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From Minstrel to Instagram: The Power of Blackface Make-Up in Performative Spaces

Camille Wise

AMST 502T: American Space, Place, and Architecture

This essay was written for AMST 502T: American Space, Place, and Architecture taught by Dr. Sara Fingal. This paper seeks to illustrate the power of blackface make-up within historical and contemporary performative spaces. Through dramatic theory and archival research of minstrel show guides, I analyze how the power of blackface make-up in relieving and supporting its users in traditional theatrical spaces has traveled into contemporary spaces. I argue that the make-up of blackface played a critical role in traditional blackface minstrel shows as it assisted in perpetuating White supremacy, gender roles, and racism. The success of this practice has allowed blackface and its variants to continue in twenty-first century public (including digital) spaces. Altogether, the study fits into the larger discourses of beauty politics, dress studies, social media and the protection and preservation of White supremacy in physical and digital spaces.

In a 2018 interview, a White woman named Aga Brzostowska defended her practice of blackfishing by making the following statement: “I really appreciate the culture and I really just love the look - that was literally it.”1 Blackfishing, a practice where (mostly) White women mimic Black aesthetics and culture through make-up and other accessories for capital gain, has become a growing phenomenon in digital spaces and has been regarded as a contemporary form of blackface.2 Unknowingly, Brzostowska shares the same sense of “appreciation” of Black culture as White, blackface performers during the nineteenth
The “father” of American blackface minstrelsy, Thomas D. Rice, was also fascinated by Black people and their culture. To “appreciate” and share this culture, both Rice and Brzostowska used make-up and other aesthetics to emulate and perform Blackness. Although the two performers are from different time periods and spaces, they both gained capital for the usage of blackface make-up.

The flexibility and longevity of blackface make-up demonstrates that it is a tool of power to gain capital and to dominate different spaces. Despite this power, the make-up is often reduced to a disguise or as a racist practice. Additionally, the literature surrounding blackface minstrelsy examines other artistic elements of the shows, such as music, dance, and comedy, yet make-up is excluded. However, as the application of blackface make-up is one of the few components of traditional blackface minstrel shows that continues to be used in contemporary, performative spaces, it too should be discussed. The make-up of blackface played a critical role in traditional blackface shows as it assisted in perpetuating White supremacy, gender roles, and racism. The power and success provided to the users of blackface make-up has traveled and survived into contemporary spaces. Thus, this paper illustrates the power of blackface make-up within these historical and contemporary performative spaces. First, the creation of blackface in nineteenth century theaters by White men will be examined as they set the foundation for the performance style. Next, the blackface theater as an illusionary, gendered, and therapeutic space will be explored, along with how blackface make-up reinforced these spaces. Finally, this paper will conclude by considering how the practice of blackface and its variants have continued in twenty-first century public, including digital, spaces. By examining the continuation and power of blackface in different performative spaces, this paper contributes to the study of blackface minstrelsy and its legacy.

The History of American Blackface

The application of blackface was not a new practice within the theater. Decades before, Americans and Europeans had been using blackface make-up to portray darker-skinned characters such as Shakespeare’s Othello. However Americans, particularly those residing in Northeastern states, had created their own form of blackface
During the early nineteenth century; a make-up application that would transform the theater into a place of racism, White supremacy, and misogyny, while alleviating the anxieties of its user and audience.

During the early nineteenth century, the American North was experiencing a time of quick progression in industrialization, immigration, and racial tensions. Mesmerized by the North’s pride in progressive industrialization and the abolishment of chattel slavery, multiple populations, including Black people, relocated to the American North. However, their presence was not welcomed by White workers as they too wanted these opportunities. Additionally, the freedom promised by the North came with contingencies in the form of laws. With the threat of immigration already affecting Americans, laws such as the 1821 Constitution were put into place to limit the freedoms of Black people. While Black people were limited in their freedom, they still had similar opportunities for working-class jobs. Feeling a sense of threat and violation, White men turned to the theatrical stage.

Why the theater? The theater was a place of entertainment for the audience and performer(s) to escape the realities and responsibilities of their daily lives. The theater gave its attendees a sense of control over each other and their own lives. Dramatic theorist, Gay McAuley defines theater as a place that exists to help further construct the culture it is within. Thus, the theater mirrors culture in a constructed manner. Recognizing the power of the theater, White men took the stage in torn clothing and blackface make-up to reinforce their White supremacy.

In 1824 Charles Matthew, a British performer, is recorded as one of the first to perform in blackface, mimicking the Black people he had seen in the American South. However, as Matthew performed in Europe, scholars often attribute American Thomas D. Rice as the “father of American minstrelsy” due to his popular character “Jim Crow.” Regardless of who the “father” was, both performers used similar methods to create their characters. They observed and recorded Black people in the South and mimicked their findings on stage in the North. In particular, Rice observed a crippled Black man who was limping and singing on a street. Rather than assisting the man, Rice took his observations and reenacted them on stage in the North. Wear-
ing tattered clothes, speaking in exaggerated African American vernacular English, and wearing blackface make-up, Rice was committed to telling his audience about his tales in the South. His one-man show developed into a success and became the blueprint for how to perform a blackface minstrel show.

A key determinant of a successful blackface minstrel show was authenticity. Like Rice and Matthews, one had to visit the South and experience Black people and culture in order to portray them. These observations were imperative, as an objective of early blackface minstrel shows was to fascinate, introduce, and teach White Northerners about Southern Black people. As previously discussed, the theater was a place to teach and mirror society. In the case of the blackface theater, the theater was used to teach about racial hierarchies and White supremacy. Although prideful in their authentic performances, the blackface minstrel shows were ultimately the narratives of White men about Black people. Especially when the shows became popular and began building troupes such as the Christy Minstrels and the Virginia Minstrels. The show grew from a one-man show to multiple men on stage attempting to sell out shows. Thus, the emphasis of authenticity quickly switched to an emphasis of entertainment.

As racial tensions increased in the mid-nineteenth century, the material of the shows, reflecting its current culture, took a drastic turn. With the influx of Black migrants and talk of a civil war, both performers and audience members found themselves in an aggravated state of anxiety. White men, who held the power in the theater and their race, changed their innocent “Negro characters” into buffoons incapable of progression. These characters no longer just sang and danced about nonsense, rather they sang and danced in the South where they supposedly thrived and belonged; whereas in the North, the “Negro” suppositively struggled to adapt to the progression and modernization of the Northern states. For example, Black people were depicted in shows as struggling and failing to define gravity and electricity. In these instances, Black people were not only fools, but symbols of the past—a past White people were not and did not want to be associated with. Whiteness was portrayed as progressive and supreme in society. Therefore, during a time of rising racial tensions and White anxi-
ety, there was a need for this message to be reiterated. This was done through American “Negro” characters that White men had created for the theater. Not only did the characters and blackface make-up create racial hierarchies, but it also gave White men the ability and power to “switch” their races. This ability was both awed and rewarded, supporting that these men were dominant members of society. Understanding their power of illusion within the theater, these men also used the blackface minstrel show to push masculinity and as a tool to alleviate White anxiety.

The Space of Theatrical Blackface

The nineteenth century theater was unique, in the sense that it was one of the few places that brought all classes together, with the average poor man all the way up to the President of the United States attended blackface minstrel shows. However, having established that the theater reflects the culture it is in, the theater was segregated by class and race. Despite this, what drew different populations to the theater was the low price of admission. For blackface theater, the opportunity to experience and understand Black people drew in crowds. The opportunity to see and experience where “Negroes” dwell was key to the success of these performances in Northern states. Through illusion, the theater allowed its audience a venture to the South, without the need to physically travel.

A Space of Illusion

Ultimately, as a form of entertainment and art, the theater is a place of illusion, a place where the imagination can roam without questions. Yet, because the theater is based upon imagination, it is a fairly fragile place. Dramatic theorist Gay McAuley suggests that by “being an event rather than an object, performance is radically unstable.” Moreover, as the theater is a physical place that holds people, this instability applies to those within the space. Due to this instability, there is a need for dependency between the performer and audience to support the illusion of the theater. Arguably, the anxieties of blackface performers and White Northerners regarding Black people and progression not only mirrored the instability of the theater, it exacerbated it. For this reason, when a blackface performer took the stage, he accepted this instability, but expressed it through a Black character. By doing so,
White people were no longer unstable, rather it was Black people. Yet, how was it possible to create the illusion of Black people? As theater is a space that heavily relies on visual work, these performers looked towards the visual difference between Black and White people, which was their skin color. As skin color was a determinant of one’s race and place in society, especially for Black people, the change of skin color was necessary. If the skin color was not changed, White performers risked losing their power over Blackness. Without blackface make-up there were no “Negroes” on stage, there were White men. However, as the “supreme” race and gender, White men did not have exaggerated mannerisms or features, only “Negroes” did. This protection of Whiteness was seen in a review of a blackface minstrel show where the *London Illustrated News* admitted that “with white faces the whole affair would be intolerable.”¹⁵ Without blackface make-up, White men could not portray race and consequently, the illusion of Black people as fools and inferior was at risk. To mimic this difference and submerge the audience, and themselves, into illusion, White men painted their skin with black make-up, used exaggerated African American vernacular English, and learned to play the tambourine and banjo. With the combination of these elements, the space quickly transformed from a theater in the North into a caricature of a Southern plantation, and it was effective. Many audience members truly believed that there were “Negroes” on stage.¹⁶ This success of tricking the audience reveals the necessity of transforming a performer’s skin color. For if their White skin was exposed, they ran the risk of having their performance and supremacy fail.

Although the visual work stabilized the illusion within the theater, the ignorance of the audience also contributed. Summarizing Antonin Artaud’s concept of illusion, dramatic theorist Daphna Ben Chaim states that “the spectator hold a certain distance from the work.”¹⁷ Both in knowledge and physical space, the audience in the blackface theater is distanced from the “Negroes” on stage. Furthermore, if actual Black people were present in the audience, they were segregated.¹⁸ The lack of knowledge that White Northerners had about Southern Black people enticed them to the theater, yet the physical distance between the audience and the “Negroes” provided the audi-
ence a safe environment to learn about racial hierarchies. The physical space reinforced the notion that Black people were not part of society, nor were they able to be in close proximity with White people. Consequently, the blackface theater becomes what scholar Tim Cresswell defines as a “place to produce order.” While the material in blackface performances perpetuated racial hierarchies, the physical space simultaneously reinforced these ideals. The illusion of the blackface theater allowed White men to transform the stage while depicting Black people as unstable beings, further elevating their power in Whiteness. Recognizing the power the theater had, these men continued to use it to elevate their race, and their gender.

A Gendered Space

The blackface theater was a gendered space that assisted in the upliftment of masculinity. Most blackface performers on stage, especially headliners and directors, were male. Headliners such as Edwin P. Christy, Frank Dumont, Thomas D. Rice, and Dan Emmett all shared multiple characteristics—they were White, American, and men. Additionally, these men originally came from working-class jobs that were easily replaceable by technology or the labor of other people. Recognizing their vulnerability and the theater as a social tool, they took the stage to reinforce gender roles.

Before the Civil War, the Women’s Rights movement was a regular occurring topic in blackface minstrel shows. The performers ridiculed the objectives of the movement including jokes that suggested women wanted to wear pants. However, again using “Negro characters” to avoid responsibility or ridicule, these men used blackface make-up to propose that women did not deserve voting rights. Building upon the notion that Black people were fools, White men used their “Negro characters” to prove that the Women’s suffrage movement was comical. Black people were not even capable of assimilating successfully to the North, nor speaking “proper” English. Having their “Negro characters” speak of women’s rights suggested that it was a movement not to be considered seriously. By using their “Negro characters” to critique the women’s suffrage movement, White men were simultaneously relieving their racial and gender anxieties. They were able to portray the women’s suffrage movement as foolish, while continuing
to portray Black people as fools.

Another aspect that illustrated the misogyny and bulked-up masculinity of White men were the characters themselves. As the blackface minstrel show grew in popularity, the material of the shows also expanded. This included adding “Negro” female characters. Similar to their male counterparts, the female characters were fools and incapable of handling basic tasks. However, they were often depicted as more foolish than their husbands. This is notably seen in the depiction of William Burton’s character “Mrs. Toodles,” a Black woman who bought trash and attempted to convince her husband it was treasure. Simultaneously, her purchasing power was mocked and observed by her husband. A husband who was skeptical and distrusting of his wife’s purchasing power. Despite being a Negro, the husband is deemed as the reasonable character, further supporting the idea that men were the dominant gender, regardless of race.

While there were reports of women performing in blackface in the early nineteenth century, it was limited. It was limited because men were willing to cross-dress in order to control the narrative of both race and gender. Scholar Thomas Morawetz suggests that “the actor is the exemplary manipulator and tester of our psychological assumptions about the self and others.” These men recognized the power and status of the performer and thus they protected these characters for themselves. By cross-dressing, White men were able to keep their power of the stage while controlling the narratives and lives of Black and White women. Yet, during the late nineteenth century, as competition from motion pictures, girl shows, and actual Black performers increased, women were more welcomed to the blackface stage. Although women began to produce and act in blackface performances, the association of the stage with White men was concrete. The power White men had over the blackface theater has stretched across decades. For instance, in a series of interviews with Black women, Benét Burton found that multiple participants associated traditional blackface with White men. While scholars have recorded women performing in blackface, it seems that in contemporary society, White men continue to remain the dominant figure in blackface minstrelsy. This could be a result of men’s hypervisibility in records of blackface performances and
that the most successful performers were men. Regardless, it is clear that the traditional blackface theater was and still is a space preserved in masculinity.

As previously mentioned, the theater is an unstable place of illusion that requires the co-dependency of the performer and the audience. Therefore, to uphold this illusion of White masculinity, the audience too needed to reflect and believe it. This is evident through the general population attendance in nineteenth century theater, particularly blackface theater, being men. It was not until the addition of female characters and others that the shows became open to women and children. Before then, the theater was an event for men to socialize with each other. With few-to-no women in attendance, the audience was a crowd of unrestricted White masculinity, which was encouraged by directors and performers. In a guide advising proper etiquette for theater attendance, the director encouraged men to spit and chew tobacco if no women or children were present. As the theater was interactive and considered a form of free speech, these men were allowed to shout and make demands of the performers with no consequences. Their equal control over the performance fueled their desire to have power. This sense of control was mirrored on stage as performers created their own narratives of gender and race—narratives that relieved their anxieties of the unknown. While the theater captured the social norms of the nineteenth century, one of its most prevalent roles was being a therapeutic space for White anxiety. Therapeutic in the sense that blackface performances provided social, economic, and psychological relief for those who performed and attended.

A Therapeutic Space for Racial and Class Anxieties

The blackface minstrel show was ultimately the result of the fears that White Northerners and White immigrants had around social change and the migration of Black people to the North. Through a black comical mask, performers turned to the theatre, a place of communication with different classes, to emphasize that Black people were inferior to White people and did not belong in the North. Many who took to the stage were amateurs who were seeking to maintain or create a new identity. Whether it was social or economic status, the black mask provided opportunities for success. Additionally, the blackface
make-up provided a therapeutic relief for racial anxieties to those who applied and performed in it.

As mentioned above, those who generally took to the blackface stage were men with working-class jobs. The ease of their potential replacement by immigrants, women, and Black people generated anxiety among White men. The blackface theater provided opportunities to these men as it was an amateur-friendly performance that did not necessarily require talent. Men from a variety of backgrounds took to the stage, especially when the style of performance grew in popularity and produced blackface stars. During the late nineteenth century, an ordinary star would make a salary between $40 to $75 per performance.32 This salary equates to today’s purchasing power of about $900 to $1,700. If one was able to reach stardom in minstrelsy their salary would have equated to a six-figure salary today. These performers who took the stage as immigrants or middle-class Americans were obtaining and surpassing the social and economic class status that they were afraid of losing. They were no longer the poor or foreign man; they were stars listed on playbills throughout the United States and international countries.

Along with their economic success, blackface minstrel shows aided in the relief of the performers and audiences’ anxieties of the changing future. Historically, scholar Robert C. Toll suggests that White Americans have sought out to racially subordinate other people when their lives or interests were challenged.33 This practice is seen in blackface minstrelsy as these performers created inferior “Negro characters.” Although generally inferior, these characters were superior in one aspect, which was the ability to express emotion. In blackface minstrel shows, the “Negro characters” often danced, shouted, cried, and provided social commentary without judgement or repercussions. The average White immigrant or American middle-class man was not socially associated with exaggerated emotions, only women were. Therefore, the “Negro characters” these men would play allowed them to fully express these anxieties without critique. When these men were finished performing, they were once again “a Caucasian ready to take up the ‘White man’s burden’ instead of the Negroes.”34 The White man’s burden being the reality of the changing world around them,
which included the women’s suffrage movement, the abolitionist movement, and the migration of Black people, and their position within that world. By wearing the black mask these men had the opportunity to avoid this reality by indulging in a fantasy of Black people.

This fantasy of Black people was also spread throughout the entire space of the theater as audience members stated they were left in “hypnotic” and “trance-like” states. By switching their races and creating an illusion, these men were ultimately defying nature, which may have contributed towards attracting audiences. Scholar William J. Mahar argues that the make-up of blackface should not be given magical qualities, as it was the performer who contributed to the performance. However, the cosmetic and theatrical guides at the time heavily implied that the make-up does indeed play a significant role in the success of a performance. Despite whether the actors or the make-up is given credit for the transformation, the idea that White men were talented enough to represent another race further elevated Whiteness. Therefore, the black mask did not merely disguise the performer. The mask provided a coping mechanism for these White men to deal with their anxieties and self-esteem. While these men used the black mask as a therapeutic tool, the black mask also provided economic and social status which maintained their race and gender as supreme.

**The Power of Make-Up in Blackface Theater**

Evidently, the blackface make-up proved to be significant in blackface minstrel shows as it was the namesake of the shows. Blackface make-up allowed and supported these men to fully submerge into their imaginations to embody and control their version of a “Negro.” One of the causes of the growth of blackface minstrel shows in the mid-nineteenth century were the diverse characters that were created. Each character served a different purpose; therefore, they were distinguished by different means, including make-up. By having different make-up applications for these “Negro characters,” it added depth to the performance and supported the illusion in the theater. By the late nineteenth century, when the blackface minstrels show faced competition, White men sought to rectify this by adding their Whiteness to stage. Cloaked in confidence, White men began to take the stage without blackface make-up. The next section will examine the powerful
and complex role make-up, or lack thereof, played in blackface minstrel shows.

**Creating Characters**

As the material and audience for blackface minstrel shows expanded and became diverse, so did the characters. The “Negro” now came in different ages, genders, and shades. Characters such as the “endmen,” the “Old Negro,” and the “Mulatto” became some of the leading characters in blackface minstrel shows. They were key to the shows because they all supported or addressed the White supremacy, misogyny, and racism within the blackface theater. As these characters were imperative to the stage, much of their depiction heavily relied on the application of make-up.

The first and most common of these characters were the “endmen.” The endmen, often referred to as “Tambo” and “Bones,” provided comedic relief to the shows. These characters followed the same general application of blackface make-up which included painting the entire face except for the eyes and mouth. The white circle around the perimeter of the eyes produced a comical look as the eyes appeared larger to the audience, especially at a distance.\(^3\) To provide a similar effect, performers shaped around the mouth with make-up. The endmen followed the same routine, but for these characters it was advised to apply red make-up to the lips.\(^4\) Since, the blackface theater is a space of masculinity, the usage of rouge and lipstick was admonished.\(^5\) Thus, men turned to carmine, which was a red grease-paint that was used by both genders on stage.\(^6\)

The large, red mouth helped the audience to identify the characters as comedic. Historically, this exaggerated red mouth has been associated with clowns within the theater. Scholar Thomas Morawetz defines clowns as having “an ambiguous status as a human and not-quite-human.”\(^7\) Similar to clowns, while the endmen spoke and breathed, they were still “not-quite-human” as they had exaggerated expressions and mannerisms. This was intentionally done as White men wanted to perpetuate that the “Negro” race was inferior in comparison to the White race. It is no mere coincidence that clowns and the endmen shared similar characteristics and make-up. Many of the performers who took to blackface minstrelsy were previously trained
and performed in circuses. Along with their skills, these performers brought the make-up of clowns to Negro minstrelsy. As their roles in comedy were similar, their make-up application required the same. The make-up of the endmen gave the characters an identity of comedy, one that was easily recognizable and signaled the audience to laugh. Moreover, it was an identity that was specifically reserved for these characters. At the turn of the twentieth century, the application of a red lip on one who was not an endman suggested amateurism. However, as endmen soon grew to become the only blackface characters on the stage, their red-lipped legacy continued in the selling of make-up. Twentieth century make-up guides created for both professionals and the common people advised for all “Negro characters” lips to be red. The character’s popularity would eventually lead to the selling of make-up kits to children. The endmen’s hypervisibility in blackface minstrel shows further preserved the ideal that Black people were inferior and that their inferiority was comedic.

Another popular character that rose to prominence in blackface minstrel shows was the “Old Negro.” The “Old Negro” made appearances in skits that reminisced the “good” times of living in the South. Shows including this character arose before and after the Civil War to mitigate the experiences of Black people in the South and to defer migration to the North. In such shows, the “Old Negro” would wail of missing his Master or a scene depicting his death would make his Master weep. The “Old Negro” was a unique character as he expressed somberness while perpetuating White supremacy. The responsibility of the “Old Negro” was to relay to the audience that Black people were loved by their masters and happy with the conditions that they were living in the South. Rather than being isolated from White people, the “Old Negro” was unique as he had a dependent relationship with them. These emotional relationships with their masters, attracted female audiences which grew the admissions and popularity of minstrel shows. The popularity of these shows would eventually lead it to include children in the audience, thus becoming a family affair. With the audience of blackface minstrel shows growing in diversity and numbers, the White men on stage were able to reinforce their White supremacy to their White, female counterparts and the upcoming generation.
Although the character seemed to innocently add depth to the performance, the character was ultimately a tool to give power to White people. The weeping of the “Old Negro’s” master suggested that the character was reliant on him just as much as he was reliant on his White master. Not only was he reliant on his White master, but the character was also portrayed as miserable in the North. His character echoed the earlier White anxieties of Black people migrating to the North. He was a physical and metaphorical representation of the past. Having established that he is a representation of the past, it is clear as to why they made him elderly.

As a character of the past and one who could make the audience weep, the “Old Negro” needed to be distinguished. To represent old age and the graying of hair, performers would apply white make-up to their wigs and apply “whiskers.” Instructional guides would recommend mixing the black pigment of burnt cork with a lighter color or to use greasepaint with a “more brown color.” The application of a lighter complexion was to bring authenticity to the character, as the color of one’s skin diminishes with age. The lighter skin color would also allow the performer to layer a darker colored liner on top to emphasize and create wrinkles on the face. Although the lighter skin color was used to represent aging, the diversity of hues among actual Black people was mimicked in the make-up of other “Negro characters.”

During the mid-to-late nineteenth century, as Black minstrel performers took to the stage, audience members were in awe of the variety of shades Black people came in. Scholar Robert C. Toll quotes minstrel attendees as being impressed with the “hues and complexions from light cream tint down to the darkness.” To compete and perform “authenticity,” White performers created the “Mulatto” and “Yaller gal” characters. These characters were created based on the racial classification of Black people who had African and European ancestry. The “Mulatto” character was often included in skits of slave rebellions. However, as the blackface theater was a place to relieve White anxiety and not induce it, slave rebellions were not commonly portrayed or the slaves never succeeded. If the show did portray a rebellion, it was often led by the “Mulatto” character. Placing the “Mulatto” in a position of leadership, was the attempt of White per-
formers to associate Whiteness with freedom and strength. It was due to the White blood in the “Mulatto” that he had leadership qualities, but it was the “Black” blood that resulted in defeat. By creating this association, White men were further established as the dominant race in the theater.

The introduction of lighter-skinned “Negro characters” also opened the opportunity for White women to take the stage of minstrelsy. Up until the late nineteenth century, the blackface minstrel shows were generally dominated by men. When female “Negro characters” were implemented in the shows they were performed by White men. While there were women who did don blackface, it was difficult finding women to play the part. A minstrel show guide suggested that this was due to women’s fear of blackface make-up “hiding” their beauty. This fear was likely due to the association of Blackness on stage as comical fools and non-attractive. However, the “Negro characters” with lighter skin and their association with love songs in minstrel shows gave women the opportunity to perform comfortably on stage.

These characters were often referred to as “yaller gals” and were presented to be alluring to the audience. For female “Negro minstrels,” the make-up was applied in a similar fashion as men, leaving a wide-gaping mouth and eyes. For characters such as “Mulattos,” “Octoroons,” and “yaller gals,” they applied their cosmetics in a “normal” manner, meaning they did not have exaggerated mouths and eyes. These performers applied their make-up in a “normal” manner because of the White blood the characters had. Blackness was not associated with beauty, thus they required exaggerated make-up, whereas the Whiteness of the “yaller gals” allowed some connection to beauty. Thus, not only was blackface a gendered practice but it conveyed colorism within the space of the theater. As a result, the blackface minstrel show continued to perpetuate White supremacy and White beauty standards within “Black” bodies.

Overall, the range of “Negro characters” and plots changed the theater into a place that sympathized slavery, reproduced gender roles, and colorism. To distinguish and create these characters make-up was required. The make-up allowed the performers to fully engage with their characters, but also allowed the audience to identify the charac-
ters and succumb to the illusion.

**The Style**

Along with the development of characters, the make-up ultimately changed the style and physical space of the minstrel show. Towards the late nineteenth century, minstrel shows were facing competition with other forms of entertainment such as “girl shows” and moving motion pictures. Furthermore, minstrel shows were no longer reserved for White men as White women and Black people were taking the stage, both together and separately. Thus, to stay competitive and attract larger audiences, the blackface minstrel show underwent a major transformation. This transformation produced different styles of shows and included categories such as whiteface and blackface. The definitive marker of each style of show was the usage of blackface make-up or the lack-thereof. The blackface style of shows mimicked the traditional minstrel shows where all performers wore blackface make-up. However, in whiteface shows, many of the White performers did not wear blackface make-up apart from the endmen. The White performers without make-up would be placed in the center of the stage, while the endmen sat on the sides. If make-up was worn by whiteface performers it was applied lightly to appear natural. The contrast in make-up application reiterated the vast difference between Whiteness and Blackness. Whiteness did not require much make-up and was stage ready, whereas the excess and exaggerations of blackface make-up made Blackness inferior. This is further supported by the notion that many White men discarded blackface make-up due to it being a “nuisance.” Blackness, both people and the pigment, were deemed inferior to these performers.

The whiteface performance style had intricate classifications on stage. The position and sequence of White men and endmen served a racial purpose. Geographer Tim Creswell suggests, “the stronger the spatial classification—the greater the desire to expel and exclude.” This spatial classification of White men and endmen was intentional as the purpose of the whiteface show was to “refine” and distance themselves from Black minstrel performers. White men used a tool that Black minstrel performers did not have—they used their White supremacy in an attempt to overpower this competition. Finally able to
relinquish their Whiteness, White bodies were centered on stage and many performers discarded blackface make-up. The same make-up that uplifted Whiteness was now only reserved for the “Negro” fools marginalized on the sides of the stage.

Overall, the make-up of blackface created a diverse space for multiple characters and genders to perform. The make-up assisted performers in transforming into their characters to provide a successful and “authentic” performance to the audience. The make-up allowed the audience to easily identify the characters on stage which further developed the co-dependent relationship between the performers and audience. The make-up of the characters transformed the theater into a place of colorism, misogyny, and White supremacy. With this power in mind, in comparison with other aesthetic and artistic elements, it could be argued that the make-up had the most control in blackface theater. Once White supremacy had been established in the theater, many blackface minstrel performers progressively removed the black mask that they had cherished for decades.

**Blackface in 21st Century Spaces**

There is a belief that blackface make-up declined and eventually disappeared in the mid-twentieth century. However, scholar Stephen Johnson suggests that blackface never fully disappeared at all. Johnson is correct; while blackface is not commonly practiced, it has been portrayed in films and shows such as *Tropic Thunder* (2008), *The Office* (2012), and *It’s Always Sunny in Philadelphia* (2013). Even outside of film and television, the application of blackface for costumes is still practiced in the twenty-first century. Notably in 2013, when actress Julianne Hough was photographed wearing blackface for her Halloween costume, she was heavily criticized in digital spaces such as Twitter. Fashion companies such as Gucci have been criticized for portraying traditional blackface in their clothing. It seems that the traditional application of blackface, such as the exaggerated application of black or brown make-up and enlarged lips, has become intolerable in contemporary American society. Despite this condemnation, a variant of blackface has been tolerated and even rewarded—a phenomenon called *blackfishing*. 
Coining the term in 2018, Wanna Thompson defines blackfishing as the practice of White women who impersonate Black women on social media and gain success from their impersonation. The practice of blackfishing includes a “range of practices to alter the physical appearances to adopt Black cultural aesthetics and linguistic patterns.” These practices include the application of darker make-up, tanning, and wearing hairstyles associated with African Americans, such as cornrows or box braids. While Thompson attributes this phenomenon to White women, it is not exclusive to them; other women such as Nikita “Dragun” Nguyen, who is of Vietnamese and Mexican decent, and Kim Kardashian, who has both European and Armenian ancestry, have been accused of blackfishing. Regardless of their race, these women practice blackface to gain some form of capital.

