Comm-entary

The University of New Hampshire Student Journal of Communication

2008-2009

Table of Contents

Zelig: The Faculty of Mockumentary
By Dan Trefethen

There are a number of well-crafted feature length films that have exploited the modes and tendencies belonging to documentary that have created a relatively new genre: Mockumentary. One film in particular that stands out among the genre of mockumentary is entitled *Zelig*. *Zelig* is a 1983 fictional film written and directed by Woody Allen and also features him playing the lead role, Leonard Zelig. Allen's character is that of a human chameleon who physically and mentally adapts to the company he is with and in doing so, is considered by 1920's American public as a phenomenon. The creation of *Zelig* is a clear demonstration of how the genre of mockumentary employs the long lineage of documentary modes and methods in order to construct an aesthetic to which only media experienced audiences understand. *Zelig* mimics the classic styles of most expository documentaries through meticulous creation an authentic illusion of its subject matter. The production of the film is stylistically based on widely held perceptions of what makes motion picture film realistic and how audiences view what they see on screen as fact or fiction. In doing so, *Zelig* teeters on the edge of a reflexive documentary, its mocking approach of documentary film was one of the first of the genre and is a strong representation of the validity mockumentary film presents.

Documentary films, through extensive tradition and historical presence, have employed certain identifiable and expected methods of projection. They are seen as something other than fiction, as non-fiction, a resemblance to reality through which film has been able to achieve thus far. Of course, there are numerous works that have aimed at challenging those perceived pillars of the medium, and have expanded the notion of reality through film, but at large, there are certain tendencies in documentary that tend to render the viewer as seeing something that's unpolished, a more accurate depiction of fact and history. These methods have emerged from the origins of filmmaking and have created a normative perception on viewers of certain filming techniques.

Mockumentary film steps in and applies those filming techniques to create an illusion of realism much like documentary does. Gerd Bayer puts it nicely in his essay entitled *Artifice and Artificiality in Mockumentaries* "Within the frame work of mockumentary film making, the presence of staged artifice disavows a film's actual artificiality. Where as the cinematic aesthetic of fiction

films – through its perfected hyperrealism of imagery – clearly if subconsciously indicates that the visual representations really must be artificial, the absence of this perfection with in the documentary genre aims to indicate that reality is actually presented in its actual form." (Bayer p.165).

Zelig employs these methods in an attempt to gain authenticity in the historical realm of its subject matter. The film, excluding contemporary interviews, is shot entirely in black and white; cinematographer, Gordon Willis, used original lenses, lighting, and sound equipment from the 1920's era to shape a genuine appearance of the historical content. On top of that, flicker-mattes were used while filming to re-create the flickering of historical films and the black and white film negatives were purposely scratched by technicians to achieve the worn and aged appearance of film footage from that time (Schwartz p.273). *Zelig* heavily relies on insight from intellectuals and witnesses of the phenomenon that is Leonard Zelig (Woody Allen's character), which are shot "modernly" in color. These interviews create a stark contrast of past and present, which makes the viewer see the color film of a particular "high" quality and the black and white film of a particular "low" or "aged" quality. In Jane Roscoe and Craig Hight's one of a kind publication *Faking it: Mock-documentary and the Subversion of Factuality* they stress the subconscious effect black and white film has on viewers in noting, "the use of black and white footage and stills is seen to be more authentic, and, given that so much contemporary material is manipulated, this material is assumed to be 'original', because manipulation is a recent phenomena associated with the development of certain digital technologies." (Roscoe and Hight p.17).

Zelig's realism does not solely come from trick photography. Mostly relying on the expository mode of documentary, *Zelig* presents actual untouched stock footage of the 1920's as much as possible. Scenes shown with F. Scott Fitzgerald and Charlie Chaplin are not manipulated and are linked through an unseen narrator who directs the viewer through the film. Likewise, several scenes of jazz clubs and speakeasies, crowded Time Square parades and traffic jams are used to incorporate the non-fictional trends and attitudes of the American public at the time. These scenes play a large role in themes the film explores, and added with the consistent input by actual intellects and "experts" of that time period, like Saul Bellow and Irving Howe, create a non-fiction text with in the fictional story of the film, not unlike strategies used by early documentary filmmakers like

Flaherty and Bunuel, although they reversed the technique. (Bayer p. 168).

    For scenes and evidence of Leonard Zelig's existence before the media caught wind of him, the film continues on its expository path by employing the use of still photography that show, Zelig as a gangster, as a college student, and as a jazz player. These scenes are well as the aforementioned photos are done in black and white and use techniques introduced by Ken Burns that incorporate motion into a still photograph. Here, Allen is relying on the factuality of a photograph which is correlated with documentary stanza's – here is evidence of the subject content the film speaks of, with out motion film footage of said subject, where Allen begins to question the medium of documentary as a whole, a subject to be touched on later.

    With the strict cannons of documentary practices followed entirely throughout *Zelig*, it brings to the question of audience involvement. How does the audience react to such illusionary tricks? Is it any different from watching a "serious" documentary? Bill Nichols speaks in his 1991 publication *Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary* that the pleasure in watching fictional films comes from "scopophilia", a sense of identifying with certain characters and situations on an egotistical level. He further mentions "documentary realism aligns itself with an 'epistephilia', so to speak, a pleasure in knowing" (Nichols p.178). This concept underlies the basic audience appeal of documentary: joy in learning and visually experiencing factual events and situations. With this notion applied to mockumentary film, which is fiction in documentary form, the audience must be in on the joke. Roscoe and Hight further examine the role of audience as is needed for parody when writing, "the comic elements of parody can be appreciated only if we recognize the object being mocked. The mock-documentary can develop the complexity inherent to parody only if we are familiar with the codes and conventions of documentary, and its serious intent. Parodic texts actively construct a position for viewers through which they can take up an at least potential critical stance towards the object of the parody" (Roscoe and Hight p.31).

    The relatively new emergence of mockumentary as a genre signifies the media savvy audience of today's movie going public. With *Zelig*, its deceptive presentation is balanced by the notoriety of Woody Allen, whom the public knows is a fictional filmmaker and in knowing understands the film is entirely fictional. Bayer clarifies: "the viewer is taking pleasure in being fooled, and rejoices in the idea of a false sense of reality, more so, maybe, than in regular feature

film" (Bayer p.167). This concept is in tune to Nichol's research, as "the content of mockumentaries is by definition fabricated, the pleasure of viewing such films stems from learning about the making- and artifice – of mockumentaries, and by extension, of cinema and the media industry at large" (Bayer p.167).

The success of *Zelig* or any mockumentary hinges on comedic logic. Other films such as *This is Spinal Tap* and *Best in Show* succeed to be amusing and entertaining because the audience understands the knocks and stereotypes presented in the abundance of documentaries they've seen. Films created with this intention in mind, when facing an unaware audience, lose their validity.

A 1996 mockumentary, *Forgotten Silver* by Peter Jackson and Costa Botes, documents a revolutionary, but forgotten, New Zealand filmmaker named Colin Mckenzie. Mckenzie is claimed to have been the first to use the tracking shot and close up. He also built his own camera around the turn of the 20th century- a filmmaker ahead of his time and forgotten by his peers. The film employs similar methods as *Zelig*, in reconstructing aged film and creating a fictional character in historical text, but with out the obvious presence of a well known actor (Woody Allen). Prior to the airing of the film on Kiwi Television, a publication was released with consent of the filmmakers, which supported the authenticity of Colin Mckenzie. As a result, the mockumentary was taken for truth among the general public, and the joke fell on deaf ears. The filmmakers owned up to the hoax, and instead of being taken as a clever stance on documentary film, the viewers felt more cheated than amused (Thompson and Bordwell).

With the critical knowledge of *Zelig* as fiction, the audience can then examine the themes Allen is putting on debate through out the film. An unmentioned technique that distances *Zelig* from most other films is its impressive ability to infuse Allen's fictional character into actual historical footage. The method of intertwining fictional elements into stock footage was first introduced by Orson Wells in *Citizen Kane* and then later in *F for Fake*, but Allen's use is for the comic and parody of such abilities. There are several scenes through out the film that look like seamless photography. Notably when Leonard Zelig appears next to Eugene O'Neill and Calvin Coolidge, he appears riding in a 1920's city parade, and even in the same frame as Adolph Hitler at a Nazi rally. This is where *Zelig* begins to challenge the thought of fact through image. Since the average viewer of the modern age identifies photographs as specific points of frozen time, locked in the imprint of celluloid, Allen

challenges that notion with implementing his fictional character into these frozen imprints of time. He's in fact using media to illustrate the power media has in creating false realities (Girgus p.95).

In one particular scene, the narrator carefully explains and shows how Dr. Fletcher, the psychiatrist that's determined to help Zelig (played by Mia Farrow), plans on filming her therapy sessions with Zelig. The cameraman is introduced and is shown setting up lights and hiding behind a see-through mirror. Dr. Fletchers reasoning for her actions are that "when a man changes his physical appearance, people want to see it". Leonard Zelig eventually notices the camera and the intense lighting and begins to act momentarily different because of it, waving and making faces. Allen was probably using it for comedic purposes, but it does call to mind images from Dziga Vertov's *Man with a Movie Camera*, in that it is describing how the camera works and what principals are behind the images one sees.

The character of Zelig also questions the power of the camera lens. Considering the attention put on the set up of the "white room" sessions, which were the therapy sessions that were being filmed, and their scientific purposes, the film claims there is a suggestion through out the whole film that not even the camera lens can fully capture the true self of Leonard Zelig, due to the fact he is ever changing. Allen is directly questioning the validity of the camera in recording reality if something like this could actually happen (Roscoe and Hight p.113). Given that Zelig is a fictional character, his essence of is entirely metaphorical, but persistent throughout the whole film. The fame of Leonard Zelig, rises and falls with the American public based on the media's angle. When he's fresh and new everyone loves him, but when he's heard of and boring they lose interest. Once he disappears, he loses his popularity, but when he re-appears with a fresh media angle, he's adored with new life, even to the point of having Hollywood movies made after his story.

In addition, the reflexive documentary*, No Lies*, has a similar approach. The entire film is fiction, yet works as a documentary to challenge certain codes of documentary. This film quickly asserts itself as being conscious of its creation. The camera and cameraman are quickly seen in the frame through use of mirrors and shaky control. The voice of the inquisitor is heard loud and clear behind the camera and participates in turn with the in-frame action and dialogue. This films purpose was to question the ethics behind documentary's invasion in order to get a good story, or to find something real. Its text may be completely constructed, but the film it's self was made in order to question something higher than its content. Is that to say that

Woody Allen wrote *Zelig* with sole purpose to question the role of media and documentary in American society? Probably not. Woody Allen is an entertainer, so that was his main goal, but that doesn't discount the underlying principals behind *Zelig*.

      Zelig is not the only mockumentary to work as a reflexive documentary or one that takes aim at the medium it's self. A 1992 Belgian mockumentary called *Man Bites Dog* follows around a charming serial killer through out the film. The student film crew is not only present in murders and beating, but also with the murderer's pleasant family. This film takes aim at the ethics of documentary filmmaking much like *No Lies*, albeit it is much more fictional and absurd of a situation. Some members of the film crew even interact in the plot, two of which end up dead and are replaced to complete the project. This form of presentation is bringing the objectivity of documentary film to question. As the film crew is suppose to be an invisible presence recording actual events, *Man Bites Dog* starts off with that intention then slowly has the crew become more intertwined with their subject, commenting on the subjectivity created through documentary by the mere presence of a film crew and the relationship that is created in reality between subject and observer (Roscoe and Hight p.173). Though *Zelig* touches on similar premises, its aim is rather different, but it does support the validity of mockumentary in questioning such fixed notions of documentary indoctrination. The 1984 film *This is Spinal Tap* doesn't attempt to accomplish nearly as much as *Zelig* or *Man Bites Dog*, but it does bring to question the stereotypes that are formed through seeing subjects presented in a similar matter. Director Reiner is aiming at pure satire, but he also illustrates the ridiculousness of such constantly covered material and the high esteem in which the public holds in it. The famous line from the film "there's a fine line between clever and- and stupid," fits well in with the genre of mockumentary.

      Though the above examples of other mockumentaries mention the purposes of identifying the strength that mockumentary can bring to audiences, the film *Zelig* effectively paints a clear picture of what mockumentaries capabilities are. Through carefully crafting of historical attributes belonging to the field of documentary, *Zelig* is able to create a fictional reality with non-fiction elements surrounding its text. In doing so, the film creates a relationship with its audience that can only exist in a media saturated public. The viewers of *Zelig* and other like mockumentaries are well aware of what usually consists of fact and fiction within film, and in watching accessible feature length films that put to question those perceived differences,

the genre of mockumentary employs elements of what Bill Nichols calls the "reflexive" mode of documentary. Similar to the importance on *No Lies*, *Zelig* takes aim right at the American public and what they perceive to be factual and truthful representations of reality through photographic images. Although films of the mockumentary genre are produced commonly for satirical and parodic purposes, they demonstrate to a mass audience the limits documentary has in representing reality, and the limitlessness they have in creating fictional constructions of said reality.

<div align="center">Works Cited</div>

Allen, Woody. Woody Allen: Interviews. Ed. Robert E. Kapsis and Kathie Coblentz. New York: University P of Mississippi, 2006.

Bayer, Gerd, Artifice and Artificiality in Mockumentaries. Essay. Rhodes, Gary D., and John P. Springer, eds. Docufictions : Essays on the Intersection of Documentary and Fictional Filmaking. Boston: McFarland & Company, Incorporated, 2005.

Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson. "Observations on Film Art and Film Art." Davidbordwell.net. 25 Mar. 2007. 8 Dec. 2008 <http://www.davidbordwell.net/blog/?p=596>.

Girgus, Sam B. The Films of Woody Allen. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Nichols, Bill. Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

Nichols, Bill. Introduction to Documentary. New York: Indiana UP, 2001.

Roscoe, Jane, and Craig Hight. Faking It : Mock-Documentary and the Subversion of Factuality. New York: Manchester UP, 2001.

Schwartz, Richard A. Woody, from Antz to Zelig : A Reference Guide to Woody Allen's Creative Work, 1964-1998. New York: Greenwood P, 2000

Marriage and Gender Roles: The Reality of the 21st Century Woman
By Ashley Bournival

Section I: History and Event

The modern feminist movement of the post-war era is most often considered the direct result of women's desires to break free from the chains of social gender norms. Ruth Rosen describes this revolution as a "dawn of discontent," as women began to realize how entirely bitter and unhappy they were (3).[1] Major gender roles were heavily enforced within marriage and personal settings. The emphasis of women in the home and as childcare providers was so strong during this time that society began to legitimize the "professionalization of the housewife" (14).[2] Women were smothered with the image of the perfect homemaker and wife and more importantly, the perfect mother. Many daughters born during this time felt such disconnect with their mothers that they vowed not to follow the same path. They had witnessed this suppression first hand and knew how unhappy their mothers were. "Women like me who grew up in the 1950s had been made edgy and claustrophobic by the narrowness of the life laid out for them from birth. To give mother-feeling any place in your heart might mean being lost to mothering forever" (38).[3] Rosen introduces Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique, as one of the main books that led women of this time to the recognition that they were not alone in their feelings of discontent.[4] The book helped women see that many of them shared a collective rhetoric of experience.

"For some housewives, Friedan's revelations came not a minute too soon. Letters arrived by the hundreds, as housewives poured out their confusion, despair, self-contempt, or determination to change" (6).[5] Women yearned to get out into the world with the rest of their family and experience it. Many wrote about their new endeavors in returning back to school or searching for a job. Others

---

[1] Rosen, Ruth. <u>The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America</u>. New York: Penguin (Non-Classics), 2001. 3-26.

[2] Ibid., 3-26.

[3] Ibid., 3-26

[4] Ibid., 3-26

[5] Rosen, Ruth. <u>The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America</u>. New York: Penguin (Non-Classics), 2001. 3-26.

expressed how having a career had kept them from feeling this hopelessness and their support for women who were seeking change in their lives.

As it was, record numbers of women had already begun to join the workforce around the World War II era, however after the war they were often pushed back into domesticity. In 1954, an article titled the Modern Mothers' Dilemma advised that men "can't be asked to take over much. It is more than unfair to expect him to do half the housework as well as carry the load of a full-time job" (25).[6] However, this concept didn't apply to the women who did have a full time job. They were expected to carry this heavy load, grin, and bear it. "A modern woman of today would have to be four women to be everything that is expected of her" (25).[7] It was not unusual for a woman with a job to be expected to cook dinner, clean, put the kids to bed, and then satisfy her husband at his will. A reporter from abroad also noted that "Only in America is 'Career Woman' an obscene phrase" (26).[8] It seemed that even as the country became more aware of these issues, the advent of public change was slow to come. Yet, as another decade passed, youth coming of age during the 60s and 70s, began a quest for their own future that was marked by this pursuit for change and revolution.

The impact that followed the movement of the 1960s and 1970s was such that researchers and writers have documented and analyzed it for years to follow, right up to the present day. In fact, an article published in Sex Roles: A Journal of Research in 2000, reviewed the previous 35 years of women and gender roles leading up to the turn of the century.[9] The study looks at the contemporary women's liberation movement as rooted in three major events that took place during the 1960's: the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women in 1961, Friedan's The Feminine Mystique in 1963, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting discrimination by sex.[10] These advantageous developments pushed women to work toward a change in marriage role expectations, and for awhile, some dramatic changes did occur. Families of the 1970s and 1980s began to

---

[6] Ibid., 3-26.

[7] Ibid., 3-26

[8] Ibid., 3-26.

[9] Botkin, Darla R., M. O'Neal Weeks, and Jeanette E. Morris. "Changing Marriage Role Expectations: 1961-1996." Sex Roles: A Journal of Research (2000): 1.

[10] Ibid., 1

experience increased flexibility in what were previously considered distinct gender roles.[11]

However, forty-five years after the original publication of The Feminine Mystique the general inequity of gender roles in marriage seems to remain surprisingly the same. Although it is clear that women in the work force have considerably enhanced the position of women in outward society, it remains true that this is not the case in all aspects of women's lives, particularly their personal lives. There is a constant pattern of women quitting work to stay home with their children, often because of the lack of cultural, societal, or systemic solutions to the overburdening of the modern women. One major factor is the lack of access to adequate daycare services. Women may be more apt to stay home with their children if they cannot afford access to high quality childcare providers. To researcher, David Blau, Professor of Economics at UNC Chapel Hill, it seems that the main problem in the childcare market is the low quality being offered.[12] Mothers of young children simply may not be able to afford the level of care that they want to provide for their children, so they stay home instead. Also, within women's personal domains, they are generally expected to handle the childcare burdens, whether they work full-time or not. This means that when a child is hurt or sick, it is mommy's duty to take care of it. In one study, "among targets who worked 60 hours per week, women were still expected to maintain an ''average'' amount of childcare responsibilities (4 on a 7-pt. scale), whereas the expectation for men was one and a third scale points below the ''average'' mark" (1160).[13] The researcher writes that "while these women likely enjoy advantages due to multiple esteem-promoting roles (i.e., the benefits of ''having it all''), they also experience the stress of having to ''do it all'' (1163).[14] Indeed, many seek to understand these continuing discrepancies in the roles of women within their personal lives and

---

[11] Ibid., 1

[12] Ibid., 1

[13] Park, Bernadette, Allegra Smith, and Joshua Correll. "'Having it all" or "doing it all"? Perceived trait attributes and behavioral obligations as a function of workload, parenthood, and gender." European Journal of Social Psychology 38 (2008): 1156-164.

[14] Park, Bernadette, Allegra Smith, and Joshua Correll. "'Having it all" or "doing it all"? Perceived trait attributes and behavioral obligations as a function of workload, parenthood, and gender." European Journal of Social Psychology 38 (2008): 1156-164.

homes. By taking a look at three specific representations of gender norms and sex roles in mainstream magazine articles, one which examines egalitarian homes, another which exemplifies the generic idea of mother and wife, and a third which brings together assertions against gender norm stereotypes, we may better understand the problems women are facing and the reasons that have resulted in such a lack of change or solutions.

A New York Times Magazine article published in June 2008 titled "When Mom and Dad Share It All," unveils the true weight of this gender role issue.[15] The piece engages several couples who have worked to create a partnership within their marriage, specifically focusing on one couple of the three that was best able to make this egalitarian notion work. The largest portion of the article is dedicated to emphasizing how this equality is not the norm for most marriages in America. According to the article, "social scientists" note that in the average American home "little has changed in the roles of men and women" (3).[16] In fact, statistics show that women still do about twice as much house work as men and that child-rearing is even more disproportionate with a wife-husband ratio that is "close to five to one" (4).[17] The article quotes insight from Sampson Lee Blair, an associate professor of sociology at the University of Buffalo, who suggests that these ratios hardly even change when the mother is in the workforce. "In a family in which both parents are wage earners, the mother spends about eleven hours a week caring for the children while the Dad spends about three (4).[18] In the same scenario where both parents work full-time, women do about 28 hours of housework while the husband does around 16. The scary part is that these ratios are not much better than 90 years ago when the status of women in society was considered more oppressive.[19]

The article furthers its discussion of this lack of equal proportion in marriage today with a look at how several families that tried to make egalitarian lives work, could not. Jo and Tim Pannabecker were both consumed by their careers when they first met. Jo did not want to turn into the American housewife when she

---

[15] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

[16] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

[17] Ibid., 1-13.

[18] Ibid., 1-13.

[19] Ibid.,1-13.

married Tim and they vowed to "share all housework equally" (5).[20]
For awhile it worked and the couple joined ThirdPath, an organization
created to coach families in the ways of shared parenting. In 2005
with the birth of their second child, Tim and Jo decided they could
not "envision a schedule that would account for the demands of two
children under the age of 2" (7).[21] Eventually Jo left the work force to
care for her children and now works at home full-time looking after
the children, cooking, cleaning; the exact lifestyle she "feared" when
she decided to get married. However, she says that she finds more joy
in being with her children then working a desk job just to pay the
bills. Another couple, Alexandra and Bill Taussig have lived out a
similar scenario but the couple managed to work out a 90% plan with
their jobs where each gets every other Friday off and they rotate who
is home with the children. However, "less equal is their allotment of
household chores," where Alexandra appears to take the upper hand
(8).[22] Bill claims that at the end of the day "it's about a 60-40 split,
with her doing the 60" (8).[23] Alex prefers it to be this way rather then
spending all their time measuring.

The article continues to question why this "status quo" of
unequal relationships persists in today's society when couples are
acutely aware of the imbalance. It appears by looking at these couples
that there could be a number of reasons, why, which is almost
impossible to answer from any perspective. Yet, it may be possible
and more beneficial to gage the social constructions and
representations put upon women in order to better understand and
contextualize the issue.

Section II: Contextualizing
Through a critical reading of the New York Times Magazine
article and two additional mainstream magazine articles, one
specifically a women's magazine, we can understand how the
messages aimed at women in America today plays into the traditional
depiction of social norms within the home. Rhetorically speaking, the
mass majority of writing for or towards women in magazines or
publications does not portray the underlying message of an egalitarian
lifestyle, although it may discuss issues of equality. Women's

---

[20] Ibid., 1-13.

[21] Ibid., 1-13.

[22] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15
June 2008: 1-13.

[23] Ibid.,1-13.

magazines focus extensively on beauty, children, and homecare paying little respect to how this is culturally conditioning women into gender roles. When the title of a magazine is Good Housekeeping and it is distinctly labeled for women, this conditioning becomes blatantly obvious.

By reading "When Mom and Dad Share It All" through a rhetorical standpoint it is easier to understand some of the ways in which articles about women operate to frame them in society. The article, although relatively forward thinking in how it emphasizes equal marriages as what should be the norm, still unconsciously uses the idea that gender differences do exist, to ignore how the separation of tasks fall into traditional gender roles. The author writes that "Sure some of their tasks [the Vachons that have established an equality based marriage] would fall along traditional gender roles," with disregard to the fact that she is reinforcing gender constructs within that statement alone (10).[24] In addition, the author writes that lesbian couples are much better at maintaining equal partnerships. She questions why this is the case, "Is it because you take gender out of the equation or because women are better at sharing or because parents of the same gender see things more similarly" (11).[25] Describing women as being better at sharing equates the female sex to a feminine trait as if it's a natural biological factor in all females. Also, the author quotes the opinion of a professor in women's studies at San Diego State University, Esther D. Rothblum, who suggests to her "informed guess" that it is the last of the three presumed reasons and that differences in men and women are so strong. "It's really a miracle that hetero couples manage to ever make things work" (12).[26] This statement plays into the collective norms of society without even seeking to give a solution to the hetero situation.

A similar article from Good Housekeeping, "When Mom Must Go Back To Work," is a more obvious example of how writing aimed at women produces rhetoric that socially constructs gender roles.[27] The self-proclaimed women's magazine is entirely devoted to women and their homes. In this article a mother of three children, all less than eight years old, had to return to work after her husband lost his job in 2002. "She was not someone who expected to work full-

---

[24] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." <u>New York Times Magazine</u> 15 June 2008: 1-13.

[25] Ibid., 1-13.

[26] BIbid.,1-13.

[27] Rubin, Bonnie M. "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." <u>GoodHousekeeping</u>: 1-2.

time while her children were this young," claims the author as she presumes that all mothers place is with their children.[28] She goes on to describe the tough reality of life for women who return to their careers and must "balance work and home responsibilities."[29] In addition, the author describes how "more and more mothers are facing such trade-offs," and that "there's a statistically significant shift in women being pressed into service as primary breadwinners."[30] According to the language associations in this article it seems that it is not inherently natural for women to be in the work force, basically that the innate place for women is with the family and in the home. The author develops this point more specifically in the case of mothers, assuming that all mothers are being pressed into the workforce and that it is not a normal choice. She suggests that "some women propelled back into the workforce feel distressed, if not a bit humiliated by the circumstances that landed them there."[31] Why is it that the title even reinforces gender by stating that mom "must" go back to work? Is it possible that a woman would want to work outside the home?

According to today's women's magazines, these are the thoughts and struggles of American wives and mothers. Could it be that articles like this, which portray women as inherently housekeepers, mothers, and cooks, etc, are the reasons why society understands the female gender as preordained for these positions? One could certainly question why it is necessary to mention that it's a "delightful domestic discovery" to find that one's husband is a good cook and excellent cleaner.[32] No one is impressed when a woman finds success in these areas.

These two articles can help a reader and analyst recognize the types of power structures behind social constructions of gender. One does not have to dig too deep to find cultural constraints placed upon women all along the surface of our culture. Looking at another mainstream article that does the opposite of these, by calling into question this cultural conditioning of women in society, allows these constraints to become much clearer. Slate Magazine, a political analysis magazine of culture, news, and politics, printed an article in

---

[28] Ibid., 1-2.

[29] Ibid., 1-2.

[30] Ibid., 1-2.

[31] Ibid., 1-2.

[32] Rubin, Bonnie M. "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." GoodHousekeeping: 1-2.

February 2005 titled "Summers' School."[33] This article analyzed a speech that President Summers of Harvard University gave about "genetic differences" playing a role "in the lack of women in the sciences" (1).[34] According to President Summers, "the leading cause for women's under representation at top levels of the hard sciences is that women are far less willing to put in the 80-hour weeks" that "top-level jobs require" (1).[35] The author of "Summers' School" discredits this statement by making the clear assertion that the President is assuming that "women and men make free and clear choices" (1).[36] She then furthers this statement by recognizing that women face "a slew of obstacles that men don't" (1).[37] Women face issues of family and homecare while men don't often face assumptions or obligations tied to domestic life. It is a similar concept to the question often faced by pregnant wives about whether they will go back to work after having a child. Why is the husband never asked this question? The author of "Summers' School" calls this the "ways in which institutional and social factors shape both people's desires and their ability to act on them" (1).[38] She makes explicit recognition of the reality that "implicit and unconscious cultural attitudes mold an individual's sense of self" and that this "culture-wide conditioning" that leads to people's decisions on career paths may have "social rather then biological origins" (2).[39]

       The author's attack of President Summers' lack of presentable material on how socialization has a crucial role in people's decisions on which paths to pursue, is a valid reversal of framing in regard to what is normally presented towards gender in our society today. By bringing attention to this, the author tries to force people to understand gender difference as socially constructed and not

---

[33] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. <u>Slate Magazine</u>. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[34] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. <u>Slate Magazine</u>. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[35] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. <u>Slate Magazine</u>. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[36] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. <u>Slate Magazine</u>. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[37] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. <u>Slate Magazine</u>. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[38] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. <u>Slate Magazine</u>. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[39] Ibid.

simply innate. When this issue of cultural conditioning is depicted so vividly it makes articles like "When Mom and Dad Share It All" and "When Mom Must Go Back to Work" seem pretentious and so markedly blameworthy.

