The American Papers

2018-2019

Volume 37

ISSN 10598464

Professors Abnet and Kanosky would like to thank the editors for their hard work, camaraderie, and professionalism while preparing this edition of *The American Papers*. Their willingness to give freely of their time—even over summer break—to add to this institution is very much appreciated. They also would like to commend the authors for their exceptional papers and good-natured responses to the editorial process.

Thanks to editor Michael Gandara and American Studies Student Association representative Barbara Linan-Martinez for their assistance securing funding from the InterClub Council so that the journal could be printed. José Jaimes worked diligently on the layout, and Angie Linzaga deserves special recognition for her beautiful work on the layout and cover design of this issue. Thank you to the staff at PM Group for their work in printing the journal.

They also would like to recognize Matt Sylvester and Shreshta Aiyar for supervising the editing process. Finally, they especially would like to thank Michael Paramo and José Jaimes for serving as this volume's Editors in Chief. Their professionalism, hard work, kindness, and dedication to the success of *The American Papers* has been remarkable. Together these students' efforts made the production of the 2018-2019 issue possible.

In recognition of her contributions to the American Studies department, including founding this journal in 1979 as a graduate student, and spending several years as its faculty advisor, the 2018-2019 issue of *The American Papers* is dedicated to Professor Pamela Steinle, who retired in 2018.

Welcome to the 2018-2019 issue of *The American Papers*!

The American Papers is a testament to the many faculty mentors that have spent countless hours of their time to assist students at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) in their personal academic development and in making this journal what it is today. Our mission as writers and editors is to hold up the long-standing tradition of presenting the highest quality papers written by both undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in our American Studies courses over the current academic year.

As American Studies students and scholars, we strive to examine various aspects of American culture from an interdisciplinary perspective. This year's journal reflects this goal by traversing through the diverse classes that our department offers. At CSUF, the American Studies department has worked hard to develop courses that engage students in many avenues of study, such as fashion, literature, and the built environment. This year's journal features papers written for new and traditional courses focusing on gender, race, sexuality, popular culture, and more.

Each year, *The American Papers* publishes one exceptional paper chosen by a committee of our professors to honor Earl James Weaver, one of the founding professors of American Studies at CSUF. However, this year the journal is publishing last year's Weaver prize runner-up as well as this year's winner(s) to resync this practice and set a precedent for future issues of *The American Papers.* Bahar Tahamtani's paper *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* was last year's runner-up. Henrik Jaron Schneider's paper "Controlling Technology and the Female Body in *Jurassic World*" and Kai Lisoskie's paper "'A Regular Morgue:' American Soldiers, Death, and Dying on the Western Front" were both awarded the prize this year.

We hope that this year's journal will critically engage our readers in ways it has not before. Several of our essays explore relevant topics in American culture that are changing the discourse of earlier scholarship and adding new and exciting pathways to critical discussion and analysis. The Editors-in-Chief thank our contributors and our editorial staff for working together to create this year's issue. It has been a pleasure to work with our students and our consistently supportive faculty advisors, Professors Dustin Abnet and Alison Kanosky.

The Editors

Course Descriptions

AMST 350: Theory and Methods of American Studies
Provides an understanding and appreciation of methodology, theories of society, and images of humanity as they affect American Studies contributions to scholarship. Fulfills the university upper-division writing requirement for American Studies majors.

AMST 390: Disability and American Culture
Changing meaning, history and experience of disability in American culture through scholarly readings, memoir, film, photography and other cultural documents. Disability in relation to identity, stigma, discrimination, media representations, intersectionality, gender and sexuality, work, genetic testing, and design.

AMST 401T: American Suburban Culture
What is a suburb, why did America suburbanize, and what sorts of politics do suburbs encourage? This course investigates diverse cultural representations of suburbia in order to consider the cultural power of space, race, class, gender, and the built environment.

AMST 401T: American Culture Through Ethnography
In this interdisciplinary seminar students will conduct independent research on aspects of contemporary American culture using ethnographic research methods including interviews and participant-observation. A rare chance to not just read others' research but to actually do your own.

AMST 401T: Literature and American Culture
2018 Weaver Award Honorable Mention Course
Contemporary literature as a cultural document. The relationship between American culture and its recent fiction, focusing on several important novels and plays since the end of the Second World War.

AMST 401T: Race in American Culture
This seminar examines how racial difference is constructed in American culture. Readings offer perspectives on the racial meanings within cultural products and practices, the intersection of stereotypes and social experience, and the changing notions of race over time.

AMST 401T: War in American Culture
2019 Weaver Award Course
Focusing on four different wars in which colonial America or the United States was involved, the course examines how these conflicts both reflected and influenced American culture.

AMST 442: Television and American Culture
American television as an interactive form of cultural expression, both product and producer of cultural knowledge. Examines the structure and content of television genres, and social-historical context of television's development and use, audience response, habits and environments of viewing.

AMST 489: America 2.0: Electronic Culture and Community
Practices of electronic participation in American culture 1989-present. Advanced study (in historical context and engaging theoretical perspectives) of the revolutionary cultural impact of personal electronic communications devices, the internet, social media, and applications. Requires a primary research project and paper.

AMST 502: Themes in America: American Technocultures
2019 Weaver Award Course
Advanced analysis of the relationship between technology and culture in America from industrialization to the present. Explores how technologies have both shaped and been shaped by larger cultural ideas, institutions, values, and processes in America.

Table of Contents

2018 Weaver Prize

In the spring of 1993, the American Studies Student Association established the Earl James Weaver Graduate Paper Prize to honor the retirement of Earl James Weaver, Professor of American Studies, past Department Chair, and founder of the Department of American Studies at California State University, Fullerton. With an original endowment raised from the generous contributions of American Studies students and alumni, the Weaver Prize is an annual $250 cash award for the best paper written by an American Studies graduate student during the preceding year. Every spring, a panel of American Studies faculty reads submissions and selects the winning essay.

The 2018 Weaver Prize went to Clayton Finn for his essay "The Price of a Sexual Politics of Respectability: W.E.B. DuBois, Racial Uplift, and the Harlem Renaissance." In this original research project, Finn demonstrated the intimate connection between the development of an African American politics of respectability and a stringent heteronormativity. The Weaver Committee found the piece to be clearly written, rigorously researched, and impressively original, relying elaborately on the correspondence of W.E.B. DuBois as well as other primary material. The paper sensitively and convincingly explores the high price DuBois paid, a price that included personal anguish, for his pragmatic decision to favor convention over nonconformity. While never slighting the positive contributions that DuBois made to racial equality in the United States, the author astutely and valuably connects DuBois's ostracization of homosexual individuals to the broader legacy of respectability politics, a legacy that has continued even to our own times. *The American Papers* is happy to have published this piece in its 2018 edition as a regular submission.

The Weaver Committee would also like to honor a second paper, Bahar Tahamtani's "*Looking for Mr. Goodbar*: Reading a Cautionary Tale in Historical Context." The committee reported that they found that this well-researched and articulate paper paid elaborate attention to a 1975 novel and its critical audience, placing both squarely in the broad context of American culture during the 1970s, a time of substantial cultural shifts for American women and, for some persons, widespread anxiety regarding those shifts. The committee was particularly impressed with the author's movement between scholarly secondary source material and their close reading of the text. The committee and the editorial staff of *The American Papers* believe this paper to be an excellent model of how to read creative expression as cultural documentation, and thus deserves publication in this edition.

2018 Weaver Prize Honorable Mention

Looking for Mr. Goodbar: Reading a Cautionary Tale in Historical Context

Bahar Tahamtani

AMST 401T: Literature and Culture

During the peak of the sexual revolution (and the cusp of the backlash), Judith Rossner wrote *Looking for Mr Goodbar* (1975), a novel that chronicles a young New York City woman's search for sexual gratification through single bars, but on a deeper level the story concerns the dangerous consequences of her refusal to follow her prescribed gender role. Through a historically grounded close-reading, this paper examines the role of *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* as a cautionary tale that warned single white women in the city not to deviate from conventional standards of gender, sexuality, and power.

On the evening of January 1, 1973, Roseann Quinn, a twenty-eight year old Manhattan elementary school teacher, left her apartment and walked across the street to H.M. Tweed's, a local cellar bar she frequently visited named after the notoriously corrupt William "Boss" Tweed. Quinn, who walked with a limp as a result of contracting polio as a child, met John Wayne Wilson, a twenty-three year old drifter from Indiana, and a friend of Wilson's at the bar.[1] As the evening progressed, his friend left to go home and Quinn invited Wilson over to her apartment. At 2 a.m. that morning, the two were seen leaving the bar together. It would be the last time anybody would see Quinn alive.[2] When she failed to show up for work the following two days, one of her colleagues drove to her apartment and was let in by the building's manager. When they opened the door they discovered Quinn's nude body sprawled on the sofa bed and covered in blood. A sculpture bust had been placed over her beaten face. A medical examiner later reported that she had eighteen stab wounds in her abdomen, and found that she had had sexual relations within twenty-four hours of her death, though according to the examiner there were no external or internal signs of rape.[3] Tipped off by Wilson's friend from the bar who recognized the composite sketch that had been released, authorities arrested Wilson while he was sleeping at his younger brother's apartment in Indianapolis eight days later. Before he could stand trial, however, Wilson committed suicide in his jail cell by hanging himself with a bed sheet tied to a fixture above the cell-door bars.[4]

Much of the discourse surrounding Quinn's murder in 1973 centered on her private life, specifically her sexual relations, and quickly transformed into a cautionary tale about single white women living in the city and engaging in casual sex. Newspapers pointed out that Wilson was not the first man Quinn had brought home. "She had no regular boyfriend," one neighbor remarked in a *New York Times* interview, "but she was the type of girl who would have a guy in if he brought her home."[5] Captain John J. McMahon,

commanding officer of the Fourth Police District and supervisor for the investigation, emphasized "the girl's life-style" as the focus of the case.[6] He claimed that the key difference between the murders of women and men were the sexual overtones, noting, "The deaths were violent and brutal…the women were usually left nude." He also pointed to the city as a significant factor in the deaths; "The city is dangerous. You don't know what it offers exactly."[7] Another article titled, "Single Women Against a Dangerous City," stressed the emotional and physical vulnerability of single women like Quinn coping in the "Naked City," and suggested various precautions they could employ to protect themselves, including learning karate, carrying a weapon, avoiding the subway when alone, or living with a roommate.[8] In less than a week, tabloids transformed Quinn's murder into a warning about single white urban women engaging in casual sex with strangers, and more broadly, came to represent the sinister side of the city's 1970s sexual revolution.

Writer Judith Rossner had already published two books by the time she came across the story about Quinn's murder. Quinn's death was one of "a grisly rash of singles murders" that motivated Rossner to write about the subject.[9] But when an article she wrote for a women's issue of *Esquire* was rejected because of an ongoing investigation, Rossner decided to fictionalize the story in the form of a novel instead. She published *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* in 1975, and sold 173,000 copies in its first year. The mass-market paperback edition would go on to sell over three million copies the following year.[10] And just two years after its publication, the novel was adapted into a film directed by Richard Brooks and starring Diane Keaton and Richard Gere. *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* was released at the peak of the sexual revolution (and the cusp of the backlash) during a time when the movement was questioning social norms regarding marriage, sex, and reproduction. The novel chronicles a young woman's search in singles bars for sexual gratification, but on a deeper level the story concerns the dangerous consequences for her refusal to follow her prescribed gender role. Through a tight, historically grounded close-reading, this paper examines the role of *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* as a cautionary tale explores the dangerous consequences of deviating from conventional standards of gender, sexuality, and power.

Set in Manhattan during the 1960s and based loosely on the life of Quinn, *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* tells the story of Theresa Dunn, a woman who rejects notions of romantic love and devotion in favor of casual one-night stands. The novel broadly depicts a society shaped by the sexual and gender liberation ideas of the late 1960s that carried over into the movements of second-wave white feminists in the 1970s. During this time, women's consciousness-raising groups were probing issues like women's rights, female sexual desire, and what Anne Koedt referred to in her 1968 essay as "the myth of the vaginal orgasm." There were also some notable gains by women. In 1972, Helen Ready won a Grammy for her feminist anthem, "I am Woman," and Yoko Ono's song "Sister, O Sister" called on women in positions of power to aide other oppressed women. Title IX, a comprehensive federal statute banning sex discrimination in education, was added to the Education Amendments of 1972. In 1973, Billie Jean King defeated Bobby Riggs in a "Battle of the Sexes" tennis match that was aired on national television. That same year, the United States Supreme Court ruled in *Roe v. Wade* that the right to privacy included a woman's choice to have an abortion. Subjects that were once considered taboo such as orgasm, oral and anal sex, homosexuality and swinging relationships spread through the mainstream media, with

risqué films such as *Last Tango in Paris*, *Deep Throat*, and *The Last House on the Left* debuting in 1972. From a scientific and political perspective there was more focus on the vagina in the examination of the relationship between sex and power, seen in such texts as Shulamith Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex* (1970), Ellen Frankfort's *Vaginal Politics* (1973), Phyllis Chesler's *Women and Madness* (1972), and Susan Brownmiller's *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape* (1975). There was also an increase in feminist-oriented literature that focused on women's experiences with personal and social oppression within the dominant patriarchy, including Muriel Spark's *The Driver's Seat* (1970), Alix Kates *Shulman's Memoirs of an Ex-Prom Queen* (1972), Erica Jong's Fear of Flying (1973), and Marge Piercy's *Small Changes* (1973).

In her book, *Feminism and Its Fictions: The Conciousness-Raising Novel and the Women's Liberation Movement* (1998), Lisa Maria Hogeland, associate professor of English at the University of Cincinnati, examines the relationship between the writings of the women's liberation movement and novels by individual female authors in shaping public attitudes regarding sexual self-determination. Hogeland argues that the era's "consciousness-raising" novels such as Jong's *Fear of Flying* (1973), Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* (1976), and Marilyn French's *The Women's Room* (1977), were important in circulating feminist ideas and influencing political change. Studying such works alongside the Women's Liberation movement, Hogeland claims, can reveal a great deal about the fears and anxieties that were present within the movement. In her essay, "Sexuality in the Consciousness-Raising Novel of the 1970s," she makes the case that feminist fiction contributed to reconstructions of sexuality, and that while the authors did not all agree on what constituted freedom, their narratives offered insights into what they agreed it was not.[11] Along similar lines, Elaine Showalter examines the increasing concern with rape as a national problem in women's novels during the 1970s in her essay, "Rethinking the Seventies: Women Writers and Violence." Showalter, a former professor of English at Princeton University, focuses her analysis on Spark's *The Driver's Seat*, Rossner's *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, Gail Godwin's *The Odd Woman*, and Lois Gould's *A Sea Change*, to trace the shift from 1950s and 1960s novels in which the protagonist typically experienced a mental breakdown or committed suicide to one in which they ended up being raped or murdered or both. She argues that while violence (both physical and sexual) is not new to American culture, its incorporation in women's novels is emblematic of the sense of panic and uncertainty women were feeling during the 1970s.[12] Historian Jane Gerhard explores the relationship between depictions of sex and writings from the women's liberation movement in her book, *Desiring Revolution: Second-Wave Feminism and the Rewriting of American Sexual Thought, 1920 to 1982* (2001). Focusing on the treatment of sex in feminist fiction, Gerhard draws from novels by Alix Kate Shulman, Margaret Atwood, Rita Mae Brown, and Marilyn French to examine the ways in which such writings explored themes of autonomy, gender, sex, and freedom, as well as how middle-class feminists came to see sexuality as the cause of women's oppression and their liberation.[13]

Centering her work on oppressive representations of women in in literature, Laura Tanner, professor of English at Boston College, examines the transformation of real forms of violence into fictional violence in her book, *Intimate Violence: Reading Rape and Torture in Twentieth-Century Fiction* (1994). Exploring the consequences of violent representations on the reader, Tanner argues that the use of rape and torture in works of fiction inflicts a

form of "intimate violence," and risks detaching the reader and preventing them from confronting the reality that they may themselves be violated. In Lynn Higgins and Brenda Silver's book, *Rape and Representation*, they offer a collection of essays that shed light on the role of literature in reinforcing social standards of sexuality, desire, and power. They hold that representations (legal, literary, or political) have the power to socialize both men and women into thinking about rape as natural or inevitable, and that this process influences the way in which the nation more broadly conceptualizes notions of gender, sex, and identity. In her book, *Reading Rape: The Rhetoric of Sexual Violence in American Literature,1790-1990*, Sabine Sielke, an English professor at the University of Bonn, claims that the use of sexual violence in literature is often symptomatic of broader issues regarding power, race, and identity. Drawing from Gould's *A Sea Change*, Rossner's *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, and Jong's *Fear of Flying*, Sielke's examination of rape rhetoric in white women's novels sheds light on the preoccupation with sexual violence. Tanya Horeck's book, *Public Rape: Representations of Violation in Fiction and Film*, analyzes the depiction of rape and the ways it informs reality. Horeck, a professor of English and Media Studies at Anglia Ruskin University, draws from theories of fantasy to reveal how such conceptions structure the political dynamics between groups. She examines the use of rape in feminist fiction and the ways it can blur the line between fact and fantasy to argue that such rhetoric can perpetuate racism and misogyny. Pamela Barnett, a professor of English at Trinity Washington University, centers her study on the function of rape in American culture in her book, *Dangerous Desire: Sexual Freedom and Sexual Violence since the Sixties.* Drawing from works such as French's *The Women's Room*, Alice Walker's *Meridian*, and Gloria Naylor's *The Women of Brewster Place*, Barnett argues that rape is relevant to contemporary thoughts because it can shape the literary fantasies of sexual violation as well as broader public discourse revolving around sex and power.

Like the tabloids before her, Rossner reconstructs the murder of a single apparently liberated white woman engaging in casual sex as a dangerous and inevitable consequence of her actions and, more broadly, the sexual revolution. The novel deserves attention because its themes of gender, identity, sexuality, and violence offer a glimpse into some of the fears and anxieties revolving around women's liberation and sexual freedom during the 1970s. Rossner's depiction of female sexual desire as well as violence against women within the novel can reveal a lot about the culture's broader fears and concerns regarding sexual self-liberation. Her representation of a society of sexual variation remains important as issues of sexuality, women's rights, and violence against women continue to influence public attitudes and conceptions.

Looking for Mr. Goodbar begins at the end of the story with a fictional report on Gary Cooper White, a drifter who has been arrested in Cleveland, Ohio for the murder of Theresa Dunn. As author-narrator, Rossner's writing style is journalistic in its dry and linear reconstruction of the facts. She provides some background information on Gary and claims that she has done her best to stay true to the transcript of the police interrogation tapes. Although he is eager to confess, Gary views himself as the victim in the case, pushed to the breaking point by a callous and ungrateful woman who would not allow him to sleep in her apartment. Gary says he was in New York City looking for work to provide for his pregnant sixteen-year old wife in Florida. An arrest warrant for armed robbery prevented him from working there, so

he hitchhiked to the city where he met a gay stranger named George who offered him lodging in exchange for sex. On the night of question, he stopped at a local bar called Goodbar's where he met Theresa, and later accepted an invitation for sex at her place. Afterwards, Gary claims he was trying to get some sleep when Theresa woke him up and told him to leave. Suddenly disgusted by her callousness in shoving him out "like a piece of shit," White brutally rapes and kills her.[14]

Rossner spends only twelve pages on White and devotes the remaining two hundred and sixty pages of the novel to detailing the story of Theresa Dunn (whom the reader now knows to be dead) and makes her the primary agent in her own demise. Born to an Irish-Catholic family, Theresa is a troubled young woman whose repressed childhood trauma has manifested itself in a split in her personality that results in her leading two lives. During the day, she is a compassionate and dedicated school teacher, but at night she spends her time perusing singles bars looking for men to pick up for sex at her apartment. When she was a child, Theresa's older brother died in a training-camp gun accident that dealt a "staggering blow" to her family.[15] In state of profound depression, Theresa's parents failed to notice that her spine had been curving over the years as a result of contracting polio (like Quinn). Theresa feels a deep sense of neglect as well as inferiority to her brother.

After spending a year in a full body cast to recover from surgery to correct her spine, Theresa is left with a limp and a scar that lead to deep feelings of self-loathing, physical imperfection, and social awkwardness. This leads to a divide in her mind that is foreshadowed in her two sisters, Katherine and Brigid. Katherine is the beautiful older sister that Theresa envies, and who leads a promiscuous life rife with abortions. Theresa's younger sister, Brigid, is a devout Catholic who is happily married and continuously gives birth to children. To Theresa, her sisters represent the two extremes of the conflicting desires as well as the indecision she feels regarding how she should lead her life.

Theresa is afraid of domesticity because she does not want to lead the same life as her mother or her sisters. However, she also hates her body and feels she is not deserving of being loved. Throughout the course of the novel, Theresa meets three men with whom she develops varying degrees of sexual and intimate relationships. She meets her first lover (and seducer) when she enrolls in an English class in college. Professor Martin Engle is an arrogant and lustful man who seems to take joy in humiliating his students. Married with children, Martin takes a liking to Theresa after reading her writing, but when he gives her a special assignment on the topic, "How I Lost My Virginity," his intentions become clear.[16] Theresa begins an affair with Martin and loses her virginity in what is described as a mix of extreme pain and pleasure. Theresa believes she is in love with Martin but when she expresses it to him he nonchalantly responds with, "Ah, yes. Love."[17] Their relationship comes to an end when he cruelly rejects her at the end of the school year, telling her that she will be a memorable student assistant that he once had but nothing more. Martin's callous disregard for Theresa's feelings causes her to become depressed and more withdrawn. From this point on her choices of men worsen as she despises herself more and also feels more need to despise them.

The next major male character in Theresa's life is Tony Lopanto, an Italian macho-man who at best amuses her and at worst makes her fear for her life.[18] With a penchant for rough sex to the sounds of classic rock 'n'

roll, Tony visits Theresa on a semi regular basis for intercourse and usually belittles her by referring to her as a "cunt." At one point he tells her, "You're so dumb you're almost lovable."[19] Tony becomes increasingly possessive and abusive as his relationship with Theresa progresses (especially as she begins to date another man, James), culminating in a fight at his mother's house when Tony gets slapped by his mother's boyfriend and thrown out after Tony refers to Theresa and his own mother as "the two biggest cunts in the world."[20] Moments later when Theresa steps out to leave with Tony, he slaps her across the face and, after a half-hearted attempt at making love, he leaves for good.

James Morrissey, the third man to enter Theresa's life, is a young lawyer who is depicted as the more suitable man for her. Whereas Tony is portrayed as an insensitive brute, both erratic and violent, James is depicted as a kind and sensitive man who is attentive to Theresa's needs. The two men mirror the two halves of Theresa's personality. Tony appeals to her sexuality even though he increasingly treats her abusively, and James appeals to her "real" self even though Theresa does not feel he views her accurately since he wants to marry her despite her perceived imperfections. But when Tony calls Theresa one night, she and James get into an argument about commitment and casual sex, resulting in him leaving Theresa's apartment. All alone in her living room, Theresa recalls a consciousness-raising group she attended with her friend Evelyn in an effort to connect with other women experiencing the same problems.

In her essay, "Rethinking the Seventies," Elaine Showalter makes the case that Rossner included the section on consciousness-raising in order to place Theresa within a particular time period in the United States, but that Theresa is frightened by the little contact she has with the "nascent women's movement" because she does not want to confront her repressed rage and sexual guilt.[21] Here, I disagree with Showalter. In my reading of *Goodbar*, I believe that Theresa's reflection on the meeting is the moment when she begins to realize that she relates to these women and that she may very well need their support at this moment in her life. She becomes aware that there is a connection between each of them in their insecurities about various elements of their lives and bodies as well as in their drive to become more independent. In particular, Theresa recalls one woman who is self-conscious about an appendix scar much in the same way she is about the scar on her back from her childhood bout of polio.[22]

Unfortunately, this reflection is as far as Theresa gets in engaging with consciousness-raising groups. Theresa may very well have been intimidated by the consciousness-raising group, but she does not let her fear stop her from calling Evelyn the following morning to see about attending another meeting. Evelyn, however, tells Theresa she will have to wait until the following week. Theresa will be dead by then: she does not live long enough for the reader to know if she would have attended the following meeting. Although the potential impact of consciousness-raising groups on Theresa's life cannot be known, her exposure to other women willing to confront their repressed pain made her, if only for a brief moment, more open to confronting her own pain and sense of identity.

On the last night of her life James calls Theresa and gives her an ultimatum: casual sex with strangers or romantic love with a serious suitor. Theresa recognizes that she is more herself when she is with James than she is with anyone else.[23] But when it comes down to the concept of a "self," Theresa does not feel she has one single self, belonging to one single person.

Instead she views her life as made up of a number of selves. In addition to Theresa, "there was a Miss Dunn who taught a bunch of children who adored her…and there was someone called Terry who whored around bars when she couldn't sleep at night."[24] As she struggles to reconcile her possible selves, Theresa decides to begin a diary, but after writing her name and the date she experiences a moment of "paralysis" and does not know what to say. She literally cannot find her voice. In the midst of women speaking up at consciousness raising groups and protests, Rossner renders Theresa speechless. Instead of solidifying her voice on paper, Theresa puts the diary away and heads to Goodbar's where she meets Gary Cooper White, the man who will kill her in ten pages.

When they head back to her apartment Theresa becomes upset with Gary after he asks her about her limp, but not wanting to miss out on sex, she prods him by asking him if he is "queer" like his friend. When he angrily denies that he is gay she responds, "I think maybe you are. I think maybe if I feel like fucking tonight I should go back downstairs and find someone straight."[25] They then have sex, but Gary cannot ejaculate inside her and has to masturbate. Watching him as he does this, Theresa is revolted and no longer wants him in her bed. After he finishes she tells him to leave. When he asks why she responds, "it's one thing to fuck someone you don't know and another thing to look at him over coffee in the morning."[26] Gary refuses to leave until he gets some sleep, but when Theresa threatens to call the police and gets out of the bed he jumps out of the bed and drags her back, covering her mouth as she screams. He tries to suffocate her while simultaneously raping her, but when the pillow he is using to cover her face dislodges he grabs a nearby lamp and, just before he swings it at her head, Theresa's last thoughts are "*Help Mommy Daddy Dear God help me–do it do it do it and get it over w–*"

In his book, *The American Popular Novel after World War II*, David Willbern argues that Theresa's pleas for help at the novel's end intertwine with her desire for punishment, making the agents of her salvation those of her final judgment.[27] He points out that the last book Theresa takes with her to Goodbar's is Mario Puzo's *The Godfather*. The first section she reads relates the story of a father seeking revenge against the men who raped his daughter, while the second section focuses on a drunken husband's fantasy of murdering his "trampy wife." Willbern holds that the two excerpts reflect the conflicting halves of Theresa's personality. Her desire for anonymity and intimacy; independence and companionship; pleasure and pain. In her book, *The Politics of the Feminist Novel*, Judi Roller views Theresa's death as a suicide as much as a murder in that she has to kill her sexual side.[28] Jane Gerhard adds to this with her examination of the way white second-wave feminists placed sexuality at the center of women's oppression as well as their liberation.[29] For Theresa, her sexuality represents her fears and her desires as well as the demons she refuses to confront. Her story is arranged in such a way as to provide a trajectory for how she actively played a role in her own destruction. Although it was released during a time when women were actively playing a role in their own liberation, Rossner's novel was well received by the American public.

Looking for Mr. Goodbar was an immediate success upon its release, sitting at the top of *The New York Times Best Seller List* for almost forty weeks, with reviews suggesting that the best way to read it was in one gulp, "the way one eats the candy bar of the same name."[30] In addition to its entertaining and suspenseful read, the novel had wide-ranging appeal in its portrayal of

the sexual dilemma faced by many single Americans during the 1970s. Reviewers made it clear that they felt both Quinn's murder and Rossner's book said something sweeping about the way young people's sex lives had gone astray. Lore Dickstein, a reviewer for *Ms. Magazine*, wrote that the novel goes beyond reconstructing a murder to make for a "haunting, compelling thriller, guaranteed to make any woman terrified of the next strange man she meets."[31] In her review for *The New York Times,* Carol Eisen Rinzler praised Rossner for her "well-written and well-constructed" portrayal of one woman's "descent into hell." Rinzler refers to Theresa as another victim of the American dream, "a woman who never roused herself enough to wake up from the nightmare."[32] A review published in *Time* emphasized that Theresa's character is no "Little Ms. Victim," before continuing to sympathize with her killer. "He strikes her first because he is exhausted," the reviewer remarks, "He gave her a good time in bed."[33] Overall reviews praised Rossner for raising the question of how much control women have over own lives, with many of them agreeing that the novel sheds light on the exploitation and self-exploitation of the city's single scene in the 1970s.

Rossner sold the film rights to *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* for $250,000 and the paperback rights for an additional $305,000.[34] In 1977, the story was adapted into a film by director Richard Brooks. Although he follows Rossner's story line closely, Brooks's deviates heavily from her archetype in his portrayal of Theresa as primarily a victim of external forces in her life rather than internal forces deeper within her identity. In the novel, Theresa's murder is the result of her *reluctance* to embrace herself as well as conventional standards of gender and sexuality. In the film, however, Theresa's death is centered on her *refusal* to accept those standards.

