View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by Scholarship@Western

Western University

Scholarship@Western

FIMS Publications

Information & Media Studies (FIMS) Faculty

8-13-2010

The Synthespian's Animated Prehistory: The Monkees, The Archies, Don Kirshner, and the Politics of "Virtual Labor"

Matt Stahl
The University of Western Ontario

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/fimspub

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Citation of this paper:
Stahl, Matt, "The Synthespian's Animated Prehistory: The Monkees, The Archies, Don Kirshner, and the Politics of "Virtual Labor"" (2010). *FIMS Publications*. 334.
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/fimspub/334

The Synthespian's Animated Prehistory: *The Monkees*, *The Archies*, Don Kirshner, and the Politics of "Virtual Labor"

Matt Stahl, University of Western Ontario

1. Introduction

Recent innovations in film and television production involving new visual effects technologies challenge common-sense conceptions of actor labor and alter the social organization and politics of production. In some well-known examples, such as Peter Jackson's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy and his *King Kong,* actors are used to render computer-generated non-human characters more believable; in others, such as Sam Raimi's *Spider-Man* movies and other recent superhero-based action films, visual effects technologies are used to make actors' performances, for example, of a human with eight mechanical arms or who can stretch like a rubber band, more convincing. Hybrid performances like these – increasingly the norm in commercial film and television production – are the product of evolving ensembles of creative performers and digital technologies. In explaining a taxonomy of elements involved in what he calls the "technological construction of performance," Mark Wolf notes that performances such as those of Gollum, the ape Kong, or Doctor Octopus "need[] to be rethought due to the large number of people who may be involved in the creation of a single example" (2003, 48). Wolf's approach is technocentric, but the burgeoning of innovations into production systems that he traces has political consequences. A labor-centric examination of hybrid performances in television and film production shows that the development of new techniques and occupations and the introduction of new technologies and divisions of labor alters the power relations among creative performers and their cultural industry employers.

please cite published version

This article seeks to illuminate these politics by analyzing the late 1960s trajectory of impresario and music executive Don Kirshner from his position as music supervisor of the live-action sitcom *The Monkees* (NBC, 1966-68) to a similar position in the production of the Saturday morning cartoon *The Archie Show* (CBS, 1968-69).[i] With *The Monkees*, Kirshner encountered recalcitrant human performers unwilling to submit to his alienating production system; this friction led to his firing by the program's producers. With *The Archies*, on the other hand, the coupling of his system of music supervision and production with a well-developed animation production regime led to the appearance of an early form of what I call *virtual labor*, that is, performative labor that appears to be performed by an individual, but which is actually the result of a division of labor incorporating creative and technical workers, intellectual property, and high-tech equipment.

Virtual labor names a dynamic political arrangement whereby the managerially-driven concealment or displacement of creative and technical cultural workers by "synthespians" is correlated to the intensified alienation of those workers, to the erosion of their bargaining power, to the diminution their power to claim credit, remuneration, proprietorship, autonomy, or other forms of political-economic agency. To explain this dynamic, I draw on the political-economic conceptions of "agency costs" and "variable" and "constant capital." Agency costs are "the combined costs [to employers] of shirking [by workers] and supervision [by managers]" (Steinfeld 2001, 8). Variable and constant capital are ways of thinking about the relationship, in the labor process, between human labor to other forms of "production inputs."[ii] Approaching historical phases in the development of the synthespian from this angle brings into relief political aspects of

please cite published version

media production systems that have since become more naturalized and (perhaps on that account) are generally underemphasized in current scholarship.

Contemporary film and animation studies scholarship concentrates on textual and reception dimensions of these phenomena, highlighting, for example, the "uncanny" aspects of new technologies of representation and simulation and cultural and historical responses of audiences to them. The "digital actor's" uncanniness, writes Lisa Bode, is transitory; like that of all human simulacra, it is "due to a framework of uncertainty about what it is to be human" which is informed by historically-situated discourses "both theoretical and fictional, concerning the impact of aspects of contemporary life (urbanization, media, consumerism, etc.) on lived experience" (Bode 2006, 179, 183; Matrix 2006; Aldred 2006). While they work with different priorities, and frameworks, these approaches nevertheless connect to the present analysis; scholars of entertainment labor are, in fact, quite interested in the impact of a central category of "contemporary life" – labor in the digitalizing economy – on "lived experience."

Foregrounding labor, however, opens up the scope of analysis and brings to its center a range of political-economic questions. While "performance capture"[iii] and "image analysis"[iv] technologies are being hailed for new heights of "uncanny" realism, and actors like Andy Serkis, whose hybrid performances contributed to the creation of Gollum in the *Lord of the Rings* movies and the ape in *King Kong*, are considered for Oscar nominations, these same technologies are implicated in new forms of domination and exploitation, particularly in the lower-profile worlds of video game and advertising production. In two recent U.S. cases, for example, courts rejected performers' demands for reuse payments and shares in royalties in the sales of blockbuster videogames in

please cite published version

which the martial arts mastery of the games' characters depended on those performers' motion-captured performances (Sweeney and Williams 2002).

More recently, after a protracted struggle and a narrowly averted strike in 2005, the Screen Actors Guild and the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, whose jurisdiction includes human performances in video games, agreed to a contract with the videogame industry in which they relinquished rights to such profit sharing, known in the industry as "residuals," in exchange for salary increases and other benefits (Backstage.com 2005). Residuals are an important part of Hollywood's multi-tiered political economy of actor labor (Paul and Kleingartner 1996, 163-170); the official acceptance of a residual-free contract in this very profitable and rapidly expanding area of performer employment was an unprecedented concession. SAG performers supplying performance capture performances in advertising and television are eligible for standard residuals, but only if what they do is defined in their contracts as "above-the-line" ("creative") work rather than "below-the-line" ("technical") contribution (Paul and Kleingartner 1994, 666, n. 3; Stahl 2005, 98-99; Stahl 2009).

A flyer posted to the Web by the "Restore Respect" faction of the Screen Actors Guild argues that the expanding use of performance capture reflects a desire to cut costs by redefining the very nature of the performance:

> Performance Capture technology was primarily used to create characters that moved naturally when there was no other way to get the look and shot needed live. Now the capture, and reproduction of movement directly into a computer is used to save money as well. The technicians at the keyboard do not get residuals or overtime or require contributions paid into a Pension & Health fund.
>
> Nor do they bring performance skills to the piece.

please cite published version

> SAG actors and dancers, who “author” the physical performances that are manipulated later deserve full theatrical contracts for their work; yet the producers define the motion capture of a performer's physical creation of a character, or group, as a technical aspect of a piece - and NOT as a defined performance worthy of the contract rates and residuals their project is responsible for as a SAG signatory (http://www.restorerespect.com/singersdvo.shtml).