Further developing these articles will allow one to attain a different understanding for the number of ways in which gender issues are represented in society. This greater understanding for the functions of gender will help answer questions regarding how knowledge is made in articles about or towards women and more specifically how gender norms in society are socially constructed. Incorporating historical perspectives into aspects of rhetorical theory within this study will provide for a better case of analysis.

Section III: Conceptualizing

By conceiving how cause gets articulated within these articles we will be able to observe the language patterns that are expressed in gender related situations, specifically with the use of rhetorical concepts of persuasion like ethos, logos, and pathos to examine these patterns. The authors of these magazine articles use appeals of authority, in the form of ethos, to portray themselves as credible and therefore providing quality insight on women in society. The use of logos, in the form of inductive or deductive reasoning, also works within these articles to place women in society as they have been placed for centuries. Language oriented around pathos, or emotional appeals, articulates the ways in which the author's appeals can work to alter the audience's judgments regarding gender and women.[40]

Hauser looks at ethos as "an interpretation that is the product of speaker-audience interaction" (147).[41] It is about the ability of the speaker, or writer in this case, to manage their appeals in such a way that their argument is considered more substantial. In Richard Sennett's book, Authority, the idea of authority as a social construct suggests that social constructs are the result of interaction.[42] What one thinks and believes is a construct of the "give-and-take of a rhetorical exchange" (147).[43] Hauser looks at logos as "using good reasons to

---

[40] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[41] Sennet, Richard. Authority (New York: Knopf, 1980): 16-17
[42] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

persuade" (119).[44] He discusses a few important modes for persuasion in suggesting paradigms and enthymemes as influential in constructing meaning between the rhetor, or writer, and the audience. Applying these concepts to the case study articles may provide us with some helpful insight on how patterns of language work to persuade. When looking at Aristotle's concept of pathos, Hauser suggests that practical reasoning plays a large role in how and why people make decisions and feel certain ways. Practical reasoning is based on the values and passions of individuals, which are brought out in rhetoric through the use of language.[45] Even women who do not want to be subjected to the gender roles that claim our society still value their children and families. The author appeals to their emotions and better judgments on issues so that they may end up seeing certain notion, ideas, or concepts of gender as practical. Gender differences and normative constructions certainly trace back for centuries and the use theory may allow us to better ask the questions in which we seek to understand regarding knowledge and women's work.

It may also be helpful to look at how men's language frames the traditional or nontraditional gender roles in contemporary society through the work of Sarah Riley in "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision."[10] Her article "presents an analysis of constructions of gender roles by a group of professional, employed, white, heterosexual men" (99).[46] The author seeks to understand what kinds of constructions are available to these men that enable them to manage "the potentially conflicting discourses of masculinities produced through breadwinning and the hegemony of gender-egalitarian values" (100).[47] She recognizes that women's equalized place in the workforce "has not been met by an equivalent decrease in

---

[43]Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[44] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[47]Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111

[48] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111

their domestic responsibilities" (100).[48] The goal of Riley's article is to present language as constructing and that these constructions "allow some ways of understanding to be ascribed with greater credibility or authenticity than others" (100).[49] It would be beneficial to apply her approach to studying language patterns to the three mainstream articles I have looked at in order to understand gender construction as a social practice.

In readings of contemporary cases where sex roles in marriage/home are based upon gender norms, and equality based homes rarely exist, we may also further seek to understand the question of whether depictions of egalitarian homes and relationships are a form of gender trouble. It is important to first examine the concept of gender trouble, which can broadly be looked at as changing the distinct categories that keep gender in place in society. The term is most dominantly noted for its development in Gender Trouble by Judith Butler.[50] Focusing on the work of Butler as well as John Sloop in an excerpt from his book Disciplining Gender to elaborate upon Butler's theory, will make for an important part of this analysis.[51] The egalitarian concepts presented in "When Mom and Dad Share It All" which appear to promote the concept of equal home life and parenting could be considered a type of gender trouble, disrupting the normative binary of gender. Sloop also suggests how these potential gender troubles, even while seeking to disrupt gender-typing, work to reinforce norms and re-inscribe this binary.[52] This idea may be most relevant to my analysis, as "When Mom and Dad Share It All" seems to focus on egalitarian homes only as a way of suggesting that they often don't work.

---

[49] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111

[50] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111

[51] Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble, Preface. New York: Routledge Press, 1999.

[52] Sloop, John M. "Critical Rhetoric, Public Argument, and Gender Trouble." Disciplining Gender, Rhetorics of Sexual Identity in Contemporary U.S. Culture. Amherst and Boston: Universisty of Massachusetts P, 2004. 1-24.

[52] Sloop, John M. "Critical Rhetoric, Public Argument, and Gender Trouble." Disciplining Gender, Rhetorics of Sexual Identity in Contemporary U.S. Culture. Amherst and Boston: Universisty of Massachusetts P, 2004. 1-24.

Also, considering the many theories of gender construction and focusing in on the social cognitive theory as applicable to my analysis will frame this study's overall purpose of distinguishing and understanding gender roles in society as socially constructed. One look at this social cognitive theory emphasizes that "in this perspective, gender conceptions and role behavior are the products of a broad network of social influences operating both familially and in the many societal systems encountered in everyday life" (2).[53] I will use this theory as a basis for finalizing my analysis.

Section IV: Analysis

Here we will begin to examine the language patterns of the three contextual magazine articles through the use of ethos, logos, and pathos in order to present how one can manipulate these rhetorical concepts through writing to persuade audiences with their reinforcements of gender norms. As mentioned earlier, Hauser defines ethos, logos, and pathos as having a serious effect on altering audience perceptions, judgments, and beliefs regarding issues.[54]

We have discussed ethos in terms of authority. The use of authority by these authors, simply through the basis that they write editorials for a high-end, well-known magazine, may provide their audience with a greater perception of their substantiality. Hauser believes that authority can cause negative affects in that it "exercises such power over our thoughts and actions that we abdicate our independence and become subjects" (146).[55] One could argue here that the audiences of NYT magazine or Good Housekeeping are dominated by the views presented to them on a regular basis and lack independence to shape their own perceptions of gender norms. These magazines shape and mold our own thoughts so much that we start to believe things only as they are represented and lose our own sense of independent thought.

In addition, language patterns in the form of paradigms and enthymemes can exemplify how writers may use logical appeals to

---

[53] Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. Psychological Review, 106, 676-713.

[54] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[55] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

sway their audience through particular or general associations.[56] Logos is easily exemplified within the three articles. One example of a paradigm, which is a comparison from a particular to particular case, is found in "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." The author first compares one specific women's story of having to go back to work with another's to draw upon her presumption that it is not natural for mothers to be in the workplace. "For Kelley Senkowski, 36, the most stressful time of the day is when she comes home from the office and tries to reconnect with her children, ages eight, six and four," and "One mother of a three-year-old boy took an accounting job after her husband was pink-slipped. She takes pride in her paycheck but also waxes nostalgic for home."[57] She makes this comparison in order to enforce her general claim that mothers are being pressed back into the workplace and this is not the natural place for them, nor did they want to be there (1).[58] One example of an enthymeme, which consists of a common ground, linking premise and a co-constructed conclusion, with one of the three is left out, is from "When Mom and Dad Share It All."[59] The whole basis of the article is a bit of an enthymeme because it's major premise is that equality based relationships should be the norm, while its minor premise is that several couples have tried this and for the majority, it has not worked. So conclusively, the article suggests that perhaps gender norms are so largely imbedded in our society that this search for equality is a dead-end road, it just won't work. These rhetorical appeals play upon people's perceptions and judgments of what is reasonable and logical. They appear to make it difficult for society to view things any other way.

Another example of an enthymeme comes from the NYT articles discussion of lesbian couples and equality. The common ground here would be that "same-sex couples cannot default to gender when deciding who does what at home," then the linking premise is that "both partners in lesbian couples seem to make equal professional sacrifices in exchange for this equality."[60] The co-

---

[56] Hauser, Gerard A. <u>Introduction to Rhetorical Theory</u>. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[57] Rubin, Bonnie M. "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." <u>GoodHousekeeping</u>: 1-2.

[58] Rubin, Bonnie M. "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." <u>GoodHousekeeping</u>: 1-2.

[59] Hauser, Gerard A. <u>Introduction to Rhetorical Theory</u>. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[60] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." <u>New York Times Magazine</u> 15 June 2008: 1-13.

construction that the writer seems to seek to create between herself and the audience is that same-sex couples are better at equality-based parenting. Also, in the "Summers' School" article a common ground argument developed upon by President Summers was that there is a disparity between men and women in the 'hard' sciences. His linking premise explained that the "leading cause of women's under representation at top levels of the hard sciences is that women are far less willing than men to put in their 80-hour weeks that top-level jobs require."[61] Here it seems he attempts to co-construct the notion that women are not as represented in the sciences because they do not choose time consuming professions. Of course this attempt at logical reasoning was faced with excessive backlash in his effort to define gender roles as biological rather than socially constructed. However, all of these examples of logos show how easily audience perceptions can be influenced through logical appeals and rhetorical tactics of writers and rhetors. Paradigms and enthymemes are so subtle we neglect to realize their existence and what these devices can do to one's judgment and view of reality.

Pathos, the last of the major rhetorical appeals is also important in analyzing these articles, because it shows how writers work to play upon people's emotions. Hauser describes pathos as the ways to express how our "desires, needs, values, and appetites are satisfied or frustrated" and how this affects our response to issues (169).[62] He suggested that when evoking emotion there are three factors involved; the referent, "any object of experience," the feeling, "self-involving judgment," and the future, "projections of appropriate actions" (173-174).[63] In "When Mom Must Go Back to Work" the referent presented is considered the event of going back to work. The feelings could be guilt and shame for the reasons why one must go back or because they are missing out on their child's upbringing. The future is the challenges that they will face to remain a 'good' mother and wife and maintain a job; for example, leaving the workplace. Women in society may feel the pressure to be the best mother and wife because of the emotional appeals that are forced upon them by these magazines. Of course women value their families even when

---

[61] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. Slate Magazine. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[62] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

[63] Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

they work outside the home, so it seems that emotional appeals to stay home with one's children may be a kind of guilt inducing method, whether or not the writer even knows that they are inducing this.

In continuing our analysis it may also be helpful to take a quick look at how language frames the traditional or nontraditional gender roles in contemporary society through the work of Sarah Riley in "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision."[64] Riley argues, "as a social practice, the constructions we use have the power to structure our ways of understanding" (100).[65] She also argues that we can analyze language in three ways, the most pertinent to my analysis being through "identification of linguistic tools" for example, "warranting gender roles by associating them with biological sex differences," and "issues of power in focusing on what is enabled or disenabled by the constructions used" (100-101).[66]

When looking at the Slate Magazine article "Summers' School" it is clear that President Summers was using the notion of choice to warrant gender norms in regard to the under representation of women in sciences. He claimed that "it is a fact about our society that that is a level of commitment that a much higher fraction of married men have been historically prepared to make than of married women."[67] As Riley would say he is "enabling an account to be made plausible" (100).[68] He is constructing the language in such a way that enables this reasoning to be true. He simply doesn't consider that women may not have such an easy choice to make, free of obstacles.

Also, in "When Mom Must Go Back To Work" is it obvious that the author is seeking to enable the idea of working women as

---

[64] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111.

[65] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111.

[66] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111.

[67] O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. Slate Magazine. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

[68] Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111.

unnatural, therefore leading to the constancy of women in the home considered as normal or average. The author also enables the notion of women as inherently domestic within her choice of language. "Still with any transition, there are problems—from figuring out how to squeeze in a dry-cleaner stop to dealing with a husband who is dying to talk when you wearily return" (2).[69] She enables the idea that domestic work such as picking up dry cleaning is always linked to women. The author's construction of language patterns seeks to create a particular understanding of gender norms in society.

To further this analysis, in our readings of contemporary cases where sex roles in marriage/home are based upon gender norms, and equality based homes rarely exist, we may also seek to understand the question of whether depictions of egalitarian homes and relationships are a form of gender trouble and whether they re-establish gender normativity through this gender trouble. Judith Butler draws upon the notion that "sexual practice has the power to destabilize gender" (5).[70] Her main focus was on how the notion of the homosexual or transgender works as a way of messing with the binaries that create gender norms. However, she furthers her concept of gender trouble by wondering why "new forms of gendering have emerged in light of transgenderism and transsexuality, lesbian and gay parenting, new butch and femme identities" (5).[71] She seeks to understand how gender is reinforced within these supposed gender troubling sexual practices. John Sloop also suggests this idea within his study of gender performance, "Although drag and other forms of ambiguity and transgression clearly work to subvert gender normativity, it is also true that multiple facets of culture powerfully stress traditional gender normativity" (8).[72] These concepts can be applied to "When Mom and Dad Share It All" to show how the idea of egalitarian homes serve as a reinforcement of gender norms in the home.

---

[69] Rubin, Bonnie M. "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." GoodHousekeeping: 1-2.

[70] Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble, Preface. New York: Routledge Press, 1999.

[71] Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble, Preface. New York: Routledge Press, 1999.

[72] Sloop, John M. "Critical Rhetoric, Public Argument, and Gender Trouble." Disciplining Gender, Rhetorics of Sexual Identity in Contemporary U.S. Culture. Amherst and Boston: Universisty of Massachusetts P, 2004. 1-24.

The concept of egalitarian relationships is discussed fervently within the NYT article, but all the article ends up doing is showing how difficult these types of relationships are to maintain and the failure rate. They do not make an effort to give advice on how to reach these relationships, perhaps because there really is no set agenda. The article suggests how families that attempted them ended up in unequal relationships that they had been trying to avoid. Even when a couple can make the egalitarian relationship work, like with the Vachons, the roles that they take on still reiterate gender norms, since Amy prefers the shopping, while Marc prefers to mow the lawn (9).[73] Also, lesbian egalitarian relationships are discussed as well. The women in these relationships often end up taking on traditional roles with one being the main mommy and each taking on certain gender typical roles. One woman discussed how, since she gave birth and was the source of nourishment for the baby, it became a situation where her partner was "more like a working dad" and she "was the default mom" (10-11).[74] Even with lesbian couples, where one would think that the relationship would work as gender trouble to mess up the binary of gender roles, the notion of egalitarian relationships for parenting and home life can reiterate traditional male/female gender norms. It is interesting to see that as society is pushing for these equal partner relationships it is actually allowing sex roles to be reinforced. It will be helpful to look at a relative theory of gender construction to better understand the societal constructs that enable gender norms to continually mark our society.

Considering the many theories of gender construction and focusing in on the social cognitive theory as applicable to my analysis will frame this study's overall purpose of distinguishing and understanding gender roles in society as socially constructed. "Most people find it hard to believe that gender is constantly created and re-created out of human interaction, out of social life, and is the texture and order of that social life" (276).[75]
One look into the social cognitive theory is presented here;

> "Theories that heavily attribute human social behavior to the
> rule of nature are disputed by the remarkable cultural

---

[73] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

[74] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

[75] The Inequality Reader : Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender. New York: Westview P, 2006.

diversity. Consider aggression, which is presumably genetically programmed as a biological universal and more so for males than for females--Gender differences in aggression are much smaller than claimed and further shrink under certain environmental conditions" (13).[76]

The social cognitive theory of gender construction suggests that "gender development is explained in terms of triadic reciprocal causation" (14).[77] This means that there are three factors that affect gender construct, those being "personal factors in the form of cognitive, affective and biological events; behavior patterns; and environmental events" (14).[78] The personal factors focus around concepts that are linked to gender, like girls as fragile and boys as tough. The behavioral patterns refer to activities that tend to be linked to gender, such as male pursuit of science or math related professions. The environmental events refer to encounters of everyday life, like the people, places, and communities that one comes across everyday (14).[79] This notion of gender construct is linked to gender norms because the ways in which we develop and construct our gender effect how we perceive roles as normative.

In "When Mom and Dad Share It All" there are several instances of personal, behavioral and environmental factors discussed. An example may be the inclination towards tidiness in women as a personal factor. This was emphasized in the article when Amy Vachon was described as feeling happier "and more centered when her house is clean enough for unexpected company" while her husband was described as thinking cleaning was a burden (9).[80] Another instance of these factors could be within the suggestion of behavioral patterns, specifically how Jo Pannabecker chose a college major with "little practical career application" while her husband obtained "two master's degrees" and surpassed her on the "career

---

[76] Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. Psychological Review, 106, 676-713.

[77] Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. Psychological Review, 106, 676-713

[78] Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. Psychological Review, 106, 676-713

[79] Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. Psychological Review, 106, 676-713

[80] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

ladder" (7).[81] Both of these instances evoke social circumstances as framing sex roles, particularly within marriage.

In considering environmental events it is important to think of how mainstream media affects our perceptions and constructs ours views. "Sex roles are an integral part of people's lives. We learn the roles we exhibit from numerous sources- families, friends, teachers, books, movies, and of course, television" (341).[82] It is a much discussed topic that we learn the roles that society denotes towards our gender simply by watching TV, or in this case, by reading a magazine. These environmental events link people to retain certain perceptions of who they are and how they are supposed to perform their gender.

"I see gender as an institution that establishes patterns of expectations for individuals, orders the social processes of everyday life, is built into the major social organization of society, such as the economy, ideology, the family, and politics, and is also an entity in and of itself (1)."[83] In the 21st century many are surprised that gender norms remain curiously the same within the house and marriage patterns. Within this analysis of several current magazine articles through the use of rhetorical concepts, historical basis, conceptual framing, and the social cognitive theory of gender construction, I hope that I have allowed one to better understand and clarify how and why this inequity still exists and the ways in which these norms are continuing to be constructed and reinforced. Perhaps the knowledge produced here signals us to understand gender as so embedded in the woodwork of social practices that efforts to change them may always fall short. Or perhaps this analysis just heeds us with the knowledge to recognize the invisible and often unconscious tactics and patterns that mold our own perceptions of our gender and in knowing them, give us the resolution to form or break the mold

---

[81] Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

[82] Signorielli, Nancy. "Television and conceptions about sex roles: Maintaining conventionality and the status quo." Sex Roles: A Journal of Research 21 (1989): 341-60.

[83] Lorber, Judith. Paradoxes of Gender. New York: Yale UP, 1995.

Works Cited

Belkin, Lisa. "When Mom and Dad Share It All." New York Times Magazine 15 June 2008: 1-13.

Botkin, Darla R., M. O'Neal Weeks, and Jeanette E. Morris. "Changing Marriage Role Expectations: 1961-1996." Sex Roles: A Journal of Research (2000): 1.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. Psychological Review, 106, 676-713.

Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble, Preface. New York: Routledge Press, 1999.

"Conversation with the Experts, "The Childcare Problem, An Economic Analysis"" Sloan Work and Family Research Network 4 (2002).

Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. New York: Waveland P, Incorporated, 2002. 119-65.

Lorber, Judith. Paradoxes of Gender. New York: Yale UP, 1995.

O'Rourke, Meghan. "Summers' School." 20 Feb. 2005. Slate Magazine. <http://www.slate.com/id/2113810/>.

Park, Bernadette, Allegra Smith, and Joshua Correll. "''Having it all'' or ''doing it all''? Perceived trait attributes and behavioral obligations as a function of workload, parenthood, and gender." European Journal of Social Psychology 38 (2008): 1156-164.

Riley, Sarah. "The Management of the Traditional Male Role: a discourse analysis of the constructions and functions of provision." Journal of Gender Studies 12 (2003): 99-111

Rosen, Ruth. The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America. New York: Penguin (Non-Classics), 2001. 3-26.

Rubin, Bonnie M. "When Mom Must Go Back To Work." Good Housekeeping: 1-2.

Sennet, Richard. Authority (New York: Knopf, 1980): 16-17

Signorielli, Nancy. "Television and conceptions about sex roles: Maintaining conventionality and the status quo." Sex Roles: A Journal of Research 21 (1989): 341-60.

Sloop, John M. "Critical Rhetoric, Public Argument, and Gender Trouble." Disciplining Gender, Rhetorics of Sexual Identity in Contemporary U.S. Culture. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts P, 2004. 1-24.

The Inequality Reader : Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender. New York: Westview P, 2006.

Mutual Adoption Clubs: A Social Constructionist Approach to Family
By Brian McKenney

Introduction

In order to grasp the pragmatic value of social constructionism, it is essential to understand the underlying concepts that are at its base. Social constructionism can best be understood as a move from the internal world of the individual to the external world of relationships, thus bringing into question all the taken for granted ways that permeate our society. Rather than placing value on intrinsic processes such as thinking, feeling, or believing, social constructionism sees the self as an expression of relationships. Therefore, the shift towards social constructionism can be understood as a shift away from the long established norm of individualism.

In order to deconstruct individualism and the traditions it invites, we first must recognize that there is no fixed relationship between our words and the objects they represent. However, expressive, symbols can never be the thing they are representing. If words possess no inherent quality, then they alternatively must derive their meaning in relation to other words. The idea of Truth is thus fixed in the functional relationship of our language. In other words, social constructionists do not deny the performative quality of truth within our society, but simply place it within a specific context, so even though some ultimate Truth does not exist, it can still serve as a resource within the relational world. Therefore, when we employ the word "truth" to describe something, it is truth according to the conventions of a particular group. Various discourses bring different facets into focus and have different implications for us in the world. In essence, truth is just one form of discourse that is socially derived and socially maintained, and thus we can start questioning the long-standing position of individualism as a form of ultimate truth in our society.

At its core, individualism asserts that each of us possess some intrinsic set of qualities that allow us to navigate through the world. However, this viewpoint is not without conceptual problems. For example, if we all possess intrinsic personalities, then the next logical step is solipsism, the idea that there is no real way to know one another. Another problem with the individualist ideology is its potential to lead to narcissism, which is best understood as acting solely out of self-gratification, an extreme form of egotism or selfishness. In turn, individualism fosters a kind competition that

creates feelings of isolation and distrust. Moreover, because we believe in self-contained individuals, any problem is consequently deemed a problem within the individual, what Gergen refers to as systemic blindness.

The Individualist Family Tradition
Once we recognize the individualist tradition is not without problems, we can begin to see the need for a new vision of self, one that understands that our ability to mean anything is accomplished solely through relationships. Nonetheless, in our current society, familial value is placed upon sustaining the tradition of private individual units. Families are centered on a moral order or standards for what is appropriate and acceptable (Gergen 15).   They are predestined and exclusive. Knowledge is transferred from parent to offspring, endlessly perpetuating the system.   Thus, it is no surprise that families often develop shared constructions of themselves. Consequently, these constructions often result in egocentric ways of being. In essence, the individualist family fosters a kind of competition with the other.   Our familial values are equated with opinions or prejudices, pitting us against those who may differ. Therefore, our family identities become valued as a form of Truth over all other realities.   These group divisions consequently foster a kind of antagonism. As Gergen says, "For insiders it suggests that 'we are different, and you can neither understand nor authentically participate in our community.' For the outsider, every group thus becomes the Other- alien, self-seeking and ultimately antagonistic" (45). Moreover, as we encounter people who differ from us, we tend to represent ourselves one-dimensionally, ensuring a picture of a unified self. When we enter relationships commitment to unity maintains our distance (Gergen 162).

         Another possible result of the individualist family is isolation and antagonism between the family members themselves. As previously noted, if we each contain intrinsic personalities, the self becomes the primary reality and everything and everyone else comes second. Under this presumption, conflict is bound to emerge within the exclusivity of the individualist family. Gergen says, "In its emphasis on self expression, freedom, self development, and fulfillment, the individualism of today works at cross purposes with the kinds of social institutions that are central to a viable society" (119). In other words, the values of individualism are incompatible

with the relational notion of family. Ultimately, the result is that relationships are generally considered artificial and temporary. Furthermore, the structure of the family proves equally vulnerable to systemic blindness. Thus, when problems emerge within the family, they are deemed problems of the individual members, rather than the families themselves.

If the individualist family leads to feelings of competition, egotism, and isolation, what alternatives can be implemented? In what ways can the traditionally exclusive family be replaced by a more communal approach? Although there is no definitive answer, the only way to bring about significant change is to significantly break with the conventions. One way in which social constructionism provides us with new possibilities for action is through the idea of generative theory. Generative theory is best understood as "accounts of our world that challenge the taken-for-granted conventions of understanding, and simultaneously invite us into new worlds of meaning and action" (Gergen 116). In a sense, generative theory is a form of poetic activism, creating potential for new forms of analysis and in turn new ways of being in the world. Thus, in order to generate new possibilities, we must look for creative alternatives that not only challenge the traditional system, but also completely break from the accepted realities, which we currently navigate.

Mutual Adoption Clubs and Relational Being

Aldous Huxley's final novel *Island* was first published in 1962. Within the novel are many innovative and liberating ideas, including that of Mutual Adoption Clubs (MAC), which are Huxley's form of communal living. Although Huxley was not a social constructionist, the idea of a MAC largely coincides with the ways of relational being, placing value on mutual coordination and understanding, resulting in healthier relationships. Within the context of the novel, the MAC's serve as a way to escape the detrimental effects of exclusive parenting, which too often result in isolation and antagonism.

In able to connect the idea of Mutual Adoption Clubs to social constructionism, it is first necessary to provide a framework describing how they work. Mutual Adoption Clubs consist of about fifteen to twenty-five assorted couples. Everybody in the club adopts everyone else. Thus, in addition to biological parents, everyone has a quota of surrogate mothers, father, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, and

so on. In essence, MAC's do not take children away from their parents; rather, they give children additional parents and parents additional children. Therefore, if a child is unhappy at their first home, they are provided with fifteen or twenty second homes. Meanwhile, the parents receive tactful therapy from other members. Thus, in a few weeks the children and parents are fit to be with one another again. However, children do not only spend time with their surrogate families in times of trouble, but whenever they feel the need for change or a new experience. The result is "An inclusive, unpredestined and voluntary family" (Huxley 107).

The technical term assigned to MAC's within the novel is labeled "hybridization of microcultures," meaning the combination of smaller cultures to form one unified culture.   In terms of constructionist discourse, the MAC's present potential for what Gergen calls polyvocality, or expanding the number of voices that we are exposed to, broadening our perspectives and questioning one's own position (174). Regardless of the title, the goal remains the same, to strengthen our relationships by creating wider sympathies and deeper understandings. Thus, unlike the individualist family, which in Huxley's words is only interested in turning out good party members, the Mutual Adoption Club instead places value on turning out good human beings. In addition, within MAC's, children grow up in an environment that reflects society at large, a society built which is built upon relationships.

 By exposing children to an environment that reflects the society they live in, they are able to escape the problems that the individualist family traditionally invites. In an individualist society, problems exist because of the way we negotiate reality; thus, any given situation may be deemed problematic or not depending on the discourse we employ (Gergen 177). By alternatively creating a kind of communal living, a move is made toward mutual understanding, growth, and appreciation. According to David Cooperrider, this kind of move is known as appreciative inquiry. Although Cooperrider is primarily concerned with organizational life, his idea of appreciative inquiry can be generalized to mean anything that "strengthens a system's capacity to apprehend, anticipate, and heighten positive potential" (173). In essence, Mutual Adoption Clubs can be seen as a kind of appreciative narrative, allowing individuals to locate positive stories through their exposure to many different backgrounds. This provides both children and parents with time apart creates more opportunities for new experiences and positive relationships.

Not only does a communal approach to family life open up opportunities for new experiences, but it also alters the traditional approach to understanding identity. Through exposure to a wide variety of perspectives, individuals are propelled into new roles, forcing them to question those things typically taken for granted. Gergen terms this process as social saturation. Social saturation entails a wider variation of expressions, increasing the range of possible relationships. According to Gergen, "The result of this wrenching from the familiar is an enhanced sense of 'playing a role,' managing impressions, or acting a part to achieve goals" (148 Saturated Self). To say one is playing a role is not to be interpreted negatively though, for in a constructionist world, all actions are considered performances. As we expand our range or performances we increase our ability for empathy and range of expressions. For instance, within an individualist family, children are expected to maintain the status quo of their parents without question, in turn learning to judge any variation or disparity with the same assumptions used by their parents (Dorfman 203). On the contrary, a community as MAC, guarantees children against the prejudices of their parents by expanding their freedoms. Moreover, as children grow older and become more suited to take on a variety of experiences, their freedoms also increase. This is not to say that members of a MAC are free from responsibility or discipline. Rather, expanding the potential freedoms of children simultaneously increases their responsibilities. As they migrate from family to family, children are expected to maintain their duties across a wider range of disciplines. Boundaries are eliminated as children become exposed to more voices and perspectives. Thus, rather than placing value on a single, ultimate form of truth, there is no truth outside of the community (Gergen 180).