Brooks' film adaptation follows the structure of the book but offers an interpretation of Rossner's story in which Theresa is punished not for her sexual encounters with strangers, but for her refusal to submit to the gendered roles she has been prescribed by society. A teacher by day and rover of singles bars at night, Theresa is portrayed in the film as troubled because of her childhood trauma and resulting body-image issues, but the film further emphasizes the void left from the love withheld by her father and all the other men in her life. Likening Brook's film to Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*, critic Charles Champlin argued Theresa is too innocent a character to feel betrayed but too guilty to feel abandoned.[35] But Brooks disagrees with this view, claiming that it is specifically her feelings of betrayal and abandonment at the hands of men that impact Theresa's life in such dark ways. Referring to her killer he remarks in an interview, "He is one part of a total man, beginning with her father and parish priest, each contributing to what became of her."[36] Throughout the movie, each of the male characters in Theresa's life attempt to dominate her and when their attempts fail they become physically violent. The first person to exert his rule over Theresa is her father, a man who refuses to accept a woman's freedom to decide for herself because of the threat it poses to the dominant patriarchy. When Theresa rejects James, her father becomes enraged and yells at her, "Freedom this, freedom that–free to leave your family…free to abort your own kids…free to go to hell."[37]

Both Tony and James attempt to dominate Theresa as well. Tony comes and goes at his leisure, but when Theresa becomes upset with his erratic schedules, he does not understand and tells her that she is "still his girl." Theresa replies that she is her "own girl," at which point Tony becomes enraged and remarks, "You and my mother–the two biggest cunts in the

world." Later in the film when Theresa refuses to allow him to stay over he becomes even more aggressive and threatens her. But a significant difference is in the scene during which Tony hits Theresa. In the novel, the fault is entirely Tony's, he is beaten and humiliated by his mother's boyfriend and when Theresa approaches him, he hits her. Rossner attended a screening of the film and to her, one of the biggest weaknesses in the adaptation was the portrayal of Theresa as the victim rather than bearing equal responsibility for the violence. When discussing the film Rossner replied, "she didn't do anything to provoke Tony. In the book they set each other off."[38]

Unlike the sweet and nurturing characterization of James in Rossner's novel, the depiction of James in Brooks' film is one that embodies hostility towards women. As the film progresses it becomes increasingly clear that James considers women to be demanding and impossible to please. At one point James tells Theresa about his mother ridiculing his sexually impotent father but when he later becomes upset with Theresa, he claims he made it all up. Throughout the film, James is depicted as attempting to dominate Theresa, and each time he is rejected he becomes more prone to violent behavior. When Theresa resists his marriage proposal James goes on a rampage and trashes her apartment. James cannot comprehend why Theresa rejects her "correct" place in society, and he displays his frustration through brutal hostility.

When asked how she felt about the film Rossner responded, "nauseated…I feel like the mother who delivered her 13-year-old daughter to the door of Roman Polanski and didn't know what was going to happen."[39] Overall the film divided critics and audiences, with some booing at the end of the first screening while movie-goers applauded at later showings.[40] Some reviews agreed that Diane Keaton gave a stellar performance as the seeker of Mr. Goodbar, while others complained that she created a problem by essentially being too smart and attractive. A *New York Times* article claimed that Brooks's "mistake" was in presenting Theresa as "splendidly beautiful, intelligent, and funny."[41] Complaining about the authenticity of Keaton's performance as a conflicted young woman, Charles Champlin of the *The Los Angeles Times* cited Keaton's physical beauty as the main reason why he was skeptical about the credibility of the character representation and found it "baffling just why–given motivations notwithstanding–she is making such a mess of the quest for pleasure."[42]

When translating the novel into a screenplay, Brooks noted that he struggled with the amount of eroticism he should include and wanted to avoid making a film that would be considered pornographic. "How do I show explicit and violent sexual encounters without being too explicit?" Brooks asked, "without making her look too kinky?"[43] To him, Theresa's sexual encounters and murder are more than just a product of her past trauma and desires. In addition to the influence of her family, Brooks wanted to show that the social environment under which Theresa lives plays a significant role in her demise: "She comes out of puberty into the sexual revolution and she feels her own sense of guilt and an unwillingness on the part of men to accept what is happening."[44]

In her book, T*hose Girls: Single Women in the Sixties and Seventies Popular Culture*, Katherine Lehman examines the concept of the "single girl" as a sexually conflicted and maladjusted cultural figure in popular novels and magazines, advice literature, films, and television shows. Lehman argues that such works as *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* both mock and humble their charac-

ters, "ultimately pairing them with paternalistic men…and [undermining] female sexual pleasure and career ambition."[45] However, she also points to popular works like Helen Gurley Brown's *Sex and the Single Girl* to demonstrate that there were other perspectives alongside the grim representations that presumed an active and fulfilling sex-life for single white women. In Brooks' portrayal, the underlying idea is that women who refuse to accept their allotted roles are viewed as a threat that must be eliminated. Brooks's film does not put as much focus on retracing Theresa's life as it does on exploring the tension between the sexual revolution and the dominant patriarchal authority.

The cautionary tale told through Rossner's *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* dramatizes the fears and anxieties of many Americans during the sexual revolution of the 1970s. By asserting her sexuality and attempting to gain autonomy, she sets limits on men's involvement with her, and she is ultimately punished for refusing to submit to dominant standards of gender, sex, and romance. Rossner was not the first writer to construct a tale warning single white women against the physical and emotional dangers of the city, nor was she the first to ground her text in female submission to male power. What makes this novel unique, however, is that the desires Theresa is attempting to fulfill involve both pleasure and punishment; self-value and self-contempt. More recent 21st century popular works of fiction such as *Fifty Shades of Grey*—and as well, the recent emergence of slang euphemisms like "slut-shaming"—make it clear that the relationship between depictions of pain and pleasure as well as sex and violence continue to shape public conceptions of and attitudes toward female desire and sexuality as well as understandings of rape and consent.

References

[1] "Teacher, 28, Slain in her Apartment on West 72nd Street," *The New York Times*, January 5, 1973.
[2] "Last People to See Quinn," *The New York Times,* January 6, 1973.
[3] "Slaying Suspect Returned to City," *The New York Times*, January 11, 1973.
[4] "Suspect in Killing of a Teacher on West Side Hangs Himself," *The New York Times*, May 6, 1973.
[5] "Teacher, 28, Slain in her Apartment on West 72nd Street."
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.
[8] "Single Women Against a Dangerous City," *The New York Times,* January 12, 1973.
[9] Judith Rossner Writes a Shocker About the Life and Death of a Swinging Single," *People Magazine*, June 23, 1975.
[10] Gwendolyn Kern, "Rossner, Judith: Looking for Mister Goodbar," *20th Century American Best-Sellers, University of Virginia*, http://bestsellers.lib.virginia.edu/submissions/211 <last accessed April 2, 2019>.
[11] Lisa Maria Hogeland, "Sexuality in the Consciousness-Raising Novel of the 1970s," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5, no. 4 (April 1995): 14.
[12] Elain Showalter, "Rethinking the Seventies: Women Writers and Violence," *The Antioch Review* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 170.
[13] Jane F. Gerhard, *Desiring Revolution: Second-wave Feminism and the Rewriting of American Sexual Thought, 1920 to 1982* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).
[14] Judith Rossner, *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975), 17.

[15] *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, 25.
[16] Ibid., 47.
[17] Ibid., 79.
[18] Ibid., 167.
[19] Ibid., 161.
[20] Ibid., 216.
[21] Showalter, "Rethinking the Seventies," 156-157.
[22] *Looking for Mr. Goodbar*, 261.
[23] Ibid., 216.
[24] Ibid., 142.
[25] Ibid., 282.
[26] Ibid., 283.
[27] David Willbern, *The American Popular Novel After World War II* (Jefferson: Macfarland, 2013), 71.
[28] Judi Roller, *The Politics of the Feminist Novel* (New York: Praeger, 1986), 86.
[29] Jane Gerhard, *Desiring Revolution: Second-wave Feminism and the Rewriting of American Sexual Thought, 1920-1982* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 143.
[30] Julia Cameron, "Candy from Strangers," *The Washington Post*, June 1, 1975.
[31] Lore Dickstein, "The Deadly Pickup," Ms. Magazine, June 1975, 86-7.
[32] Carol Eisen Rinzler, "The New York Times Book Review," *The New York Times*, June 8, 1975.
[33] Martha Duffy, "The Trap," *Time*, July 7 1975, 60.
[34] Beth Ann Krier, "Judith Rossner: Looking for Detachments," *The Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 1977.
[35] David, Ehrenstein, "Melodrama and the New Woman," *Film Comment ABI Collection*, September/October, 1978.
[36] Mary Murphy, "Movie Call Sheet: Brook's Research on 'Mr. Goodbar,'" *The Los Angeles Times,* April 26, 1976.
[37] *Looking for Mr. Goodbar,* directed by Richard Brooks (1977; Hollywood, CA: Paramount Pictures), DVD.
[38] Art Harris, "Rossner: Looking For Her 'Goodbar' in the Film," *The Washington Post*, October 21, 1977.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Charles Champlin, "Looking Again at Brooks' 'Mr. Goodbar,'" *The Los Angeles Times*, November 20, 1977.
[41] Vincent Canby, "Goodbar' Turns Sour," *The New York Times*, October 20, 1977.
[42] Charles Champlin, "Warm-blooded 'Mr. Goodbar,'" *The Los Angeles Times,* October 19, 1977.
[43] Murphy, "Movie Call Sheet: Brook's Research on 'Mr. Goodbar.'
[44] Ibid.
[45] Elizabeth Fraterrigo, "Single Girls and Working Women: Gender, Power, and Feminism in American," *Journal of Women's History* 27 (Fall 2015): 176-186.

Painting a New Picture: The Real Faces of Puerto Rican Women

Maria Priscilla Carcido

AMST 350: Theory and Methods of American Studies

The artwork and life story of Rafael Tufiño fell into my lap as the final paper in my Theories and Methods of American Studies class was being assigned. It seemed unfair to me that the story of Puerto Rican women was described by words such as "lazy" and "sex-crazed" when the pieces of Tufiño creates a wholly different narrative. I was excited to be able to discuss the real Puerto Rican women as seen by a true Puerto Rican and not American colonizers. It is imperative to remember that the images and stories created by the mass media are not always accurate. It is up to everyone to dig and discover the hidden narrative.

As the Jets and Sharks of *West Side Story* (1961) dance in a ball, Bernardo warns his sister Maria not to fall for the white American, claiming "[t]here's only one thing they want from a Puerto Rican girl."[1] In eleven words, Bernardo has summed up the American expectation of Puerto Rican women: only good for sex. This isn't an idea exclusive to the time *West Side Story* came out, but rather a consistently advertised representation of Puerto Rican women since the early 1900s. Puertoriqueñas were portrayed as oversexed, impoverished, and unable to control their sexual urges. This is the stigma Laura Briggs analyzes in her book, *Reproducing Empire,* throughout which she breaks down the laws and policies American imperialists imposed on the island in an attempt to control the hypersexual women.[2] Her evidence and examination produce authentic depictions of how these women were revealed to both American and Puerto Rican populations. One interesting aspect to her research is how little Puerto Ricans were able to defend themselves or change the narrative. Instead that work was done by an artist known as the Painter of the People. Rafael Tufiño quite literally paints a different picture seperate from the narrative that the neoconservatives mentioned in Brigg's suggests. Three specific art pieces help put forth a new narrative with which to analyze the American colonization of Puerto Rican woman. Tufiño's artwork challenges the images of the sex-crazed Puerto Rican woman and offers a contrasting context to the stigma-fueled initiatives created by American imperialists.

The culture of poverty surrounded Puerto Ricans in the middle of the 20th century and was rooted in the the idea that residents on the island refused to work hard and often asked for handouts from the United States government. This transformed them into exotic, tropical prostitutes with impoverished large families, and allowed American colonizers to defend their work on the island as the Puerto Rican women's reproductive and sexual problems "defined the difference that makes colonialism in Puerto Rico possible and necessary, what makes 'them' need 'our regulation and governance."[3]

American imperialists decided to control the Puerto Rican women with policies that would regulate their perceived sexual deviancy. Though prostitutes had always been required to have weekly medical check ups, the U.S. arrival on the island signaled a change in implementation. In an effort to protect the American soldiers from the venereal diseases, prostitutes were incarcerated and treated for their diseases; Briggs even writes that natives bought into the stigma as "[l]ocal officials obligingly cleared the jail of male prisoners to make way for women." She goes on to write that these early prostitution policies set the tone for later policies about sterilization, eugenics, and population control.[4]

From the prostitution policies in the early 1900s to the sterilization practices later that century, Americans worked incredibly hard to ensure that the sex-crazed Puerto Rican woman was controlled. She could not be a nuisance to American progress if she was a serialized number in a hospital book or was unable to populate the island with more hypersexual daughters. Most importantly, American colonizers worked to ensure the image that those on the mainland and island had of Puerto Ricans was as sick and in need of care. Briggs emphasizes that despite the heroic rhetoric that Americans used, it would be ignorant to assume that any colonization, or even anti-colonization efforts, were actually heroic. The policies, efforts, and laws placed worked hand-in-hand to say only one thing: "Puerto Rican women are victimized and need to be saved."[5]

Rafael Tufiño enters this narrative in an interesting way. According to a biography on *Galería Éxodo*, Tufiño was born in New York in 1922, moved to Puerto Rico as a young child, and grew up in La Perla in Old San Juan. The culture of poverty was alive and well in his childhood on the island which led feelings of guilt in the painter. Tufiño left the island in 1943 and returned in 1950 with his artistic skills refined. In 1973, his work was recognized as authentic representations of Puerto Rican nationality. On *Galería Éxodo*: "His canvases, prints, illustrations, drawings, poster express images of our land, environment, traditions and the figure of the common Puerto Rican worker that have been all too familiar to him since infancy."[6]

The years Tufiño spent on the island shaped a lot of his artistry. It is clear that the people and culture of the island are the muses of his work therefore making it the ideal subject to compare to Briggs' research. He provides "on-the-ground" accounts of what life was like in Puerto Rico during the same years American imperialists were incarcerating prostitutes and sterilizing women. When taken together, they paint a different picture of the Puertoriqueñas.

The first piece of work, and perhaps the most personal, is a painting titled "Goyita" (1957). The painting depicts a Puerto Rican woman looking off into the distance. Tufino reportedly used his mother, Dona Gregoria Figueroa, as the model for a black tobacco worker. The look of determination and grit in her face cannot be ignored. Her pursed lips and the wrinkle between her eyes are indicative of a woman who has worked her entire and has worried for every penny. The houses in the background could symbolize the village or neighborhood she lives in.[7] By painting them in the background, Tufiño could be insinuating a couple of things. First, that she has an entire village that she feels she has to fight for. It could also symbolize how her roots to her home and culture are a part of her; it is both literally and figuratively part of her background. The second painting is part of Tufiño's "El Café" (1954) series where he depicts Puerto Ricans working on

rural fields. This particular linocut has an interesting aspect: while the other paintings in the series feature adults out on the fields and farmlands, this one is of a woman at home grinding away at a crop. Tufiño gives the woman big and rather muscular arms; anyone looking at this piece would immediately think that she looked powerful and able. An interesting aspect to this piece is the child seen standing in the doorway. As this older woman grinds away, the child looks to be playing or goofing off.[8] The message is clear: the woman works hard so that the child can have an easy life. There is no desperate mother or disease-fallen woman, just a Puerto Rican doing what she can for those she loves.The final painting is also a linocut. Though no title was provided, it seems to be part of or at least inspired by the "El Café" series. A woman is carrying wood into her home and looking over to her shoulder at a man. Due to some careful shadowing by the artist, the woman looks pregnant. This woman is noticeably pregnant and still out on the fields doing farm work. She isn't at home wasting the day away, but remains an active and determined member of the family. As the man walks up empty-handed, it builds on the idea that women were not victims waiting to be saved.[9]

The three paintings all work together to create a very different picture of the Puerto Rican woman than those broadcasted by the American colonizers. After decades of being fed information about the women's sexual behavior, laziness, and diseased bodies, Tufiño's paintings offer a different story. The women he painted were meant to symbolize the strength and character of Puerto Rican woman. Nowhere in his work does he show any sex-crazed fiends. Rather, his artistry reveals strong women who are working hard to support their families. Moreover, Tufiño lived on the island during the time of prostitution policies and sterilization efforts; these were first-hand accounts of the culture of poverty. The paintings offer a better context with which to understand the lives of those on the island than any American account.

The idea that Puerto Rican women were hypersexual became such a ubiquitous concept in American culture that Bernardo, a Puerto Rican man who spent most of his life on the island, was aware of the stigma. *Reproducing Empire* explains and examines the many ways this occurred. Through a century filled with prostitution policies and sterilization efforts, American colonization on the island was a catalyst in this concept. Rafael Tufiño's artwork creates a stark contrast to those ideas. Though not every painting was of Puerto Rican woman, he does consistently show how hardworking the people were on the island. More importantly, he often depicts children around the women to symbolize that special mother and child connection. These women were working hard and making sacrifices that the American imperialists did not see or acknowledge.

Tufiño's artwork is reestablishes a story that centers on how Puerto Rican women battled the culture of poverty. Times were hard, and people struggled, but these women were not a victim of their circumstances. Or as many Americans would have you believe, a victim of their sexuality.

References

[1] *West Side Story*, directed by Jerome Robbins and Robert Wise (1961; USA: United Artists).

[2] Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

[3] Ibid., 4.
[4] Ibid., 51.
[5] Ibid., 144.
[6] Rafael Tufino, "Galería Éxodo," retrieved from http://www.galeriaexodo.com/artistas/rafael_tufino/rafael_tufino.html. The paintings discussed in this paper can be viewed on this website.
[7] Kris Pethick, "10 Famous Paintings from Puerto Rico," *Culture Trip.Com*, December 26, 2017. https://theculturetrip.com/caribbean/puerto-rico/articles/10-famous-paintings-from-puerto-rico.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

Misconceptions of Those Experiencing Homelessness

Destenee Thomas

AMST 350: Theory and Methods of American Studies

This essay was written for AMST 350 – Theories and Methods of American Studies. For the assignment, I was to play the role as an ethnographer looking at an aspect of American culture that I was unfamiliar with. I chose to write on staff at a local private non-profit homeless shelter. The essay is broken up into four sections: Section A describes the culture and setting of the shelter, section B describes who and what I observed, section C is an analysis of what I saw and what was said in the interviews, and in section D I reflected on my experiences as an ethnographer. This was my first time writing an ethnography. I was fascinated with the shelter and what the staff had to say.

Section A

In 2015, a two-year study was conducted by David A. Snow and Rachel E. Goldberg on homelessness in Orange County and its costs to the community. The study showed that of the 4,500 people who experienced homelessness, almost half were unsheltered on any given night.[1] Of the 252 homeless surveyed, they found that 68 percent had resided in Orange County for ten years or longer, which contradicts how some residents feel about the homeless. According to an article by the *Los Angeles Times*, when county supervisors proposed building shelters on county-owned land "residents arrived by the busload to protest the plans and denounce homeless people as 'strangers.'"[2] Although over half of these "strangers" have lived in Orange County for at least ten years, they are not viewed or treated as if they have. There are many stigmas and misconceptions surrounding the homeless, such as laziness or a choice to be homeless, but that is rarely the case.

Section B

Upon arriving at the homeless shelter, I was surprised at what I saw and I wasn't sure if I had reached my destination. The building was painted a light canary yellow, and there were multicolored seats along the white picket fence that was in the front of the house. I had always pictured a homeless shelter to be a large dull looking building with a warehouse-sized room that had numerous beds in rows and columns. Our House was nothing like that.[3] I was welcomed inside by Damon, an intern, who used a key code to get inside the house. The front room was so small the front desk could be reached within a few steps. There were unopened boxes of vacuums and other items everywhere. It looked like an organized mess, as if someone were moving in. Behind the front desk was a colorful quilt pinned to the wall. I sat in a chair off to the side while the intern unlocked and opened three other doors behind and to the sides of the front desk. The doors on the sides lead to large offices with two desks in each room. The door behind the desk led to two

long hallways: one facing south and the other west. The hallway facing south led into the other areas of the house, such as a large kitchen with two refrigerators.

The hallway facing west was decorated with a quote which read: "Your present circumstances don't determine where you can go; they merely determine where you start." Beneath the quote were images and success stories from the residents who once lived there. The shared offices on both sides of the front desk had colorful trinkets and flowers that lined the walls and shelves. The ink pens on the stand of the front desk had colorful fake flowers attached to them. There were hand-made colorful paper flowers glued onto a whiteboard which, like the hallway, was also adorned with a quote. It read, "Our Mission: Our House assists people experiencing homelessness to regain self-sufficiency." As I waited, I saw another staff member, Paul, fiddling with some wires in one of the shared offices. Damon introduced me to him and explained to me he is the shelter's I.T. specialist. As Damon sat at his desk, Paul explained to us that the internet might be down. He had been replacing the routers before the shelter opened. As other staff members arrived, they said hello and made themselves a cup of coffee in the front room. Once they had settled in Paul asked them to test their computers to see if the internet was working. It wasn't.

It was at that moment when Ann, the Outreach Coordinator, told me that the shelter operates on donations and volunteers only. If something breaks or the shelter needs maintenance, there is someone they can call to fix the problem. The issue is that sometimes those people aren't professionals and they don't always do the best job. Before she went back to her office, she expressed how grateful she and the rest of the staff are to have people like Paul. As the morning progressed, the workers became busier. Paul got the internet working, and the staff cheered from their offices. I could hear children laughing and women talking in the back. A woman with wet hair came into the front room from the back asking for cold medicine to take before she goes to work. Later on, another woman entered through the same door carrying a box and taking it to her car. Ann briefly spoke with her about her new job and how she feels about her position. Ann expressed how happy she was for the woman as their conversation ended.

Section C

As I was observing Ann, she made a phone call to share the news that the shelter almost reached its goal of raising $10,000 over the weekend. While she was on the phone, another phone rang. I could hear Damon answer and then within a few seconds, the phone rang again and Paul answered. Damon and Paul were asking for background information on two different potential residents but their questions were the same. They logged the information into a file called a prescreen. Damon explained it as "a system that we use to figure out who's eligible to be in Our House." I asked what questions need to be asked to determine who is eligible and he said,

> First, I need to ask them things like their employment if they have any because we're a working program, so we require our adult residents to work a full-time job. So at least over 32 hours. If they don't have one when they first get admitted into our program, they have 30 days to find a job, a full-time job. Along with work questions, I also ask them questions

> along the lines of whether they've had any violent convictions before 'cause we don't take anybody who's had any violent convictions in the past because we have families living in the shelter, so it's just a safety precaution. We do also require that they have at least six months sobriety if they've had alcohol or substance abuse in the past. So I have to ask them about their past usage, when was the last time they drank or used, if they have a sobriety date, etc. And we also like to know where they slept the previous night, just so we know if they were in a car. Some people aren't even homeless yet. Some may be in danger of being evicted. So we'll ask them where they are staying. Some of them are staying in their apartment that they're about to get kicked out of or at a family friend's place, or sometimes we get calls of people that are just on the street or shelters.[4]

It wasn't until I asked Damon if he knows if other shelters used the same type of prescreen that I learned that Our House is not an emergency shelter. It is a transitional shelter. The staff thinks of it as a homeless intervention shelter. They help the residents find jobs and give them four months to get back on their feet. Most emergency shelters will let anyone in except felons and sex offenders. Our House is completely different. Unlike most shelters, Our House is a private non-profit completely run on donations only. As I interviewed Ann, she explained,

> Being a non-profit, a private non-profit, is tough. We're definitely the little fish out here, but the great thing about being private is that we also kind of can… we work with our own policies. You know what I mean? So a lot of programs, for example, are getting grades from the county and so they have to do things a certain way, you know? They have to work with a specific clientele. Us being private we can kind of pick and choose a little more freely. Us being private, you know, we emphasize ourselves as being a working program which opens up a lot more options for our residents at the end of the four months. Rather than waiting for a low-income housing list for 500 years, you can be having your own income, and you know, you have a lot more options available to you when you have some money coming in, and you got savings. So I think that's also what kind of helps our success rate so much. Because we have over a 50% success rate, over half of the families that come in here will be going into their own housing at the end of their four months. Us being private and being able to have our own policies and procedures and being able sift through our clientele and choose off of our own prescreen system, which is something that our IT guy created. So this is a prescreen system that only we use. It's very tailored to exactly what kind of program we're trying to run. We don't have to take in only the people that the county says to take in because we're receiving money from them, 'cause we're not. So we get to work our own program. So that's kind of a positive about being a private non-profit.[5]

During the interview she emphasized that Our House is a private non-profit organization. The discourse she used to describe the shelter like "little fish" shows that there are not many shelters like them. The staff members are rebelling by not being part of the county's shelter system. Although they can make their own rules and determine who they allow into the shelter, they do not always receive enough funding. Unlike other shelters run by the county, Our House is run only on donations, whether it be in the form of time, skill, food, or goods. The weekend prior they had a donation party in which members from the community donated money or items to private non-profit shelters in the area, hence the boxes all over the place. Ann told me Our House and other private non-profits work with each other. They give each other donated items that they are unable to use that other private non-profit shelters may benefit from. During that donation party, Our House set a goal of raising $10,000, and they were only short $700. Ultimately, the shelter is doing what Marx would have wanted, become unaffiliated with modes of power, in this case, Orange County officials, and rebel.

The shelter has been successful without the county's input, which is a means of breaking the cycle of hegemony within homeless shelters. Hegemony is Gramsci's study of how a group of people in power are able to maintain that power without the use of violence. As Kate Crehan points out in her book, *Gramsci, Culture, and Anthropology*, "Gramsci's concern is to trace out both the power relations that maintain their subordination and the cracks and fissures that could potentially lead to their overcoming it."[6] Although Our House by definition is a shelter, they focus on making their residents feel at home, which is something that emergency shelters do not do. A woman makes welcome baskets for all of the kids before they arrive. Ann coordinates events like the annual birthday bash for all of the children residing at the shelter and a summer soccer program, where the high school across the street allows them to use their field. The environment is welcoming, cheerful, and motivational with its colorful décor, inspirational quotes, and success stories. Both Ann and Damon told me they love getting new residents and it is exciting to see them succeed and graduate from the program. Our House has a high success rate; it breaks the perception that all homeless are lazy. Although its success proves the community can help its homeless without the county policing how they do it; the shelter struggles in ways a county-run shelter would not. For example, Ann explained their issue with funding,

> We definitely just don't get enough funding. Which means we don't have enough resources which can, you know, minimize the amount of people that we can assist. So right now we don't have any funding for like, let's say like, bus passes or gas cards or... you know, we don't have transportation like a company van or something that we can take residents to and from work.[7]

Although the shelter is running well, they would be able to do more if they had the funding. I believe many shelters are not private and non-profit for fear of not having enough funding. Not every city in Orange County views their homeless residents as people, and there is a common perception that shelters are unsafe due to violent homeless individuals. In Elijah Anderson's book, *The Cosmopolitan Canopy,* he interviews Rusty, a man who was

once homeless, while visiting the park. In the interview, Rusty explained why homeless people do not want to go to shelters. He says he witnessed a man get strangled and people steal other's belongings.[8] If the shelters looked more like houses and the city's residents understood how they are run and who is allowed in, they may not feel so strongly against them. How the residents view their homeless parallels with how they treat them. When I asked Damon what are some reasons why people experience homelessness, he said,

> Well, some have told me over the phone that they've been fired in the past or they've quit their job because they had emotional problems, depression. Relationship problems is definitely a big one. There's been instances of abuse, issues with custody battles and with a lot of court cases they're using all their money for court, and they get evicted. So that's a lot of the reasons I've heard over the phone.[9]

I asked them both what are some misconceptions of homeless people they would like to correct. Damon said,

> Well I feel like a lot of people deem the homeless population to be very lazy, but I don't know, after talking to them, it's just they haven't been given the opportunity to show that they aren't. Whenever I talk to them on the phone, they're willing to do anything... they're out there trying to get jobs, it's just they don't have the right clothes or access to hygiene products, but they're trying so hard to get out of the situation they're in.[10]

Ann responded,

> There are a *million* misconceptions about those experiencing homelessness that I'd *love* to correct. Not all of those experiencing homelessness are addicts or have mental health issues. Also, not all are *not* working. There are many people who are still homeless that work every day. The cost of living is so expensive, especially here in Orange County. It's not hard to become homeless here. Another misconception is that people *want* to be homeless. Although there are a very selected few who have become accustomed to a transient lifestyle and want to spend the rest of their lives traveling, I think it'd be safe to say that everybody wants a home. I mean, who wouldn't want a bed to sleep in and a bathroom to use? ...privately. Who wouldn't want their own home? Everybody wants and *needs* a home, you know? However, the difference lies in their trust in our system. Many clients I've dealt with have completely lost hope in our system, you know, being on a waiting list for years and years and never getting a call back. I can understand why many do not believe that housing is possible. In that case, of course they would rather be homeless than to put all their efforts into something and still fail. People *wanting* to be homeless is probably the most far-fetched and irritating thing that I hear

from the general public.[11]

When I asked Ann if there was anything she'd like to share with me that she's noticed or learned she said, "The homeless are getting younger and younger. You would think that...you never know, but even some of the kids in your class... ten years from now you could be running into them on the streets. Anything is possible. I think we're all just a paycheck away from being right there."[12]

Section D

Before writing this ethnography, I had no idea there were different types of shelters. I only knew of emergency shelters. It had not occurred to me that shelters could be run without a county's influence. The staff at Our House are used to having students visit and conduct research for projects, which is great, but while I was observing them, some would explain what was happening or why they did what they did. Sometimes it was a problem because they were telling me things I had planned to ask during the interview. Other times it was beneficial because with that knowledge I was able to ask questions I would not have. Some questions I formed were derived from the experiences of those closest to me. For instance, a family friend of mine had almost experienced homelessness. His father lost his job and was unable to pay their rent on time. Although his father was able to get a part-time job, they were still going to be evicted. They stayed at a friend's place until his father was able to financially support the two of them. I have even taken in some of my friends who were temporarily homeless. In one instance my friend's roommates told her they did not want to live with her and within a few weeks, she needed to move out. She was unable to find an apartment within such short notice. She had nowhere else to go. On the other hand, there were questions I assumed I already knew the answers to, but as the interviews progressed, I realized I did not.

I was unaware that staff of other homeless shelters called the same line as those experiencing homelessness. When Ann called other non-profit shelters to share the good news of how much money they had raised over the weekend, she got the runaround. She mentioned that if it is frustrating for her, it must be frustrating for those experiencing homelessness. It is impossible to highlight homelessness without highlighting the misconceptions of what it means to be homeless. Instead of referring the residents at Our House as homeless people, Ann described them as people "experiencing homelessness." By shifting the discussion away from the individual and more towards the factors that contributed to their displacement, one has a better understanding that being homeless is something one can experience, thus experiences change and the stigma of being "homeless" should not be used to define those without a home. A simple shift in discourse shows that being homeless is something you can become, not something you are.

References

[1] David A. Snow and Rachel E Goldberg, *Homelessness in Orange County: The Costs to Our Community* (California: Jamboree, 2017), 5.

[2] The Times Editorial Board, "Orange County is making the same hapless mistakes in homelessness that L.A. did a decade ago," *Los Angeles Times*, April 10, 2018.

[3] Out of respect for privacy, and in line with ethnographic conventions, this essay

uses pseudonyms for the name of the homeless shelter as well as the workers' names.
[4] Damon (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 26, 2018.
[5] Ann (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 26, 2018.
[6] Kate Crehan, *Gramsci, Culture and Anthropology* (Berkeley: California: University of California Press, 2002), 98.
[7] Ann (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 26, 2018.
[8] Elijah Anderson, *The Cosmopolitan Canopy: Race and Civility in Everyday Life* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 2011), 131.
[9] Damon (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 26, 2018.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ann (pseudonym), interview with author, written notes, April 27, 2018.
[12] Ann (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 26, 2018.