Rhetorics of authorship are divisive; claims like Restore Respect’s point to the political nature of “the line’s” placement in a division of entertainment labor (Stahl 2009). But they also point to the politics accompanying the ongoing reconfiguration of performer labor in the digital era.

In Wolf’s analysis, the “technological construction of performance” is carried out through its fragmentation and the organization and supervision of those fragments by non-actors. Motion capture, for example, “divide[s] performance by separating motion from an actor’s body” (2003, 53). Though Wolf does not use these terms, the process he is describing has been treated in more labor-focused literature as a distinctly Taylorist form of alienation (Braverman 1975). In this process, Wolf writes,

> a single character’s performance can become an ensemble performance, involving the direct input of actors, technicians, editors, and the director in its creation. Unlike live theatre, actors may have very little control over the final version of performances. Instead of being a performance’s author, they may become more a supplier of raw data to be combined into a performance and shaped by others (2003, 55).

Contemporary arguments over the status of performance capture bring to light the socio-political dynamism at work in production arenas in which new relations of labor, power, and property are taking shape.

Such struggles are played out politically in courts and collective bargaining, but also symbolically, in and around the texts themselves. The more textually-focused work

please cite published version

of Bode and her film and animation studies colleagues illuminates ways in which proliferating anxieties associated with tectonic (if nevertheless hard-to-pin-down) changes in the relations of people to new and newly mediated technologies, institutions and social roles. As Jessica Aldred writes, for example, drawing on the work of Scott Bukatman, uncanny forms of performance in new media help to "render typically 'invisible' electronic spaces" – such as those "in" which waged work is increasingly taking place – "visible, concrete, and open for exploration" (Aldred 2006, 154); such "media can provide a means of inscribing new, potentially traumatic phenomena and perspectives onto the familiar field of the film spectator's body . . . serv[ing] as both a physical and [therefore] a conceptual interface with new technologies and the life-world they produce" (Aldred 2006, 155, quoting Bukatman [Aldred's bracketed text]). The capacity of digital media and synthespians to engage in the ideological work of naturalizing new (increasingly digitally mediated) modes of life is as crucially important as its obverse: the emerging politics of labor in the digital era.

That the virtual labor of an animated or human/digital hybrid character is a stand-in for a complex division of human labor has the effect of dissociating the final performance from those workers whose labor constitutes it. Wolf notes that "the ensemble nature of technologically constructed performances … raises the question of how much input must come from a single actor for the performance to be considered his or her own, or even eligible for an award" (2003, 55). From the standpoint of labor, the process of technologically-enabled separation of performer from performance that Wolf describes appears as alienation. In the cases of Gollum and the ape Kong, Andy Serkis' creative contributions were highlighted by a promotional juggernaut: the characters were

please cite published version

hyped as "real" and deserving of Academy recognition because of the mix of Serkis' authentic(ating) presence and the films' many technological breakthroughs. Nevertheless, despite the repeated linkage of Serkis with the characters in which his labor is embedded, the actor felt the "removal of [his own] humanity" in the creation of the character Gollum (Burston 2006, 256). Performer invisibility underwrites the legal-material, symbolic, and social-psychological alienation of performers in the relations of cultural production, and thereby weakens the basis for claims on residual rights and other customary privileges and protections (Stahl 2005, 102-103; 2009). The family resemblance of human-digital hybrid performance to earlier forms of virtual labor discussed below – the advantages of which were rooted in enhanced managerial control and reduced agency costs, as well as the consolidated control of intellectual property rights – should cause us to consider questions of the politics of its present and future use.[v] Don Kirshner's experiences with *The Monkees* and *The Archies* offer stark evidence of the relationship between work, visibility, power, and technology encompassed in virtual labor.

2. The Monkees, Raybert, and Don Kirshner's Expulsion

The Monkees, featuring a young rock band, aimed at a growing, counterculturally-sympathetic youth market, was the brainchild of Bob Rafelson and Bert Schneider, a producer and a financial vice president of Screen Gems (the TV production arm of Columbia Pictures). To create a show that wouldn't "talk down to young people" (Baker 1997, 7), Raybert – Rafelson and Schneider's production company – assembled a quartet of attractive, quick-thinking young men whose could provide spontaneous comic performances that the performers themselves would enjoy. "We didn't even look at actors," said the producers at the time, "and we didn't look for experienced rock'n'roll

please cite published version

groups because we wanted guys who could play themselves" (Canby 1966, 54~~, emphasis added~~). Despite an elaborate search for "authentic" young men (Stahl 2002, 310-311), only two of the four Monkees were not already actors. Both Davy Jones and Micky Dolenz had been child stars, and Jones was actually under contract to Screen Gems at the time of the auditions. Michael Nesmith and Peter Tork came in as new television recruits, though each of them already had some professional music experience. Later conflicts in the band would split along this seam; Nesmith and Tork, not socialized into an entertainment industry division of labor, would see as oppressive and alienating labor relations that the others accepted as routine.

Golden Ear, Iron Hand

Screen Gems/Columbia executives did not trust Tommy Boyce and Bobby Hart – the young songwriters hired by Raybert to write and record the show's theme and the pilot's two featured musical numbers – to manage an efficient system capable of producing a steady supply of appealing songs for the show. The executives sought an industry veteran whose reputation would promise to add stability to this unusual and unproven program's production. This effort would meet with success when the executives turned to music publisher and new Columbia Pictures Corporation executive Don Kirshner. Between 1958, when he hired a number of young songwriters and organized a rationalized, Tin Pan Alley-style music production system and publishing company in New York City's famous Brill Building, shepherding an astonishing number of songs to the top of the pop charts (Shaw 1980, 120-127, see also Szatmary 1991, 61-64), and 1963, when he sold this publishing company to and became a vice president of Screen Gems/Columbia, Kirshner had achieved mogul status. In 1972, he summarized his

please cite published version

music business philosophy in an interview with Rolling Stone: “I look at songs like real estate. A song is like a building. It’s an annuity on which you collect residuals. But I’m in the music business rather than in stocks because I love talent and I love music. It’s the essence of our culture” (Werbin 1972, 10). Kirshner presented himself as an entrepreneurial employer. If a song is like a building, then the people who produce it are like builders: craftspersons, perhaps, but employees before they are artists. In the fall of 1964, as president of Columbia Pictures’ music division, Kirshner undertook to reshape aspects of the songwriting labor market, explicitly drawing on the language of union-busting: “[m]any of the writers I’ve discovered would love to compose for movies and television” he told an interviewer “[u]ntil now, the field was a closed shop. I plan to bring them in” (Archer 1964, 10). Kirshner’s authoritarian approach to musical labor was to encounter resistance when members of the Monkees began to think of themselves as artists rather than employees.