As previously mentioned, one byproduct of the individualist tradition is its emphasis on transferring of knowledge, a kind of osmosis of information from parent to child. This kind of communication typically takes the form of monologue. According to Gergen, the reliance on monologue fails to take advantage of an individual's multiple skills. In essence, monologue places value on a single answer by providing authority figures, in this case parents, with unquestionable power (Gergen 130). Opposed to the monologic voice of authority, is that of dialogue. Dialogue opens the door for conversation, creating new potential for curiosity and transformation. Unlike the traditional family, MAC's greatly increase the potential for dialogic communication. MAC's create an inclusive community,

encouraging cooperation and coordination between members. MAC's not only foster communication, but more importantly, they promote relational responsibility. By creating an environment that recognizes the multiplicitous nature of meaning making, the MAC's are able to create and sustain healthier relationships in more responsible groups with deeper understandings. In essence, the members of an MAC are able to forgo seeing themselves as singular individuals, but as representations of the larger community (157 Gergen). The construction of a group reality mindset allows people to move past blaming individuals to understand the context of their origin of differences. The MAC takes group realities a step further. By exposing everyone to a wide variety of voices, it becomes much easier for individuals to contextualize their experiences, allowing them to question their own taken for granted position in the world. Members of a MAC are able to escape from the predestined point of view of the individualist family, left free to explore the seemingly unlimited number of perspectives of a broad and inclusive community.

Reflection

Up to this point, I have described the problematic nature of the individualist family tradition and a possible constructionist alternative in the form of Mutual Adoption Clubs. What is yet to be discussed are practical ways of implementing these ideas into our current society, which proves to be a little more complicated. One difficulty of social constructionism is the struggle to break free from the conventional discourse, while still offering practical uses. If social constructionism poses ideas that are too radical, they are unlikely to be accepted. On the other hand, if it poses ideas that exist within the accepted realities, little change is likely to occur. The question is how can we best implement the ideas of social constructionism into the current system? The answer is by placing relationships at the center of our existence. As Gergen says, "First, we find that the meaning of utterances is generated in a dialogic relationship... Second, we find that the ability of the individual to mean anything – to be rational or sensible is owing to relationship. The self cannot in this sense be separated from the other" (131). Therefore, in order to start building communities that value deeper understandings and mutual coordination, we must first move from our position of self-contained individuals towards relational beings. We must move from a single Truth, to recognize that there are an unlimited number of truths for any given situation. We must move

from the monologic voice of authority, to the realm of dialogic relationships. Once we can accept that there is no meaning beyond relationships, transformation becomes possible.

Although the idea of a Mutual Adoption Club appears implausible under our current system, it can be used as a guide toward a more relational world. Despite the fact that when *Island* was released in 1962 social constructionism probably had not even been conceived of, MAC's can nonetheless be seen as an ideal constructionist community. With its emphasis on inclusivity and polyvocality, deeper understandings and wider sympathies, MAC's place relationships at the center of being. Unlike the individualist family, which can lead to isolation, distrust or even narcissism, MAC's create an entirely different kind of family. Rather than being interested in producing miniature clones, parents are simply interested in creating good human beings. To quote the novel, "It's not a question of doing anything *against* anybody. All that's being backed up is intelligence and good feeling, and all that's being opposed is unhappiness and its avoidable causes" (110 Huxley). It is one thing to bring into question the traditional assumptions that govern our lives, but quite another to actually generate alternatives and thus as we move forward, it is imperative to begin to explore creative and innovative ways of being in the world, "in which rationality and relationship cannot be disengaged" (131 Gergen).

Works Cited

Cooperrider, David and Diana Whitney. "Appreciative Inquiry." Social Construction : A Reader. Minneapolis: SAGE Publications, Incorporated, 2003. 173-180.

Dorfman, Ariel. "The Lone Ranger, Barbar and Other Innocent Heroes" Social Construction : A Reader. Minneapolis: SAGE Publications, Incorporated, 2003. 200-207.

Gergen, Kenneth J. An Invitation to Social Construction. Minneapolis: SAGE Publications, Limited, 1999.

Gergen, Kenneth J. Saturated Self : Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life. New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Huxley, Aldous. Island. New York: HarperPerennial Modern Classics, 2002.

Hollywood's Compliment: Hollywood and its 'National' Cinema Counterpart
By Katrina Ingrham

Since its inception in the nineteenth century, the film industry has played a critical role in the development of a citizen's national identity. Much of what is written about national cinema today focuses on the 'nation' itself ,what its national cinema has produced over the past 100 years, and how that reflects a national identity. National cinemas undergo various transformations corresponding to changes in national identity. There are observable fluctuations in genres and themes that mirror political and social changes, and fluctuations in production levels with economic changes. The term 'nation' or 'national' fluctuates with these changes as well. The concept of a 'national' cinema is primarily defined in terms of how it is different from Hollywood. Hollywood is the cinema most often recognized within the United States, which is regarded as the only country with a cinema that is not a considered national cinema. There has not been much discussion among scholars of a second counter cinema- a 'national' cinema of the United States. The purpose of this paper is to prove that two American cinemas exist: one is Hollywood, which exists as separate entity, and the other is an independent or 'national cinema' that is defined in opposition to Hollywood and reflects political, societal, and cultural changes within the United States.

Hollywood is what cinema scholars consider to be the only cinema of the United States. It is like other national cinemas in that it relies on certainties of its domestic market, is rooted in a particular industrial policy and aesthetic setting, and has dynamics that are both domestic and international. The primary difference, however, is that Hollywood is first and foremost a business. It is an affirmatively commercial enterprise and only receives governmental assistance on its commercial ends, while national cinemas rely on government involvement and funding in order to create and sustain production (O'Regan, 1996). Hollywood, along with India, is one of the only cinemas that consistently dominate its domestic box offices. Critics, film-makers, policy makers, audiences, marketers, and scholars of cinema therefore reserve the term 'national cinema' for those other than the US .

Because the term 'nation' is difficult to define, scholars struggle with how to discuss the 'national' in national cinema. In the introduction to *French National Cinema*, Susan Hayward describes

the term as having "almost tautological proportions: 'it's there because it's there,'" (Hayward, 2005). Hayward continues by suggesting that concepts of nation bring it very close to myth (Hayward, 2005). Benedict Anderson, author of *Imagined Communities*, defines nation as "an imagined political community-and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign," (Anderson, 1990). Anderson claims the collective idea of a 'nation' is a socially constructed communicative space. He also suggests that mediated communication is of central importance in the formation of what we now call 'national identity,' (Anderson, 1990). These terms and ideas would not exist had it not been for the French Enlightenment and the two major political events which embodied it: the French Revolution and the American Declaration of Independence.

The advent of the nation-state created a need for a sense of collective identity. The concept of nation is therefore based in an assumption of difference because its 'different-ness' is its starting point (Hayward, 2005). Ideologies are created by governments; but people "make ideology have meaning by colluding with it and acting according to it," (Hayward, 2005). The people consent to this because of the reassuring nature of national identity. The nation-state gives "people a secure sense of identity, status, and (usually) pride," (Birch, 1989). "The state is their state, the governing body is their indigenous governing body, not some foreign ruler's… They look at it and see themselves in it," (Hayward, 2005).

The nineteenth century was a time of nationalism in adition to the time in which cinema was born. National cinema became a way to reinforce national and cultural identity within a society. With awareness of identity came the concept of different-ness and the constructing of identity in contrast to another. In terms of national cinema, Hayward points out how "traditionally, the 'national' of cinemas is defined in terms of its difference from cinemas of other nations, primarily in terms of its difference from the United States (i.e. Hollywood)," (Hayward, 2005). Although she feels this definition runs the risk of being too reductionist, Hayward does not think it should be rejected because "every national cinema, especially in the West, will be defined in relation to that very specific other, Hollywood cinema, given the latter's dominance on the field from 1914 onwards," (Hayward, 2005). Hayward identifies narratives as one of the seven typologies which enunciate the 'national' in national cinema. Narratives, according to Lévi-Strauss, are "a culture's way of making sense of itself," (Lévi-Strauss, 1986). Narrative form serves the same function in all cultures, but the 'specificity of articulation' is

determined by the particular culture. In this specificity, the filmic narrative can be seen as a reflection of the nation itself (Hayward, 2005).

In *Australian National Cinema*, Tom O'Regan generalizes the shape and outlook of national cinema as a category. "Like all national cinemas, the Australian cinema contends with Hollywood dominance, it is simultaneously a local and international form, it is a producer of festival cinema, it has a significant relation with the nation and the state, and it is constitutionally fuzzy," (O'Regan, 1996). O'Regan also points out that most national cinemas do not dominate their domestic market. Although national cinemas generally need as much access to their domestic box-office as possible to be viable, only part of their local box-office is available. In the Australian case, between 3 and 21 percent of the box-office was available between 1977 and 1993 (O'Regan, 1996). "At best, Australian films supplement the audience's and the exhibition and distribution industry's mostly Hollywood diet," (O'Regan, 1996).

National cinemas develop strategies to respond to Hollywood's paramount place in Western cinema. One strategy many English-speaking cinemas exercise is to tackle the competition head on, with titles like *Crocodile Dundee*, *Mad Max*, and *Four Weddings and a Funeral* which circulated as major Hollywood products (O'Regan, 1996). Another strategy to counter Hollywood competition is to compete indirectly by seeking complementarities (O'Regan, 1996). In doing this, filmmakers find a niche in the local market not yet explored by the competition. The niche market option "can seek local specificities in domestic social events, issues, stories and myths foregrounding the coherence of the national cultural system," (O'Regan, 1996). Another important aspect of national cinema is the texture of speech and vernacular that may draw upon "more localized approaches to cultural codification," (Butler, 1992). German philosophers Johann Herder and Johann Fichte both saw language as the basis for nationhood (Hayward, 2005). Fichte believed 'languages had intrinsic value as the expression of Volk cultures,' (Hayward, 2005). National cinema can also counter Hollywood through seeking aesthetic distinctions by promoting cinema product as 'Art,' (O'Regan, 1996).

In the United States, Hollywood films dominate local and national box-offices as they do in other countries around the world, especially those which are English speaking. Because of the way Hollywood is constructed, with major production companies having millions of dollars at their disposal, it is not difficult for directors and

producers to obtain the necessary resources to create a large budget film. Hollywood is an extremely competitive industry and the drive for profit and success often influences script and content choice. However, for those who wish to create a film without being scrutinized and rewritten to accommodate Hollywood's style, many aspiring writers and directors choose to make independent films and submit them to film festivals around the country with the hope their film will be scouted and picked out among the rest for distribution. Independent filmmakers can apply for grants and often use much of their own income to finance their projects. Sometimes independent films gain large amounts of recognition and accrue relatively large sums of money despite its small budget. *The Blair Witch Project* (1999), a film made using a handheld digital home video camera by three film students from Montgomery College, did just this in 1999 when it grossed more than $29 million in its opening weekend. The film cost an estimated $60,000 to make. Box-office hits such as *Little Miss Sunshine* (2006) and *Juno* (2007) also began in festivals and were later picked up by distributors. Films from other national cinemas are also distributed through Hollywood companies like Paramount Pictures, which picked up Australian film *Crocodile Dundee* in 1986 for international distribution.

Independent films can take chances with challenging themes and problems within American society. A film such as *The Chumscrubber* (2005), a dark satire about life crumbling inside a seemingly idyllic California suburb, challenges American normalcy and perfection, lack of communication between teenagers and parents, the abnormality of suburban living, our country's reliance on prescription drugs, and teen suicide. Although this film contains an ensemble cast of famous actors including Ralph Fiennes (*The English Patient*) and Glenn Close, the film was not widely released, reaching no more than twenty-eight screens nationwide. Another film that remained under the radar is *Imaginary Heroes* (2004), which starred Emile Hirsch (*Into the Wild*), Sigourney Weaver, and Jeff Daniels (*Pleasantville*). *Imaginary Heroes* is a drama which touches on almost every major societal issue in America today. The Travis family experiences the loss of their eldest son after his younger brother Tim (Hirsch) finds he had killed himself in his room. His father Ben (Daniels), unravels, tunes out, and treats his wife and children like strangers. His mother Sandy (Weaver) dulls her senses with pot while trying hard to conceal a secret that could ruin them all. It's an illuminating coming-of-age story of self-discovery, with themes like drug use, suicide, parental pressure, homosexuality,

friendship, cancer, and adultery among others. These films come directly from the niche market that Hollywood leaves out in the United States. Like national cinemas in other countries, the budgets were small, they had limited releases or were shown at festivals, and ultimately they criticize and reflect concerns within American society, and construct a moment in our nation's history.

Another example of America's national cinema comes out of the language used in these films. Language is the basis for nationhood and citizens relate to characters based on narrative as well as speech. The language in the film *Brick* (2005), a gritty and provocative thriller emulating the film-noir style, regionalizes the text so that the audience can place the film's setting within a geographic area. Although the phrases and terms used throughout the film may not be used frequently across the United States, American citizens can understand the semantics and identify it as their own. In the following transcript from the film, the main character Brendon talks with Laura about her involvement with Brendon's estranged ex-girlfriend:

> Laura: You trust me now?

> Brendon: Less now than when I didn't trust you before. Maybe if you can tell me your angle in all this I could.

> Laura: Emily tried to get with Brad and I about three months ago

> Brendon: Three months ago and you stonewalled her.

> Laura: Oh all right if you've already got the royal's address. (Pause) Three months ago. And I liked her. But she wasn't us and it didn't work and when she left, she took some souvenirs with her. Dirty habit she wasn't strong enough to control and a connection to the Pin to keep him going. Few months pass and the next I hear is the Pin is raging over a certain situation with the junk Em is partial to. And it's all coming down on her head.

> Brendon: Are you saying Em scraped the junk off the Pin? I don't care how hard she was hooked, I don't buy that.

> Laura: You weren't there. She wasn't herself and it dug deep. It was awful. And whether she scraped or coughed she just

ran her tab around the world and into her own back. Must have been grand. Never seen the Pin so hot. And when he thought his precious, his bricks of whatever it was, when he thought one of them was missing? He scared me.

Brendon: Why are you telling me all of this? What's your play?

Laura: You think nobody sees you, eating lunch behind the portables, loving some girl like she's all there is anywhere to you. I always see you. And maybe I liked Emily, maybe I see what you're trying to do for her, trying to help her. And I don't know of anybody that would do that for me.

Brendon: You are dangerous.

National cinemas are a way for citizens to make sense of their culture and themselves. They are traditionally and most commonly defined in regards to their "different-ness" to national cinemas of other countries, especially their difference to Hollywood. National cinemas must compete with Hollywood films for domestic box-office space. Competition with Hollywood is most often achieved through finding a niche audience in the market. By complementing Hollywood films with films that reflect domestic cultural differences and societal challenges, national cinemas act as a social mirror. The United States has within it a considerable alternative to Hollywood, with its significant festival cinema, independent films, and limited release films. The American national cinema is Hollywood's counterpart; reflecting political, cultural, and societal changes within the United States as well as its people.

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict 1990, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London.

Birch, A. H. 1989, *Nationalism and National Integration*, Unwin Hyman, London.

Butler, Allison 1992, *New Film Histories and the Politics of Location*, Screen 33.

Hayward, Susan 2005, *French National Cinema*, Routledge, London.

Hjort, Mette & MacKenzie, Scott 2000, *Cinema and Nation*, Routledge, London.

Levi-Strauss, C. 1972, 'The Structural Study of Myth,' Austin University Press, Austin.

O'Regan, Tom 1996, *Australian National Cinema*, Routledge, London.

The Effect of E-mail on Student/Professor Relationships
By Anna Bruning

Question

E-mail has become such an ingrained form of communication in our society that most people have forgotten how they ever lived without it. E-mail has surpassed traditional "snail mail" and can even be used instead of phones or face to face communication. This relatively new medium has changed how people communicate with friends, family and colleagues. The focus of this analytical study goes beyond how E-mail changes the way people communicate and looks at how those changes affect the relationships between people.

E-mail has influenced the relationships of many different people, but this study analyzes how E-mail has changed the relationships between students and professors. Before E-mail, students and professors had to communicate face to face, with occasional communication through notes left with department secretaries or phone calls. Now students are more likely to send a professor a quick question via E-mail rather than go to office hours. E-mail is not just a new communication conduit, it influences what, when, and how people communicate.

Definition of Terms

E-mail is defined as electronic communication through the internet that gets sent to one's inbox. E-mail does not include texting or instant messaging.

Literature Review

A number of studies have been written on electronic communication, but most of the studies group E-mail with instant messaging and texting. There are very few studies on E-mail alone, and the ones that exist deal with the effects on conducting surveys, customer service or business. A few studies look at internet usage and college students, but they are focused mostly on how students use electronic media to connect with friends and family. Quan-Haase (2007) studied how students used these different media to communicate with local and distant friends, but she did not examine how these media influenced their relationship with the faculty on

campus. Anderson (2004) conducted a study on the internet use of college students and found that the average student spends 100 minutes online every day and 35 of those minutes are on E-mail (24). His study looked at general internet usage of college students and, in particular, internet dependence. Anderson found that many college students are dependent on the internet, a finding which supports my claim that E-mail has a strong affect on student relationships with others, namely professors (25).

The literature about the internet did not offer insight into E-mail specifically and it did not look at what role it plays in the interactions between students and professors.

Significance of Question

As the literature review has shown, E-mail is not well studied. It is important to know not just that a new medium is changing the way in which people communicate, but one ought to study how and why. New media change not only the way people communicate, but the relationships between those people. E-mail in particular has changed the relationship between students and professors. This is necessary to study because it is important to be aware of the positive and negative influences of the medium. If E-mail is negatively affecting the relationship, people should know so that changes can be made.

Theoretical Rationale

In "The Rise of the 'Middle Region' Politics," Joshua Meyrowitz studies how electronic media have changed people's impression of politicians. Meyrowitz uses Erving Goffman's concept of social interaction to understand how electronic media, particularly radio and television, have changed politics. Goffman sees all social interactions as performances that are divided between front and back regions. In front region performances, a person must play what they deem to be the appropriate role for the situation. In the back region performance, a person can relax and analyze their front region performance (Meyrowitz 134).

Meyrowitz argues that electronic media have blurred the division between front region and back region, to create a middle region. In the middle region, people do not act as though they are in the public setting like in a front region performance, but they are not in the private setting of a backstage performance either. This new

region does not allow politicians the privacy they once had to reflect and compose themselves and thus makes it harder for them to be the awe-inspiring politicians we want them to be (Meyrowitz 135).

This study will apply Goffman's concept of social interactions and Meyrowitz's concept of the middle region to the E-mail between professors and students. Before E-mail communication, professors had a work space where they could be contacted easily and a home space where few could contact them. E-mail has blurred the lines between those two spaces and thus created a middle region in the lives of professors and students.

Method

This study is particularly an analytical study of E-mail, but it uses descriptive data as evidence. I surveyed 11 students and 4 professors about their expectations of student and professors and how they communicate with each other. I also collected anonymous E-mails from professors in order to study the way in which students communicate with professors. The descriptive data is a convenience sample, so I cannot draw any universal conclusions from them. They do represent some varying opinions that give light to how E-mail communication has affected the relationship between students and professors.

Analysis

E-mail is a remarkable communication tool that enables near instantaneous communication, 24 hours a day, to anywhere that has internet access. It does not divide between home and work. As long as one can get online, one can access their internet. This tool has allowed students and professors to be in contact at times and places that were not possible before. E-mail can help students and professors communicate, but it also has broken down a barrier between the roles of students and professors.

Before E-mail, professors had control over the limited access students had to them. Students could talk to them before, during, and after class; during their office hours; or on their office telephone. All of these ways of communicating have limited hours of access. Students were rarely given the professor's home phone number, but even when they were, there was an understanding of the appropriate times to call. Calling someone may disrupt whatever that person is

doing, and thus it is a mode of communication many students use sparingly with their professors.

E-mail is different. This faceless, voiceless, immediate communication does not ring or knock when it is received, thus it is acceptable to send E-mails at any time of day or night. This ability of students and professors to contact each other anytime anywhere has broken down the front region and back region roles that once divided their public, school lives with their private, personal lives. Now students can invade professors' personal time with questions about homework, exams and registration; and professors can assign to students papers due at midnight. This new invaded space is a middle region which does not have the same privacy and informality of a back region, but it also does not have the same access and formality of a front region. The breakdown of the front and back regions do not mean that people can see all aspects of others' lives, but this loss has blurred the difference between public life and private life.

The haziness of boundaries is problematic in terms of roles and expectations. Because of the advent of E-mail, students and professors are both equally accessible to each other. It is just as easy for a student to contact the professor about a question on an assignment as it is another classmate. Thus the professor takes on the role of answering questions that the students used to have to figure out on their own. Students now hold professors responsible for answering their questions in and out of the classroom.

Just as Machiavelli explained that a ruler must keep his/her distance from his/her subjects if he wants to maintain his reputation of grandeur, so must a professor keep his/her distance from students if he is to maintain a level of authority: "…he should take account of these groups, meet with them occasionally,…while always, nevertheless, firmly maintaining the majesty of his dignity" (79). E-mail has taken away professors' control of access to themselves, which is the basis of maintaining a higher status. Thus E-mail has created a new relationship in which students view themselves in a more equal relationship with professors. This new view of equality gives students the impression that anytime they are accessible to professors (all the time), professors should be available for them. Some students recognize that weekends should be reserved as private time for professors, but most students believe that professors should be available on weekends if the students have to work on weekends.

E-mail has fostered an impression of professors as equal players with the students in the formation of a student's education.

Students see themselves as equal with professors because E-mail takes their communication out of areas which remind one of his/her position. Students no longer have to go to office hours where they are in a professor's space on a professor's time. They do not see the other people waiting to see the professor or the stack of papers waiting to be graded; thus students expect that professors have as much time as students to answer E-mails. Yet students generally have four classes a semester while professors might have 300 students in a semester. Most students expect professors to respond to their E-mails within 24 hours of receipt because that is the general expectation of students.

In a survey of eleven students, seven expected professors to respond to E-mails within a day or less, while the rest expected professors to respond within two days. A number of students said that professors have easy access to internet and thus should be able to answer within a few hours. Implicit in this expectation is the assumption that professors and students have the same demands and expectations. Students are expected to devote all of their time to school and thus professors should do the same. Students are not judging their expectations of professors based on work day and leisure time, but rather whether or not a professor has access to E-mail. E-mail distances students and professors from actual face to face contact that enables them to recognize the responsibilities of the other and the fact that the roles of the student and professor are very different.

Equal access to each other creates a level playing field in which students may believe it is more acceptable to communicate in a less formal manner or in a more direct, imperative manner. One student surveyed described his role as student as: "to take a proactive role with my professors and question them and push them to give me more thorough explanations until I am satisfied with them." This example demonstrates the new perspectives students have of their relationships with professors. They view professors as there for the benefit and service of students. E-mail has fostered this new perspective by enabling students to have constant, immediate access to professors by which they can make any number of requests or demands.

Professors cite instances in which students requested teaching notes because they missed a class to go to a Red Sox game or they want to know if it is necessary to buy the textbook. It would be considered inappropriate to call a professor at home or go to their house requesting the same information, but as E-mail does not interrupt with direct person to person contact, it has become and admissible way of invading a professor's private time.

The impersonality of E-mail emboldens people to say things they would be embarrassed or ashamed to say in person. E-mail requires less time and effort than "snail mail" and is more anonymous than a phone call, thus people are less careful with what they put in an E-mail. It is not uncommon for students to not use punctuation, capitalization or salutation in E-mails. People perceive it more as a faceless dialogue than as an electronic letter. This perception allows people to relax their formality, while expecting speedier response than other forms of mediated communication.

The new expectations created by E-mail, do not only affect E-mail communication between professors and students. Since students have constant access to professors they are more reliant on professors. They depend on professors to walk them step by step through coursework and assignments. Professors surveyed noted that they have had to change their teaching styles to have more structure with many rewards. Students are not forced to figure problems out on their own, so they have lost the motivation or perhaps even the capability to do so.

Conclusion

Students and professors have lost control over access to their front and back regions of school and home life through E-mail. The equal access to each other has weakened the differentiation of statuses between the two. Primarily students expect more of professors, but both have lost their privacy and distinct roles. Now students believe they can demand more of professors and professors have less authority over students. The faceless interaction allows students to be much bolder and candid with professors than they might have been in person. This instantaneous communication helps create easy access of information between student and professors, but it damages their relationship.

Delimitation

      This study focuses only on what affect E-mail has on the relationships between students and professors, but there are other factors to take into consideration as well. Cell phones, text messaging, instant messaging, and YouTube are just a few other factors that influence patience and attention span.

      This analytical study cannot prove definitively that E-mail has influences on student/professor relationships, but it offers an argument on which to base further experimental and descriptive research.

Follow-Up

      A broader descriptive study with a random sample would be the next step to testing the ideas posed in this analytical study. It would be nearly impossible to test this through an experimental study in that it is very difficult to find college students and professors who don't use internet. The descriptive study should survey current students, professors and former students (from before the introduction of E-mail) on how they communicate with professors/students, what is their internet use and what do they expect from students and professors.

<div align="center">Works Cited</div>

Anderson, Keith J. "Internet Use Among College Students." <u>Journal of American College Health</u> 50 (2001): 21-26.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, and Maurizio Viroli. <u>Prince</u>. Trans. Peter Bondanella. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated, 2005.

Meyrowitz, Joshua. "The Rise of 'Middle Region' Politics," <u>Et cetera</u>, 34 (June 1977): 133-144.

Quan-Haase, Anabel. "University Students' Local and Distant Social Ties." <u>Information, Communication and Society</u> 10 (2007): 671-93.

When Even No News is News:
An Analysis of the Media Coverage of the O.J. Simpson Trial and the Effects on the Media Today
By Beth Reny

From June 1994 to October 1995, the world watched the O.J. Simpson trial unfold in the courtroom, in the nightly news, and in the tabloids. The trial consumed every media outlet for more than a year, not to mention the subsequent civil trial concerning the custody of the Simpson/Brown children, Simpson's unpublished book "If I Did It", and the current coverage of Simpson's arraignment on charges of kidnapping and armed robbery. Telelitigation was essential in perpetuating the proliferation of case coverage, and also creating the media spectacle that surrounded the case by "setting the agenda, combining news with entertainment, and fostering media access and competition" (Furno-Lamude 19). This type of coverage moved the trial from being merely a courtroom occurrence to a number one news story. In fact, it is estimated that 95 million people (23) watched the infamous police chase in which Simpson drove a white Bronco. This single event began the minute-by-minute coverage of the trial that became a media spectacle. Many news stories can be considered "media events" – that is, they interrupt normal broadcasting (21). The Simpson trial is both a media event and a media spectacle. According to Diane Furno-Lamude, a media spectacle is created by the following characteristics: agenda setting, celebrity involvement, dramatic media events, coverage by multiple media outlets, and the access that cameras have to the event. These components, present in the Simpson trial, have set the precedent for much of the media coverage today.

Agenda setting is a key component of a media spectacle, and in the case of the Simpson trial, everyone involved was pushing their individual agenda, including the media, the lawyers, the judges, and Simpson, himself. Imperitive to the agenda setting of the trials various players are ideologies. For example, Simpson's lawyers integrated a race element whenever they could. Paul Thaler provides this example of how the Simpson team relied heavily on racial themes, thus making an appeal to black audiences "Cochran and Shapiro lashed out at prosecutors, accusing Clark and William Hodgman of treating black jurors differently from non blacks during the voire dire" (Thaler 101). This sort of argument is integral to the Simpson media spectacle because the media is able to use it to impact

the way that the public perceives Clark, Hodgman, and the jurors. Simpson was also quick to impart his agenda to declare his innocence using the hegemonic concept that as the patriarch of the family, he must continue to be the provider no matter what: "I'm an innocent man. I want to get to the jury. I want to get it over with as soon as I can… I've got two young kids out there that don't have a mother. And I didn't do it…" (101). Like his lawyers, not only is Simpson promoting his own agenda here, but the media is able to re-frame his agenda into its own, to fit the current headline and to impact the viewer's perception of his character concerning race, class, and gender roles.