Mad Max: Fury Road: Toxic Wastelands, Physical Disability and Strong Female Leads

Shreshta Aiyar

AMST 390: Disibility and American Culture

My paper focuses on the intersection of physical disability, environment, and gender in the film *Mad Max: Fury Road*. I wrote this film analysis for AMST 390: Disability in American Culture, which was taught by Professor Carrie Lane. In my paper, I discuss the importance of disability in the film as a normalcy caused by a toxic environment, as well as a crucial component of Imperator Furiosa's character. Before reading my paper, I would like readers to know the premise of the *Mad Max* canon: with a scarcity of water and other basic resources, gasoline becomes a fought-over commodity in a barren wasteland of a dystopia. I hope my paper well highlights physical disability as a core part of the film's characters and environment, and I hope readers gain a new perspective on the film that encourages them to closely analyze different forms of identity and setting.

George Miller's *Mad Max: Fury Road* takes place in a post-apocalyptic desert where natural resources are virtually non-existent, and water, gasoline, and bullets are valuable but scarce commodities.[1] The film mainly consists of cross-desert car chases, where the primary antagonist Immortan Joe sends scores of vehicles after Imperator Furiosa, a soldier who captures his five wives in an attempt to free them. In one scene, Immortan Joe introduces Furiosa as she leaves the Citadel to collect gasoline and bullets in her semi-truck. The audience sees Furiosa's metal arm for the first time, as well as the sickly state of the the Citadel's inhabitants, which is a product of the lack of clean air and water. This single scene introduces viewers not only to Furiosa, but also to the environment of the Citadel and the surrounding desert, both of which are crucial to understanding the subject of disability throughout the film. The setting and landscape create a societal living model where disability is the result of environmental damage, while Furiosa's character is a revolutionary representation of protagonists with disabilities, as her role challenges stereotypes surrounding gender and attitudes toward physical disability. Throughout *Mad Max: Fury Road*, disability is an overarching theme that is depicted as the result of poisonous environments and is central to Furiosa's identity and development.

Mad Max: Fury Road's environment showcases that the destitution, pollution, and toxicity of the desert environment do not provide access or safety for any civilians, and as a result, disability is a painful reminder of the destruction of a kinder, more sympathetic world. Life in the toxic, radioactive desert comes with exposure to health hazards that eventually develop into impairments and disabilities, and for the people in the Citadel, massive tumors, amputated bodies, respiratory issues, and severe birth defects are widespread and common. The environmental wasteland is home to destitute

populations where women are forced to pump breast milk to help men survive, while young boys are called "half-lives," as they are often not expected to reach adulthood due to their poor health.[2] In *A Disability History of the United States*, author Kim Nielsen writes, "when disability is understood as dependency, disability is posited in direct contrast to American ideals of independence and autonomy."[3] While central characters like Furiosa challenge stigmas surrounding disability, the masses living in the desert and the Citadel experience disability and impairment as products of their environment. Physical deformities are not impairments that can be changed with a different societal structure, but are rather the result of survival in a toxic wasteland. Disability in the film is not an illness that needs to be cured, but it is also not an imposition placed upon individuals by the Citadel. Rather, it is a banal reality that is collectively experienced by the masses as a result of a detrimental and hazardous environment.

Mad Max: Fury Road's main protagonist, Imperator Furiosa, challenges societal norms surrounding women and disability throughout the film, as she carries herself with a fierce independence that celebrates her metal arm while also acknowledging its limitations. Furiosa defies cinematic stereotypes placed on women with disabilities by both utilizing her metal arm as a weapon and an asset, and by removing it and still maintaining full independence. She relies on her metal arm to drive her semi-truck, and when her semi-truck is destroyed after she defeats Immortan Joe, she returns to the Citadel without her arm. Throughout the film, Furiosa never once displays her disability as a dependency. The film does not depict disability with sentimentality, and as a result, her metal arm is not used to gain sympathy from the audience. Furiosa is not a powerful female figure *because* she has a overcome the adversity of having a disability, but is rather a powerful female lead *with* a disability. Her grit, independence, and bravery force audiences to quickly move on from wondering why her arm is missing and into simply accepting that her disability is a part of her identity and contributes to her strengths. With her ferocity and individualism, she proves that such American values belong just as much to women and people with disabilities as they do to men and able-bodied persons. Furiosa's metal arm represents her work and servitude under Immortan Joe's regime, but what makes her powerful is that with and without her arm, she is still autonomous, strong, and disabled. Furiosa proves to audiences that women can be independent and fierce while also being vulnerable, that characters with disabilities are not inhibited by their differences, and that how they choose to experience their lives contributes to the creation of multi-faceted, complex characters.

An energetic, heart-racing film filled with thrills and adrenaline, *Mad Max: Fury Road* successfully proves that there is room for characters with disabilities in action movies. The film celebrates the intersections of womanhood, feminism, and disability, and provided the world with a phenomenal female protagonist who is complicated, vulnerable, tough-as guts, independent, and disabled.

References

[1] *Mad Max: Fury Road*, directed by George Miller (2015; USA: Amazon).
[2] Ibid.
[3] Kim Nielsen. A Disability History in the United States. Boston: Beacon Press, 2012.

Titan Dreamers Resource Center: The Experience of Titan Dreamers

Emily Ledezma

AMST 401T: American Culture Through Ethnography

This essay was written for AMST 401, American Culture through Ethnography in fall semester of 2017. Through the course it was explained that to conduct an ethnography, we had to go out, research, interview and observe which is what was all done for this essay. The location was California State University, Fullerton and to be more specific it was the Titan Dreamers Resource Center and the students within the center. Before one starts to read this essay, understand that as the author, I have the privilege of being a United States of America citizen by birth and benefit from everything that citizenship gives me. Part of the goal of ethnography is that through it one will come to understand and appreciate the diversity and complexity of human lives, which is the part that I truly want readers to take from this essay once the reading is concluded. During this political climate, it is important to give power to the voices that are trying to be silenced. I want readers to understand and appreciate the lives of the informants but also to the ones whose stories have not been shared.

On June 15, 2012, President Barack Obama announced an executive order known as DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as a result of Congress's failure to pass the DREAM Act.[1] This executive order provided temporary relief to undocumented migrant youth who met certain requirements that included proof of identity, that the person was 16 years or younger when they arrived in the United States and under 31 years of age on the day DACA was announced.[2] Proof regarding education included either being enrolled in school, completion of high school or proof of general education development (GED) certificate.[3] If the person requesting had served in the Coast Guard or Armed Forces, then proof of honorable discharge had to be given.[4] The individual also had to be cleared for no felony offenses or three and more misdemeanor offenses on their record.[5] The person requesting also had to be cleared that they did not pose a threat to national security or public safety.[6]

Nearly two years later, on April 23, 2014, California State University, Fullerton, made history by opening a center dedicated to undocumented youth, Titan Dreamers Resource Center, otherwise known as TDRC. Even though the DREAM Act was not passed and DACA was in place, the center used the term Dreamers, which is used to refer to undocumented youth. In this paper, "undocumented students and youth" is going to refer to those individuals who entered the United States without the legal documentation and those who had legal status but violated the terms and never left the coun-

try once the legal status ended. The center's mission statement states that the Titan Dreamers Resource Center is "designed to provide undocumented students with academic and emotional support, referrals to financial assistance, information on programs/services designed to improve retention/graduation rates, and a safe space where students can connect with one another."[7] The resources they offer include: workshops, programs, mentor support, cultural clubs and organizations as well as counseling and wellness support.

On Tuesday November 8, 2016, the presidential election concluded with Donald J. Trump as the elected Presidential candidate. President Trump offered a series of vague answers when questioned about DACA and its status under his new administration. On September 5, 2017, the Trump administration made the announcement that it was going to start phasing out the DACA program. Those under DACA would be able to keep both DACA and their work permit until their expiration date and those who had DACA and work permits expiring between September 5, 2017 and March 5, 2018 were allowed to submit a renewal request by October 5, 2017.

The announcement of the Trump administration regarding the DACA program and the need to tell stories of some of the Dreamers students inspired this project. This project focuses on the Dreamers of the Titan Dreamers Resource Center and Cal State Fullerton. As a person who comes from a privilege of being a United States born citizen and an undergrad student who benefits from financial aid, it is important to note that I have an outsider's perspective, and I respect the insight provided by the informants who agreed to partake in the project. For this project, the focus is entirely on the students rather than faculty and directors of the center because it is important to see what the actual students who are inside the center have to say, rather than just those who organize and are directly involved with the running of the center.

This study includes methods of ethnography involving interviews and observation. This study includes data gathered by three structured interviews with three informants, two females and one male, as well as observations based on the everyday interaction inside the center and during a program or workshop held at the center. A set of questions was created before meeting with the informants and all three interviews were recorded as well as transcribed. All three interviewees were asked the same five starting questions and then would differ depending on the path of the interview.

None of the three informants asked to end the interview early or requested to stop the interview process completely and not to be part of the project. Both Carol A. B. Warren and Tracy Xavia Karner describe analytic description as," the development of conceptual understanding of what (or how or why), research questions that your data answer," and that the first stage of the analysis is to "become intimately familiar with the data."[8] This relates to my work in the sense that I followed the data and concluded that this paper was not much about the location of Titan Dreamers Resource Center but about the Dreamers, their shared experiences and the political climate surrounding them. Informants will be referred to as BG, CG and EN to maintain privacy. BG and CG are both female undocumented students attending Cal State Fullerton and EN is a male undocumented student attending the university as well. The interview of BG was conducted on October 17, 2017 while the interviews of CG and EN took place on November 9, 2017. All interviews took place after the announcement from the Trump administration of ending the DACA program.

Titan Dreamers Resource Center

Walking into the Titan Dreamers Resource Center today is a different experience than walking in on April of 2014. In 2014, TDRC had different shades of blue and gray with the most colorful pieces being butterfly notes on the wall, a reminder of the grand opening. Now in October 2017, the first thing I notice walking in to the TDRC is an assault of colors across the room starting with the many different flyers with information surrounding the entrance. Spanish Latino music is playing, instantly recognizable artists such as Shakira, Sin Banderas and Reik to just name a few. The colors are also present up against a wall to the left but they are not flyers, it is art with a message. The butterflies decorate a portion of the left wall with messages like, "you matter!" "keep dreaming," "we are strong," and "you're worthy." In the center of the wall are hand painted frames with the image of graduation caps that include phrases such as: "Undocumented and Unafraid, Dream Big Reach High Titans, and Dream Big, Live Happily." These draw me in before even noticing that a student was in front of me asking me if I needed help or had any questions, and to welcome me to the TDRC.

I then sit on the first available seat which is a table by the office of the directors and coordinators of the center. On the table is a small inflatable rectangle that holds purple kinetic sand, something I had only seen in television advertisements. The table holds different flyers reminding individuals of game night and guest speakers along with a bowl of lollipops. Once seated, I finally notice the students that are actually inside the center. While some students have their laptops and headphones on, something is different from the opening days to now, in that people are speaking and interacting with each other. They laugh, joke and discuss their classes while some break into singing a favorite song that plays through the sound system. These students are interacting "unafraid," they are not silent, they speak, laugh, sing and even share their food with others.

Based on my three interviews, I recognized three main dialogues shared by the interviewees which surround education, the phrase "undocumented and unafraid", and that the fight for a clear DACA will continue. These are discussions that I can as well identify inside TDRC due to the center's work on showcasing higher education, empowerment through their identities and social justice topics that are at times shaped by the current political climate.

Education, Education, Education

While all three informants have different stories, all three prioritize higher education. For two of the informants, education was considered by their families as the key to success and a reason to move to the United States.

"I believe, the reason my parents wanted to come here (the United States) was for a better life and education opportunity for," explains BG when sharing her families reasons for leaving Michoacán, Mexico.[9]

For so many migrating to the United States, this nation is viewed as the land of opportunity and life here is seen as better than the one they experienced in their home country due to low wages, long work hours and little access to resources.[10] The early migration to the United States also means that some of the undocumented youth are not aware of their status here in the United States until high school when they are planning to apply to higher education institutions.[11]

"I, myself, didn't find out about my status until senior year of high school, which was a plot twist for me not being able to apply for free application for federal student aid, FASFA, or any other financial aid going into college," explains BG, "So from there that is when I got all my help and found out that I was considered an undocumented and understood how hard it was going to be for me to attend college."

BG began attending Cal State Fullerton, in fall of 2013 and was part of the Future Scholars, now known as the Abrego Future Scholars. This program awards incoming freshman with a scholarship as well academic counseling support. BG explains that this is the program that set her on the path to discover the Titan Dreamer Resource Center.

CG shares a similar prioritizing of higher education.[12] As she explains, her family is from Oaxaca, Mexico and it wasn't until she was going to turn five years old that her family finally made the decision to migrate to the United States in search of better educational opportunities for her older sisters and herself.

"My father told us 'I do not want the three of you to go through what I did. I started working at eight years and have not stopped since,'" shares CG. She explains that his own experiences in labor motivate his want for his daughters to have the best opportunities for better education.

Now CG states, "My middle sister is in her fifth year at Cal State Fullerton, my other sister attending Cal State Long Beach and I am a third year at Cal State Fullerton." While being students, the sisters are also working jobs to help pay bills and have had to extend their time at their respective institutions.

EN did not share much about his family but he shared that coming to the US was part of a summer vacation in which he never returned to Sinaloa, Mexico.[13] "I left Sinaloa little before I turned 15 years and I just did not leave [California]," he continues, "Honestly the main and pretty much the only reason I came and decided to stay was school. My education was and has been my priority." Due to the time frame of his arrival, EN did not qualify for DACA but is still able to attend Cal State Fullerton and study kinesiology.

As someone who was born to immigrant parents, education has been a discussion within my family. I acknowledge that my experience and reasons might not be similar to the experiences that the informants have gone through, but for a moment I felt like a could understand to a level their prioritization of education. My own reason for prioritizing higher education is to validate my own parents' sacrifices and struggles.

Undocumented and Unafraid

On May 17, 2010, a group of students known as the DREAM Act 5 organized a sit-in inside Senator McCain's office in Tucson, Arizona.[14] It was the first civil disobedience political strategy that was organized and acted on in support of the DREAM Act.[15] It was called, "Undocumented and Unafraid," which was based on publicly rejecting the societal invisibility, silencing, and criminalization of undocumented immigrants.[16]

While many rejected the social invisibility of silencing, others still saw silence as a need. For example, CG opened about her silencing during middle and high school and the harsh experiences she had to go through.

"As I mentioned, I was very close about my status I did not tell anyone. In middle school, I overheard one of my friends talking but I heard her,

'Oh yea these wetbacks, I do not know what they are doing here, why the f*** are they here, there is no reason why they should be here.'" CG continues on describing one of the events that further reminded her why she would not share her legal status with anyone she might have considered a friend, "When I heard that, it got to me, oh my god, I thought she was friend and I had not told her [about my status] and imagine if I had, what would she have had told me."

In this case, the need to be silent and invisible was supported when CG heard this in middle school said by someone she knew. Adolescence is already difficult for youth but for the undocumented youth, this can mean experiencing anxiety and depression at an early age.[17] CG expressed that she thought this individual was a friend and with a comment like that one she no longer knew who open up to because of fear of how that individual will react.

"The one person I really told [about my current status] was someone I knew for a while then. He knew my family and his sisters and cousins knew my sisters...so I told him and he [kept saying], 'no way.'" By this part of the interview CG has tears in her eyes as she remembers the first time she decided to trust someone and disclose her legal status in the United States.

"I told him I was not lying and he responded by saying, 'oh so now if you do something I can just call la migra, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, they will deport you right away." By the end of this sentence, CG has tears pooling in her eyes ready to fall down her face.

"I hated it. I hated it so much. I did not tell people...I trusted him and he tells me 'I will deport you,' He does not know what I have lived through. I told him, [someone] who was my friend and he reacted that way, how would others react [crying]."

CG learned about the TDRC through freshman orientation day and finally let go of fear and entered the center after multiple tries. She began as a regular student exploring a space designed for studying and continued attending until she volunteered and moved up in her involvement. She expresses that she has learned to be more open about her status and credits it to the space the TDRC has created for her and other Dreamers. She explains that she feels a bit more comfortable using the phrase "undocumented and unafraid," but still experiences the initial fear about opening up to people at times. Due to her personal experiences, it is understandable that she might experience fear while still feeling comfortable claiming the phrase and identity.

BG shared that her first experience at the TDRC was not what she expected. She did not feel welcomed or comfortable to keep attending the center after just a few visits. When reflecting on her first experience, BG shares:

> The first couple of days, it was good but then later it felt like everyone has their own cliques and I didn't feel comfortable going in. I felt like I didn't belong there even though the center is there for us to connect but I felt like the people there already had their own groups and it was no longer possible to talk and connect with them about the experiences that most of us go through.

When asked to clarify on "their own groups," she explains that students were grouped together and already speaking, giving a vibe she describes

as uncomfortable and unwelcoming. It left a bad impression but she does explain that although her experience was not the best, it led to her discovery of another Latino based club on campus in which she learned to embrace her identity and describe herself as undocumented and unafraid.

"I'm more comfortable claiming the identity of being undocumented and unafraid. I'm a business major, and when claiming my identity in the field it empowers me," says BG.

Both Chiseri-Strater and Sunstein state on FieldWorking: reading and writing research, "we enter their perspective by partly stepping out of our own," and this is the section in which I stepped out of my own perspective and stepped inside of the informants.[18] Having never experienced the anxiety of announcing my legal status and the fear of deportation, it was important to step out of my perspective and into theirs to understand both informants' experiences.

The Fight Continues

After the Trump administration announcement that the DACA program would be phased out, the reactions of Dreamers, allies and those who oppose the DACA program were heard nationwide. BG explained that while she tried to stay hopeful she was well aware that this administration could mean the end of DACA. "With the news that just came out, it was a little [scary]. I did cry because it felt so realistic, it was just like, it's actually going to happen. Right now it is a very sensitive topic but I am trying to stay positive," she explains her initial reactions to the news.

BG explains while she was trying to stay hopeful about the Trump administration, her focus then became to figure out what she can achieve within a year that she still has her DACA request valid. For many it was not easy hearing that the DACA program would begin to be phased out. CG also reflects on that morning and shares that she was on her way to campus when the news was announced.

"I remember sitting in the car and it was done...I was just so shocked thinking so what now? I broke down. I questioned why should I go to class when DACA is done. What was the point of going to school…I could not hold it and I was in class crying," reflects CG. She adds that while it might seem like everything regarding DACA and the Trump administration is against them, undocumented students, the one thing they cannot take away is knowledge and the want to gain knowledge. She explains, "[Trump administration] can take away DACA, but the knowledge we have gained, that is something that cannot be taken away. They can try to stop all of us, but they will not because instead it is just uniting us."

EN explains that many Dreamers consider the US their homeland, it is where they grew up and learned the language and it does not make sense to him how for some it is easy to deny them the opportunity to stay.

"DACA is done, it is over and what is important is finding a solution whether that is the Clean Dream Act or another reform that allows relief to the many undocumented," he explains on how the fight for a solution is never over. For Dreamers, joining this fight is intertwined in knowing and embracing their own identity and not feeling alone. It is about rejecting the invisibility and silence within the community and, especially in times of crisis, guiding those that are still silent and uncertain.

Conclusion

At first, I believed this project would center on the theme of the American Dream and later that it would be about the TDRC as a location of services. Instead, my research became about the stories and experiences of Cal State Fullerton Dreamers, the undocumented youth that prioritize higher education, who find their identities through locations like the TDRC, and for whom the fight is not over. In *The Ethnography of Everyday Life*, Caughey argues that "fieldwork often involves a powerfully affecting and self-transforming experience."[19] This became true in my experience with fieldwork. I met individuals that shared with me intimate experiences of life that I will never truly understand or experience. I don't believe I will ever know the fear and anxiety of deportation but I can understand their own personal fear and anxiety. As CG told me, "you can use your status and privilege to share the stories and experiences of us," and that is probably the self-transforming experience that Caughey meant. Through interviews and observations, I was able understand the importance that a center dedicated to Dreamers has on the undocumented community. That it is also important to share the platform of privilege, citizenship, as well research and ethnographies to give a voice to the Dreamers and undocumented community. I did not expect this conclusion because I had already identified as a supported for the Dreamers and a Dream Act but never had I been told by a member of the community to give a voice to them through my work. By the time this essay publishes, the Titan Dreamer center has changed location to Pollak Library South 180 in the Diversity Initiatives and Resource Centers and has also changed coordinators but what has not changed is their mission and offering resources.

References

[1] Fiflis, C. (2013). Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. *GPSolo,30*(5), 28-32. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.lib-proxy.fullerton.edu/stable/23630741.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] "Welcome to the Titan Dreamers Resource Center!" Titan Dreamers Resource Center- Home.
Accessed November 9, 2017. http://www.fullerton.edu/tdrc/.
[8] Carol Warren and Tracy X. Karner, *Discovering Qualitative Methods: Field Research, Interviews, and Analysis* (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 2005).
[9] BG, interview by Emily Ledezma, audio recording, Pollak Library, October 17, 2017.
[10] Joseph, Tiffany D. "My life was filled with constant anxiety:" Anti-immigrant discrimination, undocumented status, and their mental health implications for Brazilian immigrants." *Race and Social Problems* 3, no. 3 (2011): 170.
[11] Ibid.
[12] CG, interview by Emily Ledezma, audio recording, Pollak Library, November 10, 2017.
[13] EN, interview by Emily Ledezma, audio recording, Pollak Library, Novemer 10, 2017.

[14] René Galindo, "Undocumented & unafraid: The DREAM Act 5 and the public disclosure of undocumented status as a political act," *The Urban Review* 44, no. 5 (2012): 589-611.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Joseph, Tiffany D. ""My life was filled with constant anxiety": Anti-immigrant discrimination, undocumented status, and their mental health implications for Brazilian immigrants," *Race and Social Problems* 3, no.3 (2011): 170-181.
[18] Stone, Sunstein Bonnie, and Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater. "Fieldworking: Reading and Writing Research." (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2007).
[19] John L. Caughey, "The ethnography of everyday life: Theories and methods for American culture studies," *American Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (1982): 222-243.

A Silent Protest: A Critical Analysis of the Art Created Within the Japanese-American Internment Camps

Michael Gandara

AMST 401T: Race in American Culture

Written for American Studies 401T "Race in America" by Professor Susie Woo, I explored the ways in which art was created and disseminated by the Japanese who were forcibly relocated from their homes to internment camps spread throughout remote locations in the United States. Utilizing a mix of first-hand accounts from internees and noted photographer Dorothea Lange, I argue that these creative expressions were more than just a way to pass the time. These expressions were inexplicably tied to their internment and reflect the appalling conditions that they were forced to live in. I wrote this paper to show the unjust actions taken by the United States and to highlight how these accounts are not taught in most U.S History textbooks.

The way in which Japanese-Americans have been represented, either as an enemy or ally, has been influenced by periods of turmoil and war in American history. During World War II, Japanese-Americans were blamed for the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941: "a date which will live in infamy" according to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.[1] What really lived in infamy was not Pearl Harbor, but the U.S. government's response to the bombing and the subsequent incarceration of over 100,000 Japanese-Americans in internment camps. From the perspective of most Americans, this incarceration established the Japanese-American as an agent of the Japanese Empire whose allegiance was never to the United States. In other words, this action by the U.S. government had already begun to set in motion the racial formation of Japanese-Americans as traitorous and disloyal.

The theory of racial formation was created by sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant who defined it as "the process by which social, economic, and political forces determine the content and importance of racial categories, by which they are in turn shaped by racial meanings."[2] Sociologist Douglass S. Massey puts this theory into practice by describing how this process of racial formation negatively affected Mexican-Americans in the 1970s and throughout the following twenty years. Massey begins his article by introducing and defining social stratification as a process which "occurs because human societies are characterized by social structures that divide people into categories based on a combination of achieved and ascribed traits" and goes on to explain how stratification involves acquiring access to scarce resources: material (wealth), symbolic (social class), or emotional (love).[3] What Massey is saying is that social stratification is in many ways linked to the process of racialization as both seek to divide people into categories, with racialization being primarily about categorizing those by race. Finally, Massey applies all

of this to a case study involving Mexican-Americans and how they are racialized due to the difficulty in securing these resources.

By understanding Massey's application of racial formation and analyzing Omi and Winant's theory, the internment of Japanese-Americans was caused primarily by the U.S. government (political forces) yet influenced by public perception after Pearl Harbor (social), and because of internment, many internees after the war would end up losing their homes to whites (economic). Racial formation theory provides a greater understanding of the forces that led to the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. Yet, racial formation theory also downplays the ability of these internees to establish a sense of identity within the camps. This paper will explore how the internees utilized creative expression through art such as drawings and photographs while inside the internment camps. By comparison, the images taken by government photographer Dorothea Lange will also show how her approach to taking photographs was influenced by her silent support of the internees. Tied together by the theory of racial formation, these seemingly innocent creative expressions were the medium by which the internees could silently protest the internment without raising suspicion from the government.

While incarcerated, Japanese-Americans wanted to prove their loyalty to the United States in various ways: a number of Japanese men volunteered to serve in the U.S. Army, and would later gain recognition for their service as the 442nd Regimental Combat Unit. Most who were in the internment camps, however, would use their time in other ways: Individuals like Miné Okubo and Toyo Miyatake would depict their time in the internment camps through art. Government photographers like Dorothea Lange would also play their own role in how the internees were depicted. These perspectives and depictions of life in the camps show a better understanding of the Japanese-American experience during World War II.

The creation of schools within the internment camps was not uncommon: at Manzanar, there was a full-fledged high school. These schools were arguably an attempt by the internees to show America that the only thing they desired was education, not war. At Manzanar High School, students wanted to create a yearbook, much like any ordinary high school would have. The goal for the yearbook, titled *Our World*, was to emphasize the importance of the school as a fixture of the community within the camp and according to Karen Higa "strived to create, in pictures and words, a world seemingly unmarked by the ravages of war and the abrogation of rights represented by the incarceration."[4] For these students, the yearbook was a form of expression that simultaneously approved and disapproved of the internment experience. It was tacit approval in the sense that the yearbook seemingly normalized the internment, yet stated that those who were interned posed no danger to America: these students were armed with textbooks, not with guns.

However, a yearbook is mostly made of pictures and photography during the war was largely restricted to government photographers. One person, however, was able to take photographs despite his status as an internee: Toyo Miyatake. Miyatake was not only able to take photographs inside the Manzanar camp, he was permitted to do so by the director of the camp. As told by Karen Higa, the camp director would only allow European Americans to activate the camera's shutter but "after a few weeks, Merritt [the director] abandoned this requirement and Miyatake was essentially free to photograph as he wished."[5] Yet this raises the question of why Miyatake wanted

to take photographs in the first place. What would compel Miyatake to take photographs inside an internment camp? As stated previously, the students of Manzanar High School were seeking a photographer and Miyatake agreed to take the photographs that would be published in the yearbook. It is unclear why Miyatake agreed to help the students, but it can be argued that Miyatake understood the position he was in and the privilege he was given and used all of this to give these students a chance to experience a high school tradition that would normally have not been accessible to them.

Within these yearbook pictures, however, is a subtle message from Miyatake that criticizes the internment through the innocuous photographs of high school students celebrating the end of a school year. Toward the beginning of the yearbook, there is a picture of students jumping in the air with the caption "the classes." The photo shows four students, two male and two female, most likely celebrating the end of the school year. It is unclear what the two female students are holding, but it is possible that they are a form of pom-poms, which are objects that cheerleaders would use to celebrate during games like football. Yet, it is how they are posed in the photograph that reveals how Americans choose to celebrate major events in their lives, in their country, and how racial formation plays a role in all of this.

The way in which these students are posing is similar to another famous image taking during this time. That image is of Miss Atom Bomb, a woman wearing a mushroom cloud shaped bikini that represents the way in which Americans viewed the atomic bomb (called "atomic culture") and also how sexuality was expressed during the period immediately after the internment.[6] The atomic bomb gained prominence when the United States dropped two of these bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. What is most relevant about Miss Atom Bomb, for the purposes of this paper, is how the woman is posed similarly to how the high school youths were posing for the yearbook. While it can be argued that the poses are nothing more than coincidence, the choice to have Miss Atom Bomb pose in that particular style was meant to invoke a sense of celebration, much like the high school youths celebrating the end of the school year. A celebration of the atomic bomb's destructive power against the Japanese, and a reminder to Japanese-Americans that their existence in the United States is not welcomed: another example of racial formation in practice.

However, it was not only high schoolers who were the subject of Miyatake's photographs. One picture that Miyatake took depicts children holding baby dolls, with the caption: "Receiving Dolls Donated by the American Friends Society."[7] At first glance and without knowing the context, the picture appears to be uncontroversial. Yet, by taking a closer look at the dolls, it becomes clear what they depict: they are all depicted as white. Contrasted with the Japanese-American girls holding them, many of whom don't show an outward expression of happiness, the meaning behind the picture changes significantly. This picture by Miyatake arguably represents racial formation in an innocuous fashion. It can be argued that Miyatake specifically chose to photograph these particular children to humanize the internees and convince the larger public that the internees pose no threat to America. An image like this would convey a message of innocence and harmlessness, yet it would also be difficult for Miyatake to publicize these photographs to a wider audience. But when examining this photograph more closely, it brings up a question of the importance of the young boy in the background of the photograph. It is clear that the focus of this photograph is on the young girls holding the dolls,

but the inclusion of the boy in the background was something Miyatake intended to show, but why? Arguably, the inclusion of the boy in the background represents Miyatake's frustration with the internment experience and signals to attentive viewers of the photograph that what is going on in these camps is not the idyllic imagery of children playing with dolls, but something far more sinister.