In July of 1966 Raybert enlisted Kirshner to take on the duties of music supervision of *The Monkees*; Boyce and Hart were moved into subordinate producer positions. Kirshner oversaw the contracting of songwriters and the hiring of studio musicians to play the backing tracks and supervised the Monkees’ recording of vocal tracks. His golden ear and iron hand performed as was hoped: the Monkees’ first single “Last Train to Clarksville” was released in August of 1966, the show debuted September 12, and the song was #1 on the Billboard Hot 100 by the end of October.

The success of the show and the records resulted in mounting demand for live concert appearances. The four Monkees convinced Screen Gems to let them develop a live act; they incorporated a rigorous rehearsal regimen into their already gruelling

please cite published version

television show production schedule. Thus, at the same time that they were being prevented from playing any of the instruments on their records (an unnecessary risk, according to Kirshner, when more expert and reliable professional musicians were available), the Monkees were beginning to achieve mastery over their repertoire. For the two band members socialized into the world of professional entertainment this posed no contradiction. Michael Nesmith, however, did not appreciate the irony of this situation passively. In December of 1966 – not even four months after the show's debut – Nesmith told the Saturday Evening Post: "The music has nothing to do with us. It is totally dishonest. Do you know how debilitating it is to sit up and have to duplicate someone else's records? That's really what we are doing. The music happens in spite of the Monkees. It's what Kirshner wants to do. Our records are not our forte. I don't care if we never sell another record" (quoted in Baker 1997, 45).

Finally, in early 1967, Michael Nesmith, supported by Peter Tork, threatened a walkout unless Raybert fired Kirshner. Bert Schneider, increasingly alarmed at the savvy Kirshner's relatively whopping share of Monkee profits, and likely sensing that it was at this point more the appeal of the Monkees themselves than the songs or the quality of their production that was sustaining audience interest, took action (Ramaeker 2001, 83-85) and Kirshner was fired. With Kirshner's removal the Monkees won increased control over their work, but without his expertise record sales plummeted; the show lasted only one more season.[vi]

"Fixing" Variable Entertainment Capital

please cite published version

Don Kirshner's supervisory regime in *The Monkees* depended on a separation of conception, i.e., the organizational work of the music supervisor, from execution, the work of writers, arrangers, musicians, engineers, and the four Monkees themselves as singers.[vii] The slotting of the Monkees into the execution side of the equation rather than the conception side brings to mind Wolf's insight that any participant in a "division of authorship" (Stahl 2005, 92) "may become more a supplier of raw data" (Wolf 2003, 6). Nesmith and Tork's perceived relegation to this status led to a standoff in which the value of their televised personalities ultimately prevailed. Theories of capitalist control of labor can help explain the problem the (living) Monkees posed to employers and supervisors interested in cross-platform children's entertainment production and marketing, and to anticipate the solution made possible by the virtual labor of the (animated) Archies.

In Volume 1, Chapter 8 of *Capital*, Marx points out that the labor process in capitalism can be understood as the interaction of two aspects of capital: raw materials, equipment, and infrastructure, on the one hand, and labor power – the contracted-for (or "rented") capacity of workers to work – on the other. These, he writes, "are merely the different modes of existence which the value of the original capital assumed when from being money it was transformed into the various factors of the labour-process" (Marx 1906, 232). These different "modes of existence" are distinguished by their relationship to the production of value. "That part of capital…which is represented by the means of production, by the raw material, auxiliary material and the instruments of labour does not, in the process of production, undergo any quantitative alteration of value." Instruments cannot play themselves; songs, once written, cannot record themselves; costumes do not

please cite published version

get up and act; film and television cameras do not operate themselves. Marx therefore calls these "constant capital" (232).

"On the other hand," Marx continues, "that part of capital, represented by labour-power, does, in the process of production, undergo an alteration of value. It both reproduces the equivalent of its own value, and also produces an excess, a surplus-value, which may itself vary, may be more or less according to circumstances" (232-33). He calls labor power "variable capital," because at the same time that it preserves and transmits the value of the constant capital involved in production into the final product, its value can increase as it adds value by transforming inert instruments, songs, costumes and cameras into recordings and television shows. These latter themselves constitute what is known in the business as a "property" – a constellation of ownable, rentable features which can be further exploited (e.g., as lunchboxes, fan magazines, dolls, movies, etc.). ("Variable capital" is an especially useful way of conceiving creative cultural labor because it sensitizes the researcher to the ways in which the value of a given performance can increase with the increased popularity of the film, television show, or character with which that performer is associated.)

The problem is that *variable* capital behaves very differently from *constant* capital. Constant capital is machines, objects, intellectual property; variable capital is people, and this is where politics comes into the picture. Constant capital can be bought,[viii] but labor is not a commodity (Polanyi 2001, 69-76); what the entrepreneur "buys" is labor power, a person's capacity to work for a certain time: variable capital must be hired, or, more to the point, rented (Ellerman 1992, Ch. 6). What one gains when one rents labor power is the right to tell people what to do for the time one has them on

please cite published version

the clock (Pateman 2002, 33-35; Ellerman 2005, 468-470). But people are endowed with agency, that is, the capacity to thwart the aims of those in position to command them. "Agency costs" is a way of conceiving the expenditures involved in making sure one's employees do what one wants them to. When one buys this capacity to labor, as Harry Braverman noted,

> the outcome is far from being either so certain or so definite that it can be reckoned … with precision and in advance This is merely an expression of the fact that the portion of his capital expended on labor power is the "variable" portion, which undergoes an increase in the process of production; for him the question is how great that increase will be (1975, 40).

Control of labor is central to minimizing agency costs and making sure that the increase in value will meet at least a minimum expectation; control is facilitated by any process that can increase management's relative power over employees.