Of the key players, it would seem the presiding Judge, Lance Ito, would be the least likely to set an agenda, as it was his job to ensure that Simpson was presumed innocent until proven guilty. Still, like the other influential players, Ito was caught up in the media spectacle, , as demonstrated in this example provided by Thaler, "After weeks of voicing his disdain about media coverage, threatening to bar trial participants from speaking to the press, and warning prospective jurors to avoid publicity about the case, Ito agreed to be interviewed on a local news program, which was aggressively promoted in full page newspaper ads" (Thaler 90). Thaller continues, stating that the agenda Ito was pushing was his own celebrity status,"This was LA and Ito was drunk with media attention… this was a judge, said Darden, who would invite Hollywood actors into his chambers, and gave celebrity writers and TV personalities the best seats in the courtroom" (91). This desperation for celebrity was picked up on by the media, and perpetuated relentlessly. On his talk show, Jay Leno featured "The Dancing Itos", a troupe of men dressed to look like the judge. Essentially, their purpose was to make a mockery of Ito. Ito received the celebrity status he sought, but only because the media chose to confer attention on him.

Choosing who is seen and heard is a dangerous power that all media outlets wield. During the coverage of the Simpson trial, the media demonstrated its ability to choose who becomes a part of the elitist class. By the end of the trial, nearly everyone involved had reached celebrity status. In addition to Ito, Simpson's lawyers made the most of the media spectacle generated by their client as they gained celebrity status through their media prominence (Ferno-Lamude 26). Simpson's lawyers were able to utilize this aspect of the media spectacle to both further their own agendas, and for their own personal celebrity status, as evidenced by E! Television's reality-

show <u>Keeping up With the Kardashians</u>. This show details the lives of Simpson defense team member Robert Kardashian's ex-wife and his children, all of whom received notoriety simply for their relation to Kardashian.

In addition to creating celebrities, the media thrives on the involvement of already recognized celebrities. Per the definition of a media spectacle, the O.J. Simpson trial featured several prominent celebrities, including O.J. Simpson himself. "Celebrity appearances were made by actors James Woods and Richard Dreyfuss; former baseball star Steve Gawey; playwright Anna Deavre Smith; and media personalities Barbara Walters, Larry King, Diane Sawyer, Jimmy Breslin, and Geraldo Rivera" (Ferno-Lamude 26). Celebrity appearances within the trial are an instant media magnet. Events that may have otherwise been mundane are instantly hyped as soon as a celebrity arrives. The fact that Simpson himself is a celebrity ensured media attention for the duration of the trial (Ferno-Lamude 25). Media attention was driven by an interest in Simpson's activities because of his status. It was the double murder charge that changed Simpson from a fairly well known celebrity to a household name.

The third component of a media spectacle is the dramatic media event. Largely because of the celebrities involved, most events became (or were at least portrayed as) dramatic. "The cases that become media trials contain the same elements popular in entertainment programming. For example, a media trial may contain human interest bordered with mystery, sex, bizarre circumstances, and famous or powerful people (Ferno-Lamude 26). The Simpson trial contained all of these elements, which is why the public followed the events so closely. Although media outlets create celebrity status, it is the task of the public to perpetuate the interest in these stories. Following the Simpson trial was almost like watching a soap opera unfold. Because sex sells, it became a large part in discussions about the trial. In addition, the controversy was heightened by the interracial marriage between Brown and Simpson. Much of the speculation centered on the "Othello Syndrome" which perpetuated racial hegemonies. The assertion is that "race discrimination leads to self-loathing in certain black men, causing them to believe that any white woman who accepts them is worthless. They project that auto-hatred onto their wives, causing them to experience irrational suspicion and ultimately leading them to lash out (cuCille 298). This is a notable discussion, because not only does it reassert the hegemonic idea that black men are irrationally jealous, and that interracial marriages are less likely to be successful, but it also embodies the components of a

media trial. Like creating celebrities, the media is powerful in this aspect. Creating an image of Simpson in correlation with the "Othello Syndrome" is in keeping with perpetuating the hegemonic concept that black men are inherently violent.

Interestingly, as the other half of the marriage, not to mention the victim of a brutal murder, Nicole Brown is noticeably absent from many of the conversations around the topic. "She is absent, for example, from the magazine cover that O.J. Simpson's darkened mug shot made infamous: the June 27, 1994 issue of Time whose caption announced 'An American Tragedy'" (312). If media spectacles are carefully construed behind the scenes, and specific decisions are made concerning which players receive the majority of the media attention, Brown's absence cannot be merely an oversight: "She slept with the enemy and populated the nation with his mulatto babies" (duCille 311). This statement suggests that ignoring Brown was an intentional response to her interracial marriage, as well as a proponent of the hegemonic concept that men, no matter what color, retain the utmost importance.

Media spectacles reach "spectacle" status by being covered by multiple media outlets. According to Diane Ferno-Laumude, "The primary venues for the Simpson case included Court TV, CNN, the tabloids, the weekly television magazine shows, the nightly talk/interview programs, and the internet" (30). The Simpson case was covered extensively by the majority of media outlets – television, internet, and print. Once a media event reaches spectacle status, the story no longer needs to be traditionally newsworthy. In fact, there were weeks when "NBC's 'Nightly News' led every other night with the Simpson trial, if only to alert American that nothing newsworthy had happened in the courtroom, while ending each of those programs with a summary of what didn't happen" (Rosenberg 195). The effects of this are apparent in the success of media outlets like CourtTV which provides 24 hour coverage of the major trials of the day. When nothing is happening they are still there, providing analysis and speculation. This is an example of how saturated the media became by the Simpson trial, and how we are still seeing the effects today – proving even no news can be news.

Before the Simpson trial, tabloids were considered the lowest level of publication. Remaining true to the media spectacle definition, even the tabloids became news sources for information on Simpson, largely because they have always been the place to look for sex, scandal, and mystery – several components that the media focused on (Thaler 119). Tabloid involvement, particularly as a credible source,

is important in considering the impacts that are seen in the media today. Prior to this case, tabloids were recognized as largely un-credible sources. The fact that these publications became legitimate sources of news concerning the O.J. Simpson trial has certainly had an impact. This shift in credible sources was a clear reinforcement of the idea that sordid scandal stories sell – and for a high profit. *Times* reporter David Margolick was quoted saying, "The Enquirer has probably shaped public perceptions of the case more than any other publication. In a story made for the tabloids, it stands head and shoulders above them all for aggressiveness and accuracy" (Thaler 122). The continuing effects of this are seen in the news today. Not only do standard nightly news programs like 60 Minutes or 20/20 now cover tabloid-esque stories concerning the likes of Britney Spears or Paris Hilton, but viewers are increasingly turning to entertainment news programs modeled after tabloids as their daily news sources.

The final component of the media spectacle that was embodied by the O.J. Simpson trial is an unprecedented amount of live coverage. Allowing cameras in the courtroom was a controversial decision, but with Ito's permission, the live courtroom coverage allowed the O.J. Simpson trial to reach media spectacle status, leading to the impact it has had on the media today. Because of the outlandish level that the spectacle reached, even when cameras weren't permitted, re-enactments allowed an alternative to live coverage (Furno-Lamude 30). With reenactments, viewers were able to continue to be a part of the action, even if they couldn't see the actual proceedings. Considering the extensive coverage that was provided in the print media, it follows that television networks would want to present their share of coverage as well. However, the fact that the public willingly accepted reenactments in lieu of live coverage is a reflection of the desperate state that viewers had reached. So voracious for the next piece of gossip, they were eager to see even the reenactments.

The enthusiasm for recreated events is highly telling of the way media evolved throughout the Simpson trial. According to National Public Radio's Brooke Gladstone,

> "O.J. left an enormous and rather dark legacy across all news media, and particularly cable news. I think it's fair to say that it's a very short hop from O.J. to the "runaway bride." If it doesn't really matter how important a story is, only that it has certain elements of human drama and that's enough to keep it

dominating the news channels and crowding out legitimate news, then you have a situation that's sad, because it makes the public less informed" (Rating the Media's Performance)

Featuring elements of human drama and maintaining high news coverage are both key elements in a media spectacle, and exemplified by the O.J. Simpson case in particular. It is due to these factors that, as Gladstone mentioned, stories like the "runaway bride" or Paris Hilton's lost dog become leading news stories.. Gerald Uelmen, a member of the Simpson defense team, and a professor at Santa Clara University of Law has also seen the impacts of the Simpson coverage: "It's like O.J. set the standard… They call it 'a trial of the century,' and now we have a trial of the century every year. And I think what the media learned from this whole thing is what this'll do for ratings. People really glom onto this stuff: They watch it, they really want to get involved and follow it" (Rating the Media's Performance). Since the Simpson trial, media outlets have seen their ratings rise with every celebrity scandal. Human interest news is increasingly replacing hard news. Despite the occasional relevance of a human interest story, it is no supplement to world news stories, or international affairs.

It can be argued that the impact of the Simpson trials are seeping into entertainment television as well as into news broadcasts. When considering the huge popularity of reality television – particularly those shows that imply 24 hour surveillance of the participants, like Big Brother or the more recently popular Brett Michaels: Rock of Love, it is difficult to ignore the correlation. For the duration of the Simpson trial, there was constant coverage – even when nothing was happening. Because the trial involved sex, murder, relationships, race, class, and gender, watching the developments in the trial was like watching a soap opera, and audiences became emotionally involved for many different reasons. Reality television functions in a similar way in that the idea is that participants are always under surveillance, and the topics addressed in the "story lines" are often similar to those that were present in the Simpson trial.

The Simpson trial exemplified agenda setting, celebrity involvement, dramatic media events, coverage by multiple media outlets, and extensive camera access – the components of a media trial. The emphasis that was placed on these factors has affected the coverage of celebrity news and directly impacts the level of importance of both these stories and what is considered "news" in general. This change has ultimately been detrimental to the public as

a whole, because these "spectacular" human interest stories often take the place of other news stories that could be equally, if not more important. Furthermore, the extensive camera access and coverage by multiple media outlets has impacted the way that all news stories, particularly court trials, are covered. After the ratings success seen during the Simpson trials, media outlets are willing to devote large portions of their air time to these human interest stories, if only to report that nothing has happened yet. A current example of this might be the 2004 Scott Peterson trial, or the extensive coverage of Paris Hilton's short stint in prison.

The disproportionate nature of the media spectacle had significant effects on the portrayal of race, class, and gender in the proliferate coverage of the Simpson trial, and those effects continue to be seen today. The dominance of celebrity culture has allowed an elitist class to overtake an increasingly larger portion of newscasts. This has caused the focus to shift from news that concerns the average citizen to extensive coverage that features only the celebrities themselves. Furthermore, because the status of the elitist class is perpetuated, it follows that race and class will continue to be shown in an equally disproportionate light. While events like the Simpson or Peterson trials, or even Hilton's jail sentence are all worthy of news coverage, it is the disillusionment that the media spectacle creates that produces the problem. When the media has the power to make anyone a celebrity, they also have the power to shape perceptions of race and gender. Furthermore, when media outlets are more concerned with celebrity news, and not world affairs or even local events, the larger audience is left ignorant of the news that may have a more direct impact on their day to day lives. It is for this reason that the impact of the media spectacle of the O.J. Simpson trial has been detrimental. There has been much reflection by the media as a whole about the way that the trial was handled, but it is time for changes to be made. Before it's too late, the media needs to correct the damage that has been done concerning the perpetuation of hegemonic concepts and lack of variation of the types of news stories that presently dominate the headlines.

Works Cited

duCille, Ann. "The Unbearable Darkness of Being: 'Fresh' Thoughts of Race, Sex, and the
Simpsons." <u>Birth of a Nation'hood</u>. Ed. Toni Morrison and Claudia Brodsky Lacour. New York: Pantheon Books, 1997.

Furno-Lamude, Diane. "The Media Spectacle and the O.J. Simpson Case." <u>The O.J. Simpson</u>
<u>Trials: Rhetoric, Media, and the Law</u>.USA: Southern Illinois University, 1999.

Rating the Media's Performance. 2005. Frontline, PBS. 3 April 2008. <
http://www.pbs.org/
wgbh/pages/frontline/oj/themes/media.html>

Rosenberg, Howard. <u>Not So Prime Time: Chasing the Trivial on American Television</u>. Chicago:
Ivan R. Dee, 2004.

Thaler, Paul. <u>The Spectacle: Media and the Making of the O.J. Simpson Story</u>. Westport,
Connecticut: Praeger, 1997.

CONTRADICTORY GRAMMAR: The Influence of Production Variables on Audience Evaluation in *A CLOCKWORK ORANGE*

By Brian McKenney

Introduction

When *A Clockwork Orange* debuted in 1971, it was both severely criticized and highly acclaimed. It won several prestigious awards including Best Film of the Year and Best Director by the New York Film Critics, the Italian David Donatello award, the Belgium film critic's award, the German Spotlight award and the Hugo award for the Best Science-Fiction Movie. It also received four Academy Award nominations, including that of Best picture (Ciment 162). However, despite all the accolades, controversy surrounded the film for its blatant and casual acts of violence. It required censoring in the US in order to change its initial "X" rating to a less restrictive "R", and was withdrawn from the UK until the year 2000 because it was believed to have inspired copycat crimes (Staiger 94). Yet, regardless of the controversy, the film has continued to be evaluated favorably amongst a wide range of audiences.   In recent surveys, the American Film Institute rated it the 4th best science fiction film and the 70th best film of all time (American Film Institute).   Ultimately, this begs the question as to why it was able to garner such a wide array of conflicting responses.

In the past, studies including that of Shannon Robinson and Day Evans, as well as Jennifer Kelly, have argued that production variables have the ability to create a powerful emotional connection with the viewer, which ultimately overrides his/her response to the manifested content. Robinson and Evans argued that because of the shot structure used in the film *Platoon*, the audience identifies with the character Chris Taylor, allowing the viewer to overlook the negative acts that Taylor commits. Similarly, Kelley investigates the film *Goodfellas* in order to display how the grammar variables used throughout the film allow the viewer to accept this group of individuals who would typically be considered "bad guys." However, both of these studies only provide an overall evaluation of characters, assuming a static relationship between viewer and character. In the case of *A Clockwork Orange*, where the main character, Alex, is both a criminal and a victim, this approach appears to be too simplistic. Although Alex is unquestionably the main character in both content and in grammar, different scenes in the film seem to generate

conflicting reactions. What, then, is the reason for the debate over the film?

According to Joshua Meyrowitz, the answer may lie in the continuous interaction of content and grammar. In his article "TV and Interpersonal Behavior," Meyrowitz presents the theories of para-proxemics and para-social impressions, which may provide insight into the controversy. According to the theory of para-proxemics, a relationship exists between the perception of interpersonal distance and the "framing variable" (the choice of close-ups, medium shots, or long shots) (Meyrowitz 257). In other words, the way a person is framed suggests an interpersonal distance between that person and the viewer (Meyrowitz 257). Thus, whereas close-ups create a much more intimate relationship between character and viewer, longer shots remain more impersonal and detached. Under the presumption of this theory, Meyrowitz claims that although content variables may determine the nature of our response, the intensity of response is connected to the distances established through the shot structure (261). Therefore, viewer evaluation towards a character is not limited to a particular piece of content or production variable, but rather it is impacted by both the content and the grammar.

The theory of para-social impressions likewise suggests a relationship between interpersonal behavior and filmed sequences. The theory argues that viewer evaluation towards a character is influenced by the amount of exposure the viewer receives of that character. The camera can either position the viewer as an audience to a character's front stage region, or as a teammate exposed to the character's back stage region (Meyrowitz 266). In the front stage region, characters play out ideal conceptions of social roles, whereas back stage behavior is understood as the place where those who share the same role relax and rehearse their performances (Meyrowitz 265). Consequently, the viewer's perceived region greatly influences his/her perception of that particular character.

Using Meyrowitz's theories of para-proxemics and para-social interactions, I plan to argue that contradictory manipulations of grammar variables throughout *A Clockwork Orange* serve to produce mixed feelings in the viewer towards the main character Alex, rather than generating one coherent response. In essence, the production techniques employed during scenes of violence seem to either mitigate or heighten the emotional response of the viewer. More specifically, the way in which the violent scenes are shot cause the viewer to at times be positioned *with* Alex, and will be referred to as warm grammar, while at other times, grammar variables position the

viewer *against* Alex, referred to as cold grammar. Although past grammar studies have been limited to the viewer's overall evaluation of a character, my analysis will look at how specific scenes can be constructed with grammar variables to generate opposing responses, resulting in feelings of ambivalence and ultimately the controversy surrounding the film.

Method

In order to study the shot structure of violent scenes, it is first necessary to provide an operational definition of the terms violence and shot structure. In this particular case, violence will simply refer to any act of physical or sexual abuse. The violent scenes will also be limited to those scenes that occur in the real context of the film, not fantasies or violent films that are pictured. The term shot structure will be used to describe various production techniques including, but not limited to: camera angle (high, level, or low), framing variable (close up, medium, or long shot), subjective shots (from the point of view of a specific character) versus objective shots (maintains the role of a detached observer), and voice-over narration.

Warm Grammar

From the beginning of the film, the employed grammar variables point to Alex as the main character. The studies of Robinson and Evans as well as Kelley, suggest this would garner an emotional link between the viewer and Alex, thus negating any potentially horrible things he may do. Many of the scenes seem to corroborate this theory, acting to align the viewer with Alex, particularly in the scenes where he is the one committing the act of violence. These scenes are shot close-up, with the camera physically positioned with Alex. In scenes employed with warm grammar, the camera remains on Alex for the majority of the time, usually in a level shot, thus acting to create a bond between the viewer and Alex. The effect of these scenes allows the audience to overlook Alex's acts of violence by creating an intimate bond with him.

In the first violent scene of the film, for instance, Alex and his gang come across an old man asking for change on the street that they eventually assault. During this scene, Alex is the only person seen in close-up, which according to Meyrowitz's theory of para-proxemics, establishes audience identification with him. The camera is also placed behind Alex, literally positioning the viewer with him as opposed to the man on the street. Although it is not exactly a

subjective shot, it still depicts the events from Alex's perspective and physically aligns the audience with him.

In the following scene, Alex and his crew come across a rival gang attempting to rape a girl. The scene begins with a voice over of Alex while the camera gradually zooms out to show the scene from his perspective. Before the two gangs begin to fight, Alex is again the only character shown in close up. The costumes of the other gang make it difficult for the audience to identify their faces, whereas Alex and his crew are easily recognized. All of these grammar variables contribute to the viewer's position with Alex and his teammates. The content in this particular scene also serves to align the viewer with Alex because, in a way, his gang is saving the female victim. Although both groups seem to participate equally in the fight, the viewer certainly finds him/herself allied with Alex.

Viewer association with Alex is progressed even further in a scene depicting Alex fighting against the members of his own crew. This scene is important because it is the first time in which the content serves to divide Alex and the members of his gang. Before this scene, both Alex and his crew would have generated a similar response, explained by Meyrowitz's theory of para-social impressions. Up until this point, the camera had depicted the back region of the entire gang, thus positioning the viewer as a kind of teammate. However, this scene clearly establishes the viewer with Alex, as opposed to the other gang members. Not only is Alex shot in close-up, but the camera is also positioned behind him, making only the viewer privy to the fact that Alex is pulling out a knife. Consequently, the viewer is both literally and symbolically aligned with Alex during this scene.

Later in the film, Alex breaks into the home of an unsuspecting victim. The shot structure throughout this scene similarly serves to provide the viewer with Alex's perspective. For instance, although the majority of the action is captured through objective shots, the mediated distance between the camera and Alex creates a sense of closeness to Alex. Furthermore, much of the action is depicted from over Alex's shoulder, serving to physically align the viewer with him. The culmination of this scene ends with Alex murdering the victim; however, the murder is seemingly downplayed by other grammar variables. Rather than showing a close up of the woman's face after Alex has hit her, the camera instead cuts to a painting. In a sense, this can be seen as a way to mitigate the negative aspects of the murder so that the viewer is able to side with Alex.

Cold Grammar

According to the studies by Robinson and Evans, and Kelly, any atrocious content committed by Alex would nonetheless be negated by the emotional link previously established through the use of grammar variables. Although this is usually the case, it is not the whole story. While Alex does remain the main character in scenes when violence is not taking place, there are moments in the film where the grammar variables do not contribute to a favorable evaluation. Opposed to scenes shot with warm grammar, these scenes serve to detach the viewer from Alex, highlighting the negative content of his actions. Typically, the action of these scenes is depicted with a long shot, literally distancing the viewer from Alex. Scenes depicted with cold grammar also spend more time on the other characters, frequently showing them in close-ups and level shots. These scenes portray Alex in low angle shots, making him appear intimidating and authoritative. Despite the previous connection established through the grammar variables, the viewer is also simultaneously cognizant of Alex's previous content. Thus, scenes that do not overtly place the viewer with Alex alternatively serve to interrupt the relationship, making it difficult for the viewer to overlook his violent actions.

One striking example of cold grammar depicts Alex and his gang breaking into the home of a couple whom they proceed to beat up and rape. The grammar variables used to highlight this scene not only serve to detach and distance the viewer from Alex, but actually serve to side the viewer with the victims. For example, the camera spends more time on the victims than with Alex. The victims are also shown in multiple close-up shots, garnering an emotional response for the pain they are experiencing. The only close up of Alex in this scene is from a subjective point of view from the male victim. where Alex is depicted from a low angle shot making him appear that much more violent. Therefore, despite the link the audience previously had with Alex, they now view his acts negatively, making him seem daunting and demoralizing.

As noted in the previous section, the murder which Alex commits is downplayed by the grammar variables used to convey the scene. However, the scene immediately following the murder reverses this alignment, further mystifying the relationship between Alex and the viewer. The scene begins as Alex is attempting to escape from the house where the murder has just taken place. Before Alex exits, the camera switches from inside the home with him, to outside where his gang awaits. At this point, the camera is no longer

positioned with Alex, but rather with his crew members. The camera reveals to the viewer a milk bottle that one of the members is holding, making the viewer, not Alex, privy to the information. This shot is strikingly similar to the way the knife was revealed in an earlier scene, which had served to align the viewer with Alex. However, in this scene, the alliance is switched. Thus, when Alex is smashed with the bottle, the audience hardly feels sympathy for him. The action of the scene is also captured in a long shot, creating a sense of detachment from the action. Coupled with the content of the murder just committed, the overall effect is a sense of viewer satisfaction. This scene adds to the conflicting and often confusing portrayal of Alex to viewer. In the previous scene, Alex commits murder, yet due to the manipulation of the grammar variables, the viewer associates with him. On the other hand, this scene depicts violence against Alex and due to the grammar variables employed, the viewer is repositioned to side with the members of the crew.

One of the last violent scenes in the film serves to further the trend of contradictory grammar. Alex stumbles into the homeless man he viciously beat up in the opening scene. Once the man recognizes Alex, he seeks revenge by assaulting him with the help of other homeless people. Initially the camera is somewhat level with Alex, showing him in a fairly tight shot. This is followed by several close-up shots of the assailants. The viewer is thus aware of the situation and therefore the violence against Alex in this scene appears somewhat warranted. However, the shakiness of the camera and the shots of Alex also seem to generate feelings of sympathy in the viewer.

Discussion

The point of this analysis was to not simply display the contradictory use of grammar variables throughout the film, but rather to argue that the relationship between the viewer and characters is dynamic. Whereas the study on *Platoon* by Robinson and Evans aptly exhibited how grammar variables were able to negate distasteful content conducted by the film's main character, they assumed viewers were only capable of one general response. Similarly, the study by Kelley on *Goodfellas* looked at how "bad guys" could be accepted and identified with, despite their horrid behavior, simply due to the manipulation of grammar variables. According to these studies, *A Clockwork Orange* would be no different. Under this assumption, any negative content committed by Alex would be overcome by the fact that he is the character most often portrayed in close up.

Similarly, any violence towards Alex would seemingly garner sympathy from the viewer. Although these studies are not necessarily incorrect, they do seem to simplify an audience member's potential to feel uncertainty towards a character, eliminating the possibility of having an unlikeable main character. Thus, whereas a viewer's past relationship with a character may typically determine the nature of his/her response, in the case of *A Clockwork Orange,* what is that relationship? From the very start of the film, the viewer is exposed to an abundance of violence, committed both by and against Alex, which is often shot in contradictory ways. Although the film is seen from Alex's perspective, it does not necessarily mean the viewer will automatically align him/herself with him.

To make the claim that grammar variables totally negate the impact of the content is to ignore the fact that neither content, nor grammar can exist without the other. As Meyrowitz says "a piece of television content─ such as an act of violence─ has no meaning in and of itself…Furthermore, just as a unit of television content has no meaning apart from the way it is presented, so does a production variable have no inherent meaning apart from the portrayed content and relevant social context." If Meyrowitz is correct, would it not be possible to have two contradictory responses in different scenes? Therefore, although the viewer is positioned with Alex the majority of the time, the negative aspects of his content are only occasionally counteracted. In other instances, where the camera is either more neutral, or aligns you with other characters, the effect is that the viewer evaluates Alex negatively. This is emphasized in the acts of violence against him, where the camera places you in the perspective of those doing the violence. The outcome is a feeling of ambivalence towards Alex, one that resonates with the viewer long after the film is over.

Delimitations

At first glance, the biggest limitation appears to be the lack of comparison between *A Clockwork Orange* and another film. Although comparing it to another film may have produced a stronger argument, comparing the opposing usages of grammar within the film itself seems to fulfill the need for a comparison to another film. Ultimately, the biggest limitation was a lack of hard data to support the claim. With no empirical data, the polysemic nature of the film is reduced to a single argument, which signifies the need for further investigations. Thus, further studies could contain other possible analyses examining the content/grammar interaction within the film.

A lack of empirical data similarly suggests a need for some kind of descriptive or experiential research.

Conclusion

   Traditionally, studies concerning *A Clockwork Orange* have fallen short by solely concentrating on the film's violent content. Ever since the film's original release, critics have been astounded by the fact that audiences could feel any connection towards an evil character, such as Alex. Ultimately, the focus on the film's violent content has led to little research being conducted on the interaction between the content and the grammar variables. At first glance this may be because the interaction does not appear to generate a fluid response, however, this study argues that the incongruous way in which the violent scenes are shot is the very reason why the film generated such an enormous amount of controversy.

   Regardless of the film's long history, this analysis proves to be significant in that it sheds light on the dynamic relationship between character and viewer. Moreover, it illuminates the complexity of the continuous exchange of content and grammar. Although this study is grounded in previous research, it is new in the sense that it does not concentrate on an overall response towards a particular character, but rather how grammar techniques may be variably used to generate a wide range of responses. At times, the grammar variables negate the content, while at others they reinforce it, resulting in an ambivalent audience response. It can be argued that if one simply analyzed the film in terms of its content, one would evaluate Alex negatively. Conversely, if one were to produce a general response towards the grammar of the film, the results would certainly display an intimate link between Alex and the viewer. However, both of these studies would be ignoring the changing nature of both the content and the grammar throughout the film. Ultimately, this study serves to show that viewer response to a character should not be based off an overarching evaluation, but instead be analyzed in terms of a continuously shifting and growing relationship. As in real life, it is a process rather than a product.

Works Cited

Ciment, Michel. <u>Kubrick: The Deinitive Edition</u>. NY: Faber and Faber, Inc., 2001. 149-163.

Cocks, Geoffrey, James Diedrick, and Glenn Perusek, eds. <u>Depth of Field : Stanley Kubrick, Film, and the Uses of History</u>. New York: University of Wisconsin P, 2006, 146-162.

Kelley, Jennifer. "Influencing Viewers to Perceive Characters Positively: Interaction of Grammar Variables and Content in *Goodfellas*," <u>Comm-entary</u>, 2005, 46-57.

Meyrowitz, Joshua. "Television and Interpersonal Behavior: Codes of Perception and Response." <u>Inter/Media.</u> New York: Oxford University Press, 1986, 253-272.

Robinson, Shannon and Day Evans. "*Platoon*: The Implications of Grammar Variables for Viewer Reaction," <u>Comm-entary</u> 1992, 39-46.

Staiger, Janet. <u>Perverse Spectators : The Practices of Film Reception</u>. New York: New York UP, 2000, 93-108.