How does blackfishing produce capital for its users? Like the White men who took the blackface theatrical stage in the nineteenth century, these women create their own narratives of Blackness. These women pick and choose elements of Black culture they deem profitable or attractive enough to depict themselves. For instance, scholar Wesley Stevens notes that they [blackfishers] can choose how dark they want their skin one day and revert it the next day. Blackfishers participate in developing racial hierarchies by determining what parts of Black culture and people are profitable. Not only what is profitable, but what aspect of Blackness is allowed to touch their bodies. Through this process, these women create their own narratives of Blackness, a narrative that suggests Blackness is a commodity. Yet, how are these women even gaining access to Black culture? Especially when popular blackfishers such as Aga Brzostowska (Poland), Kim Kardashian (Calabasas, California), and Emma Hallberg (Sweden) all live in locations where the Black population is less than five percent? They are able to access this culture through social media, particularly through apps like Instagram that welcome and house international users.

Instagram is a digital space that is open to all users with internet access. It is a platform where users share visual work and personal aesthetics. Its accessibility leads to the platform being easily capitalized. Through the capitalization of aesthetics, a growing form of digital labor was created, known as influencing. Wesley Stevens defines influ-
encing as “a mode of digital labor that utilizes neoliberal logics and entrepreneurial discourses which invite users to capitalize on racialized bodies.” These neoliberal discourses suggest that all can take advantage and profit from the digital space. However, the capitalization of race prevents raced people from having equal access to these proposed opportunities.

Those who do successfully become influencers gain financial capital through sponsorships, marketing, and brand partnerships. To obtain this capital, there must be an appealing aesthetic or a relatable identity because Instagram is a space of visual work. Users search through millions of cultures and aesthetics online that they may see as being potentially profitable for them to replicate. So why choose Blackness? Scholar Maha Cherid proposes that it is because people, particularly White people, have been historically fascinated with Black culture, especially their aesthetics and art. Cherid’s theory is evidently seen in the fascination of blackface performers and attendees in traditional blackface minstrel shows. Similar to the blackface performers, blackfishers choose components of Black people and culture to mimic without the need to interact with real Black people. Unlike some White men who had to travel to the South for “authentic” material for their blackface routine, Instagram’s open platform allows these women to have easy access to cultures through hashtags created by Black people. This search is not only fueled by fascination, but also a desire to create and control their own type of identity and part of the digital space.

Blackfishers create their own ideals of Blackness and control what is considered reputable, but they also control the visibility of Blackness in digital spaces. As these women are rewarded for stolen aesthetics, financial opportunities are taken from the Black women who developed them. While Black women continue to contribute to digital spaces, blackfishers, their supporters, and social media apps continue to take advantage of these Black women. For example, Tajia Reed (also known as @donidarkowitz) is a Black female make-up artist who was mistreated and overworked by the cosmetic company Anastasia Beverly Hills. Reed revealed that the company promised compensation for her social media advertisements, but ultimately she was ignored
by the company and did not receive the correct compensation. Yet, Emma Hallberg, a woman from Sweden who is infamous for blackfishing, continues to be sponsored by beauty companies like Fashion Nova and Anastasia Beverly Hills. Additionally, she was offered the opportunity to create her own make-up line. By awarding Hallberg with the opportunity to create her own make-up, it validates her application of blackface make-up. The companies that endorse and reward Hallberg demonstrate that her blackface make-up is appropriate and an ideal aesthetic, worthy enough to be compensated. As a result, this aesthetic becomes something to be strived after and copied by many Instagram users which leads to the normalization and acceptance of blackface in digital spaces.

While the practice of blackfishing thrives in digital spaces, it is not exclusive to these spaces. The tolerance and compensation of blackfishing in digital spaces has normalized the practice in physical spaces. Notably, the case of Rachel Dolezal reflects this acceptance of blackfishing. In 2015, Dolezal, a White woman from Montana, was exposed by her parents for passing as a Black woman. To pass as Black, Dolezal tans her skin, wears darker make-up, and wears curly wigs and box braids. Through her practice of blackfishing, Dolezal was able to obtain opportunities such as attending a historical Black college, becoming the president of the NAACP Spokane chapter, and earning a position as an African American Studies professor. The exposure of her real race and her identification as “transracial” led her to lose all her positions of leadership. While Dolezal has seemingly been ostracized, she continues to gain capital from blackfishing. Her condemnation has rewarded her multiple sources of income including recurring interviews, a published book titled In Full Color: Finding My Place in a Black and White World (2017), and a Netflix documentary titled The Rachel Divide (2018). Additionally, because of her infamy, Dolezal legally changed her name to the Nigerian name Nkechi Amare Diallo. Dolezal states that she had to take a new name due to her struggles in obtaining a job after the scandal. Her choice in choosing a Nigerian name is no accident, it is part of her practice in blackfishing. In an interview with Tamron Hall, Dolezal explains that by having a Nigerian name she is able to receive job offers. Despite the criticism Dolezal
has received, she continues to take from Black culture to benefit herself, in this case to receive a job. Arguably, Dolezal continues to practice blackfishing because society continues to reward her for it. While Tamron Hall notes that Dolezal gets compensation from interviews and her books, Hall also is contributing to the pattern of rewarding Dolezal by giving her a platform. By providing Dolezal platforms, she continues to take up spaces for actual Black women while simultaneously giving blackface make-up power, as it continues to be shared and compensated by society.

The evidence examined in this paper highlights that the power and practice of blackface make-up has transcended across decades in both physical and digital performative spaces. The success White men in the North experienced by using blackface make-up as a tool of White supremacy, misogyny, and relief of anxiety has carried into contemporary users. Ironically, women now use blackface make-up and other aesthetics to gain the same form of capital as the men who performed traditional blackface. These women have gained power over digital and beauty spaces, including the access Black people have to these spaces. Both forms of blackface performance have commodified Black people while simultaneously rewarding those who apply the make-up. Black people and their culture have become a commodity that can be easily thrown away when it no longer benefits the user. Therefore, until this practice of traditional and contemporary blackface is rebuked, Black people and their culture will remain as sources of capital for non–Black people. By doing so, Robert C. Toll suggests that like the Cheshire Cat the legacy of blackface continues to linger invisible, except for its “grinning black mask” embedded in America’s consciousness and its performative spaces.83
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The Breast Pump: Reinforcing Oppressive "Good" Mother Ideologies Since 1996

Kelly Hansch McMahon

AMST 502T: American Space, Place, and Architecture

This paper was written in the spring of 2022 for Dr. Fin-gal’s AMST 502T Graduate Seminar on Space, Place, and Architecture. My paper examines the double electric breast pump and the space it allows between a lactating mother and her nursing child. First, my paper identifies four perspectives amongst feminist and motherhood scholars within the debate over the breast pump, organized by how each perspective deems this space created between mother and child, from liberating to oppressive. Next, I add to this discourse by suggesting the breast pump is an oppressive technology because it reinforces key tenants of intensive mothering and new momism, normative motherhood ideologies that emerged as more mothers entered the workforce. As the physical space between mother and child changed, with a mother in the workspace and her child at home or in a childcare space, there remained a cultural need to preserve a tradition connection between mother and child; I argue the breast pump allowed a working mother to maintain this connection to her nursing child across space and time through her expressed breast milk. However, in a society that encourages mothers to exclusively breastfeed for six months while only guaranteeing twelve weeks of unpaid maternity leave, an undue burden has been placed on the individual mother to “do it all.” Therefore, the breast pump reinforces unrealistic expectations of a “good” mother, who will participate in wage work while also performing the tedious tasks of breast pumping, motherwork that continues to be deeply devalued and unseen.

The electric breast pump, a sophisticated piece of medical equipment, has become so deeply implanted within the process of breastfeeding that it has developed into an omnipresent personal accessory for the American nursing mother, more like a cell phone than a
Actress, pop star, and new mom Mandy Moore brought her breast pump to the Emmys in September 2021, calling it her MVP accessory. In September 2020, fashion designer Rebecca Minkoff partnered with Medela, the leader of the breast pump industry, to unveil a limited-edition breast pump tote bag during New York Fashion Week as part of their Breastfeeding is Beautiful collaboration. Legendary tennis player Serena Williams used a breast pump several times throughout Being Serena, a five-part HBO documentary released in 2018 that followed a postpartum Williams and her struggle to continue breastfeeding as she got back into competitive shape for the 2017 French Open. And in December 2018, a photo featuring actress Rachel McAdams breast pumping mid-photoshoot while wearing a Versace jacket and a Bulgari diamond necklace went viral after the photographer, Claire Rothstein, shared it on her Instagram account to illustrate how “breastfeeding is the most normal thing in the world.”

There is an irony to “the most normal thing in the world” being represented by an image of a woman hooked up to a piece of technology rather than an image of a woman feeding her child directly from her breast. However, Rothstein’s comment illustrates how intertwined the breast pump has become within the process of breastfeeding. Once relegated to use behind closed doors, today the breast pump is more visible than ever before.

While breastmilk expression has become mainstream, it may be surprising to learn that a breastfeeding mother was unlikely to use an electric breast pump thirty years ago. The electric breast pump did not transition from a medical device, largely used in hospitals and by trained lactation consultants, to the consumer product we know today until the 1990s. The electric breast pump was first invented in 1956 by the Swedish team Einar Egnell (inventor) and Olle Larsson (engineer and future founder of Medela). It weighed almost eighteen pounds, cost the equivalent to $4,500 today, and was designed to relieve breast engorgement or to feed babies too sick or premature to breastfeed. In 1996, Medela revolutionized how women used the breast pump when they released the Pump In Style, the first double electric breast pump designed for portability and personal use. Heavily marketed to working moms, the technology of the Pump In Style allowed a mother to si-
multaneously pump both breasts, making it more efficient and less time consuming than pumping one side at a time. The Pump In Style was also designed to look like a shoulder bag, making it easy to transport while also offering a lactating mother discretion within the workplace. The technology and design of the Pump In Style would become the industry standard for the next two decades. By 2007, approximately 85 percent of American mothers who breastfed were also using a breast pump to some extent. That number came closer to 100 percent after the 2013 Affordable Care Act (ACA) required insurance companies to cover the financial cost of breast pumps for new mothers. Breast pumps are now a two billion global industry. In just three decades, the breast pump has not only become an essential tool for the breastfeeding mother, it has redefined the term breastfeeding to represent any process in which a child receives breastmilk, be it from breast or bottle. As a result, the breast pump, its relationship to breastfeeding, and its role within the lives of lactating mothers, has become a constant source of debate within feminist and motherhood scholarship.

Inherent within the debate over the breast pump is a theme of separation and space. According to Jessica Martucci, a historian and sociologist of science and medicine, the breast pump helped create a new model of breastfeeding that did not rely on the mother and child being within the same space or time. The discourse surrounding the breast pump is rooted in how scholars view this creation of space between mother and child—is it liberating or oppressive? Human geographer Tim Cresswell describes how the use of space and place can produce social order by defining normative behavior in the context of a particular social hierarchy. Cresswell illustrates how this can lead to the “unintended consequence of place becoming an object and tool of resistance to that order.” Some contemporary feminist scholars see the breast pump as a tool of resistance, an emancipatory technology that offers mothers more spatial freedom. Other scholars see the breast pump as a technology that severs the natural spatial connection required by the act of breastfeeding, disembodying the mother from her milk. As I reviewed the various viewpoints on the breast pump for this project, I began to see four perspectives emerge—each structured around the meaning feminist and motherhood scholars ascribed
to the space created between a mother and her child. The first part of my paper will identify these four perspectives, organizing them along the spectrum of the liberating to the oppressive qualities of the breast pump.

The second part of my paper will add to this discourse by illustrating how the breast pump is an oppressive technology because it reinforces disempowering “good” mother ideologies of Susan Hays’s intensive mothering and new momism, Susan J. Douglas and Meredith W. Michaels’s more contemporary version of intensive mothering.17 These impossibly high standards of “good” mothering emerged just as a record number of mothers left the private domestic space for the public space of paid employment. Therefore, this project argues that as the physical space between mother and child changed, with the mother now in the workspace and the child in the home or childcare space, there was a cultural need to maintain the traditional connection between mother and child across this distance—and the breast pump helped preserve that connection. The breast pump created the separation necessary for mothers to participate in wage work within a country that has minimal maternity leave while also allowing a mother to maintain a connection to her child across space and time through her expressed breastmilk. Essentially, the pump allowed working mothers to remain “good” mothers.

According to motherhood scholar Andrea O’Reilly, the definition of a “good” mother and the concept of normative motherhood have changed over time because they are cultural constructions; they evolve in response to, and because of, considerable cultural and economic change.18 O’Reilly asserts the normative ideology of intensive mothering emerged in the late 1980s as a way for working mothers to compensate for the time they spent away from their children while they were at work.19 Considering Hays coined the term intensive mothering in 1996, the same year the Pump In Style was released, I suggest the double electric breast pump became irreversibly entwined with a working mother’s attempt to compensate for the time she spent away from her child. Through the lens of O’Reilly’s matricentric feminism, I will explore how the breast pump has redefined the contemporary cultural model of socially appropriate mothering—requiring a working
mother to compensate for the separation between herself and her child through her breastmilk.\textsuperscript{20} Finally, I will illustrate how the breast pump has contributed to the impossibly high standards of socially appropriate mothering in a society that has limited support for early motherhood, one in which Hays asserts “all the troubles of the world can be solved by the individual efforts of superhuman women.”\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{The Breast Pump and the Wage-earning/Breastfeeding Dilemma}

The Pump In Style emerged out of two contradictory cultural trends, which sociologist Linda M. Blum describes as the “wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma.”\textsuperscript{22} The first trend began in the 1970s when an increased number of mothers to young children began entering the paid labor force.\textsuperscript{23} By the 1990s, over half of mothers with children under the age of one were participating in wage work, many of them full-time.\textsuperscript{24} The second trend, beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, was a growing awareness of the nutritional superiority of breastmilk compared to infant formula.\textsuperscript{25} By 1997, the U.S. Department of Agriculture began a national “breast is best” campaign to encourage mothers to breastfeed their infants rather than use formula.\textsuperscript{26} That same year, Daniel Glick’s article in \textit{Newsweek} discussed how breastfeeding was good for the health of the mother and baby, as well as their bonding. Glick pointed to studies that showed how breastfed babies were less likely to get ear and respiratory infections than bottle-fed babies and how nursing mothers had a lower chance of getting breast cancer. He also highlighted a series of studies that seemed to indicate breastfeeding boosted a child’s intelligence.\textsuperscript{27} As a result of these new studies, the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) began recommending mothers exclusively breastfeed for an infant’s first six months, followed by another six months of partial breastfeeding supplemented with other foods. Yet the 1993 Family and Medical Leave Act only guaranteed twelve weeks of \textit{unpaid} maternity leave to new mothers.\textsuperscript{28} To meet the AAP’s new recommendations, the majority of lactating mothers would have to figure out how to breastfeed for at least nine months after returning to wage work full time.\textsuperscript{29}

The National Organization for Woman protested this new recommendation, citing the burden this new policy would place on working mothers. After all, the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma was
about more than an increase of mothers participating in wage work—it was about mothers, with minimal unpaid maternity leave, returning to wage work so soon after childbirth. However, the objection of the National Organization for Woman did nothing to change the AAP’s recommendation or the country’s policy on maternity leave. Instead, sociologist Linda M. Blum argues, this wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma was attempted to be resolved with the breast pump.

Faced with this wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma, the United States had three options to help nursing mothers meet the AAP’s new recommendation: extend and/or subsidize maternity leave, help employers create on-site childcare facilities, or subsidize breast pumps. Industry and government went with the cheapest option, devoting their attention to legislation and government programs to support the use of breast pumps. Twenty-five years later the United States, unlike every other country within the developed world, still does not mandate that employers offer paid maternity leave to new mothers. For comparison, the UK entitles new mothers to thirty-nine weeks of paid leave, Canada offers one year, and Finland provides up to three years. In contrast, American working mothers are offered twelve weeks of unpaid maternity leave, a subsidized breast pump, and the promise of a non-bathroom place to pump within their workspace—but some women don’t even get that. In the United States, there is a disproportionate burden placed on working mothers, who must return to work far too soon after childbirth, by encouraging breast pumping on top of the responsibilities of a full-time workday. Enfolding the extra work of lactation into the time and space of wage work creates impossibly high standards for working mothers to “do it all”—with limited support. Yet it goes beyond the extra work required of mothers who use a breast pump. It is the role the breast pump has played in redefining the ideal “good” mother within contemporary society.

Mother, Motherhood, and Mothering

While various books and papers have explored the complete history and cultural context surrounding the breast pump and its relationship to breastfeeding, this paper will not be one of them. This paper is centered on how the technology of the breast pump—specifically the space it has created between mother and child—has influenced the
American institution of motherhood and the experience of mothering in America. While the term *mother* can generally refer to any individual who engages in motherwork, this paper will use *mother* to refer to a cisgendered lactating woman to focus on the gendered experience of mothering through breastfeeding and lactation. Within motherhood studies, the term *motherhood* is used to signify the patriarchal institution of motherhood, which is defined and controlled by men and inherently oppressive to women. The term *mothering* refers to a women's lived experience of mothering as she conforms to and/or resists the oppressive ideologies of the patriarchal institution of motherhood. With these terms in mind, this paper is a mother-centered analysis of how the breast pump has reinforced contemporary normative motherhood ideologies and reshaped the practice of mothering in America.

**Women Who Breastfeed and Use the Breast Pump**

Women have diverse experiences when it comes to breastfeeding and using a breast pump. Some mothers breastfeed their children, while other women can't or don't want to. Some mothers supplement their breastmilk with infant formula, while others exclusively breastfeed. Some mothers who breastfeed never use a breast pump, others exclusively pump, and most women are somewhere in between. Some mothers have one baby that refuses to take a bottle, only to have their second baby refuse the breast. It is just like everything else within the practice of parenting: nothing works for everyone all the time.

A woman's age, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and where she lives within the United States are just some of the factors that can contribute to her ability to breastfeed and to use a breast pump. Her access to information about the immunological benefits of breastmilk and awareness of breast pumps as a supportive tool for breastfeeding are structured by her cultural background, social network, and education. Since breastfeeding is considered preventative health, insurance companies, like Kaiser, strongly encourage new mothers to both breastfeed and use a breast pump once they return to work. Thus, having health insurance will likely increase the probability of a mother using a breast pump, as well as influence the type of breast pump she has access to, with different insurance plans covering different types of pumps. Considering all these factors, it would be impossible to cap-
ture the diversity of experiences that exist for women who breastfeed and use a breast pump.

Like breastfeeding, the breast pump is, to some extent, a classed and racialized technology—its benefits are not distributed evenly across women who mother within society. White, highly educated, middle-to-upper class women employed within a workplace that provides private protected space and time for breast pumping are the most likely to use a breast pump. Therefore, this paper focuses on the liberating and oppressive qualities of the breast pump for this demographic. Affluent white women are also most likely to participate within the ideologies of intensive mothering and new momism. Even as these ideologies continue to permeate every corner of American society, imposing new standards and expectations on all contemporary parents, it is largely the white, middle-to-upper class who are most able to provide their children with the time, attention, and money these ideologies require. As a result, many of the scholars and studies I refer to within this paper have also focused on this population within their research. While this paper explores the liberating and oppressive qualities of the breast pump for this specific demographic, it is important to acknowledge that women who have reduced access to resources and support, as well as less control over their time and space, face more complex challenges with breast pumping and breastfeeding. It should also be noted that although the AAP breastfeeding recommendations and the rhetoric surrounding the benefits of breastmilk—campaigns like “breast is best” and calling breast milk “liquid gold”—place immense amount of pressure on women to breastfeed, some scholars suggest the health benefits for mothers and babies have been overstated and overemphasized.

**The Technology of the Breast Pump**

To understand how the technology of the breast pump transformed the experience of breastfeeding, a simple understanding of lactation is required. Producing breastmilk is a process of supply and demand. For the average lactating woman, her body supplies the amount of milk her child’s nutritional needs demand. As the baby’s demand grows, so does the mother’s milk supply. To avoid a slowdown of milk production or painful engorgement of the breast for the
mother, the process requires breastmilk to be continuously removed. On average, most exclusively breastfed babies in their first six months will spend around twenty to thirty minutes nursing every one to three hours, although babies can take up to sixty minutes to feed in the first two to three months. The clock starts on that one-to-three-hour window when the baby begins feeding. So that means a mother of a six-week-old infant could spend thirty to sixty minutes nursing only to have a hungry baby within another hour or two. While the time between feedings will increase as the baby gets older, it was nonetheless impractical for nursing mothers to be away from their infants for more than a few hours, let alone an entire workday. Therefore, because the majority of American mothers must return to work within months after giving birth, working mothers had to choose between breastfeeding and going back to work before the introduction of Pump In Style in 1996.

The advent of modern breast pump technology provided these working mothers, with minimal maternity leave, the ability to continue to breastfeed once they returned to wage work. The breast pump enables a mother to substitute a nursing session with a pumping session when she is away from her baby. In addition, regular pumping allows a mother to maintain her milk supply once she returns to wage work, allowing her to continue to nurse her child at night and on weekends. The modern double electric breast pump, like the Pump In Style, uses a motor to create a gentle vacuum, designed to mimic the sucking of a child nursing. This expresses the mother’s breastmilk into a storage device, like a bottle or plastic bag, which is then placed in a refrigerator or frozen for later use. Each pumping session takes about thirty minutes: five minutes to set up the pump, at least fifteen minutes of pumping (some women need up to thirty minutes), and five to ten minutes to clean the pump parts and store the breastmilk in a cold place. However, breast pumping within a workplace is not easy. It requires both time and a private place that is ideally calm and sanitary.

Finding a private place to pump within one’s workplace can be challenging. Although some women may have access to a private office or a lactation room, others pump in the women’s bathroom, in their car, or in a small relatively unused room within their workplace like a
storage room or a janitor’s closet. The 2013 ACA requires all private health insurers to cover the cost of a breast pump. It also requires some, but not all, employers to give a lactating employee reasonable break times at work to express her breastmilk for up to a year after childbirth in a non-bathroom private place to pump. However, employers are not required to pay their employees during these pumping breaks, and this portion of the federal law only applies to workplaces with over fifty employees. Despite this legislation, a 2019 survey showed that only 51 percent of employers provided worksite lactation support programs, including an on-site lactation room. The realities of expressing breastmilk within the time and space of wage work contribute to the ongoing conversation amongst feminist and motherhood scholars as they ask how well the breast pump has resolved the wage-earning/breast-feeding dilemma. I will now provide an overview of this debate by reframing this discourse in terms of how these scholars evaluated the breast pump and the significance they subscribed to the separation and space between mother and child—from liberating to oppressive.

**The Breast Pump as a Feminist Technology**

Within their 2010 study, feminist scholars Kate Boyer and Maia Boswell-Penc deem the space created between mother and child by the breast pump as liberating because it expands a mother’s mobility after childbirth and offers more temporal and spatial freedom. Boyer and Boswell-Penc consider the breast pump to be a feminist technology for three reasons. First, the breast pump expands the choices a mother has in what she feeds her child. Second, the breast pump increases the spatial mobility for women after childbirth and provides the mother with greater autonomy. Third, the breast pump allows for the option of another caregiver to participate in the feeding of the infant, possibly taking over nighttime feedings or early morning feeding so the mother can get more sleep. Yet Boyer and Boswell-Penc acknowledge that the liberating benefits of the breast pump are constrained by societal factors within the United States and that the “goods” of breast pumping were not distributed evenly across women within society. Although the breast pump certainly provides women with more freedom and choices, Boyer and Boswell-Penc’s study overlooks the work of breast pumping. For instance, a mother may be able to sleep while
her partner takes over a nighttime feeding, but she is still doing the motherwork of providing the expressed breast milk within the bottle. She may skip the feeding, but she doesn’t skip the work.

**The Breast Pump as a Double-edged Sword**

Within her 2006 *Slate* article, journalist Emily Bazelon articulates how the liberating qualities of the breast pump act as a double-edged sword by comparing it to devices like the BlackBerry. When we use a device like the Blackberry, we experience more temporal and spatial freedom to work outside of our designated workplaces and times, but these devices also raise the expectations of our availability outside of work hours. Brazelon argues that the breast pump, like the BlackBerry, gives mothers “a freedom we otherwise wouldn’t have in exchange for inviting us to go to lengths that we otherwise couldn’t.” Ultimately, Bazelon concludes the breast pump is a convenience that allows mothers to “have it both ways.” Bazelon’s declaration makes it sound easy to “have it both ways,” when straddling the divide between home and work is anything but that.

The breast pump is often marketed as a piece of modern technology that helps ease a woman’s burden like other labor-saving devices such as the washing machine or dishwasher. However, in 1983 historian Ruth Schwartz Cowan asserts that despite the addition of various labor-saving technologies within the home, like the washing machine or the dishwasher, the amount of time women spent on housework had remained consistent for the last fifty years. Why? Although the technologies were marketed to save women time and toil, they only increased standards of cleanliness, variety, and novelty. Cowan believed that these raised standards were often beyond what should be expected of women. Just like the washing machine and the dishwasher, I suggest the breast pump can be seen as another modern technology originally designed to make a woman’s life easier, only to create higher expectations and “more work for mother.”

While these modern household technologies raised standards in housework for women, Cowan argues they also enabled women to participate in wage work without compromising their families’ standard of living. She explains that the “symbolic connection between ‘working wife’ and ‘threatened family’ was thus severed, not by ideo-
logues but by housewives with machines.” Applying Cowan’s theory, the breast pump could be viewed as a technology that severs the symbolic connection between “working mom” and “threatened child.” The breast pump made it possible for women to participate in wage work while also maintaining a standard of “good” mothering. Thus, the breast pump is a double-edge sword—it liberates a woman’s transition back into the workplace after giving birth without compromising her ability to breastfeed, yet it also creates more work and higher expectations for new mothers.

**The Breast Pump as a Barrier**

Renowned anthropologist Margaret Mead also contemplated ways to ease women’s transition into the workplace without sacrificing standards of childcare within her 1970 article in *MANPOWER Magazine*. Mead’s main concern was ensuring infants and children received continuity of care as more mothers with young children entered the paid labor force. One solution offered by Mead was that women should return to breastfeeding. In 1970, the United States’ breastfeeding rate was historically low. Mead theorized that if women began to breastfeed their children, rather than use formula, breastfeeding within the workplace would become accepted as a “necessary and usual practice.” Thus, employers and the government would be forced to prioritize a mother being near her child for at least the first six months by providing on-site childcare facilities or offering staggered and/or flexible work hours. Mead noted how these accommodations were made available to women during World War II, when male workers were scarce, implying that these modifications were no longer a priority after the war when men returned to the workspace and women were encouraged to reclaim the home space. Beginning in 1975, mothers did begin to return to breastfeeding; however, breast pumping within the time and space of full-time wage work would become the “necessary and usual practice” for lactating mothers.

As more mothers participated in paid employment and breastfeeding, creating the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma, industry and government choose the more affordable solution of subsidizing breast pumps and passing supportive legislation rather than funding extended paid maternity leave or on-site childcare. American historian
and journalist Jill Lepore explores the consequences of the United States relying solely on the breast pump to combine wage work and lactation within her 2009 article for *The New Yorker*. Lepore worries that by defining a workplace as “breastfeeding-friendly” by the private and protected spaces they provide women to breast pump, we have lost the ability to imagine the possibility of a “breastfeeding-friendly” workplace being defined by the extended paid maternity leave and/or on-site childcare they offer. Lepore argues that rather than placing an emphasis on a mother’s breast milk, we as a culture should be asking the difficult question of “is it the mother, or her milk that matters more to the baby?”

Journalist Jessica Grose wrestled with the same issues within her 2013 *Bloomberg Businessweek* article. Published shortly after the ACA became federal law, Grose admits free breast pumps were an improvement for working mothers; however, she humorously suggests, “if Americans are committed to encouraging women to breast-feed, the biggest help won’t be covering the cost of breast pumps. It will be catching up with the rest of the industrialized world by offering paid maternity leave for longer than a scant three months.” Grose believes paid maternity would provide meaningful support for mothers, but in the United States mothers are expected to do it all on their own—without the support of industry or government.

Expecting women to shoulder the burden of the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma reflects the individualization and privatization of motherwork that is indicative of American neoliberalism. Within her 2014 *Feminist Theory* article, feminist scholar Kate Boyer explains how legislation designed to support pumping at work has produced what she terms *neoliberal motherhood*—a form of mothering that encourages mothers to provide what is “best for one’s baby” while remaining arduously committed to her workforce participation. Thus, the experience of wage work becomes significantly intensified for working mothers as they attempt to perform the care work of breastfeeding within the time and space of full-time wage work. Boyer argues that in the absence of expanded maternity leave or the option for on-site breastfeeding, this type of legislation, which solidifies the breast pump as the only solution to the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma in America, fails to deliver support to working mothers at-
tempting to achieve the AAP recommendations. If the United States truly supports the AAP breastfeeding goals, industry and government need to start shouldering the burden of the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma too.

By focusing on the breast pump, our country has been able to avoid exploring other options that would allow for less separation and space between a working mother and her child. Yet these other options come at a financial cost to companies and the government, whereas the breast pump comes at a financial (not to mention emotional, physical, and psychological) cost to the mother. Thus, the breast pump has become a barrier to Americans’ ability to imagine policies that would prioritize a mother’s time with her infant rather than a mother’s milk. If Americans can’t imagine something different, we can’t demand it from our employers or our government.