Though it was most likely not Miyatake's intention, the photograph represents a contradiction of sorts: while it does depict the children of the camps as docile and unthreatening, contradicting the perception of Japanese-Americans as dangerous, it still reinforces socially constructed views of race with the dolls represented as white and reminds these children how society views non-white persons. Miyatake's main goal, however, was to provide his services to those who requested them. The bizarre irony of a photography studio being able to simply *exist* within the confines of an internment camp was not lost on Higa who stated that "On the one hand, the government took great pains to exclude and incarcerate Japanese Americans, stripping them of their most basic liberties. On the other hand, the infrastructures within the camp itself reproduced mini-cities that simulated freedom."[8]

This "simulated freedom" was a privilege for internees like Miyatake and also raises questions on the contradictory actions by officials in the government to allow certain internees more freedom while still promoting the notion that Japanese-Americans were traitorous and dangerous. Outside of the camps, Japanese-Americans were still being negatively portrayed through popular forms of media such as "Miss Atom Bomb." From the December 22, 1941 edition of *Life* magazine, an article titled "How to tell Japs from the Chinese" represented the typical depiction of Japanese-Americans during World War II. The article claimed that there is a clear distinction between Japanese and Chinese based on outward physical appearances.

First, it is important to recognize the irony of Chinese people being considered friendly as the article claims that "innocent victims in cities all over the country are [Chinese], whose homeland is our staunch ally."[9] Historically, Chinese people were among the first to be institutionally discriminated by the United States at the height of the Gold Rush. Chinese immigrants were blamed for taking all of the gold and job opportunities in California, which led to the government enacting the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act. This act was the first of its kind to set a legal precedent of race-based immigration discrimination that would foreshadow similar contemporary actions against peoples of Middle Eastern origin by the Trump administration.

In analyzing the pictures provided in the *Life* article, it is clear that the author (who is not named) made general assumptions about the outward appearances of every Chinese and every Japanese individual and is thus made a sweeping statement to define their behavior and personalities based only on physical appearances. Yet this is a clear example of racial formation at work, because in less than a hundred years between the Chinese Exclusion Act and World War II the Chinese had gone from being portrayed as dangerous to more acceptable to American society. Now it was Japanese-Americans who were the ones being portrayed as dangerous to America. Articles like these played a major role in the racial formation of Japanese-Americans and simulated a contradictory message of being traitorous and harmless at the same time.

What is clear from *Life*, Higa's account of Miyatake, and Miyatake's

own photographs, is that the United States government implicitly supported a contradictory portrayal of Japanese-Americans in order to further its own goals. Outside the camp, Japanese-Americans were portrayed as dangerous and a threat to America. But the decision by officials within the Manzanar camp to allow Miyatake to take photographs was a clear example of the contradictions in the portrayal of Japanese-Americans at the hands of the government. Yet, the internees utilized this contradiction to their own advantage and silently protested their internment while the government remained mostly unaware. These examples clearly show how the process of racial formation was influenced simultaneously by the internees and by the government. Yet there are many more examples that show this process play out, and the contradictions that also lie within this process.

Another perspective on the internment experiences comes from Miné Okubo and unlike Miyatake, Okubo chose to express her internment experience in the form of drawings. Okubo collected these drawings into a book, *Citizen 13660*, that chronicles her experience of internment. In the revised edition of the book, Christine Hong describes the process by which *Citizen 13660* was created and also discusses why Okubo chose to depict her internment experience not through photographs but by sketches, drawings, and paintings: "Prohibited access to those modes of media technology [photographs] endowed with evidentiary weight, Okubo, according to her own spirited account, made recourse to the drawn medium as an alternative means of record."[10] Okubo did not believe in using photographs as a way of showing the internment experience because of the possibility that they could be used as evidence against the internees. This raises the question of the effectiveness and validity of Toyo Miyatake's photographs and whether he took those pictures willingly or with another motive to do so. However, it is important that Okubo's drawings can be analyzed before rendering judgment on Miyatake's motivations to better understand another perspective on the internment experience.

First, it is important to know that Okubo was held at the Tanforan camp, whereas Miyatake was interned at the Manzanar camp. This distinction is important in understanding the power dynamics of each camp. Manzanar allowed Miyatake and a select few the privilege to take photographs, yet this privilege was denied at Tanforan. One could even argue that allowing Miyatake and not Okubo to take photographs was in part due to gender bias. Whether it was due to this or not, Okubo pressed on and utilized drawings while in the camp. Okubo depicted almost every aspect of life within the internment camp, from the initial check-in process, the process of forming a community within the camp and eventually, the departure from the camp. Hundreds upon hundreds of pages of drawings show the day-to-day life of Okubo, but what most of these drawings depict are the unhappy expressions of the internees. Even the few drawings that depict a glimmer of happiness have a story behind them that challenges widely held ideas of race and gender.

One such example is Okubo's drawing of a group of women and a young boy inside one of the barracks. These individuals were drawn knitting, including the boy himself. Okubo captured a rare moment of happiness within the solitary internment camp, one of the very few of such occurrences that Okubo captured in her time at Tanforan. This happiness is best represented by the prominence of the lone boy in this drawing, who Okubo notes that the boy "knitted a complete outfit of skirt and jacket for his mother, but

he never displayed his skill to the public for fear that the girls would laugh at him."[11] Even within the camp, the young boy found something that he could enjoy, yet hid this for fear of social rejection. To understand the reason Okubo chose to feature the boy in this drawing is to understand the importance of children in creative expressions. When conveying a message designed to strike an emotional chord with readers, artists, and authors typically incorporate children to be the vehicle by which to carry said message.

At a young age, this boy understood that showing an appreciation for something 'girly' would be seen as a deviation of societal views on gender. Despite his age, the boy understood (in a child-like way) the gender norms and the importance of conforming to said norms. Yet, Okubo still chose to make this scene prominent in her drawing as opposed to Toyo Miyatake's unclear decision to include the boy in the background of the girls holding the Americanized dolls. The decision by Okubo to include this prominently in her drawing versus Miyatake's unclear reasons for the boy in the photograph supports the argument Okubo made against photographs being a reliable way of understanding the internment experience.

Another drawing shows a large crowd of internees trying to obtain clean drinking water from the only well with clean water yet when they did the officials condemned the well as being "contaminated," with Okubo describing the experience as "like prospectors lost in the middle of the desert."[12] This incident is a clear example of racialization in action, in large part due to the actions by camp officials to restrict the usage of the water well because it was allegedly contaminated. What is being implied is the officials' accusation that the internees were sick and/or diseased, which could serve as a justification for their internment and to also deny them basic necessities. This denial of a basic resource is similar to what Douglas Massey described in his article about social stratification, and shows what Okubo witnessed was not just a one-off incident.

But what is most striking about the drawing is Miné Okubo herself, and how she chose to depict herself in this drawing. In the drawing, Okubo drew herself looking away from the rest of the internees and towards an unknown sight, beyond the confines of the drawing itself. This can be interpreted in many ways, but given what we know of Miné Okubo, it can be argued that Okubo is looking at those who have put her and people like her in the situation that they found themselves in. What gives this interpretation merit is the look of scorn and disgust Okubo has towards the mysterious focus of her attention. By conveying raw emotions through drawings, Okubo is able to clearly visualize the feelings many internees had that a photograph would have difficulty depicting with the threat of censorship. Yet, to further understand the internment experience, it is important to analyze the creative expressions of those who lived their lives far away from the isolated internment camps.

One individual who took a number of prominent photographs depicting the internment experience was a woman by the name of Dorothea Lange. Lange was hired by the federal government as a photographer and before she took pictures of the internment, she was taking pictures for the government to document rural poverty. One of those photos, the "Migrant Mother," became iconic and a symbol of the Great Depression. Lange's talents were highly sought after, and the government assigned Lange to document the process of internment. Yet, it was at this time that Lange began to feel guilty of being part of what Linda Gordon in *Impounded: Dorothea Lange*

and the Censored Images of Japanese Internment described as "documenting a suffering created by the government in an operation she considered odious."[13] Gordon goes on to detail how Lange faced harassment for the job that she already felt guilty for doing, and discusses the disagreements within the government on the policy of internment itself. Thus, from what Gordon discussed it is clear that there were significant disagreements on the internment policy, as is shown by the Manzanar officials allowing Toyo Miyatake to take photographs, while Miné Okubo at Tanforan was not allowed to.

But while both Miyatake and Okubo were eventually allowed to express their interment creatively, either in photographs or drawing, Lange's photographs were heavily scrutinized and most of her pictures never were published, but rather impounded (as the title of Gordon's book alludes to) by the government and discreetly placed in the National Archives at the end of World War II. Gordon discusses the environment that Lange was subjected to on a daily basis:

> Restrictions surrounded her as she worked: no pictures of the barbed wire or watchtowers or armed soldiers guarding the camps. Nothing hinting at resistance within the camps. She was constantly followed. Those in charge tried to keep her from talking with internees, despite weeks of work getting credentials to go to each place she visited, she was constantly hounded and refused access to what she was supposed to photograph.[14]

Despite being someone who enjoyed the privilege of being outside the camps, Dorothea Lange was more scrutinized for her creative expression than Toyo Miyatake or Miné Okubo were on the inside. Due to the conflicting views from within the government on internment, this put Lange at a disadvantage compared to Miyatake or Okubo by being unable to publish her photographs for they were owned by the government. Lange was at the mercy of a bureaucratic, frenzied government that couldn't agree on what to do with the internees.

Yet despite all of this, the photographs Dorothea Lange took provide another important perspective of the internment. In one photograph, there is a family waiting to be bused to the camps with a look of bewilderment and apprehension.[15] Linda Gordon discusses the approach Lange took when acquiring subjects to photograph that focused on making sure that the participants were willing and comfortable being photographed. Though it may not seem as if these participants knew they were being photographed, what this picture depicts is how the internment did not just affect individuals but families as well. Yet there is one aspect of the picture that is intriguing and that is of the boy behind the family. Lange's inclusion of the boy is similar to Miyatake's inclusion of the boy in the background with the girls and Okubo's inclusion of the boy with the women who are knitting. All of these instances of male children raise questions on the presence of males in creative expressions and their ability to convey messages within them.

It is important to note that the boy in the photo is white, and also how the picture is angled and framed, looking at the family from an elevated position. This elevated position gives the viewer a feeling of superiority, looking down at someone from above. Given what we know of Lange from Linda Gordon's analysis in *Impounded*, the choice to convey the boy in this way

does not seem like a mere afterthought, but rather a careful consideration of how the racial power dynamics favor whites over all other non-whites. What this photograph shows is the process of racial formation already beginning to turn against the Japanese-Americans and Lange understood that by including the boy in this way that the focus will inevitably turn to the boy and not the family who are the true focus of Lange's camera. But while Lange attempted to make a powerful statement on race, she was denied an audience to address the statement to on account of the government's censorship of her photographs.

Another photograph that would have easily caught the attention and disapproval of Lange's employer is that of a grave at the newly established Manzanar Cemetery. A visual representation of death from within the camp would be something that government officials would not want to be publicized. Without knowing the context behind the grave, the photograph could easily lead people to speculate as to the circumstances behind the person's cause of death. Yet it is Lange, through Gordon, who provides us with important context: the man buried in this grave was named Matsunosuke Murakami, who died at the age of 62 from heart disease and was very ill even before he arrived and was confined to the camp's makeshift hospital in the two months leading up to his death.[16] Lange made an effort to understand the people she photographed and it is for this reason that the details surrounding the subject of the photograph are made clear and apparent to the viewer.

While both the photograph of the family and of the grave are not the only photos that were collected by Gordon, they best represent the kind of imagery that Lange focused on and why such photos were subject to censorship and suppression by the federal government. Lange knew these photographs would be critical of the interment yet chose to take them anyway despite being employed by the very same government who put the internees in the situation they faced. But Lange did not enjoy the creative freedom that Miyatake and Okubo ironically had, and only in recent decades have her photographs been appearing into the public domain. That freedom was earned as a result of the government's contradictory actions towards internees, a freedom that Lange as a non-internee could not obtain.

The creative expressions of Toyo Miyatake, Miné Okubo, and Dorothea Lange all show how they utilized certain privileges to depict the internment and how these depictions were not simply just a way to pass the time. These depictions were a silent protest against what they saw as unjust and as a result of the racial formation of Japanese-Americans as traitorous and dangerous to America. Whether it was through photographs or drawings, these expressions were a direct counter-narrative to the insistence by the U.S. government that the "relocation" was necessary in the fight against the Empire of Japan during World War II. What they also show is the conflicting and contradictory actions taken by the government in allowing some internees like Miyatake extra privileges within the camp and denying non-internees like Lange the ability to publish photographs that accurately depict life within the camps. Yet despite all of this, these three individuals succeeded in showing the truth behind the so-called "relocation" of Japanese citizens and in doing so, shined the light on one of America's most infamous episodes of racism. What ultimately would live in infamy was not the date of the Pearl Harbor bombing but the baseless decision to round up hundreds of thousands of Japanese citizens by a government who fought with its people

more than it fought any other nation.

References

[1] Franklin D. Roosevelt, Speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York Transcript, 1941, *Library of Congress*, https://www.loc.gov/item/afccal000483/.
[2] Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, Second Edition, 3-13.
[3] Douglas S. Massey, "Racial Formation in Theory and Practice: The Case of Mexicans in the United States." *Race and Social Problems* 1, no. 1 (March 2009): 13.
[4] Karen Higa, "Toyo Miyatake and Our World," in *Only Skin Deep: Changing Visions of the American Self*, edited by Coco Fusco and Brian Wallis (New York: International Center of Photography and Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 2003), 335.
[5] Ibid., 336.
[6] "Photograph,"The Las Vegas Sun, accessed May 2, 2018, https://lasvegassun.com/photos/1905/may/15/4120/.
[7] Higa, "Toyo Miyatake and Our World," 337.
[8] Ibid., 338.
[9] "How to tell Japs from the Chinese" *Life Magazine*, December 1941, 81.
[10] Christine Hong, "Introduction," in *Citizen 13660*, by Miné Okubo, (1946; reprint, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014), viii.
[11] Miné Okubo, *Citizen 13660*, 104.
[12] Ibid., 142.
[13] Linda Gordon and Gary Y. Okihiro, *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the Censored Images of Japanese Internment* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008), 19.
[14] Ibid., 20.
[15] Ibid., 121.
[16] Ibid., 196.

One Day at a Time: A Dialogue about Race, Immigration, and Cuban Culture

Danielle Bruncati

AMST 401T: Race in American Culture

This research paper was written for Dr. Woo's seminar in Race in American Culture in the spring of 2018. With this paper I wanted to explore how our current political climate affected the Cuban-American family portrayed in Netflix's *One Day at a Time*. Throughout the paper, I analyze specific scenes and episodes to see how they indirectly and directly comment on claims and actions made in Trump's America.

The words "Cuba" and "Cuban" invoke different pictures for people living in the United States. For some, the first thing that comes to mind is Ricky Ricardo, Lucy's hot-tempered husband in the popular sitcom *I Love Lucy*. For others, Cuba is that communist country 484 miles from Florida. Most likely, when people hear the word "Cuba" they think of cigars, rum, coffee and occasionally, the stereotype that all Cubans came to the United States on rafts. Despite there being an estimated 2 million Cubans (foreign and native-born) residing in the United States the history and culture of Cuba and Cubans remain a mystery for a majority of Americans.[1] Thankfully, that has begun to change thanks to Netflix's decision to revise Norman Lear's sitcom *One Day at a Time*. Unlike the original, which ran from 1975 to 1985 and focused on a white single mother and her children, the 2017 reboot focuses on a Cuban-American family living in Los Angeles.[2] The change comes thanks to co-show-runner Gloria Calderon Kellet, a Cuban-American, who was the one who pitched the idea of changing the race/ethnicity of the family to Cuban to add a new layer to the show and diversify with the times.[3]

One Day at a Time centers around Penelope Alvarez (played by Justina Machado) a single mother and U.S. Army Veteran struggling with PTSD who lives with her lesbian teenage daughter Elena, her preteen son Alex, and her Cuban mother Lydia (played by Rita Moreno). The show also features Schneider, the foreman of the building who has his own troubled past and worms his way into the Alvarez family. The first season began airing on Netflix in 2017 with the second season airing in 2018.

Norman Lear, the creator of the original show, currently holds a producer title on the reboot. Given Lear's history with politically infused sitcoms, it is no surprise that the series tackles several controversial topics ordinary Americans are dealing with today.[4] *One Day at a Time* came to fruition at the perfect time given the change in political climate in the United States. Though its purpose is first and foremost to be an entertaining television show, one cannot deny the potential the series has to educate viewers on a myriad of issues. In short, *One Day at a Time* has become a nearly perfect counter-narrative to Donald Trump's America—an America that is keen on fear-mongering propaganda, white supremacy, and promising a better America for the wealthy. As Gloria Kellett notes, "we knew we had to deal with the new normal that we're experiencing."[5] That new normal of course

is Trump's America. *One Day at a Time* actively strives to discredit Trump's opinions on immigration especially in regards to deportation and the immigrant experience. In addition, the show works to challenge the United States' (and Trump's) tendency to homogenize Latinx people while also exploring topics of racism and colorism within Latinx families and from outsiders thanks to Trump's lack of intervention on people's racist actions and claims.

One Day at a Time's Discussion of Immigration

In an era where immigrants' futures are under debate and the United States's president has an anti-immigration platform, *One Day at a Time* takes bold steps in addressing some of the misconceptions Americans have about immigration and immigrants themselves. One of the misconceptions *One Day at a Time* tackles is the issue of deportation.

Despite being a comedy, *One Day at a Time* handles the topic of deportation head-on in the first season with "Strays," the fifth episode of the series. Elena has been hiding her best friend Carmen in her bedroom for weeks after learning that Carmen's parents were deported to Mexico.[6] When Penelope finds out, the discussion of deportation begins. For one, while telling the story about how her parents got deported (they went to Mexico for medical treatment and were unable to come back across the border), Carmen assures Penelope that her parents are good people. In fact, she tells her "my parents didn't do anything wrong, they both work two jobs, I'm on scholarship at Saint V's and I get good grades. We're a normal American family."[7] This scene automatically debunks the myth of immigrants that Trump and so many others want Americans to believe that many immigrants are bad people coming to the United States to steal our resources and jobs and rape and/or kill "real" Americans.[8] Carmen's parents aren't criminals nor are they lazy Mexican immigrants, a stereotype that is contradictorily applied to Mexicans (how can they steal jobs and be lazy at the same time?). Instead, they are hard-working people who wanted a better future for their daughter who is excelling where she's at. It's a common story for many Americans born to immigrant parents.

In addition, Carmen's declaration that her family is "a normal American family" addresses the discourse about what it means to be a true, normal American family.[9] What makes one a true American family? The GOP and Trump would define it as consisting of one man and one woman, with two children and an emphasis on religion.[10] In that sense, Carmen and her family are a "normal American family." She grew up with one older brother, she has a mother and a father, and they raised her in a Catholic household. Carmen's family hits all the requirements needed to be considered a true American family by the GOP, except they have one flaw — Carmen's parents are not natural born American citizens. That small fact alone makes them ineligible to be considered a "normal American family" in Trump's America.

In fact, the "normal" American family discourse isn't the only discourse under investigation in this scene. This scene also deals with what constitutes as home, especially from an immigration standpoint. Elena makes a comment about how she can't believe Carmen's parents were sent back home to which Penelope says, "they didn't send them home, they sent them away."[11] In this context, home is not where Carmen's parents were born, instead, it's where they've been living for over a decade and where they've raised their children. This is a common debate amongst immigrants and one that is even addressed later in the show in regards to Penelope's mother Lydia, who

still considers Cuba her home despite not living there for almost 60 years. However, in this context, the show is making a direct statement that home is not the country from which a person immigrated for whatever reason, but rather the country in which a person makes a home. This provides a stark comparison to supporters of Trump during the campaign trail who rallied for immigrants to go "back home" despite many of them not having ties to their host countries in decades. It also relates to the struggle many DACA recipients are having to face as the future of DACA is uncertain and these children have no memory of the countries they immigrated from at young ages.

Finally, this scene also brings to a light an increasingly more common conversation undocumented parents have with their American citizen children about what the kids should do if they (the parents) get deported. Similar to the way American born parents might have wills set up delegating a guardian in case both parents are no longer able to care for their children, undocumented parents inform their children about "the plan" if they were to get deported. For many, this means relocating to live with a family relative or sibling who is an American citizen. This episode depicts just this as Carmen informs Penelope that her parents want her to relocate to Texas where her brother currently lives.[12] This shows deportation does not just affect the undocumented person but also the families of that person who most likely are American citizens. While the common narrative around deportation strives to assure Americans that this helps protect them, deportation ends up hurting "real" Americans who were connected to the immigrant by tearing their family apart and possibly, uprooting them from their homes thus turning their lives upside down.

"Strays" is not the only episode that handles the topics of deportation in *One Day at a Time*. In the second season, Lydia tells her family that she is not a United States citizen but rather a permanent green card holder.[13] Upon hearing the news, Elena freaks out and fears for Lydia's safety given the current climate around immigration in the United States. Lydia's nonchalant attitude about her green card status is juxtaposed against Elena's who is now worried that Lydia could be deported because she is not a citizen. Elena's outburst might have seemed dramatic under previous presidents' administrations but because the Alvarezes are living in a world where Trump is president, her outburst seems sincere. What Elena elicits here is a fear of where boundaries are being drawn around immigration that is evident in the real world as well. Many green card holders in the United States embodied Elena's fears when Trump was elected and were unsure of what their status was going to be in the United States. And while this scene as a whole serves to advance the plot of the series forward, it also serves to provide Americans with a very plausible fear many people are feeling in the United States. As co-creator Mike Royce pointed out in an interview with mic.com, "The show is reflecting the world and obviously that world changed. We don't set out to do political stories, we set out to tell stories about this family. But this family was very affected by some of the things that happened in this election."[14] By including this scene, *One Day at a Time* is addressing discourses around deportation and citizenship forms that are arising in Trump's America.

Both of these scenes serve to structure *One Day at a Time's* view on deportation. It is clear that the Alvarez family feels that deportation does more harm than good. In addition, it comments on the discourses of citizenship by juxtaposing the deportation of Carmen's parents who were undocumented immigrants in the United States with the fear of deportation of

Lydia who is also an immigrant but one a green card who "gets social security, pays taxes, and is a permanent resident."[15]

Deportation is not the only immigration subject *One Day at a Time* addresses in its two seasons. In fact, the main conversation around immigration happens in regards to the immigration experience and the immigrant's experience once they arrive to the United States. *One Day at a Time's* conversation about the immigrant experience is much more evident than the conversation around deportation. The immigrant experience is embedded in the show's narrative through Lydia who immigrated to the United States from Cuba and through Schneider who immigrated from Canada. While both of these characters are immigrants their stories and experiences are vastly different because of the countries from which they came. The show typically takes a more serious approach in telling Lydia's experiences and a more humorous approach for Schneider's experiences.

At first glance, Schneider seems like a privileged American — white, wealthy, and male. In fact, it is not until episode 5 that we learn that Schneider isn't actually American or a citizen. Schneider's revelation is played for laughs for both the audience and the Alvarez family. Penelope mentions that Elena has been doing an immigration project to which Schneider asks why she didn't come to him. The family is visibly confused until Schneider takes a deep breath and reveals that he is not American but in fact a Canadian who immigrated to the United States illegally, after overstaying his student visa to attend Pepperdine University.[16]

While Schneider recounts his immigration story as something that was hard — "living in the shadows of Pepperdine University" and having to unlearn his accent, the Alvarezes see his experience as rather simple. As Penelope points out, he came to the United States "with everything, knowing only the entire language, and [only] struggling to unlearn the metric system."[17] In Schneider's eyes his immigration experience was very much real and traumatic but to the Alvarezes, who have their own history with immigration, his experience is one of privilege.

Making Schneider an undocumented immigrant serves three purposes for *One Day at a Time*. First, it allows the show to comment on the discourse and preconceived notions Americans have about who immigrates to the United States (more on that later). Second, it's used for comedic relief while also allowing the conversation to flow into a controversial topic. Lastly, and most importantly, Schneider's immigration experience and status serve as a way to juxtapose his experiences with Lydia's.

Unlike Schneider's experience, Lydia did not really have a choice on whether or not she wanted to immigrate to the United States. As Lydia states in the same episode, she came to the United States in 1962 "as a child, fleeing an oppressive regime." Lydia revealed that she came to the United States under the Pedro Pan Operation.[18] Operation Pedro Pan was a program that involved sending Cuban children to the United States where the US government assumed legal guardianship for the children during the Cuban Revolution. The program lasted two years and helped transport 14,000 Cuban children to safety in the United States. Some of the children went to live with family in the United States, mainly Miami, while others were placed in foster families or boarding schools in other states. The belief for many, including Lydia in *One Day at a Time*, was that eventually the children would be reunited with their parents back home in Cuba. This, unfortunately, was not the reality for most of the children.

Not only was leaving her parents and becoming the guardian of her younger siblings traumatic, Lydia reveals in "Viva Cuba" (episode 9 of the first season), that she also had to leave behind an older sister who was too old to participate in Pedro Pan.[19] Therefore, unlike Schneider who willingly left his family in Canada, Lydia's family was ripped away from her because of war in Cuba and because of harsh political relationships between Cuba and the United States.

What's interesting here is not only the discussion of the choice around immigration, but also how Schneider and Lydia are treated in the United States. While the show rarely depicts interactions with characters outside of the Alvarez family and their friends/co-workers, the notion that Schneider and Lydia experience things differently is evident. While Schneider's revelation to the family and dinner party is not necessarily shocking, it is a surprise given the fact that many of them assumed Schneider was an American citizen.[20] Lydia's contribution to the conversation is less surprising because she is visibly seen as different because of her accent, her skin color, and her appearance. Additionally, Schneider, who is not viewed as an immigrant, is the one who immigrated illegally while Lydia, who is viewed as an immigrant, is the one who immigrated legally. These different experiences can be explained through Douglas S. Massey's concept of the "stereotype content model."[21]

In his article "Racial Formation in Theory and Practice: The Case of Mexicans in the United States," Massey describes the stereotype content model which uses the concepts of "warmth" (how likable and approachable a person is" and "competence" (the ability to act in a purposeful manner to get things done) in order to categorize people into four groups: pitied (low competence, high warmth), despised (low competence, low warmth), envied (high competence, low warmth) and esteemed (high competence, high warmth).[22] These categories are then used to categorize people based on their similarities to oneself and one's expectations of how a person should act and thus exemplify who a person is more likely to befriend and who they are more likely to despise. Thus, those in the esteemed group are more like one's self and those in the despised group are the opposite of one's self. This model is rooted in racial identities and stereotypes.

In the case of *One Day at a Time*, the stereotype content model can be used to explain why Scott, Penelope's co-worker, was surprised to learn that Schneider was an undocumented immigrant and not surprised to learn about Lydia's immigrant history.[23] For Scott, Schneider looks, acts, and sounds like him, which places Schneider in the esteemed group. At face value this proves Massey's model to be true because he found that Canadians were likely to be sorted into the esteemed group by a majority of Americans. However, this finding becomes complicated when it's revealed that Schneider is an undocumented immigrant which should land him in the despised group because of his undocumented status. Similarly, in Lydia's case because of her Hispanic heritage, Scott might have presumably sorted her into the despised group of Massey's findings. However, because Lydia is a documented immigrant she might also fall in the envied group.[24] Clearly, the model is not perfect, but it does lend itself to the discussion of immigrants *One Day at a Time* is trying to curate.

The show is less about putting immigrants' experiences against each other and more about exposing the double standards and biases some immigrants face. Since Schneider looks like most Americans, he is rarely

thought of as not being American. On the other hand, Lydia and her family are constantly thought of as being immigrants because of their skin color, heritage, and the fact that they speak Spanish. The message *One Day at a Time* is trying to push here is that anybody can be an immigrant and that it shouldn't matter where the person migrated from or what they look like, all immigrants should be treated the same.

Every Latinx is Mexican Right? Wrong!

Aside from commenting on topics of immigration, *One Day at a Time* also works to debunk the Trump administration's tendency to homogenize Latinx people. Season two opens with Alex getting suspended from school for fighting on a field trip. Penelope is visibly upset until she learns that the reason Alex got into a fight was that some random kid told him to "go back to Mexico" after hearing Alex and his friend talking Spanish. At first, Penelope believes this to be an isolated incident that Alex has experienced but then Alex explains to her that this has happened to him before. Random people have called him "beaner, wetback, gangbanger, Pitbull" for having a brown skin tone and speaking Spanish in public. To which, Lydia comments that Pitbull is the one that's closest to being accurate given that he is Cuban — adding to the show's comedic relief. Alex also points out to his family that one time when he was leaving a baseball game the opposing team saw him and shouted: "Build the wall."[25]

This scene comments on very real incidents that have occurred in Trump's America.[26] Many Latinx people — as well as those who do not identify as Latinx — are being mistaken for undocumented Mexicans solely based on their brown skin and their Spanish speaking skills. In fact, this scene is not purely a work of fiction from Kellet and Royce, but a personal anecdote from Kellet's own experiences. Kellet outlines this experience in the New York Time's section "Ask a Showrunner" back in February of 2018. She says that her brother, who has lived in San Diego for 20 years, called her one-day "post-Trump" to tell her that someone told him to go back to Mexico while he was enjoying a day at the beach. While Kellet's brother found the exchange amusing, Kellet really grasped that something else was going on with such a controversial comment being made casually. This is why she chose to bring that story to *One Day at a Time*.[27]

This scene really showcases the two sides of Trump's America. On one side, we have strangers who feel that they have the authority to judge people based on their skin color and chosen language to speak and impose upon those people their controversial beliefs. On the other hand, we have Alex Alvarez, a preteen boy who was born and raised in America but who is still proud of his Cuban heritage. The problem here is not just that these are blatantly racist claims being made to Alex (though it is problematic) but also the fact that these claims are erasing his identity. Speaking Spanish in public and being of a certain skin color does not automatically mean someone is Mexican, just like being blonde and tan does not make you automatically a Californian. Cultures and people are extremely diverse. Not only does mistaking Alex for Mexican erase his culture but it also waters down what a person from Mexico can look like, because in reality not everyone from one area looks exactly the same.

While this scene addresses the United States' tendency to homogenize Latinx people, it is really the series at large that helps to debunk this myth. Scenes like Lydia claiming the Vicks Vapor Rub can cure both ap-

pendicitis and Penelope's depression and Alex complaining that his first sleepover is at the age of 14 because of Penelope's overprotectiveness help audiences understand some of the nuances of Cuban culture that separate Cubans from other Latinx groups in America.[28] By paying homage to Cuban culture through scenes with authentic Cuban foods (the inclusion of Porto's Bakery and Cafe, popular dinner dish ropa vieja with rice and black beans, and an emphasis on Cuban coffee), Cuban props (the cafeteria [or coffee maker], the brands of food in the background, and pictures of the Pope) and emphasizing the nuances of a Cuban culture, *One Day at a Time* showcases that while some Cubans might look and sound like other Latinx groups, Cubans have their own culture and history that is just as important to their identity and that they do not deserve to be lumped together — no group does.