"Top 10 Sci-Fi." American Film Institution. <u><http://http://www.afi.com/10top10/ scifi.html>.</u>

"AFI's 100 Years, 100 Movies, 10th Anniversary Edition." American Film Institution. <u><http://connect.afi.com/site/DocServer/100Movies.pdf?docID=281 >.</u>

The Future of Television
By Brian McKenney

In the fast paced, constantly changing, technology driven society of today, television has become more than entertainment, it is a form of cultural transportation. As Rudolph Arnheim predicted, television provides audiences with the feeling for the multiplicity of what happens simultaneously in different places, but it also threatens to isolate and alienate audiences[i]. From the early stages of its development, TV has been rich in potential and moving ahead, and seems to be returning to the concepts that sparked its initial fascination. Its flexibility as a medium has allowed it to infiltrate the lives of citizens, and in turn cementing its influence in the years to come, but in what form, still remains uncertain. Rather than predicting specific technologies, it is more important to understand the social and economic forces that are central to TV's development as a medium. As Lisa Gitelman once said, "Success of all media depends on some level of inattention to the media technologies themselves"[ii]. Looking towards the future, it is imperative to concentrate on the relationship between the media and the public and to understand that neither work in isolation from one another, but rather they exist symbiotically.

Ultimately, the goal behind today's media corporations is to make their product as accessible as possible to the widest potential audience. Two ways in which media corporations will try to make television more accessible for viewers are through mobility and flexibility. The mobility of technology eliminates the spatial boundaries historically restricting television, permitting viewers the chance to lessen the gap between viewing sessions. Flexibility refers to the ease in which programs can move across different platforms; essentially allowing viewers to divulge further into programs than ever before. The emergence of new viewing devices and platforms has totally altered the viewing process, changing the entire nature of television.

Television is historically characterized by the concept of flow, which is premised on a continuous exchange between producers, broadcasters and advertising[iii]. The idea of flow was coined by Raymond Williams who claimed flow was central to the television experience. Yet as new technologies emerge, such as video on demand (VOD) and the video iPod, viewers no longer have to rely solely on networks to transport programs to them[iv]. As television

becomes increasingly fragmented, the concept of flow needs to be adjusted, if not totally discarded. It appears the future of television will not be defined by the uninterrupted consumption of program material, but rather by the segmentation of content.

Max Dawson refers to this segmentation of content as "unbundling." Unbundling refers to the dismantling of integral TV texts into fragmentary, yet self contained segments[v]. A noticeable shift has already begun that places more importance on methods such as DVD sales and internet video services[vi]. An example can be found in Wes Anderson's release of the short film *Hotel Chevalier*. *Hotel Chevalier* served as a prologue to Anderson's feature length film *The Darjeeling Limited*, containing valuable information to the plot. Despite this fact, the short was not released theatrically with the film, but rather was exclusively released as a free download on iTunes and to be later included in the DVD release. All of this points toward the segmentation of content, but also towards new forms of marketing as well as distribution.

As Lotz says, "Distribution no longer follows the linear trickle of programming dictated by network executives, but has come to represent a wide ocean of content into which viewers can dip at will"[vii]. New developments aiming to increase the mobility and flexibility of television have also altered the traditional payment process attached to TV. Viewers now have the opportunity to pay directly for episodes, introducing a new "transactional model" to television[viii]. The new transactional financial methods make it possible to support smaller, more specific niche audiences. Moving away from the flow model that has for so long defined television, TV networks now recognize the profitability in directly marketing to consumers, also known as the publishing model. This economic trend essentially represents the general shift in concentration from exclusivity in broadcasting to a multiplicity of platforms and new revenue opportunities.

The movement towards digital content and time shifting does however; destabilize the relationship between advertiser, broadcaster and viewer, providing the viewer with a unique opportunity to skip over advertisements all together[ix]. The very real possibility of programs illegally circulating online immediately after airing has caused networks to make content legally available for purchase hours within their original airing[x]. Despite feelings of uncertainty, networks have had no choice to experiment with new distribution methods, i.e. *Hotel Chevalier*. New forms of distribution have also provided viewers with a much greater personalization of content, resulting in

highly specified niche audiences. Although networks were initially timid to switch distribution methods, these new methods proved to be largely successful. They ensured niche programming would have a significant role in the future of television, and this has led to changes in both programming and revenue opportunities. As Amanda Lotz says, "Changes in distribution shifted production economics enough to allow audiences that were too small or specific to be commercially viable for broadcast or cable to be able to support niche content through some of the new distribution methods"[xi].

       Another reason niche audiences became sustainable was by the reallocation of material from broadcast to cable networks. Shifting program material to commonly owned cable networks allowed corporations to reduce production costs, decrease the risk factor and encourage programmers to pursue shows otherwise too uncertain[xii]. By reaching more specific audiences, shows that were for whatever reason unsuccessful on broadcast networks were given another chance on cable. This is largely made possible due to the current state of deregulation laws that permits mega conglomerates to buy up smaller companies. The convergence of corporations provides alternative outlets for distribution, thus creating a market for more unconventional shows. Commercial broadcasters now have more incentive to create programming that matches the tastes of discreet audience groups because audience members are more likely to pay for programs they are fans of, rather than programs they just watch to pass time[xiii].

       The advent of the DVD and on demand content has also greatly contributed to the maintainability of niche audiences. Profits coming from DVD sales support more varied programming because they can appeal to diverse audiences and enhance the original experience. As Derek Kompare says:

"As they have with feature film releases on DVD, extra features and stylish   packaging add filters of meaning to the original episodes, and function as   significant texts on their own. Their inclusion further promotes the idea that a   DVD set is *better* than the broadcast version, that it offers a more intensive
      experience than is available anywhere on mere television."[xiv]

By offering additional material, such as extra photos, contests, games, etc, the DVD has the ability to attract audiences for both successful shows as well as for boundary-defying shows that did not succeed in their original airing[xv]. The video on demand capabilities introduced

by cable providers also allowed studios to profit from fairly obscure programming through what Chris Anderson calls the "long tail" of digital distribution for cultural products[xvi]. Essentially it allowed studios to profit from material that is rather wide-ranging by placing it on the internet for digital retail. Once internet distribution became largely possible, the opportunities to make programs available on demand increased enormously. One surprising result was that low budget amateur videos now possessed the ability to reach large audiences. For example, internet video distributor YouTube streamed about thirty five million videos a day just four months after its initial release[xvii]. YouTube's initial fascination can be explained by its recreational content and non-intrusive commercials. Providers like YouTube have redefined the role of the network by gathering original content with varied models of economic support[xviii]. Ultimately the result of internet distribution and on demand content has enabled highly specified programming to be increasingly profitable, thus altering the entire dynamic between audience and network.

In the past, in order to understand audience behavior networks typically have relied on the numbers of Nielson Media Research to provide valuable information on who is watching TV[xix]. Traditionally audiences have been measured in a strictly quantitative way, but with the move towards digital recording, the standards are beginning to change. In the digital era, numbers alone are not suitable for tracking viewing habits. The arrival of the DVR has had several implications on television audiences. One unanticipated result of DVR deployments was that the homes using them actually watched more television[xx]. Another impact of the DVR was that it led to the emergence of entirely new protocols for measuring audiences, resulting in the development of an active/passive (AP) reader, which reads a code in the audio track, rather then frequency tuning[xxi]. The innovations of DVR technology have also led to second viewing information to be widely available. As a result, Nielson released the Local People Meter (LPM) in order to try to adapt to the changing technological environment; the LPM attempted to provide a more accurate portrayal of local markets. However, despite the LPM's higher precision, it received much criticism because of the drastic number of discrepancies it caused.

With the impact of the DVR as well as an increasing amount of cross platform media, Nielson became involved in an audience measurement system that was not just accurate, but mobile as well, known at the Portable People Meter[xxii]. The PPM provided measurement for the whole media field users encounter everyday.

Dropping out of the venture to deploy PPM's, Nielson developed another plan called Anywhere Anytime Media Measurement (A2M2)[xxiii]. The goal of this plan was to follow the various mobile devices that possess video capability. Other developments such as Project Apollo and ScanAmerica provided both viewing and purchasing information, which could prove to be valuable for how they market their media in the future[xxiv]. Lastly, there is a third type of research that has begun development, which provides broad surveys on psychographic and attitudinal behavior. This kind of research produces intricate information about potential buyers.

All of these developments make it fairly obvious that there is a need for a sort of multiplicity in measurement protocols. As the number of variables continues to increase, the measurement standard has been forced to move to a qualitative approach, providing a much more thorough context on viewing behavior. According to Amanda Lotz, there are two ways to use increasingly detailed research about audiences. The first is to target them more precisely with persuasive advertising appeals. Another is to create entertainment programming most likely to appeal to the target audience[xxv]. Aiming programming at target audiences has major implications for TV because it allows for formulaic recreations of successful shows. Although this research seeks to fulfill audience demands, it also stifles creativity and therefore has been rejected by many writers. Another facet of the new research possibilities is the increased surveillance of viewer preferences[xxvi]. Surprisingly, viewers have supported surveillance as a way to receive more personalized content and desirable products. However, despite viewer acceptance, the result can not be regarded as wholly positive. The increasing amount of information available about viewing behavior may provide higher levels of personalization, but it also can divide audiences along viewing lines.

As we move rapidly toward an era of highly specified niche audiences and even further splintercasting, the media run the risk of isolating their audiences. With video on demand, networks have given audiences little reason to encounter one another, and by making program material more accessible, networks have prevented any sort of unification of outlook within audiences. Just as Rudolph Arnheim feared, television is making up for actual physical presence and in turn alienating audiences[xxvii]. Raymond Williams named this paradoxically mobile and home centered way of thinking, *mobile privatization*[xxviii]. Mobile privatization provides citizens with the opportunity to extend the privacy of their home as far as technology permits, resulting in higher levels of self sufficiency. Although it is

easy to say that these new technologies have made mobile privatization possible, it is more likely a combination of both technological advancements and audience demands. As Liza Gitelman says, "Media and their publics coevolve"[xxix] However, since niche programming has proved be profitable, networks have tried to exploit it, in turn ignoring any possible negative effects.

An exception to the growing number of niche programs can be found in ABC's program *Lost*, which has successfully united audiences across the globe. *Lost's* approach to globalization included, but was not limited to gathering a variety of actors and story lines that could travel across national boundaries[xxx]. *Lost* also employed a non-traditional revenue model which revolves around a fragmented text that can move with ease across different platforms. In this sense, *Lost* appears to be included in television's shift towards the convergence of media platforms, corporations and audiences. Although *Lost* is certainly a part of this trend, according to Daniel Johnson, *Lost's* narrative simultaneously constitutes a narrative *divergence* because of its fragmented clues that must be pieced together across a series of media[xxxi]. Lost's ability to create a fictional world enabled it to move outside the boundaries of the fictional world and to permeate our everyday lives. While trying to create a text that was fragmented and guided toward a more pervasive sense of textuality, *Lost*'s tactics are borrowing from the *DisneyLand* approach, one that encouraged the consumption of further Disney experiences[xxxii].

The fictional world of *Lost* can also be viewed as a revitalized approach to program marketing. In the wake of DVR recorders, reality television emerged as a cost cutting enterprise that emphasized product placement, merchandizing, and multiplatform content[xxxiii]. However, *Lost* forgoes current advertising schemes and essentially lets the fans drive distribution through a collaborative world that transcends any one particular platform. *Lost* represents a new direction of TV that aims to create fictional institutions and then to install them within the everyday realms of the real world. By integrating *Lost* into the everyday life of viewers, networks have an opportunity to blur the line between its own institutions and the institutionalized spaces of everyday life[xxxiv]. This creates opportunities for expanding the narrative across media platforms as well allowing for advertisers to become integrated within the narrative detail. As Daniel Johnson says, "When narrative encompasses the corporate realm of everyday life, the economic exchanges between viewer and advertiser can take place in the

context of the narrative"[xxxv].   *Lost* effectively made it possible to move brand integration outside of the fictional world and into a space where sponsors could control. For example, AOL recently released an online platform called, In2TV that provides full content for many shows within the Time Warner Library[xxxvi]. Although viewers can fast forward through the shows, it is impossible to do so for the commercials. In moving outside the confines of traditional viewing, sponsors are able to exhibit more control over viewers. Another point worth mentioning is that *Lost* not only creates new revenue opportunities for advertisers, but they have been successful in creating a brand in itself. Johnson refers to this kind of marketing as reverse product placement because it offers a line of consumable goods under fictional institutions[xxxvii]. Although it is still unsure what the potential for reverse product placement is, further expansion seems possible. In the meantime, *Lost* remains an exception to the dominance of reality TV formats and cheap production.

Another marketing trend, which can be expected as we progress towards a new era of television, is that of branding. Branding is an especially important factor in subscription and pay per view services. Subscription networks offer an alternative to traditional television; providing viewers with not only more options, but also permitting viewers to time shift their viewing. Creating a brand is vital for first order commodity relations because it provides points of access that are recognizable and reliable[xxxviii]. Establishing a brand effectively creates more revenue opportunities for networks. For example, with a subscription network such as HBO, branding plays an important role in attracting potential subscribers. Branding also greatly contributes to merchandizing, whether it is diegetic, pseudo-diegetic, or extra-diegetic. According to Catherine Johnson, branding is an important commercial strategy for two reasons. First, it enables networks to create strong relationships with viewers. Second, it allows TV programs themselves to act as brands that can be exploited across media platforms, thus increasing profits[xxxix]. If programs can be understood as brands, then merchandizing can be understood simply as an extension of that brand, exalting the same values of the program itself[xl]. Branding not only speaks to marketing strategies, but it also reveals particular values about the program, altering the way viewers engage with programs.

As networks began to experiment with new forms of distribution, a number of new changes emerged in both the content and the financial models used. With audience demands calling for a higher degree of personalization and more flexibility in viewing

times, television commenced the shift toward a new concept of multiplicity. Center to this shift was the idea of making programming more accessible to viewers and thus television began to spread out past the realm of the box in the corner to new platforms and new locations. Innovative distribution methods have consequently led to the disintegration of the concept of flow and increase in first commodity relations. The changing nature of distribution has also had several implications on the economics and programming of television. The shift towards the publishing model has allowed networks to bypass the traditional gatekeeper, ultimately changing the entire dynamic of the relationship between networks and their audiences.   If we accept these newly emerging media to be forms of television, then it becomes clear that we are heading towards a new era of television defined not by flow or exclusivity, but on demand content, multiplicitous media and audience engagement.

In the new era of television, networks will no longer have a choice to spread their programming across platforms, rather cross platform shifting will simply become a necessity for networks competing for fragmented audiences. If niche audiences continue to prove to be sustainable, TV will lose its collective intelligence and be replaced by the individuals' pursuit of specific content. Although this shift appears to eliminate any unification of outlook, it also provides more opportunities for collaboration and amateur created content. As television moves progressively forward its repercussions may be ambivalent, but its influence on society can be assured by its overall adaptability as a medium.

---

[i] Rudolf Arnheim, "A Forecast of Television" (Intercine, 1935) in *Film as Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957): 194.

[ii] Lisa Gitelman, "Introduction: Media As Historical Subjects," in *Always Already New: Media, History and the Data of Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006): 6.

[iii] Derek Kompare, "Acquisitive Repetition: Home Video and the Television Heritage," in *Rerun Nation: How Repeats Invented American Television* (New York: Routledge, 2005): 202.

[iv] Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 123.

[v] Max Dawson, "Little Players, Big Shows Format, Narration, and Style on Television's New Small*er* Screens," 5.

[vi] Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 120.

[vii] Ibid, 120.

[viii] Ibid, 123.

[ix] Derek Kompare, "Acquisitive Repetition: Home Video and the Television Heritage," in *Rerun Nation: How Repeats Invented American Television* (New York: Routledge, 2005): 203.

[x] Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 123.

[xi] Ibid, 124.

[xii] Ibid, 126.

[xiii] Ibid, 141

[xiv] Derek Kompare, "Acquisitive Repetition: Home Video and the Television Heritage," in *Rerun Nation: How Repeats Invented American Television* (New York: Routledge, 2005): 210.

[xv] Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 129.

[xvi] Ibid, 131.

[xvii] Ibid, 134.

[xviii] Ibid, 136.

[xix] Amanda Lotz, "Recounting the Audience: integrating new measurement techniques and technologies," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 193.

[xx] Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 138.

[xxi] Amanda Lotz, "Recounting the Audience: integrating new measurement techniques and technologies," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 196.

[xxii] Ibid, 201.

[xxiii] Ibid, 202.

[xxiv] Ibid, 202.

[xxv] Ibid, 212.

[xxvi] Ibid, 213.

[xxvii] Rudolf Arnheim, "A Forecast of Television" (Intercine, 1935) in *Film as Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957): 197.

[xxviii] Raymond Williams, Chapter 1, *Television, Technology and Cultural Form* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975): 19.

[xxix] Lisa Gitelman, "Introduction: Media As Historical Subjects," in *Always Already New: Media, History and the Data of Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006): 1-22.

[xxx] Roberta E. Pearson, "Lost in Transition: from post-network to post-television" 16.

[xxxi] Derek Johnson, "The Fictional Institutions of *Lost*: World Building, Reality, and the Economic Possibilities of Narrative Divergence" 13.
[xxxii] Ibid, 10.
[xxxiii] Ibid, 7.
[xxxiv] Ibid, 24.
[xxxv] Ibid, 26.
[xxxvi] Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 134.
[xxxvii] Derek Johnson, "The Fictional Institutions of *Lost*: World Building, Reality, and the Economic Possibilities of Narrative Divergence" 27.
[xxxviii] Catherine Johnson, Tele-branding in TViii: The network as brand and the programme as brand 13.
[xxxix] Ibid, 8.
[xl] Ibid, 17

<div align="center">

Works Cited

</div>

Rudolf Arnheim, "A Forecast of Television" (Intercine, 1935) in *Film as Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957): 188-198

Max Dawson, "Little Players, Big Shows Format, Narration, and Style on Television's New Small*er* Screens,"

Lisa Gitelman, "Introduction: Media As Historical Subjects," in *Always Already New: Media, History and the Data of Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006): 1-22

Derek Johnson, "The Fictional Institutions of *Lost*: World Building, Reality, and the Economic Possibilities of Narrative Divergence

Catherine Johnson, 'Tele-branding in TViii: The network as brand and the programme as brand'

Derek Kompare, "Acquisitive Repetition: Home Video and the Television Heritage," in *Rerun Nation: How Repeats Invented American Television* (New York: Routledge, 2005): 197-219

Amanda Lotz, "Revolutionizing Distribution: breaking open the network bottleneck," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 117-151.

Amanda Lotz, "Recounting the Audience: integrating new measurement techniques and technologies," *The Television Will be Revolutionized* (New York: NYU Press, 2007): 193-214

Roberta E. Pearson, "Lost in Transition: from post-network to post-television,"

Representations of Jewish People in the Media
By Haley B. Dunn

"*Over the past century, the various connections between American Jews and the nation's entertainment media have generated a discussion that has been extensive, passionate, and at times contentious…It is a conversation that is sometimes proudly pro-Jewish, sometimes virulently anti-Semitic, often highly ambivalent; it is anything but trivial. Indeed it constitutes one of the most significant public conversations on identity and culture in American life.*"
http://www.jewishmuseum.org/online

Introduction: Constructing a Jewish Identity

I have always identified myself as being Jewish. My mother's side of the family is Russian Jewish, and my father's side is ambiguously Gentile. As a child I attended Hebrew school for only one year, celebrated Hanukkah and Christmas, and wore a necklace with the Star of David that my Grandmother gave me as a birthday gift. Neither of my parents are religious-- if you asked me to tell you anything about Jewish holidays or Judaism in general I would not be able to divulge much intelligible information. For me, being Jewish is not about religion. I am more interested in Jewishness as an ethnicity-- I identify myself with a race of people, rather than with particular religious beliefs. When I was younger, I simply said I was Jewish because I was not sure what other group to affiliate myself with. Upon entering college and thinking about the concept of identity, I became much more interested in what it means to belong to the Jewish culture. Belonging to a culture, or a group of people, is an important part of the construction of one's identity. I belong to a group of people who have historically faced many prejudices and persecution; and as I have become more conscientious of my identification as a Jewish woman I am especially sensitive to the harsh stereotypes and preconceived notions that Jewish people in America face today.

Once I became aware of how many negative stereotypes are associated with Jewish people, I sometimes felt as though my Jewishness was something I needed to hide. While I may not have the archetypal "Jewish nose" (a "large, massive, club-shaped, hooked nose, three or four times larger than suits the face…"), I do have a prominent and possibly Jewish looking nose that induced ridicule during my younger years (Schrank 24). I have been called both cheap

and a Jewish Princess and I have heard just the word "Jew" alone has been directed towards me and others as an insult. The stereotypes and negative connotations associated with being Jewish are hurtful and are intended to make Jewish people feel as though their identity is something to be ashamed of—and in my own experience, these malicious tactics work quite well. During times of persecution, many Jewish people would hide their Jewishness in an effort to save their own lives-- this was fairly easy to do because unless one has a Jewish name, it is difficult to identify a Jew based on looks alone. Jews may look similar to Italians or Greeks (amongst other groups), and can omit Jewish 'markers' such as yamakahs and Stars of David. One would think that in a modern world where cultural diversity is finally starting to be accepted and celebrated, Jews would no longer have to hide their cultural identification. Unfortunately, anti-Semitism is not a thing of the past, and it has had immense effects on the representation of Jewish people in the media to this day.

Self- Deprecation or Self-Loathing?

"Although Jewish executives, producers, writers, performers, and directors dominate the American film industry, [the films they produced] which so accurately captured the country's spirit, almost totally ignored one of American's most prominent minorities. How ironic that those pictures, which forever froze our national experiences into unforgettable images, limited almost all references to the cultural and religious heritage of the industry's leaders"
(Schrank 34)

In thinking about Jews in the media, the phrase "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em" comes to mind. I use this phrase because many of the shows and films that depict Jewish people are produced and/or written by Jewish people. One would think that since Jewish people are essentially in charge of their own representation, they would try to create likeable, realistic Jewish characters. However, Jewish representation in the media is still highly stereotyped and at times, even ignored. "…Jews in American popular entertainment convey Otherness in one of three ways: by the discrimination they experienced, through flagrant stereotypes, or by concealing or merely implying their Jewishness" (Baskind 4). Indeed, in looking at shows and films from recent decades it seems that Jews are only represented in Holocaust memoirs, as exaggerated stereotypes, or as ambiguously

Jewish. In defense of the Jewish writers who choose to exploit negative stereotypes, I understand why they may employ tactics of self-deprecation. Self-deprecation allows for Jewish people to laugh at themselves before anyone else laughs at their expense. However, what I find problematic is the thin line between self-deprecation and self-loathing. "Overall, Jewish self-censorship in television reflects that to a certain extent anti-Semitism and apprehensions about the unknown have informed middle-class attitudes towards Jewishness in American popular culture" (Krieger 391). In a Gentile society, Jewishness is something that is to be censored and toned down. In the money-hungry media world, "honest" Jewishness doesn't sell. Why should Jewish people have to laugh at themselves in order to be accepted? Why must we be the butt of our own jokes? And if we aren't going to laugh at ourselves, why must we conceal our identities as though they were offensive to the majority Gentile population? Why can't we celebrate and be celebrated for our differences as a unique group of people? These are some of the questions that inspired me to research and analyze the representations of Jewish people in the mass media. To begin, I will discuss the slew of Jewish stereotypes that are exhibited in the media. I will then be examining the popular television series *Seinfeld* to exemplify the concealing of Jewishness, followed by how the television series *The Nanny* that straddles the line between self-loathing and self-deprecation; and finally I will discuss the film *Meet the Fockers,* which may be read as a celebration of Jewishness. Finally, will predict how Jews may be represented in the media in the future.

Stereotypes

> *"…movies about Jews often employ clichés of the nitpicky, overbearing mother who wants her son or daughter to marry Jewish; high maintenance daughters interested in shopping and material pleasure as opposed to pleasure in the bedroom; and men who possess a neurosis or avarice that overwhelms any other positive character trait…Jewish characters frequently remain within this formula"*
> *(Baskind 6)*

There are numerous stereotypes associated with Jewish people, and most of which are extremely negative. In the quote above, Baskind discusses many of the negative character traits associated with Jews that can be found not only in movies, but on television as

well. The Jewish mother is categorized as pushy and overly traditional. "Too many Jewish mothers…become props for humor that often teeters on outright ridicule or even occasional cruelty" (Antler 668). Jewish mothers are not the only Jewish women that are harshly stereotyped. Unmarried Jewish women are associated with the idea of the "Jewish Princess". These women are portrayed as selfish gold-diggers. Both the Jewish mother and the Jewish Princess are portrayed as having insatiable appetites for men, money, and food. It is not only Jewish women who are subjected to such homogenization; Jewish men are narrowly represented in the media as well. In television and film, the Jewish man is most often seen as highly neurotic and effeminate. "…Stereotypes of the unmanly, powerless Jew…designed to allay fears of Jewish intelligence, wealth, or political power—are also exemplified by Jewish male characters on television who hint at effeminacy or homosexuality" (Krieger 400). According to Krieger, portraying Jewish men in this way is a tactic used to reassure the dominant Gentile population that they need not be threatened by the Jews "…despite their assimilation, inter-dating, and material success" (Krieger 400). Furthermore, Jewish men are often portrayed in the media as dating only non-Jewish women. "Moreover, in portraying Jewish men as almost invariably in relationships with non-Jewish women, TV shows foster the notions that Jewish women are undesirable and unattractive and that Jews only rarely, if ever, become romantically involved with each other" (Antler 670). Overall, both Jewish men and women are stereotypically represented as being cheap, brash, and out of place in society.

Physically speaking, as I mentioned earlier, Jewish people are stereotypically associated with having large, crooked noses. "The importance of the 'Jewish nose' is that it is perceived as one of the most obvious defining features of Jews" (Schrank 18). Even though many non-Jews have prominent noses, the stereotypically large Jewish nose is associated with ugliness and imperfection. "For over a century, the term the "Jewish nose" has been used in Western scientific literature to describe a set of physical features thought to constitute a distinct, race-based deformity…Thus it is that the Jewish face never can [be], and never is, perfectly beautiful" (Schrank 24). In my own experience, people are often surprised to discover that I am Jewish. They tell me that I don't "look Jewish". I wonder why that is? Is it because my nose isn't big enough or crooked enough? Is it because my hair isn't curly enough? Is it because my eyes are blue, not dark? It seems that many people have a specific picture in their

mind of how a Jewish person should look and act —this is undoubtedly a result of the stereotyped representations of Jews found in the media.

Seinfeld: Ambiguously Jewish

> *"Indeed, the Jews and inferred Jews in Seinfeld seem to strike a balance, a middle ground that satisfies both Gentile and Jewish-oriented viewers. That is, they are represented as assimilated, with just enough Jewishness to suggest ethnic demarcation and identification, but not enough to alienate their Gentile audience"*
> *(Krieger 391)*

Seinfeld is known as one of the most successful and beloved sitcoms on television. The show has also been regarded as a breakthrough "Jewish" sitcom, because the lead character (Jerry Seinfeld) is defined as Jewish. Interestingly, Jerry only self identifies as a Jew in one episode and none of the other characters are ever identified as being Jewish. *Seinfeld* instead implies that the characters are Jewish in various ways—by the food they eat, the stereotypical traits they possess, and through "Jewish moments" (Krieger 388). Initially rejected by the president of NBC for being "too Jewish", the self-censored version of *Seinfeld* (complete with Italian soundings names instead of the original Jewish ones) did make it on the air because "…a large part of the audience prefers its Jews Gentile" (Krieger 391). Although *Seinfeld* can absolutely be read as Jewish and enjoyed by Jewish viewers, the fact that the Jewishness on the show is masked in order to be accepted by a mainstream audience further portrays Jewish people as not being acceptable in society. On *Seinfeld*, Jewishness is something that cannot be celebrated—instead it is encoded.

As I mentioned earlier, Jerry is the only character on the show that self identifies as a Jew—however, he is not portrayed as being very stereotypically Jewish. "What he seems to articulate, is that his Jewishness is indeed a source of anxiety, but acceptable if kept in check" (Krieger 397). Krieger's statement about Jerry's "checked" Jewishness makes more sense when comparing his character to that of George Constanza and his parents, Frank and Estelle. Despite the fact that George and his parents are supposedly Italian, Krieger points out that these characters are meant to be read as Jewish. The "Italian" Constanza's are never shown eating authentic Italian foods, but there

are instances of the family eating Kasha, a kind of porridge associated with Jewish immigrants. Moreover, the Constanza's possess what Krieger describes as Jewish body types—short and chubby (Krieger 396). Krieger also sees the Constanza's as acting and speaking in stereotypically Jewish ways. Both George and his father are pessimistic and go on "hysterical rants", and "Estelle speaks with Yiddish inflections and cadence…is short-tempered, argumentative and nags Frank and George" (Krieger 396). Estelle Constanza fulfills her role as the stereotypical Jewish mother, while Frank and George both fit the stereotypes of Jewish men. George is probably the most stereotyped Jewish character on the show—he is nebbish, cynical, neurotic, and often portrayed as effeminate. "George is Jerry's foil…[he] personifies the Jewish side of Jerry's personality—the self-deprecation, the neuroses, the deceit" (Krieger 400). George, unlike Jerry, is unsuccessful in both work and love. It seems that *Seinfeld* implies that George's negative Jewish qualities (specifically his pessimism and neurosis) ultimately cause his troubles. Jerry on the other hand, whose Jewishness is nondescript, is able to enjoy life because he has assimilated to Gentile society.

