015: 5) She describes how humanistic education

is beginning to look like an antique romance (...) As universities are beaten into the shapes dictated by business, so language is suborned to its ends... We have all heard the robotic idiom of management, as if a button had activated a digitally generated voice... business-speak is an instance of magical naming, superimposing the idea of the market on the idea of a university – through 'targets', 'benchmarks', time charts, league tables, 'vision statements', 'content providers'... thickets of TLAs – three letter acronyms... accumulate like dental plaque. Such acronyms now pepper every document circulating in every institution, not just universities (emphasis added)... they swallow everything up and deaden it. The code conceals aggression: actions are undertaken in its name and justified by its rules; it pushes responsibility from persons to systems. It pushes individuals to one side and replaces them with columns, boxes, numbers, rubrics, often meaningless tautologies (a form will ask for 'aims', and then for 'objectives'). 'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty says, 'it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.' Alice is puzzled by this, but Humpty explains: 'The question is... which is to be master – that's all.' The term that is successfully imposed will occupy the field of meaning: calling the work of writing a book 'generating an output' or a university 'a knowledge delivery solution' has a cryokinetic effect: it freezes the infinite differences that writing and research make possible, and sets them hard in the mould of market ideology, as sales items. (Warner, 2015: 6)

There is a brilliant articulation of this problem in Alan Bennett's play (2004), *The History Boys*. The play, a comedy with very serious intent, is about two different ways of thinking about the nature and purpose of education, centered around two teachers, the wonderful Hector who believes that education is about learning, cultivating the young mind and Irwin, who has been brought in by the odiously ambitious headmaster, to train pupils in the mechanics of passing exams. At one point the headmaster, Felix, says to another teacher:

"Shall I tell you what is wrong with Hector as a teacher? And it isn't that he doesn't produce results – he does. But they're unpredictable and unquantifiable. And in the current educational climate, that is of no use. I mean, there's inspiration, certainly. But how do I quantify that?"

There is another description of these processes by Bennett (2007). He is a Trustee of the National Gallery in London:

Like most public institutions today the Gallery is required not merely to do its job but also to prove that it is doing its job... Necessary to this merry-go-round is another misapprehension, namely that everything is quantifiable, that what visitors to the Gallery came with can be assessed by means of questionnaires and so on. Well maybe 20% of it can, and maybe 20% of all these efficiency inducing exercises are worthwhile... And yes, one can gauge from a questionnaire how quick the service is in the café and how clean the lavatories are, but it cannot be said too often that the heart of what goes on here, the experience of someone in front of a painting, cannot be assessed and remains a mystery even, very often, to them. (Bennett, 2007: 475-6)

Communication, education, the arts, capitalist modernity has each by the throat.

AN END NOTE

Let me try and get at the point of this essay in an admittedly personal, even quixotic, manner. I have long thought that those of us who script away in the realm of the humanities, and in social and cultural theory, might reasonably be allowed in our work a certain 'voice'. Of course we need to follow the proper protocols of scholarly inquiry but there is also something inside – that would be the voice, 'this is important, that isn't, this is right, that is wrong' – guiding, nudging, nagging, a kind of moral compass, but understanding that a compass can point you in the right direction, it cannot take you there, that is the role of scholarship. I say this simply as a means of recognizing that the voice is always, and properly, there. I know of no social, cultural or humanist theorists, including, indeed especially, the truly great and influential thinkers, who were, or are, not in the first instance impelled by certain normative, even moral, moods, who did not at the outset see the world, modernity, as a wicked place that had to be understood in order to be redeemed. Their starting and end-point is, essentially, the question of what it is to be fully human and that of how to get there? That we are still, or should be, pursuing answers to these questions, and may do so until the sun goes cold, does not, should not, cannot diminish their significance.

In this context it does not rest easily to imagine that some of the more assumed sublime aspects of being human – loving, feeling, being moved to tears by the beautiful and the sad and the horrific, believing in rights, having a sense of 'me' and 'you' – are 'no more' than biology or *things* that can be measured, reduced to some statistic or algorithm.

A personal example. I've long liked classical music, especially Italian. Quite late in life I fell in love with the music of Mahler, a composer I had avoided on the rather stupidly prejudiced basis that I sensed, utterly irrationally, that he would be too dull, heavy. Then when I did start to listen something curious happened. When I listen to Mahler, particularly the 3rd and 8th symphonies, the same image comes into my 'mind' not because I have hailed it but because it is simply there, unbeckoned but deeply affecting. It is of a small boy. He is standing on the edge of a cliff. He wears a woolen shirt, buttoned at the collar, a woolen jacket with three buttons, short woolen trousers, socks that hang over shoes that were once patent, shiny black but are now scuffed, and a peaked cap. His hands hang by his side almost as if he is standing to attention. His face is so expressionless that it is deeply expressive, of what I barely know, and through green eyes he stares out over the ocean to the far horizon where a twelve-masted schooner is silhouetted against the giant, orange orb of the setting sun. I wrote this for an essay I have been working on about the need for the humanities to begin to engage developments in neuroscience, on the basis of the fearful thought that I would hate for that image to be 'no more' than the firing of neurons. What I equally understand is that however deep, if somewhat mysterious, the feeling, brought forth by the genius of Mahler, in that moment is something that no calculable measure can, or should, capture. It cannot be measured, only felt.