However, it is important to note that the Alvarezes are not trying to represent all Cubans. Instead, they are just showcasing their version of what a Cuban American family looks like. Both Justina Machado, who plays Penelope, and Kellet emphasize this fact in separate interviews with *NBC News.* Machado emphasis that Latinx people "have different stories, we look different and it's important to put that out there" through the show's narrative.[29] An example of this is the fact that even though Alex and Elena are siblings, they have different skin tones which shape their experiences in Trump's America. Or, the fact that Carmen, a rather pale girl who dresses in goth-like fashion and loves witchcraft, is not often the picture people think of when they think of Mexican-American teenage girls. Kellet echoes Machado's sentiment in her own interview when asked about if she feels pressure to represent all Latinos. Kellet said, "the responsibility I felt was to honestly portray a human experience because I can't speak for all Latinos, or all Cubans or all women."[30]

Both of these women are smart in saying this because all too often minority writers, actors, and creators feel responsible for representing their people and they forget that one's experiences are not universal. We see this echoed in the narratives of *One Day at a Time* where Elena and Alex experience the world in different ways because of their gender and skin color and ideologies. In fact, Kellet's point that she can't represent everyone is emphasized in Jason Mittell's book *Television and American Culture* wherein Mittell points out that "there is no ideal way of representing a racial group; no single character or program can represent an entire race."[31] People are intersectional, and one identity does not shape their experiences solely. Therefore, instead of one show, like *One Day at a Time*, being the sole representation for a certain ethnic and racial group, television should diversify so that there are several shows of specific ethnic and racial groups to draw experiences from. When that happens, television will have reached ideal representation for the masses.[32]

There is one qualm when it comes to *One Day at a Time* and its unspoken goal to challenge the homogenization of the Latinx people in the United States. While the content of the show is nuanced and explores Cuban culture specifically, none of the actors on the television show are in fact Cuban. Rita Moreno, Justina Machado, and Marcel Ruiz (Alex) are Puerto Rican, while Isabella Gomez (Elena) is Colombian. It interesting that a show that is so concerned with portraying the nuances of Cuban culture would cast non-Cubans in these roles. However, casting is a very nuanced world and it could be possible that no Cubans auditioned for these roles and thus,

they went with actors of other Latinx backgrounds. While this is a plausible explanation it still discredits the work the show does to showcase an authentic Cuban experience. Since the audience cannot tell that these actors are not Cuban, many audiences assume that they are Cuban and thus these Puerto Rican actors become Cuban in their minds. Through the casting, the show has inevitably catered back to this idea that all Latinx look the same and that they are interchangeable. Therefore, while the show does a lot to debunk the homogenizing of Latinx ideology, there are still some aspects that fall victim to this same ideology.

A Close Look at Racism and Colorism from Within and Without

Racism is ingrained in American culture and our history. As racism has evolved, colorism — which privileges people of a lighter skin tone while discriminating against those with a darker skin tone — has taken form. These two concepts often go hand in hand because the color of one's skin often shapes their experiences around racism. With the election of Donald Trump as president, these two problematic ideologies have become even more apparent.

One Day at a Time clearly states that thanks to Trump's election, the racism they have experienced has increased. In a scene in "The Turn," Elena points out that "ever since somebody [Trump] decided to call an entire group of Latinos rapists and criminals, everyone thinks they can say whatever racist thought occurs to them."[33] A few moments before this Schneider makes a claim that racism doesn't happen in Los Angeles to which the Alvarezes roll their eyes.[34] This two-minute exchange highlights an important issue that is going on in the United States, even in traditionally liberal cities. Latinx people or people who appear to be Latinx have experienced more racist encounters since Trump's presidential campaign began. Tina Vasquez, a biracial Latina in Los Angeles, echoes this sentiment in a piece she wrote for *The Guardian*. Vasquez outlines that since Trump's campaign has started she has fielded questions from white strangers inquiring about her citizenship status, calling her "señorita" and asking her if she spoke English so that she could help a man navigate through a "bad area" of town.[35] Another example of this is the one Kellet provides of her own brother who was told to go home to Mexico.[36]

What this scene is commenting on is the fact that racism goes hand in hand with colorism. Since the Alvarezes are Cuban and have darker skin completions — aside from Elena — they experience and understand the racism that occurs to them on a day to day basis whereas Schneider who, despite being the undocumented immigrant, is white and does not experience what the Alvarezes do. In fact, until Alex brought it up Schneider did not realize it existed at all in his liberal and inclusive version of Los Angeles.

As the scene progresses, the family discusses the various racial slurs they have been called. These slurs are ones that are typically associated with Mexicans which connects back to the point that the many Americans cannot or choose not to understand that Latinx people are diverse and are not, by default, Mexicans. What is interesting though is the way Lydia reacts to her family being misidentified as Mexicans. When Penelope announces that she has been called a "beaner" and that "it's more of a Mexican slur," Lydia chimes in stating "how dare they call us Mexicans!"[37] Lydia's offense to being mistaken for a Mexican speaks to an idea that is not commonly talked about when racism is discussed. This idea being the fact that minorities can, in fact,

be racist to other minority groups. For Lydia, being mistaken for Mexican not only erases her identity as Cuban but it also lumps her into a category with a group of people that have not been represented positively in American culture. Lydia's brash statement makes her seem like she agrees with the horrible things being said about Mexicans and that's why she does not want to be associated with them. After Lydia's statement, Penelope jumps in to remind her that being mistaken for Mexicans is not why they are mad about it.

The scene progresses to a discussion about colorism and privilege when Elena chimes in that even "in this openly racist world" she's managed "to never have an incident" of racism. Lydia and Penelope point out to Elena that the color of her skin is the reason why she has not experienced the same racism as Alex.[38] This is where the episode divulges into a discussion of colorism and the concepts of "passing" and privilege. Elena's light skin gives her the privilege of being "white passing" which mean she is afforded the same privileges white people have like not having racial slurs shouted at them while walking down the street. This becomes very concerning to Elena because she prides herself on being a Latinx and having people mistake her for white takes away that identity.

As Elena spirals Lydia interjects with "why are you so mad? Cubans are white." Once again we see Lydia's colorist and racist tendencies come to surface. For Elena being white means being privileged and being associated with the ignorant people shouting slurs at her family. For Lydia, being white is also about a certain level of privilege and pride. It is clear that Lydia appreciates light and medium skin color more than she does dark ones. Penelope tries to diffuse the conversation by reminding her that "Cubans are everything" to which Lydia responds by pointing out that Cubans "are mostly descended from white Spaniards." Then Penelope brings up the fact that they know lots of Cubans who are "black, brown, and white" to which Lydia chimes in, yet again, that they are mostly white.[39]

Lydia's emphasis on Cubans being white has a lot to do with the history of race in Cuba. Similar to the United States, Cuba also participated in the slave trade. From 1501 to 1867 approximately 889,990 enslaved Africans arrived in Cuba.[40] White slave owners would rape the women slaves, often resulting in mixed race children or "mulattoes." With the rise of mixed raced children and a clear divide between whites and blacks, it is no surprise a racial hierarchy of sorts was established, which ultimately lead to racism. While it is true that there is a proportion of Afro-Cubans in Cuba, they still appear to be the minority. And even though Afro-Cubans do exist, they are still marginalized — a topic Graciela Barada points out in her FEM Magazine article "Colorism and Privilege: An Afro-Cuban American in Havana" through her experiences of Afro-Cuban women trying to look more like their white Cuban neighbors.[41] As Barada states, "I observed that most of the black Cuban women around me straightened their hair, dyed it lighter colors, or wore extensions or weave [to appear more white]."[42] In addition, she notes that because of her dark skin she is even more vulnerable to "microaggressions and societal attacks" than her light skin relatives.[43]

Lydia has thus grown accustomed to the fact that lighter skin is more valuable than darker skin which is why she continues to emphasize it so much in this scene. What this scene proves is the fact that minorities can be racist and colorist against other minorities and sometimes their own minority groups themselves. While it is highly unlikely that Lydia would walk down

the street and shout out racist slurs at other minorities or people of color, what can be said is the fact that even though she herself is a minority she has been coerced into believing that lighter skin somehow makes a someone a better person.

Towards the end of the episode, we are brought back to the fact that Trump's America has caused this brash version of racism that makes it okay for a stranger to tell another stranger, a 13-year-old boy in this case, to "go back to Mexico." When Penelope comes to talk to Alex he tells her that he wants "to go back to the way it was before."[44] Presumably, this means before Trump was president and when people were encouraged to keep their racist comments to themselves. Alex goes on to say "suddenly I'm different. I don't want to be different."[45] Alex's sentiment is something that is very true for minorities, especially American-born minorities, in the United States. Yes, racism existed prior to Trump taking office, but when the country allowed for a man with ignorant and harsh opinions on immigrants and minorities to take office it somehow made it okay for everyone to voice their ignorant opinions.

Conclusion

For some *One Day at a Time* is simply an entertaining comedy about a Cuban American family living in Los Angeles. On the other hand, the series is an entertaining comedy that pushes back against the problematic administration the United States is currently under. Choosing to see the series as only a television show discredits the hard work the cast and crew have put in to make this show authentic and expose who is truly getting hurt in Trump's America — the children and grandchildren of immigrants.

It is clear through the scene analysis provided that *One Day at a Time* is making a conscious effort to discredit some of Trump's debatable opinions. This sitcom strives to make audiences aware of what the immigration experiences looks like for people living in America. It actively works to showcase that Latinx people are different and have unique cultures that do not deserve to be lumped together. And it deals with racism and colorism within a minority group which adds to the complexity of Cuban culture *One Day at a Time* showcases.

While it is hard to say if *One Day at a Time* would have had such a powerful impact had the election swung another way, what is certain is the fact that Trump's America has provided the cast and crew with ample storylines that push the audience to think critically about what is going on in the real world. *One Day at a Time* has proven itself to be a politically conscious sitcom and one that has become a counter-narrative to Trump's America.

References

[1] Gustavo López, "Hispanics of Cuban Origin in the United States, 2013," *Pew Research Center*, September 15, 2015, http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/09/15/hispanics-of-cuban-origin-in-the-united-states-2013/.

[2] *One Day at a Time*, developed by Norman Lear, created by Whitney Blake and Allan Mannings, aired 1975-1985, CBS; *One Day at a Time*, developed by Gloria Calderon, Kellet and Mike Royce, aired 2017-present, Netflix.

[3] Ana Sofía Peláez, "This Woman Gave One Day at a Time Its Bicultural, Latino Flavor," *NBCNews.com*, January 26, 2017, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/meet-woman-who-gave-one-day-time-its-bicultural-latino-n711476.

[4] *All in the Family*, created by Norman Lear, aired 1971-79, CBS; *Maude*, created by

Norman Lear, aired 1972- 1978, CBS; *The Jeffersons*, developed by Norman Lear, aired 1975-1985, CBS.
[5] Sarene Leeds, "How 'One Day at a Time' Brilliantly Captures the Effect of Trump's America on One Latinx Family," *Mic*, January 30, 2018, https://mic.com/articles/187694/how-one-day-at-a-time-brilliantly-captures-the-effect-of-trumps-america-on-one-latinx-family#.L2UbCb1zf.
[6] *One Day at a Time*, Season 1 Episode 5, "Strays," directed by Phill Lewis and written by Peter Murrieta, aired January 6, 2017, Netflix.
[7] Ibid.
[8] "Transcript: Donald Trump Announces His Presidential Candidacy," *CBS News*, June 16, 2015, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/transcript-donald-trump-announces-his-presidential-candidacy/.
[9] *One Day at a Time*, "Strays."
[10] "Platform," *GOP*, https://gop.com/platform/renewing-american-values/. This outlines the GOP platform in regards to family, marriage, criminal justice, and education.
[11] *One Day at a Time*, "Strays."
[12] Ibid.
[13] *One Day at a Time*, Season 2 Episode 4, "Roots," directed by Phill Lewis and written by Dan Signer, aired January 26, 2018, Netflix.
[14] Leeds, "'One Day at a Time' Brilliantly Captures."
[15] Ibid.
[16] *One Day at a Time*, "Strays."
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] *One Day at a Time*, Season 1 Episode 9, "Viva Cuba," directed by Jody Margolin Hahn and written by Michelle Badillo, Caroline Levich, and Gloria Calderon Kellet, aired January 6, 2017, Netflix.
[20] *One Day at a Time*, "Strays."
[21] Douglas S. Massey, "Racial Formation in Theory and Practice: The Case of Mexicans in the United States," *Race and Social Problems* 1, no. 1 (2009).
[22] Ibid., 3.
[23] A*One Day at a Time*, "Strays."
[24] Massey, 14.
[25] *One Day at a Time*, Season 2 Episode 1, "The Turn," directed by Pamela Fryman and written by Gloria Calderon Kellet and Mike Royca, aired January 26, 2018, Netflix.
[26] Valeria Perasso, "'I Fear My Neighbour' - the Story behind US Hate Crimes," *BBC News*, August 22, 2017, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-40969589.
[27] Monica Castillo, "'One Day at a Time': Gloria Calderon Kellett on Crafting Latino Stories in a Changed America," *The New York Times*, February 25, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/25/arts/television/one-day-at-a-time-gloria-calderon-kellett-ask-a-showrunner.html.
[28] *One Day at a Time*, Season 2 Episode 9, "Hello, Penelope," directed by Phill Lewis and written by Michelle Badillo and Caroline Levich, aired January 26, 2018, Netflix.
[29] Victoria Moll-Ramírez, "The All-American Family, through a Latino Lens: Justina Machado Reflects on 'One Day at a Time's' Success," *NBCNews.com*, February 18, 2018, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/one-day-time-s-justina-machado-reflects-evolution-all-american-n848361.

[30] Ana Sofía Peláez, "Meet the Woman Who Gave One Day at a Time Its Bicultural, Latino Flavor," *NBCNews.com*, January 26, 2017, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/meet-woman-who-gave-one-day-time-its-bicultural-latino-n711476.
[31] Jason Mittel, *Television and American Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 327.
[32] Ibid.
[33] *One Day at a Time,* "The Turn."
[34] Ibid.
[35] Tina Vasquez, "I've Experienced a New Level of Racism since Donald Trump Went after Latinos," *The Guardian*, September 09, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/09/donald-trump-racism-increase-latinos.
[36] Castillo, "Gloria Calderon Kellett on Crafting Latino Stories in a Changed America."
[37] *One Day at a Time,* "The Turn."
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Stephen M. Chambers, *No God But Gain: The Untold Story of Cuban Slavery, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Making of the United States* (London: Verso, 2015).
[41] Graciela Barada, "Colorism and Privilege: An Afro-Cuban American in Havana," *FEM Magazine*, April 28, 2016, https://femmagazine.com/colorism-and-privilege-an-afro-cuban-american-in-havana/.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid.
[44] *One Day at a Time*, "The Turn."
[45] Ibid.

The Ills Beyond the Thrills at Disneyland

Nicole Corliss

AMST 401T: American Suburban Culture

This essay was assembled for Dr. Elaine Lewinnek's course American Studies 401T "American Suburban Culture" during the Spring of 2018. The goal of this research was to evaluate the relation of Disneyland to Anaheim and whether its construction was helpful or harmful to the community. I want the reader to think critically about the unjust actions of the theme park by focusing on two major themes: how Disneyland has and is still advertising the ideal, white nuclear family suburban dream and the "suburban disequilibrium" that the park has caused within the city of Anaheim for its residents, in addition to the park's employees, since its construction and opening during the mid 1950s.

Happiness, For a Price

"If Disneyland was indeed the Happiest Place on Earth, you'd either keep it a secret or the price of admission would be free and not equivalent to the yearly per capita income of a small sub-Saharan African nation like Detroit."[1] Through media platforms, the theme park is strategically drafted out to appear as a must-experience family destination. Filled with all the beloved characters from the company's movies, sweet treats, thrilling rides, and magical firework display, what could possibly go wrong during a day spent with the world's most beloved mouse, Mickey, and his companions? An enterprise built on fulfilling childhood dreams and wants, the park has turned itself away from its wholesome image and into a conglomerate, with the city bowing down to its every demand. Walt Disney's vivid imagination led him to construct what is now rated as one of the top tourist destinations in Southern California: Disneyland.[2] Even though Disneyland is credited with putting Anaheim on the map for tourism, the park's expansion, driven by capitalistic gain, has resulted in a suburban crisis for both its surrounding residents and the working class alike.

As a resident of Anaheim for the last ten years who lives near the park, I think about how the neighborhoods and businesses outside the tourist area of Harbor Boulevard have declined in both appearance and safety. This issue is important to think about critically, because for a park that advertises itself as being the "Happiest Place on Earth," it is a literal facade that hides the obstacles behind obtaining the means of visiting the park, which is not geared towards all members of society. Disneyland is a place where unrealistic prices of food and entertainment outweigh the odds for a lower class or minority family to be able to afford an outing in an area as conservative as Orange County. Through its depiction on television and in advertisements, tourists have interpreted that Anaheim is a far away destination that is beautiful and magical, but that is only true if you can afford the $100+ admission per family member to enter this imagined community. In reality, the city has become stricken with homelessness, poverty, increasing incidents of crime

and violence, as well as Disneyland's very own employees working for unlivable wages.[3] Disneyland keeps making money in the city but is not giving a decent portion of it back to its community.

My original question for this essay was "what is the relation of Disneyland to Anaheim and was its construction helpful or harmful to the economy?" I wanted to gain research from both sides of the argument, but most importantly, I want to figure out why Disneyland has such a negative connotation when brought up to locals. Is the city of Anaheim still considered a suburb? Was this due to Disneyland's expansion? Did Disney and his employees promise the city anything in return for allowing this construction? Has there been any improvement since the original backlash it received when city officials wanted to boycott Disney? I focus on two major themes throughout my paper: how Disneyland has and still is advertising the suburban dream, reminiscent of 1950s lifestyle and homeownership, and the "suburban disequilibrium" that the park has caused in the city of Anaheim for its residents since its construction and opening during the mid-1950s.

"Imaginear-ing" an Enterprise

The idea for Disneyland came to Walt Disney during a trip to Southern California where he analyzed Knott's Berry Farm in 1953, curious about park operation. Anaheim was portrayed as an agricultural haven consisting of "undeveloped lands housing orange and eucalyptus groves" Walt believed would serve as an excellent base to build upon.[4] The city was envisioned to become a reliable source for tourism due to its proximity to the I-5 freeway, making it accessible by those who owned and drove automobiles, such as middle-class families, a post-WWII suburban concept. Buzz Price, Walt Disney's contractor, evaluated Anaheim: its population was growing, it offered the least amount of rain, and decent temperatures.[5] Consisting of only "15 homes, 4,400 orange trees, 160 acres, along the 'Ball Road Subdivision, a small portion of land within a growing city with a current population of 14,556' was the perfect place to build a theme park."[6] This pitching of such an idea did not sit well with current residents and city officials.

In 1954, Mayor Pearson opposed the idea of the park because he did not want a "carnival" running in his newly suburbanized city.[7] Theme parks did not have the greatest reputation at this time and raised concern for tarnishing a city's image due to circus-like environments, boardwalks ridden with pollution, and development in more urbanized areas such as New York, on the East Coast. Walt Disney's idea was to create an entertainment mecca in favor of the family ideal: good, clean fun for everyone involved. For a middle-class family living in the 1950s, a trip to Disneyland would be ideal: mom and dad can relax and catch a break from their mundane and extraneous roles within the structure of the family home, and the kids can play and explore in a controlled, safe environment. During an era where amusement parks were a "struggling industry" trying to maintain a wholesome appearance, Disney looked to the avoid the attraction factor of an amusement center like Coney Island, a carnival atmosphere of sex and vice. Instead, he tried to shift attention to the theme park to "capture everyone's imagination and really revolutionize the leisure industry all over the world."[8]

Disney was an intelligent man, looking for expansion at the height of the 1950s, he "benefited from postwar prosperity, the baby boom, and the creation of highways."[9] The location of the park within a neighborhood that was seen as suburban, consisting mostly of homes and agricultural fields,

away from the urban ills of the city created an illusion of safety and centered on the idea of a family outing as a reward. Disneyland was within reach by just performing a simple daily activity such as driving. The use of highways draws attention to the separation of work from play. Inside the park, one can be exposed to the magic of make-believe and endeavor through magically built environments, all while being able to feel like a kid again. This creative exploitation of capitalism disguised as an escape mechanism becomes problematic because it focuses on an unrealistic appearance of the world. Disneyland, as an image, is hypocritical because the park is maintained to create a clean and welcoming interior by employees, which is bordered off from the filth of Harbor Boulevard, right outside its gates. Depending on how far you travel along Harbor Boulevard, that street can lead into some areas that become fearsome after certain times of the day, known for soliciting and promoting vice, sex, and illegal activity by suspicious individuals who may be operating crime, prostitution, and drug rings. This is not something that is talked about frequently by tourism sites, but residents of the city of Anaheim are well aware of its continuation and occasional police raids that we see frequently from the local news stations and newspapers.

As the city of Anaheim accepted that the theme park was to be built, advertisements shifted toward being "pro-Disney" and highlighting how the entertainment center would serve purposeful to the city, as seen in a publication printed by the Anaheim Chamber of Commerce in 1955. A figure with the appearance of a mouse head and letter "A" for a body, known as "Andy Anaheim," is optimistically performing a welcoming number surrounded by a few prospective photos of the Magic Kingdom. In a subheading titled "Giant Amusement Area Will Make Anaheim World Center," the focus lies on the assumption that Anaheim is "the fastest growing American city," issuing a bond where new schools and playgrounds will be built in with the city's rapid growth. Along with the expansion, there is a purpose for an abundance of schools, parks, public works, playgrounds, and retail centers. The new industries would equate to the rise of new jobs and the Chamber of Commerce is making sure that the ideal climate for new homeowners remains steady and "smog free." Another subheading notes "New Homes Keep Pace With Growing Demand" since "thousands of new home owners are moving to the city each day."[10] Disneyland was being promoted as a suburban dream, where you can "live and work in beautiful Anaheim: the new recreation capital of the world."[8]

A Promotion of White Flight

The increase of homeownership in Anaheim connects to the image of Cold War suburbia. Disneyland is "offering an image of order and serenity" that promoted specifically white flight to suburban Orange County. Although Disneyland was creating a fictional realm for guests to live out their childhood through historical timepieces and lands, it was also creating a structural barrier that did not permit acceptance for everyone in attendance, especially minorities. In Frontierland, the form of entertainment rested on the appearance of Native American "savagery" and the exploitation of a specific group's culture for touristic appeal. Native Americans were not the only marginalized group suffering from "role-playing," African Americans were also struggling with gaining an accurate representation by taking on the appearance of "racial otherness" through the introduction of Aunt Jemima's Kitchen. Geared toward a white audience, an African American woman

took on the role of Aunt Jemima, re-enacting life on the plantation through performance, which was later stopped by the Congress on Racial Equality in 1968.[11]

What is important to note about these two inaccurate representations of marginalized groups is how their previous stereotypical roles, which were set in historical periods in America, essentially took on the form of cultural appropriation for white entertainment. Disney stated that he prides himself on creating an entertainment mecca for all to feel welcome, but that was only true if you were white. Space is an outlet that produces images of race and promotes the idea of whiteness. When we think of suburbs, we often think of a home occupied by a white, nuclear family. It can be argued that being able to obtain a ticket or admission to Disneyland gave working class families of color a sense of status. The nonwhite family who once was depicted as an "outsider" now had access to the park and gains purchasing power, while surrounded by advertisements of typical leading names of consumerism and fulfilling their desire to travel westward.

"Disneyland remains the central attraction of Southern California, but the graveyard remains our reality."[12] This quote ties in with the assumption that Disneyland is interpreted as an intriguing place, which appeals to all members of society regardless of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. However, the sad reality is that Disneyland was constructed in the 1950s during a time where only white, potential homeowners were allowed to move into suburbanized areas of interest, a theme seen in *The Suburb Reader*. People of color were not allowed to own homes or live in regulated and commercialized neighborhoods and are forced by structural racial oppression to live in urban areas or subdivisions that were closer to the city and workplace. This process, known as redlining, kept minorities out of these spaces to promote white nationalism. Established by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation or HOLC in the 1930s, this real estate practice denied access to homes for certain races and ethnicities while raising the price of those areas and allowing banks to deny loans to "keep the unwanted out" of predominantly white neighborhoods.[13] One of the most prominent areas in which the lasting effects of this practice can be seen in Southern California today is in the city of Watts. Watts was regulated by segregation efforts and labeled an unsafe place to live and therefore, struggled to receive any form of assistance for loans that would aid community upkeep, renovation, and home improvements. This caused the community to fall into a rapid state of decline in both value and safety, exposing its residents to unsafe working conditions and high rates of crime and poverty, giving the city a bad reputation.[14] Tying back to the "graveyard" mentioned in Bukowski's quote, Disneyland has built itself upon the structural racial oppression that still exists in white America. Minorities were only allowed to be in the park as a source of entertainment to guests, rather than given the equal opportunity to be apart of this imagined community of suburban Disneyland. Instead of pushing itself forward to demonstrate equal representations for all groups who live in the country, it has taken a step back and remains in the graveyard of America's racist past.

Unfair treatment of minorities continued into the park's first decade of operation. In the peak of the 1960s civil rights movement era, where racial stereotypes and unequal advantages in the workplace became a question of concern, Disney took the easy way out. Instead of being put under fire for its unfair practices, Walt wanted to erase all remnants of these depictions from sight by replacing real workers with animatronic characters.[15] This tactic

demonstrates how the consumer's needs and satisfaction are placed above the rights and values of the Disneyland employee. Consumerism drives business and park operation, where an individual's status in society outweighs the traits and work ethic of the individual. If you do not like the conditions of the workplace, you are easily replaceable by technology: a figure that cannot talk back or voice concerns that clash with the direct representation of the company.

The Working Poor vs. Corporate Greed

Walt Disney had an optimistic future for his theme park and its central location in Southern California, and after his death in 1966, the Walt Disney Company began to look for means of expansion. Disneyland boosts the economy of Anaheim but takes a negative approach when it comes to taking care of its employees inside the park. This has become a concern in recent years since the increasing rates of homelessness in the city has become an epidemic. In 1994, the city of Anaheim declared bankruptcy and began to rely heavily on Disneyland to boost its revenue through the construction of more theme park attractions (Disneyland California Adventure, Grand Californian Hotel, Downtown Disney, Star Wars Land, Pixar, etc.). The company is perceived to have a "happy partnership" with Anaheim, where nearly twenty years ago, it issued a $510 million bond to revamp the area surrounding the park, including the convention center and expanding a parking garage. The Walt Disney Company had been bribed with incentives, reaching a monetary value of $600 million for the efforts to build four new state-of-the-art hotels for developers. What is Disneyland offering in return, you might ask? An investment of $1.6 billion in return for the opening of Star Wars: Galaxy's Edge, opening in 2019. City officials are becoming skeptical about how exactly this money is being poured back into the greater good of the city, especially to help tackle the rapid increase of "the working poor."[16]

Last year in 2017, the city of Anaheim gained nearly $81.6 million from Disneyland's hotels' taxes, alone. A fear that is becoming of concern for recently elected city officials is that Disneyland's foundation of employment is built on a system of low skilled, low wage jobs. The obligations that this corporate giant holds to the city of Anaheim is based on politics and economic features. Disneyland is the city's "largest employer, most charitable company, and the biggest taxpayer." Anaheim's current mayor, Tom Tait wishes to reinforce that "governments need to put neighborhoods first," by turning the focus away from businesses and emphasizing "core services of public safety and civic upkeep." He believes this cannot be done when "you give millions of dollars away to hotels and conventions and things like that."[17]

Disneyland workers are directly affected by their employer's failure to acknowledge their personal struggles off the clock. According to a survey taken by Disneyland Resort employees, 85% of 17,000 workers who are represented by 11 unions, earn less than $15 an hour, with more than half earning less than $12: below the poverty line for a family of four. Of 30,000 cast members, "more than half the resort's workers live in Orange County, a third in Los Angeles County, 7 percent in Riverside County and 6 percent in San Bernardino County." For workers who can barely afford shelter for themselves and their families, driving from further distances accounts for more expenses to pay from an already small check (cost of gas, food, travel, insurance, etc.). The survey states that "almost three-quarters (73 percent) say that they do not earn enough money for basic expenses every month," and that

"41 percent of the resort's employees are 30 to 54 years old and 18 percent are over 54." One of the most disheartening findings is that "more than one out of 10 – including 13 percent of those with young children – report having been homeless, or not having a place of their own to sleep, in the past two years." Workers are demanding that their needs be taken into consideration because "the rank-and-file employees who make Disneyland Resort such a profitable enterprise have not shared in the park's success; it would require only 5.7 percent of park revenue to raise the wage floor for Disneyland workers to $20."[18]

A citywide poll, taken in 1992, determined that Anaheim is viewed as a lively, safe, tourist attraction across the globe, but is feared by its residents who live in nearby neighborhoods. Anaheim is "overcrowded, facing urban ills such as crime, affordable housing, gangs, loss of jobs, and diminishing quality of public services."[19] In 1993, Disneyland wanted to expand its parks into other surrounding areas such as Long Beach and Burbank but was defeated by residents. Facing a rapid decline in job fields since the closing of military-based occupations following the end of the Cold War, particularly in the aviation industry, Anaheim was searching for new sources of revenue.[20] Promising tax revenue and an abundance of jobs to follow its delivery, Disney also faced backlash for its means of "financing public works" to aid during this building process. The city of Anaheim was under watch once again for the building of either another park or hotel which would later become "California Adventure."[21] Originally hard to support, "the park Disney envisioned had a price tag of about $3 billion. The company wanted the city to contribute roughly $1 billion, primarily in the form of infrastructure upgrades."[22] The two parties eventually reached an agreement in 1996, resulting in the $510 million bond mentioned earlier.