The Breast Pump and the Disembodied Mother

U.K. breastfeeding advocate Gabrielle Palmer believed countries, like the United States, that rely on the separation between a breastfeeding mother and child reflect distorted cultural norms that disempower women. In her 1991 editorial, Palmer boldly insisted that a “mother working outside the home, whose commitment to her child is demonstrated through her use of pumps, is an oppressed woman.” She did not consider the space and separation between mother and child liberating. Rather, Palmer viewed the breast pump as an invasive attempt to control the natural and empowering ability of the female body to breastfeed her child. She insisted, “breast pumping is not breastfeeding.” Yet she understood it had become a “necessary second-best for those of us who live in such weird societies…where breastfeeding mother and child are separated because of the warped norms to which we have become accustomed.” By allowing space and separation between a mother and her child, Palmer believed the breast pump severed the spatial and physical connection required by the act of a mother nursing her child. Sociologist Linda M. Blum agreed with Palmer. Blum states that breastfeeding, “a deeply embodied and interdependent act…has fast become something that can occur without the mother being physically present…the mother is disembodied, as if she is the milk…as if mother and baby are still monogamous and physi-
ally tied.” The space and separation created by the breast pump has effectively removed the mother from her milk. In a society that requires lactating women to return to wage work far too soon after childbirth, the emphasis must be placed on the breastmilk, not the mother.

The Breast Pump Redefining the “Good” Mother

While feminist scholars have debated the liberating and oppressive qualities of the breast pump, there has yet to be an analysis of the breast pump as a tool of reinforcement for the most recent redesigns of normative motherhood, intensive mothering and its more contemporary version new momism. The technology of the modern double electric breast pump and intensive mothering are irrevocably intertwined because they emerged out of the same cultural moment within America—when an increase of mothers within the workforce resulted in increasing demands on mothers.

Motherhood scholar O’Reilly asserts “the demands made on mothers today are unparalleled in history.” Carrying the burden of the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma is part of this demand, yet mothers are also carrying the burden of the country’s social and moral concerns over the problems of modernity. Sociologist Susan Hays suggests “the valorization of nurturing mothers and innocent children is meant to protect us all from the full impact of a dog-eat-dog world.” Consequently, as mothers began to move from the private domestic space to the public space of the paid workforce, American society needed reassurance that the children were still protected and connected to their mothers. Therefore, I argue that as the physical space between mother and child changed, there was a cultural necessity for a mother to maintain the traditional connection to her child across space and time, and the breast pump became an essential tool for maintaining this connection. It allowed the working mother to preserve her status of a “good” mother, a nurturing mother who does not allow the ruthless world of the paid workforce to inhibit her ability to provide what is “best” for her baby—her breastmilk.

Since motherhood is a cultural construction, it is important to understand that the foundations of the modern “good” mother—rooted in the ideal of a nurturing mother who remains full-time within the private domestic space to take care of the children and housework—
began during industrialization. As industrialization sent men out of private homes and into the public space to participate in wage work, women were encouraged to stay in the private domestic space because someone needed to take care of the children and the household. It wasn’t until World War II, as men left the workforce to fight abroad, that an unprecedented number of women were implored to join the paid labor force as part of their patriotic duty. Although women had participated in wage work before, suddenly a new demographic—white, middle-class mothers to young children—were leaving their traditional place within the domestic sphere to participate in full-time paid employment. Once men returned to reclaim their positions within the paid workforce at the end of World War II, a gendered social reorganization was needed to encourage women to reclaim their position within the private domestic space. Thus, ideas around normative motherhood needed to be rewritten to create the ideology of a naturally sacrificial “stay-at-home mom.” This dominant postwar view of a “good” mother was characterized by three central and connected themes: mothering came naturally to women and was a fundamental part of their being; children require full-time mothering and mothers should be the central caregiver to their biological children; and if a mother must work outside the home, the care of her children must come before her job.67

While Hay’s ideology of intensive mothering emerged from this postwar dominate definition of motherhood, it did not fully develop into the normative behavior of a “good” mother until the late 1980s and early 1990s.68 Within her 1996 book *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*, Hays identifies a combination of three connected themes that characterize intensive mothering: the mother is the best central caregiver for the constant nurturing of her child, mothering is considered to be more important than a mother’s paid employment, and mothering requires putting the child’s needs above the mother’s needs and “lavishing copious amounts of time, energy, and material resources on the child.”69 O’Reilly suggests that while the first two characterize postwar mothering, it is only in the last thirty years that mothering has been characterized by the third theme. While normative motherhood in the postwar era required a full-time stay-at-home
mother, the emphasis was placed on the mother’s physical proximity to her children. In contrast, intensive mothering places an emphasis on a mother’s ability to place her child’s needs before her own. As a result, although mothers today have fewer children and more labor-saving devices, they spend more time, energy, and money on their children than stay-at-home mothers did in the 1960s. However, most mothers who practice intensive mothering are not staying at home with their children; they are participating in full-time wage work.  

It may seem absurd that such a demanding “good” mother ideology would emerge in the late 1980s just as an increase of mothers were entering the paid labor force. However, O’Reilly argues that intensive mothering developed in response to the rise of neoliberalism and the changing demographic of motherhood—with many middle-class women delaying having their first child until after their careers were established and returning to those careers before their child turned one. These professional women (with fewer children, more labor-saving devices, and more household help) were able to shift their focus from the cooking and cleaning characteristic of previous generations and instead devote their time and attention to their child’s enrichment. Yet because these mothers were still participating in the paid labor force, O’Reilly suggests the practice of intensive mothering became a way for working mothers to compensate for the time they spent away from their children while they were at work. I suggest the breast pump, and the breastmilk expressed, became an essential tool for a working mother to compensate for the time she spent away from her child.

To illustrate this point is an excerpt from sociologist Blum’s 1999 book, *At the Breast*, where Blum recounts a conversation she had with a feminist obstetrician who was a self-professed fanatic about breastfeeding her baby. Blum quotes this mother as she described her breastmilk, saying, “it’s the best food for the baby. It’s the one thing you can do that no one else can. When you come home from work…that baby will remember who you are.” Intrigued by the mother’s last statement, Blum wondered if a mother could be replaced so easily. This statement alludes to an anxiety around working mothers being replaced when they are not physically with their children. I maintain that
the breast pump was the answer to this anxiety, ensuring that a mother could not be so easily replaced. Not only did the breast pump allow a mother to maintain her milk supply after returning to work, permitting the mother to continue to nurse her baby when she was at home, the breast pump also created an opportunity for a mother to maintain a connection to her child through her expressed breastmilk when she was at work. By emphasizing the importance of breastmilk, the working mother remained connected to her child across space and time; she remained irreplaceable.

The breast pump also enabled a working mother to adhere to the three core themes of intensive mothering. First, the breast pump allowed the working mother with minimal maternity leave to remain engaged with the constant nurturing of her child once she returned to wage work by continuously providing her breastmilk by breast (when home) or bottle (when at work). When she is not physically present with her child, her breastmilk—something only a mother can provide—stands in for her, maintaining her role as the central caregiver.

Second, because the act of mothering is believed to be more important than a mother’s paid employment, it is acceptable for breast pumping to cost the mother both time and money. On average, a working mother will pump for thirty minutes three times within an eight-hour workday. For many mothers, pumping becomes akin to a second job.73 In this way, I suggest breast pumping has become part of a mother’s “second shift,” intensifying, rather than alleviating, the double burden for a working mother.74 Breast pumping at work is not just time-consuming, it results in an estimated $14,250 of lost wages for the working mother during the first six months of breast-feeding.75 Breastfeeding and breast pumping cost mothers time and money.

Third, a “good” mother puts her child’s needs above her own by spending copious amounts of her time, energy, and material resources expressing her breast milk. Breast pumping is physical, social, and psychological labor done by the mother. It can be painful, tiresome, and frustrating. Breast pumping can also feel isolating and lonely, and cause feelings of stress and inadequacy for the mother.76 It is hard to balance working full time, raising a baby with intensive mothering practices, and breastfeeding/breast pumping.77 But a “good” mother
puts the needs of her child before anything else, committing an extensive amount of her time and energy to breast pumping because she is told “breast is best” for her child. Although insurance companies now cover the cost of the pump, the greatest cost of breast pumping, which is invisible to most people who are not actively performing this form of care work, is time and a mother’s bodily autonomy.78 Therefore, the breast pump has enabled working mothers to adhere to the three core themes of intensive mothering—a ideology that places such high expectations on mothers as a way to reinforce the patriarchal structure of motherhood.

New momism, a term coined by cultural critics Susan J. Douglas and Meredith W. Michaels, is a contemporary form of intensive mothering. Within their 2004 book The Mommy Myth: The Idealization of Motherhood and How It Has Undermined All Women, journalist Douglas and writer Michaels identified three core beliefs of the “good” mother ideology of new momism: first, the insistence that no woman is truly complete until she has children; second, the mother remains the best primary caregiver of her child; and third, a “good” mother devotes her entire physical, emotional, psychological, and intellectual being to her children all day, every day. Douglas and Michaels argued the main difference between new momism and intensive mothering is the ideology’s insistence that being a perfect mother is the most important thing a woman can do, requiring women who want to do anything more than stay home full-time with their children, like have a career, to “prove they can ‘do it all.’”79

The breast pump has become a symbol of this motherly devotion and involvement for working mothers. Within her 2006 “Milk Me” article, Bazelon echoes this sentiment when she says, “pumps make mothers feel irreplaceable and virtuous. We’re away from our babies, but we’re still doing right by them—though perhaps the goal is as much to do right by ourselves. It’s hard for mothers to make any move that smacks of selfishness. So the hair-shirt aspect of pumping can be reassuring. How selfish can you be if you’re willing to put your nipples through a juice squeezer everyday?”80 Not only does Bazelon allude to how the breast pump assured working mothers that they were irreplaceable, but she also addresses how the breast pump helped the
working mother prove, to others and herself, that she was still a doting and involved mother despite her “selfish” return to work. This illustrates how for women like Bazelon, who chose to have a career and a kid, the breast pump has become an essential tool to prove they could “do it all” while still being a devoted mother.

According to communications and women’s studies scholar Lynn O’Brien Hallstein, new momism frames the impossibly high standards of a perfect mother, one who effortlessly balances professionalism and intensive mothering, as an empowering choice and an assertion of female agency. According to communications and women’s studies scholar Lynn O’Brien Hallstein, new momism frames the impossibly high standards of a perfect mother, one who effortlessly balances professionalism and intensive mothering, as an empowering choice and an assertion of female agency. Contemporary women have the choice to “do it all,” to be superhuman—supermom. Yet O’Reilly asserts this concept of choice is a neoliberal fiction, one that is used to disguise and justify gendered social inequities. Women don’t choose to be supermoms. They have been forced into it—by a culture that refuses to accommodate mothers entering the paid workforce. Douglas and Michaels assert that the model of the “supermom” was never the goal of second-wave feminists of the 1970s. “Feminists didn’t think mom should suddenly do everything—work outside the home and clean the house and care for the children and make gourmet meals. Feminists thought that maybe dad and the government should participate too.” In short, they expected that just as women accommodated men leaving the home for wage work during the Industrial Revolution, a corresponding revolution would take place to ease the burden of women leaving the home for wage work. But when fathers, corporations, and the government didn’t participate to ease the burden, or at least have yet to move fast enough to do so, mothers have had no other choice than to “do it all” within this “stalled revolution.”

The breast pump has changed the definition of breastfeeding, but it has also reshaped contemporary normative motherhood and the discourse around the “good” mother ideologies of intensive mothering and new momism. Therefore, just as the breast pump has become intertwined within the process of breastfeeding in America, it has also become a tool of reinforcement for the patriarchal and neoliberal motherhood. Feminist scholars argue that normative motherhood is “disempowering if not oppressive for a multitude of reasons, including the individualization and devaluation of motherwork, the endless tasks
of privatized mothering, the incompatibility of wage work and motherwork, and the impossible standards of idealized motherhood.”

**Conclusion**

Without paid maternity leave, the breast pump is disempowering, if not oppressive, for the same multitude of reasons. First, the burden of the wage-earning/breastfeeding dilemma relies on the individual mother to perform the tedious, time-consuming tasks involved in breast pumping, motherwork that continues to be deeply devalued and unseen. Second, the breast pump conceals the incompatibility of wage work and motherwork from society by placing the burden of incompatibility solely on the mother. As evidence of the incompatibility between wage work and the motherwork of breastfeeding, only 25.6 percent of American infants today are exclusively breastfed for their first six months, and only 35.3 percent of infants are partially breastfed up to their first birthday, as the AAP recommends. The heavy reliance on the breast pump within the United States has not helped mothers meet these breastfeeding goals; mothers need cultural, institutional, and societal support. For example, if the AAP recommends mothers exclusively breastfeed for six months, then the United States government and industry should give new mothers the same amount of paid maternity leave, at a minimum, like every other country in the developed world. Third, participating in full-time work and continuing to exclusively breastfeed with the help of a breast pump is an impossibly high standard of idealized motherhood. This high standard is why Rothstein’s image of McAdams breast pumping represents “the most normal thing in the world.” In a time and place where intensive mothering and new momism are the normative motherhood ideologies, what has become “the most normal thing in the world” is not a mother breastfeeding her child within the same space, it is the unattainable expectation that a mother will juggle full-time wage work and extended breastfeeding while also looking incredibly empowered and glamorous in designer clothes and diamonds—in other words, be a supermom. It is “normal” for mothers to be superhuman in this world because we have come to rely on all the troubles of this world being solved “by the individual efforts of superhuman women” rather than asking fathers, corporations, and the government to help ease the
burdens of the working mother. By doing so, patriarchal society can rest assured that women will continue to “do it all” without aid or assistance. It is an impossibly high standard of idealized motherhood—one in which a working mother (with minimal maternity leave) must compensate for the separation and space between herself and her child by maintaining a connection to her child across that space through her breastmilk (and copious amounts of time and energy dedicated to breast pumping) to prove she can “do it all,” so she can prove she is a “good” mother.

Women do have agency within their lived experiences of mothering in America. They can resist these oppressive ideologies and the patriarchal institution of motherhood. There are other ways to mother—ways that do not require a mother to sacrifice her own self or relinquish her power to be considered a “good” mother. However, to do so would go against normative motherhood, risking the label of a “bad” mother. Women often feel they are “bad” mothers for supplementing their breastmilk with infant formula, deciding “fed is best,” or stopping short of the AAP recommendations for breastfeeding when breast pumping at work becomes unmanageable. What kind of mother are you if can’t do what is “best” for your child? Yet motherhood scholars Adrienne Rich and Andrea O’Reilly suggest women who resist these oppressive ideologies are not “bad” mothers, they are empowered mothers—freed from the oppressive pressure to “do it all.” Maybe mothers need to let go of the expectation to be supermoms to become empowered moms. Use a breast pump or don’t use a breast pump—whatever a mother decides, it should be within the interest of her own selfhood and power. If mothers are “doing it all,” maybe they should at least be doing it on their own terms.
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Help Wanted, Change Needed
Examining the Food Industry Labor Shortage Through Restaurant Signage

Shannon Anderson

AMST 418: Food and American Culture

This paper was written for Dr. Lewinnek’s class, AMST 418 Food and American Culture, held in the fall of 2021. The aim of the assignment was to contribute to the wide range of food studies scholarship through the analyzing primary sources. In this paper, I examine the signage posted in the storefronts of restaurants in the United States during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. I maintain that the language used in these signs reveals insight into the poor conditions and unjust labor issues within the food service industry that have contributed to the quitting trend, known as the Great Resignation. Ultimately, I argue that the mass worker exodus from the food industry has served as a form of resistance against the exploitative structure of the American food system.

In January of 2021, I left a particularly grueling shift at a local restaurant, where I had worked as assistant manager and server for nearly three years, having decided that I would never return. For the first ten months of the COVID-19 pandemic, I risked my health and peace of mind to keep my employers’ small business running, all for little more than minimum wage. During this time, I endured ramped-up labor exploitation, escalating verbal abuse from customers, and insufficient safety procedures. I received no hazard pay, nor a simple “thank you” from the owners of the restaurant. Rather, I was told to be grateful to be employed when millions of Americans had lost their jobs. But after learning that my employer was trying to cover up a possible coronavirus outbreak in the kitchen, I finally reached the end of my rope. It became evident within the following months that I was not alone in my experience or my decision to leave the food industry.
From its onset, the COVID-19 pandemic has been undeniably connected to food and the food industries. Initially, there were reports within the American press suggesting the Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market in Wuhan, China was “ground zero” of the outbreak, provoking some to blame the global spread of coronavirus on “exotic Chinese eating habits and unhygienic wet markets.”1 In the United States, the shelves of grocery stores were left bare after production struggled to keep up with the national surge in panic buying.2 Institutions and organizations slowly began to provide free lunches to school-aged children during the stay-at-home mandates.3 Then, in the later stages of the pandemic, the focus shifted to highlight labor in the food industry.4

In the words of the acclaimed food journalist Mark Bittman, as expressed in his book *Animal, Vegetable, Junk*, “food always comes back to labor.”5 From Big Agriculture to the restaurant business, the American food system implicitly relies on the exploited labor of its workers, who are often subjected to poor working conditions and denied a livable wage and health benefits.6 Yet there has been a noticeable shift within the power dynamics of the food industry during COVID-19 pandemic, as workers have wielded their influence by refusing their labor. With millions of Americans deciding to leave their food service and labor jobs altogether, a significant gap has been left in the workforce that places a noticeable strain on the industry as a whole.7 Evidence of this labor shortage can be found in the variations of signage posted in the windows and marquees of restaurants nationwide. Among the generic “Help Wanted” and “Now Hiring” signs displayed in restaurant storefronts, there is an increase of signs declaring “nobody wants to work anymore,” and requests for the customer’s cooperation and patience with a shorter staff.8 However, the labor shortage is not a result of people no longer wanting to work; rather, it is the underlying sentiment of these signs that indicate the various contemporary labor issues plaguing the larger food system that have truly driven many food workers to quit. Through my analysis of these publicly displayed messages, I argue that those who are choosing to quit the food industry are challenging the hegemonic power of the larger American food system, intentionally or not, by denying the institution the labor it needs to operate.
The COVID-19 pandemic forced an abrupt closure of many American businesses, leaving a sizable percentage of the workforce unemployed or furloughed. While some jobs involved in the food industry were similarly impacted, the food system managed to remain in limited operation, tasked with the responsibility of keeping the country fed. Despite the praise food workers received as “essential employees,” they continued to be mistreated and exploited by the unjust food industry and its defenders. Yet, the emphasis placed on food workers during the COVID-19 pandemic has helped to expose the cracks within the system. By the spring of 2021, Americans started to leave their jobs at an alarming rate in a trend referred to as the Great Resignation. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly four million people quit working in April 2021 alone. It is within this context that the news media began to take notice of certain signs going up in various dining establishments.

In June of 2021, a pizza shop in Jacksonville, Florida attracted moderate social media attention over a posted sign conveying a controversial opinion of the national labor shortage. Printed in bold letters and outlined in red, V Pizza’s sign cuttingly stated: “Sadly, due to government handouts, no one wants to work anymore. Therefore, we are short staffed. Please be patient with the staff that did choose to come to work today and remember to tip your server. They chose to show up to serve you.” At the time V Pizza’s managers decided to display this sign, Florida’s governor Ron DeSantos was in the process of launching a Return to Work initiative designed to push workers back into the workforce by ending the state’s participation with the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation program. Within this particular political atmosphere, V Pizza’s sign struck a nerve with both frustrated employers of the food system and its resistant workers, thus providing insight into the current state of labor conflict within America’s food industry.

While the message crafted by the managers of V Pizza, and other signs like it, may be an attempt to retain employment and garner sympathy (and business) from the local community, I suggest that the underpinnings of their sentiments and their method of approach work to achieve the opposite effect. For example, the idea that “no one wants
to work” because of government subsidies echoes the false narrative that people receiving unemployment are lazy exploiters of the benefits system. This is in stark contrast to the portrayal of food workers during the height of the pandemic, when they were revered as heroes. This shift in attitude towards food service employees, from viewing them as “essential” to “entitled,” places the blame solely on food workers for the labor shortage while ignoring a multitude of factors that have contributed to the decrease in food service employment, including unjust business practices. Rather than taking responsibility for their part in the Great Resignation, some food service employers have publicly promoted this new narrative with signs like the one posted in the window of V Pizza. However, the suggestion that the lack of food labor has been caused by workers who would rather take advantage of the U.S. unemployment program than earn an honest wage has been disproven. The number of workers walking away from the food industry continued to rise, despite the end of the extended government unemployment benefits in September of 2021. That same month, the quitting rate in the leisure and hospitality industry, which includes food service, reached a high of 6.4 percent, making this sector the most critically affected by the Great Resignation. As this job quitting trend lingers on, regardless of government handouts, attention is drawn to the severity of the labor issues afflicting workers and influencing their mass departure from the American food system.

It is important to note that although a portion of the food worker shortage is caused by voluntary resignation, as the sign’s message insinuates, other sobering factors have also contributed to the rising unemployment rates. While many food employees have decided to leave the business on their own accord, some workers no longer have the option to work in the United States because of tightened border restrictions and limitations on work visas during the pandemic’s peak. This increased absence of immigrant workers accounts for a significant percentage of the gap in the food labor force since the American food system is so reliant on immigrant labor from the fields to restaurant kitchens. Thus, Bittman insists, “the immigrant ‘crisis’ is a food and labor crisis.” In addition to the decline of immigrant labor, as of December 2021 the COVID-19 virus has been responsible for
the loss of over 790,000 American lives.\textsuperscript{18} An analysis conducted by UC Merced, examining the coronavirus fatality rate in California’s “high risk industries,” found that the labor sector suffered a 30 percent increase in worker deaths within the first ten months of the pandemic. The study determined that “food-chain workers were most affected” by COVID-19 because the people employed within industries such as warehousing, agriculture, food processing, and restaurant services experienced the most significant rise in deaths.\textsuperscript{19} Furthermore, UC Merced’s analysis states that “California’s high risk workers, compared with those in non-risk sectors, were far more likely to be immigrant, particularly non-citizen,” illustrating how these two factors intersect.\textsuperscript{20}

Thus, the narrative claiming “nobody wants to work” is a gross over-simplification that points the finger at presumably lazy workers rather than acknowledging the many structural factors that have contributed to the shortage of food industry workers.

Ironically, the key points highlighted in signs like the one posted by V Pizza assist in exposing some of the specific problems food industry workers are subjected to. Jobs in the food supply chain—including field labor, factory work, transportation, delivery, food service, and grocery—generally thrive off questionable conditions and treatment of workers. Bittman states, “many of these jobs are repetitive, demanding, and dangerous. Workers are denied basic rights like regular bathroom breaks; a reliable schedule; freedom from abuse, harassment, and wage theft; and the right to organize and bargain collectively.”\textsuperscript{21} In the restaurant sector specifically, workers function under high levels of stress as they are often overburdened with tasks. According to the evidence gathered by food labor activist Saru Jayaraman in her book \textit{Behind the Kitchen Door}, restaurant workers are also faced with racial and gender discrimination, adding additional layers of obstacles for female workers and workers of color. Jayaraman particularly cites issues of labor segregation, such as the common practice of putting “lighter-skinned workers in the front, serving customers, and darker-skinned workers in the back, hidden in the kitchen.”\textsuperscript{22} In my own experience, the owners of the restaurant where I worked insisted on having all the male employees working in the kitchen as cooks and dishwashers. In contrast, all the female employees worked in the front as servers, aside
from the few middle-aged female cooks who predominately spoke Spanish. There was no point in questioning this gendered and racialized dynamic, as we were told that’s just how the restaurant was run. We accepted it along with the other subpar circumstances that we felt were beyond our control.

When the pandemic hit, many of these inadequate conditions were only exasperated as restaurant jobs were further complicated by the health risks food service workers faced being in constant contact with the public. While the management responsible for V Pizza’s sign requested that customers “be patient” with their workers, acknowledging their awareness of existing hostility directed towards their employees, the sign placed outside of my former employer’s business addressed a different issue altogether. On a whiteboard marquee easel, my boss instructed me to write: “For the safety of our essential workers and customers, wearing a mask is required!” With the overt politicization of the COVID-19 pandemic, arguing with customers opposing face-masks became a daily struggle. While thankfully I never experienced any instances of physical assault, the news media documented various acts of violence committed against restaurant workers in this time of heightened tensions. Despite the owners’ hollow efforts to protect their employees, this message highlights the irony faced by many in the industry who were praised as “essential workers” while simultaneously experiencing poor treatment from customers and employers alike.

The most blatant labor issue referenced in V Pizza’s sign comes with the reminder to leave a tip, essentially asking customers to make up for unlivable wages. In her book *Forked: A New Standard in American Dining*, Saru Jayaraman draws attention to the power imbalance between the food system and its workers, arguing that the restaurant industry is “the absolute lowest paying employer in the United States.” Jayaraman asserts the National Restaurant Association, or the Other NRA, has lobbied to keep the minimum wage low. As a result, employees must rely on the practice of tipping to supplement their paychecks. Adding to this argument, Mark Bittman states that the establishment of a “sub-minimum-wage standard” for food workers who receive tips has permitted 85 percent of American restaurants to violate minimum wages laws. Jayaraman further maintains that “the cur-
rent system of allowing the restaurant industry to exempt itself from paying its own workers because they earn tips is a legacy of slavery." In the late 1800s, hospitality and railroad companies refused to pay formerly enslaved African Americans for their labor, citing that their income should be sustained through customer tips alone. Over the years, the act of tipping became stubbornly engrained in the American food service industry. However, Jayaraman reports that 20 percent of restaurants can afford to pay workers a livable wage. This continuing discrepancy of payment responsibility ultimately signals a structural dynamic of unchecked labor exploitation.

Furthermore, the tipping system in American restaurants creates an environment in which female workers are more susceptible to sexual harassment and customer abuse. According to Jayaraman’s research, women have made up two-thirds of the tipped worker sector in recent years; and “since the customer was paying their wages, rather than their employer, the customer was always right.” Thus, female restaurant workers are often forced to endure harassment and comply with customers’ requests that make them feel uncomfortable because they don’t want to risk losing part of their pay. While I was aware that unwanted attention usually comes along with working with the public as a female, I was taken off guard during an interaction with an older male patron who offered me a substantially larger tip if I would pull down my mask to show him my smile. I felt violated and unsettled by the knowledge that this unjust system of wage supplementation allowed this man to assume he could bribe me into doing something inappropriate and unsafe for his political and chauvinistic pleasure. Yet, as a server there was not much that I could do in a situation like this other than politely decline and lose out on the larger tip. Research conducted by the restaurant worker advocacy organization One Fair Wage found that food service workers have experienced a 41 percent increase in sexual harassment during the pandemic. Restaurant employers who rely on this means of wage supplementation, rather than paying their employees a livable wage, have allowed for their already vulnerable workers to be taken advantage by customers in a time of financial uncertainty. Thus, the sign posted by V Pizza, reminding patrons to tip their wait staff, unintentionally reveals the lack of value its employers
place on their “essential workers” by offering insufficient wages that leave workers susceptible to customer harassment.

Therefore, the bold claim made by the management at V Pizza—blaming the government’s COVID-19 emergency unemployment benefits for labor shortage within the restaurant industry—was designed to remove the responsibility of the labor shortage off profiteers of the hegemonic food system and place the blame on individual workers, rather than recognize the multiple issues—like immigration restrictions and increased health and safety risks—facing food workers within the uncertain times of global pandemic. In addition, the reminder for V Pizza’s customers to tip the few servers that did “show up to serve you” is intended to pressure the consumers into compensating for the food industry’s resistance to providing their employees with a living wage. The need for employers like V Pizza to amplify such pointed sentiments during a time of increasing quitting rates indicates an ongoing power struggle between unsatisfied food workers and their employers, who strive to uphold the flawed food system. Thus, the mass exodus of employees from various food industry sectors stands as a form of resistance against the American food supply chain’s oppressive and exploitative forces.

The relationship between food, exploitative labor practices, and resistance has a long history in the United States that can be traced back to the times of slavery, in which enslaved individuals wielded their ability to refuse nutrition as one of the few forms of agency they possessed. In the Netflix documentary series *High on the Hog: How African American Cuisine Transformed America*, food writer Stephen Satterfield explains how the act of refusing food was so prevalent among the enslaved that a special speculum was invented to force feed those who resisted. By the time of the nineteenth-century Labor Movement in America, labor strikes became a pressing way for factory workers to demand better protection on the job with the right to unionize. Fitting within this lineage, workers choosing to leave the food industry today are fundamentally disrupting the structure of the supply chain and service sector that implicitly relies on its workers’ exploited labor. Denying this system the labor it needs to operate shifts the power into the hands of the remaining food workforce as the industry struggles to
keep up production and profit. The scarcity of labor then puts increasing pressure on government agencies and food industry employers to offer better work conditions and better pay, regardless of the reason for those who resigned—be it an intentional attempt to cause structural change, a forced leave due to revised immigration restrictions, or a personal choice to escape dangerous and exploitive work environments.