Braverman's critique centers on Taylorism, or "scientific management," in which complex "craft" production processes are broken down into their constituent parts and distributed in the form of separate tasks to a host of workers who, in large part because of their greater ease of replaceability, have little power to contest the commands of their supervisors. Braverman's analysis suggests that by minimizing the amount of interpretation, variation, autonomy, and improvisation in a given job – in other words, the effective agency necessary to complete a task – the variability of variable capital can be standardized such that the persons participating in the production process need only be slightly less objectlike than the objects with which they are working. In light of compelling critiques of Braverman's lack of consideration of worker subjectivity, Michael Burawoy argues that the "deskilling" dynamic Braverman postulates is most significant in its establishment as an "*ideological* movement," the promulgation

please cite published version

throughout American enterprise of an ideal picture of what relations of production could look like if – fantastically – variable capital could actually be treated as constant capital, and yet still deliver surplus (1985, 42). This line of thinking limns politics lurking unarticulated in the background of Mark Wolf's technocentric analysis of what might more tendentiously be called the political deconstruction of performance.

Through the development of virtual labor, entertainment entrepreneurs like Filmation Studio's Lou Scheimer and Norm Prescott – producers of *The Archie Show* and its many variants – made striking advances in the implementation of the managerial desideratum to treat (as effectively as possible or necessary) variable as constant capital, while nevertheless continuing to exploit variable capital's variability. "Virtual labor" thus designates the special capacity of a delicately balanced, historically contingent ensemble of cultural industry labor and technology, organized by a supervisor(s) on behalf of capital, to minimize the extent of actual employee agency (and its costs), while maintaining the appearance of on-screen character agency. The problems raised and addressed by virtual labor are pronounced in the context of media narratives about or featuring popular music makers because the conceptions of authorship (and associated beliefs about ownership and control) that typically cling to many of the various activities associated with music making tend to pull against capitalist control in that arena (Toynbee 2000, 6; 2003, 43-49; more generally: Ryan 1992, 46-50; Banks 2007 6-7, 184-186). The heightened agency of creative cultural workers who, by reasons of custom, cultural expectation, corporate requirements, or legal status, are in the position to thwart the objectives of their supervisors poses a further threat to the already risky businesses of

please cite published version

film and television production when they occupy central places – whether in symbolic/narrative or social/productive terms – in television and film.

The management of uncertainty in Kirshner's popular music production regime by way of a division of labor with separate (though sometimes overlapping) roles for writers, arrangers, producers, musicians, engineers and singers reflected the dominance in 1960s managerial theory of what Barley and Kunda call "systems rationalism." Systems rationalism

> exhorted managers to be experts: to bring rational analysis and a body of empirical knowledge to bear on the firm's problems... [and] assumed that employees were calculative actors with instrumental orientations to work. Employees were said either to understand the economic advantages of an efficient system or to be powerless to resist a well-designed structure. (Barley and Kunda 1992, 384)

An instrumental orientation to work, a willingness to embrace or an inability to overcome objectification in work is what supervisors require as they embrace the ideology and strategy of "fixing" variable capital. Indeed, this principle is evident in Lisa Bode's observation of the "double meaning" of "automaton:" "[i]t is both" she writes, quoting Gaby Wood, "'a figure which simulates the action of a living being' and 'a human being acting mechanically in a monotonous routine'." In the past, Bode writes, "[t]he figure of the automaton [had] resonance as [a] metaphor[] to describe people transformed through shifting conditions of industrialized work;" this figure, she notes, can "remind us of living people who seem deadened or inanimate to some degree" (2006, 182).

Fired from *The Monkees*, Kirshner's recognition of the television program's potential for effective music marketing seems to have made him determined to remain in Hollywood. But a question must have consumed him: Where, in a pop music world

please cite published version

increasingly populated by performers who, like the Monkees, had been infected by the Romantic-countercultural rock ethic of individualism and authenticity ascendant at the time, would he find a commercially viable group who would add value to his constant capital in a satisfactory way and whom he could treat as calculative actors for whom alienation and powerlessness could easily be compensated?[ix] The answer was to be found in the felicitous meeting of "bubblegum" pop music and Saturday morning cartoons: production systems largely inhabited by calculative and/or powerless "below-the-line" workers and virtual, non-agentic performers imbued with neither ideology or ethic, endowed with no rights.

Since the 1920s commercial animation has been organized more or less rigidly (and increasingly internationally) according to principles of scientific management (Crafton 1984, 162-167; Stahl 2005, 2009). Animation has also been preserved from excessive agency costs through the management of worker-artists' visibility relative to the drawn and now computer-generated images they produce, the politics implied by a general shortage of jobs relative to labor supply, and, since a rash of labor actions in the late 1930s and early 1940s, accords established through collective bargaining.[x]

3. *The Archies*, Filmation, and Kirshner's Subsumption

Between 1965 and 1976 over two dozen television cartoons produced for children featured animated musical groups made up of human, animal, and other fantastic characters, and integrated rock'n'roll (mostly in the new form of bubblegum music) into their content. *The Archie Show* was an early entrant in this world of animated Saturday morning rock'n'roll cartoons. Whereas its forerunners, the primetime series *The Alvin*

please cite published version

Show (CBS, 1961-65) and the Saturday morning series *The Beatles* (ABC, 1965-69) had relied on pre-existing novelty and pop hits, respectively, for their initial appeal (Erickson 1995, 62-65, 96-97), *The Archie Show* created its musical properties out of whole cloth. The innovation here was the combination of divisions of creative labor – Kirshner-style record production involving writers, arrangers, performers, and producers, and animation, which involved writers, story artists, animators, inbetweeners, ink and paint, camera and a number of other job descriptions – in the creation of a product that had little need or room for the kind of agentic capacity to thwart employer objectives that the Monkees brought to bear in their struggle to, like Pinocchio, become "real boys."