I mentioned earlier that *Seinfeld* also implies the Jewishness of the characters through "Jewish moments". For example, Krieger refers to "The Handicap Spot Episode", in which Frank's car is vandalized as a result of George illegally parking it in a handicap zone. To explain what happened, George tells his father that he, Jerry, Elaine, and Kramer were chased by people in a car with swastikas, and that the passengers were yelling racial slurs at them. "This excuse of George's suggests that he is Jewish, and that he fears or has experienced anti-Jewishness in the past. It also suggests that he and the others could perhaps be perceived as "looking Jewish", as they all were the focus of this fictional harassment". Krieger also mentions that in one episode Estelle says that she does not buy things from Germany—her refusal may be associated with the Holocaust, and can also be read as Jewish (Krieger 396).   These examples that Krieger discusses demonstrate how these "Jewish moments" are used to convey the Jewishness of the characters. On the other hand, there are also blatant omissions of Jewish markers in some episodes. Krieger discusses "The Pony Remark Episode", in which the characters attend the funeral of Jerry's relative. Although Jerry and his family are indeed identified as Jewish on the show, there are no Jewish markers to be found at the funeral—not even a Rabbi! "Even if the funeral depicted in the episode was Reform or Reconstructionist, there should

have been Jewish markers, Jewish stars, and so on, in plain view"
(Krieger 392). The blatant omission of Jewish markers in this episode
and others seems inappropriate. While it is admirable that the main
characters self-identifies as being a Jew, *Seinfeld*'s omission of Jewish
markers and the overall ambiguousness of Jewishness on the show is
extremely problematic in that it suggests that Jewishness is not
acceptable for mainstream audiences.

The Nanny: Exaggerated Jewishness

> *"Jewishness is then, an attitude, a phrase, even a set of clothes—*
> *glitzy, gaudy, and ornate. It is a shtick, a framing device that sets*
> *the heroine apart from the other in the cast. But it is artificial,*
> *exaggerated Jewishness, drawn from anomalous images and*
> *negative stereotypes—Jewish women's self-centered and*
> *encompassing desires for money, men, and food—that are long*
> *out of date and mainly fiction in origin"*
> *(Antler 666)*

The sitcom, *The Nanny* exemplifies the representation of
Jewish people in the media as highly stereotyped. It seems that *The
Nanny* uses tactics of self-deprecation in order to poke fun at the
negative stereotypes associated with Jews, however such exaggerated
stereotypes border on self-loathing rather than self-deprecation. *The
Nanny* is another show that is written and produced by a Jew, Fran
Drescher, who also plays the lead character. Drescher's character,
Fran Fine, is a Jewish woman who works as a nanny for an upper-
class English family. Drescher's character fits the stereotype of the
Jewish Princess—she loves to shop, wears outrageous outfits, and
dreams of marrying a Jewish doctor—or any rich man. Moreover,
Fran Fine also possesses a trademark nasal whine and tosses around
Yiddish words and phrases. Her mother, Sylvia, typifies the
stereotypical Jewish mother who, like her daughter, dresses garishly,
and is obsessed with her daughter getting married to a Jewish man.
Unlike on *Seinfeld,* Jewish markers are not omitted on *The Nanny*—
there are even episodes where Fran and her mother attend synagogue.

Both Fran and her mother are portrayed as lower class when
compared to the Sheffields—the family that Fran works for. The
women are outspoken and unrefined—and this seems to be associated
with their stereotypical Jewish qualities. However, Fran Fine does
possess some likeable qualities. "What many find likeable in the
show are the nanny's cleverness, honesty, sense of pride, and

warmth…then nanny always outsmarts her dramatic antagonists…because of her innate shrewdness, a genuine concern for others, and the folk wisdom apparently imparted from her heritage" (Antler 668).   Although Fran Fine does have many positive attributes, the exaggerated Jewish stereotypes portrayed by her and her mother ultimately supersede any of her more likeable characteristics. "Despite the nanny's warmth, wit, and honesty, including the breezy sexuality she openly flaunts, she remains the kind of course, greedy, and selfish Jew that any anti-Semite might envision" (Antler 668). While it seems that *The Nanny* certainly tries to use the self-deprecating tactic in an effort to positively represent Jewish people, the exaggerated stereotypes that the Jewish women on the show possess seem to portray more self-loathing than anything, and further contribute to the warped perceptions about Jewish women.

Meet the Fockers: Celebrating Jewishness

> ***"…**Meet the Fockers *subverts stereotypes and shuns encrypted Jewishness"*
> *(Baskind 6)*

In addition, the 2004 film *Meet the Fockers* as an example of a Jewish representation that is not only realistic, but positive and as Baskind thinks—even "cool". In the film, three Jewish actors play lead roles: Ben Stiller as Greg Focker, Dustin Hoffman as Bernie Focker, and Barbara Streisand as Roz Focker. *Meet the Fockers* is the sequel to the film *Meet the Parents* (2000)—both of which were wildly successful at the box office. Unlike most Jewish characters that we see represented in television and film, the Fockers are "the good guys in this movie, the hip characters, the anti-Shy-Locks, the Jews happy to be Jews…" (Baskind 3). The Fockers are unabashedly Jewish—they do not shy away from referencing Jewish religious practices, there are abundant Jewish markers, and Yiddish words and phrases are used throughout the film.

The tension within the film stems from the upcoming wedding of Greg to his fiancée, Pam. Pam comes from a "WASPy" (White Anglo Saxon Protestant) family that greatly contrasts with the Fockers. While the Fockers are free-spirited and warm, Pam's family comes off as uptight and cold. The fact that the Jewish family is more "cool" than the "WASPy" family is already unconventional, what is even more exceptional is that the tension between the

families has nothing to do with their opposing religions. Unlike a stereotypical representation of a Jewish mother, Roz is unconcerned with the fact that her son is marrying outside of their religion. The conflict between the families instead lies in their attitudes—the Fockers are more easy-going, while Pam's family is more straight-laced. At the end of the movie, Pam's family is proclaimed to be "Fockerized". "For the Jewish movie spectator, to be Fockerized means to be Jewish/liberal/cool/laidback, while for a non-Jewish viewer to be Fockerized often suggests all of the aforementioned minus the Jewish element. Nevertheless, that Roz and Bernie are happy to be Jewish and unassimilated still says something important about twenty-first-century American culture" (Baskind 17). Although there are indeed possibilities for multiple readings, *Meet the Fockers* can undoubtedly be read as a celebration of Jewishness. Unlike the other examples I have discussed, *Meet the Fockers* stands alone in its realistic and unafraid representation of a Jewish family.

Conclusion

As I have discussed, the ways that Jewish people are represented in the media highly influences not only the perception of what Jewish people are like, but also how Jewish people feel about themselves. The ambiguous Jewry shown on *Seinfeld* alludes to Jewishness as being something that should be hidden and deemphasized. While it was certainly a step forward to have a Jewish lead character, *Seinfeld* ultimately shows that Jews must assimilate in order to be successful in a Gentile world. While Jewishness is certainly not encrypted on *The Nanny*, the ridiculously exaggerated stereotypes contribute to the assumption that all Jewish women are greedy, loud, and low class. In an effort to self-deprecate, *The Nanny* falls short of showing Jewish women in a positive light and only reinforces negative stereotypes. Negative stereotypes and ambiguous Jewry only feed into anti-Semitism. The film *Meet the Fockers* distances itself from previous representations of Jews in the media. Not only are the lead characters of the movie Jewish, but these characters are the ones that the audience is rooting for. *Meet the Fockers* neither encodes Jewishness nor does it employ negative stereotypes. If more films and television shows would follow the lead of *Meet the Fockers*, Jewishness would no longer be so closely associated with negative stereotypes and Jews would enjoy a more positive self-image. It is my hope that there are many more positive representations of happy, unashamed, "Jewish Jews" to come in future

television shows and films.

Work Cited

Antler, Joyce. "Jewish Women on Television: Too Jewish or Not Enough?" Gender, Race, and Class in Media. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, 2003. 665-671.

Baskind, Samantha. "The Fockerized Jew? Questioning Jewishness as Cool in American Popular Entertainment." Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies 25 (2007): 3-17.Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. 20 Apr. 2008.

"Entertaining America: Jews, Movies, and Broadcasting." The Jewish Museum. 2003. National Endowment for the Humanities. 25 Apr.2008<http://www.thejewishmuseum.org/online>.

Krieger, Rosalin. ""Does He Actually Say the Word Jewish?"--Jewish Representation in Seinfeld." Journal for Cultural Research 7 (2003): 387-404. Academic Search Premiere.EBSCO. 20 Apr. 2008.

Schrank, Bernice. ""Cutting Off Your Nose to Spite Your Race": Jewish Stereotypes, Media Images, Cultural Hybridity." Shofar: an Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies 25 (2007): 18-42. Academic Search Premiere. EBSCO. 20 Apr. 2008.

Facebook & Other Social Networking Sites: Candy-coating Surveillance
By Haley B. Dunn

Have You Checked Your Facebook Today?

"Facebook me!"; "She just friended me on Facebook"; "I have got to un-tag that"; "I can't believe he un-friended me!"; "Her status said she was at the mall"…if you cannot understand what these phrases mean, then you must not be on Facebook. Since its launch in February of 2004, Facebook has been deemed "Gen Y's first official revolution", and those who do not have a Facebook account can be considered far removed from the digital loop. Facebook's company overview states that: "Facebook gives people the power to share and makes the world more open and connected. Millions of people use Facebook everyday to keep up with friends, upload an unlimited number of photos, share links and videos, and learn more about the people they meet" (facebook.com). The terms used on this free-access social networking website seem simple enough— users can share information with others, learn more about the people they meet, and keep in touch with old friends. While Facebook does indeed enable people from all over the world to be connected and share information, it has also become an arguably invasive method of surveillance that is encouraging people to embrace living in a surveillance society.

Welcome to Facebook! (A Digital Surveillance Society)

Harvard alum Mark Zuckerberg created Facebook when he was still an undergrad. Originally, the site was only available to Harvard students and then grew to accept students from other Ivy League schools. Rather quickly, the website gained popularity and press and went on to accept all college students, then high school students, and now anyone over the age of 13 years old can create a Facebook account. Since its creation, Facebook has become the most popular website among Americans between the ages of 17-25, and attracts nearly 250,000 new members everyday (Melber 2008). Today, Facebook boasts 130 million active users, and it is the fourth most trafficked website in the world (Facebook.com).

The idea for Facebook stemmed from the paperbound "face books" distributed in small collegiate or preparatory high school communities. These face books were essentially a list of names with

corresponding photos that were intended to unite the community of people, students, faculty, and staff alike. Zuckerberg's original design for Facebook was nearly as simplistic as the paperback design it was based upon—in the first version, users could put up one picture of themselves and include basic information such as name, hometown, birthday, field of study, and maybe a few hobbies and favorite things. Since then, Facebook has quickly become a frighteningly exceptional tool for displaying, exchanging, or simply looking at others' personal information. Not only can users put up an unlimited number of pictures, but other people can put up pictures and "tag" (or attach a name to the digital image) their friends. Users have the option to display their phone numbers, current addresses, class schedules, and even which parties and events they will be attending. One may wonder: why would anyone in their right mind display so much of their personal information? Is Facebook an exhibitionist's paradise or a stalker's dream come true? Or both? One thing is for certain—Facebook and other social networking sites like it have ultimately changed the ways in which people keep track of each other. Ari Melber of *The Nation* magazine writes that Facebook has also changed how people view and value privacy: "…social networking sites are rupturing the traditional concept of privacy and priming a new generation for complacency in surveillance society" (Melber 2008). Facebook has created a new context for the way we watch others and the way we present ourselves—and thereby altered the way people think about privacy and surveillance in general.

Social Surveillance & The Presentation of Self

Before digital technologies, people met and developed friendships with others primarily in the realm of face-to-face interaction. Today, with the availability of social networking sites online, we have seen a change in the construction and maintenance of interpersonal relationships. Facebook, and the onslaught of sites like it, have enabled people to sustain friendships and even meet new friends despite the miles that lie between them. For some, Facebook is their primary resource for keeping track of their friends—as well as enemies, exes, acquaintances, co-workers, etc. Facebook provides reminders for peoples' birthdays in advance, gives users with up-to-the-millisecond information about their friends' activities on Facebook in the mini-feed displayed on the homepage, and even suggests "people you may know" according to the number of mutual

friends between users.

It is not uncommon for people to "friend" (become Facebook friends with) people they are acquaintances with on Facebook. In a world without Facebook, an individual would have to take the time to talk to their acquaintances to get to know them better. "If unacquainted with the individual, observers can glean clues from his conduct and appearance which allow them to apply their previous experience with individuals roughly similar to the one before them, or more important, to apply untested stereotypes to him" (Goffman 1959). In a Facebook savvy world, users do not necessarily need to take the time to talk with their acquaintances or apply past experiences in an effort to glean information or make inferences about them. It would not be outlandish to say that Facebook has become a new place for making a first impression-- all users have to do to learn personal information about their Facebook friends is to look at their page. A Facebook user's page provides a bounty of information for interested parties; not only does it provide "basic" information such as the person's birthday, relationship status, religious and political views, interests, etc.; but there are many other aspects of a person's Facebook that can be used to glean information. "…users readily post photos from wild parties, lists of all their favorite bands and books, and frank comments on others' profiles" (Vaidhyanathan 2008). Aside from the personal information the user themselves provides, a great deal can be learned through looking at the digital interactions on a person's wall (even if you cannot view both sides of the conversation), and furthermore, a person's pictures (whether it be their own personal photo albums or pictures that they are tagged in) provide even more insight into a person's life—the phrase "a picture is worth a thousand words" comes to mind. "It seems that for many, creating and networking online content is becoming an integral means of managing one's identity, lifestyle and social relations" (Livingstone 2008). By using Facebook, an individual performs identity and maintains relationships on a digital frontier.

In the 1950's, social theorist, Erving Goffman, discussed the presentation of self in everyday life as being negotiated through what information individuals "give" and "give off" about themselves to other participants in an interaction. What an individual gives is mostly verbal—it is the effort the participant makes to convey information. Giving off is contrarily non-purposeful and "…involves a wide range of action that others can treat as symptomatic of the

actor, the expectation being that the action was performed for reasons other than the information conveyed in this way" (Goffman 1959). Here Goffman is saying that what an individual gives off is not intentional—it is something that the other participant picks up from how they are dressed, the way in which they talk, or even their general mannerisms. In the realm of Facebook, Goffman's ideas of giving and giving off are evident—but in a new way. The information a user chooses to provide (and they do have the option of how much information they wish to disclose) can be considered what they "give"—however instead of verbal interaction, the user is voluntarily giving information about themselves in the fields provided. What the user gives off, on the other hand, may be in the form of pictures, wall posts from friends, groups they join, events they plan to attend, and even the number of friends a user has. "For example, a person may act in a way that is appropriate at a friend's birthday party, but the photograph taken by someone with a cell phone camera and uploaded to MySpace is not appropriate for a job interview, nor is it necessarily representative of the person" (Tufekci 2008). Despite a person's actions in the realm of face-to-face interaction, Facebook may jeopardize one's preferred presentation of self by presenting information or images that can be misconstrued by others. In regard to face-to-face interaction, Goffman asserts that when an individual is in the presence of others, "the others are likely to find that they must accept an individual on faith, offering him a just return while he is present before them in exchange for something whose true value will not be established until after he has left their presence" (Goffman 1959). Today, not only will individuals make inferences about each other following face-to-face interactions, but they can also look at the other's Facebook page in order to glean additional information and in turn make complementary inferences about them. This new pre/post interaction social research that takes place on Facebook can potentially be problematic when it is conducted by authoritative figures such as police, potential employers, and college admission officers.

Facebook on Your Resume?

Before social networking sites, college applicants already had to worry about creating attractive resumes, crafting impressive essays, and in some cases performing well in interviews with admissions officers. Today, these students (and job applicants alike) should also take into consideration how their Facebook page will affect their

acceptance into their school or job of choice. A study found that of 500 top colleges, 10% of admissions officers acknowledged using Facebook to evaluate applicants and 38% of those who utilized the social networking site said that what they found "negatively affected" their opinion of an applicant. Only a quarter of schools using Facebook to judge applicants said that their opinions were improved, according to the survey conducted by the education company Kaplan (Hechinger 2008). Moreover, it is no surprise that police are also using Facebook to their advantage-- a teen in Jefferson, Colorado was arrested after police saw pictures he uploaded of himself holding handguns (Giffen 2008).

While it is no secret that colleges, potential employers, and law enforcement officials are using Facebook to obtain information about individuals, this has not stopped a majority of Facebook users to continue displaying potentially detrimental information and images on their pages. In a study conducted to research undergraduate students disclosure behavior on social networking sites, one researcher found that a majority of users were only somewhat, but not extremely, concerned with their privacy. The research commented that: "Even though there is a great deal of media coverage of online privacy problems, the participants were not overly worried" (Tufekci 2008).

In the case of younger users, it is fair to say that they may not be developmentally mature enough to understand the repercussions of the information displayed on their Facebook pages. Young adults may use Facebook as a tool by which to express themselves, and to experiment with their identities. "Selves are constituted through interaction with others and, for today's teenagers, self-actualization increasingly includes a careful negotiation between the opportunities (for identity, intimacy, sociability) and risks (regarding privacy, misunderstanding, abuse) afforded by internet- mediated communication" (Livingstone 2008). For young people, Facebook provides the opportunity for users to take control of their identity in a way that they may be prohibited to do so otherwise because of the regiments of school and the supervision of their parents. However, the question still remains: why do so many people—teen aged and beyond-- choose to display so much personal information about themselves on Facebook, despite the prying eyes of acquaintances and authoritative figures?

Privacy Vs. Control

As previously discussed, Facebook profiles can be considered an extension of one's identity into the digital realm. Although there are risks involved with displaying information online, many users feel that the benefits/pleasures associated with disclosing and sharing information, and ultimately taking control over their online personalities, outweigh the potential hazards. "In technologically mediated sociality, being seen by those we wish to be seen by, in ways we wish to be seen, and thereby engaging in identity expression, communication and impression management are central motivations" (Tufekci 2008). It seems that users are less concerned with their privacy on Facebook, and more concerned about the control they have over how others see them in this digital space.

Furthermore, it seems that in today's society, the term privacy does not have the same implications that it once did before surveillance technologies. As we go about our daily routines we are aware that there are other people who may look at us (we may notice them, we may not), and we are aware that there may be surveillance cameras taping us virtually anywhere. While these forms of surveillance may modify our behavior in the sense that we will abstain from picking our noses or shoplifting, it is fair to say that these kinds of surveillance do not make us feel as though our privacy is being overwhelmingly infringed upon. In the case of Facebook, the issue of privacy has always been on the table, but it has not in any way affected the site's phenomenal popularity. "...both Facbook and its privacy protesters largely operated within the same model of privacy control-- opt-in versus opt-out, sharing versus concealing" (Melber 2008), because if a user does not feel comfortable with the amount of information being displayed then they can modify their privacy settings, or simply deactivate their pages.

It seems that the issue of privacy is becoming an increasingly moot topic in our so-called surveillance society. In a world where we know we are being watched, the term privacy takes on a new meaning. "The 'new privacy' is about controlling how many people know-- not if anyone knows" (Melber 2008). Facebook's popularity may be attributed to the "new" kind of privacy it provides its users-- the power to control one's identity and reputation in the digital realm. "When we complain about infringements of privacy, what we really demand is some measure of control over our reputation in the world. If I choose to declare my romantic status or sexual orientation on Facebook, then at least it's my choice, not Facebook's"

(Vaidhyanathan 2008).   Identifying this new concept of privacy poses yet another question: are we being groomed to live in a surveillance society where we have not only internalized surveillance, but furthermore we perform it ourselves by using Facebook? Or are we living in a new kind of society all together-- a synoptic society-- where the rules about privacy and surveillance have changed?

Facebook: A Hyper-Synoptic Society
Gone are the days when it was theorized that we may be living in a panoptic society. Panopticism refers to Michael Foucault's ideas that Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon (a circular prison with isolated cells with an all-seeing guard tower located in the center) could be executed in modern disciplinary societies in the form of schools, factories, prisons, etc. Foucault theorized that panopticism was self-surveillance-- individuals would monitor their own behavior because they were not certain when they were being watched. Essentially, Foucault believed that panopticism would have a regimenting effect on individual's behavior, and would produce "homogenous effects of power" (Foucault 1977). While some may believe that we are living in a panoptic society where we monitor our own behavior and are unaware of when and by whom we are being watched, I believe that we are actually living in a synoptic society.

      A synoptic society refers to assumption that everyone is watching everyone, unlike panopticism, where the few see the many. "It is maintained that the control and discipline of the 'soul', that is, the creation of human beings who control themselves through self-control and who thus fit neatly into a so-called democratic capitalist society, is a task which is actually fulfilled by modern Synopticon, whereas Foucault saw it as a function of Panopticon" (Mathiesen1997). In his discussion of panopticism, Foucault did not take into consideration modern surveillance technologies, which have only multiplied and increased in precision since his time. Because of the onslaught of these new technologies, people know that they are being watched all the time and they can partake in watching others as well. Living in a modern synopticon, people are still just as likely to monitor their behavior (for example, carefully censoring information on one's Facebook page), but they are also likely to behave in ways that could garner attention because they know there is a possibility that they could be noticed and gain fame.

      Facebook could be considered the ultimate synoptic society. The premise of Facebook is to be seen and see others at any time.

People monitor their behaviors on Facebook in order to maintain control over their identities and reputations, but it is interesting to note the ways in which people will attempt to draw attention to themselves (be it positive or controversial), knowing that others will be able to see their actions. For instance, it is not uncommon for users to put up racy pictures of themselves-- whether they be scantily clad, partaking in illegal activities, or in bed with their boyfriend/girlfriend/flavor of the month-- in an effort to be noticed. Furthermore, I have noticed that many people will changed their "status" in order to be noticed. A Facebook status is a field in which a user can write what they are up to at the moment. When a user updates this field, it will read "John Smith is going to the store", or something of the like. However, many users update their status with dramatic information that is likely used to seek attention from many people or even a single person. An example from my mini-feed at this moment reads: "Whitney _____ doesn't know what she ever saw in you". It is fair to say that Whitney wants whoever this person is to read this and be affected by her statement. Whitney utilizes her status in this way because assuming this person has Facebook, he/she will see her status eventually (or even immediately on their mini-feed!), and perhaps recognize that her status is directed to them. It is in this synoptic way that Facebook operates-- peoples' actions on the site are performed with the understanding that others will see them, and the entire basis of the site is to watch others.

Facebook should be considered a hyper-synoptic society where users know everyone is watching each other, and virtually all of their actions on the site are executed with that fact in mind. In society outside of this digital realm, we may not be as conscious of synopticism-- at least not in every action that we take.

Conclusion

The advent of Facebook and other social networking sites have ultimately changed the way people think about privacy and surveillance. Furthermore, Facebook has become a new outlet for the presentation of self and the maintenance of friendships and acquaintanceships alike. Facebook should be considered a hyper-synoptic environment in which all actions are performed with the understanding of and for the purpose of being watched by others. Many users divulge multitudes of personal information in an effort to take control of their identities and reputations, with little concern for their privacy. It seems that in today's surveillance saturated world,

people think of privacy with concern about having control over what others know-- rather than if they know anything at all. Furthermore, Facebook has framed the activity of watching and being watched by others as a fun, leisurely activity. Facebook candy-coats surveillance as something to do on break from work, or as a means of sharing our lives with others. Love it, or hate it, Facebook's unwavering popularity certainly speaks to the fact that peoples' ideas about surveillance and privacy have changed dramatically over the past few years.

Works Cited

Foucault, Michel. <u>Discipline and Punish.</u> 1977.

Giffen, Maria. "Online Privacy". Current Health 2; Mar2008, Vol. 34 Issue 7, 8-11.

Goffman, Erving. <u>The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.</u> 1959.

Hechinger, John. "College Applicants, Beware: Your Facebook Page is Showing". The   Wall Street Journal. September 18th, 2008.

Livingstone, Sonia. "Taking Risky Opportunities in Youthful Content Creation: Teenagers' Use of Social Networking Sites for Intimacy, Privacy, and Self Expression." New   Media and Society. Volume 10(3): 393-411. 2008.

Mathiesen, Thomas. "The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon' revisited."   Theoretical Criminology. Volume 1(2): 215-234. 1997.

Melber, Ari. "About Facebook". *The Nation.* January 7/14, 2008. Pages 22-24.

Tufekci, Zeynep. "Can You See Me Now? Audience and Disclosure Regulation in Online Social Network Sites". <u>Bulletin of Science, Technology, and Society.</u> Volume 28, No. 1. 2008.

Vaidhyanathan, Siva. "Naked in the Nonopticon". *Chronicle of Higher Education*;   2/15/2008, Vol. 54 Issue 23, pB7-B10, 4p, 3 color

www.facebook.com

I can see Russia from my house; Tina Fey & Political Parody
By Leslie Dow

[Unofficial Transcript of Palin/Hillary opener for the 34th season premier of SNL]

Fey/Palin: *Just look at how far we've come, Hillary Clinton who came so close to the white house and me Sarah Palin who is even closer.*

Fey/Palin: *Can you believe it Hillary?*

Poehler/Clinton: *I CAN NOT.*

Fey/Palin: *It's truly amazing and I think women everywhere can agree that no matter your politics its time for a woman to make it to the white house.*

Poehler/Clinton: *NOO! Mine. It was supposed to be mine. I'm sorry I need to say something, I didn't want a woman to be president I wanted to be President and I just happen to be a woman.*

Poehler/Clinton: *And I don't want to hear you compare your road to the white house to my road to the white house. I scratched and clawed through mud a barbed wire and you just glided in on a dog sled, wearing your pageant sash and your Tina Fey glasses.*

Fey/Palin: *What an amazing time we live in to think that just two years ago I was a small town mayor of Alaska's crystal meth capital and now I'm just one heartbeat away from being the President of the United States.*

Fey Palin: *It just goes to show that anyone can be president.*

Poehler/Clinton: *Anyone, anyone, anyone.*

Fey/Palin: *All you have to do is want it.*
Poehler/Clinton: *(laughter) yeah (more laughter) you know Sarah looking back if I could change one thing I probably should have wanted it more (end laughter)*

Fey/Palin*: So in the next 6 weeks I invite the media to be vigilant for sexist behavior.*

Poehler/Clinton*: Although it is never sexist to question female politician credentials please ask this one about dinosaurs.*

Poehler/Clinton*: In conclusion I invite the media to grow a pair and if you cant I will lend you mine.*

On August 29, 2008 Senator John McCain announced his running Vice President candidate would be a governor from Alaska named Sarah Palin. For most people in the country this name would be foreign and unfamiliar. Little did everyone know that the next few months would unravel events that would make Sarah Palin not only a household name, but one that would also carry controversy, news, and most importantly unforgettable parody.

However, what's at stake with putting yourself on the line for a good laugh? Your audience may not align with you and find your joke funny, or maybe the audience is doubled over with laughter and you the comedian are successful. In the world of communication and public discourse, the comedian can be capable of much more. In this essay I examine Tina Fey's political skits of Sarah Palin that aired this year on Saturday Night Live. I first explain history of past political parodies, noting Herb Block's political cartoons of the Nixon scandal, and then a history of SNL. To examine how parody works I have studied theories of political parody through Robert Hairman's essay, *Political Parody and Public Culture*. I have also found several secondary sources consisted of political critics who have written and discussed implications of Fey's impersonations, touching upon apparent sexism embedded in portrayals of Palin and Clinton.