However, this method of resistance needs to be recognized as a trade-off of power rather than a full-blown reclamation. While the workers stepping away from the food industry are relieving themselves of its abuse and acknowledging their agency to better negotiate their worth, they are also relinquishing their guarantee of a steady paycheck. In an investigative series produced in 2021 by NPR called *Help Wanted: Where Are the Workers?*, some former food industry workers report seeking employment in other industries that offer better pay and more reliable hours, like the corporate sector. In the meantime, whether these unemployed former food workers are seeking new opportunities in alternative industries or waiting for circumstance to improve within the food industry before they return to work, many of these individuals are running through their personal savings to sustain themselves financially.\(^{31}\) It is important to recognize that those electively participating in the Great Resignation, including myself, experience a degree of privilege, having the option to temporarily go without a regular income, while others might not be able to afford to quit. But even those who can choose to leave the food industry are forced to make financial sacrifices.

As Bittman suggests, catastrophic forces like the COVID-19 pandemic can serve as “an opportunity for humans to enact our own form of change.”\(^ {32}\) Since the summer of 2021, labor advocacy organizations, like the Fight for 15, have made progress with countless national restaurant chains beginning to offer higher pay and upgraded benefits to their workers. According to *The Washington Post*, 84 percent of restaurants in the United States raised their wages as of January 2022, a feat that would have been inconceivable prior to the Great Resignation.\(^ {33}\) Nevertheless the quitting trend continues, with the leisure and hospitality industry accounting for the highest unemployment rate of all job sectors—remaining at 5.9 percent in September of 2022.\(^ {34}\) This data reminds us that the issues of the food system run deeper than wages alone.
In conclusion, the contemporary food worker shortage is not a matter of people not wanting to work anymore, but rather a mass resistance against inadequate labor standards. Participation in the Great Resignation has served as a viable measure to disrupt the structure of the American food system and has helped to shift the power from the employers to the employees. Because of this mass exodus, changes have begun to be implemented within the industry. However, the food system in the United States will remain unjust until its workers are prioritized over profit. In the words of Saru Jayaraman, “times are changing, and the industry—and society—certainly can do better.”
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A Common Thread: The Perception of Women as Threats in WWII

Evelyn A. Goode

AMST 320: Women in American Society

In the Spring of 2022, I took the course American Studies 320: Women in American Society, with Professor Carrie Lane. For one of our final assignments, we were tasked with crafting an essay which discussed the ways in which World War II impacted at least three different groups of American women. During the war, a societal shift in gender roles had begun, with men away and women filling in the gaps left behind. Numerous groups of women were singled out and believed by the public at large to be “threats” to the American way of life. This essay discusses the experiences of three groups of women: “Pachucas” (Mexican-American women that dressed and behaved in a particular fashion), Japanese women, and queer women. Though they were similarly perceived as “threats” and are united in this way, their experiences were very different, and this essay aims to discuss both their similarities and differences through an intersectional lens.

Introduction

The start of World War II brought about many new opportunities and life changes for the women of that time. More women entered the workforce than ever before to fill the need caused by the absence of men. Though most women were affected in some way or another, their experiences differed based on the various social/ethnic groups they belonged to. While many white married women had never worked outside of the home and suddenly were doing so, other groups of women such as Mexican-American women, Japanese-American women, and queer women were affected by differing experiences in their own right.

Mexican–American Women

In Los Angeles, some Mexican–American women had developed and adopted a style all their own. In The Pachuca Panic: Sexual and Cultural Battlegrounds in WWII Los Angeles by Elizabeth R. Escobedo, this style is explored not only as a fashion statement, but a political one. As a response to the male “Zoot suiter,” young women took to
wearing heavy makeup, drape pants, and high pompadour hairstyles. This style of dress was believed by the Anglo community and juvenile courts to be affiliated with gang behavior, though most of the girls did not engage in it. These girls became labeled as “Pachucas”—a derivative of their male counterparts known as Pachucos. The lifestyle was not about committing crimes, but rather a rebellion against the assimilationist culture imposed on immigrants and their children.1 Most of these young women simply “flirted with the image of disrepute” by staying out late with friends, roaming neighborhoods, jitterbugging at dance halls, and engaging in sexual behavior.2 This was troubling not only to authorities, but also to the parents of these young women. They believed the girls to be adopting too much of an “Americanized” attitude towards sex, while rejecting their cultural backgrounds. From their parents’ perspective, they had become “too American,” while from the Anglo perspective, they were “not American enough.”3 Wartime rhetoric had stressed the importance of national unity and sacrifice for the “greater good,” but Pachucas rejected this narrative.4 They were tired of being seen as second-class citizens, and did not feel a need to sacrifice for a nation that did not embrace them. Their self-indulgent behavior was seen by many as selfish, and a blatant disregard for the gravity of the global circumstances.

Most threatening of all to outsiders, was the Pachucas’ attitude towards sexuality. For these young women of color, sex offered an opportunity to experience a sense of excitement and pleasure in the context of lives typically defined by discrimination, poverty, and severe social restrictions. This is an example of the overall heightened public obsession with women’s sexuality during World War II. In this way, the Pachucas had become a new wartime enemy—“Mexican girl hoodlums.”5 As noted by Escobedo, “women were expected to patriotically fulfill sacrificial feminine roles; minorities were expected to embrace Americanism. Pachucas, however, seemed to do neither.”6 They were seen as a threat on US soil by the Anglo community, much like their Japanese-American counterparts.

Japanese—American Women

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, distrust of Japanese and Japanese-American community members in the US became common-
place. This was partially fueled by rumors that Japanese inhabitants in Hawaii had somehow aided in the attack. On February 19th, 1942, FDR signed Executive Order 9066 which authorized the removal of 110,000 Japanese and their American born children from the western half of the Pacific Coastal states and the southern third of Arizona. Involuntary evacuations began in the spring of 1942, and these displaced people were sent to internment camps located throughout California, Oregon and Washington.

The lives of the people in the camps were forever changed, especially the Japanese women. “Japanese American Women during World War II” by Valerie Matsumoto details the conditions of the camps and the daily lives of the women who endured them. The conditions of camp life profoundly altered family relations and affected women of all ages and backgrounds. The barracks were crowded and dirty, they were subjected to frigid temperatures, and there were continual shortages of basic items like toilet paper, which eroded family unity and morale. Women were often assigned shifts at odd hours in the mess halls and infirmaries, which made it impossible for them and their families to sit down and have meals together.

Life in the camps was by no means glamorous, though there were some positive effects for women. For example, there was a wide variety of jobs that women were able to gain experience in, that they otherwise would not have had access to. The camps were intended to function like small cities, and therefore jobs ranged in everything from accounting, to agriculture, education, medical care, mess hall service, and the weekly newspaper. The most affected in work and education were the Nisei (second generation Japanese Americans). For the first generation (Issei) women, they suddenly were able to experience more leisure time than they were previously accustomed to. Traditionally, Issei women would spend their days completing long hours of work both inside and outside the home. As they were no longer solely responsible for preparing meals for their family unit due to the communally prepared meals of the camps, Issei women had more free time on their hands. This free time was often used to attend classes in handiwork, flower arrangement, sewing, painting, calligraphy, and wood carving. For the Issei women, these skills were a way for them to contribute to
their family’s material comfort. Internment also affected Nisei women in their romantic relationships. Within the camps, romances moved rather quickly. This created a new standard of courtship as more young Japanese women married for love, rather than the traditional arranged marriages experienced by their Issei parents.

Once relocation began, some of the first to be moved out of the camps were college students, and many them were women. Armed with a new sense of confidence in their abilities and independence, Nisei women departed the camps and headed to the Midwest and Eastern United States to find new opportunities in education and work. Some of the most popular career choices included nursing, clerical, beautician, factory, and domestic work. Prior to the war, Japanese-Americans had largely been excluded from working in these fields due to racism. In their new settings, Japanese/Japanese-American women experienced some hostility from other Americans, as people still did not trust them. The environment left women with little choice but to repress their feelings of anger and resentment towards the racism they encountered to better fit in. After the war ended in 1945, a majority of the relocated Japanese-Americans returned to the West Coast. Many were left with lasting psychological scars and trauma that resulted from being uprooted and destabilized for so long.

Queer Women

With women starting work in roles that had traditionally been reserved for men, there was a demanding double standard imposed—the expectation that they excel in their jobs while maintaining the heteronormative perception of femininity. This double standard and the resulting environment it created are explored in Creating G.I. Jane: The Regulation of Sexuality and Sexual Behavior in the Women’s Army Corps during World War II by Leisa D. Meyer and Born for Liberty: A History of Women in America by Sara Evans. The Director of the Women’s Army Corps, Olveta Culp Hobby, largely based the WAC image on this notion of femininity and chastity. Though she tried to limit the visibility of actual queer women in the WACS through advertising promoting the “attractiveness of WACS to servicemen,” the nature of wartime did provide some benefits to queer women. Most obviously, the all-female environment of the WACS created an opportunity
for women to explore their sexualities that had never been presented before. Secondly, queer women were able to be seen publicly with other women without inherent public scrutiny, as women visibly dominated many public spaces. Lesbian bars began to appear around the country, and not only in large urban centers.11

Queer women used various methods to communicate with and identify each other, such as employing specific mannerisms and coded language. Homosexual behavior was prohibited for both male and female soldiers, though the harshest punishments were usually imposed on men if discovered. When females were suspected of homosexual behavior, discharge was reserved only for the “most serious cases,” and instead less strict methods of control were employed such as room and post re-assignments. When accused of homosexuality, some women resorted to accusing others, or getting married/pregnant to protect themselves and/or their lovers.12

During this period, the public was paranoid about women’s sexuality and homosexuality. They feared that environments which fostered possible same sex relations could lead to the eventual breakdown of heterosexual norms and “morality.” Their attention was focused on the possible “masculinizing” effect that the military and workforce may have on women.13 Heterosexual women in the military often used this “lesbian threat” to their advantage, manipulating public fears for their own benefit. Allegations of lesbianism were made against female officers who enforced fraternization regulations, accusing them of being “anti-male” and “discouraging normal heterosexual interactions.”

**Conclusion**

Through the lens of intersectionality, we can see that women’s experiences during World War II greatly varied according to the identity groups they belonged to. Intersectionality is the concept that with overlapping characteristics of gender, race, sexual orientation, etc., a unique human experience is created. For example, a woman of color who is also queer would have a unique experience from a woman who is simply queer. A uniting thread between the experiences of all of these women, however, was their perception by outsiders as a threat. Mexican-American women were seen as a “threat” to American patriotism and assimilation into Anglocentric American culture.
Japanese-American women were seen as “threats” to the nation at large, possibly having ties to the enemy. Queer women were seen as “threats” to the very notion of “womanhood”—possessing the ability to both emasculate men and render them obsolete, in the minds of the public. This wartime obsession with women’s sexualities and independence arose out of fear. For years, women had been told it was not possible for them to work in certain fields or excel at certain tasks, and suddenly this lie was exposed. As women began to subvert the narrative that had been imposed on them, this created a panic in those who wished to keep the false narrative intact. The resilience of these courageous women during World War II blazed trails and made great strides in women’s equality for future generations.
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Carnation Milk and the Marketing of White Hegemonic Performance

Kathleen Loreto Spennato

AMST 418: Food and American Culture

This paper was written for Dr. Elaine Lewinnek’s Fall 2021 course Food and American Culture. Written as a semester-long research project, my paper seeks to understand the cultural work Carnation Company cookbooks were doing between World War I and World War II. Dr. Lewinnek introduced the course by saying, “Food is good to think with.” My paper seeks to demonstrate how food assists in forming identity. Primarily using milk as the starting point, food ingredients and recipes communicate a great deal about American culture during the interwar period. Cookbooks tell us about everyday experiences. Foodways and preparation methods help us to explore themes of power, gender, race, and class. My paper seeks to understand how the Carnation Company cookbooks helped to maintain hegemonic cultural ideas whilst silencing diverse cultural heritages.

“When ‘hubby’ telephones at the last minute that he is just starting home and is bringing a friend to dinner, the thoughtful housewife refuses to get flustered for she is prepared for just such an emergency,” wrote the Carnation Milk Company in the introduction to their 1920 advertising cookbook *Carnation 5 Minute Recipes*. Statements like these were common in Carnation Milk’s promotional cookbooks, which were comprised of recipes that featured Carnation products and distributed freely to housewives by request. Carnation’s promotional cookbooks offer more than quick recipes; they offer clues about how food reflects perceived national and personal identities through everyday practices. By examining milk—specifically evaporated milk—we gain insight into the white middle-class American identity of the interwar period. “Food culture,” says professor of food studies Mark Padoongpatt, “is but one example of how practices of everyday life are often critical to how people make sense of the world around them, where they fit into that world, who should belong to that world, and how they imagine and remake new worlds.” Therefore, cookbooks
are a terrific way to gain an understanding of the everyday experience. Looking at Carnation Milk Company cookbooks published during the interwar period, the marketing of evaporated milk as a commodity to white middle-class women reveals the values of white Americans before World War II. While Carnation Milk attempted to sell “milk from contented cows,” as their slogan suggested, this paper asserts that Carnation Milk marketed white hegemonic feminine performance through appearance, conformity, and containment.

Like American colonial heritage, cow milk has a dark history of dishonest trading and deceitful marketing campaigns. The English settlers of Jamestown imposed dairy cows on the American landscape during the early 1600s through the Columbian exchange. With many non-European people being lactose intolerant, it was not an equal exchange. In the mid-1800s, as cities expanded during the industrial revolution, the distance between farms and cities filled with the consuming public grew. Due to the unsanitary farm conditions and the travel time from farm to city, milk developed a bad reputation as these circumstances allowed for milk-borne epidemics to occur frequently. The dairy farms tried to cover up the poor milk they produced. Milk distilleries created what they called “Pure Country Milk” to take advantage of consumers, masking milk with substances such as chalk, flour, and molasses to maximize profits. However, their willingness to deceive and take advantage of the late nineteenth-century consumer caused many to die, including infants. To win back the public’s trust, milk producers turned to new methods of production and marketing.

Evaporated milk became one solution to reinstate the reputation of the dairy industry. In 1929, Dr. Frank E. Rice wrote about the benefits of evaporated milk in an article called “Evaporated Milk and Its Relation to Public Health” for the American Journal of Public Health. As executive secretary of the Evaporated Milk Association in Chicago, he aimed to sell the American public on evaporated milk’s safety, economics, and nutritional value. He argued that it was pure, clean, and wholesome as well as nutritious and healthy. Rice claimed that evaporated milk was an excellent economic investment due to its ability to be transported without refrigeration. Additionally, its transportation allowed evaporated milk companies to avoid paying high wages to union
milk wagon drivers. The solution, as Rice saw it, was to increase milk consumption for the betterment of public health. He wrote,

It would seem to be wise, as one part of our educational pro-
gram, to find new ways of putting milk into the diet, rather
than expend all our efforts in urging the drinking of more milk.
There is a limit to the amount of milk people will drink; a quart
per person per day probably can never be reached.

Thus, the promotional cookbook became a critical way to add milk to
the American diet through cooking. Furthermore, the cookbook would
increase the profits of evaporated milk companies during a time of
significant milk surplus and changes in consumer purchasing habits.

As a way of encouraging the purchase of evaporated milk in newly
developed supermarkets, cookbooks explicitly provided ideas on how to
cook with milk. However, an implicit reading of the promotional cook-
book shows that these promotional materials actively idealized white
middle-class American women.

One business that utilizes these promotional materials was
the Carnation Company, led by E. A. Stuart. Beginning in 1899,
the Carnation Company capitalized on the growing milk industry
through their commodification of evaporated milk. Following World
War I, the boom in exports ended and milk surpluses grew. In an
effort to revive American agriculture, the Agricultural Adjustment
Act of 1933 attempted to address the post-war surpluses by raising
prices of basic commodities like milk to benefit agricultural produc-
ers. The Carnation company took advantage of the act to grow their
profits by advertising through cookbooks that could be obtained
simply by writing to them, as long as one had the means to write
and pay for postage. Promotional cookbooks by Carnation are part
of the imaginative marketing employed to convince the public of
the safety of milk. One example from 1939’s *Carnation Cook Book*
begins with an explanation of the “new” Irradiated Carnation Milk.
According to the introduction, irradiated milk is exposed to ultra-
violet rays from a carbon-arc lamp for a few seconds, killing harmful
bacteria and delaying spoilage. The cookbook then explains that not
only is Carnation milk irradiated with “wonderful ‘sunshine’ vitamin D,” their canned milk is pure and safe, dependable, convenient, rich, economical, and more digestible than raw or pasteurized milk—all while producing better cooking results. These arguments, similar to the ones Rice made ten years earlier, provide us with the explicit intentions for publishing promotional cookbooks by evaporated milk companies. Irradiated Carnation Milk was marketing milk as a pure, clean, wholesome, and nutritious option by focusing on a variety of safe ways to cook with the product. However, the underlying motive of Big Business was to utilize the marketing of cookbooks to capitalize on the milk surplus for increased profit.

To maximize company profits, Carnation promoted its cookbooks to white middle-class women, who were typically responsible for preparing food for their families during the interwar period. By following a sales pitch comparable to that of Rice, Carnation set up the cookbooks to focus on the values of the “homemaker,” emphasizing the education of women and the household. Carnation Cook Book codifies these values through hints hidden in topics such as Rules, Child Feeding, and Menus. The implicit marketing messages of the cookbook targets women by using language that defines the reader as wife and mother. Written discreetly, the book describes the menu-making process as “an important task of the homemaker, for upon her rests the nourishment of the family.” This quote asserts that the woman is responsible for providing nutritious and healthy food for the assumed husband and children in her home by putting forth the time and labor to ensure each family member eats balanced meals to fulfill their daily food requirements. According to Carnation Cook Book, the number one way to preserve health was to eat or drink “one quart of milk a day for each child and at least a pint for each adult.” During this period, home economists set out to “educate” families, especially children, on the specific quantities of milk to consume. Food journalist Mark Bittman explains in his book Animal, Vegetable, Junk that Big Business exploited home economics as a marketing machine to train women in consumption instead of production. According to American studies professor Sarah Walden, home economists’ corporate participation in the dairy industry helped companies like Carnation recognize that
the average consumer was a white, middle-class woman. The only illustrations throughout *Carnation Cook Book* are of white women and children. Therefore, the cookbooks validate that Carnation marketed to the white female consumer.

As the exclusive illustrations of white women and children reflect, promotional Carnation cookbooks of the interwar period upheld American racial hegemony. During the 1920s and 1930s, Americanization efforts promoted racial beliefs through food. White Americans created classes to teach immigrants to be model citizens and workers. For immigrant women, classes emphasized housework, hygiene, and etiquette. These classes conveyed the racialization of food by using white ingredients like milk, butter, flour, and salt with the belief that plain food pushed immigrants to become American. *Carnation 5 Minute Recipes* devotes an entire page to nine variations of white sauce. With examples like Thin White Sauce, Thick White Sauce, and Plain Sauce, Carnation cookbooks reified the dominance of white Americans’ power through their palate. Food scholar Meredith Abarca writes, “what we eat, how we eat, and where we eat create political, social, and symbolic messages regarding attitudes toward ourselves and toward the ethnic other.” Carnation cookbook recipes performed Americanization by implicit means of racializing white food. Therefore, evaporated milk cookbooks are symbolic, political, and social messages of white hegemonic performance.

Within these messages of white hegemonic performance and the racializing of white food, ran themes of conformity and containment. With diets expected to have up to a quart of milk per day, the Carnation cookbooks found innovative ways of putting milk into the white American diet. From appetizers to desserts, the cookbooks provided recipes for any occasion and included a wide variety of serving options. Recipes using molds, very often with gelatin, were ubiquitous. One example is the Noodle Ring with Creamed Chicken, which was garnished with parsley and flowers made of onion cups and marmalade flowers. It was a ring of noodles made with Carnation milk, eggs, Worcestershire sauce, cheese, and catsup in a mold with creamed chicken poured into the center. The molds controlled and presented the food, keeping everything in its place. Like gelatin, molds are a
symbol of conformity and containment. They signify women molded into suppression and pressured into consumption. During the interwar period, women had very few alternatives to homemaking. Through the usage of molds and gelatin, the patriarchy symbolically contained white middle-class women just as they tried to contain the form of their food. Furthermore, food molds were an additional consumer good that the homemaker needed to purchase. Thus, molds assisted in the training of women as consumers. Products, like molds, are an example of how marketing pushed female consumption and containment. Consequently, product marketing encouraged women to conform to the societal role of the family consumer contained within her kitchen and home.

With the emphasis on food presentation, appearance was of the utmost importance to the Carnation Company. Their cookbooks can be seen as another way to control and contain white middle-class women within the kitchen. The Christmas Candle Salad recipe is one extreme example of form over function. This “salad” presentation, illustrated in great detail, requires exotic ingredients for the interwar period: a banana, a slice of pineapple, and a Brazil nut. The cook is directed to place the slice of pineapple on a salad plate, then cut both ends of the banana (so that it measures four inches) before placing it in the center of the pineapple slice, and finally to cut the Brazil nut lengthwise so that it sticks into the top of the banana. After building the “candle,” the cook is directed to garnish the Christmas Candle Salad and to light the nut on fire when ready to serve. The *Carnation Cook Book* indicates that the presentation of the food should take precedence over the food’s taste, texture, and smell. Yet Padoongpatt writes about how important all the senses are to how people experience food, stating “taste, in visceral and emotional ways draws boundaries around food and the people who cook and eat the food, distinguishes between the foreign and the familiar, links cuisine and individuals to places, and above all inscribes relations of power onto plates and bodies.” However, the *Carnation Cook Book* promotes form over function by emphasizing sight over the other senses, including taste. Despite this lack of emphasis on taste, these cookbooks seemingly draw boundaries around who cooks the food and who holds the power within American
interwar society. By linking white middle-class women to the kitchen, the cookbook inscribes relations of power onto the food production of women and the labor of their bodies. By promoting appearance over purpose in food, the cookbook implies an emphasis on the appearance of the female cook—thus reinforcing the power of the patriarchy. With the appearance of food and the female cook meant to appeal to the male point of view, masculinity is where the power rests. It is the plating of perfect dishes that signifies idealized white female bodies. It is the time and labor required to make these perfect dishes that keep women contained. The kitchen defines their place in society. In both scenarios, the patriarchy is sustained.

The *Carnation Cook Book* conveys an absence of ingenuity in the use of leftovers that illustrates an overall societal desire for consistency and sameness. Carnation tells the reader that “many times left-over food can be used to good advantage if a little thought is put on its appearance—how it will look when it appears before the family is critical.” Even with leftovers, appearance was a critical component. Lacking creativity to repurpose excess food from a previous meal into a new tasty dish, corporate cookbooks taught white middle-class women to present the leftovers for the same unskilled dish with a spruced up facade. The message seems to be for these women to live the same lives day-to-day, kept fresh only in appearance. Therefore, leftovers signify the homogenization of white middle-class women. Perhaps the absence of creativity in the kitchen was meant to encourage a lack of resistance to homogeny by these women. In contrast, historian Katharina Vester described how Freda De Knight’s 1948 cookbook *A Date with A Dish*, which reinscribed African American cooks into culinary traditions of America, highlighted the ingenuity of enslaved cooks to use what little food they had in creative ways as an act of opposition. For these expert cooks, De Knight states how the “lowliest ingredients became comfort foods in the hands of the cooks, who skillfully transposed them from meals created out of sheer necessity to morsels of hope and resistance.” The Carnation cookbooks do not express hope and resistance. Instead, they are full of conformity and idealized lifestyles. The treatment of leftovers within the *Carnation Cook Book* symbolizes the pressure white middle-class women felt to conform to
the image of the perfect homogenized homemakers to their husbands and children.

Recipes featured in these promotional materials were created for the ideal homemaker, who has both time and financial means to create elaborate meals for her family and friends. The *Carnation Cook Book* provides a variety of suggested menus, from everyday meals for children to special occasions. One noteworthy special occasion menu, labeled as Lincoln’s Birthday Bridge Luncheon, lists eight items to prepare: a tomato juice cocktail, Ham à la King in Noodle Nest, buttered beats, cornmeal muffins, Pineapple Jellied Salad, Log Cabin Cake, wafers, and coffee. To plan and prepare all eight dishes in large portions for the multiple guests attending the bridge luncheon, a woman would need an extensive amount of time and the economic means to purchase the food. Not to mention the additional time, space, and ability to play bridge. Domestic unpaid labor in the kitchen embodies the identity of white middle-class American women. Vester contends that, in twentieth-century white culture, it was a sign of middle-class prosperity if the husband’s wages could support his wife and family without the need for the wife to work. “At the same time,” Vester writes, “this defined unpaid cooking and kitchen labor as part of hegemonic feminine performance.” With these assumptions embedded within the menus/recipes, Carnation cookbooks reinforce the ideal white middle-class female identity during the interwar period. Therefore, promotional cookbooks of the midcentury inscribe power relations onto white female bodies in the kitchen through the corporate white men who used milk to contain the white female body. Pure, clean, and wholesome—these milky white bodies symbolized ideal women of the interwar period.

Ultimately, Carnation cookbooks reflect the white patriarchal hegemony encouraged in America during the interwar period. As the star ingredient of the cookbooks, milk expresses the many complex ideas that surround food. Academic Christine Marks writes about the importance of reading cookbooks for their cultural messages. She states, “cookbooks can be instruments of both maintaining and erasing cultural heritage, and they allow the reader to trace foodways and preparation methods as well as gender, race, and class relations played out in the kitchen.” Carnation cookbooks defined white middle-class
women through appearance, conformity, and containment. Through milk, we can see how food helps express relationships of power. Food scholar Fabio Parasecoli contends that food has the power to influence everyday lives through its cultural capital, class, gender, and ethnic identities. Evaporated Milk companies, like Carnation Milk, pull from this power to push for profits. It is not the nutrition and health of its consumers that truly concerns them. Rather, the companies want the money and the subsequent power that it brings. The evaporated milk industry continued to grow and ramp up their promotions in the postwar era. Just as these trends in marketing lasted through the decades, the white hegemonic ideology they promoted has continued to linger in American culture. Further exploration of evaporated milk and its marketing might help us to understand how American culture evolved after World War II.
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How Cookbooks Have Shaped American Identity

Nicole Spinos

AMST 418: Food and American Culture

This paper was written for Dr. Lewinnek’s Fall 2021 course on Food and American Culture in which we were instructed to investigate American food-based identities. This paper critically analyzes two Farm Journal cookbooks, specifically Country Cookbook (1959) and Busy Woman’s Cookbook (1971). Both cookbooks reflect the long-standing beliefs of white America surrounding food, whether it is about what foods should be eaten and by whom, who is in the kitchen preparing the food, or where the recipes and foodways originate from. The research discusses the colonialist, racialized, and gendered aspects of the recipes comprised in the cookbooks, as well as explores what ‘American’ food truly is. Additionally, the research addresses how ‘American’ food is comprised of recipes, ingredients, and labor of others but taken by colonialists as the nation’s own.

Dedicated to my late grandmother, Marie Golemis (April 24, 1938–September 6, 2022). The cookbooks used to conduct the research were used and lent to me by my grandma.

The Farm Journal’s 1959 Country Cookbook and 1971 Busy Woman’s Cookbook reflect the long-standing American colonial beliefs surrounding food—whether it is about what foods should be eaten and by whom, who is in the kitchen preparing the food, or where the recipes and foodways originate from. These two cookbooks focus on the diets of white communities in the American Midwest and New England and they reflect skewed Eurocentric, white, gendered notions regarding food that have often been set in place and perpetuated from the perspective of a dominant white society. Not only does the 1959 and 1971 editions of the Farm Journal cookbook provide recipes considered to be authentically “country,” they also give the reader insight into the nation’s relationship to food over time. The Country Cookbook begins with a letter from the food editor, Nell B. Nichols,
explaining why the Farm Journal is unlike any other cookbook. “You’ll find the chapters or groups of recipes divided in just the way country women think of food...Next come the recipes using staple farm foods like Meats, Chicken, and Other Poultry, Potatoes, Eggs, Apples, Milk and Cheese, and Butter and Cream. These are some of the ingredients responsible for the country-good taste.”

When looking at the American diet from a historical perspective, there has been a great shift from the traditional foods and foodways, or the method of food preparation, of the Indigenous communities, who first lived on the land, to foods and foodways of the colonialist, who invaded and stayed in the country. Along with Indigenous food cultures, the influences of African American and Asian communities have been altered as well. Prior to the destructive intrusion of Native lands by European settlers of the Columbian era, Indigenous communities prospered by the cultivation and utilization of the foods that were native to the environment in which they lived. In the book *Animal, Vegetable, Junk* author Mark Bittman displays the array of foods that Indigenous communities ate in pre-Columbian America which included: “corn, potatoes, cassava, sweet potatoes, and legumes—which were more productive than wheat, barley, oats, and millet, and as productive as rice.” The introduction of Spanish and European foods not only decimated the landscapes crucial to the livelihood of Native communities, it changed the diets of all those living in America from that point forward. European and Spanish invaders prioritized the production of foods from their home countries over that of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas to the point of “shunning tortillas or potatoes or turkey or guinea pigs or beans; They wanted their pork and bread.” Additionally, *Animal, Vegetable, Junk* explains how by the mid-1600s “the Europeans were bringing cattle as well as pigs, and meat, hides, tallow, and dairy,” which all became less expensive and more common throughout the newly Western society.