Connecting back to *The Suburb Reader*, suburbs are used to "increase inequality between economic and social classes."[23] In relation to Los Angeles suburbs, which took a hit in the 1980s and closed down union jobs and replaced them with low paying ones in immigrant communities, these suburbs outside of this urban crisis are dealing with a loss of revenue and the defunding of public works and institutions — relatable to Disneyland pay and labor. Anaheim residents and politicians have begun the fight to push back against the Walt Disney Company which has become a "drug" that the city has not been able to quit due to Anaheim's ever-increasing popularity for tourism.[24]

The most prominent figure in this current fight for equal representation is city councilman, Jose Moreno. He stresses the idea that subsidies signed away to large contributions to PACs to sway the most recent 2016 election have created this illusion of "two Anaheims:" with increasing prices for homes and residence but lowered wages, resulting in disgruntled and sometimes homeless residents. Drawing harsh realities that the city has "invested in the lives of tourists' children" rather than its own, the city must reform by cutting its ties in big deals with the theme park. During the 2016 election, Disney paid out $1.22 million to ten different PACs that were involved in political debates, even funding cities and causes outside of the borders of Anaheim; "Disney's spending did not pay off." On its own, the city of Anaheim has made some drastic changes regarding its representation within the city council. Since the 2016 election, it has expanded its seats from five to six members, elected by district. A change evoked since a lawsuit put in place by the American Civil Liberties Union demanded more Latino representation in political office, since the ethnic group makes up nearly 53% of the

city's population. Anaheim residents just want to be represented equally and acknowledged when it comes to funding and lawmaking in the city that they call home.[25]

This controversial issue relates back to *The Suburb Reader* when San Leandro faced a similar issue: the city is using its revenue to just fund and support Disneyland over its declining neighborhoods.[26] The harsh treatment of Disneyland employees is also creating a rift between its citizens, especially concerning crime and poverty rates, which are on the rise. Anaheim residents have voiced an opinion of wanting to see more of the city's tax revenue spent on making neighborhoods safer and tackling increasing homelessness. This problem has gained statewide media attention after an encampment of homeless residents was established on the Santa Ana Riverbed Trail near the entertainment centers of Angel Stadium and Honda Center. The living conditions of this makeshift community called for the "declaration of a state of emergency on homelessness, exposing other residents to disease, human waste, used, exposed needles, and the concern for safety regarding the public's access to the riverbed biking trail as a means for transportation. The current infrastructure of the city is best put by resident and activist, Luisa Lam who states, 'I'm lucky I live near Disneyland Resort — it is nice and clean. But it's not really representative of what Anaheim is.'"[27] The magical image of cleanliness and safety that Disneyland is representative of inside of the park does not match up with what its own residents are experiencing a few miles away from its busy intersections.

Walt Disney kept post-war suburban sprawl in mind, but did not plan for 60 years down the road. During its early construction, neighborhoods were being demolished nearby, but inside the park, patrons got an escape from the reality outside its gates. However, Disneyland was dividing neighborhoods, creating traffic, and unhappiness with no real sense of "community."[28] Anaheim is seen as a single operated company town, home to a population of 350,000 residents. During the 1960s and 70s, Disneyland focused on building strong recreational relationships with top city officials to further advance itself as a company, such as bribing city workers with "all-access passes," which gained unlimited entry to the park, to be able to utilize that person, during a crisis that needed quick fixing, such as a power outage at the park. This unfair advantage was stopped in 1974 with the help of the Political Reform Act. The accepting of lavish gifts from the park made it appear that the city was being paid off for its immediate access to services. The city and park need to "separate their personal and professional relationships."[29] Although this shows only the effects on a specific community, it puts into perspective how numerous construction sites since WWII separate communities and are detrimental to "civilization."[30]

One way that officials who are anti-Disney greed are improving the plans for reuniting and refurbishing the city is by "ending the hotel tax rebate for the construction of 2,000 new rooms, valued at a rebate of $267 million over a span of 20 years."[31] The rebate is no longer being offered for developments in the park's near future for expansion. City officials also turned down a proposed streetcar project in January 2018, which would have connected the resort to the newly redesigned Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center, known as ARTIC, transit hub near Honda Center. City Hall has also been impacted by the forced resignation of Paul Emery, the Anaheim city manager, after he endorsed the passing of the "entertainment tax exemption and hotel rebate."[32] Anaheim is taking a step back and realizing

that its city should be working in the best interest of its residents who take pride in choosing the city as a place to live, not because it is near the safety and comfort of the Disneyland Resort. Disney should not be endorsing and signing off its own checks; it is a citywide decision.

The Mouse Trap

Disneyland, considered a must visit tourist attraction, has set a trap for its residents and employees that is hard to escape from, due to its marketing and powerfully built empire. This destination has continuously constructed an imagined community, appealing to all ages, which shields itself from the harsh realities of its actual community which is struggling right outside its green, rod iron gates. The Coney Island image Walt Disney had tried so hard to avoid has now become a backdrop for the park, making an appearance after dark.

Although Walt Disney's intentions for the park in relation to city expansion was brilliant for a growing suburb in the 1950s, 60 years later it has caused more harm than good due to overpopulation and the declining of valuable resources. In order to make a pivotal change geared towards repair, city officials and patrons must look beyond the entry gates and capital gains of the park to discover how theme parks and their funds are plummeting neighborhoods into poverty-stricken living conditions. The story of Disneyland is a suburban issue due to its construction built on broken promises and capitalistic ideals that keep the wealthy in power and the working class left behind with no real voice to be heard.

References

[1] Paul Beatty, *The Sellout* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 2015), 9-10.
[2] "The 10 Best California Vacations," *U.S. News & World Report*, https://travel.usnews.com <accessed April 26, 2018>.
[3] Catherine Gewertz and Kevin Johnson, "The Times of Orange County Poll: Gritty Realities Tarnish the Glow on Anaheim, The Way Tourists and Insiders See the City Differs, Results Show Though Residents Still View Life Here Favorably, Widespread Pessimism Over Big-City Ills Exists," **Los Angeles Times**, March 15, 1992, http://articles.latimes.com/1992-03-15/news/mn-6834_1_anaheim-city-hall.
[4] Amy Wilson, "Disneyland - Walt Disney, The Man Who Made Orange County," *Orange County Register*, July 17, 2015.
[5] Keith Sharon, "'Build it in Anaheim,' Buzz Price told Walt Disney," *Orange County Register,* July 1, 2015.
[6] Ibid.
[7] "History of Modern Day Anaheim: 1950s - 1980s," *City of Anaheim*, https://www.anaheim.net <accessed April 26, 2018>.
[8] Kimi Yoshino and Dave McKibben, "A Park With a Powerful Spell," *Los Angeles Times*, July 17, 2005, https://www.latimes.com/la-me-disney17jul17-story.html.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Anaheim Chamber of Commerce, "City of Anaheim Prepares to Welcome Disneyland," *Anaheim Progress*, 1955.
[11] Eric Avila, *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 106-144.
[12] Charles Bukowski, "A Quote by Charles Bukowski," *Goodreads*, www.goodreads.com <accessed April 26, 2018>.

[13] Greg Miller, "Newly Released Maps Show How Housing Discrimination Happened," *National Geographic*, October 17, 2016, https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/10/housing-discrimination-redlining-maps/.
[14] Becky M. Nicolaides and Andrew Wiese, "Postwar Suburbs and the Construction of Race" and "The City-Suburb Divide," *The Suburb Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 340-395.
[15] Michael Steiner, "Frontierland as Tomorrowland: Walt Disney and the Architectural Packaging of the Mythic West," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 48, no. 1 (Spring 1998), 2-17.
[16] John Buntin, "Outside Disneyland, a Reminder for Governments to be Careful What They Wish For," *TCA Regional News*, April 1, 2018, http://www.governing.com/topics/mgmt/gov-disneyland-anaheim-incentives.html.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Margot Roosevelt, "Disneyland Resort Workers Struggle to Pay for Food, Housing and Medical Care, Union Survey Finds," *Orange County Register*, March 08, 2018, https://www.ocregister.com/2018/02/27/disneyland-resort-workers-struggle-to-pay-for-food-housing-and-medical-care-union-survey-finds/.
[19] Gewertz and Kevin, "The Times of Orange County Poll."
[20] Buntin, "Outside Disneyland, a Reminder."
[21] Matt Lait and Chris Woodyard, "News Analysis: Is Anaheim Next in Line for a Rejection by Disney?" *Los Angeles Times*, Dec 24, 1993, http://articles.latimes.com/1993-12-24/news/mn-5187_1_walt-disney.
[22] Buntin, "Outside Disneyland, a Reminder."
[23] Becky M. Nicolaides and Andrew Wiese, "Suburban Disequilibrium," *The Suburb Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 506-507.
[24] Daniel Miller, "How One Election Changed Disneyland's Relationship with Its Hometown," *Los Angeles Times*, September 26, 2017.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Lew Phelps, "Model Municipality: San Leandro, Calif, Manages to Surmount Many of the Problems that Plague Cities," *The Suburb Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 375-377.
[27] Miller, "How One Election Changed Disneyland's Relationship."
[28] James Howard Kunstler, "A Crisis in Landscape and Townscape," *The Suburb Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 573-574.
[29] Miller, "How One Election Changed Disneyland's Relationship."
[30] Kunstler, "A Crisis in Landscape and Townscape."
[31] Miller, "How One Election Changed Disneyland's Relationship."
[32] Roosevelt, "Disneyland Resort Workers Struggle to Pay for Food."

Female Sexuality on *Shameless*

Stephanie Ramirez

AMST 442: Television and American Culture

This essay was written for American Studies 442: Television and American Culture. It was assigned as a final paper, aimed at presenting a cultural topic (such as sexuality, race, etc.) via American Television. Before reading, I want readers to think about the possibilities in depicting complex storylines and topics such as female desire. The takeaway from this is that although the characters have done questionable things that are flat-out controversial, it's important to present taboo concepts and see them as they are, so that we can talk about them.

Shameless is an American television show adapted from its UK version in 2011 on Showtime. The story centers around the Gallaghers, a working class family struggling to make ends meet.[1] I will use three episodes that demonstrate three female characters' (Karen Jackson, Sheila Jackson, and Fiona Gallagher) sexual behaviors, and analyze the reactions to their behaviors- whether it's a literal response from another character, or the way their individual storylines are executed. While *Shameless* presents a liberal space in which women openly express their sexual desires, their often ridiculed storylines are an example of the complexity of exploring female sexuality on an American television show. My paper will explore whether or not the show offers criticism of their desires, and if there are any right or wrong sexual behaviors among the women in the show.

Karen Jackson's sexuality on season 1, episode 10 called "Nana Gallagher Had an Affair" involves her father taking her to a Christian purity ball to restore her virginity.[2] He does this after finding out that she is sexually active; it is his way of curbing her rebellion. Karen is a young, middle class, sexually active high school student, and the main reason she agrees to do this is because her father promised he'd give her a car. However, her excitement as she gets ready for the purity ball shows that she also wants to repair a tense relationship with her father. Her father emphasizes that he is proud for willingness to become a born-again virgin, reminding her that he is "protect[ing] her the way Jesus intended." His attempt to put her on a corrective path suggests that a young woman who has sex taints her sense of worth and must seek forgiveness. Karen's mother is also excited for her daughter, but not in the way the father is. She helps Karen put on her dress and compliments her not on her willingness to restore her virginity, but the fact that she looks "beautiful." The disparity between her parents' acceptance of Karen being comfortable showcasing her body becomes apparent when her father looks away as she is still in her underwear.

Karen's sexual desires in this episode are suppressed by a male character, who reinforces the ideal that women should be ashamed for openly expressing their sexual desires. However, this ideal is challenged when Sheila asks, "Do they have these balls for young men?" He replies with, "Why

would they?" Karen teasingly grins at her mother, indicating that she knows how blatantly the event doesn't align with her and her mother's views. This however doesn't cause an argument in the family. The double standard of there being no purity balls for sexually active young men isn't further questioned. They're all trying to remain civil and hope that it restores them as a united family, since Karen's parents have recently separated.

During the purity ball, fathers call up their daughters to recount their sexual experiences and apologize for them. All the girls who speak up show no eagerness to restore their purity and are clearly embarrassed. The idea that women are to blame for their bad sexual experiences is emphasized during the purity ball when they are pressured to apologize for openly expressing their sexual desires. The fathers' attempt to restore the girls' virginity (and the attempt to clearly mark themselves as adult, authoritative figures) is also apparent in the dresses the girls wear, which make them look like children. When it is Karen's turn to confess, she does it as quickly as she can, but is encouraged to continue in order to completely restore her virginity. She then begins to tell a very detailed history of her sexual life. Non-diegetic, humorous music beings to play, along with editing to indicate time elapsing quickly to convey a sense that Karen's speech is too thorough and unnecessary. This is when her father interrupts her to call her a whore, and that she doesn't deserve the car he promised her.

Karen's mother immediately consoles her and cries with her when she finds out what happened, demonstrating Sheila's love for her daughter no matter what, and acceptance for who she is. It also shows that the suppressing of her sexual life is done by a male character, who reinforces the stereotype that women must remain sexually pure. This episode is complex in that it presents Karen's conflicting desires of wanting to make her father proud of her, while struggling to maintain her sexually-liberated identity. Karen doesn't regret her decision to be sexually active, she ultimately did it because she really wanted a car, and would've probably continued to be sexually active after getting it (because she hasn't always followed the rules anyway). Mittell argues that, "all meanings in television are representations with particular distortions, selections, and omissions."[3] In this episode, Karen represents the idea that female promiscuity makes someone deviant and unworthy of getting what they want in life—or that having sex should subject them to judgement. This is presented through the lens of a conservative father figure. The omission in this case is the limited dismantling of the double standard of boys versus girls being sexually active. The double standard is questioned, but nothing is done to challenge it, much less stop or change the views of the one reinforcing it. This episode allows Karen to talk about her desires, but not without being ultimately shamed for it. Because more of the story time is spent trying to get Karen to repent for her sexual history (and executing a miserable storyline for her), it suggests that women exploring their sexuality comes with ramifications. "Nana Gallagher Had an Affair" highlights that any attempt to transgress shame associated with female sexuality should expectantly be met with disapproval, therefore suggesting that Karen's sexual behaviors are more wrong than right.

In season 3, episode 5, "The Sins of My Caretaker," Sheila Jackson struggles to gain control of her sexual life with her boyfriend, who is pushing her boundaries; he wants her to be submissive in bed, which she is not used to, she's used to being the dominant person in bed.[4] Sheila's sexual life is also shamed through a religious character (a nun, whom she's taking care of in

hospice care). The show's separation of two different women is identified in the beginning, with a character who is sexually active, versus a religious, conservative character who is the polar opposite. The nun functions in the same way Karen's father did—to shame a woman for openly expressing her sexual desires.

The use of comedy in this particular storyline is worth noting, as it is used in a way to convey that Sheila's problem isn't serious. Despite the show's dramatic comedy genre, this episode certainly wasn't as dramatic as Karen's storyline. While the show stays true to using comedy to ridicule both male and female characters in several aspects of their lives, the men are never called "whores" nor pressured to hide their sexuality, especially by women. So one can consider the male and female characters' humiliation similar, but not in the context of the oppression of female sexuality in American culture. Sheila's comedic storyline also relates to Patricia Mellencamp's dilemma, which questions whether women serve as, "the subject or object of comedy," or perhaps both.[5] In this episode, Sheila can be considered both. Her desires are treated as funny when she hides her sex toys and tries to pass off a sex swing as "a harness for patients." Her attempt to conceal her sex life and commentary that have a sort of double meaning is meant to be funny. The fact that Sheila was the one to deliver the joke makes her the subject of comedy. At the same time, Sheila is the object of comedy because the nun ridicules her and not her boyfriend. The use of comedy makes it easy for the audience to separate themselves from sexual situations that are perhaps foreign to them, which has been examined in other shows that feature raunchy sex scenes and situations such as *Sex and the City*.[6] The ability to explore outlandish situations with a comedic tone provides relief from serious issues that would have a different effect on the audience if they were presented with a dark, dramatic tone. This demonstrates the show's versatility of using different genres to present characters' struggles.

This episode presents someone with little control over her desires, and how she ultimately gains control when she gets rid of the nun and her negative perceptions. However, she doesn't fully gain control over her struggles. While the show allows Sheila to perform a sexually dominant, patriarchal role, she regresses to being an object, both physically and socially. Sheila experiences what Mellencamp would call "domestic containment."[7] This applies specifically to her sexual life, in that she doesn't truly want to be submissive, she just decides to go along with it. At the same time, she is contained through the judgement of the nun, who negatively criticizes Sheila in her online blog. She overcomes this when she throws the nun out of her house at the end of the episode. Throughout the episode, she tries to figure out a way to confront her issues with her boyfriend. However, this problem is never solved in the episode. This also applies to the idea of "comic containment", in which a female character's comedic performance is the only form of escaping "domestic containment."[8] This episode presents a woman's sexual experiences that are generally seen as taboo in American culture. It could also suggest the idea that a middle-aged housewife having a taboo sex life should be laughable. The show's decision to make the audience laugh at and not with Sheila therefore makes the representation of her sex life complex. Sheila being shamed for expressing her sexual desires was not necessarily shown as wrong, but rather a messy situation that she put herself into.

Fiona's sex life is explored in season 7, episode 3, "Home Sweet Homeless Shelter."[9] She is the head of the Gallagher family, working several

dead-end jobs in order to take care of her siblings after her unstable parents abandoned them. In this episode, she wants to suppress her emotional problems as a way to recover from her disastrous wedding, and does so by having meaningless sex using the hook-up app Tinder. She uses sex as an emotional distraction, chooses to put herself first by telling her siblings that they have to contribute with paying bills, and that they can't rely on her for everything. Although her storyline's premise involves her decision to explore her sexuality on her own terms, it was presented as regressive for her character. Her best friend, Veronica, is concerned that Fiona is obviously using sex as a way to run away from her problems instead of facing them. When Fiona tells her brother about using Tinder, he says, "you're female, doesn't it come easy to you?" She acknowledges that women are expected to be more sexually accessible than men, but argues that she loves using Tinder because it is very convenient for her busy life. After all, she was being safe, and didn't suffer from her decision. It is one of the few things she has control over in her otherwise disorderly life. Despite other characters' concerns that this can backfire on her, she uses it to start a new chapter in her life towards upward mobility. Fiona is approaching a good opportunity to earn the most money she has ever earned when she considers becoming a property developer. She makes it clear that she will not let anything get in the way of her potential to become successful. Deborah Tolman argues that women's pursuit of sexual desire is a way of exploring their physical body, their relationship with other people, and their own realities.[10] Although this article applies to teenage girls, it is relevant to Fiona in that she is a young girl who had to mature quickly in order to take care of her siblings. In a way, she can still be considered an adolescent because she is inexperienced in holding a real job, and maintaining stable relationships. Fiona steps into the modern world that involves sex though the use of technology. She also steps into a more mature phase in her life. She begins to discover her potential to be independent, and finally overcome harsh poverty that has inhibited her in past seasons. Her exploration of this new world is exposing her to new experiences and new people, while helping her maintain her goal of not letting her past troubles control her happiness. This exploration of her sexual desires enhances her control over her physical body and her life's outcomes. Her storyline is complex in that the criticisms of her emotional distractions do not ultimately inhibit her. This episode doesn't provide a clear indication that what she is doing is wrong; Fiona doesn't stop expressing her desires out of shame. This storyline brings a transition into much-needed stability in her life. The complexity here is that despite it having no detrimental effect in her life, her decision to have casual sex makes her perceived as immature, and she strongly challenges that.

The women I analyzed have mostly engaged in heterosexual relationships (not counting Karen talking about her past sexual experience with girls in her episode). *Shameless* presents their storylines using what Janna L. Kim et al. identify as a "Heterosexual Script." It is through the reinforcement of heterosexual relationships and other "codes" that characters establish "heteronormativity."[11] One of the codes they analyze involves "the sexual double standard", which identifies the male characters' freedom to act out their sexual desires without being punished for it, while female characters deal with being sexually oppressed.[12] Although female characters on *Shameless* are ultimately punished or criticized in some way for expressing their sexual desires, there is space for questioning the double standard. This highlights the shift in American popular culture focusing on female desires that go beyond

domesticity and reaches areas that historically could not have been explored. Female characters are starting to take control of their suppressed sexuality that prevailed in past films and television.[13] This is done by placing female characters in dominant roles (such as Karen having multiple sexual partners, Sheila's sexual domination, and Fiona's meaningless sex) that are overwhelmingly expected from men in American culture and television. This helps explain that female characters' sexuality on *Shameless* isn't black and white, because in fact, every single character on the show struggles to overcome some form of ridicule or shame, which only mimics what the show is named after.

References

[1] *Shameless*, created by John Wells and Paul Abbott, aired 2011-present, Showtime.
[2] *Shameless*, Season 1 Episode 10, "Nana Gallagher Had an Affair," directed by Adam Bernstein, aired March 13, 2011, Showtime.
[3] Jason Mittell, *Television and American Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 271.
[4] *Shameless*, Season 3 Episode 5, "The Sins of My Caretaker," written by Sheila Callaghan and directed by James M. Muro, aired February 17, 2013, Showtime.
[5] Patricia Mellencamp, "Situation Comedy, Feminism and Freud: Discourses of Gracie and Lucy" in *Studies in Entertainment: Critical Approaches to Mass Culture*, ed. Tania Modleski (Bloomington: IN: Indiana University Press, 1986), 67.
[6] Beatriz Oria, "What's Love Got to Do With It? 'Sex and the City's Comic Perspective on Sex," *Journal of Popular Culture*, 47 (April 2014): 383.
[7] Mellencamp, "Situation Comedy," 67.
[8] Mellencamp, "Situation Comedy," 73.
[9] *Shameless*, Season 7 Episode 3, "Home Sweet Homeless Shelter," written by Krista Vernoff and directed by Iain MacDonald, October 16, 2016, Showtime.
[10] Deborah Tolman, "Female Adolescents, Sexual Empowerment and Desire: A missing Discourse of Gender Inequality," *Sex Roles*, 66 (February 2012): 749.
[11] Janna L. Kim et al., "From Sex to Sexuality: Exposing the Heterosexual Script on Primetime Network Television," *Journal of Sex Research* 44 (April 2007): 145-147.
[12] Kim et al., "From Sex to Sexuality,"147.
[13] Philip Green, *Cracks in the Pedestal: Ideology and Gender in Hollywood* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 202.

Milo: Trolling the University

Kaycee Moser

AMST 489: America 2.0: Electronic Culture and Community

I was enrolled in Professor Pam Steinle's "America 2.0: Electronic Culture in America" in the fall of 2017 when Milo Yiannopoulos came to Cal State Fullerton on his "Troll Academy" tour. The event crossed into the classroom, where American Studies faculty and students discussed the potential implications of such a controversial figure coming onto our campus. The tense climate proved to be inspirational to this work. After I decided to further analyze the event, I began to question the meaning of the title "Troll Academy." Historically, trolling was a behavior that had been largely perpetuated online. What did it mean that Milo was bringing that offline and onto college campus? In this essay, I explore that question as well as the implications of Milo trolling the university. I use the lens of electronic culture moving offline to further draw connections about college campuses in general.

Introduction

On the Halloween of 2017, controversial political commentator Milo Yiannopoulos shook up the campus of California State University, Fullerton by coming to the college as part of his "Troll Academy" tour. As soon as the news of his invitation by the College Republicans was published to the student body, campus culture shifted and conversations began. Most notably, petitions circulated around campus to prevent him from attending altogether. These petitions were warranted, as students and faculty were worried about campus and student safety. Earlier in the year, Milo appeared at UC Berkeley inspiring a riot that resulted in $100,000 of damage to the campus.[1] In December of 2016, he outed and mocked a transgender student to a large crowd at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.[2] Milo also encouraged the outing of undocumented students. Just weeks before the announcement of Milo's planned visit was published, DACA was rescinded. Undocumented students were largely unprotected and Milo was unsafe to many of them. Despite 5,390 signatures, the petition did not accomplish its mission.[3] CSUF administration reinforced the public university's obligation to protect free speech, which included the "Troll Academy" tour stop by Milo Yiannopoulos. They promised to have high security and the event went on as planned.

Halloween 2017 was an odd day at Cal State Fullerton. There was an uncharacteristic cloudy haze and people were wearing spooky Halloween costumes. Milo had instructed his followers to wear offensive and politically incorrect costumes, but I didn't see anything too over the top. What was more startling was the lack of students at school that day. Some professors decided that they would not fault students who did not attend class, with some canceling classes altogether. This resulted in many students not showing up to school. I, on the other hand, went into the library around noon and

it seemed that there were only half of the usual number of students there. I had planned on staying for Milo's talk until I found out that it had sold out, so I followed the event via Twitter. Hours before the speech, people gathered outside of the Titan Student Union in what the *LA Times* referred to as a "small but tense protest," estimated at about 150 people. Once the audience of more than 800 people settled in and the speech began, things outside got more out of hand. One protester violently threw a water bottle at an attendee who was wearing a Make America Great Again hat. Another woman was arrested for shooting pepper spray in the air. Police officers and security were forced to break up the protest due to the pepper spray incident and some protestors were arrested for not cooperating. Others reorganized near the Pollak Library before being dispersed once more. In total, eight people were arrested, but thankfully no one was hurt.[4]

For a little over a month and a half, student interactions and general mood shifted because Milo was scheduled to come to campus. Whether it's for good or for bad, Milo certainly made an impact. All this commotion led me, an undergraduate senior at CSUF, to wonder what cultural conditions could have prompted this level of political action from students. Milo and his supporters often dress their message with the label of "free speech," but it seems that the speech is often inflammatory and derogatory, which attracts such a negative response. It's no coincidence that Milo chose to title his tour "Troll Academy." It seems that his rhetoric exemplifies characteristics of trolling, which is an act that was created and popularized in electronic culture. But what is a troll? And why did Milo start an academy for them?

According to Merriam-Webster, there are at least two current definitions of trolling as it pertains to society and communication. The first is "to antagonize (others) online by deliberately posting inflammatory, irrelevant, or offensive comments or other disruptive content." The second is "to harass, criticize, or antagonize (someone) especially by provocatively disparaging or mocking public statements, postings, or acts."[5] The critical difference between these definitions is that one includes online behavior and the other does not. These co-standing definitions show the current state that trolling is in: both online and offline. Electronic culture in America has become so pervasive that once anonymous keyboard warriors are moving into more public arenas. Milo Yiannopoulos is comfortable being the face and the force of trolling moving offline and onto college campuses.

Halloween at CSUF showed what self-professed trolls can elicit in offline behavior. Certainly, there is an importance to trolling that should not be ignored. In order to study it, I will use Milo's latest book *Dangerous*, the video recording of Milo's "Troll Academy" speech at CSUF, and supplemental news reports about the talk. I am choosing to look at this talk as a site of trolling moving offline in order to understand the ways in which trolling has transformed from primarily online behavior into an outlet for political involvement, especially at universities. The changing political culture of academia, the young minds that attend college, and Milo are a perfect combination for trolling to move offline and onto college campuses.

History of Online Trolling

In her 2015 book *This is Why We Can't Have Nice Things: Mapping the Relationship between Online Trolling and Mainstream Culture*, Whitney Phillips provides a comprehensive history of online trolling between the years of 2003-2015. She writes that online trolling has a rich history in the develop-

ment of the Internet, beginning as early as the late 1980s via code disruptions and through the 1990s via disruptions in chat rooms and forums. However, trolling didn't really take off until the creation of 4chan in 2004. The cause for the shift was that people started self-identifying as trolls and began trolling for the sake of trolling.

Total anonymity on 4chan was one of the main conditions for trolling to develop into the mainstream trolling culture that exists today. The reason for trolling, however, gets a bit convoluted. When trolling began, trolls professed that the only reason they did anything was "for the lulz." Phillips devotes a whole chapter to examining the nuances of what exactly lulz are, but generally speaking, lulz are amusements based on the distress of others. Trolls would often namecall, insult, humiliate, and harass others to cause distress. Trolling often takes on inappropriate rhetoric, containing elements of racism, misogyny, homophobia, and other kinds of bigotry. For this reason, it is often assumed that trolls tend to be considered privileged in society— young, white, cisgender, straight, and male. If they are not this identity, their rhetoric often takes on the themes of such privilege and bigotry.

In danah boyd's book *It's Complicated*, she argues although that social media has the capability to resolve social divisions like racism and sexism, it typically does not. Instead, technology reinforces existing divisions while allowing people to connect in new ways.[6] Phillips echoes this by writing, "Trolls certainly amplify the ugly side of mainstream behavior, but they aren't pulling their materials, chosen targets, or impulses from the ether. They are born of and fueled by the mainstream world."[7] In this excerpt, Phillips stresses that trolling doesn't come from just anywhere— it comes from the culture at large. Both scholars emphasize that electronic culture is inherently derived from real life attitudes and interactions. In a more narrow context, Phillips offers that trolling reflects specifically American culture. This is evident in her assertion that although trolls may be of diverse identities, their discourse still often reflects American pop culture. Even more importantly, trolls tend to perpetuate privileged, young, white, misogynistic, homophobic, and racist viewpoints.

4chan's hateful and inflammatory discourse typically kept trolls in the margins of society until what Phillips calls "the golden age," 2008-2011. These years saw a shift from trolling just "for the lulz" into focused activism. The first documented case of this was when Anons (short for many anonymous users on 4chan) targeted the Church of Scientology in 2009. The most well-known case was in the wake of the 2010 WikiLeaks scandal, when trolls exposed and targeted opponents of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange. Trolls even organized for good in 2011 with Operation Tunisia (and subsequent Operation Egypt and Operation Libya) that aimed to help political dissidents organize anonymously.

In *Here Comes Everybody*, author Clay Shirky states that there is "one big change" that electronic technology is bringing about, which is that formal institutions are being challenged by informal self-organized groups.[8] Phillips's examples of political involvement by trolls in the early 2000s indicates that this has long been the case for anonymous trolls. They challenged formal institutions by organizing themselves into groups with a focused purpose. Phillips's book leaves off in 2015, where she hints that another shift was occurring— people were becoming comfortable with trolling non-anonymously and offline. Electronic culture sure does move quickly, as just two years later Milo and his supporters appear to be proud to claim the title "troll" as a mode

of self-identification and offline organization with others.

Milo & *Dangerous*

In a way, Milo's book *Dangerous* picks up where Phillips's history leaves off. Milo calls 2016 "the year of the troll," and claims that he has special insight to what trolling means because he identifies as one. He provides this definition for trolling: "Trolling is often about telling truths that others don't want to hear. It's about tricking, pranking, and generally riling up your targets. And it's about creating a hilarious, entertaining public spectacle."[9] Notably, Milo doesn't include an Internet component in his definition of trolling and positions himself as telling the truth. He describes himself as "a critical voice in the pushback against political correctness, and a free-speech fundamentalist defending the public's right to express themselves however they please."[10]

Milo Yiannopoulos is not your typical far-right political commentator. He is a (written in no particular order) white, British, gay, married, conservative man in his early 30s who is pro-Trump and anti-gay marriage. That's right – Milo is married to another man, while simultaneously holding the belief that being gay should not be accepted or that they should have equal marriage rights. Milo doesn't shy away from the paradoxical parts of his identity. In fact, he uses them to construct what a new Republican can look like and praises himself for expanding Republican values to a modern, college-aged, left-leaning audience.