In my research I explain that Tina Fey has been a successful comedian who has not only pulled off a few good jokes, but also has created a way for parody to function rhetorically, unveiling masks and walls of the politically elite, opening up the floor to the public sphere to critique and question their motives and ideas. To hold the political world accountable, parody creates and sustains public consciousness first and foremost by exposing the limitations of dominant discourses: it counters idealization, mythic enchantment, and other form of hegemony (Hairman, 253).

The Event

Parody can be defined in contemporary usage, as a work created to mock, comment on, or poke fun at an original work, its subject or author, by means of humorous or satiric imitation. Parodies can create political and social awareness by bringing a human figure from behind the mask. (Hairman 264) Mocking political figures reveals to audiences a not-so-powerful side to politics that are usually kept hidden from the public sphere.

With the help of today's technology, parodies can be streamed into millions of homes and computers, via popular variety shows such as Saturday Night Live and websites such as YouTube. Political humor grabs audience's attention and holds on to it. Parodies and satiric imitations have the power to stamp themselves into the minds of their viewers, due to the fact they are so far from the norm, they leave a lasting affect.   As an example, the sky rocketing popularity of Tina Fey's infamous Sarah Palin parody has given the audience a new set of eyes to view of the recent 2008 presidential election.

The SNL political skits that started in the fall of 2008 would become almost as important as having the first Black President elected. The 34th season premiere for Saturday Night Live opened with Tina Fey's unforgettable skit imitating Alaska Governor Sarah Palin, along with Amy Poheler acting as Hillary Clinton. This particular skit's topic was on the "ugly role that sexism is playing in the campaign". With Fey' memorable lines of the SNL transcript saying, "*I can see Russia from my house*" and when speaking of the Bush Doctrine, "*I don't know what that is*" to Poheler saying, "*I didn't want a woman to be president, I wanted to be president, and I just happen to be a woman*", this first skit was jam packed with political satire that gave the world an eye opener to this election, which notably the mainstream media has tip-toed around. These memorable lines hint at contemporary discourses of sexism in politics, and credentials of political candidates, which I will further explore.

History of Parody: "Humor is an important vehicle for delivering a message"

Cartoons have historically been one way to poke fun at politics, which can still be used today as rhetorical text. The 1972 Watergate scandal, involving then President Nixon, was played out in historic cartoons created by Herb Block. He published the *Herblock*

Special Report, which featured cartoons and texts revealing Nixon's political activities from the 1940s to his resignation in 1974. The Library of Congress devoted a website to Herb Block's publishing's and states,

> "This incident began the unraveling of the Nixon Administration's abuses of power and illegal actions and the administration's efforts to cover up these activities. Two days after the break-in, Herb Block drew cartoons of Nixon and his attorney general feigning surprise, and saying, 'Who would think of doing such a thing?' This was followed by one of Nixon and Department of Justice officials saying; Remember we don't talk until we get a lawyer" (Library of Congress)

Herb Block spent more than half a century cartooning politics for newspapers, leaving a lasting impression on the nation. One could also argue that he also helped fuel ideas and pave the way for parodying future political figures. According to Harry L. Katz, curator for the Library of Congress, "Humor has been one of his greatest assets, drawing people in, encouraging them to read the cartoons and consider his opinions. Laughter warms the coldest heart and lends perspective to serious issues and events. 'I enjoy humor and comedy,' he says, 'and try to get fun into the work.' Humor is an important vehicle for delivering a message, making it a little easier for the medicine to go down. Herb Block's cartoons may never cure cancer or the common cold, but for the better part of a century they have helped ward off the ill effects of war, bigotry, economic opportunism, political arrogance, and social injustice"(Katz). Humor stemming from parody and irony can help create ideas that are apart from the norm. The so called ill effects in the country that Katz speaks of relate to the inevitable flaws in politics and in the media that SNL has always parodied.

Without resources of the internet, Block's cartoon became one medium in which people could see truth in the Nixon scandals.

Did the October 2008 SNL election specials impersonating Sarah Palin have the same effects of these earlier parodies? Did SNL's skits help influence voters in this election, in particular with the younger demographics? - Maybe. Clearly SNL has grasped a political edge that neither candidates nor other political journalists have, and this edge has become the artistic skill of combining intelligent humor with political satire. By showing over the top

imitations of real life attributes of Sarah Palin, Tina Fey has been an important part of this campaign creating a way for parody to function in our society,

She has invited viewers to critique Sarah Palin in ways that all politicians should be critiqued. Further research shows that the mainstream media did not review Sarah Palin in the same way as Hillary Clinton, or similar to any other political candidate. The research I present stems from political critics who have read this event in a rhetorical way. Their reactions are the relevant to the research of Tina Fey's parody, the implications of this parody, and how new knowledge can be gained from analyzing this event.

"The Fey Effect"

> "Whatever the outcome of the presidential race, one thing's for certain: Come Election Day, a woman will have finally reached the pinnacle of American political power. That woman, of course, is Tina Fey."(Mario Carrea, Denver Post)

Today, the parodies we see on SNL with Tina Fey as Sarah Palin are circulating everywhere and are creating news. Before Fey's infamous SNL skits, no one really touched upon the characteristics of the Alaskan hockey-mom candidate. Since Fey's popular spoofs, SNL ratings have sky rocketed, web hits of her parody have reached the millions, and record numbers of people have watched this years' Vice Presidential debate, all resulting in Sarah Palin's name dominating headlines everywhere. The internet has the ability to bring this election to a wider audience than ever before. People who don't regularly watch the news can get their information through the web. David Bauder quotes Vivi Zigler, the president of NBC Universal Digital Entertainment (owned by General Electric Co.) on this hype of streaming the skits online, "The idea is to create buzz; if people see the clips online they might find them funny and tune in to Saturday Night Live, lapsed viewers might return, or even people who have never seen the show might watch". (Bauder) Such buzz is easy to see if you type in "Sarah Palin" in a Google search, Tina Fey's SNL skit will unsurprisingly appear first.
According to Boston Globe TV critic Matthew Gilbert, Fey's impressions have the capability to change reality. Tina Fey stays extremely close to Palin's transcripts, sometimes repeating her verbatim, making the doubling of her character seem so real (never

mind the freakishly close resemblance of the two). This allows for the reframing of Sarah Palin as someone who (according to Fey's seclected dialog) may be incapable of the job at hand. Her impersonation and its consequences have therefore been coined, "The Tina Fey Effect". According to writer David R. Sands of the Washington Times, "Two new polls find that Mrs. Palin and running mate Sen. John McCain have lost ground in recent days among independent voters — precisely the demographic that the 'outsider/maverick/hockey mom' was supposed to attract. And the numbers suggest that Mrs. Fey's uncanny impersonation of the Alaska governor is playing a role". (Sands) Many people started to believe that the parodies by Fey could have influenced the political outcome of this year's election.

When Sarah Palin decided to perform on Saturday Night Live, she helped the show get the best ratings it had in fourteen years. She went along with the spoof, but stood a neutral ground, not saying too much of anything relevant. She seemed a little more stiff and serious than she has in debates and other interviews. Now questions of whether the Republican VP nominee is actually qualified or not, have made headlines for most major news outlets. Alessandra Stanley from the New York times, states, "Mostly, it was another sign of the brinkmanship of the McCain campaign: just two weeks before the election, the Republicans are not pulling out all the stops to frame Ms. Palin as a knowledgeable, thoughtful vice president; they are showcasing her as a star". She also goes on to explain how political advisors are trying to deal with the "Fey Effect", "So instead of arming their vice-presidential candidate with new economic policy talking points, McCain advisers tried to disarm Ms. Fey" (Stanley).

The initial objective for Sarah Palin to appear on SNL, was to prove that she can take a good joke just like other political figures. However, she has been seen as the butt of the joke after Tina Fey skillfully used strategic parody to expose her in a real way to audiences. It is evident that SNL's political parodies have been so popular and influential that political candidates will put themselves on the line and appear on the show. Parody has always created a form of discourse that political figures now need to be attuned to, because it is playing such an influential part of the whole political process.

Other impacts that involve these satirist shows are seen in current advertising trends. Advertisers that have typically stayed away from political humor on television are starting to come back, stemming from high ratings of SNL and the Daily Show. John

Lafayette explains this comeback in his article, *Political Parodies Pay in Election Year*, "Comedy Central plans to capitalize on the rush to political humor with a live 'Indecision 2008' Election Night special that will be sponsored mainly by clients who signed up last year for a special 'Indecision' package, including Volkswagen, AT&T, Subway, Diageo, Apple, E-Trade, Columbia Sportswear and Anheuser-Busch. The "Indecision" package includes sponsorship in Comedy Central's coverage of the conventions and Election Night, presence on an election-related Web site and other promotional opportunities". Advertisers now want to jump on the political humor bandwagon.

Milf vs. Flurge

The Denver Post quotes political scientist Larry Sabato, who explains how the media have left the credentials of Governor Palin untouched before the recent SNL hype: "the media was too cowed by Palin's gender and by the fervor of her supporters to poke much at her then little-known record"(Sabato). Gender roles have also played a historical factor in this election. However, the media's reactions to both Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin have been significantly different. Again, the very first parody of Tina Fey (as Palin) and Amy Poehler (as Clinton) shed light to these depictions that the media has created for the two political figures. Both actresses make jokes about how Palin pictures have been photo shopped on "sexy bikini bodies", and while others have called Clinton a "flurge". Amy Poehler (playing Hillary Clinton) invites the media to not be afraid to test the credentials of Sarah Palin.

Why and how has the media depicted Clinton as such a harsh, masculine candidate, and Palin as a feminine, good-looking candidate? The jokes not only play on Palin's credentials for Vice Presidency, but also apparent sexism in the race for candidacy. It seems that masculine characteristics as opposed to feminine characteristics of politicians are set under a magnifying glass, and are held more accountable for their appearances. There has been a popular harsher critique of Hillary Clinton, also known as "Feminazi Fever", while Sarah Palin has gotten off a little easier. These depictions can be seen spread across the internet, on blog sites, YouTube videos, and other political satire news sites that are not in mainstream media. Sarah Palin's pictures and videos of her earlier beauty pageant days are some of the things you will find, among photo shopped pictures online. "Some people disliked Hillary just because she was Hillary. But it's true that her personal style –

frequently chilly, determinedly frumpy, visibly calculating, pointedly humorless – did come to seem like a kind of norm" (Applebaum).

Author Linda Hansen from the *Huffington Post*, notes the overwhelmingly misogynistic headlines circulating about Clinton in noting, "Internet social networking sites are especially fertile ground for misogynist seeding; anti-Hillary groups spring up like ragweed in pollen season and, before you can get your hankie out, everybody's sneezing. Facebook is the home of groups like 'Hillary Clinton: Stop Running for President and Make Me a Sandwich and 'Life's a Bitch, Why Vote for One? Anti-Hillary '08'. Myspace hosts 'Citizens United Not Timid'-- catch the acronym"(Hansen). Such headlines as these do not resonate when you search for Sarah Palin online. While Hillary's past brings up her husband's sex scandals, and her strong feminist ideals, Palin's past has notably been summarized by the media as a beauty pageant, hockey mom, and PTA mom. These characteristics all represent certain "feminine" ideals.

Sarah Palin has not been scrutinized in the same way that Clinton has in the media. They have paid close attention to Palin's wardrobe expenses, her hair and makeup, while portraying Hillary as an unfeminine candidate. Writer Mark Anthony Neal talks about the sexism linked between both women in this year's election, "Senator Hillary Clinton and Governor Sarah Palin share very little ideologically or politically, but during the 2008 election cycle, they will be forever linked by the palpable sexism that has accompanied mainstream media coverage of their campaigns. Frenzy over the cost of Palin's RNC sponsored wardrobe is not unlike the mocking of Clinton's pantsuits. In a society largely concerned with the physical attractiveness of women, it's not surprising that women politicians with national constituencies would also be subject to beauty contest standards, even by so-called respectable journalists". (Neal) Even though both women have not been scrutinized in the same light, there is evidence that sexism in politics has been an issue for the both of them. Is there a common ground between the two that would have made a better candidate for the media?

Tina Fey has picked up on this lack of a credentials critique through her SNL skits when she portrays Palin, as a beauty pageant contestant, who is a compulsive winker, waver, and is always smiling. Another famous line from the Vice President Debate skit was when Fey takes out a flute and says, "Are we not doing the talent portion?" If mainstream media won't critique the credentials of women politicians, than SNL, and other political humor shows clearly will.

Carnival Show

According to Robert Hairman, "Parodic artistry crafts a productive articulation of public identity and agency through at least four operations: doubling, carnivalesque spectatorship, leveling, and transforming the world of speech into an antagonistic field of proliferating voices"(253). He defines doubling as creating more than one meaning, or a new meaning, for the subject being mocked. The public discourse of parody allows for audiences to reconsider what they think on a subject, person, or idea. Political parodies are also important symbolic actions. Differences or binary opposites can create meaning. The binary opposite of politics and humor is an effective way to create meaning in a culture, revealing truths that would otherwise be hidden.

In addition Hairman's theories explain how Tina Fey's skits are functioning rhetorically. The *carnival show* she has put on this past fall has created new ways in reading and writing about parody. He explains what parody radically reveals, "Only through the shifts, slippage, and silliness of parody does the prior text become an obviously contrived performance. As the parodic techniques coalesce in the construction of a carnivalesque spectatorship, institutional forms are revealed to be masks, power and status are shown to be acts, and the key to success is not transcendental backing but rather some combination of backstage maneuver and audience gullibility" (256).

Tina Fey has been one influential person this year that has ripped off the mask of politics. SNL together with Fey have challenged ways that politicians get taken up in the media, and the way the public observes them. The prior text Hairman refers to is what gets delivered to an audience in the news about political figures. The act of parodying sets the audience up as spectators to a type of "carnival show". For the veiwerm role parody is playing an important part in this contemporary political media landscape.

The amplified version of Sarah Palin has reconstructed a new genre for political parody. With help from the great Northwestern accent Fey has picked up, she has brought a political figure out of a safety net, and put front in center for the public audience. Attention can be grabbed vividly through amplified parody. The saying "everybody loves a good laugh" is very true in this context. The comedic role in politics today is what reaches most people, especially through websites such as YouTube, and other video clips posted to the internet.

Dichotomy of Politics & Parody

As much as parody and satire work well to jar people into another realm of thinking, it is also oppositional. What can be deemed acceptable, and what is crossing the line? Author James Poniewozik from *TIME* magazine explains tensions that can arise with comedy and politics, "There is such productive tension between politics and comedy because the two fields are so different. Politics is about biting your tongue and sticking to bland bromides (for which you have to blame not just politicians but also voters and the gaffe-happy media). Comedy is about tearing off scabs and unveiling anxieties. In a race that's so much about identity taboos--*an old guy is running against a black guy who defeated a white lady--we need that more than ever*"(Poniewozik). These racial and gendered taboos that won't be shown on your regular news station, but with a little digging on the internet, one is able to find the circulation of discussion on these important topics.

Some tensions arose over Tina Fey's impersonations, bringing ideas of sexism back into question. Some criticized Tina Fey for being sexist with her impersonation of Sarah Palin, especially with the skit of Palin being interviewed by Katie Couric. On the Late Night Show with David Letterman, Fey revealed that, "you have to be able goof on the female politicians just as much otherwise you're treating them as weaker". As far as tensions arising over parody, Hairman believes that parody is neither radical nor conservative, but both at once. (254) Parodies are not limited to the left or the right, but an important part of political humor is to bring irony to both sides. SNL has exemplified this fact by parodying not only Sarah Palin, but also Hillary Clinton, Barrack Obama, John McCain, Joe Biden, and countless other politicians.

The relationship between politics and parody is one that has become an important part of culture. Russian author Anatolii Dmitriev has explored the relationship between humor and politics, "Humor and laughter have become integral, albeit variable and mobile, attributes of the political process. Political humor, even in extreme manifestations, cleanses society and protects part of the population from authoritarian pretensions. In some sense it is the 'fiftth branch of power', the most unagressive of all". (Dmitriev) Humor in politics is vital for a society and culture to remain critical of its politics and authority. The cleansing of society keeps balance, order, and reality in politics. It can bring about influence, change, and truth to politics.

Tina Fey can also be categorized as a political prankster. The binary depictions of being politically elite, and part of the populous, can be played out in a form known as culture jamming. Culture jamming is a way a prankster performs an art of rhetorical jujitsu, in an effort to redirect the resources of commercial media toward new ends(Harold, 3). Culture jamming uses parody, and pranking to bring to the table something unexpected to shock its audiences. In this way, Tina Fey's parodies of Sarah Palin can be considered a rhetorical form of culture jamming. On SNL, Fey was a witty prankster who could reveal truths onto society that mainstream media would normally omit. Authors Margaret Farrar and Jamie Warner also define culture jamming as activists who deliberately subvert spectacular images in order to reclaim them. This idea of culture jamming uses political parody, satire, and irony, as a vehicle to create opposition to dominant images of politics. "Through their use of ironic self-presentation and humor, political culture jammers offer an appealing alternative means of invigorating political praxis by complicating the citizen/spectator binary that so many critics invoke". (Farrar, Warner)

New Knowledge

There is so much that can be embedded into political satire, which is up for grabs for any comedians savvy enough to do so. Political parodies have gained a new recognition since Tina Fey's appearances on SNL during this past election season. By pushing boundaries and challenging issues through parody, I believe that politics will be different as we progress into the future. There is a chance to minimize sexism in politics if it is pushed into the spotlight by political parodies, thus allowing for a questioning of these issues.

I do not believe that my research shows that Fey's Palin parody had the most influence on Obama winning the 2008 election. What I have found is that this event has circulated very highly in political news, has had many implications on gender issues, and has brought people to political consciousness. Much of Hairman's theories on functions of parody have served invaluable in this research, however I take a different stance on his views of the audience. He deems them as having the important characteristic of gullibility, and also argues that the parodied subject is held up to be exposed and ridiculed rather than discussed, and he or she is offered up to anyone who might be played for a laugh, rather than for peer review(255). I think that this event has brought about more

discussion of politics from the audience. There has been a recent rise in politically conscious irony in contemporary media, and this consciousness has undeniably stemmed from Tina Fey. The medium YouTube, as a rhetorical communication tool has brought new attention to parodies, as well as new responses to them, thus bringing a type of "peer review" for the parodies' object.

The idea that political figures are not flawless is an important aspect which has been brought to attention. A social norm that has always existed is that political leaders are all righteous and perfect. I have explored and discovered that parody challenges this notion. Joao Duarte Ferreira explains how parody becomes the backbone for this attention, "To be able to fulfill its critical and ridiculing function, parody presupposes the law or the norm to be challenged, as well as its own discursive codification. What is at stake here is of course an authorized transgression of social norms" (66). Tina Fey has been the most popular of the SNL cast to challenge these norms.

Tina Fey has done more than pull of a good mockery in her performances. She has created a ripple effect that is bigger than spoofing an unknown politician. This event is layered and can be taken apart for examination. One layer is made up of the secondary sources- the critics and what they have written and discussed about her famous parody. The next layer consists of the scholars who have theorized the functions of parody and what they can create. The last layer is how the history, the theories, and relevant journalism are tied together because of this event. The genre of political parody now has new players who are not only the comedians, the journalists, or the scholars, but the audience who are unknowingly playing the role of jurors, now able to evaluate politics with the green light of parody.

By countering ideologies, mythic enchantment, and other forms of hegemony, the parodies of Sarah Palin have become a forceful commodity to political awareness. Sarah Palin's mythic enchantment can be categorized with the media paying attention to her good looks, wardrobe, hockey-mom feminine persona, and her all American woman ideals. SNL along with Tina Fey has done a historical and influential job at bringing an audience to see beyond these myths and hegemony, to assess a politician in ways which hold true to the democracy that has built our country.

Works Cited

Applebaum, Anne. "Sarah Palin brings the Hillary Clinton era to an end."
    Against Hillary Clinton. 6 Sep. 2008. 5 Nov.
    2008.<http://www.againsthillary.com/2008/09/06/sarah-palin-
    brings-the-hillary-clinton-era-to-an-end/>

Bauder, David. "For Many Viewers, it's Saturday Night Later: More fans
    watching Fey's Palin impersonation online than on TV."MSNBC.
    19 Oct. 2008. 2 Nov. 2008.
    < http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/27268260/>.

Correa, Mario. "Fey's Palin parodies change political landscape."
    Denverpost. 11 Oct. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008
    <http://www.denverpost.com/nationalpolitics/ci_10682285>.

Dmirtiev, Anatolii. "Humor and Politics." Russian Social Science Review.
    49 (2008) : 53-89.

Duarte, Joao Ferreira. "Transgression of Parody." European Journal of
    English Studies 3 (1999) : 64-77

Gilbert, Matthew. "TV critic Matthew Gilbert took your questions." The
    Boston Globe. 16 Oct. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008
    <http://www.boston.com/ae/tv/chats/101608gilbertchat/>.

Hairman, Robert. "Political Parody and Public Culture." Quarterly Journal of
    Speech 94 (2008) : 247-272.

Hansen, Linda. "I Am Woman…Misogyny, Ambivalence, and the Clinton
    Campaign". The Huffington Post. 1 Feb. 2008. 3 Nov. 2008. <
    http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-hansen/i-am-
    womanmisogyny-am_b_84555.html>

Harold, Christine. "Pranking Rhetoric: Culture Jamming as Media
    Activism." Critical Studies in Media Communication 21 (2004) :
    189-211

Jenkins, Mercilee M. , Lovaas, Karen. "Chapter 18 Queering the Sacred
    (Body) Politic." Sexualities and Communication in Everyday Life:
    A Reader. CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2007.

Katz, Harry. "Herblock's History". Library of Congress. 9 Nov. 2001. 2
    Nov. 2008.
    < http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/about.html>.

Key, Caroline. "Political Parodies Define Upcoming Election". The
    Pendulum. 29 Oct. 2008. 5 Nov. 2008.
    <http://www.elon.edu/pendulum/Story.aspx?id=1112>

Lafayette, John. "Political Parodies Pay in Election Year" TV Week. 5 Oct.
    2008. 22 Oct. 2008
    <http://www.tvweek.com/news/2008/10/political_parodies_pay_in_
    elec.php>.

Neal, Mark. "OPINION: Sexism, Misogyny and Sarah Palin." <u>News One:</u>
  <u>For Black America</u>. 24 Oct. 2008. 3 Nov. 2008 <
  http://newsone.blackplanet.com/elections/op-ed-sexism-misogyny-
  and-sarah-palin/>

Poniewozik, James. "That's Not Funny!" <u>Time</u> 28 Jul. 2008: p21-21

PRNewswire-USNewswire via COMTEX. "The SNL Effect: 'Saturday
  Night Live' Political Skits Make Real Impact on Voters." <u>The Wall</u>
  <u>Street Journal Digital Network</u>. 5 Nov. 2008. 5 Nov. 2008. <
  http://www.marketwatch.com/news/story/The-SNL-Effect-
  Saturday-Night/story.aspx?guid=%7B75B08A75-8B2F-442C-
  BD8B-0C54AE0661B6%7D>

Sands, David R. "As Tina Fey soars, Sarah Palin struggles." <u>The</u>
  <u>Washington Times</u>. 8 Oct. 2008. 22 Oct. 2008
  <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/oct/08/tina-fey-
  soars-sarah-palin-struggles/>.

Stanley, Alessandra. "On 'SNL' It's the Real Sarah Palin, Looking Like a
  Real Entertainer." <u>The New York Times</u>. 19 Oct. 2008. 22 Oct.
  2008
  <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/20/arts/television/20watch.html
  ?ref=politics>.

Farrar, Margaret. Warner, Jamie. "Spectacular Resistance: The Billionaires
  for Bush and the Art of Political Culture Jamming" EBSCOhost

Scheming on Screen: The Art of Audience Manipulation as Manifested in *John Q.*
By Jenna Heinz

       Film is an extremely effective and influential medium in the evocation of emotion and delivery of drama. It is known and praised for the incredible "experience" it gives its audience through its mildly hypnotic images. Ever since the creation of cinema it has been clearly noted that the mass appeal film has on movie-goers is its sense of escape from everyday reality. For a short while, the audience lives in the world unfolded for them by the film. It is effortless to see then how it is possible and quite universal for audience members to become emotionally involved in what they are viewing as they become a part of the world on the screen. It is the director's job to invoke public emotion and it is common for him or her to do whatever it takes to achieve it, especially in politically motivated films whose purpose is to create a public uproar on current issues. Concerns of over-the-top plots, exaggerated "real-life" situations, and the manipulation of the audience's feelings frequently come into play in the review of politically focused films such as *John Q* (2002).

       The issues raised surrounding the release and production of the film *John Q.* are becoming more significant in 21st-century culture. Every year millions of people are exposed to major Hollywood films, and an even more overwhelming number are exposed to the ideas and images of films through advertising, news, and the entertainment media. Therefore, the question left unanswered seems to be: What does the fictionalized world of filmmaking owe us when it comes to political statements, and just how far do they have to push to get the public talking before it's considered manipulation?

       In 1993, nine years prior to the opening day of *John Q.*, screenwriter James Kearns read an article in a newspaper that quoted an older wealthy man, who was the recipient of a heart transplant. "If I wasn't rich, I'd be dead by now," the man said. "Then I thought about my own kids," recalls Kearns in the DVD commentary. "What would you do if your child were dying and you were denied access to medical care? The health crisis in America and in other parts of the world rages on. It's an extremely complex issue that affects every strata of our society." The idea then for the drama, *John Q.* was jumpstarted.

The 112 minute film tells the dramatic story of John Q. Archibald, an average man struggling to provide for his wife Denise, and son Mike. As John and Denise were cheering on their son at one of his baseball games, the family's financial situation turned into a life or death dilemma when Mike collapsed due to a life-long condition of his heart being too big which was previously undetected. The situation becomes more bleak as the family is informed that if Mike does not receive a heart transplant immediately he will die. Unfortunately, John's HMO will not pay for the expensive procedure. With his wife pleading for him to act, and the hospital and his insurance agency unwilling to help, John takes matters into his own hands and holds the hospital's lead cardiac surgeon, among others in the emergency room, hostage until his son's name is placed on the heart transplant list. The title of the film is in reference to the term "John Q. Public," which is a term used to represent the "common man."

Alan L. Wells, PhD, a bioethics scholar stated that "[t]he movie mirrors some disturbing trends. Simply put, for many, life is really very sad underneath the statistics on health disparities, and medicine is failing to meet its social responsibilities" (Wells, 1). The movie is a protest against the policies and hidden procedures of many of today's insurance companies. Director Nick Cassavetes attacks the American Health Care System and criticizes hospitals and health care providers for working together against the working class. Cassavetes' hostage drama triggered a mixed discussion among insurance companies, the public, and journalists about the relationship between entertainment and politics. "There is a burgeoning interest in the health and illness content of popular media in the domains of advertising, journalism, and entertainment" (Kline, 43). DeLuca and Peeples argue that the public's perception is shaped by a mass-mediated culture in which images, spectacle, emotion and distraction are a constant in everyday life, a string of events they call "the public screen." DeLuca and Peeples help show how Jürgen Habermas' "public sphere" models, a network for communicating information and points of view, and consequently "politcal discourse are privileged even though they may not be a good fit for fictional media" (69).

Perhaps as a result of this awkward "fit" between political discourse and fictional film, the majority of the critical responses to *John Q.* were negative. The mixed reviews generally praised few aspects of the film, most of which primarily applauded Denzel

Washington's performance. Although some were positive, most had expressed serious reservations about the film's realism.

However, much controversy and criticism of the film starts with its fictional simplicity and melodramatic manipulation of the audience's emotions on the "public screen." In the *Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel*, reviewer KJ Bozelka stated that the film is hard to take seriously. "This film aims to show how desperately America is in need of health care reform. But is that possible to convey through such a cartoon character as John Q. Archibald?" Similarly argued, a reviewer from the *Wall Street Journal* stated, "the issue of how to assure that all Americans have access to quality health care is a complex one with few easy answers. It is not a case of bad guys vs. good guys, as action drama movies must portray."

An audience is easily swayed because of their identification with the protagonist and a storyline that capitalizes on emotional and personal connections. Hence, Peeples' and DeLuca's fitting definition of the public screen, which "takes technology seriously" and places "emotion over rationality" (133). Roger Ebert wrote in the *Chicago Sun-Times:* "I agree with its message—that the richest nation in history should be able to afford national health insurance—but the message is pounded in with such fevered melodrama, it's as slanted and manipulative as your average political commercial."