Accounts of the genesis of *The Archie Show* conflict; Kirshner arrogated credit to himself, telling *Rolling Stone* that he "wanted to do the same thing with a cartoon series that Ross Bagdassarian had done with the Chipmunks. …I wanted my own Alvin, Simon and Theodore, I figured the country was ready for it and "Sugar, Sugar" sold 10 million copies (Werbin 1972, 10). While music writers and critics generally accept Kirshner's assertion of responsibility;[xi] historical television scholarship locates the show's impetus in executive response to institutional and regulatory frictions centering on violence in children's cartoons.[xii]

Norm Prescott and Lou Scheimer, co-founders of Filmation and producers of *The Archie Show*, offered their own accounts in interviews I conducted in 2004. According to Prescott, after Filmation's success with their first series, *Superman* (CBS, 1966-70), they figured pre-existing properties were the safest sources of new show ideas. Already endowed with established name recognition, characters, "worlds," and source material for stories, established properties would save time and money in the conception phase and

please cite published version

minimize risk in marketing. Very early on, according to Prescott, he, Scheimer, and some of their employees

> made a list of every property we knew. We didn't know the status [or if they were] doable, just every one. I had a list of two hundred properties; gut instinct told me that this one's better than this, this one's got stories that no longer reflect reality, and they're grown up and now they're putting them in pornos, whatever. […] We just made up a list, and we were sitting around, and somebody would say "whattayou think of the Lone Ranger?" "Sure." We [would] immediately find out who the copyright holder was, contact him, make a pitch, and if he said okay, we did it. If he said not okay, we didn't do it (author interview, 2004).

This scattershot approach produced a number of successful licenses, including *Aquaman* (CBS, 1968-69), *The Hardy Boys* (ABC, 1969-71), *The New Adventures of Gilligan* (CBS, 1974-77), that resulted in dozens of animated series.

"Everybody knew the Archies," said Prescott of that discussion, and it seemed like a natural property to exploit. The idea to put the Archie characters in a band seems also to have been a very logical choice, particularly in the wake of the Monkees' staggering commercial success. According to Scheimer,

> the music, was totally [our idea], we brought that into it because the comic books had no suggestion of them being a band or anything like that. […] It just seemed appropriate, I mean, there was no [animated] show on the air that had music as its basis … and we thought it would just be interesting to do something with a musical background. [Prescott] had been a disc jockey in Boston, and really knew the music industry. I said "hey, wouldn't that be fun, to have them as a band, as a group?" … It was that era when, I guess, this must have been late 67, and Don Kirshner had just come off of doing the Monkees, and [Norm] knew Don and got in touch with Don, and asked him if he'd like to do the music, and he said "absolutely" (author interview, 2004).

As a disk jockey in Boston in the 1940s, Prescott had helped "break" several records, that is, he helped fuel their climb up the pop charts through his on-air promotion and off-air communication with DJs in other regions. Prescott's promotional skills prompted him to explore the cross-platform potential of the new show, to see if he could break these new

please cite published version

records to an underexploited market through an unusual medium. Prescott made a "friendly bet" with his associates that he could create a hit solely through television exposure to an audience aged in the single digits, and he followed through by setting up a division of music production labor very like that which Kirshner had assembled prior to the latter's association with *The Monkees*.

Accustomed to the production of rightless, uncomplaining, non-agentic characters through the division of animation authorship, Prescott considers his innovation not to have been the production of a compliant band, but rather the use of children's cartoon entertainment for the marketing of radio-friendly popular music. He decided

> to do something that our competition, Hanna-Barbera, never did and wouldn't think of doing. Whenever they used music for background or vocal or whatever on their shows, … they always went to the [staff] musician who gave you his version of pop, or his version of jazz, or his version of rock and roll, but he was not the [successful popular] songwriter, … he was a copycat. I said, "I'm going to use top ten writers, who are catering specifically for the music business, okay?" Well, at that time, Don Kirshner was very big as a record producer, and he also created this artificial musical group called the Monkees, where the first year, they didn't sing at all, they used other vocalists, but they spent a lot of time working on them, and they developed a pretty good in-house team.[xiii] Well, I said, '"we'll do the same thing" (author interview, 2004).

They would do what they thought was the same thing – produce an "artificial musical group" – and then produce massively popular hits through marketing initially to 3-9 year-olds. Using, as did Kirshner, top-selling writers, "people who know bubblegum music, …immediately gave us credibility. We had fifteen opportunities, because we did fifteen shows that year, and each had a song by the Archies. I was gonna make a hit." In this relation, however, Kirshner was demoted to producer – Prescott preferred to hire the writers and select songs himself. His "friendly bet" was won with "Sugar, Sugar:" "we did well over a million and a half copies, and it was originated and it was played on, as I

please cite published version

said, only and exclusively Saturday morning animated shows for kids." (author interview 2004).

Interviews with Scheimer and Prescott reveal a consistent theme of calculation and minimization of risk in the production of *The Archie Show*, which was doubly primed for commercial success not only because it was an animated version of a comic book popular since the late 1940s, but also because it was essentially a repackaging of *The Monkees* for a "kiddie" audience. In addition to the marketing calculus, however, were other significant layers of rationalization. For example, where *The Monkees* integrated the band members' professional musical identities into the program's narratives (Goostree 1988, 52), there was a total disjuncture between the plots of *The Archie Show* and the characters' multiplatform musical careers. This disjuncture reflected the exigencies of cost control playing out through control of the labor process. Just as, in Taylorism, the work of "execution" is broken down and distributed among "deskilled" workers, at Filmation, "conceptual" work – the production of narratives – was similarly broken down, resulting in the decomposition not only of conceptual work, but of individual *Archies* characters themselves into "pop musician" and "story participant." Filmation were well known (and frequently criticized) in the Los Angeles animation industry for having developed the "stock" system, a hyper-rationalized production process. Many television animation studios made use of "cycling" of clips to save time and money: a character's walk, for example, once animated, could be filed away in the form of a stack of cells and reused against a variety of backgrounds. This is what is known as the "limited animation" system pioneered in the early sixties by Hanna Barbera and eminently visible in their hit show *The Flintstones* (Solomon 1989, 236-240).

please cite published version

Filmation, however, based their entire production system – from conception to execution – around this principle (Solomon 1989, 241; Swanigan 1993). With each new series, a stock of clips – mouth movements, gestures, walks, and so on – would accumulate and begin to form a pool of materials to be used and reused. Directors and storyboard artists could then develop and block out new narratives and musical performances around existing "stock" sequences. Keeping the Archie characters' two identities distinct minimized both the amount of stock and the amount of conceptual labor necessary for the production of the show. In Scheimer's words,

> we would have directors who would be aware of the material that had to be used and could be used and existed, but more important than that, the guys that did the storyboards all had with them the booklets of the available material we had…. The files were kept, the stock scenes were kept; it just sort of accumulated, and then the camera department would have its own list of guys who would take care of the stock scenes and make sure they were available for any picture[xiv] (author interview, 2004).