References

- >Bennett, Alan (2007) *Untold Stories*. New York: Picador.
- >Born, Georgina (2003) From Reithian Ethic to Managerial Discourse: Accountability and Audit at the BBC. *The Public/Javnost* 10 (2): 63-80.
- >Carr, Nicholas (2007) *Is Google Making Us Stupid? What The Internet is Doing to Our Brains*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/print/2008/07/is-google-making-us-stupid/306868> (14.10.2013).
- >Collins, Richard (2006) *The BBC and Public Value. Working Paper No. 19, Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change*. Milton Keynes: Open University. DOI: 10.5771/1615-634x-2007-2-164.
- >Collins, Richard (undated) *Public Value and the BBC: a report prepared for the Work Foundation's Public Value Consortium*. Lancaster: Work Foundation. DOI: 10.5771/1615-634x-2007-2-164 (edition 2007).
- >Coppens, Tomas and Saeys, Frieda (2006) Enforcing Performance: New Approaches to Govern Public Service Broadcasting. *Media, Culture and Society* 28 (2): 261-284. DOI: 10.1177/0163443706061684.
- >Donders, Karen and Pauwels, Caroline (2010) *The Introduction of an Ex-ante Evaluation for New Media Services: Europe Asks it, or Public Service Broadcasting Needs it?.* London: RIPE@2010. DOI: 10.1386/mcp.6.2.133_1.
- >Durkheim, Emile ([1897] 2001) *Suicide: a study in sociology*. New York: Free Press. DOI: 10.1037/10406-003.
- >Gerth, Hans Heinrich and Mills, Charles Wright (1946) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- >Giraldi, William (2015) *Object lesson: why we need physical books*. www.newrepublic.com/article/121560 (09.07.2015).

- >Hargreaves-Heap, Shaun (2005) Television in the Digital Age: What Role for Public Service Broadcasting?. *Economic Policy* 20 (41): 112-157. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0327.2005.00134.x.
- >Hastings, Christina (2004) Discussion of Performance Measures in Public Service Broadcasting. *Aslib Proceedings* 56 (5): 301-307. DOI: 10.1108/00012530410560896.
- >Kreiss, Steve (2006) *Lecture 13: George Orwell and The Last Man in Europe*. www.historyguide.org (10.03.2010).
- >Krutch, James Wood (1962) *The Measure of Man*. New York: Charter Books.
- >Lowe, Gregory Ferrell and Martin, Fiona (eds) (2014) *The Value of Public Service Media*. Gotteburg: Nordicom.
- >Radoslavov, Stoyan, and Thomass, Barbara (2010) *The Public Value Test as a Societal Debate About the Future of PSB: The Case of the German ZDF*. London: Ripe@2010.
- >Reith, John (1924) *Broadcast Over Britain*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- >Reith, John (1962) *Introduction of commercial broadcasting*. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1962/may/09/introduction-of-commercial-broadcasting> (09.07.2015).
- >Simmel, Georg (1950) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. London: Collier MacMillan.
- >Thompson, Mark (2003) *The Future of Public Service Communication*. Oxford: The Oxford Media Convention. The full text is available in The Guardian, 15 January 2003. <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/jan/15/channel4.broadcasting> (09.07.2015).
- >Warner, Marina (2015) Learning My Lesson. *London Review of Books* 37 (6): 8-14.

POPUT TRAŽENJA DUŠE U EPRUVETI: BANALNE ZLOUPOTREBE „ČOVJEKA KOJEGA SE MJERI” U NOVOJ ERI JAVNOG MEDIJSKOG SERVISA

Michael Tracey

SAŽETAK *Postalo je gotovo uobičajeno sugerirati kako nove tehnologije, nove politike i nove ekonomije donose mnoge izazove koji ugrožavaju opstojnost koncepta javne radio-televizije (engl. public service broadcasting) i institucija javnih radio-televizija. Iz tih izazova, u duhu plemenitog optimizma, proizišla je ideja kako javne radio-televizije mogu biti redefinirane u javne medijske servise i kako njihova vrijednost može biti mjerljiva pa samim time i „vjerodostojna”. Ovaj pak članak sugerira ne samo da je to vjerojatno pogrešno nego i da je ono što je zapravo na stvari povijesno određena borba oko vrijednosti koje će modernitet prihvatiti.*

KLJUČNE RIJEČI

JAVNOST, USLUGA, TEORIJA, MODERNITET, DUŠA, ČOVJEK

Bilješka o autoru _____

Michael Tracey :: University of Colorado at Boulder, College of Media, Communication and Information, Department of Media Studies, SAD :: michael.tracey@colorado.edu