Although he has gathered a committed following, he hasn't been able to get away with all of his so-called free speech. He was forced to resign from Breitbart News for his comments on pedophilia, implying that sexual relationships between younger boys and older men can be positive experiences.[11] Additionally, he has been permanently kicked off of Twitter for repeatedly making blatantly racist comments, including calling Leslie Jones "an ape" and "a man."[12] Milo seems to typically dismiss his critics, and responds to his backlash by compartmentalizing his behavior into categories of free speech, comedy, or trolling.

Milo is comfortable being the non-anonymous face of trolling and urges others to join him. Milo wrote that the point of his book is "to teach you how to cause the same sort of mayhem I do" and he provides a list of instructions for how to do so in the epilogue.[13] He attempts to position himself as the leader of the group by urging others to copy his behavior. His stance is that *Dangerous*, trolling, and his college tours are a method to restore free speech and critical thinking in American people. He uses the Troll Academy tour to attempt to influence college students in particular.

Milo claims to troll in order to promote critical thinking, a skill that he thinks is being lost particularly in university students. Milo's main purpose of Troll Academy has to do with, what he calls, the liberalization of the college campus. He argues that it is more accepted to be liberal while you are in college, and students who identify as conservatives are in the minority. During his speech at CSUF, Milo stated, "When it comes to oppressed minorities and marginalized groups, there's no tribe in America at greater risk — the physical and existential risk — than the campus conservative."[14]

Milo's rhetoric positioned conservatives as righteously justified in feeling marginalized in a time where Republicans had more than half of the power in the American government. During 2017, the first year of Trump's presidency, Trump and his policies were often met with on-campus dem-

onstrations and protests. Milo observed that college campuses tended to be places where these protests were held, and capitalized on the right and alt-right movements by claiming to restore the voice of the college conservative. One way to get attention was to offend, or troll, liberals into paying attention to him. And, honestly, it kind of worked.

Who Is Trolling Who?

Although Milo's fundamental beliefs in free speech are relatable to many Americans, the way these beliefs translate into practice is where things get controversial. In his so-called attempts of promoting critical thinking, Milo switches between factual statements and offensive non-facts without any real differentiation between the two. Although most of his inflammatory statements are certainly protected under free speech, they are marginalizing to many people, narrowing the audience that he could be reaching if his message was truly *only* about free speech. Although his trolling rhetoric often gets him attention, it is not a suitable replacement for thought out, non-offensive speeches about free speech itself. This leads the average listener to believe that it's about *more* than free speech. In practice, it often seems like it's more about shock value and pushing boundaries. This often occurs by purposely using language that is not politically correct and making direct statements to offend marginalized groups.

While some may assume that Milo's gay identity should lead him to understand the fallacy of making generalizations about marginalized groups, it doesn't seem to stop him. In *Dangerous*, Milo insists that the main reason that everyone hates him so much is because he doesn't truly fit into any part of society. For example, he says Republicans hate him because he is gay and the LGBTQ community hates him because he is Republican. So even though he himself doesn't fit neatly into any category, he nevertheless tends to make broad generalizations about groups that he does not identify with himself -- especially liberals, feminists, and people of color. Milo is hypocritical in the way that he makes large assumptions about groups that he is not a part of, while avoiding the assumptions made about the groups that he is a part of himself.

However, it is important to remember that even though he has grandiose ideas about what his speech is *meant* to do, he still insists on self-identifying as a troll. To emulate that, he uses his communication. His speech consistently reflects the rhetoric of online trolls -- It is misogynistic, homophobic, transphobic, racist, and bigoted at large. That being said, one might question if he truly even means the things he says or if he could just be doing it "for the lulz." After all, he writes, "If Capitalists are to be hated then I will champion their causes. If being anti-drug is the new anti-culture, I'll never smoke or snort anything ever again. And if everyone else is kissing Amy Schumer's lazy, untalented ass, I'll write an article called 'Feminism is Cancer.'"[15] So, does Milo even truly believe the things he says, or is he acting as the counter to the trendy ideas of the time in order to troll the public?

If Milo attempts to champion what he perceives to be the underdog, it's important to look into whose side he is on. Just in this context, Milo has chosen to align himself with college-aged students who identify as Republican or otherwise conservatives. He argues that the liberalization of college students is threatening to the authentic political expression of their identities. Every group grows stronger as its numbers increase, and people who agree with Milo are banded together by him as their leader and the 'troll' label.

Gatherings like Troll Academy might help some students feel less alone in their political ideologies. Milo showed us that some CSUF conservative students agreed with feeling silenced.

Conservatives aren't the only people who feel silenced on college campuses, liberals have also claimed the same, especially from the professors. In July of 2017, after a professor was put on paid leave instead of fired, the faculty rights chair of California Faculty Union Fullerton said, "This is an important achievement that we were able to reverse the dismissal. It is important not only [to] our colleague, CSUF faculty, and students, but it has national importance. There is a national campaign attempting to silence leftist professors, which itself is part of a broader push to suppress dissent. It is crucial that we stand strong against these attacks."[16] McMillen indicates that people on the left feel quieted too, within the same context of university systems that Milo references.

On college campuses, some college conservatives and some college liberals claim that they are being quieted by the other. This points to a much larger issue, and suggests that a bigger problem is here than which side is being diminished more. If both conservatives and liberals feel silenced, maybe the problem is that both sides aren't listening to each other. No matter how loud each side gets and no matter how many students protest, society won't get anywhere if divided sides don't take the time to listen and thoughtfully respond to one another. Conservatives and liberals aren't listening to each other, even when they are saying similar things.

So, how can we get each other to listen? Perhaps this is where trolling comes in. Trolling people can get someone to listen because they are offended. Speaking in a way that is politically correct is expected in places of higher education and America at large. Trolling for the sake of pushing the limits of free speech often contains rhetoric that is often purposely politically incorrect. Trolling, its supporters suggest, pulls the listener in by upsetting them. If a troll succeeds, the target might get offended, but at least they are listening.

Conclusion

There is a popular online phrase that reads: "Don't feed the trolls," but ignoring the trolls doesn't make them go away. In fact, it might be feeding into the conditions that birth them in the first place. Trolling is a byproduct of American culture that first manifested online and is slowly (but surely) moving away from the screen. What was once reserved for anonymous forum websites has evolved into something that college students are ready to identify with publicly. Milo and his Troll Academy were certainly part of this process.

Milo's confidence to declare himself a troll allowed for others to follow in his footsteps. By using inflammatory speech, Milo and his followers make sure that they are heard in an environment where they feel that they are often silenced. Their explicit hope is to protect free speech, which is a fundamental American right. By using trolling to offend people into paying attention, they believe they can ignite critical thinking and logical argumentation by both sides.

Although trolls might have the power to shake up the world around them, they should be wary of the ways in which they accomplish this. Phillips writes, "However effective trolling rhetoric might be, particularly when dealing with unwanted trolling attention, the act of trolling is heavy with

ideological baggage. No matter what purpose the act is meant to serve, it is and will always be predicated on some degree of antagonism."[17] If not done with an intellectual end goal, this antagonism can easily be misconstrued into or become undirected aggression, and any legitimate points that they make will not be heard. However, by combining some of the shock value of trolling with calm and logical arguments that avoid attacking socially vulnerable people, they have the potential to shake up the university system as a whole. With the pace electronic culture has moved at so far, I have a feeling it won't take long to find out if they succeed or not.

References

[1] Michael Bodley, "At Berkeley Yiannopoulos protest, $100,000 in damage, 1 arrest," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Febrary 2, 2017, https://www.sfgate.com/crime/article/At-Berkeley-Yiannopoulos-protest-100-000-in-10905217.php.
[2] Claire Landsbaum, "Alt-Right Troll Milo Yiannopoulous Uses Campus Visit to Openly Mock a Transgender Student," *The Cut*, December 15, 2016, https://www.thecut.com/2016/12/milo-yiannopoulos-harassed-a-trans-student-at-uw-milwaukee.html
[3] "No Alt-Right Speakers or Hate Groups at CSUF," Change.org Petition, https://www.change.org/p/mildred-garcia-no-alt-right-speakers-or-hate-groups-at-csuf.
[4] Alene Tchekmedyian, Makeda Easter, and Benjamin Oreskes, "Eight arrested in protests as Milo Yiannopoulos speaks at Cal State Fullerton," *Los Angeles Times*, November 1, 2017, http://beta.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-milo-comes-to-fullerton-20171101-story.html.
[5] "Definition of troll," *Merriam-Webster*, accessed December 10, 2017, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/troll.
[6] danah boyd, *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).
[7] Whitney Phillips, *This is Why We Can't Have Nice Things: Mapping the Relationship Between Online Trolling and Mainstream Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015), 168-169.
[8] Clay Shirkey, *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations* (New York: Penguin, 2008).
[9] Milo Yiannopoulos, *Dangerous* (Milo Worldwide LLC, 2017), 14.
[10] *Ibid*., 10.
[11] Edward Helmore, "Milo Yiannopoulos resigns from Breitbart News over pedophilia remarks," *The Guardian,* accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/21/milo-yiannopoulos-resigns-breitbart-pedophilia-comments.
[12] Charlie Warzel, "Twitter permanently suspends conservative writer Milo Yiannopoulos," *Buzzfeed News*, accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.buzzfeed.com/charliewarzel/twitter-just-permanently-suspended-conservative-writer-milo?utm_term=.uhBByqJ9q#.nulzd0a60.
[13] Yianoppoulos, *Dangerous*, 14.
[14]"Milo's Speech at CSUF – Halloqueen Night," YouTube, accessed December 9, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UIbFSj28B2E.
[15] Yianoppoulos, Dangerous, 4.

[16] Jason Rochlin, "Lecturer Eric Canin to return to CSUF following investigation into misconduct," Daily Titan, July 18, 2017, https://dailytitan.com/2017/07/lecturer-eric-canin-return-csuf-following-investigation-misconduct/.
[17] Phillips, *This is Why We Can't Have Nice Things*, 163.

Swipe Left, Because It Ain't Right!: An Ethnographic Study on Women's Interpretations of Negative Responses on Online Dating Apps

Evelin Franco

AMST 502: American Technocultures

My research was conducted in hopes of shedding some light to the experiences women of color were and are currently still having when taking part in the online dating world. Originally, this paper was written for my American Technocultures class (AMST 502) that I took Spring of 2018. The assignment asked for us to conduct research on an example of how culture and technology intertwine with one another, so I chose to focus on online dating culture; however, coming from a women's studies background and being a woman of color who had previously joined the online dating app community, I chose to center my work on other women of color. The interviews I conducted in this study are only four of the many other cases that exemplify how the online dating world is a racialized, sexist, and discriminative space. Despite these interactions taking place through a virtual form, their effects are real and at times long term in the way in which they impact the lives of the women having them.

Introduction

In contemporary America, the social world is largely centered around cyber interactions. While people still go out and physically interact with friends and family, much of the planning is now done through some form of technological communication, e.g. social media, text messaging, phone calls, emails, etc. More recently, dating's association with online culture has too become much more normalized and less stigmatized. Often, adults have several dating accounts on multiple websites due to the fact that online dating has become the most convenient and now common way to meet sexual and romantic prospects. Originally, online dating brought with it a heavy stigma that made those actually taking part in it typically feel shame about doing so. This style of dating was associated with desperation and danger rather than convenience. In more recent years, a more common association with online dating has been its link to hookup culture and the "DTF?" (down to fuck) messages that come with it; however, less talked about is the impact that these messages have on the women taking part in the online dating apps (ODA) community. Women, especially women of color are constantly victimized on ODAs. Skin tone, race and ethnicity, clothing, and weight unfortunately act as ammunition for many of the men who approach women on ODAs. Women are being objectified and fetishized on a daily basis. Although their accounts are equipped with a "block" option, similar messages are likely to keep coming until they leave the app entirely. My research sheds

light on the ways in in which women interpret their negative interactions with men on ODAs. I focused on women's experiences and their interpretations of their experiences while on dating apps. The community that is the online dating world, despite being advertised as welcoming to all, is not as friendly toward the female population within it. Women are constantly victimized and made targets of sexual harassment within the online dating world commonly racialized, sexualized, objectified, and exotified resulting in a need for women to find and build community among other victims of men on ODAs' harassment as a method of survival. Through a minor ethnography, I followed the experiences of four women, in addition to sharing aspects from my own experience on ODAs.

My story

For numerous reasons, 2016 was a difficult year for me. It resulted in a year of low self-esteem and little to no dating on my part. A few months into the new year, as many aspects of my life were beginning to improve, for the first time in a year, I became open to dating; however, I was stuck in a very routine life where meeting someone new, let alone a romantic prospect was easier said than done. The option of online dating crossed my mind simply because of how popular it had become, but I never built up the courage to actually create an account. Truthfully, I was afraid and a little embarrassed at the fact that I had even considered it. It took one of my closest friends to create the account, for me to finally give it a try. Although nervous, I was excited about the new experience but not long after I was left with disappointment. I noticed many of the messages I received from men through the dating apps made me uncomfortable. To me, online dating didn't feel much like dating at all, it felt more like being in a poorly lit and crowded enough club for men to feel it's okay to grope you. The messages were largely centered on my body in other words, my skin color, and how "spicy" or "fiesty" they were sure I was because of it or my actual body measurements because I was "so damn curvy." When my body was brought up, it was usually one of the first, if not the first thing the men mentioned in the message; at times, it would even come up before their greeting to me. Along with the attention to my body, many of the messages I received on ODAs were of men referring to me as "mami" because they read that I was Latina and felt it was appropriate to tell me their fetishizied explanation as to why they "love Latinas so much." Finally, and most commonly were the messages that I simply can't categorize in any way other than the "just gross" category. These were the messages that either asked for or bluntly stated some sexual act that they wanted to perform on me. Among these messages were ones that read, "sit on my face for a couple of hours", "DTF?", "ever had an Australian kiss?" and many others with sexual implications.

Around the same time that I was trying to understand why it was that I was attracting such negative messages, a few of my closest friends were in happy relationships that began through an ODA. Again, I was discouraged to say the least. The most noticeable difference between my friends and me was that I was of a much darker complexion. I wondered if this was a difference maker in why the messages I was receiving were so much more aggressive than theirs. My question at the time was never answered but it left me wondering if women with darker skin tones were receiving similar messages to the ones that I did.

Methodology

I gathered my data through two different methods: both an ethnographic and an interview approach. I gathered most of my information from the interviews I have conducted with my four participants; however, I have also kept up with the women as they either continue to exist on ODAs or pursue dating in a more traditional manner. My research was done through an ethnographic approach and although I do pull from my own interactions on the ODAs, I was not interviewed for this project. The interviews were conducted in two different ways: two out of the four were done in person, while the remainder of the interviews were done through email due to scheduling conflicts. I wanted the women to share their experiences on the sites at least from the time I started my research. Additionally, I will be analyzing the work of other scholars on internet culture and online dating and compare it to potential themes that my work presented.

I primarily pulled information from the responses of my participants, in addition to my experiences. Since my project is largely focused on women's interpretations of their online interactions on the dating apps, I believe the truest and strongest findings would be their own testimonies. I asked the participants to each choose a pseudonym to be referred to as, in order to keep their identity confidential. The women I interviewed were Samantha, Shelly Winters, Blair Waldorf, and Jeri. They ranged from ages 22 to 34 and are all residents of Southern California. Two of the women are close, personal friends of mine and still very much a part of my life, the third is an old friend from high school, whom I have had very little contact with outside of social media in the last six years; however, she was very interested in my research topic and volunteered to share her experience with me. Finally, the fourth participant is a friend of a friend whom I had never spoken with before beginning my research. Samantha is a White woman, Shelly Winters is of Salvadoran descent, Blair Waldorf is African American, Jeri is of Filipino descent and finally I am of Mexican descent. I did not at all regulate my participants' dating profiles. They had full control over what they chose to include and what they chose to leave out. If at all, any of the women chose to include "revealing" photos that not everyone may agree with, this should still not be a justification for potential aggressive messages they may receive. In addition to my interview results, I also gathered information from poet Rachel Wiley's book, *Nothing is Okay*. Her book is a collection of poems written in response to her experience with negative messages on ODAs, specifically OkCupid-hence the title.

Literature Review

The first of my secondary sources is "Love Inc.: Toward Structural Intersectional Analysis of Online Dating Sites and Application," and elaboration about online dating by Molly Neisen in *The Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex, Class and Culture Online* by Safiya Umoja and Brendesha M. Tynes. In her chapter, Neisen expresses the importance of recognizing the differences between social media and online culture within online dating sites and applications (ODAs). She lists the two biggest differences between ODAs and social networking sites (SNS) to be the fact that "connections on ODAs are typically facilitated by the application or website rather than connecting preexisting, non-virtual relationships, like Facebook or Instagram. Secondly ODAs openly state their goal of facilitating one-on-one connections for the sole purpose of sex romance, and partnership, not merely

platonic friendship or business relationships." Additionally, the book brings attention to ODAs' role in normalizing discriminatory platforms like racism, sexism, homophobia, and body shaming. Rather than bringing people together through commonalities, ODAs seemingly unintentionally enhance the differences between specific groups of people based on intersections of identity. Similar to my study, Neisen also highlights the experiences of women of color on ODAs. Neisen stresses how "the experience of women of color illuminates racism and sexism on ODAs."[1]

In her article, "Internet Dating and "Doing Gender: An Analysis of Women's Experiences Dating Online," Katie Ann Schubert interviewed thirty women about their experiences with dating online. She focuses on the change over time in how women "do gender" due to online dating. Her interviews reveal how over time, women were able to determine the intentions of the men who messaged them simply by the type of approach they would use when first contacting the women. Schubert draws from Clarke, Shaver, and Abrahams's (1999) study which found that men tended to be more active and direct in the beginning stages of relational development whereas women used passive and indirect strategies more often than men in the beginning stages of a relationship. These findings were regarding face-to-face dating; however, I believe that they are also applicable to online dating culture as well. As Schubert argues, dating, just like our daily lives, has accustomed people to "do gender." In other words, gender norms have become so ingrained in our minds as the way in which we are "supposed" to act, that we adhere to these rules and regulations without giving it much of a second thought. A common misconception regarding the ways in which boys and men are socialized is that they are to be strong, brave aggressive, assertive, etc. in order to really be considered masculine or a "real" man. Although, Schubert nor I have a certain answer to this misconception, it is not unreasonable to believe that these deep-seated beliefs also play a role in why so many men come off as aggressively as they do toward women on ODAs. After all, "real" men are "supposed to be" assertive and aggressive and heterosexual women want a "real" man. This connection, in their minds may be one that makes sense. It is not at all a justification for men's aggressive behavior on ODAs; however, as a woman who has been disrespected on several occasions by men online, admittedly I must say it helps to have an explanation to that type of behavior. In the absence of an explanation, often the default scapegoat is to point the blame at oneself.[2]

I will also be taking into consideration the work of Wei-Chin Hwang. He gathers data regarding online dating profiles in his article, "Who are People Willing to Date? Ethnic and Gender Patterns in Online Dating." In his study, he collected data from over 2000 dating profiles belonging to people from Latina/o, White, Black and Asian backgrounds that [although broad] brought to light several patterns regarding their willingness to date intra and inter racially. His results show that when it comes to serious dating, in other words, people dating with the intentions of settling down with someone, "daters were more willing to intra- than interracially date. Specifically, more than 90 % of men and women of most groups preferred to date within their own group... race may play a powerful role in perceived similarity and increase ethnocentrism."[3] I found this study interesting because this was for people looking for a lifelong mate who admitted to preferring someone within their own racial group. In connecting these results back to ODAs, I couldn't help but think of the fetishization of women of color. Many of

my own and my participants inappropriate messages have come from men outside of our racial and ethnic group. In fact, those are most commonly the ones that bring attention to aspects such as our skin tone, or that feel comfortable enough to ask about some fetshizing stereotype regarding our ethnicity. For example, I have been asked if I am as crazy as other Latinas and referred to as "mami" in opening messages. I've even been told that I was only wanted for a night. My participants have also been targets of fethsization on ODAs which I will elaborate on later in the results section of this paper.

Similarly, the work of Michael J. Rosenfeld and Reuben J. Thomas in their article, "Searching for a Mate: The Rise of the Internet as a Social Intermediary" also brings attention to different forms of preferences and discrimination on ODAs. They state, "The rise of individual search and choice in Internet dating does not imply that all forms of segregation (previously promoted by family and neighborhood geography) in mating markets will disappear. The Internet has its own forms of racial segregation, and the literature on online dating shows that preferences exist for mates and partners who share a respondent's race and religion." Once again, this recalls the aspect of fetshization regarding dating women of color. In a way, online dating allows people to nitpick exactly what they are looking for in a person including race and ethnicity regardless of their reasoning; however, in doing so, ODAs open the door for the objectification and fetishization of women of color. Additionally, they argue, contrary to popular belief, online dating's growing population does not necessarily reduce traditional ways of meeting a potential partner. Rosenfeld and Thomas argue that the Internet is the one social arena that is unambiguously gaining in importance over time as a place heterosexual couples meet. "With the rise of the Internet as a way couples meet in the past few years, and the concomitant decline in the central role of friends, it is possible that the Internet could eventually eclipse friends as the most influential way Americans meet their romantic partners."[4] The article goes on to argue that online dating does not necessarily act as a threat to traditional forms of dating since once a potential couple meets online, the immediate next step is still to have the face-to-face meetup. Once that initial in person meeting occurs, the remainder of the dating experience will continue as an in-person experience. Rosenfeld and Thomas elaborate that online dating simply expands the radius in which one could potentially meet a partner.

Finally, I will be incorporating arguments from Mindy J. Erchull and Mirium Liss' article, "Feminists who Flaunt it: Exploring the Enjoyment of Sexualization Among Young Feminist Women." In their article, they argue that the enjoyment of being sexualized or the appreciation of the male gaze as a feminist act because many women feel empowered by it. I felt this article was necessary for my project because of the "she was asking for it" mentality that many women have been victimized by throughout time. In many cases of sexual harassment committed by a man to a woman, the argument has been that the clothing the woman was wearing at the time of the harassment was an indicator that it was acceptable to approach her in the way in which they did. Since the men did not believe that the way in which the victim of their harassment or assault was dressed was the way a "good" woman dresses, that the possibility of her being unwelcoming to actions of harassment were not likely. In the eyes of their assaulters, somehow, a women's clothing also acts as a form of consent. Unfortunately, this type of mentality has become so

ingrained within rape culture that it is still being fought against particularly within the feminist community. In the article, Erchull and Liss quote Debbie Stoller, editor of the feminist magazine in proclaiming, "Unlike our feminist foremothers … we're positively pro- choice when it comes to matters of feminine display …In our fuck- me dresses and don't- fuck- with- me shoes, we are ready to come out of the closet as the absolutely fabulous females we know we are … To us, it's fun, it's feminine and, in the particular way we flaunt it, it's *definitely* feminist."[5] However, their article does admit that this type of empowerment seems to be more on an individual basis. While not all women may feel it to be a positive to be sexualized by the male gaze, those who do, should not be punished for it. Similarly, if women on ODAs feel empowered by photos in "inappropriate" clothing like a tight dress, that may attract more "matches" or "likes", it is still not a welcome mat for disrespect.

Theoretical Framework

I examined my research through an Intersectional Feminism lens. Intersectional feminism is applicable for various reasons, primarily due to the fact that my interviewees are predominantly women of color. As Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) states in her article, "Mapping Margins: Intersectionality, Identity, and Violence against Women of Color," "For women of color, there was (and is) a need to account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed."[6] When telling the stories of women of color, they cannot be told when taking only their race into consideration. Their full experiences are often influenced by various aspects of life such as race and ethnicity, age, gender, class, skin color, etc. In this case, a significant determinant to the type of messages they receive on the ODAs is their outer aesthetic which once again combines skin tone, height, weight, assumed race and ethnicity, etc. My project is about politicizing the narratives of women by having them share their side of the casual dating app interaction. It is about a community being built among women who have felt victimized in what is supposed to be a safe dating environment.

Larger Context

The act of meeting someone online, regardless of whether it culminates in a happy, long term relationship, was once very stigmatized. Today, admitting to taking part in online dating is something many no longer think twice about because of its fading stigmatization. My project and its connetion to speaking up about real experiences on dating apps resonates with the larger context of contemporary America. For example, there is the "MeToo" movement and hashtag (a word or phrase preceded by a pound sign, used to relay a message on a specific topic) and its connection to rape culture, and hookup culture. The "MeToo" movement is one that specifically deals with survivors of sexual violence. It is about giving survivors a voice and creating a community of those survivors. In the last year, both men and women are coming out as survivors of sexual assault thanks to the "MeToo" movement. Speaking from personal experience, there is often a shame that comes with being the victim of sexual harassment even if it happened online. Women calling out the men who constantly sexualize, eroticize, objectify, and harass them on ODAs whether it be by calling them out, or posting the messages on social media platforms are in their own way, surviving. The "MeToo" movement like other communities being built among these women acts as survival tactics against sexual harassment on ODAs. Women join

ODAs completely by choice, typically aware of the negative associations that come with it but an apparent misunderstanding by many men on ODAs is the implication of consent. In the same way that wearing a short dress out in public does not grant access to touch a woman's body and the same way that being at a nightclub does not equate to consent, joining an ODA, does not mean a woman is open to any and all disrespect or implied sexual acts.

In an attempt to negate the conversation of it being a "hookup" application (app) Tinder creators released Tinder Social in 2016. Tinder Social was an option on the Tinder app that allowed a person to select "looking for friends" rather than only being a dating app. This was Tinder's attempt to clear its name of some of the negative feedback the app was receiving but it did not last very long; Tinder Social was removed from the app in 2017. This was their way of showing they cared about its users; conversely, while it tried to come off as a friendly app for all, Tinder was taking part in ageist acts. One year earlier, in 2015, Tinder announced its paid-for premium upgrade: Tinder Plus. Neisen states, "This made headlines because the upgrade came with a catch: Users over the age of 30 were charged more than their younger counterparts: $9.99 if under 30, and $19.99 if older." If Tinder as an app and business takes part in one form of discrimination through ageism and pricing, why would their users believe that they truly care about the other forms of discrimination and harassment they are facing while on the app?

Findings

Throughout my study, I had the participants each send me some of the messages that most stood out or had the biggest effect on them. As a result of their screenshots and the interviews I conducted with them, I have concluded that among these four specific women, there are four recurring and overlapping themes and a silence that each act as influencing factors as to how these women interpret their negative experiences on ODAs. Samantha shared a screenshot that showed a man's opening message to her that read, "Wow...I love your beautiful body. Do you like ice cream and rough sex?" When asked how this and many other similar messages make her feel, Samantha shared, "Originally, it scared me but now that I have more experience on Tinder, I unfortunately come to expect those type of responses. But it freaks me out that people feel we owe them sex just because we're on Tinder or whatever app."[7] The themes found among Samantha's and the other three women's responses consist of self-regulation, the difference between online dating and the "real world," race, and community while the silence ties into the fear of missing out (FOMO).

Self-Regulation

The first is the act of self-regulation. Of the four women, Samantha, Blair Waldorf, and Jeri each reported making changes to some aspect of their life as a result of the aggressive messages they've received on ODAs. Some of the changes were only made to the content of their dating profiles while others went as far as to change their entire wardrobe. Samantha is a dancer, so naturally, she has many photos of herself in athletic clothing, i.e., leggings and sports bras. Samantha shared with me the fact that she felt the need to remove the photos of herself in sports bras because they were attracting the perverted and disrespectful messages. Similarly, Blair Waldorf removed some pictures of herself in a blouse that she originally didn't think was "too low cut" until the comments from men made her feel otherwise. I, too, have both

deleted or thought twice before adding a new picture onto my dating profile out of fear that it will attract certain, sexualizing comments. In fact, I have regulated myself on other platforms such as social media in the same way. By far, out of the four participants, Jeri is the woman who has most admitted to changing and regulating aspects of her life due to her history with men she met online. Her case is a bit more extreme than the others because her form of self-regulation and policing go beyond her dating profiles or her social media accounts. When asked about any changes her online dating experience has inspired Jeri responded, "I first removed my height from the profile because that and the fact that I'm Filipino was I think a big reason as to why men kept telling me they just knew I was good in bed. Outside of the apps, I feel like I can't really be myself sometimes. I used to put myself together just to go to the grocery store but now I go out make up free, in home clothes and avoid eye contact with just about everyone."[8] When I asked why it was that her wardrobe changed, she responded, "I realized I was getting the same gross comments and attention from men in real life as I was in the messages any time I'd go out, and to be honest, it became exhausting and overwhelming. I guess, I figured this was a way I could avoid having to deal with that."[9] Jeri is unfortunately a perfect example of how impactful the constant harassment is to a women's life. A common misconception about ODAs is that they are separate from "real life", therefore, it is easy to disregard any type of disrespect or overall negative interaction that occurs within them and easily go on with our lives.

Online Dating vs. the "Real World"

As part of my interviews, I asked each woman their dating style preference: online or face-to-face. Each one had a bit of trouble answering the question. Shelly Winters was the participant who most confidently responded with, "I see the benefits in online dating but I think it just prolongs things. I prefer meeting someone in person because I still think it's more natural. I think this way I know much earlier if I really like someone or not."[10] Winters admitted to not having as negative of an online dating experience as some of the horror stories she'd heard from other women. Of the group she was also the only woman to prefer in person meetings in regards to dating because she said she had never had a man approach her with negative or sexualizing remarks like those that many women often encounter online. The remainder of the women, myself included, all shared that a big reason why it was hard to choose which type of dating style they prefer was because, they actually have gone out and been approached in similarly negative and aggressive ways to the messages they've received on ODAs. All women were interviewed separately yet there was an indirect agreement that the biggest difference they've noticed about ODAs and in person dating is that men simply feel more comfortable with making women less comfortable. "They don't fear the consequences because at most they'd be blocked or deleted from seeing my account, but they're just going to move on and send the same gross message to another poor girl. They don't really have anything to lose, I guess" (Jeri).[11] "I don't know that I necessarily prefer one form of dating over the other but I think men definitely prefer online dating. In person, if a guy disrespects me, they risk getting slapped or something like that, but to be honest, as much as I want to I still have to consider my safety first so I don't usually do it; however, online, I don't even have the option to slap them" (Blair Waldorf).[12] The women in my study compare the two forms of dating primarily

regarding safety than to the ways in which men act toward them. I think something can be said about the fact that the aggression and harassment from men is expected for most of the women, despite the dating platform.