From the selection of props, to the production of music, visuals and narratives, *The Archie Show* production apparatus into which Kirshner was to be integrated was already extraordinarily rationalized.

In the case of *The Monkees*, once the show was on the air and viewers began developing fan relations with the four Monkees, the entire venture turned on the continued enthusiastic compliance of the four young, flesh-and-blood performers at the centre of the narrative and musical content of the show. Accounts of the production of *The Archie Show* offered by the show's producers, on the other hand, rarely even mention the characters or the animation artists by name: what mattered were the rational systems and the calculative, replaceable workers engaged in them. Nevertheless, as Prescott remarked, "a kid in that [very young] age group, he thinks a cartoon character is a real

please cite published version

live person" (author interview, 2004), and, as Kirshner recounted in the Rolling Stone interview cited above, he and Filmation were bombarded with requests for an Archies live performance tour.[xv] The effect is one of virtual labor: labor "that is such for practical purposes though not in name or according to strict definition" (Concise Oxford Dictionary 1999~~, 1565~~).

Norm Prescott assumed a similar role with respect to *The Archie Show* that Kirshner had with *The Monkees*. He discussed with his songwriters (many of whom had worked for Kirshner before and during his Monkees tenure) "the fact that the kind of songs that we wanted were bubblegum oriented songs, I gave a few examples, they understood immediately." Kirshner had been hired because "he'd already done it [with the Monkees]," recalls Prescott, and

> I figured this was a shortcut. He got a good deal, he got a guarantee of the music being on the air. And that gives the publisher a pretty sizeable chunk of dough. He was hired by Filmation to do a job and he was hired because he was good. For that job he got X percentage of the publishing rights [and because of his existing deal with RCA] we had an automatic RCA Victor release on one of their other subsidiary labels (author interview, 2004).

Kirshner had treated the Monkees as "calculative actors with instrumental orientations to work," who, as such, should have been willing to be controlled and objectified in the manner he preferred. Yet efficiency, stability, and predictability had not been their essential motivations and they threw off the yoke of his command. The new form of "bubblegum" music was attractive to Prescott and Kirshner at least in part because many of its writers, arrangers, musicians and performers were "calculative actors" agreeable to being slotted into a rational system. Kirshner tended to inflate his

please cite published version

role in the creation of the Archies; perhaps he found his own relegation to a position of "value-adding," despite the rivers of income it generated for him, something of an ignominy after his years at the top of the division of musical labor. In the long run, perhaps, that would appear to be a small price to pay for the kind of control he and Filmation were able to exercise over divisions of creative labor through their production of the virtual labor of the Archies.[xvi]

4. Conclusion: Agency, Alienation, and the Politics of the Virtual in Entertainment Labor

In his discussion of the *Lord of the Rings* character Gollum, Tom Gunning (2006, 330) argues that the impulse to create a "moving human simulacrum" predates the advent of motion pictures by centuries and has been a crucial impulse in filmmaking for the history of the field. But while that impulse may be a longstanding one, its meaning changes in different political-economic conditions. Jonathan Burston, in his call for a reprioritization of critical political economic approaches to communication and media studies, argues for the centrality of the consideration of conditions of labor in what he calls "the military industrial media complex," "an emerging macro-political formation inside of which Siliwood [an industry nickname for digitalized Hollywood]-Pentagon collaboration has been increasing prodigiously" (Burston 2006, 251). Burston understands what I've termed virtual labor as the further managerial penetration and alienation of a form of highly public labor that had in fact proposed as possible in modern society, if only symbolically, the realization of species being. "[E]mbedded within the actor's nearly insatiable desire for attention is a distinctly non-neurotic desire fundamental to progressive politics. This is the desire for unalienated labor; for work in

please cite published version

which each of us may fully apprehend the linked dimensions of our individuality and our sociality" (Burston 2006, 257). What Gunning's historicization of the centuries-old aesthetic project of simulacra production misses – as does Mark Wolf's taxonomy, however helpfully descriptive it may be – are "the material and cultural circumstances" of hybrid or "cyborg" subjects, who, "despite 'the indeterminacy of their hybrid design', continue operating quite comfortably inside 'concrete relations of power and domination'" (Balsamo 1997, quoted in Burston).

The recent SAG videogame contract negotiations suggest some of the stakes involved in struggles over the terms and degrees of alienation and appropriation engaged in by actors and their industry employers. The story of this particular struggle involves "bitter infighting" at SAG (Hiestand 2005b) and deserves greater attention than I can give it here. However, some of the arguments made by video game industry representatives merit mention. Howard Fabrick told the Hollywood Reporter that "the union's demand for an equity stake, or residual structure, is unreasonable and not fair to the hundreds of people who often spend years in developing games" (quoted in Hiestand 2005a). The subtext here is not buried too deeply; this is suggested by the remarks of another videogame industry professional, Lev Chapelsky, who argued that "it was amazingly presumptive of them to impose procedures from Hollywood onto an industry that's really a technology with a different heritage, culture, business practices and economics" (quoted in Hiestand 2005a). What they are not saying (particularly Chapelsky with his depoliticizing reduction of "an industry" to "a technology") is that the videogame industry is accustomed to a "work-for-hire" environment in which the alienation and appropriation characteristic of the employment relation in capitalism – to which game

please cite published version

developers are typically subject – is unhampered by "Hollywood"-style proprietary claims based either on collective bargaining or legal or cultural concepts of authorship (Stahl 2009; Fisk 2003). The granting to performers of an "equity stake" based on the recognition of authorship codified in SAG's basic agreements with other contractors of actor labor could be seen as a validation of the "non-neurotic" desire for less- or un-alienated occupational positions. The "foot in the door" of reuse payments sought by SAG might be seen by videogame executives as a contagion, threatening to infect game developers – de-authorized by way of the employment relation – with the notion that they too might be able to make claims on such a stake based either on collective bargaining or a widespread and consequential redefinition of what they do as authorship.

This article has offered a glimpse into the prehistory of contemporary televisual-cinematic innovation in order to bring to light the logics and politics that are never far from "purely technical" advances in entertainment and advertising production. The trajectory of Don Kirshner from *The Monkees* to *The Archies* brings into relief historical convergences of efficiencies and rationalizations in different but related fields. These convergences are fortuitous for entertainment capital in that they allow the solution of labor problems – the minimization of agency costs made possible by the replacement of singing/dancing/instrument-playing, potentially ungovernable flesh and blood subjects – with "virtual laborers," the visible, audible and non-agentic avatars of hidden ensembles of visual effects technology and divisions of cultural industry labor.

please cite published version

Works Cited

Aldred, J. 2006. All Aboard *The Polar Express*: A 'Playful' Change of Address in the Computer-Generated Blockbuster. *Animation: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 1/2: 153-172.