The thin line between emotion and rationality is where the concern lies about using the tools of Hollywood to address a serious issue. Audiences can easily be misled by the "realism and feasibility of the film's plot . . . . because the *John Q.* plot line resided right on the borders of believability" (West 85). Trudy Lieberman , author of *Trustworthy Information: The Role of the Media,* feels that "media outlets fail to provide viewers with the accurate information they need, and they provide too much information that is misleading, unreliable, or simply useless" (115). A critic from the *St. Petersburg Times* was concerned that after watching the movie, Americans would view themselves equally as vulnerable to poor treatment and stated: "Director Nick Cassavetes takes the cracks that some patients fall into and exaggerates them into canyons swallowing us all." Reviewers and commentators complain that "*John Q.* fails the test of realism or accuracy, with a consensus emerging that any perceived inaccuracies or exaggerations (in the service of a dramatic license) only undermine the movie's message" (West 85). A *Time* magazine article also discussed this falsehood of the movie, quoting Anne Paschke, a spokeswoman for the United Network for Organ Sharing. "That's

Hollywood," she said, "The fact is, there are a lot of things that would prevent that from happening in the real world."

Hollywood doesn't have any formal or legal obligation to be accurate in its fictional representations, but critics seem to be concerned with a moral obligation to not distort facts to the public, especially when a film does not provide a realistic solution. If taken literally, this film promotes that violence is the answer. The *St. Petersburg Times* protested the fact that "John Q. takes a serious problem and finds only the most irrational solution." An article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* agreed and said, "The film deserves points for tackling a difficult subject, but it hasn't a clue about fixing those problems. Threatening your local casualty nurse with a gun doesn't seem a helpful suggestion."

However, although a minority, there are a few articles and journalists who praise *John Q.*'s political statement. The audience's approval clashed with the critical disapproval and kept the film at a respectable box office spot. One review argues that the film did succeed in its political goals. The New Orleans *Times-Picayune* writes, "*John Q.* manages to be entertaining as well as informative. There's no denying the gripping nature of the drama, even if certain aspects of the medical industry's behavior are exaggerated to strengthen the movie's case for national healthcare." Along the lines of that argument, "those who think *John Q.* has some redeeming qualities point to its use of narrative, drama, and strong characters as necessary techniques in mobilizing interest and support among an apathetic, depoliticized public" (West 93). Of the many things that can be said of the film, it can be broken down into two classes: a productive piece for public discourse vs. over manipulation of the issue and audience. The latter seems to be the most believable when scenes and dialogue are broken down and carefully looked at.

In the first few chapters of the film, the audience is introduced to the burdened family who, though they have strong tension at times, care endlessly for each other. The film mostly follows John in his quest to get answers, insurance coverage, and essentially his son's name placed on the heart transplant list. John's initial desperation does not begin with a violent hostage situation, but rather with paperwork. The audience is invited to go on the long, ultimately dead-end, journey with John and Denise in a particular montage sequence. Along with the journey, the audience witnesses the emotional damage that is starting to weigh on the ill-fated family. The audience easily identifies with the family and grows to adopt the

emotions that Denise and John are going through. It is here that the heart-strings of the audience start to be "played" by the director. With his viewers already attached to the family's story and the unfortunate turn of events in young Mike's life, director Nick Cassevetes drags the audience along with him on a turbulent ride of exasperation against U.S. healthcare policies and insurance industries.

The paperwork montage sequence ends with a camera shot from waist upwards of John sitting at his kitchen table, fingering through his mail. The camera swings around to his point-of-view, looking down at a specific letter. The camera scrolls the words quickly but comes to a standstill on the words "your appeal has been approved." Finally, some sort of assurance is brought to John and Denise that things can and will work out. The audience can smile and relax knowing that something is going John's way after all. However, that quick sigh of relief is shattered as the scene ends with an abrupt stop to the music that has been continually playing and a close up of Rebecca Paine, the cold hospital administrator, with the letter in her hand saying, "No, no, no. You filed an appeal? An appeal is for an already existing claim. What you needed to file was a grievance. You'll have to resubmit. But that could take up to thirty days."

The audience then feels as the characters do: it was all for nothing. John and Denise have wasted an entire week (indicated by the issuing and approval of the appeal) feeling invisible, alienated, alone, forgotten, ignored and misunderstood for nothing. The emotions of the audience have been viciously brought upon and can now feel the utter distress and outrage that John and Denise must feel. But does this really happen? It is easy for the audience to get so involved in the emotional aspects of the film that he or she forgets to ask themselves if the truth is ultimately being portrayed. John and Denise hold the attitude that all state-run facilities are both unhelpful and uncaring. The camera shifts from showing John on screen, to then allow the audience to see his point of view, showing us what John sees, hears and feels. Thus, there is no evidence or indication of where the line lies between truth and fiction; exaggeration and emphasis.

It is after this montage that the film takes on a completely different approach to portraying its message to its audience. It becomes apparent at this point that there is a dichotomy in the film between the "grim" reality of John's situation, his change in employment, his downgrade in healthcare, the bureaucracy of the health care system, and the surreal spectacle of the second half of the

film that's more of a live action movie. The first half of the film successfully grabbed the attention of the audience and held on to their emotions tied to the characters with their unfortunate story, and lead them into a high stress situation that is made sensible because of the identification with John and the ability for the audience to understand his situation. There is tension here between a film that is trying to do political work, and one that merely manipulates the public as part of the Hollywood marketing scheme. The chaos of the hostage situation is best represented by a helicopter's view of the outside premises. It shows a few dozen police officers barricading the scene, news trucks and cameras scattered throughout the area, and a shockingly massive amount of spectators all rooting for John and his cause. This contributes to the film's reliance on provoking emotion from its audience rather than a logical awareness.

It seems to be that the intent of the filmmakers was to push a hot political issue through interpretation of what they understood to be, mass public opinion. However, the filmmakers chose to do this by appealing to audience emotion rather than realistic logic or reason. Hollywood's fictional representations of real-life situations border the lines of believability and can leave its audience questioning if something as dramatic as a *John Q.* situation can happen to him, her or a loved one. Coincidentally enough, close to six years after the film's release, united healthcare has become one of the most popular political issues facing the candidates for the 2008 presidential election.

Works Cited

Bozelka, K J. ""John Q." Needs Healthy Dose of Realism." <u>Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel</u> 15 Feb. 2002.

Davis, R. ""John Q." Vs. Healthcare System." <u>USA Today</u> 21 Feb. 2002.

Ebert, Roger. ""John Q." Tugs At Too Many Heartstrings." <u>Chicago Sun-Times</u> 15 Feb. 2002.

Kleinschrodt, M H. "Political Drama Remembers Also to Entertain." <u>Times Picayune</u> 15 Feb. 2002.

Kline, Kimberly N. "A Decade of Research on Health Content in the Media: the Focus on Health Challenges and Socioculturual Context and Attendant Informational and Ideological Problems." <u>Journal of Health Communication</u> 11 (2006): 43-59.

Kluger, Jeffrey, Bjerklie, and David. "John Q.: How Real is This Horror Story?" <u>Time</u> 159 (2002).

Lieberman, Trudy. The Trust Crisis in Healthcare. Ed. David A. Shore. Oxford UP, Inc., 2007. 115-131.

Martinez, Barbara. "Health Insurers Try Ounce of Prevention Against "John Q."" The Wall Street Journal 14 Feb. 2002.

Mitchell, Elvis. "If Arguing Won'T Move Insurers, Maybe a Gun Will." The New York Times 15 Feb. 2002.

Noelker, D. "Letters to the Editor: the Daunting Expense of Transplants." The Wall Street Journal 5 Mar. 2002.

Peeples, J, and K M. Deluca. "From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the "Violence" of Seattle." Critical Studies in Media Communication 19 (2002): 125-151.

Persall, S. "Healthcare Fraud." St. Petersburg Times 14 Feb. 2002.

Stryker, J. "More Drama Added to Politics of Transplants." The New York Times 19 Feb. 2002.

Verghese, A. "Changing Hearts." The New York Times 10 Mar. 2002.

Wells, Alan L. "Reevaluating the Social Contract in American Medicine." Ethics Journal of the American Medical Association 6 (2004).

West, Emily. "Scolding John Q.: Articulating a Normative Relationship Between Politics and Entertainment." Communication Review 8 (2005): 79-104.

Yamey, Gavin. "Film: the Curious Adoption of John Q." BMJ 324 (2002): 551.

Buck vs. Bell and the Eugenic Sterilization Movement in Early 20th Century America
By Andrew Long

> Of the high importance of the intellectual faculties there can be no doubt, for man mainly owes to them his predominant position in the world.
> Charles Darwin, *The Decent of Man (1871)*

> Eugenics co-operates with the workings of Nature by securing that humanity shall be represented by the fittest races. What Nature does blindly, slowly and ruthlessly, man must do providently, quickly and kindly.
> Sir Francis Galton

Over the course of the early twentieth century, the United States of America was confronted with the cultural policies associated with eugenics. Although eugenic policy provided many cultural implications on society, none had the overwhelming cultural aura as that of mandatory sterilization. The institution of this policy through monetary and intellectually backed legislation, landmark court decisions, scientific findings, and public opinion campaigns worked to frame mandatory sterilization into a perceived positive cure for social ills and misgivings.

In this essay, through the examination of the 1927 Supreme Court case of Buck vs. Bell, I explore the ways in which this landmark court case was a cornerstone to the implementation of mandatory sterilization as well as the cultural implications this procedure had on society at this time. The case looks at the proposed sterilization of a woman named Carrie Buck of Charlottesville, VA, who according to state physicians suffered from hereditary 'feeblemindedness.' The Buck vs. Bell verdict rendered not only a national acceptance of mandatory sterilization but also a stamp on the validity of eugenic philosophy within the power circle of the United States.

The arguments made by James Hendren Bell following the ideas of Albert Priddy, both superintendents of the Virginia Colony for the Epileptic and Feebleminded, follow the same rhetorical strategies used by earlier eugenics advocates citing social concern and social well-being. In this way, the main argument for the sterilization

of Carrie Buck was founded in authoritative power within the field of social and genetic science. The argument that Carrie Buck was part of a hereditary line of promiscuous and 'feebleminded' women, a trait shared by her mother and infant daughter, was presented to the court as viable grounds for a state sponsored sterilization procedure. James Hendren Bell sought to display and prove to the Supreme Court Justices that the life of Carrie Buck was representative of a young woman with sexual inhibitions and acute feeblemindedness. Moreover, Bell wanted to show evidence that these traits were inherited though birth and became apparent and continuous after she gave birth to an illegitimate daughter while in the custody of a foster family. This raises the question, did the court have a legitimate understanding of Carrie's circumstances beyond reasonable doubt, or was the churning eugenics movement enough to sway the opinion of eight of the nine most respectable judicial minds of the time? What social, historical, cultural, and ideological terrain does the Buck vs. Bell case encounter as well as make its mark upon? In the end, what does the Buck vs. Bell case tell us about the overall public conception in early twentieth century America of eugenic policy?

The controversial case of Buck vs. Bell, that dealt with the proposed mandatory sterilization of a young woman has become one of the most famous and remarkable cases in the history of the Supreme Court. The defendant, Carrie Buck, was born in Charlottesville, VA in 1907, as an unfortunate child of Emma Buck. Due to the death of Carrie's father and the consensus in the town that Emma was unable to care for her, Carrie was placed in a foster home at the age of three where she remained until she was seventeen. During this time, Carrie was the foster-child of a wealthy family, but was unfortunately treated as if she were an indentured servant. In 1923, Carrie was raped by the nephew of her foster mother, became pregnant and gave birth to an illegitimate child. This birth was considered an example of her incorrigible sexual nature and subsequently, she was committed to the Virginia Colony for the Epileptic and Feebleminded, where her mother was already a resident. According to Albert Priddy, the Superintendent of the colony, both Carrie and Emma Buck suffered from similar forms of 'feeblemindedness' with the apparent mental capacities of eight year olds and obvious problems with sexual promiscuity.[xl]

The origins of the case against Carrie Buck are complicated. Dr. Albert Priddy, the superintendent who first admitted Carrie Buck to the Virginia Colony for the Feebleminded and Epileptics was a

staunch proponent of sterilizing what he deemed were promiscuous women. He stated, "The admission on female morons to this institution has consisted for the most part of those who would formerly have found their way into the red light district and become dangerous to society."[xl] However, Priddy was aware that the process of sterilization was quite out of the eyes of the law and henceforth tried to conjure up ways to perform the surgeries for trumped reasons such as a therapeutic procedure or by having victims unknowingly agree. However, in 1916, Priddy sterilized two of the female members of a lower class family without consent, resulting in the head of the household, George Mallory filing a suit against him. Though the court upheld the actions of Priddy, behind closed doors he was warned not to sterilize anyone else without consent of the law.[xl] Eugenic legislation was slow to follow in the state of Virginia, however when it finally appeared in March of 1924, Carrie Buck gave Priddy an opportunity to test the new law. Priddy then filed a request to have Carrie Buck sterilized on the basis that her condition was due to inherited 'defects' that could be passed down to her next of kin. He concluded that "[The Bucks] belong to the shiftless, ignorant, and worthless class of anti-social whites of the South."[xl] Moreover, representatives from the Eugenics Record Office were requested to attend the upcoming trial to examine Vivian, Carrie's illegitimate daughter, to determine that she also suffered from traits of feeblemindedness. All the while, her legal guardian, attorney Robert Shelton who was appointed by the state of Virginia through the colony, was instructed to appeal each judgment through the courts, up to the Supreme Court as a manner of display.[xl]

After the death of Albert Priddy, James Hendren Bell was named the superintendent of the Virginia Colony for the Epileptic and Feebleminded. Bell brought the case through the courts and pleaded it was in the best interest for not only Buck, but also for the state of Virginia for her to be sterilized. Court cases ensued and made their way through the Virginia court system and eventually to the Supreme Court. As he was instructed, Robert Shelton continually challenged the constitutionality of the sterilization act passed by Virginia in 1924. Despite his argument, in a ruling of 8-1, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of this act, affirming that Carrie Buck should be sterilized due to the fact that not only she, but her mother, and her six month old daughter were diagnosed as 'feebleminded'. In his case report, Judge Oliver Wendell Holmes reported that, "It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate

offspring for their crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind…three generations of imbeciles are enough"[xl]

In support, the New York Times printed an article on May 3, 1927, a day after the Buck vs. Bell decision had been reached. The headline read "Upholds Operating On Feeble-Minded" with a specific statement telling that this decision was made within the context of "The Right to Protect Society." As the article goes on to describe the case finding and Judge Oliver Wendell Holmes' remarks, stating that the Law "does all that it can" the article quotes perhaps the most poignant and shocking statement.

In the view of the general declarations and the specific findings of the court, obviously we cannot say as a matter of law that the grounds do not exist, and if they exist they justify the result. We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the state for these lesser sacrifices, often not felt to be such by those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence[xl]

In order to situate the discourse, we first must address what the Buck vs. Bell case tells us about the social, historical, cultural, and ideological views towards eugenics and the process of sterilization. Eugenics was implemented as a philosophical thought in America by the early 20th century. However, Eugenics was a term first coined by Sir Francis Galton in 1883, (though it has roots as far back as Plato's *Republic*). Eugenics surrounds body of philosophical thought dealing with ways to "improve" human hereditary traits as part of a socially responsible plan for the human race to save resources, costs, and end human suffering.[xl] Galton, who was the cousin of Charles Darwin, used Darwin's research on the natural selection of plants and animals and applied this research to human beings. In his original philosophy of eugenics, Galton advocated for an increase in "good stock" namely from those who were well off, educated, and of Anglo-Saxon decent. From his research Galton deemed this group racially superior, which he claimed "proved that the genius of prominent contemporaries was derived from their families' superior hereditary".[xl]

Galton's positive eugenics theory quickly gained a following in Europe, and with it, tactics for improving the quality of human life. With increasing scientific interest, eugenic theory also quickly gained acceptance across continents and dominated scientific thought and

public health policy the world over. However, in America and Germany, a different kind of eugenic theory began to prosper, that of Negative Eugenics. From this philosophy spurred an array of practical solutions, first and foremost, sterilization, which was discussed and eventually accepted as a feasible eugenic option to rid societies of 'defects'. The American Eugenics Society (AES) founded in 1923, was the culmination of the overwhelming acceptance to this concept in the states, as well as the foremost body of American thought on the subject. The AES sought dominance over a German eugenics movement, which until the 1930's also vied for superiority within the international scientific community.[xl]

One could surmise when looking at how quickly eugenic policies sprung up across the United States that these pieces of legislation expanded their influence in eugenics both domestically and abroad. However, while in Great Britain experts suggested instituting positive eugenic policy, America set its sights on negative policy which sought the "sterilization of society's failures". [xl] Both the AES and ERO had the philosophy of breeding the strongest members of society while preventing the weakest members from reproducing. [xl]

In examining the type of 'fit' families the AES and ERO had in mind to breed good stock, we must remember the overt feelings of superiority of white Anglo-Saxson decent. The guilded age provided a society with seggreated social classes led by wealthy, educated, prominent white families who were in a small minority. On the other end of the spectrum, tens of thousands of uneducated lower class whites became characterized more with black and immigrant populations than with the white cultural elite.[xl] The notion that these 'tainted-white' citizens were reproducing unfit children caused great concern among elite whites who saw themseleves as racially and intellectually superior. As a result, the white elite used negative nomenclature such as 'feebleminded' to describe this group, a condition which warrented protection and seperation from society.

Although disputed in court, the case for the sterilization of Carrie Buck had been decided long before the hearing by researchers looking into maintaining the provocation of good genetic lineage. As a victim of the eugenic philosophy movement, Carrie Buck became a nationalized figure for the practice of involuntary sterilization of those with perceived diminished physical and mental capacity. Between the years of 1911 and 1930, 24 states had passed sterilization laws aimed at various social 'misfits,' including the

mentally retarded, criminals, and the insane..[xl] These states, which also included Delaware, Montana, Michigan, as well as many other southern states had used the Model Eugenical Sterilization Law published by Harry Laughlin in 1914 to allow involuntary eugenic sterilization in state legislation. Through the case of Buck vs. Bell, these implemented practices of eugenic policy gained a new authenticity—in the end becoming accepted nationally as a means of protecting both impaired individuals and society.

Carrie Buck was diagnosed as a 'feebleminded' poor, white girl due to the circumstances of her birth rather than her actual characteristics. Her mother, Emma Buck, was perceieved to have the intelliegence of an eight year old with social issues of immorality, divorce, and records of prostitution. Carrie was born fatherless with no clear knowledge of her deceased father. In this time, such a conception into the world was treated with contempt and as a result, Carrie was adopted by a respected family in the Lynchburg area to raise her in a respectable manner. However, upon her rape and subsequent illegitiamate pregnancy, it was determined on the basis of her genetic heritage that she was truly feebleminded and subject to sexual proclivity. The fact that she was raped by the nephew of her foster mother was never publicly disclosed at the time, resulting in a public perception that her pregnancy was due to an action resulting from her feeblemindedness and her uncontrollable sexual urge. More damaging was the fact that Carrie's daughter, Vivian, appeared to show signs of feeblemindedness, just as her mother and grandmother before her. This perception appeared to public officals, and those at the Virginia Colony for the Epileptic and Feebleminded as a dangerous hazard for the respectable elite of society. How could an up and coming society function with generations of feebleminded women breeding more and more illegitimate unfit youths?

Although the Buck vs. Bell case only represents one of the many victims of the eugenics movement and the laws that enforced sterilizations, its details and history behind the case shed light on the views of many Americans at the time with wealth, power, and prestige and their quest to remove those from society not of their kind. As an unfortunate repercussion of their views, many who sought to make the world a better place, in the cliché version of the phrase, were swept into the allure of an actual science that could do just this. Even more vile were those who embraced the eugenic ideology, knowing full well that much of the data and propaganda was false and detrimental.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., was the respected son of the famous literary giant and lived a life of privilege and intrigue that culminated with being appointed Supreme Court Justice in 1902. To the public, he was considered one of the greatest living Americans, but in his personal life, Holmes had many prejudices towards Americans of the lower class. He, like other prominent thinkers at the time, believed in the sterilization of people of lower stature for reasons such as feeblemindedness, especially in women. Eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices, including the Jewish humanitarian Louis Brande decided in favor of Bell and the state of Virginia because of the notion that it would help society at large rather than thinking of the person. In turn, this decision was essential to the argument because it made the process an issue of the greater good over the individual.[xl]

As an indirect result of this case, the public began to accept these thoughts without question due to the pressing insistence of those in power—allowing permeation into other aspects of society. Unlike more modern Supreme Court cases such as Roe vs. Wade, a popular piece of public discourse the Buck vs. Bell decision and its implications were felt more within professionals and those in power. The public's acceptance to eugenics therefore, was more insidious as those in power used the Buck vs. Bell decision to influence society in ways to make the public notice. As a result, cultural permeation of the eugenic philosophy was through education and the mass media. Eugenics became a staple in public schools by the 1930's, with the AES leading the implementation of curriculum such as the 1935 book *Tomorrows Children*, written by Yale Professor and AES president Ellsworth Huntington. This book made an attempt to have "simple but accurate language that taught the main principles of eugenics and their application to social problems."[xl] In addition, eugenics was portrayed to the masses via the silver screen. Hollywood motion pictures such as *A Bill of Divorcement* (1932) starring Katherine Hepburn, championed citizens who made the responsible choice of not having children due to negative hereditary traits.[xl] Those who believed they did have positive hereditary traits were more than willing to send their family data to the ERO in Cold Spring in order to solidify their place in society.[xl]

Those who gained the title of 'feebleminded,' ususally women who were already considered of lower intellectual capacity, were often subject to measures that would control their reproduction around the turn of the twentieth century. Reseacher Susan Cahn looks

at the position of these women and how often they were looked down upon not only for being poor and white, but also as uneducated, promiscuous, and 'feebleminded'—the perfect recipe for involunatry sterilization.

The presented picture is one that would seem almost genocidal to those who have been brought up in the present era where discrimination and prejudicial beliefs, which are at the forefront of eugenic philosophy, are not tolerated within the public discourse. Proponents of the science of eugenics and those who were sympathetic to the aims of eugenic policy found themselves in a time period of much social, political, and cultural reform. The research and testimony presented in the Buck vs. Bell case along with numerous scientific advancements in hereditary function, notably Mendel's and Darwin's exploration of genetics, natural selection, and inheritance of traits, had many people questioning the effect this science would have on the human race. When this new scientific thought spread with the bitter economic and class divide of the period, especially due to modernization and immigration, it was easy to see how the education 'haves' wanted to halt the growing numbers of uneducated 'have-nots'.

However, whether or not many victims of sterilization were in fact disabled, or in reality, if they were a chosen victim of classism, is still in question. It is important to note that before dying at age eight from sickness, Carrie Buck's daughter Vivian had been on the honor roll at her elementary school, a remarkable achievement for a girl who was classified as 'feebleminded' as an infant. From the perspective of Carrie Buck, when interviewed later in life, she proved to have lived a relatively normal life and had married twice, and regretted not being able to have more children.[xl] While looking at her story, and others, it is necessary to look at how these people's personal lives were affected from the eugenic way of thinking and practice of sterilization.

Eugenics, as a science, has been considered little more than a fraud filled with bias and socio-racial prejudice. However, before it ended, the forced sterilization movement in the United States saw over 70,000 Americans sterilized. This figure represents a generation of individuals who were persecuted for being labeled 'inferior,' and were robbed of the human right to reproduce. The Supreme Court reversed the Buck vs. Bell decision with the 1967 Lovering case that fought the eugenic bred marriage discrimination, that disallowed whites and blacks to marry, and guaranteed fourteenth amendment

rights to all. In addition, most state legislation that supported forced sterilization was repealed in the late sixties and early seventies. Genetics, however, has become the descendent of eugenics, albeit with less cancerous intentions. However, with all the research being done in DNA and the passing of genetic traits such as disease and conditions, the science remains contentious among those who have seen the dark side of eugenics.

Finally, the story of Carrie Buck is one that fits into a churning engine of eugenic ideology and practice. Set in the early 20th century's poor, white south, reinforced with nationwide economic strain and prejudiced beliefs of the cultural elite, this story was concerned with ridding the American nation of those who were considered physically and mentally deficient; a genetic breeding stock full of feeblemindedness and corrupt family values; a social and economic burden to themselves and to the greater society; and overall a poor reflection of an up and coming nation's image and prestige. The case of Carrie Buck had less to do with her reproduction than it had to do with a social policy for the masses to ensure that only citizens of good breeding stock would provide a new generation of quality heritage. It was utilized to distribute an unfortunate science of eugenic philosophy to an "anxious middle class who devoured studies of among others, inherited feeblemindedness, uniting and capturing the imaginations of so many."[xl]

[xl] Cahn, 158
[xl] Black, 110
[xl] Ibid.,
[xl] University of Virginia
[xl] Ibid., 114
[xl] Arizona State University
[xl] New York Times
[xl] Encarta
[xl] Franks, 69
[xl] Dowbiggin, 24
[xl] Ibid., 25
[xl] University of Virginia
[xl] Cahn, 161
[xl] Encarta
[xl] Black., 116
[xl] Currell & Cogdell, 94
[xl] Ibid., 5
[xl] Black., 398

[xl] University of Virginia
[xl] Currell & Cogdell, 198

Works Cited

Agar, Nicholas. Liberal Eugenics : In Defence of Human Enhancement.
        Grand Rapids: Blackwell Limited, 2004.

Arizona State University. Buck vs. Bell. 11 5 2008
        http://www.public.asu.edu/-jacquies/Holmes.pdf

Black, Edwin. War Against the Weak : Eugenics and America's Campaign to
        Create a Master Race. New York: Basic Books, 2004.

Block, Pamela. "Sexuality, Fertility, and Danger: Twentieth Century Images
        of Women with Cognitive Disabilities." Sexuality and Disability.
        (2000): 18(4): 239-254

Brands, H. W. Traitor to His Class : The Life and Radical Presidency of
        Franklin Delano Roosevelt. New York: Doubleday, 2008.

Bruinius, Harry. Better for All the World : The Secret History of Forced
        Sterilization and America's Quest for Racial Purity. New York:
        Vintage, 2007.

Cahn, Susan K. Sexual Reckonings : Southern Girls in a Troubling Age.
        New York: Harvard UP, 2007.

Carlson, Elof A. The Unfit : A History of a Bad Idea. New York: Cold
        Spring Harbor Laboratory P, 2001.

Chesterton, G. K., and Francis Galton. Eugenics and Other Evils : An
        Argument Against the Scientifically Organized State. Ed. Michael
        W. Perry. New York: Inkling Books, 2000.

Cogdell, Christina. Eugenic Design : Streamlining America in the 1930s.
        New York: University of Pennsylvania P, 2004.

Currell, Susan, and Christina Cogdell, eds. Popular Eugenics : National
        Efficiency and American Mass Culture in The 1930s. New York:
        Ohio UP, 2006.

Davenport, C. B. Eugenics: The Science of Human Improvement By Better
        Breeding. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co., 1910.

Dowbiggin, Ian R. The Sterilization Movement and Global Fertility in the
        Twentieth Century. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated, 2008.
Encarta, MSN. Eugenics. 10 21 2008
        <http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia 761560245/eugenics/html>

Franks, Angela. Margaret Sanger's Eugenic Legacy : The Control of Female
        Fertility. Boston: McFarland & Company, Incorporated, 2005.

Hartouni, Valerie. <u>Cultural Conceptions : On Reproductive Technologies and the Remaking of Life</u>. New York: University of Minnesota P, 1997.

Hasian, Marouf A. <u>The Rhetoric of Eugenics in Anglo-American Thought</u>. New York: University of Georgia P, 1996.

Kuhl, Stefan. <u>The Nazi Connection : Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism</u>. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.

Largent, Mark A. <u>Breeding Contempt : The History of Coerced Sterilization in the United States</u>. New York: Rutgers UP, 2007.

Lombardo, Paul A. <u>Three Generations, No Imbeciles : Eugenics, the Supreme Court, and Buck V. Bell</u>. New York: Johns Hopkins UP, 2008.

Nourse, Victoria F. <u>In Reckless Hands : Skinner V. Oklahoma and the near-Triumph of American Eugenics</u>. Boston: W. W. Norton & Company, Incorporated, 2008.

Stern, Alexandra. <u>Eugenic Nation - Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America</u>. New York: University of California P, 2005.

University of Virginia Library: Claude Moore Health Sciences. Eugenics: Three Generations, No Imbeciles: Virginia, Eugenics, and Buck vs. Bell. 11 5 2008
http://www.hsl.virginia.edu/historical/eugenics/