Both the 1959 *Country Cookbook* and the 1971 *Busy Woman's Cookbook* embody the ingredients, foods, and foodways of the European invaders as opposed to that of the country’s Indigenous peoples. By doing so, these cookbooks perpetuate the favoring and promotion of colonial foods by placing them above those of non-dominant Ameri-
can communities. Within a collection of essays featured in the book *Dethroning the Deceitful Porkchop*, food studies scholar Christine Marks describes how cookbooks can be “instruments of both maintaining and erasing cultural heritage, allowing the reader to trace foodways and preparation methods.” Both the *Country Cookbook* and *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* uphold European colonial culture and ideologies within their recipes while erasing the cultural heritage of others. Therefore, the authenticity of the cookbook recipes then become questionable because they do not allow for the tracing of traditional foodways. For instance, while food editor Nichols does credit the foundation of American dishes to Native communities to some extent in the subsection of the 1959 cookbook titled “Regional Dishes,” he also arrogantly adds in the contribution of European settlers. Nichols states, “regional dishes developed in home kitchens of our early colonists… the dishes were thoroughly Americanized by the foods available and by the influence of friendly Indians… some of the classic national treats [were] introduced by Indians and refined by early settlers.” By using the language “thoroughly Americanized” and “refined” to describe how the influences of Indigenous food were adapted into dishes considered to be classic American foods today, Nichols implies that those dishes were improved upon, modified, and modernized by the colonialists to create something better. Regarding foodways, one woman in the 1971 *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* claimed, “I use the Indian technique,” while Nichols remarked “others stick to the traditional method.” It is important to note that the distinction between “Indian” and “traditional” techniques is questionable, as Indigenous communities are inherently American; however, the distinction is made to reinforce colonialist superiority, pinning the Indian technique as inauthentically American. Therefore, the hegemonic ideologies, not only regarding foods but society as a whole, continue to be spread. While the foods and foodways of communities of color are reworked in a way to perpetuate colonial culinary superiority, the same is not said when looking at recipes and techniques of ethnically white countries used in American cooking. Nichols explains in the *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* how “you can borrow the Danish way of stacking tempting foods on buttered bread slices, using favorite American foods.” Rather than adopting the technique and claim-
ing it as one that belongs to the United States, as was done within the discussion of Indigenous foodways, the cookbook uses words like “borrow” when referencing the foodways of other ethnically white countries.

This speaks to a historical pattern of erasing Indigenous culture, histories, and experiences in order to perpetuate white Western superiority in America. Despite the inclusion of “Regional Dishes” within the *Country Cookbook*, a chapter meant to provide an ethnically diverse display of recipes, none of the recipes included are without colonial influence. Some examples of recipes shared in this section include Little Indian Pudding, Chow Mein, Tortillas, and Enchiladas. Although there is not a designated chapter in Farm Journal’s *Busy Woman’s Cookbook*, it also includes Americanized versions of ethnically diverse dishes such as Eggs Foo Young, Creole Beans, and Pork Curry. While *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* includes many dishes with the term “Creole” in the title, ethnically Creole people are never credited. Marks states, “Creole cuisine is composed of ingredients and cooking methods from both African American and Native American cultures.”9 The Creole identity, with all that it entails, includes food and foodways. It is a mixing of cultures—a result of colonialism. The African American and Indigenous influence in Creole cooking have been erased, along with their cultures and histories. In contrast, French and Spanish settler cultures are at the forefront of Creole cuisine, furthering notions of white, colonial superiority, not only in the cookbooks examined within this paper but in all things Creole. Colonialism worked to pursue “the goal of whitening the past by denying interracial mixing.”10 Thus, the discrediting of African American and Native American influence on Creole cuisine occurred. Creole cuisine is American by its nature as it reflects the American identity, that which is Creole. It is interesting to read the explanatory blurbs provided in *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* under each recipe title, as they are intended to give origin to the recipe but never actually do so. Why? Because the vast foods of Native and African American communities have been essentialized to only one type of food category instead of representing all “American” foods. For example, in American food culture soul food is often the only cuisine that represents African American cooking, when that is not
the case. American Studies scholar Katharina Vester notes how Freda De Knight’s 1948 *A Date with a Dish: A Cook Book for American Ne-gro Recipes* is a noteworthy text for American and African American cooking because it “claims a variety of regional foodways as well as fine American dining for this heritage [including Creole], thus making a much broader and bolder assertion of African American ownership of American cooking.” Yet, *A Date with a Dish* is an exception to the rule. Like the erasure of Indigenous influences in culinary work, the influences of African American food and foodways are often expunged from American cookbooks.

The underlying messages of both *Country Cookbook* and *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* regarding what foods should be consumed in the United States as well as what foods are “authentically country” were created for a target audience. An analysis of the collection of recipes encapsulated in the Farm Journal cookbooks reveal that they were intended for white, middle-to-upper class, women in particular. In the letter from the food editor, Nichols writes that the recipes included in the cookbook have been collected from over five hundred farm women for farm women. These women, however, were not farmers themselves but rather, they were the wives of the farmers. Vester adds that “De Knight calls women who ‘stay at home’ ‘fortunate,’” which is reflected in the both the 1959 and 1971 cookbooks. The *Country Cookbook* is broken down into twenty-five separate sections, including sections titled: Dishes to Tote, Cooking for a Crowd, and Coffee Break. Within the introduction page for Dishes to Tote, Nichols states that, “grandmother spoke of such talented cooks as women born with silver spoons in their hands.” While the phrase “born with a silver spoon” could refer to the producer of the food as well as the consumer of the food, both scenarios indicate a certain socioeconomic class and a person with white privilege. This exemplifies that the targeted audience for the cookbook were (white) women who came from wealthy families. Some of the more expensive ingredients listed in recipes of the cookbooks include: lamb chops, oysters, and saffron. The cookbooks themselves are racialized in the sense that not only were the ingredients and dishes shared typically found in European settler diets but they also speak to the privilege of white women who are stay-at-home
housewives with the time to prepare such elaborate dishes. Despite the cookbook including recipes for simple dishes, many of the recipes—such as scalloped oysters, chocolate-mint towers, and standing rib roasts—were more extravagant. These dishes may not be elaborate in their ingredients per se, but they are complex in the techniques used to execute the recipe. In addition, the introduction to the desserts chapter in *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* hints to class by claiming, “it’s a rare woman who does not have a few simple dress-ups for these tall light cakes.” The assumption that all women have access to “simple dress-ups” does not consider a variation of class. By claiming that it is rare for a cook to not have such decorations readily available creates an othering of this “rare” woman. What might seem simple and normal to one home cook may be elaborate and expensive to another. Lastly, there is a theme of colonialist Christianity displayed in Farm Journal’s *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* that is not seen in the *Country Cookbook* of 1959. Although it is not explicitly stated, recipe titles such as the After Church Stew, Church Supper Potatoes, and Sunday Swiss Steaks allude to an expectation that the readers attended church. The titles of these recipes instill yet another aspect of colonialism within cookbooks. By making the inherent assumption that the readers of these two cookbooks would be a white, middle-to-upper class, female audience, it becomes the socioeconomic and racial norm.

Another dimension of colonial ideologies being perpetuated in American society is the cultural conditioning to believe that only women belong in the kitchen—preparing meals, baking desserts, and feeding their families. *Country Cooking* and *Busy Woman’s Cookbook*, and cookbooks like them, help to carry on the gendered notions surrounding cooking. For example, while Nichols discusses the plethora of dessert recipes comprised in the *Busy Woman’s Cookbook*, he states, “men will reach for third helpings!” The decision to single out men, rather than suggesting all family members and guests will enjoy the bakes, contributes to the gendering of cooking by implying that women are in the kitchen in order to please men. The gender hierarchy displayed through the cookbooks exemplify the power relations between men and women in American households. By way of cooking, women fall into the patriarchal male gaze. Moreover, the recipes in the Farm
Journal 1959 and 1971 cookbooks were created for women by a man, further instilling the patriarchal structures of American society. In the reading *Empty Pleasures: The Story of Artificial Sweeteners from Saccharin to Splenda* author Carolyn de la Peña states, “women have long been valued by the advertising industry for their ability to enable product promoters (mostly men) to get into the minds of female consumers. The first women employed at the J. Walter Thompson advertising agency, for example, were hired expressly as ‘women’s researchers’ and went door-to-door talking with housewives.”  

The research provided by De La Peña took place during the same time that the Farm Journal’s *Country Cookbook* was published, which reflects the similar method of data collection used both by Farm Journal and J. Walter Thompson advertising agency. In all cases, women were utilized by men to conduct research that would deem their projects profitable as it was tailored to the white, female consumer.

The gendering of cooking goes beyond the mere collection and spreading of recipes. In Western society, women are often the primary cooks of the house. The kitchen has been deemed to be a women’s place in the house, much like the garage has been deemed as being a place for men in the house. When taking race and gender into account in regards to cooking, the United States has a dark history of subjecting African American women to the kitchen, particularly during the enslavement era. The African American women who worked within the houses of white slaveowners prepared and cooked all the meals eaten there. As a result of subjecting Black women to domestic kitchen work, the mammy trope arose. The mammy trope is a racialized character depicted as being a Black “plump, submissive, domestic servant,” as explained by Afro-American studies scholar Lindsey Swindall in “Looking Through Prism Optics: Toward an Understanding of Michell Obama’s Food Reform.” According to Swindall, the “mammy depictions like Aunt Jemima have been ‘rooted deeply into the white American consciousness, representing a reassuring tie with the Old South’... Mammy thus represents a clear historical connection between Black women and food that depicts them as preparers of meals.” These racial and gender hierarchies act as a foundation for white American society. Not only does the mammy trope attributed to black women in
America solidify the gender roles placed on women, but it also perpetuates the racial hierarchy set forth by white colonialism. Though cookbooks such as those published by Farm Journal were created for women, they were not intended for all women. During the enslavement era, the wives of slaveowners were not in the kitchen cooking the meals themselves because while they were women, they were white women who had Black women doing their domestic work like cooking. However, both Farm Journal’s *Country Cookbook* and *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* were designed to provide white women recipes to leisurely cook as opposed to the African American women who had to cook as a form of paid domestic labor. Nichols adds in the 1971 cookbook that the recipes included were “for the woman who… perhaps had a job.” However, the jobs of the white women were not within the household, like those of their Black counterparts. The legacies of African American women in the kitchen are silenced by the adoption of such recipes by the white women who ate their foods.

Another observation from both the Farm Journal’s 1959 edition of *Country Cookbook* as well as the 1971 edition of *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* is the lack of accreditation for the recipes place of origin. Colonialism has created a narrative for white America which consists of taking aspects from other cultures and communities, adopting it as their own, and crediting themselves for the work. In *Animals, Vegetable, Junk* Bittman notes, “the world’s most far-reaching and powerful empire was borne on the backs of Brown and Black humans.” The United States was built off the backs of people of color, and the American food culture has been no exception. The recipes shared in these two cookbooks have been taken from an array of cultures. Whether it be recipes for Chow Mein, Tortillas, or Little Indian Pudding, white Americans have claimed it as part of their own cuisine. In *Country Cookbook*, rather than noting a country of origin for the “oriental” recipes, states such as California and Colorado are given credit. Additionally, what is considered to be “American” food has almost completely erased the influence of African Americans from the history of such “classic American” meals. For example, the well-known American classic macaroni and cheese was first crafted at Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, by his enslaved chef James Hemings. However, nei-
ther Hemings—nor the Black community and heritage that informed his creation of the American staple—have hardly been acknowledged for their culinary contributions. In the documentary *High on the Hog*, host Stephen Satterfield describes how American food culture was built off the backs of African American foods and foodways by stating, “we planted a seed, nourished a nation, but our legacy isn’t found in statues or history books… it lives on in people and kitchens… Our story is America.” White Americans have placed themselves at the center of success for foods that originate across a plethora of racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse communities. In the reading *Flavors of Empire: Food and the Making of Thai America*, Mark Padoongpatt speaks to Lisa Heldke’s term “cultural food colonialism.” Heldke explains that cultural food colonialism is “rooted in a colonial thirst for authenticity, adventure, and novelty among whites that could be quenched by finding and appropriating cuisines.” As a term, cultural food colonialism can be seen today as what is called “white-washing” or Americanizing a cultural food, which is embodied in the works of Farm Journal. One example of Americanizing in the cookbook is the recipe for enchiladas. *Country Cookbook’s* rendition of enchiladas includes scrambled eggs, which is not seen in more authentic recipes for Mexican enchiladas. Much like colonialism has done to all aspects of cultural communities, Padoongpatt discusses how the 1960s cookbooks of Marie Wilson, author of *Siamese Cookery*, and Jennifer Brennan, author of *The Original Thai Cookbook*, contributed to Americans’ sense of “authentic” Thai food. Both Wilson and Brennan based their cookbooks on their separate experiences briefly living in or visiting Thailand. Padoongpatt suggests that by “taking cooking methods that were passed down orally and then publishing them in written form enabled these [white] women to establish expertise and ownership of a food culture different from their own.” Therefore, Wilson and Brennan received the credit for the “authentic” Thai foods they shared with other middle-class white women. The cookbooks produced by both Wilson and Brennan were presented from the perspective of a tourist, this “allowed them to play a key role in constructing an idealized image” of the Thai people and their food cultures. Food tourism, as presented in ethnic and cultural cookbooks, often essentializes a community’s food culture, presenting only the
most popular and well-known dishes to the readers. With food tourism comes the confusion of where lesser-known dishes may originate once seen in American food culture. This continues the pattern seen within cookbooks in which the origin of dishes from marginalized countries and cultures within America are lost at the hands of cultural food colonialism.

Both Farm Journal’s *Country Cookbook* from 1959 and the 1971 *Busy Woman’s Cookbook* provide white women with a wide variety of recipes to choose from, all while enforcing white Eurocentrism, gender roles, and cultural appropriation of foods. By placing the influence of Indigenous and African American foods and foodways in the shadows of American cooking, the effects of colonialism are preserved and continued to be carried out by white dominant society in the kitchen. Together, these two cookbooks aid in the preservation of gendered, white superiority in the kitchens of Americans.
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Settler Dominance and Indigenous Defiance: Native American Spaces and Places in Modern Television
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This paper was written for American Space, Place, and Architecture taught by Professor Sara Fingal in Spring 2022. It examines depictions of Native American spaces and places in popular culture, specifically twenty-first century American television, in order to understand the cultural work performed by these portrayals. My analysis focuses on three television shows that take place in whole or in part on present-day reservations: Breaking Bad (2008–2013), Longmire (2012–2017), and Reservation Dogs (2021–present). Through a close reading of these series, I explore how television navigates the weight of European-American colonization in contemporary Native communities, as well as the implications of these portrayals for Americans’ collective memory and current treatment of Indigenous peoples and places. By analyzing visual representations of modern-day reservations in each series, as well as white and Indigenous characters’ attitudes toward these locations, I find that modern television functions as a site of continual struggle where white American identity built on the oppression of the nation’s Indigenous inhabitants confronts Native American identity grounded in Native sovereignty and resilience.

The third episode of Reservation Dogs, a comedy series released by Hulu and FX in 2021, opens on an elderly white couple driving by a graffitied road sign that welcomes motorists to Okern, Oklahoma. The words “Land Back” and “Land Back Fuckerzz,” scrawled on both sides of the sign in black and red spray paint, greet drivers entering or leaving the fictional town. After establishing that local “Indians did it” (tagged the sign), the old man asks his wife, “They mean the whole damn thing?… That’s just not possible. I could see some of it back. You reckon that’s what they mean? Some of it back? Or all the damn thing?” In response, his wife observes that “the whites did kill an awful
lot of ‘em and took the land, so America oughta be ashamed of itself.” Her husband, however, argues that revenue generated by tribal casinos evens the score: “I hear they get paid a thousand dollars a month just to be an Indian!” His wife promptly responds, “Will you quit bein’ a shit ass? This ride is not fun anymore. And no, they don’t. And whatever they get, they deserve.” The conversation comes to a halt when a deer darts in front of their car. The scene abruptly cuts to four Native American teenagers gathered around a dead deer on the side of the road, speculating (correctly) that “some old white folks” were responsible for the roadkill.¹

The scene’s wry humor identifies a key tension at the heart of not only Reservation Dogs, but American society, namely that the neighborhoods, towns, and cities that modern Americans call home are built upon lands seized from North America’s Indigenous inhabitants by European settlers. This pattern of violent conquest has left modern Native Americans displaced from their ancestral homelands. The history of Native and European American relations—indeed, the history of the United States itself—cannot be fully understood without acknowledging these facts. In the words of Western Shoshone historian Ned Blackhawk, as European-American colonizers expanded the United States’ empire westward throughout the nineteenth century, these “immigrants became settlers, settlements became towns, and Indians became outsiders,” exiled to the spatial, cultural, and political margins of society.² After being forcibly removed from their rightful territory and relocated to Indian reservations, Native Americans remained subject to their colonizers’ will throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as shifting US policy sought alternately to expand and diminish reservation lands and tribal power.³ Thus, the contested possession of the space that constitutes the United States of America has indisputably shaped the experiences of Native peoples since European settlers first arrived on the continent.

If the dispossession of land is central to the study of Native American history, it follows that the study of culture must also consider matters of land and dispossession—as well as space and place more broadly—when discussing Indigeneity. Yet while numerous scholars have analyzed cultural representations of Native people in the United
States, the spaces and places in which Native people are portrayed have garnered far less attention. This paper will address this omission by examining these spaces and places as they appear in American popular culture, specifically in twenty-first century television. This examination will focus on three television shows: *Breaking Bad* (2008–2013), *Longmire* (2012–2017), and *Reservation Dogs* (2021–present). I selected these series for their varied approaches to Native representation, ranging from the almost exclusively Native people and places portrayed in *Reservation Dogs* to infrequent appearances in *Breaking Bad*, with *Longmire* falling somewhere in between. Analysis of the locations portrayed in these shows will draw upon notions of space and place as described by geographer Tim Cresswell, who regards space as the abstract prerequisite to place. In Cresswell’s words, any given place is simply “space invested with meaning.”

All three of the television shows I analyze include scenes that take place on Indian reservations in the United States, and thus my analysis will consider how modern-day reservations are conceptualized as space and/or place in recent popular culture. I am particularly interested in the process of place-making which instills reservations with cultural meaning both onscreen and off, as well as the role of space and place in identity formation. Through the close reading of these three series, I argue that portrayals of reservations in recent television shows have often reinforced settler-colonial dominance over Native spaces and places, perhaps even justifying the historical conquest of Native people in the minds of modern audiences. In so doing, these cultural productions may alleviate guilt that white Americans feel about the nation’s violent past or about living in a society built on the unceded lands of Native people. Popular television thereby upholds an American identity grounded in white supremacy. That being said, television also has the potential to resist this narrative by confronting the consequences of America’s settler-colonial past on the lives of contemporary Native people, grounding portrayals of reservations in Native community and identity, and centering Indigenous voices in the television industry.

**Cultural Representations of Native People**

Although this paper focuses on representations of Native spaces and places, such an examination must also consider depictions
of Native people in popular culture. Scholars have identified a number of stereotypes prevalent in cultural portrayals of Native Americans, generalizations that have arguably influenced perceptions of Indigenous people held by generations of Americans. In a collection of essays exploring the mythical American Indian in white popular culture, anthropologist S. Elizabeth Bird observes that most stereotypes of Native people fall into one of two categories: the *noble savage*, defined as a “peaceful, mystical, spiritual guardian,” or the *ignoble savage*, described as “marauding” and “hellish.” These stereotypes often served to justify the mistreatment of Native Americans by European settlers, such as the images of fiendish Indians on nineteenth-century advertising trade cards which affirmed white Americans’ feelings of racial superiority and thereby rationalized the conquest of Indigenous peoples. In the twentieth century, the character Tonto (which translates to “stupid” or “fool” in Spanish) became one of the most ubiquitous examples of Native representation in popular culture, appearing in radio, television, film, and literature as the Lone Ranger’s faithful sidekick. Tonto’s steady composure and succinct style of speaking exemplify what media historian Michael Ray Fitzgerald terms the *stoic Indian* stereotype, which presents Native people as long-suffering and unflappable in the face of adversity (even bearing the forced relocation and cultural annihilation enacted by European-American settlers without complaint). Fitzgerald further argues that by joining the Ranger’s pursuit of “law and order,” Tonto rejects his Native American lifestyle and instead helps the Ranger uphold “Anglo-American hegemony” with the ultimate goal of fostering economic prosperity among white settlers in the Western US. Whether depicted as dignified or barbaric, Tonto and similar caricatures of Native Americans have long upheld European-American superiority.

In addition to the noble/ignoble savage binary, white cultural productions have also demonstrated a tendency to relegate Native Americans to the past, resulting in a trope known as the *vanishing Indian*, which has proven particularly powerful in supporting settler-colonial domination. According to cultural historian Philip J. Deloria, the vanishing Indian narrative establishes “symbolic linkages between Indians and the past,” rationalizing the forced removal of Native
Americans by suggesting that “less advanced societies should disappear in the presence of those more advanced.” In her discussion of an early twentieth-century exhibition in Southern California, historian Phoebe S. K. Young suggests that depictions of Native Americans as a “vanishing race” promoted a “cultural narrative of racialized human progress.” Further, Young argues that by associating supposedly primitive Native people with the past, Anglo Americans emphasized modernity as a defining characteristic of their own present and future. Deloria, in his foundational work on the longstanding practice of white Americans “playing Indian,” similarly connects representations of Indigeneity with identity formation, illustrating that Americans throughout US history have performed “Indianness” in order to mediate the oppositions inherent in American identity—particularly the conflicting desire for stability and freedom, or civilization and savagery. Cultural representations of Native Americans have thus served as a means for European Americans to contend with their history of violent domination while simultaneously establishing themselves as distinct from a racialized “Other.”

Yet in the face of European Americans’ appropriation of Indigenous imagery, some Native Americans have reclaimed cultural images of themselves for their own ends. For example, cultural anthropologist Maureen Trudelle Schwarz describes numerous examples of Native people utilizing Indian stereotypes, ranging from Native-led marketing campaigns for bottled water to members of the American Indian Movement dressing in Native apparel. Schwarz’s case studies suggest that Native people have subversively adopted these stereotypes in order to assert power and resist white colonialism. Similarly, in her examination of the complex relationship between Native representation in film and the Western genre, film studies scholar Joanna Hearne demonstrates that Indigenous filmmakers rework non-Native visual representations of Indians to form a “counterdiscourse advocating tribal autonomy” and “reassert Indigenous ownership of images.” Dustin Tahmahkera, a Comanche scholar of Indigenous media, considers a parallel trend in Native-produced television in his recent work examining portrayals of Indigeneity in North American sitcoms—notably one of the most comprehensive inquiries into Native representation
on television to date. Tahmahkera introduces the framework of “de-
colonized viewing” to account for both Native reception and Native
production of television in addition to content, identifying an ongoing
tension between the “recognizably Indian,” or representations that are
“socially, culturally, and politically distant” from the “lived experiences
and tribal realities” of Native peoples, and the “recognizably Native,”
which seeks to “critically resist and creatively circumvent the Indian.”
Cultural representations of Native people can thus be seen as a part
of a broader cultural struggle between settler-colonial hegemony and
Indigenous sovereignty. Turning now to recent examples in popular
television, this paper will expand upon this idea by showing that just as
depictions of Native people in popular culture reflect ongoing conflicts
between Native Americans and European invaders, portrayals of Na-
tive spaces and places also participate in an ongoing reckoning over the
United States’ settler-colonial past.

Settler-Colonial Conquest in Breaking Bad

Set in present-day New Mexico, not far from the largest In-
dian reservation in the United States, Breaking Bad (2008–2013) does
not explicitly address the area’s history of colonization. However, the
show’s white characters occasionally venture into the nearby Navajo
Nation, and these portrayals of reservation space recall Europeans’
historical conquest over Indigenous people. The show centers around
high-school chemistry teacher Walter White. Reeling from his recent
lung-cancer diagnosis and concerned about his family’s finances, Walt
decides to enter the illegal drug trade and recruits former student Jesse
Pinkman to help launch this new enterprise. In the first episode of the
series, the pair drives a dilapidated RV-turned-mobile-lab to an un-
identified desert location somewhere near Albuquerque, New Mexico
to cook their first batch of crystal methamphetamine. Surrounded by
dry brush and a few rock formations, Walt and Jesse are certain no
one will disturb them here. Aside from a single structure Jesse ob-
serves in the distance, apparently housing for cows wandering nearby,
the area appears devoid of human habitation. Later in the season,
Walt’s brother-in-law, Drug Enforcement Administration agent Hank
Schrader, identifies this initial cook site as “some Indian land.” The
name of the location is not revealed to viewers until the thirteenth epi-
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sode of the series’ fifth and final season, titled “To’hajiilee.” To’hajiilee, a portion of the Navajo Nation about forty miles outside Albuquerque, serves as a backdrop for several key plot developments in both the first and final seasons of *Breaking Bad*, from Walt and Jesse’s first cook to a climactic confrontation with law enforcement in season five. Therefore, analyzing this setting alongside portrayals of To’hajiilee’s Navajo residents reveals the series’ attitude toward contemporary Native American people and places.

Overall, *Breaking Bad*’s treatment of To’hajiilee is characterized by a marked absence of Native people. Walt and Jesse establish this expectation in their initial commute to To’hajiilee, intentionally seeking out a sparsely populated area in order to pursue their lucrative drug venture without interference from law enforcement or passerby. But while the partners complete their first batch of meth undisturbed, fallout from their disastrous second attempt reveals that the reservation is not entirely uninhabited. Walt and Jesse flee the scene of their second cook after a brush fire breaks out, with sirens from approaching firetrucks audible in the background—indicating that the flames they left behind have not gone unnoticed. In his haste to leave the cook site, Walt accidently drives the RV into a ditch. A Native American man, who apparently happened to be nearby, silently tows the vehicle back onto the dirt road in exchange for a fistful of cash. Walt and Jesse return to Albuquerque, but sometime later, two Navajo children playing in To’hajiilee find Walt’s forgotten respirator lying in the desert brush, a final vestige of the white protagonists’ visit to the reservation.16 With the inclusion of these Navajo characters, *Breaking Bad* seemingly avoids the vanishing Indian tendency to confine Native Americans to narratives set in the past, instead acknowledging the existence of Native people in the show’s modern setting. However, while *Breaking Bad* admits that Native people have not entirely disappeared, the series still paints Native Americans as a vanishing population by omitting To’hajiilee’s Native community.

Throughout Walt and Jesse’s time in To’hajiilee, the series neither acknowledges nor represents the nearly 1,600-person community living in this area of the Navajo Nation; instead the series features only a handful of silent Navajo characters who appear infrequently in isolat-
Native characters in the show seemingly emerge out of nowhere to play their brief role and then disappear—or vanish—from the narrative, returning not to the community where they would likely live in reality, but to the apparent nothingness from whence they came. Further, with the exception of one line delivered by a tribal police officer when the DEA investigates Walt and Jesse’s cook site, Navajo characters in To’hajiilee scenes are relegated to nonspeaking roles. Thus, despite the occasional appearance of Native characters, the series erases more of To’hajiilee’s residents than it features. In his analysis of space and place in *Breaking Bad*, literary scholar Alex Hunt briefly discusses To’hajiilee, suggesting that Walt and Jesse’s comings and goings turn To’hajiilee from “space to place” and then back to “abstract space.” This assessment relies on perceptions of To’hajiilee as uninhabited; with no Native occupants in sight, the area is simply open space which Walt and Jesse have the right to imbue with their own meaning. *Breaking Bad* therefore conceives of To’hajiilee as lawless, unoccupied space—or at least, unoccupied by people of import—that exists for the benefit of white characters who occupy and exploit the space with little acknowledgement of, or regard for, the area’s Native inhabitants.

The final season of *Breaking Bad* places particular visual emphasis on To’hajiilee as uninhabited, highlighting the emptiness of the space and reinforcing the absence of Native characters in order to grant unimpeded use of the land to its white characters. In season five, Walt returns to To’hajiilee to bury several barrels full of cash in the desert. When he later believes this money is in danger, he rushes to To’hajiilee to save his buried riches. As Walt’s dark sedan speeds down the interstate, the sprawling city of Albuquerque visibly recedes behind him, emphasizing his movement from civilization to wilderness. The sedan then turns onto a dirt road, where wide-angle camerawork showcases an empty desert landscape lacking not only greenery, but also structures and people—perfectly illustrating literary scholar Jane Tompkins’s observation that the archetypal American West is a “land defined by absence.” Analyzing the Western genre in film and literature, Tompkins theorizes the desert landscape as “a tabula rasa on which man can write, as if for the first time, the story he wants to live.” With cinematography emphasizing the land’s desolation and
isolation, *Breaking Bad* similarly treats To’hajiilee as a blank slate on which Walter White’s story can be written. Walt apparently shares this philosophy; having used the site to cook meth and store his subsequent wealth, Walt clearly considers To’hajiilee a space in which he can do as he pleases, away from the social and legal expectations that constrain him in the city. As *Breaking Bad* alludes to the Western genre through barren desert scenery and consciously omits the residents and buildings that make up To’hajiilee’s real-life community, the series enables Walt to act, seemingly without consequence.