Archer, E. 1964. Bellhop Turned Millionaire, 30, heads a Columbia Film Division. *New York Times*. 14 Sept. 1964: 10.

Armstrong, P. 1991. Contradiction and social dynamics in the capitalist agency relationship. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 16/1: 1-25.

Backstage.com. 2005. SAG Yeas Two New Pacts. Accessed August 4, 2006.

Baker, G. A. 1997. *Monkeemania*. London: Plexus.

Barley, S. and Gideon Kunda 1992. Design and Devotion: Surges of Rational and Normative Ideologies of Control in Managerial Discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37: 363-399.

Billboard 1969a. Kirshner Sets Pic, Disk Deals for "Tomorrow." October 22: 69.

Billboard 1969b. Kirshner's TV Formula Clicks Again, Finds Plenty of Sugar in The Archies. December 24: 39.

Bouldin, J. 2004. Cadaver of the Real: Animation, Rotoscoping, and the Politics of the Body. *Animation Journal* 12: 7-31.

Braverman, H. 1975. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Burawoy, M. 1985. *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*. London: Verso.

Burston, J. 2006. Synthespians among us: Rethinking the actor in media work and media theory. In *Media and Cultural Theory*, ed. J. Curran and D. Morley, 250-262. London: Routledge.

Canby, V. 1966. The Monkees prepare audience for TV debut. *New York Times* 10 Sept 1966: 59.

Concise Oxford Dictionary. 1999. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crafton, D. 1984. *Before Mickey: The Animated Film, 1898-1928*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Deneroff, H. 1987. "We Can't Get Much Spinach": The Organization and Implementation of the Fleischer Animation Strike. *Film History* 1/1: 1-14.

Denning, M. 1997. *The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century*. London: Verso.

please cite published version

Ellerman, D. 1992. *Property and Contract in Economics: The case for Economic Democracy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Ellerman, D. 2005. Translatio versus Concessio: Retrieving the Debate about Contracts of Alienation with an Application to Today's Employment Contract. *Politics and Society*, Vol. 33 No. 3, September 2005: 449-480.

Erickson, H. 1995. *Television cartoon shows: an illustrated encyclopaedia, 1949 through 1993*. Jefferson City: McFarland.

Fisk, C. 2003. Authors at Work: The Origins of the Work-For-Hire Doctrine. *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities* 15/1: 1-70.

Fong-Torres, B. 1970. Fake Zombies? Fake Animals? Fake Archies? Rolling Stone, 28 May: 1.

Goostree, L. 1988. The Monkees and the Deconstruction of Television Realism. *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 16/2: 50-58.

Gunning, T. 2006. Gollum and Golem: Special Effects and the Technology of Artificial Bodies. In *From Hobbits to Hollywood: Essays on Peter Jackson's Lord of the Rings*, ed. E. Mathijs and M. Pomerance, 319-350. New York: Rodopi.

Hendershot, H. 1998. *Saturday morning censors: television regulation before the V-chip*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hiestand, J. 2005a. Actors tilt toward vid game strike. *Hollywood Reporter* May 16 (online edition, n.p.n.).

Hiestand, J. 2005b. Split panel rejects SAG games deal. *Hollywood Reporter* June 22 (online edition, n.p.n.).

Keightley, K. 2001. Reconsidering Rock. In *The Cambridge companion to pop and rock*, ed. S. Frith, W. Straw and J. Street, 109-142. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K. 1906. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (Vol. 1) (Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling). New York: Modern Library.

Paul, A. and A. Kleingartner. 1996. The Transformation of Industrial Relations in the Motion Picture and Television Industries: The Talent Sector. In *Under the Stars: Essays on Labor Relations in Arts and Entertainment*, ed. L. S. Gray and R. L. Seeber, 156-180. Ithaca: ILR Press.

Paul, A. and A. Kleingartner. 1994. Flexible Production and the Transformation of Industrial Relations in the Motion Picture and Television Industry. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47/4: 663-678.

Pitzonka, B. 2001. Interview with Toni Wine. In *Bubblegum music is the naked truth*, ed. K. Cooper, D. Smay, 50. Los Angeles: Feral House.

please cite published version

Polanyi, K. 2001. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ramaeker, P. 2001. "You Think They Call Us Plastic *Now*..." The Monkees and *Head*. In *Soundtrack Available: Essays on Film and Popular Music*, ed. P. Wocjik and A. Knight, 74-102. Charleston: Duke University Press.

Rolling Stone. 1969. James Bond + Monkees = Tomorrow. March 15: 8.

Ryan, B. 1992. *Making Capital from Culture: The Corporate Form of Capitalist Cultural Production*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Shaw, G. 1980. Brill building pop. In *The Rolling stone illustrated history of rock & roll*, ed. J. Miller, 120-127. New York: Rolling Stone.

Smay, D. 2001. Toni Wine. In *Bubblegum music is the naked truth*, ed. K. Cooper and D. Smay, 48-50. Los Angeles: Feral House.

Solomon, C. 1989. *Enchanted Drawings: The History of Animation*. New York: Knopf.

Stahl, M. 2002. Authentic Boy Bands on TV? Performers and Impresarios in The Monkees and Making the Band. *Popular Music*, 21/3: 327-349.

Stahl, M. 2005. Non-Proprietary Labor and the Uses of Autonomy: Artistic Labor in American Film Animation, 1900-2004. *Labor: Studies in the Working-Class History of the Americas*, 2/4: 87-105.

Stahl, M. 2009. Privilege and Distinction in Production Worlds: Copyright, Collective Bargaining, and Working Conditions in Media Making. In *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*, ed. Vicki Mayer, Miranda Banks, and John Caldwell, 54-67. New York and London: Routledge.

Starker, S. 1989. *Evil Influences: Crusades Against the Mass Media*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Steinfeld, R. 2001. *Coercion, Contract, and Free Labor in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swanigan, M. 1993. *Animation by Filmation.* Caspar, California: Black Bear Press.

Sweeney, G. and J. Williams 2002. "Mortal Kombat" The Impact of Digital Technology on the Rights of Studios and Actors to Derivative Works'" *Minnesota Intellectual Property Review* 3: 95-110.