By portraying To’hajiilee as a supposedly empty and lawless landscape, *Breaking Bad* gives its primarily white characters full command of the space, enabling acts of exploitation and violence that echo and ultimately justify the conquest of the American West. The episode “To’hajiilee” utilizes the visual conventions of Western film discussed above as prelude to a Western-style shootout that takes place at the episode’s conclusion. In so doing, the episode recalls the violent racialized conflicts that define the region’s history. In his analysis of *The Lone Ranger* (1949–1957), Fitzgerald argues that the popular television show’s wide-angled shots of sweeping landscapes, borrowed from Western film traditions, resonated with the conquest of the West by emphasizing the land as a “prize” seized from the region’s Native inhabitants by European American settlers.\(^{22}\) With similarly grand desert landscapes, *Breaking Bad*’s cinematic allusions to the Western genre also evoke these past contests over territory. By accentuating the emptiness of desert space in its portrayal of To’hajiilee, the series reflects a mythical interpretation of Western history—one in which the lands claimed by settlers were unoccupied and destined for European-American occupation, rather than violently seized from Indigenous
residents. Discussing Western films, Hearne observes that the genre’s preoccupation with the “national past” simultaneously “encodes a national future,” alternately promoting “Native absence” and “[Native] presence.” When Walt enters To’hajiilee and lays claim to space he has no legitimate right to, he mimics the historical subjugation of Native peoples—and by embedding Native absence into the landscape, *Breaking Bad* ignores the effects of this conquest on Indigenous Americans, justifying not only past conquests, but the continued oppression of Native people by descendants of European-American settlers.

**Subtle Supremacy in Longmire**

Coincidentally featuring another white male protagonist named Walt, *Longmire* (2012–2017) attempts to represent Native characters frequently and fairly, thereby portraying the reservation as a place grounded in the experiences of Indigenous peoples. Set in the fictional county of Absaroka, Wyoming, the show follows modern-day cowboy Sheriff Walter Longmire, whose law enforcement duties frequently take him onto the nearby Cheyenne Reservation and into jurisdictional disputes with Cheyenne tribal police. The series traverses throughout the rural county and the Reservation, with story lines involving white and Native characters alike. Like “To’hajiilee,” *Longmire* was filmed in New Mexico and features frequent wide-angle shots of buildingless Western landscapes, although arid mountains appear in addition to typical desert terrain. However, unlike the emptiness emphasized in *Breaking Bad*’s reservation scenes, *Longmire* shows the Cheyenne Reservation as occupied, comprised of modest, somewhat run-down homes that house the show’s numerous Native characters. Although the series does occasionally show vacant space on the reservation, these sites hold significance for the Cheyenne community. For example, a rugged rock wall seemingly surrounded by wilderness represents a place of supplication where Cheyenne characters leave notes soliciting help from Hector, a former-boxer-turned-vigilante who seeks justice for Cheyenne people when official avenues fail them. If *Breaking Bad* envisioned Indian reservations as blank space, *Longmire* clearly establishes the Cheyenne Reservation as a place, rich in life and meaning.

Although vibrant compared to To’hajiilee, the Native places portrayed in *Longmire* still contend with settler-colonial power dynam-
ics as white characters treat the reservation as a lawless space, enter-
ing at will and behaving without consequence. Much of season four
revolves around a young Cheyenne woman named Gabriella “Gab”
Langton, who was raped by two white men during a bonfire party. Gab
reports the rape to Sheriff Longmire, but Walt discovers that the crime
occurred on the reservation, just a few yards beyond the wire fence
marking his jurisdictional limit. Viewers might assume Cheyenne
tribal police will investigate the assault in Walt’s stead, but the police
chief, Mathias, grimly explains to Walt: “It happened on the rez, so
you can’t do anything. The rapist is white and a stranger, so I can’t do
anything. Neither one of us can officially investigate this case.”25 In this
statement, Mathias alludes to a complex history of federal legislation
that has shaped law enforcement on tribal lands, which Longmire seeks
to critique via Gab’s storyline.

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the US
Congress and Supreme Court alternately expanded and limited the ju-
risdiction of tribal police, notably conferring authority over interracial
crimes and most felonies committed on tribal land—including rape
and sexual assault—to the federal government rather than tribal law
enforcement. The 1978 Supreme Court case Oliphant v. Suquamish In-
dian Tribe, referenced by name in Longmire, cemented federal jurisdic-
tion over crimes committed against Native Americans by non-Native
offenders.26 The series also cites the 2013 Violence Against Women
Reauthorization Act, which circumvented these restrictions by expand-
ing tribal jurisdiction to include cases of domestic and dating abuse
involving tribe members, including violence against Native victims by
non-Native perpetrators. The act presumably sought to address the
startlingly high rates of interracial violence among Native Americans,
as evidenced by a 2010 survey which found that 56.1 percent of Na-
tive women were victims of sexual violence, with 96 percent of these women reporting experiences with interracial violence.27 However, this expansion in tribal police authority left open glaring vulnerabilities which *Longmire* explicitly attempts to demonstrate; because the sexual violence Gab experienced was not domestic or dating violence, the 2013 legislation does not apply and tribal police cannot bring her attackers to justice.28 Gab’s storyline reveals the Cheyenne Reservation to be, in the words of English doctoral candidate Cécile Heim, a “jurisdictional no man’s land.”29

Although neither Walt nor Mathias have authority to pursue the matter, they continue to seek justice for Gab, and their investigation reveals a pattern wherein white men take advantage of tribal law enforcement’s limitations by entering the reservation to commit violence. Gab identifies the rapists as two white oil-rig workers who traveled from a neighboring county to party on the Cheyenne Reservation. Later in the season, a representative from the oil company demonstrates a clear understanding of tribal jurisdiction by encouraging his mostly white workforce to recreate on the reservation, presumably to avoid legal trouble stemming from employee misconduct. At one point, the representative smugly remarks that “all kinds of crazy shit happens on the Rez that nobody has to pay for.”30 When a sympathetic federal prosecutor eventually agrees to pursue criminal proceedings against Gab’s rapists, she recalls seeing a similar pattern of sexual violence against Native women in North Dakota, committed by white oil-rig workers confident they would not face consequences because, as Mathias notes, “lack of money or lack of evidence or lack of interest” often hinder federal prosecutions for reservation crimes.31 In fact, although rates vary each year, federal agencies declined to prosecute an estimated 60 to 67 percent of sexual abuse cases that occurred on tribal lands in the years prior to *Longmire*’s premiere.32 Through Gab’s story, *Longmire* draws attention to the harm frequently experienced by contemporary Native women, critiquing the governmental structures and American indifference that have allowed white men to commit violence in Native places unrestrained.

While *Longmire* does attempt to criticize settler-colonial dominance in Native places, such commentary is undermined by a
subtler, less violent pattern of unauthorized entry among the show’s white characters, who frequently enter the reservation uninvited. Walt, in particular, lacks concern for spatial and social boundaries, repeatedly demonstrating that he will go wherever necessary to fulfill his law enforcement duties, even breaking into private residences to find evidence—and the reservation is no exception. Walt frequently finds reasons to investigate on the Cheyenne Reservation, and although he occasionally seeks permission of the tribal police, he often operates without it. In a couple of instances, he also visits the nearby Crow Reservation, where not only does he lack jurisdiction, but an ominous sign warns “Crow Tribal Members Only.”33 Walt consistently prioritizes his own objectives over the context in which he acts, using his pursuit of justice to justify his frequent unauthorized entry onto these reservations.34 Although the series gradually transitions towards cooperation between Walt and tribal police in later seasons, Walt exhibits an overall pattern of disregard for tribal police jurisdiction as he enters the reservation to question victims, interrogate suspects, and search for evidence.

Even when he seems willing to respect tribal police jurisdiction, Walt, as well as others in the Sheriff’s Department, still demonstrate indifference for tribal authority. When Mathias detains Walt’s deputy Branch for investigating on the reservation, Branch defends his actions by pointing out that Walt often visits the reservation without Mathias’s knowledge or permission. Walt confirms Branch’s accusation, but explains, “I always feel bad, and I always have a good reason,” prompting Branch to explain his “good reason” for going behind Mathias’s back. Walt concurs, and the two white men immediately return to the Cheyenne Reservation, where they break into the home of a suspect to search for evidence. Later, Branch believes that the suspect has faked his own death, and he continues to operate on the reservation without authorization to find proof. Branch’s investigation leads him to a funeral pyre on the reservation, where, after failing to heed warnings to stay away from this sacred site, he suffers a near-fatal gunshot wound.35 Determined to find Branch’s shooter, Walt watches the site through binoculars from outside the reservation and requests permission to investigate the suspicious activity he observes—but he does so by
killing on the door of Mathias’s home late at night and subsequently forcing him along, despite Mathias’s objections that “this is a holy place, we shouldn’t be here.” Notwithstanding their noble pursuit of justice, Branch and Walt thus illustrate the tendency of Longmire’s white characters to disregard the authority of tribal police and trivialize the spiritual and cultural significance that Cheyenne characters have invested into particular places.

Spurred by seemingly benevolent intentions, Walt Longmire’s repeated and often unauthorized entry onto the Cheyenne Reservation amplifies his heroic cowboy persona and thereby reinforces white male supremacy. In many ways, Walt embodies the white, male hero typical of the Western genre: his origin story is defined by loss, as well as the pursuit of righteous revenge following the murder of his wife; he masks emotions and pain behind brusque speech; he is unfailingly moral, standing firmly on the side of good as he prevails over evildoers in his county; and he executes his duties as sheriff with integrity, bending rules only when bureaucracy stands in the way of justice. Like television’s ultimate Western hero the Lone Ranger, Walt even has a Native American sidekick—his childhood best friend, Henry Standing Bear, a “constant and colonized companion” who upholds the white man’s dominance. Revisiting the story of Gab Langton, Heim argues in her analysis of Gab’s case that Longmire commodifies sexual violence and employs stereotypes of Native people to support its narrative of “white, mostly male, heroism.” Indeed, Walt ultimately becomes Gab’s hero, saving her life and helping her flee after she kills one of the men who raped her. In this instance, and elsewhere throughout the series, Walt embodies the heroic qualities that have defined generations of Western protagonists as he seeks justice for white and Cheyenne victims.

With this in mind, Walt’s interactions with Native places serve to enhance his status as the white, masculine hero of the American West. In his analysis of the Lone Ranger, philosophy scholar John Shelton Lawrence considers how the Ranger’s horse afforded him “rapid mobility, the most characteristic and coveted form of freedom in America.” Walt’s circa 1994 Ford Bronco offers him similar freedom; the reliable vehicle proves essential when Walt’s law-enforcement duties take him all throughout Absaroka County.
Implicit in these heroes’ mobility, however, is the license to go where they please. The Western hero cannot embody freedom if borders and boundaries limit his ability to roam, nor can he fulfill his heroic calling without unfettered access to anywhere his pursuit of justice may take him. Thus, Walt’s prohibited ventures onto the Cheyenne Reservation and general disregard for tribal jurisdiction are crucial to his standing as a Western hero. Discussing the Lone Ranger and Tonto, Fitzgerald describes the Ranger as a “white savior,” or an agent of “benevolent white supremacy,” who works with Tonto to bring “Anglo-American law and order” to the West. In his commitment to uphold the law, Walt asserts a similarly benevolent dominance over Native places, establishing his superiority as he polices his domain—a white, masculine savior who traverses political and geographic boundaries in order to bring justice to the people of Absaroka and the Cheyenne Reservation alike.

While Walt demonstrates a distinctly masculine brand of heroism, his daughter, Cady Longmire, has inherited his desire to do good. Throughout the series, Cady becomes the quintessential “white savior” character through her efforts to help the Cheyenne community, ultimately highlighting the significance of movement in white savior narratives. Kindness and compassion characterize Cady’s interactions with Cheyenne characters throughout the series. For example, in season two, she shuttles Cheyenne voters to their designated polling places on election day. In season four, she plays a crucial role in convincing a federal prosecutor to accept Gab’s case. Later on, Cady accepts funding from Jacob Nighthorse, owner of the nearby casino, to open a non-profit legal-aid center on the Cheyenne Reservation, becoming the community’s only lawyer. In identifying the conventions that define white savior characters, sociologists Wendy Leo Moore and Jennifer Pierce observe that such characters often occupy “professionally prestigious” positions, allowing them access to “structural power” that communities of color lack. In fact, Cady’s status as an attorney is such a common device in these stories that Moore and Pierce focus their analysis exclusively on the “white messiah lawyer” who “reifies white hegemonic power structures” through efforts to help or uplift people of color. Cady’s law practice on the reservation certainly fits this description, as
much of her day-to-day work—as well as her work on Gab’s behalf—involves helping Cheyenne clients navigate federal bureaucracy, thus upholding the institutional power of the US government. In the final season, Cady resigns from the legal-aid center after helping a Cheyenne teacher obtain life-saving medical treatment for a local boy in defiance of his parents’ wishes.44 Her insistence that “white man’s medicine” will save the boy rather than the traditional Cheyenne treatments espoused by his parents not only angers the community, but effectively establishes Cady as an agent of white hegemonic power. Notably, the outrage Cady encounters after this incident suggests that white power structures can be met with opposition from Native people, rather than the quiet deference or gratitude so often envisioned in similar narratives. However, while Longmire seemingly challenges the white-savior trope by allowing Native resistance to push Cady out of the reservation, Cady’s efforts to save a child’s life still encourage the audience to view her in a positive light. Thus, Longmire emphasizes Cady’s kindness and upholds her status as a white savior figure.

When considered alongside the historical encroachment of white settlers onto Indigenous lands in the United States, Cady’s standing as a white savior bringing aid to the marginalized Cheyenne people is amplified by the directional flow of her assistance, or the act of bringing aid. In other words, it is worth noting that Cady’s messianic mission necessitates her movement onto the reservation. Clients do not come to Cady’s home in the nearby small town of Durant, but rather to a foreclosed home on the reservation that she rents and converts into an office space—an action that arguably echoes America’s history of colonization as Cady occupies a space previously owned by a Cheyenne family.45 The home’s foreclosed status, however, suggests a gentler conquest than the violent subjugation so often enacted throughout US history. In fact, Cady’s movement onto the Cheyenne Reservation more precisely recalls the subtle colonization efforts of white Americans seeking not to eradicate or displace Native Americans, but rather to “civilize” them. From religious conversion efforts to the placement of Native children in boarding schools, European Americans have long sought to assimilate Native people to Euro-centric cultural norms, entering Native places in order to bring Christianity or other hegemonic
standards of civilization to these communities—although, as anthropologist Harvey Markowitz notes, this approach was often deployed in conjunction with the displacement or removal of Native people. Still, efforts to “civilize” so-called savage Indians involved the bringing of civilization to Native people by missionaries or reformers. Even the movement of Native children out of their homes and into boarding schools necessitated the symbolic entrance of white Americans into Native American households to replace Indigenous traditions with white customs—and in some instances, this figurative encroachment involved the very literal kidnapping of Native children.

With this in mind, Cady’s work on the Cheyenne Reservation could be considered an extension of this trend as she brought civilization—in this case, a law degree and the white hegemonic power structures mentioned earlier—with her in order to elevate a seemingly underdeveloped Native community. In fact, the very existence of the house Cady rents on the reservation reflects efforts by white Americans to civilize Native Americans. As historian Rose Stremlau demonstrates, nineteenth-century white reformers successfully influenced the configuration of Indian reservations by advocating for the partitioning of land into “individual homesteads” in order to impose private property ownership on Native people and supplant Indigenous communal practices. Houses subsequently became “physical symbols of reformers’ success” as they supposedly represented “civilized [Native] families.”

In his discussion of religious conversion efforts aimed at Native Americans, Markowitz frames European Americans’ historical treatment of the continent’s Indigenous inhabitants as an oscillation between attempts to remove and attempts to improve Native peoples. In this context, Cady’s tenancy on the reservation reflects both the displacement of Native people as she settles into a formerly Native dwelling and the attempted civilization of an allegedly uncivilized group as she seeks to help and enrich the community.

While Cady’s excursions to the reservation resonate with white savior patterns and historical practices of colonization, other characters in Longmire complicate these themes, particularly the Cheyenne characters who come and go from the reservation, intent on improving their community themselves. Throughout the series, Cheyenne charac-
ters often speak of a desire to aid their tribe—but interestingly, many of these characters have distanced themselves from the reservation in some way. For example, a local teacher left the reservation to attend college and turned down more prestigious job opportunities in order to return to teach on the reservation. In another episode, a Cheyenne HR manager’s dream was to “move back to the rez to create jobs,” although his marriage to a Black woman drew antagonism from his family and forced the couple to live nearby, outside the reservation.50 Two principal characters, Henry Standing Bear and Jacob Nighthorse, seem particularly concerned with the well-being of the Cheyenne community throughout the series, leading Jacob to remark that he and Henry share a desire for “the betterment of our people, by our people.”51 It is notable, however, that neither Jacob nor Henry resides on the reservation. The Red Pony, a bar owned by Henry in which he lives and works, is not on the reservation, as evidenced by Sheriff Longmire’s apparent jurisdiction over crimes committed there. References to the sheriff’s jurisdiction also suggest that while the casino owned and operated by Jacob is on the reservation, his lavish home is not. These examples suggest that for Cheyenne characters, improving economic conditions in their community depended to some extent on their ability to move in and out of white spaces, gaining education and resources that they could then bring back to the reservation.

**Indigenous Futures in Reservation Dogs**

While leaving the reservation also features prominently in *Reservation Dogs* (2021–present), the series creatively utilizes its reservation setting to interrogate the necessity of leaving at all, ultimately connecting its portrayal of Native places to commentary about Indigenous futures. The series, produced by and starring a primarily Indigenous cast and crew, tells of four Native teenagers in rural Oklahoma who plan to move to California. Notably, in the single season of the show released so far, *Reservation Dogs*’ portrayal of a present-day reservation significantly departs from the visual and spatial representations of reservations shown in both *Longmire* and *Breaking Bad.*52 Filmed in Oklahoma, the series boasts noticeably greener landscapes than the New Mexico locations where To’hajiilee and the Cheyenne Reservation were filmed—with trees, bushes, and tall grass signaling a vitality
not often found in desert climates. In addition, while Native characters in *Reservation Dogs* live in modest homes that perhaps outwardly resemble the Cheyenne Reservation in *Longmire*, the interiors appear more spacious and well-kept than Cheyenne characters’ fictional homes. *Reservation Dogs* also showcases a number of other buildings in the community, including quaint storefronts, hole-in-the-wall restaurants, and an abandoned brick structure where the main characters often hang out. Sterlin Harjo, a Seminole Nation filmmaker based in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and co-creator of the series, has indicated that this visual variety, from Oklahoma’s greenery to the “old buildings and the small-town downtown area,” was essential to creating the show’s atmosphere and sense of place. Through small-town architecture, commercial venues, and the interiors and exteriors of Native homes, the series clearly defines the reservation as a place, teeming with life and cultural significance.

Additionally, while character movements in *Longmire* and *Breaking Bad* suggest that the Cheyenne and Navajo reservations lay some distance away from the closest town or city, separated from neighboring communities by a distinct border, *Reservation Dogs* blurs the boundaries between the reservation and the outside world. The show’s Native characters live in an area known as “the Village,” a subdivision of a small town called Okern. Although the series does not clearly map out the area or identify the Native nation in which it takes place, Okern presumably mirrors the small town of Okmulgee in Muscogee Nation where most of the show was filmed. While Muscogee Nation has distinct borders established by an 1832 treaty, federal policies intended to diminish Native land holdings have made it unclear until recently whether the Nation remains an Indian reservation.
Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the US government and state of Oklahoma undermined tribal authority and gradually reassigned control of Muscogee territory to non-Native settlers, who established towns, cities, and counties that are still inhabited and governed by a non-Native majority today. However, in 2020, the US Supreme Court affirmed Muscogee Nation’s reservation status, meaning the Muscogee tribal government maintains jurisdiction and governance over tribal members living within the original treaty boundaries.54

Although fictional, the town of Okern appears to follow a similar system of governance as Muscogee Nation, as evidenced by its representations of law enforcement. Big, a tribal police officer played by Hunkpapa Lakota Sioux actor Zahn McClarnon (who also played tribal police chief Mathias in Longmire), exercises jurisdiction over the Native characters in Okern, but encounters condescending taunts from two white officers driving a police cruiser emblazoned “Okern Police.”55 Thus, Okern apparently contains Native and non-Native local governing authorities, suggesting the area is home to Native and non-Native communities within rather than separated by reservation borders. Assuming that the fictional setting of Reservation Dogs takes after its real-life filming location, the series conceives of the reservation as a Native place occupied, at least in part, by non-Native settlers—an arrangement that brings to mind the difficult reality that the United States itself was founded and built by European-Americans occupying unceded Native territory.

In addition to its distinctive visual and spatial treatment of the reservation, Reservation Dogs also focuses on community and relationships as an integral part of Native place-making. The show’s main characters—Bear, Elora, Willie Jack, and Cheese, who come to be known as the Reservation Dogs—dream of moving to California following the death of their friend Daniel the previous year. Although the exact reasons for moving away seem to vary among the four teens, Willie Jack expounds upon her own motivation while talking with her dad, complaining that Okern is boring and listing several careers that she might pursue when she gets to California.56 Reservation Dogs thus acknowledges that opportunities for economic and career advancement
may be available for Native Americans outside of reservations, but unlike *Longmire*, the series makes no mention of characters leaving and returning in service of community improvement. Instead, Willie Jack’s dad, Leon, insists that she doesn’t need to go to California to achieve these goals and points out what she will be leaving behind. He explains that those who leave the reservation always come back because “this is where their people are; this is their home,” suggesting that residents’ ties to the reservation outweigh the potential benefits of life outside Okern.

Through Willie Jack and Leon’s conversation, *Reservation Dogs* asserts that community, rather than geography, constitutes the reservation as a Native place. The show’s production designer, Brandon Tonner-Connolly, sought to echo Leon’s words to Willie Jack in the visual portrayal of Okern and the Village, adorning the fictional world of *Reservation Dogs* with humanizing details that evoke a “strong community” and “strong relationships” in order to complicate the protagonists’ dreams of leaving. The community ties referenced by Leon and Tonner-Connolly prove to be powerful, and not long after conversing with her dad, Willie Jack decides to abandon her California dream so she can remain in the Village with the people she knows and loves. By signaling that Willie Jack can thrive without leaving the Village and lauding the Village’s community connections, *Reservation Dogs* portrays the reservation as a place of value worth staying for, steeped in community and Native identity. The show’s commentary on community becomes particularly significant in light of Indigenous people’s history of dispossession; as European-Americans violently drove Native people across the continent, communal ties perhaps facilitated Native place-making in spite of this forced geographic displacement. Thus, the series affirms the inherent worth of the communities and individuals who make up Indian reservations while also acknowledging the role of European-American conquest in shaping these communities.

While *Reservation Dogs* portrays the complexities of reservation life with humor and an admiration for its Native characters, the series also contends with the dark consequences of past and present settler-colonial dominance in modern Native places. As articulated by Bear in the series pilot, the Reservation Dogs blame the Village for Dan-
iel’s death: “This place killed him. That’s why we’re saving our money, so we can leave this dump before it kills us too.” The friends do not detail exactly why the Village bears responsibility for Daniel’s death, but subsequent episodes provide some insight. Throughout season one, Elora seems particularly adamant about moving to California. She is the most vocal critic of the Reservation Dogs’ hometown, with her attitude best summarized by her angry outburst: “Fuck the Village. Fuck the people in it.” Notably, Elora also appears to be the hardest hit by Daniel’s death. Through a series of flashbacks, viewers learn that Elora and Daniel were close friends; Daniel even asks Elora to go to California with him, inspiring the Reservation Dogs’ California dream. In a devastating flashback towards the end of season one, Elora also finds Daniel shortly after he dies by suicide. Given their close friendship and this traumatic discovery, Daniel’s passing seems to prompt much of Elora’s hostility toward her home. Having lost her mother in a car accident as a child and now her best friend, Elora may associate her hometown with death, suggesting that death may be the catalyst fueling her desire to leave Okern and the Village behind.

Through its depiction of Daniel’s death, Reservation Dogs grounds the struggles of its Indigenous characters in problems faced by present-day Native Americans. In a 1981 essay, Lakota writer Barbara Cameron reflects on her departure from the reservation where she grew up and perhaps offers insight into the present-day experiences of Elora. After she left, Cameron recalls realizing, “I’ve seen more dead bodies than my friends will probably ever see in their lifetime.” Although Reservation Dogs offers only a snapshot of Elora’s life, death certainly seems prevalent in her fictional lived experience. In recent decades, Native Americans have, in fact, experienced demonstrably higher death rates than white populations in the United States. Daniel’s death reflects this trend as well, as suicide rates among Native Americans are approximately 50 percent higher than rates among white Americans, particularly among Native men and young people. For her part, Cameron attributed high suicide rates to the “dilemmas of contemporary Indians caught between the white and Indian worlds.” Osage/Cherokee scholar George E. Tinker similarly connects the “modern Indian context of conquest and colonization” with the frequency of Native
suicide, squarely placing blame on European-American colonizers, past and present. Although *Reservation Dogs* does not attempt to explain Daniel’s suicide, nor dwell on the act of death itself, the series undoubtedly chose Daniel’s cause of death deliberately, engaging with an issue not only prevalent among Native communities, but indicative of the damage wrought by America’s settler-colonial past.

As *Reservation Dogs* explores the repercussions of Daniel’s death throughout season one, the series contends with the contemporary consequences of historical colonization while considering the implications of reservation life on the young protagonists’ futures. When envisioning her future in the Village, Elora may see the examples of Daniel and her mother and conclude that she will meet the same fate if she remains. Each of the Reservation Dogs seems hopeful that by leaving their hometown, they will leave behind the trauma of losing their friend. However, Daniel’s death also serves as a warning—if death is the natural outcome of reservation life, they must leave before they, too, succumb. In discussing portrayals of Native people in Western film, Joanna Hearne argues that cinematic “representations of youth” proclaim the “future of Indigenous nations as legitimate, and legitimating, heirs to the land.” Indeed, the Reservation Dogs are clearly preoccupied with their future, and as they work towards their California goal, the future of the Village comes into question; if young residents leave, what will become of the fictional Native Nation they occupy? As the teenagers cope with Daniel’s death and consider the possibility of California, *Reservation Dogs* ultimately links the future of its young characters with the reservation, acknowledging what these Indigenous youth will lose if they leave while simultaneously confronting their fears about the future that awaits them if they stay.

**Conclusion**

While television shows in the twenty-first century may try to avoid the stereotypes often seen in cultural representations of Native people, analysis of television characters’ interactions with Native spaces and places, including Indian reservations, reveals that European-American conquest and superiority still manifest in popular culture today. In his discussion of sitcoms, Dustin Tahmahkera traces changing approaches to Native representation throughout the twen-
tieth and twenty-first centuries, a progression that can also be applied to the portrayals of Native spaces and places examined in this paper. Similar to the 1960s sitcoms analyzed by Tahmahkera, *Breaking Bad’s* depiction of To’hajiilee is grounded in the “contemporary erasure of Indians,” minimizing the area’s Navajo inhabitants in an act of “discursive violence.” *Longmire*, meanwhile, recalls the multicultural sitcoms popular from the 1970s through the century’s end, “promoting Indian self-determination without relinquishing settler dominance” as its Cheyenne characters deal with frequent intrusions by the show’s white protagonists.66 Although these series differed substantially in their portrayals of Native people and places, both contribute to a settler-colonial identity built upon the conquering, exploitation, and benevolent improvement of Native people, ultimately declaring that white Americans can rightfully occupy Native spaces and places without consequence.

If *Breaking Bad* and *Longmire* demonstrate that portrayals of Native spaces and places can uphold European-American colonial attitudes, *Reservation Dogs* offers a counterexample, illustrating the potential of popular culture to challenge these dominant ideologies. Stuart Hall’s influential work on popular culture identifies the “popular” as a process of “cultural struggle.”67 Similarly, in her study of Native American organizations that have fought against depictions of stereotypical Indians on television, historian Monica L. Butler argues that managing Native representations in American culture is part of a broader struggle for self-determination by Native people.68 From the show’s commentary on Native community to the Native characters who demand “Land Back Fuckerzz,” *Reservation Dogs* clearly engages in a cultural struggle over Native representation and sovereignty. In both its production and content, *Reservation Dogs* exemplifies what Tahmahkera calls “sitcom sovereignty grounded in a creative Native sensibility, self-determination in production, recognizably Native characterization, and representational agency.”69 The series demonstrates that when Indigenous creators are involved and given creative control, television does have the capacity to resist settler-colonial narratives and encourage audiences to confront uncomfortable realities about the historical and current treatment of Native people in the United States.
The significance of *Reservation Dogs* and other contested modes of Native representation becomes clear in light of recent research revealing the damaging consequences that negative media portrayals may have upon Native people who watch them. For example, a study by Peter A. Leavitt et al. found that the relative infrequency in which Native Americans are depicted in media, alongside the stereotypical nature of such representations, hindered identity formation and “self-understanding” among Native viewers by deemphasizing individual possibilities and reinforcing a homogenous, narrow Native identity. In addition to analyzing portrayals of Native people, however, future research should consider the impact that cultural representations of Native spaces and places have on the construction of Native identity. Speaking of film, Hearne explains that “controlling the signs of Indigeneity in visual representations engages issues of identity and the ongoing presence of Native tribes as distinct peoples with claims to their homelands.” With this in mind, studies of the “visual representations” of Indigeneity must necessarily include not only Native people, but the homelands they claim. While this paper took a limited approach by focusing on three televised portrayals of Indian reservations, Native spaces and places might be conceptualized in a variety of ways both inside and outside of reservations. Additionally, such representations can be seen in a variety of media equally deserving of analysis. For example, although outside the scope of this paper, *Longmire* was adapted from a series of mystery novels, and *Breaking Bad* has inspired a popular spin-off series, *Better Call Saul*, as well as a Netflix film, *El Camino*. Further scholarship might also examine issues of gender, race, and class in relation to portrayals of Native space and place. Undoubtedly, in the shadow of the United States’ settler-colonial history, the Native spaces and places portrayed in popular culture represent a site of meaningful cultural struggle where Indigenous sovereignty confronts and may someday conquer white American supremacy.
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Lakewood: Tomorrow’s City, Today

Isabel Guadalupe Saucedo

AMST 445: The Cold War and American Culture

The following paper was written for Dr. Susie Woo’s Cold War and American Culture Fall 2021 course. It uses an array of primary and secondary sources linked to suburban anxieties of the 1950s through early 2001. These sources, in combination with my own analysis, provide a counter memory to the more general public memory of the implications of atomic bomb anxieties on American suburbs. I use my findings to argue that consumerism truly flourished thanks to these same anxieties and had a larger impact on suburban culture than the atomic bomb itself. I hope that this encourages readers to take a deeper look not only at our history but at our present. As anxieties run high, distractions shape our culture—but these temporary distractions have larger implications than that which meets the eye. I encourage us all to dig deeper, maybe you’ll find a tunnel or two.