Szatmary, D. P. 1991. *Rockin' in time : a social history of rock-and-roll*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Tinker, T. 2002. Spectres of Marx and Braverman in the twilight of postmodernist labour process research. *Work, Employment, and Society* 16/2: 251-281.

Toynbee, J. 2000. *Making Popular Music*. London: Arnold.

please cite published version

Toynbee, J. 2003. Fingers to the Bone or Spaced Out on Creativity? Labor Process and Ideology in the Production of Pop. In *Cultural Work: Understanding the Cultural Industries*, ed. A. Beck, 39-55. New York: Routledge.

Watts, S. 1997. *The Magic Kingdom: Walt Disney and the American Way of Life.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Werbin, S.1972. Monkee Man Does Fillmore of the Air. *Rolling Stone*: 12 July 1972: 18-19.

Wolf, M. 2003. The Technological Construction of Performance. *Convergence* 9/4: 48-59.

(The author wishes to thank Jonathan Burston, Katie Vann, Val Hartouni, Geof Bowker, Chandra Mukerji, Keir Keightley, Robert Horwitz, and Heide Solbrig for their conversation and comments, and an anonymous reviewer for helpful critique.)

please cite published version

Notes

[i] The program actually ran through 1978 in a number of forms, on CBS through 1976, then NBC 1977-78 (Erickson 1995, 70-71).

[ii] These terms are subject to some argument and debate between critical and mainstream thinkers in economics, political economy, and political theory. My goal in adopting this admittedly somewhat simplified analytical framework is to help bring new critical perspectives to bear in the study of media's politics of production. That said, I do not believe I am misrepresenting these terms in any way other than in my simplification of them. For a critical introduction to "agency," see Armstrong (1991); for appraisal of the debates surrounding issues in the "labor process" engaged in this article, see Tinker (2002).

[iii] "Performance capture" involves suiting a performer in a bodystocking to which are fixed reflective dots that can be read by computer software. The recorded movements of these dots can then be abstracted from the original performance and used to animate the form of a digital character.

[iv] "Image analysis" is a technological improvement on the use of performance capture techniques in the animation of facial expressions and mouth movement in digital characters. It involves the use of sophisticated software to analyze and extract information from the video-recorded movements of a human actor's face, *sans* performance capture dots.

[v] The technologies of performance and image capture themselves have a technological ancestor – rotoscoping – that predates the rock'n'roll cartoons analyzed here. See Bouldin 2004.

[vi] The Monkees did, however, continue to produce audio-visual media. A one-hour television special (*33 1/3 Revolutions Per Monkee*) followed the end of the season, and then a full-length motion picture (*Head*). Each of these productions was self-reflexively, agonizingly concerned to explore the "media machine" that constructed the Monkees and foisted them upon the public as an actual band (see Ramaeker 2001, 96).

[vii] Obviously, the work of writers should in most circumstances be considered "conception." I categorize it as "execution" because of its integration into a division of labor commanded by Kirshner.

[viii] Of course, because its final destination is the public domain, intellectual property can only be held temporarily. This arrangement, nevertheless, behaves as ownership for the duration of the copyright term, or the length of time for which a property is licensed by an author to another party.

[ix] There is evidence that Kirshner initiated several other live-action projects organized around work-for-hire bands, including 1969 efforts *Tomorrow* ("James Bond + Monkees," featuring Olivia Newton-John) (Rolling Stone 1969) and *The Kowboys*

please cite published version

(Billboard 1969b), and two noted by Werbin in 1972, *The Here After* ('about a rock group that die in a plane crash…but were allowed to come back to earth with an adequate number of supernatural powers and a guardian angel for a roadie') and *Boon Town* ('about a "Creedence-type" band trying to make it in the old west') (Werbin 1972, 10).

[x] Stahl, 2005; see also Watts (1997, 203-207) and Denning (1997, 413-432) on the Disney strike, and Deneroff (1987) on the strike at the Fleischer brothers' studio.

[xi] This story is also affirmed by Billboard (1969a).

[xii] Erickson (1995) credits the impetus for *The Archie Show* to CBS executive Fred Silverman. Silverman, Erickson writes, was under fire from advocates of children's television because of the increasing amount of violent superhero cartoons in CBS' Saturday morning line-up (see also Hendershot, 1998). Silverman was supposed by Erickson to have commissioned Filmation Studios to produce *The Archie Show,* which in its original printed form was itself a comic book industry response to a full-fledged 1940s media panic about violence in comic books (See Starker 1989, 78-87), in order to assuage these critics and avoid the risk of a negative evaluation by the FCC. (Erickson also credits CBS with the engagement of Kirshner as music supervisor [71].) Also interesting to note is Erickson's (1995, 97) assertion that Silverman's original impetus for a superhero cartoons was the ratings dominance in the 1965-1966 season (52% of the Saturday morning audience) of ABC's animated Beatles cartoon.

[xiii] It's very telling that Prescott, accustomed to working with cartoon characters, would think of Kirshner not only as having created the Monkees, but that he would also transpose their restriction from *playing* on their records to *singing* as well.

[xiv] The cost savings attributable to this extreme reliance on cycling were so significant that Filmation was the last of the L.A. TV animation studios to go under in the late 70s/early 80s rash of offshoring that restructured the domestic animation industry. According to one former Filmation storyboard artist, "the stock system, with all its drawbacks, was the main reason so many of us were employed for so long in the 80s. The other studios had shipped their animation overseas and we could read the handwriting on the wall" (http://www.animationnation.com/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=print_topic;f=1;t=001868, accessed 10/24/06). Filmation remained in operation until 1989.

[xv] Kirshner and other Archies stakeholders were bedeviled for a time by a bogus Archies touring act that performed in the Midwest and Northwest areas of the US in 1969-70. "The Archies music property is controlled by my operations," Kirshner told Ben Fong-Torres of *Rolling Stone*, "[w]e've heard about this group and we've notified them that our lawyers are taking action" (Fong-Torres 1970, 6).

[xvi] In direct contrast to his experience with the Monkees, for example, Kirshner was free to fire Toni Wine – who sang on several Archies hits including "Sugar, Sugar" – when she asked to participate in royalties. (Wine had originally joined Kirsher's Brill Building

please cite published version

machine in the very early 60s as a teenaged songwriter. See Smay 2001, 48-49; Pitzonka 2001, 50).

please cite published version