“But by the time the first bombs fell, we were already bored.”
— The Suburbs, Arcade Fire

Ten years after its release, Arcade Fire’s album, The Suburbs, still encapsulates the feelings of boredom brought on by suburban spaces. Lyric after lyric, the band demonstrates the way in which suburban spaces were consumed by a depiction of safeness, the nuclear family, and, inherently, whiteness. More importantly, the album serves as a time capsule for the band members and other people who grew up in the shadow of the Cold War, navigating through the residue of the war within these picture-perfect places. From the creation of the first tract home and the largest suburban shopping center, to present-day albums centered on suburban angst, the effects of the Cold War can be seen throughout the existence of American Suburbs. Despite the ubiquity of atomic bomb centered conversations about the Cold War, suburban spaces like Lakewood, California, help highlight that the American identities—specifically the identities of suburban spaces and their people—were more heavily impacted by the push for consumerism than the bomb itself. In this paper I will further develop this thesis
The idea for Lakewood as a planned community was conceived in the year 1949, as three developers—Louis Boyar, Mark Taper, and Ben Weingart—decided to purchase land in Southern California to begin the creation of Lakewood Park.¹ As WWII ended and thousands of soldiers headed home, loans were available, space was available, and all that was left were homes to build. Dubbed the $250 million planned community² Lakewood Park built 17,500 houses using an assembly line process between 1950 and 1952.³ Achieving the goal of incorporation by the year 1954, the city was officially completed within a five-year span.⁴

As suburbs like Lakewood formed, the focus was not only the creation of these households but of the families that would reside within them. Author of *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order*, Elaine Tyler May, argues that the push for the creation of a nuclear family within a safe space like the suburbs was due in part to the active avoidance of what was deemed an “internal decay.”⁵ This internal decay, or failure of the society, could be resolved by the creation of the nuclear family and would “ward off the hazards of the age,” hazards that existed beyond the home front but impacted these communities, nonetheless.⁶ This impact on the communities is embraced by May as she argues that the Cold War culture was “more than internal reverberations of foreign policy and went beyond the explicit manifestations of anti-Communist hysteria such as McCarthyism and the Red Scare.”⁷ The culture of the time, centered on consumerism and desire of a nuclear household can only be partially attributed to the period that preceded the Cold War, as the remnants of depression and WWII led to anxieties centered around this avoidance of failure and insufficiency.⁸

Thought of as a post-World War II suburb, Lakewood, California, is not merely a product of the conclusion of WWII, but a product of the Cold War. Despite the impact of the previous time period, the suburban identity was formed and more heavily impacted by the desires brought on by the Cold War itself. Desperate to prove a difference between America and communist countries, consumerism offered
a representation of freedom by feigning the freedom to choose. Homes themselves, offered up to audiences via catalogs and rapidly built kits, were manifestations of this amplified consumerism and domestic ideology specific to the Cold War. In Lakewood, CA, it only took eight months since the foundation for the city was poured to begin the creation of the Lakewood Shopping Center. This aligned with the push for consumerism and creation of a suburban identity that prioritizes consumption and leisure over the hazards of the outside world. The creation of this idyllic neighborhood reflected the fast-paced change that was occurring during this era, and the American desire for containment and prosperity regardless of external hazards.

Though the ideal neighborhood was successfully created, it is crucial to acknowledge the exclusions that took place as this space and other suburban spaces were formed. With suburbs sprouting across the country, Lakewood was no exception to the exclusive requirements for loans set forth by the Federal Housing Administration and Veteran’s Affairs. As developers sought funding from the FHA to begin their projects, both the FHA and VA appraisers relied on a discriminatory Underwriting Manual that prevented non-white civilians and veterans from obtaining loans. The discrimination manifested itself in the demands made by the FHA as the financing of entire subdivisions and suburbs was dependent on these spaces being established as racially exclusive white enclaves. A prime example of this exclusive
suburbanization taking place is Levittown, New York. With a similar 17,500 home solution to the influx of veterans returning home, this town set the standard for the architecture and social restrictions of other suburbs. In the FHA approval of the plans for construction and future loans for Levittown were “the approved construction materials, the design specifications, the proposed sale price, the neighborhood’s zoning restrictions, and a commitment not to sell to African Americans.”

Following in Levittown’s footsteps, the exclusion of any non-white homebuyers was consistent throughout many major suburbs across America, including Lakewood, California.

New and exclusive, Lakewood served as an ideal haven from Cold War anxieties. Current reflection on the past centers on these anxieties, capitalizing off the assumed terror felt in these spaces and outside of them as the Cold War brought on worries of nuclear disasters. During the 65th anniversary of the Lakewood Center’s Macy’s Building, the city held a drawing to take a group of Lakewood residents on a tour of the historic Macy’s building. This tour was held to honor the 65th anniversary of the center but presented the historical significance of the atomic bomb on par with that of the company’s. The tour offered these residents a unique look into the half mile delivery tunnel under the Lakewood Center and pointed to the fact that this space was designated a community bomb shelter during the Cold War years. The tunnel served as a point of interest in the drawing as the Lakewood City website promoted it as a designated fallout shelter; the city historians continued to focus on this throughout a shared promotional video. The video documents the excitement of the drawing winner Sylvia Arvizu, giving her the platform to share her memories of the fallout shelter signs and displaying images of said signs in order to create a history centered around the bombs. The promotion of this tour and focus on the center’s underground tunnels creates a narrative that fear of atomic bombs was at the forefront of suburban residents’ minds—when the reality shows otherwise.

Similarly, these theatrics continue as prioritization of the atomic-bomb discourse takes the forefront in California classrooms. The Cold War is introduced to students at the end of their tenth-grade year, the focus during these teachings is a basic analysis of the Cold
War. These topics all place America as the free world against Soviet client states, starting the discourse around the Cold War with a depiction of America as a martyr against evil world powers. The shift from the tenth-grade curriculum to eleventh only amplifies this ideology as the effects of the Cold War are only discussed in terms of “the nuclear arms race and buildup, Berlin blockade and airlift, intervention in Korea, [the Eisenhower] administration’s defense policies based on nuclear deterrence and the threat of massive retaliation, [and] the CIA-assisted coup in Iran.” Every topic mentioned adds shock value to the period, while deeper discussions on the effects of the Cold War on the home front are only briefly suggested for teaching. Conversations of containment, blacklisting, and a quick reference to the exclusion of minorities from purchasing homes consumes the section on the home front—absent from these conversations is the impact of consumerism. Once again, engraining these theatrical ideas of the Cold War as a moment in time where the focus was only the anxieties brought on by the potential of war, making our retrospective perspective limited to these shock value topics and without deeper acknowledgment for the experiences of the time.

Despite this limited retrospective view, a quick look into published news articles of the time demonstrates that a push for consumption was more prevalent than conversations of the atomic bomb and other threats. While the Lakewood City website shows these exciting references to the fallout shelter through its promotion of the tunnel as a shelter, there is an astounding silence surrounding the setting itself and its function as not a mere time capsule but a representation of the evolving times. The creation of the Lakewood Center amid the Cold War demonstrates the city’s need for a place that provided excessive amounts of goods. Marketed toward these suburban families outside of a dangerous city

---

Figure 2. Quote from LA Times describing Lakewood Shopping Center (exclusion of shelter).
landscape, locations like this super center allowed suburban residents to consume without fear. We see this silence in the absence of articles promoting the fallout shelter at the time. While the city now promotes it as something exciting to be seen by the public, this pride in providing safety did not exist at the time of its creation. Article after article, the *Los Angeles Times* instead focuses on the size of the suburbs and its shopping center.\(^{25}\) These articles focus on the five million dollars in merchandise stock, 9,000 parking spots, escalators with the ability of moving 8,000 people from floor to floor in under an hour, and the 90 department stores offering diversity—all while ignoring the underground tunnels that are so focused on today.\(^{26}\) These publications helped divert attention from the anxieties that are historicized, dismissing the bomb for the sake of maintaining the image of these suburban spaces as safe.

Further substantiating the more accurate representation of the Cold War era within suburban spaces, is the more factual recounting of the fallout shelters themselves. In an entry titled “Family in Fallout Shelter” found within *Family in Society*, a primary source collection
journal, the authors argue that “no U.S. administration ever actively endorsed the construction of extensive fallout shelters” and these shelters were actually “more widely deployed in Europe and in the Eastern Block than in North America.”27 They further this argument by claiming that the Cold War fascination with fallout shelters was short-lived and only resurfaced after the occurrences of September 11, 2001.28 Suburban spaces like Lakewood, CA, were meant to represent safe havens, and a shopping center in the middle of the suburbs could not be equated with fear. Consumerism was a safe route that allowed suburbanites to escape from the already distant worries of the time. Promoting active consumption in the suburbs helped form the identity of this space into one of consumption and not one of fear. By swiftly shifting dialogue from home and community fallout shelters to shopping centers and passive protection advice, media like the LA Times actively contributed to the creation of a consumerist suburban identity.

Lasting longer than the push for self-preservation via fallout shelters, was the push for consumerism regardless of circumstances. Existing in this white space signified safety and prosperity, and the rise of consumerism demonstrated just how much the suburban public aligned themselves with this ideal. During this period people began to think of themselves less as workers in a time of depression and more as affluent consumers within these spaces.29 The practice of domestica-
tion and asking citizens to become “good consumers” who reflected back their patriotism through consuming the “right things” demonstrated the overlap of homemaking and nuclear disaster. In her book, Homemaking for the Apocalypse, Jill E. Anderson argues that this overlap “provided an intimate, private set of rules meant to allow citizens the chance to see themselves participating in a grander scale.”30 This self-assurance that the middle-class suburbanites gained as they saw their consumption as helpful to a larger cause only further led to a rise in consumerism at the time. These individuals could now consume their fears and protect themselves, as they became responsible for their own safety. This also “shifted the main responsibilities away from the federal and local governments, [and highlighted] the ways in which they were thoroughly unprepared themselves for potential catastrophe [while] reinforce[ing] American ideals of self-reliance and individualistic organization.”31
The anxieties of the Cold War demanded that certain expectations of domestic support be met. This push to make America reflect the idea of a free market and an image of strength ensured that this would happen by means of the suburban consumers. These private citizens were now pressured to reflect a very specific version of the country’s identity, and “in their positions as owners and maintainers of homes, to act as participants in a victorious capitalist system, to consider the life leading up to and immediately after an all-out nuclear war through the commodification of the necessity for preparation and the hope of survival.”  

The result of this pressure for consumption was the Consumer Era—a period that allowed individuals to demonstrate their heightened buying power and led to the rise of the ever-so American mass consumption economy.

The atomic-bomb and the anxieties that came with the threat of annihilation serve as powerful symbols of the Cold War, but the fact remains that the push for consumption under American capitalism was ultimately the greater power. A push for American consumerism in this time of peril had a more direct impact than the threat of annihilation, giving American suburbanites a more “active” role in controlling outside forces. Additionally, these feelings towards consumption continued into the 21st century. Shortly after what can be deemed the end of the Cold War, America faced a new challenge: an attack on the home front. Immediately after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush pushed Americans to spend; showing support for airline industries he urged consumers to put their worries aside and “Get on board!”  

This moment in time helps solidify the role of consumerism as it was seen throughout the Cold War period. Unable to fight, Americans could do as America does, spend.
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Let’s Ride: Police Entrapment and Punishment of Gay Men in Public Space

Timothy Paul Luna

AMST 401T: Stories of Los Angeles

“Let’s Ride: Police Entrapment and Punishment of Gay Men in Public Space” is an essay done for AMST 401T “Stories of Los Angeles” taught in the Spring 2022 Semester by Professor Elaine Lewinnek. The assignment was to tell the untold stories of Los Angeles. Students were given full creative freedom to select their subject matter and met with the professor for guidance as needed. This essay unveils the systematic oppression of gay men in Los Angeles, CA, from the period of approximately 1910 to present (2022). Entrapment techniques utilized by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) are discussed in detail. The essay also discusses themes of marginalization, punishment, and imprisonment of gay men for exploring/embracing their sexuality. Websites Grindr and Sniffies are mentioned to show cruising has metamorphosized to meet the demand for public/anonymous sexual encounters in the digital age of contemporary Los Angeles.

When thinking of the city of Los Angeles what comes to mind? Hollywood? The Los Angeles Dodgers? The Beaches? Rodeo Drive? All these areas are profoundly well known by Los Angeles natives, transplants, and tourists alike. According to the United States Census as of 2021, Los Angeles is the second-largest metropolitan area in the United States of America with a massive population of 331,893,745. This begs the question, what are the untold stories of LA? I am referring to stories that are not shown on television or reported by mass media outlets, the stories that take place behind closed doors, action packed experiences done in utter silence. These tales take place in public bathrooms, freeway rest stops, gym locker rooms, parks, alleyways, and cars, innocent fun with unjust and disproportionate consequences that resulted in arrests and convictions of gay men for simply exploring their sexuality. If you have not guessed what I am referring to by now, allow me to fill you in on where the action is.

As discussed in *Tea Room Trade*, cruising can be defined as the act of a male looking for a male sexual partner in a public space with the intention of having sexual relations with their newfound partner in a public or semipublic setting. Cruising commonly takes place in public bathrooms, freeway rest stops, gym locker rooms, parks, alleyways, and cars. A tantalizing game for those that participate but high rewards yield high risks. In 1996, an empirical study of enforcement and administration in Los Angeles shows within a four-year period alleged homosexual conduct resulted in 493 felony charges. Fifty-six percent of these arrests were made in public restrooms. Further research revealed men who have same-sex relations were being targeted by law enforcement and being slammed with felony charges. This was done as an effort to clean up the city of “undesirable” characters and to stop cruising. However, this is not the first instance of excessive policing of queer spaces/people.

Between the 1870s and 1910s, a “tramp panic” became a major concern for Los Angeles. Los Angeles targeted “tramps” and “hobos” for incarceration at the turn of the twentieth century. “Tramps” were typically men living among other men, a chosen family of sorts. “Tramps” assumed non-normative gender identities and sometimes engaged in homosexual relations. This “Tramp Era” panic spurred a new field of scholarship known as *trampology*. *Trampologists* antagonized white male migrant low-skill workers as “tramps” and “hobos” due to their failure to find a stable livelihood and economic security during the industrial revolution. *Trampologists* felt these transient men were a “degenerate, incorrigible, irreplaceable, and utterly depraved” strain of white men unfit to thrive in the industrial age. The “tramps’” unwillingness to successfully navigate the changing economy branded them as the public’s number one enemy that threatens the very life of society. Tramp behavior was deemed contagious and the only solution to save the public was mass incarceration. This led to *California Anti-Vagrancy Act (1872)* which made arresting tramps easy. According to the 1872 law, every “common beggar,” “common prostitute,” and “common drunk” was a vagrant. Persons who roam from place to place, “every lewd or dissolute person” and “every person who wanders about
the streets at late or unusual hours” were classified as a vagrant by law. This legislation drastically increased the number of persons incarcerated and led to the LAPD’s massive expansion of the prison industrial complex. In 1871, the U.S. Supreme Court, ruling in Ruffin v. Commonwealth concluded that imprisoned people are “slave[s] of the state.” These prisoners formed what is known as “the chain gang” and were used for slave labor to build the infrastructure and landscape of contemporary Los Angeles, the city they once “plagued.” Homosexuals were simply another cog in the wheel of the prison industrial complex. This horrendous infrastructure perpetuates a cycle of abuse to keep homosexuals who were incarcerated at any point from upward social mobility primarily via disenfranchisement. Following the conviction of a crime, disenfranchisement revokes a citizen’s ability to participate in elections, excluding them from voting on legislation that can affect their body, property, and livelihood. This system also ensures that there will be no shortage of free slave labor because it is easy to convict an individual if they have a previous record of criminal charges or convictions. In the mid-1900s, being convicted of a lewd act in public landed a felony charge along with the requirement to register as a sex offender. This further marginalizes homosexuals because it is challenging to secure employment with the title of sex offender bestowed upon them, leaving them no choice but to work low-wage jobs and rendering their contributions to society seemingly useless. Felony charges were a way of policing sexuality in public spaces.

Heavy and unnecessary policing of queer spaces is no revelation. Gay men have been prosecuted and persecuted preceding the development of cities. In many instances, this has disenfranchised LGBTQIA+ community members from inalienable rights. Accompanying disenfranchisement, LGBTQIA+ community members have been stigmatized. These negative connotations have long-lasting detrimental effects on the LGBTQIA+ community. First published in 1968, DSM-II (the second edition of the American classification of mental disorders) listed homosexuality as a mental disorder. Homosexuality was categorized as sexual deviation alongside other disorders such as exhibitionism, pedophilia, transvestitism and voyeurism. Considering the DSM-II stance on homosexuality it seems society defined
homosexuality by sex acts, and this has created a self-fulfilling identity for those erroneously labeled as ill. An excerpt from the Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies mentions the following quote originally from The Sexual Outlaw: A Documentary by John Rechy: “The law tells us we’re criminals, and so we’ve become defiant outlaws. Psychiatrists demand we be sick, and so we’ve become obsessed with physical beauty. Religion insists we’re sinners, and so we’ve become soulful sensualists. The result is the unique, sensual, feeling, elegant sensibility of the sexual outlaw.”12 “Homosexuals are going to perform the roles that are assigned to them.”13 These excerpts encapsulate the headspace gay men felt during this period. The gay community was intentionally marginalized, subordinated to police their behavior and make the hurdle of “coming out” seemingly infeasible.

Sex is a natural and normal part of the human experience. Although I do not necessarily condone public sex, I do not believe consenting adults should be punished for exploring their sexuality. If law enforcement was so concerned with stopping public sex, why is there no significant quantitative data showing the arrest of heterosexual partners committing the same felonies? Were they lucky enough to not get caught or was law enforcement solely concerned with gay relations as another means of oppressing the marginalized LGBTQIA2+ community? In my research, I explore how police consistently utilized undercover entrapment tactics to punish gay men for exploring their sexuality and how these impacted cruising in public spaces in Los Angeles.

Limitations and Purpose

As this is a sensitive topic for some readers, I feel the need to clarify the aim of my research and explain my limitations. Geographically, my research is evolving in the greater Los Angeles area. This research is not conducted to provide an exposé on the secret life of homosexuals or men that partake in same-sex relations nor to make a mockery of it. This research is not intended to encourage lewd activity in public spaces nor denounce it. My research aims to highlight the unjust and disproportionate arrests and convictions of gay men for exploring their sexuality. I do not intend to bash the police but rather provide constructive commentary on their policies. I seek to discover if police entrapment of gay men in public spaces is contemporarily
supported and practiced by Los Angeles Police Department. I will also uncover how cruising adapted with technological advancements. Now that the parameters have been erected, we can move forward.

**Defining Key Terms**

Some readers may not be privy to gay slang so I will define key terms that will be consistently used in this research to bridge the gap and prevent confusion. The following terms will be broken down categorically.\(^{14}\)

**Locations**

*Tearoom*: A public restroom that is a known hotspot for cruising. Although “tearooms” are commonplace, cruising can be conducted in freeway rest stops, gym locker rooms, parks, alleyways, and cars.

**Players**

*Top*: An individual that plays the insertive role in sexual activity regardless of orifice utilized, also referred to as “insertor” or “fucker.”

*Bottom*: An individual that plays the receptive role in sexual activity, typically concerning anal sex, also referred to as insertee. It has been noted that in instances where there is a lack of Tops available a Bottom may assume the role of a Top which leads to our next type of player.\(^{15}\)

*Versatile*: An individual that plays both roles, also referred to as “switch” or “vers.”

**Lookouts**

The following roles are referred to as “Watch Queens” in earlier research, defined as an individual that serves the role of a lookout for other cruisers and alerts or signals them before they are caught.

*Waiters*: Choosy men, that are either waiting for a specific person or type of man to start engagement of sexual activity.

*Masturbators*: Men who are solely present to masturbate or engage in masturbation while being a “waiter.”

*Voyeurs*: Individuals that gain sexual pleasure from watching others engage in sexual activity and may masturbate while keeping a lookout for cops or other non-cruisers.

**Nonparticipants**

*Straights*: An individual that identifies as heterosexual and does not participate in cruising.
Although it has been noted that men that identify as heterosexual can transmute into a role defined in the players’ category. Though this may be short-lived after climax and sexual arousal is subdued. Men that identify as heterosexual but participate in same-sex relations are also referred to as “DL,” an acronym for down low.

**Agents of Social Control:** Defined as anyone who seeks to stop cruising activity. These agents are vice squad (undercover law enforcement), park police, other park employees, or overly concerned self-righteous vigilante “straights.”

**Courtship**

For the safety of participants that engage in cruising, cues have been developed to express interest once a potential partner is found. The police adopt these courting methods to entrap and arrest gay men, more on that later.

**Non-Verbal Communication:** Eye contact, this usually includes making direct eye contact with the potential partner typically followed by staring at the pelvic region of said partner, followed by groping of their own pelvic region. “Trailing” is the act of following a potential partner and waiting for a signal (listed above) that confirms their mutual interest. “Foot Tapping,” usually practiced in bathrooms, is the act of tapping one’s foot on the floor 3 times. If the man in the neighboring stall taps their foot back that confirms their interest. “Flash ing” is exposing oneself to a potential partner, if interested they may follow the “flasher” to another location to engage in sexual activity or they may expose themselves to the “flasher” to show interest and engage in mutual masturbation, oral sex, or anal sex. Now that key terms and courtship have been defined, we can examine how cruising takes place in Los Angeles.

**History of Cruising in Los Angeles**

In the 1960s Los Angeles Police Department was not welcoming to the gay community. Instances of targeted harassment by Los Angeles Police Department officers of gay men were commonplace. There was seemingly no place for gays to exhibit their sexuality freely without fear of repercussion from the general public and law enforcement. The solution? Bring the scene underground, sometimes literally. The bar and club scene grew and hosted patrons, creat-
ing a somewhat safe space for the LGBTQIA2+ community. Some of these bars, clubs, and restaurants were not openly advertised as gay friendly. Additionally, they allowed freedom of expression to an extent or had certain rules that needed to be followed without exception, such as no touching, no kissing, or public displays of affection. In some bars, patrons could not speak face to face but rather by looking at each other’s reflection in a mirror affixed to the wall behind the bar. In 1964, *Life Magazine* ran the story, *Homosexuality in America: A Secret World Grows Open and Bolder*. Part of the report focused on the LAPD. They had arrested 3,069 men for homosexual offenses in 1963. *Life* reported, “the LAPD could not help but notice that a mini-revolt was already occurring on the streets.” LAPD inspector James Fisk is quoted: “The pervert is no longer as secretive as he was. He’s aggressive, and his aggressiveness is getting worse.” “Homosexuals everywhere fear arrest,” *Life* reported. But “in Los Angeles, where homosexuals are particularly apparent on city streets, police drives are regular and relentless…Leaders of homophile societies in Los Angeles and San Francisco have accused the police of ‘harassment, entrapment and brutality’ toward homosexuals.” The magazine also noted that it was a crime in California “to solicit anyone in a public place to engage in a lewd act.”

One historic incident occurred at *The Black Cat Tavern* in Silverlake, a well-known gay bar. On the night of New Year’s Eve in 1967 undercover police staged a sting operation within the bar. When the countdown ended, patrons celebrated with embraces, two men were seen kissing by two undercover police and were severely beaten. This resulted in a bar brawl injuring patrons and resulting in fourteen arrests. Police raids on bars were a familiar part of gay life, but this incident drove resistance to police brutality against the LGBTQIA2+ community. Following this tragedy, on February 11th, the Black Cat protest commenced. One of the signs the gay demonstrators held outside the Black Cat read “Stop Blue Fascism.” This protest set the tone for other demonstrations in the U.S. such as the 1969 Stonewall uprising in New York. Although these were great triumphs, not all members of the LGBTQIA2+ community were on the same page when it came to cruising and queer visibility.
The first issue of *The Advocate*, dated September 1967, began publication as the newsletter of PRIDE. An excerpt from the issue read “PRIDE is asking you to think about something, your conduct.” In the letter addressed to the gay community, it asked readers not to cruise in public parks. “As cruising is intolerable in the eyes of the LAPD, and rightly so.” A poor attempt to persuade “the homosexual in LA” to confine his sexual activities to private places. The *Advocate* asked readers to boycott Griffith Park to prove to the LAPD that gay men can obey the law, in hopes that it would stop police harassment. The request in *The Advocate* did not affect sex in the park. With such polarization in the community, it is difficult to say if any safe space existed for the gay community. With virtually no places to express affection or explore sexuality, the community was left with the choice of using their
automobile (if they had one) or utilizing the public spaces constructed by the city funded by their tax dollars.

As public sex became commonplace for gays, it did not go unnoticed. Griffith Park in the neighborhood of Los Feliz quickly became the most popular cruising location in Los Angeles. As more flocked to the park to get in on the action, police made their presence known with consistent patrolling and extra coverage of both vice and uniformed officers. This resulted in mass arrests even of men that were not at the park cruising. In the 1972 September issue of *Drummer*, the cover was dedicated to a story on police entrapment titled “L.A. Heats Up; Entrapment Increases.” The article warns readers to stay clear of Griffith Park due to heavy police surveillance. *Drummer* became a beacon of light for the LGBTQIA2+ community and regularly published stories on police harassment. The publication warned the community of heavy police presence in tearooms that was reported by first account witnesses at popular cruising areas throughout the urban sprawl of Los Angeles.

*Drummer* did not stop there, they offered readers a chance to take matters into their own hands. Stickers (pictured left) were made available for purchase. The proceeds from donations that were sent helped fund the magazine publications. The idea was to post these stickers as a warning label as a means of protecting the community against police harassment and arrest. The slogan “Don’t talk to strangers!” was coined because of the substantial presence of undercover officers in tearooms and parks. As the fight against policing of these queer spaces continued the LAPD got more creative with entrapment. In the 1973 October Issue of *Drummer*, a news column was done on
how police have come up with new ways to catch cruisers. The piece, titled “L.A. Vice Squad Encourages Vice,” reported that Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department made it a policy to comply with all requests made by police. This included but was not limited to removing the doors from bathroom stalls. Giving officers keys to maintenance rooms granted police the ability to secretly watch whoever came into a tearoom and made the swift arrest possible. At the request of police officers, holes in between stalls referred to as “glory holes” were to be left alone, not repaired nor covered. Although the city had available materials at their disposal to do so. The report also states that some vice officers resort to peeking through walls and mirrors to keep tabs on those entering a tearoom and to catch them in a lewd act. When the Los Angeles Police Commission was asked for comment on these practices, they stated “officers simply never do anything against the law.” But that does not seem to be true.

Undercover entrapment techniques were first adopted by LAPD as early as 1915. Vice officers play a few roles in tearooms to successfully entrap and arrest gay men. The most common role played by vice officers is the role of the “waiter.” Officers will stake out a known tearoom and wait until a potential cruiser walks in. This is typically when vice officers transition from the role of a waiter to voyeur. They will wait for a cruiser or cruisers to conduct any lewd act and immediately arrest them. In some instances, vice officers adopt the role of “watch queen” and pretend to keep a lookout for officers or non-participants. Once cruisers engage in sexual activity they are immediately arrested.

Nearly a century later in 2014, the Los Angeles Times released an article reporting a man being arrested in Long Beach for cruising, but in his statement, he reported that he went to use the bathroom and the vice officer had his hands in the pelvic region, made eye contact, then smiled and nodded his head. The man was arrested on a count of lewd conduct the police report stated he exposed himself to the officer, however the man denies this claim. This LA Times article is not the first instance of falsified police reports. Throughout the 1900s as reported in Drummer vice officers use tactics such as groping their genitals in front of gay men to pique interest or initiate engagement in sexual activity that would
result in arrest. Trailing was another adopted tactic by vice officers as they would play the role of waiter until an unsuspecting gay man would pass by. The officer will trail him and attempt to make advances. If the gay man took the bait, it resulted in his arrest. Instances of foot-tapping in stalls of tearooms to signal interest have also been reported. Law enforcement adopted these nonverbal communication styles of gay men and weaponized them to criminalize the gay community.

One UCLA study revealed that a vice officer stood in front of a urinal for an extended period, exposing his erect penis as bait. He was later dismissed for lewd solicitation. Ironically, the police’s objective is to stop cruising, yet it seems that they willfully play the game. I cannot fathom how it is legal for officers to partake in the activities they are instructed to condemn. It seems like these entrapment techniques promote cruising behaviors rather than deter them. It is obvious that entrapment does not work in mitigating cruising behavior. These tactics simply upheld settler colonialism and served the purpose of suppressing the gay community’s access and occupancy of public spaces. These regulations strangled the already marginalized community’s freedom of expression.

After over a century of poor policy and practice, the LAPD finally learned this lesson. In the Los Angeles Times article published in 2016 “Judge slams gay sex stings by Long Beach police, calling them discriminatory.” A judge ruled that entrapment campaigns are discriminatory on the basis that they are solely utilized to target and convict gay men. It is argued in this article that the presence of vice officers enables the behaviors they attempt to terminate. Following this ruling, it now seems that law enforcement denounces their former undercover entrapment techniques. As mentioned in the Peace Officer Psychological Screening Manual published in 2022, cruising of vice officers is categorized as “grossly ineffective, disruptive and/or counterproductive.” In the previously mentioned LA Times article, police departments concur that the use of entrapment and sting operations to curb cruising is not effective and is no longer practiced. Now that police have determined entrapment was a waste of time and tax dollars, we can discuss how these practices now influence policing of the new frontier of public spaces, the internet.
Contemporary Cruising in Los Angeles

At the turn of the 21st century, technology transformed public spaces into digital spaces. Social media platforms have become the new playground for human interaction and in some instances, there are platforms dedicated to promoting gay relations such as Grindr and Sniffies. An excerpt taken from Grindr's corporate website states “Since launching in 2009, Grindr has grown into the largest social networking app for gay, bi, trans, and queer people.” Grindr is an application that utilizes geo-location services to juxtapose users on a grid sorted by relative distance. Grindr has a feature that allows users to filter out who they do and do not want to interact with, similar to a tearoom “waiter,” defined earlier. The platform allows users to provide statistics such as height, weight, body type, age, and more demographics on their sexual preferences or roles they like to perform during a sexual activity like Top, Bottom, “Vers,” Voyeur. Grindr prohibits any illegal activity on its platform and allows users to make anonymous reports when other users break community guidelines. This typically results in a permanent ban from the platform. In more serious cases such as sex trafficking or involvement with a minor authorities will be notified.28 Grindr relies on the community it fosters to self-police its users. In addition to Grindr, Sniffies is also utilized, which is a modern, map-based meetup app for gay, bi, and curious guys looking for casual hookups in their area. Sniffies has transformed the way guys find other guys by creating a place-based cruising app that is as anonymous as you want it to be.”29 Unlike Grindr, Sniffies allows nudity on the app and does not require an account. Sniffies promotes cruising by utilizing crowdsourcing. Users are allowed to create cruising spots where they can meet potential partners. However, Sniffies exclusively states in their terms of service that they do not condone public sex. Like Grindr, Sniffies also asks users to self-police and report users that do not follow community guidelines. Though there are no clear punishments for violating community guidelines outlined in terms of service comparable to Grindr’s permanent ban of a user’s account. Applications like these allow for freedom of expression and promote self-exploration concerning sexuality. It seems, then, that the internet has transformed public spaces and allowed the gay community to overcome the obstacle of police entrapment.
Policing of queer spaces was not solely about limiting the gay community’s access and occupancy of public spaces but rather a poor attempt of enforcing a sense of morality that oppressed and ostracized and alienated queer people. Movements such as the Black Cat Tavern Demonstration and the Stonewall uprising are cornerstone examples of civil disobedience for the greater good that challenged the unnecessary policing of public space. Public space is public space and should be treated as such. Public space should not be treated as a luxury for those that are willing to abide by old standards of morality that no longer apply to contemporary society. The civil unrest of queer people and allies against police brutality and harassment paved the way for applications such as Grindr and Sniffies. For now, it seems the gay community may have finally won the senseless battle on cruising but more importantly, their right to access public space without fear of repercussions for being their most authentic self.

References
5. Laud Humphreys, “Public Settings for Private Encounters,” in *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places* (New York: Routledge, 2017),
8. Ibid., p. 46
9. Ibid., p. 46
20. Ibid., p. 205.
Mahu Identity and Globalized Queerness: Examining *We’re Here*

Austin Robles

AMST 448: Globalization and American Pop Culture

This essay was written for Professor Dustin Abnet’s Globalization and American Pop Culture class in Fall 2021. The paper critically analyzes an episode of the HBO series *We’re Here*. This episode examines the Indigenous Hawaiian third gender category, Mahu. This essay seeks to demonstrate how this identity is co-opted into a Western understanding of the queer identities while ignoring its anti-colonial significance. Although the series means to be inclusive, this inclusivity can act as a way of erasing indigenous identities.

In the age of globalized media, cultural hybridity is omnipresent, including in the HBO documentary series *We’re Here*. Specifically, the episode titled “Kona, Hawaii” hybridizes Hawaiian and mainland American understandings of gender and sexual identity. By doing so, it indirectly erases the Indigenous third gender identity, Mahu, to better align with the globalized politics of sexual identity. Cultural hybridity describes a process in which aspects from two or more cultures are combined to create a new unique cultural product, often with the intention of being marketed on a global scale. Sexuality and gender are often thought to defy borders which has allowed for an international movement for LGBTQ solidarity; however, this thinking is flawed. Ideologies like these are rooted in colonialism and erase Indigenous understandings of gender that are more nuanced. In the case of *We’re Here*, cultural hybridity waters down the uniquely Hawaiian third gender identity known as Mahu.

*We’re Here* is a documentary series on HBO that follows three popular drag queens who perform in conservative small towns across the United States. Shangela, Eureka, and Bob the Drag Queen aim to encourage tolerance and acceptance in these spaces by exposing people to expressions of queerness such as the art of drag performance. The people who are selected to participate in the drag shows get a profes-
sional team to choreograph their performance, do their makeup, and design their on-stage looks. Each episode ends with the performance that the team puts together in these communities and aims to leave the audiences present as well as the viewers at home feeling emotionally uplifted. The stories throughout the series are often heartwarming, particularly for queer audiences who seek validation and acceptance from their own loved ones and communities. The emotional appeal targets an LGBTQ audience, even though the show is intended to expose conservative, small-town Americans to drag performance and queer culture.

The show is well-intentioned, but it seems to be out of touch with the realities of marginalized queer people because its primary focus draws on neoliberal ideals. Neoliberalism is an economic philosophy that supports free market capitalism and sees the free market as the solution to widespread oppression. Neoliberal thinking often overlooks institutionalized oppression of marginalized peoples, including people of color and sexual minorities. There seems to be a lack of consideration of what happens after the show to the people who participate and are outed to the community by these events. At the time of writing this essay, none of the episodes follow up with people featured in earlier episodes. Certainly, there is freedom in no longer hiding a major part of one’s identity, but in doing so, these queer folks have also exposed themselves to potentially violent pushback from less accepting people in their communities. Additionally, the drag queens hosting the series are also putting themselves at risk by walking around in small-town America in drag and inviting people off the street to the drag show they are hosting. Most episodes start with Shangela, Bob, and Eureka walking through these towns in drag, attracting glares and attention from people in the community, both positive and negative. Although the intention of the series is to normalize drag and other queer cultures, “normalizing” allows for commodification by neoliberal opportunists. This act reduces drag and queer culture to little more than a consumable product.

One episode breaks the mold of the show, exemplifying cultural hybridity. In this episode, the team travels to Kona, Hawaii, a community that geographically exists on the margins of the American empire.
Rather than taking place in the mainland United States, they chose to travel to the colonized spaces of Hawaii. In this sense, the episode creates cultural hybridity between Native Hawaiian cultures and mainland American cultures. Cultural hybridity is defined as combining aspects of two or more distinct cultures to create a neutralized, “faceless,” and globalized culture. The third gender identity unique to the Indigenous people of Hawaii, *Mahu*, becomes the focus of the episode in Kona, Hawaii. The third gender category is an identity that differs from gender and sexuality as it is understood in an American or Western context. To most Americans, gender exists as a binary of man and woman. In Indigenous Hawaiian cultures, like many other Indigenous cultures, there exist gender categories beyond man and woman.

As explained in the episode by one of the show’s participants named Lanakila, Mahu is a gender identity that would be understood as transgender and gender fluid by queer America. Lanakila goes on to explain that historically, Mahu were accepted and, at times, revered by their communities because they were understood to see the world from a wider perspective than people who are not Mahu. Native Hawaiian cultures have a different understanding of gender; men who would be considered straight could have sexual or romantic relationships with Mahu and that does not change their identity, as those individuals are not understood to be men. Furthermore, there is no need for “coming out” for Mahu traditionally, as this identity is typically recognized while the person is young. Typically, this decision would be made based off whether they conform to their gender role according to their assigned gender. By not conforming to their prescribed role, they take on the identity of Mahu.

Indigenous Hawaiian understanding of gender differs from Western sexual and gender identities. Mahu identities are much like other third gender categories found among Native peoples around the world such as Two Spirit people of Indigenous North American cultures. Two Spirit is an umbrella term that refers to multitudes of third gender categories among Indigenous peoples native to North America. The existence of third genders outside of mainstream U.S. culture demonstrates that the way Americans and other Western cultures see sexuality is not a universal concept.
not widely understood in the U.S., so diasporic Pacific Islanders who identify this way may take on Western sexual or gender identities when in the United States mainland. This is as an act of cultural hybridity, as this diaspora is often pressured to identify in a culturally neutralized way in order to be understood in the mainland United States. They may instead identify as transgender, nonbinary, gay, or otherwise.

Those who identify themselves as Mahu instead of a different LGBTQ identity demonstrate the difference between their own understanding of gender in comparison to more common LGBTQ identities. In this act, Mahu people are reclaiming their Indigenous heritage while resisting colonial erasure of their gender identity. The resistance to colonialism, in addition to cultural differences in the understanding of gender, mark how a Mahu gender identity is different from being transgender or nonbinary. Mahu is more than the identity of the individual, it is also performing the cultural work of preserving Indigenous Hawaiian culture. This episode does not seem to recognize this resistance while repackaging the Mahu identity as yet another identity under the LGBTQ umbrella.

*We're Here* does not intend to disrespect Mahu identity, however it arguably appropriates this identity as equivalent to a Western LGBTQ+ identity. In one scene Bob the Drag Queen asks Lanakila about whether it is appropriate for him to use the term Mahu to identify himself and he is told by Lanakila that it is acceptable. Whether or not it is appropriate for Bob to identify as Mahu is debatable among Mahu people. Regardless, the episode does not explore the anti-colonial aspect of this identity. Instead, it seeks to create solidarity among LGBTQ identifying people and Mahu people. Inclusivity is appropriate. However, commodifying an Indigenous identity that resists colonialism for capitalistic gain can be harmful and destructive to the values of a Mahu identity. In its most destructive form, inclusivity can contribute to the erasure of this identity. Later in the episode, Lanakila and two other community members bring Bob to Mauna Kea and discuss the protests that happened there in response to the desecration of this sacred space. The community members note that many Mahu people were at the forefront of this resistance movement, as well as being actively involved in other acts of resistance throughout the Hawai-
ian Islands. In this case, colonialism is directly acknowledged, but not regarding gender identity.

The episode ends with a drag performance, as an act of coming out to the community of Kona. Two of the performers identify as Mahu, Kekoa and Lanakila. As stated earlier, Mahu do not normally have to “come out” as this identity is often assigned while the person is young. Coming out makes heartwarming television but not all queer people have the privilege to come out, often for their own safety or security. Queerness is a resistance to normativity, and therefore, coming out and being accepted by community is not necessary to be “queer.” Being as loud and proud as possible regarding one’s sexuality is treated as the panacea for all queer people by the series, but that message does not apply to all. Coming out does not bring an end to the struggles of queer people. In some cases, it is only the start.

Mainstream drag has only recently become more welcoming to performers who are not gay men. Notably, another performer in the drag show is a woman who identifies as bisexual, and both transgender and cisgender women still struggle to be accepted as drag artists. The commodification of drag through the popularity of drag television series brought to the forefront by *RuPaul’s Drag Race*, has led to a greater acceptance of various other gender and sexual identities in drag performance. What appears to be a greater degree of acceptance is rooted in the broadening of the audience of drag for mass consumption. Incorporating the Mahu identity into mainstream LGBTQ identity politics for the sake of selling and normalizing drag is not an act of queer liberation, it is an act of cultural hybridity. This does not demonstrate a greater degree of acceptance as much as it demonstrates the neoliberal desire to capitalize on identity politics.

Cultural hybridity can be described as a “third space” in which elements of multiple cultures “encounter and transform each other.”9 *We’re Here* is an example of hybridity between Native Hawaiian and mainstream American culture. More specifically, it is a hybrid of the cultures of marginalized identities existing in both Hawaii and the mainland United States. The blending of culture makes it neither Hawaiian nor American; it becomes culturally neutral and globalized. In this way, *We’re Here* demonstrates the limitations of cultural hybridity, as hybridity does not truly bring cultures together as much as it erases and replaces the cultural context of one by dominant culture. In the
case of this episode, American understandings of sexual identity and gender commodifies the Mahu identity of the Native people of Hawaii.

In effect, there is a latent dynamic of American imperialism via cultural hybridity as mainland American culture is presented as welcomed and embraced by Natives. Outsiders come to the island to help locals proclaim their individual identities and ask for acceptance from their communities, as if they are unable to do this on their own. All of this is done for entertainment value and for global consumption. As previously stated, the series is focused on the normalization of drag, queer culture, and mainstream acceptance. This episode not only seeks to normalize drag, but also to translate Native Hawaiian culture into a product of American television that feeds into global consumer culture, targeting an LGBTQ audience. More specifically, *We're Here* functions as an imperial translator between “the colonizer and the colonized” in terms of adapting Hawaiian culture to a North American audience.\(^1\)

*We’re Here* demonstrates cultural hybridity as a tool of colonizing gender identity and Indigenous Hawaiian tradition for mainland American consumption. The series is created with altruistic intentions of helping vulnerable LGBTQ people living in hostile communities. In the case of the episode discussed throughout this paper, it does so at the expense of Native Hawaiian identity. Indigenous understandings of gender identity get erased while attempting to create hybridity between cultures. Acceptability is not necessary for all people who embrace their queerness. Although cultural hybridity is being used in this case to support an international movement of LGBTQ people, this should not come at the expense of colonized peoples and cultures.
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So Apparently, There Are Nukes in My Neighborhood: The Forgotten Legacy of Southern California’s Nuclear Defense Pattern in Garden Grove

Jacob L. Smith

AMST 401T:

For the final paper of Elaine Lewinnek’s American Studies 401T class, we were tasked with thoroughly researching an element of the broader Los Angeles area and the history surrounding it. For this essay, I investigated elusive archival documents to uncover information on and the ramifications of Project Nike. At the height of Cold War paranoia, the US government launched Project Nike which aimed to place nuclear warheads in dozens of suburban communities as a preventative measure against nuclear attacks on major metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles. This essay attempts to explore the details of Project Nike, its potential long term effects, as well as the role of public memory in its mainstream erasure.

Since long before my earliest memory, Garden Grove has been my home. My family and I have lived here as long as I have been old enough to understand the concept of what home means. My two younger brothers and I were born and raised here and we attended school here as well. We started at Barker Elementary before moving on to Bell Intermediate and then eventually graduating from Pacifica High School. Before us, my parents each spent a good portion of their childhood here and graduated from Garden Grove High School. Garden Grove is somewhat of a peculiar city. It is rare to see new faces moving in just as it is rare to see them leave with a population that has remained rather stagnant in recent decades. It is a city created through gerrymandering that lumps the predominantly white West Garden Grove in with the rest of the primarily Latinx and Vietnamese city. It is also home to the Strawberry Festival that pays homage to the city’s strawberry-centered roots, kicked off by the mildly famous Strawberry
Stomp 5k (a race won by yours truly in 2017, but that’s beside the point). However, it wasn’t until I left Garden Grove to attend Cal State Fullerton that I learned the most shocking piece of trivia about my hometown. There are nukes in my neighborhood. Or at least, there used to be.

Picture the scene: there I am sitting in my American Studies 401T class, perhaps I was dozing off a bit, but that is to be expected in a three-hour, late afternoon class. Suddenly, I am startled into attention when my professor and acclaimed author, Elaine Lewinnek, casually mentions the US military’s Cold War-era Project Nike. At that moment, everything I knew about my hometown was turned on its head. I learned that the Chapman Education Center and Sports Park where I attended in the eighth grade while my middle school was under construction, had been previously known as the Los Angeles Defense Area Site LA-32, and had housed a nuclear missile. I was blown away at the fact that not only do I currently live less than a mile from this site, but also that I spent an entire year of school on top of its buried remains. Looking back, something about that campus always felt distinctly guarded to me. It was almost like it harbored some sort of secret, which I now know to be the case. This is why uncovering this secret nearly ten years later has felt like some sort of Scooby-Doo moment for me. I obviously cannot speak for everyone, but to me the Chapman Education Center feels like Garden Grove’s last standing remnant of Cold War paranoia.

This discovery made me think, why have I never heard of this before? In an effort to answer this question, I began to dive deeper down the rabbit hole of Project Nike. The first thing I noticed was how difficult it was to find solid, concrete documentation of LA-32, as well as much of the project as a whole. Then the answer to my question became clear: I had never heard of this before because very few people have. Naturally, that raised more questions in my mind: why does no one seem to know about this and why is information on it so scarce? In order to answer these questions, we must first explore what Project Nike was, the effects it had, and what it means as a piece of American history.
What Was Project Nike?

During the Cold War, many metropolitan areas of the US found themselves under constant threat of nuclear annihilation. A solution to this looming threat was found in the form of suburbanization. In order to decentralize industry as well as much of the population, the US government decided to stimulate suburban regions surrounding these major cities by making them centers of military industry. One such city was Los Angeles. This action saw a wave of middle-class families moving out of the inner cities and into the surrounding neighborhoods in pursuit of newly created job opportunities. However, this created a new problem: this now put suburban communities at risk of a nuclear attack. The apparent solution was to erect “rings of supersonic steel” around heavily populated, metropolitan areas. So, the US military, along with Bell Laboratories, orchestrated Project Nike to arm these neighborhoods each with a nuclear warhead of their own throughout the 1950s. This was also done to protect against nuclear threats to the large cities they surrounded. In fact, these missile sites were strategically constructed “in circular patterns in order to protect major areas of defense” such as Los Angeles or other major cities as shown in the Figure 1. This was done less as a defensive measure and more as a preventative measure, meaning they could only be used in retaliation. The nukes offered no real protection for the community but did succeed in adding to that oh-so-familiar Cold War sentiment of mutually assured destruction.

For many, these sites “served as a tangible reminder that the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union could turn hot at any moment” furthering the already rampant Cold War paranoia. Tensions seemed to ease a bit during the 1970s when new technology left the Nike missiles obsolete. In accordance with disarmament treaties and budget cuts, the Nike

Figure 1: Map of the Project Nike LA missile sites
Missile launch sites were gradually decommissioned, deconstructed, and repurposed. Most of the LA sites were all transformed into parks or other public areas. The aforementioned LA-32 site became the Chapman Education Center and Sports Park that I am very familiar with. Other locations include the LA-29 site that now sits abandoned and graffitied atop a hill in the upscale neighborhoods of Brea Hills and Rowland Heights. The Orange County Fairgrounds in Costa Mesa is another public space that once housed a nuclear warhead. Despite how prevalent these sites are, it seems like the average person has no knowledge of what they once were nor their historical significance. In order to get a better understanding of these areas, I visited the former LA-29 site in Rowland Heights and returned to the Chapman Education Center, but this time with a new perspective.

**Nike Missile Sites Today**

**LA-29: Vantage Pointe Drive**

The first site I decided to visit was the former LA-29 site situated directly in the middle of the Rowland Heights neighborhood. As I drove down Vantage Pointe Drive looking for it, I began to wonder where the site could possibly be. I imagined at some point the neighborhood would end and the road would turn to dirt, but houses continued as far as I could see. Then, as I turned a corner into what I expected to be just more houses, I saw it. The road broke away and continued up a sizeable hill that did not allow vehicle access. The most surprising thing about its placement was how clearly out of place it was in the neighborhood, yet how easily I could have ignored it had I not been specifically looking for it. It was almost as if this area was just as much a part of the neighborhood as any of the houses. I parked my car and continued on foot up the hill, definitely not doing any sort of trespassing in the process. About halfway up, I found a water treatment center for the city kept secure by barbed wire. Nothing about that seemed out of the ordinary. It only made sense to keep that sort of facility free of trespassers. What did seem odd, however, was the higher level of security awarded to the seemingly empty area at the top of the hill. At least, it would be for those who do not know its history.

From my research on the subject, I knew that this site had once been manned by “one hundred military personnel...for twenty-four
hours a day from 1958 until 1971” and had housed a nuclear missile. Unfortunately, I was not able to investigate any further because the path was blocked by a cow. I was well aware that after this site was decommissioned, the military donated its land to local municipalities. What I was not aware of was that this land is now occupied by grazing cattle, one of which stopped my investigation in its tracks. Unfortunately, this meant I did not take any photos of the location in its present state like I had planned. However, I was able to capture quite a few photos of the former LA-32 site that I believe tells an equally compelling story.

LA-32: Chapman Education Center and Sports Park

After nearly nine years since my time spent at the Chapman Education Center during Bell Intermediate’s construction, I returned to the area with my newfound understanding of the historical context. Before we take a look at the current state of the location, it is important to understand what it used to be. Figure 2 shows the LA-32 site during its time as an active military base. At the top of the image, we can see Knott Avenue, now referred to as Knott Street, bordering the site to the west while Chapman Avenue borders the south end. Notice the funnel shaped figure that cuts across the site. At the narrow end, the northwest corner, is where the fire-control facility was located. This is where those responsible for potentially launching the nuclear missile would do so if necessary. At the wide end of the funnel, was the location of the launch area. This is where the actual missile was stored and prepared for launch. The funnel shape was an area intentionally devoid of any visual obstructions so those in the fire-control facility had a clear view of the launch site. However, I believe the most compelling aspect of this image can be found running along the bottom.

Figure 2: LA-32 during its time as an active military site
They have almost been entirely cropped from the picture, but you can clearly see houses making up a suburban neighborhood, an area that I am all too familiar with.

Now, I would like to offer a look at what this site looks like today, now that it has been repurposed as the Chapman Education Center and Sports Park. As shown in Figure 3, the two streets are Knott Street and Chapman Avenue, the same two shown in the previous photo. We can see the top left corner now holds sports facilities like tennis courts, a softball field, and a hockey rink. The education center and surrounding warehouses comprise much of the remaining space of the once active site. There is no trace of the fire control or launch facilities, although it appears the land itself has not forgotten. To this day, much of the fieldspace continues to have spots where grass seems to have great difficulty growing, likely due to the overuse of high-powered chemicals to kill obstructive vegetation.

When I returned to this location with everything I had learned in mind, I began to see things differently than I had in middle school. First off, I had never considered the fact that there is an elementary school, Patton Elementary, directly across the street,
as shown in Figure 4.\textsuperscript{14} Granted, the home of the shamelessly named Patton Patriots was not opened until 1980,\textsuperscript{15} but given LA-32 was decommissioned in 1974, the city wasted little time burying the history of the site. It also calls into questions the ethics of building a facility for children so close to an area that, until six years prior, had been the site of nuclear activity. This is especially concerning given this is not nearly enough time to properly assess whether or not this area would be safe for anyone, let alone children. However, morals clearly become skewed when constructing a nuclear launch site in such a residential setting in the first place. I was unfortunately unable to investigate within the borders of the facility since it was completely fenced off and plastered with “No Trespassing” and “Authorized Personnel Only” signs. This is more likely due to the fact that the site is used by the Garden Grove Facilities Department, as opposed to anything relating to its old role as a military site, but the high level of security is interesting, nonetheless. I cannot help but think of the similarities to the Rowland Heights site and its seemingly unnecessary security measures.

\textit{Unforeseen Consequences}

In 1961, a march in protest of nuclear weapons was organized in Los Angeles by a group referring to themselves as Women Strike for Peace. They carried signs demanding the ban of all atomic weapons and marched into city hall and the Federal Building with various petitions on the matter. The demonstration was sparked by the discovery of potentially lethal remnants of radioactive waste in milk from dairies in some western states. While initially blamed on Soviet nuclear testing, it was later discovered that the United States had actually been responsible for the subsequent thousands of cancer cases. A nuclear testing site in Nevada was found to be the main source of these cases, as it leaked nuclear waste into these communities through the air from 1951 to 1961.\textsuperscript{16} However, the truth of this event was not discovered until decades after the fact. We only know what actually happened now after decades of further research on the matter. I do not believe it is a stretch to assume those responsible for nuclear weapons had very little understanding of the long-term effects they may have had on surrounding communities. However, the
more pessimistic alternative is that they did know of the costs and chose to go through with it anyway.

This brings me back to my previous point about the ethicality of Project Nike’s suburban missile sites. Again, I question the morals of those who decided to place active nuclear sites mere blocks away from neighborhoods filled with families, filled with children. I question the morals of those who chose to place not just one, but six schools within a mile and a half of this site a mere six years after its decommission. Among these, four are elementary schools, the aforementioned Patton, Enders, Garden Park, and Barker (my elementary alma mater), while the other two are Bell Intermediate and Pacifica High School. All six of these schools are filled with hundreds of kids and teenagers whose lives are just beginning, yet the locations where they spend a majority of their childhood and adolescence sit on land that once neighbored a nuclear site. We have already discussed the way in which communities have been devastated by nearby nuclear facilities in the past, yet I have not seen any of this discourse regarding the Project Nike sites. Perhaps the lack of discussion has something to do with the increase in childhood and adolescent cancer rates since 1988. While I would like to do more research into whether there is any correlation between these nuclear suburbs and an increase in cancer rates, that is not the focus of this essay. Rather, by addressing these concerns, we can begin to discover the reason behind the apparent erasure of Project Nike from the minds of the public.

The Forgotten Legacy of Project Nike

Why is Project Nike so unknown among the general public? Why is it so difficult to find information on such a large-scale military endeavor? These questions inhabited my brain for weeks during my rigorous research process for this essay. I wanted to research the legacy these Nike missile sites had left in their communities, but I struggled to find any information that they ever existed in the first place. Various libraries referred me to the Garden Grove Historical Society, yet even they too had no information to provide. Frustrated, I began to question why the details I was searching for were near impossible to find. Then, I understood that by switching my focus from the legacy of these sites
to the suspicious lack thereof would yield the answer to these questions.

**The Role of Public Memory**

Public memory is a tricky concept. The history the public remembers is often very different from history in reality. Garden Grove is an especially interesting case when it comes to this due to its rather stagnant population.\(^{19}\) Anyone from Garden Grove, especially the predominantly white, middle class, west side, knows how uncommon it is to see families move out of the neighborhood. It is largely a community of content that families move to as their ultimate destination and often stay for generations. For this reason, many of the current residents have likely been there since LA-32 was still an active site. However, that once again begs the question: why does nobody seem to remember this? Given many of the current residents were likely children at the time, I believe it comes down to the ways public memory is preserved in the US.

When thinking of different ways the US prefers to preserve aspects of its history, one that immediately stands out is monuments. Monuments such as statues and plaques often document crucial people, places, or points in history. An arts group founded by Ken Lum and Paul Farber of the University of Pennsylvania known as Monument Lab has studied the importance of these monuments. They argue the main function of monuments is to “sustain a certain narrative of memory which people of influence have deemed...important to maintain.”\(^{20}\) The most important take away from this is the fact that those with influence, often those in power, decide what information is important enough to maintain. Or, in the case of Project Nike and LA-32, what information is important enough to erase. The US has never been a stranger to commemorating and even idolizing the less attractive parts of its history. The mere existence of confederate statues should make that painfully clear. So then why draw the line here? Why would the military repurpose these sites and not leave so much as a single commemorative landmark? Adding this to their swift deconstruction and burial of the old facilities shows a clear attempt to, quite literally, bury the history of these sites.
The unceremonious sendoff for the Nike missile sites was likely an attempt to control the public’s memory of them. As more research began to reveal the true consequences of exposure to nuclear waste, the existence of these sites threatened the public opinion of the nation. By removing all traces of nuclear activity and converting the areas into public spaces, the government and military had washed their hands clean of its decades-long nuclear stain. However, in doing so, they also rushed to place families and children on and around these locations without considering the potential consequences. In typical American fashion, the government rushed to cover their tracks and in the process, endangered dozens of unknowing communities. This is seemingly why no one in Garden Grove seems to have any knowledge about this. This is why even today, it is difficult to find information on it. Public memory of Project Nike has been lost because the government decided it had to be.

**Conclusion**

Project Nike was born as a direct result of Cold War paranoia. The constant, looming threat of nuclear war found its way into the back of every American’s mind. A nuclear culture quickly spread throughout the country, normalizing even the construction of nuclear missile sites in suburban neighborhoods. However, the potential danger these sites posed to the surrounding communities was never addressed. When they were decommissioned and repurposed for public spaces, the public memory of these locations seemed to be buried along with them. This was likely done to distance them from the nuclear activity they were originally built for and the long-term effects it may have had on the community. Today these sites sit where they always have, hiding in plain sight with new names and facilities, their history buried. However, for those who know their history, they serve as a reminder that lost remnants of our history hide among us and can be found if you know where to look. So apparently, there are nukes in my neighborhood. Now the question is, what else is?
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