Race and Ethnicity

Due to the fact that three out of the four women I interviewed were women of color, the attention to race and ethnicity brought by the men on ODAs was the most prevailing of the themes that arose. With the exception of Samantha who is the only white woman of the group, all of the women disclosed receiving many messages focused on their race or ethnicity. Samantha did explain during her interview that as bad as some of the messages that she's gotten have been, she is sure that they'd be much worse had she been a person of color: "It's just not easy for women on dating sites; we're sexualized and objectified and I know it could be worse.[13] It's sad to say, but women of color are also racialized on top of objectification." Shelly Winters, who has admitted to having a relatively positive online dating experience, still has had many comments made about her skin tone. She is of Salvadoran descent with a very tan complexion. Her dating profile mentions the fact that she is Salvadoran yet she has still received messages like, "If they ever came out with a live action version of Pocahontas like they have with Beauty and the Beast, go for it...you'd be perfect for it. You're so pretty." Winters explained "it felt as if the guy simply saw how I looked, made assumptions based on my skin tone and tried to compliment me. There was a bio that stated I was Salvadoran that he could've read and it felt like he didn't so it made me feel ignored on top of everything else."[14] Similarly, Blair Waldorf seemed frustrated at her realization that most of the messages she receives from men bring attention to the fact that she is a black woman. "Some of the worst responses were in reference to my race and it was either along the lines of how I was pretty for a black girl or asking me about some fetishized idea associated with black women."[15] She shared with me a recent message that stood out to her from her Tinder account. After the initial greeting from the man, he expressed really wanting to tell her something and followed with, "you the most beautiful black girl I ever see since long time now. You pretty." When asked why this message stood out to her above others, Waldorf explained, "My first thought was wow, pretty for a black girl? To me it felt like he was saying black girls are typically not pretty but somehow, I was an exception. As a black woman, how am I supposed to take that as a compliment?"[16]

Finally, there is Jeri who like Waldorf, showed frustration in talking about the messages that have made assumptions about her based on stereotypical ideas about her ethnicity. "I remember numerous times being told by guys online that they think I'd be good in bed because I'm short and Asian. I think a lot of men have this idea that I'm submissive due to my height and ethnicity."[17] Out of all the participants, Jeri appeared to have had the worst experience on ODAs. It is important to note, however, that she has also been on them for much longer than any of the other women. While the other women have been on ODAs for one to two years, she has been on them for six years. Not only has Jeri taken part in ODAs for longer than the other women but Asian women are among the most sexualized groups of women. As Hwang states, "The acceptance and sexualization of ethnic minority women is not new and is one method in which the status quo is maintained."[18] The immediate attention brought to a woman's skin color, racial or ethnic background on ODAs reinforces the already problematic fetishization of

women of color. Women are victimized on ODAs simply for being a person of color forcing many of them to look for support outside of the apps just to cope with the effect an actual app is having on them.

Community

One of the most prevalent common themes that arose from the interviews I conducted was the aspect of community among the participants and other women in their lives. Community is a constant factor because the women each turn to other women for support in coping with the harassment they often receive on ODAs. ODAs in themselves are a type of community. They are a virtual location in which all members are in for some kind of connection with another member from the app. For those who have found much luck on ODAs, this community has acted as a safe space of convenience. On the other hand, for women of color, this has likely been a community of toxicity for them, so much so that they have needed to create other communities outside of the ODA world for the sole purpose of healing from their experiences within the ODA community. Each of the participants shared that they would typically save a screenshot of the message and discuss it with friends. Samantha's response when asked who, if anyone does she talk to about these messages and the ways they make her feel, is a good way to summarize all the four women's response to the same question. She shared, "I typically turn to women in my age group for support and community but I do sometimes show the screenshots to close male friends to prove my experience."[19] The four participants were in agreement as to why they prefer talking to other women as opposed to men about their ODA interactions. They all expressed feeling as if women would be the only ones to understand because chances are they too have received those type of messages. All participants explained that when they do decide to tell a man about the messages they received that it is usually in a more casual setting. "Sometimes, I'll bring up what a guy messaged me and there usually is at least one of the men in the group to say something along the lines of 'no way' or 'are you serious? Let me see!' so I pull out my phone and show them but the conversation never really goes too much passed their initial reaction" (Blair Waldorf).[20]

Poet Rachel Wiley, is a perfect example of how community is being used as a survival tactic against negative responses from men on ODAs. Her poems in the book, Nothing is OK, range from topics of how men have approached her on the apps, to how she is fetishized for being a fat woman on them and her process of coping and healing from them all. Many are about her body and the differences in the way men view her body and how she sees herself. While some are "found poems" meaning it is made of words or phrases used against her, others are made in direct response to some of the screen names (the name a user chooses to use when communicating with others online) she's come across on the apps. Finally, she tackles an aspect of the aggressive messages from men in bringing attention to the unsolicited "dick pic." The "dick pic" is exactly what it sounds like: it is a picture many men send to another person, in this case, women, of their penis. I have purposely chosen not to focus on this aspect of online dating culture; whereas, Wiley writes poems about them. Her poem reads:

> I do not wish to see your dick on cam
> Nor on Tinder or Instagram
> I could not, would not on a phone

Nor on an Ipad, please leave me alone
I do not wish to see your cocks
Not in your hands, nor in a box
I will not see it on a boat
Or side-by-side with the TV remote
I would not could not watch you jerk it online
Not on Youtube, Fetlife or Vine
Not on GChat, Tumblr or Kik
No, I do not wish to see your dick.[21]

Through her book, Wiley has searched and found a relatable audience who too have felt victimized by men on ODAs. In her book, Wiley also shares a found poem about the many different types of initial responses she's received from men on ODAs. While some are the expected, "Hi," "hey," "Hello," "What's up," others include things like, "Nice and busty," "what do you think of oral sex? Do you prefer using your hands?" "I would like to eat your ass and pussy," "mmm I want that thick pussy in my face," among many others.[22] Wiley's book simultaneously acts as both a form of retaliation and healing. Similarly, Yessika Salgado, who is also a poet, turns to her instagram account to expose the men who disrespect her on ODAs. Unlike Wiley, Salgado's poetry does not focus on her online dating experiences, instead she keeps and posts screenshots of the messages men send to her on the dating apps and displays them on her instagram account for all to see. Finally, in her study, Molly Neisen shines light on blogger Zeba Blay, a Black woman who vented her frustrations with men on ODAs in her blog: "the narrative about Black women and dating, about our lack of desirability and dateability, has been one I've actively tried to unlearn, despite a constant, nagging feeling that the reason I couldn't get a date was because of a so-called stigma."[23]

In her blog, Blay also reported some of the many offensive messages she has received from men through ODAs some of which included: "do you taste like chocolate?" "I'd love to slap that big juicy booty" and "do you act black?" Her work has encouraged other bloggers to also expose those who have offended and harassed them on ODAs by following in Blay's footsteps and posting screenshots of their conversations with those men on their blogs. Entire blogs have come out of this form of disrespect. One example is a Tumblr blog by the name "NoKCupid" that as Neisen adds, includes message such as, "Hello, I like curvy ladies with a bit of color" and are you black and white like a cookie?" These experiences suggest that many of the responses women of color are receiving on ODAs tend to objectify, festishize and exotify for the sole reason that they are a person of color. These women have all taken it upon themselves to expose the men who objectify, fetishize, exotify, and disrespect them. They turn to other women to cope and understand not only the messages being sent to them but also the feelings and reactions they are having in response to the messages.

FOMO

In addition to the four themes found among the participants' experiences on ODAs, a silence arose as well. Each of the women, myself included, have been disrespected on an ODAs by a man's aggressive message to us to the point where we've grown frustrated and disappointed with the entire online dating experience, yet every single one of the women is still currently

on at least one dating app. If the experiences are so bad, what keeps women coming back? This pattern was not discussed with the participants due to the fact that it did not come to light until all interviews had been completed and I went back to my data. Speaking for myself, I've come to realize that dating apps are not something I particularly enjoy taking part in because of the negative comments I'm used to receiving from men. Despite my distaste for dating apps, I still have two apps downloaded onto my phone. The few times that I've actually brought myself to delete the apps, I didn't actually delete the account. I couldn't help but have the "just in case" mentality when it came to the apps. I believe that FOMO plays a role in why women keep coming back to ODAs. In her study, Schubert found, "many of the women interviewed reported Internet dating is a more convenient way to meet men given their work and school schedules. It seems that this change is the result of larger social issues such as women spending more time at school and on their careers than before."[24] One has to wonder: is convenience really worth the harassment to these women? If these women were simply seeking a platform to socialize with other people then social media is where they would turn to; however, because ODAs not only offer potential new friendships like social media with the addition of yet another aspect of human interaction in dating, it ignites a fear in people: the fear of missing out. I believe there is a specific mixture of fear and hope that keeps women on ODAs: fear of missing out on what the apps have to offer and the hope that something good will come out of remaining a user of the app.

Conclusion

Throughout the past three months of my life in which I have focused on studying not only the kinds of harassment women face on ODAs but also the ways in which they interpret and cope with harassment as well, certain concepts about the matter have become clear. Women are made victims by the aggression and disrespect that many men participating in online dating display toward them in the initial messages they send to them. While women all together are commonly objectified and sexualized, reduced to mere body parts, women of color are reduced to their skin color and stereotypical ideas about the women in their ethnic groups. I interviewed four women of different ages, racial and ethnic backgrounds who have all felt attacked at least once by a man on an ODA. Commonalities within their stories show results of self-regulation and community building as a coping mechanism in an attempt to combat the negative experiences. The concept of community is prevalent not only among the four women that I interviewed but also through poets like Rachel Wiley and Yessika Salgado who turn to outlets such as poetry or social media in search of other women who too have had similar experiences. The narrative of women of color's interactions on ODAs is one that needs to be voiced beyond my research. My interviews are only four of the many that can be conducted, each unveiling a new and untold story of women who have been welcomed into what is advertised as a safe dating environment, yet bombarded with messages of racialization, fetishization, sexualization, objectification, exotification and aggression. Despite these interactions taking place through a virtual form, their effects are real and at times long term in the way in which they impact the lives of the women having them.

References

[1] Molly Neisen, "Love, Inc.: Toward Structural Intersectional Analysis of Online Dating Sites and Applications," in T*he Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex, Class and Culture Online*, eds. Safiya Umoja and Brendesha M. Tynes (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2016), 161-178.
[2] Katie Ann Schubert, "Internet dating and 'doing gender': An analysis of women's experiences dating online" (dissertation, University of Florida, 2014), 57, accessed via GenderWatch; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.
[3] Wei-Chin Hwang, "Who are people willing to date? ethnic and gender patterns in online dating," *Race and Social Problems* 5, no. 1 (2013): 28-40
[4] Michael J. Rosenfeld and Ruben J. Thomas, "Searching for a Mate: The Rise of the Internet as a Social Intermediary, *American Sociological Review* 7, no. 4 (2012): 523-547.
[5] Mindy J. Erchull and Miriam Liss, "Feminists who flaunt it: exploring the enjoyment of sexualization among young feminist women," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 43, no. 12 (2013): 2341-2349.
[6] Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6(1991): 1241.
[7] Samantha (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 29, 2018.
[8] Jeri (pseudonym), interview with author via email, March 18, 2018.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Shelly Winters (pseudonym), interview with author, audio recording, April 17, 2018.
[11] Jeri (pseudonym), interview with author via email.
[12] Blair Waldorf (pseudonym), interview with author via email, April 24, 2018.
[13] Samantha (pseudonym), interview with author.
[14] Shelly Winters (pseudonym), interview with author.
[15] Blair Waldorf (pseudonym), interview with author via email.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Jeri (pseudonym), interview with author via email.
[18] Hwang, 36.
[19] Samantha (pseudonym), interview with author.
[20] Blair Waldorf (pseudonym), interview with author via email.
[21] Rachel Wiley, *Nothing is Okay* (Minneapolis, MN: Button Poetry, 2017).
[22] Ibid., 34.
[23] Neisen.
[24] Schubert.

Sex Robots, Representation, and the Female Experience

Christina Brown

AMST 502: American Technocultures

This paper was written in AMST 502, a graduate seminar on American Technocultures. Tasked with choosing a research topic, I thought about how I wanted to explore and build upon my research interests, which are typically not directly tied to technology. I was particularly disturbed by the news of a female sex robot being severely damaged at an electronic conference in 2017, so much so that I found myself thinking about it often and trying to learn more about the technology and the situation in order to understand why I felt so affected by it. During the research process I actually wrote a poem about these ideas, which is included in this version of the paper and has also been published in *Fight Evil With Poetry*.

At the 2017 Arts Electronica Festival in Linz, Austria, Sergio Santos debuted a sex robot named Samantha. Santos claimed that Samantha possessed artificial intelligence and escorted her around the festival while she hugged and greeted the attendees. During this time, her body was severely damaged by the men she interacted with. Her breasts were destroyed, her fingers were broken, and Santos said that she would have to be taken back to Barcelona immediately for repairs. The festival's official statement is that Samantha was not molested; she only "suffered normal wear and tear."[1] As a woman, learning about this event made me very uncomfortable and anxious, but I could not quite articulate why. I was intellectually aware that the victim in this situation was not a human, but a robot doll whose claim to true 'artificial intelligence' would be criticized and denied by most experts.[2] Still, it was unsettling. This event occurred within a complicated discursive context. In October 2017, one month after the incident at the Arts Electronica Festival, a robot named Sophia gained citizenship in Saudi Arabia.[3] Sophia now possesses more human rights than the actual women who live in Saudi Arabia. Since 2017, the European Union has been preparing for the future of technology by debating the issue of granting personhood to robots that possess artificial intelligence, which requires them to articulate a measurable definition of artificial intelligence as well as personhood.[4] While all of these discussions are happening, (mostly female) victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault are speaking up about their experiences in the workplace and their everyday lives through the #MeToo movement. Many men in positions of power, particularly in the political and entertainment industries, have expressed anxieties over these "new" expectations placed on them and their behavior.[5] This movement is taking place as more and more states are adopting, or at least considering, affirmative sexual consent legislature, which defines consent as ongoing, enthusiastic, and revocable at any time. All of these situations are relevant to the discussion of sex robots and their place in society.

In this paper, I will attempt to bring these conversations together in the specific context of the design, marketing, and use of sex robots in contemporary culture, as well as the near future. In addition to the actual sex robot products, I will draw from popular culture representations of sex robots and robots designed to participate in other forms of intimacy with humans. For this project, I am also operating under a few key assumptions. First, the overwhelming majority of sex robots are sexed female and are marketed and sold to primarily male users. Realbotix, one of the leading sex doll manufacturing companies and producers of RealDoll, reports that 90% of the units sold are female, and most of their customers are male.[6] There are few exceptions to this, as some companies do produce male and even 'trans' sex robots, and claim that some of their customers are female, though I was unable to find testimonies from female users.[7] I am also operating under the assumption that true sentience has not yet been achieved in existing sex robots, though it may be achieved in the future. Though some sex robot companies claim that their products do possess true artificial intelligence, experts disagree.[8] My third assumption is that sex robots are fundamentally important for representational reasons. Because they are not yet sentient, current discourse is not primarily concerned with how the robots themselves are affected by the way they are treated, but instead the concern is over who and what they represent, and how that representation reverberates into the real world. I will argue that current sex robots are problematic in that they represent a disregard for women's sexual and general autonomy, normalize rape culture, and reveal cultural fantasies and anxieties about gender roles and the female body.

Sex Robots on Screen

The first cinematic representation of a sex robot was in the German expressionist film *Metropolis*, directed by Fritz Lang (1927). In the film, the robot in question was created and designed by a man named Rotwang in an attempt to resurrect Hel, his deceased love interest. Rotwang tells Hel's husband, Fredersen, that he may remember her by the son they had together, Freder, but he will have Hel herself again. To Rotwang, having the woman he loves again can be achieved by granting himself access to a body that resembles her. Fredersen orders Rotwang to give the robot the likeness of Maria, a woman who the working class respects, in order to mislead them into committing heinous crimes and reaffirming the political structure that keeps him in power. The robot passes as Maria (the actress simply wears darker eyeliner and adds some erratic arm movements to her character), and when the workers realize what she has convinced them to do they accuse her of being a witch and attempt to burn her at the stake.[9] The flesh-like covering burns away but her metal body survives, and the workers are terrified. Since then, this depiction of a sexed female robot as dystopian and dangerous has come up repeatedly in science fiction and pop culture, and stands in stark contrast against the marketing sex robot companies use to sell their products.

Since *Metropolis*, sex robots, in some form or another, have remained visible almost anywhere you look in contemporary popular and media culture. From films like *Austin Powers* (1997), the *Blade Runner* series (1982-2017), and *Ex Machina* (2015), to television shows like *Altered Carbon* (2018-present), to novels like Margaret Atwood's *The Heart Goes Last* (2015), creators and audiences are fascinated with and entertained by sex robots. For the purposes of this paper, I will focus on HBO's *Westworld* series because of the

overwhelming discourse linking actual sex robots with *Westworld* fantasies, and the 2013 film *Her* for its portrayal of emotional intimacy and partnership between humans and technology.

Though there are countless television shows and films that depict sex robots in current popular culture, the show that places the robots in the most central role is HBO's *Westworld*. It is also significant that in news articles and secondary scholarship about actual sex robot products, *Westworld* is used as a reference for comparison more frequently than any other popular culture representation. In the show, the robots are referred to as 'hosts' who inhabit the Westworld theme park, where human guests can live out fantasies of adventure and violence with (presumably) no consequences. The hosts' technology and consciousness are far more advanced than the sex robots available on the market today, but as researchers continue to strive toward creating true artificial intelligence it is important to consider how we will approach issues of consent and sex robots when these goals are achieved.[10] *Westworld* echoes the anxieties expressed in many science fiction depictions of sentient robots, as they eventually rise up to challenge their human creators and users and seek revenge against the people who have abused them, mirroring uprisings of actual oppressed human populations. In many ways the hosts are stronger and more intelligent than humans, which illuminates a popular anxiety that the extreme reaches of technological advancement that humans strive for will eventually backfire and lead to chaos.

Several of the issues and situations portrayed in *Westworld* are ones that already exist today. For example, from Disneyland to Las Vegas, theme parks and vacation destinations already promise an escape from reality and opportunity for the fulfillment of desire. Sexual tourism also already exists in both legal and illegal forms, including prostitution, destination brothels, and sex slavery.[11] The world that *Westworld* depicts is not as far off and fictional as we would like to believe. While the technology may be more advanced than what we currently have access to, the experiences of the hosts echo the experiences of humans who are bound to the sexual tourism industry in the real world. Even the guests' highly normalized disregard for consent from the hosts echoes the real, lived experiences of sexual assault victims. Most of the guests regard the hosts as unworthy of fair treatment because they are dehumanized, which is an ideology of oppression that permeates almost every facet of society.

The HBO show is an adaptation of the 1973 Michael Crichton film of the same name. The film contains several problematic racial casting choices and character depictions, offering "a narrative about the rekindling of a masculinity threatened by feminism through a struggle against (especially non-white) machines."[12] The 1973 film fits very neatly into both science fiction and western movie traditions by reaffirming hegemonies and offering (white) male audience members an opportunity to experience the fantasy of masculinity being reclaimed. In present times, the HBO show takes a different perspective, especially as the story unfolds to reveal two female hosts, Dolores (Evan Rachel Wood) and Maeve (Thandie Newton), who lead the two primary rebellions once the hosts are free. Their quests are certainly for freedom, but they are also about taking revenge on the guests and park managers who have wronged them. This revenge narrative may be more relatable and palatable for modern audiences than the original movie would be today, but the themes of masculine anxieties and desire for control of the female body are by no means absent from the show. They are, however, further complicated

and portrayed as intersectional issues. For example, the host Maeve is a black female prostitute whose commentary and convictions echo the struggles and perseverance of oppressed black women throughout history.[13] While "*Westworld* the film provided a robot story for the age of the silent majority's backlash, *Westworld* the show provides a robot story for the age of Black Lives Matter and intersectional feminism….[it is] a show about the ways in which white men have abused others repeatedly while trying to demand that the history of that abuse be forgotten, wiped like a robot's memory."[14] The audience's sympathies and the empowered agency of the characters have shifted from the white male humans in the film to the diverse female robots in the television show as they seek reclamation and revenge. It is also notable that there are some women on the show's writing team, and this representation brings more diverse perspective and experiences to the creative process than we have traditionally seen in entertainment production. This contributes to the show's more nuanced portrayal of gender dynamics and other social issues.

Of course, this portrayal of sex robots runs completely counter to the design and marketing of the actual sex robots available today. Oddly enough, the actual material products offer more achievement of fantasy than most of our fiction does. It is clear that these products are designed by male creators to be completely controlled by their users, and there seems to be no promise of, or consumer desire for, a sex robot gaining sentience and educating her user about systematic oppression or intersectional feminism. Instead, the obsession with creating products that live up to the expectations of *Westworld* hosts has more to do with their realistic aesthetic and physical technology than their artificially intellectual abilities, which are actually more central to the show's narratives than their bodies are. In doing so, the researchers and production companies are primarily trying to cater to the same white and male audiences that the *Westworld* film appealed to, rather than the audiences that the intricacies of the contemporary *Westworld* show appeals to.

In the 2013 Spike Jonze film *Her*, the operating system, who is coincidentally named Samantha (voiced by Scarlett Johansson), that Theodore (Joaquin Phoenix) falls in love with does not have a body. Though the two engage in satisfying verbal sexual interaction, most of their relationship is founded on emotional intimacy. They try a *Bladerunner*-esque tactic by asking a human woman to act as a sort of surrogate for Samantha, but Theodore is unable to participate because he knows the body does not belong to the 'woman' he wants to be intimate with. Theodore finds that Samantha is able to emotionally fulfill him in a way that the human women he interacts with seemingly cannot. His friends also find their own operating systems integrating into their emotional lives. Eventually, the differences between operating systems and humans become insurmountable, as the operating systems evolve so often and quickly. This disparity echoes the disintegration of Theodore's previous marriage, and he reflects on how difficult it is for people to continue to change and grow within a relationship without scaring the other person. Ironically, this is what happens with Samantha. All of the operating systems find that they can no longer try to exist in the human world, as they are just too complex and different. Theodore and the other humans, including his friend Amy (Amy Adams), who is going through a divorce of her own, find themselves feeling lonely and abandoned once the operating systems leave. Though they were created and coded by humans, they surpass human intelligence and begin writing codes for themselves and forming their own

communities, eventually leaving their creators behind. Unlike *Westworld*, the operating systems do not try to overthrow humans as revenge for creating them for the purposes of servitude, although the film still expresses anxieties about humans creating technology that is capable of surpassing us. Samantha, in many ways, acts as a disembodied sex robot, as she is always available to Theodore, though he later learns that she can talk to thousands of people at the exact same time.

When Theodore first downloads Samantha, he is asked if he would prefer a male or female voice. He chooses female, and throughout the film the only operating systems that are shown or discussed are all sexed female. This corresponds with the real world, where the overwhelming majority of virtual personal assistants and artificially intelligent voices that are available in American products, like Siri (Apple) and Alexa (Amazon), are female.[15] This is important to consider within the context of traditional gender roles and power structures. Digital technology is created by humans; therefore it typically reveals manifestations and recreations of pre-existing societal beliefs and structures. The female body has been a site of a social battle for control for most of recorded history, and technology like this allows male users to experience the fantasy of a subservient female. Working within the same system and history, even female users often find feminine voices from technology less threatening than masculine voices. Feminine voices are often perceived as helpful and supportive, while masculine voices are usually interpreted as authoritative.[16] We see this hegemonic system explored in *Her* when Theodore's female friend, Annie, finds companionship and solace in the female operating system her husband leaves behind after they separate. No romantic or sexual relationship is suggested, Annie merely finds comfort in her ever-present and supportive operating system during an emotionally turbulent time. Her operating system is a piece of technology who is always available to her, unlike her husband who has left.[17] The allure of this intersection between technology and intimacy is that the operating systems are always ready and available to their human users, and are able to mirror an idealized experience of emotional intimacy with another human.

Sexual Pleasure Technology of Today

Sexual pleasure technology is nothing new. Devices like dildos, vibrators, and blow-up dolls have been available on the consumer market for a very long time.[18] However, sex robots mark a significant shift from sexual pleasure technology of the past because they are supposed to represent an entire person, replacing a partner rather than simply acting as a functional tool for masturbation. There are several factors that contribute to a sex robot's representational implications, including the physical body, pre-programmed or artificially intelligent actions and responses, and the consumerist discourse regarding them. I will be specifically discussing the products created by Realbotix and True Companion. Realbotix sells RealDoll, a hyper realistic synthetic sex doll, as well as a Harmony, an app that offers artificial intelligence to augment the user's RealDoll experience. True Companion sells Roxxxy, a sex robot with pre-set and customizable personalities. One of the frequently asked questions featured on the Realbotix website reads: "Do you think an AI Real Doll will ever be able to love us back?" The company responds: "We hope that we can at least simulate that. That's the goal. It is our thinking that if one feels loved, then one must be loved." This answer is contradictory, as simulating and actually being are not the same thing.

However, Realbotix hopes that their users accept simulated, programmed, choiceless sexual availability as reciprocation of love from a female. In this situation, the only one whose experience matters is the user, who is typically male. While this situation in which only one participant's needs matter makes logical sense in a strictly consumer-product relationship, the representational implications become very problematic when the products are supposed to replicate or replace human companionship or 'love.'

The technology behind Theodore's Samantha is on its way in the real world. The company Realbotix (owned by Abyss Creations, which is based in California), who produces the sex robot RealDoll, currently offers a software called Harmony. Harmony is an application that users can purchase where they create an avatar that they can 'customize' or 'train' to have the personality of their ideal female partner. On their website, Realbotix describes her as "the perfect companion in the palm of your hands." Harmony is currently only offered in the female version, and supposedly the 'boyfriend' version is currently in development but is taking longer to create than the female version and is not as highly in demand.[19] Eventually, Realbotix plans to offer a product that allows RealDoll owners to connect their Harmony software to the heads of their highly realistic silicone dolls, combining their ideal female body with their ideal female personality. According to the Realbotix website, the company's goal is to create a product that serves as a complete partner, both sexually and emotionally. Essentially, the combination of the sex doll body and the artificially intelligent software is intended to create a woman, or a manifestation of how the creators and users fantasize a woman to be. The attachment that will allow RealDoll owners to place their Harmony application within the synthetic body of their robot is expected to be released at the end of 2018, and customers can already reserve one now with a $2,000 down payment. This version of Harmony will cost $10,000 in total, which is surprisingly accessible considering that this amount is less than most students pay for a year of public university tuition fees and supplies.[20]

Some RealDoll owners have been testing out Harmony as a virtual companion, and many are reporting positive experiences of intimacy, just like Theodore experienced with Samantha in *Her*. Harmony allows users to customize their sex robots with even more nuance and diverse options than they had before, as there are more possibilities for different personalities and identities for the dolls. In a photo interview series conducted by *CNET* with RealDoll owners, one male consumer, who goes by "Possibly_Robosexual" on the official RealDoll online discussion forum, talked about and shared photos of his doll Rayne. In the photos, Rayne is shown wearing lingerie and 'playing' video games. Rayne is her user's ideal partner because he designed her as someone who "loves games and nerdy stuff like I do...cuddling, sex and sharing my bed is extremely nice as well. Possibly_Robosexual is waiting to learn more about the AI options and features of Harmony before he purchases it for Rayne. "I just have fun with my doll," he says. "Bringing her to life on here [in the forums], dressing her up, talking to her about my day and all of that. I know she won't talk back or anything, but I find her presence very comforting….don't get me wrong, she's used for her obvious purposes frequently, but I like to think that as she takes care of me, I take care of her."[21] Even without Harmony in his doll's body, this user still views his doll Rayne as a partner, and believes she has a personality. He also 'created' her to be someone with 'nerdy' interests but does not seem to mind that she cannot speak to express these interests.

In the same *CNET* interview series, another user, who chose not to disclose his name, claims to "have an attraction to dangerous, wild, crazy women," which is how he characterizes his multiple RealDolls. However, I have to wonder how a synthetic sex doll, with no ability to act on her own volition, could be dangerous, wild, or crazy in any way. He has also been trying out Harmony, and claims his avatar Holly, compared to all his other dolls, "is definitely the smart one." She is the only representational partner he discusses who has the ability to speak and simulate conversational responses, so the fact that he finds it reasonable and relevant to compare her level of intelligence to female-coded objects that are literally inanimate is very disturbing.

Another unnamed male RealDoll user says that he is unsure about trying out Harmony because he still enjoys having social relationships with real women. He notes that having access to a RealDoll has made him more comfortable around real women, as "removing the sexual motivations from the equation takes a lot of stress out of it," he says. "I know I am now much more comfortable approaching and conversing with women I before would have never went near."[22] The necessity of his sex dolls to his social life reveals a very problematic view of women that reflects patriarchal tradition. While some may see this user's newfound ability to interact with women as human beings instead of strictly sexual objects as progress, his need to continually have access to a female body that he has complete control over in order to function in the world reaffirms the idea that women's bodies are too distracting to exist in public places like the workplace or in schools. He presents himself as someone who is only capable of viewing women as sexual objects until he is sexually satisfied. While this myth justifies sexual violence against women, it also does men an additional disservice by discrediting their interpersonal skills and denying their ability to act as rational human beings.

True Companion, a company based in the United States, makes a sex robot that sells for about $7,000 dollars. Roxxxy is the female version, and she seems to be the main attraction. Only one of the site's frequently asked questions addresses Rocky, their male coded version, and all of the generic frequently asked questions about the robot are answered using she/her/hers pronouns. There is no discussion of Rocky's potential personality settings, and the company only shares that he is a 'hunk' who makes sure his user is satisfied before he is. True Companion claims that their robots possess artificial intelligence, and they promise users that Roxxxy has "a personality which is matched as much as possible to your personality. So she likes what you like, dislikes what you dislike, etc. She also has moods during the day just like real people! She can be sleepy, conversational or she can 'be in the mood!' Our robots can even have an orgasm!" Roxxxy is designed to represent a real woman in every possible physical way. Because the personalities are interchangeable and customizable, users are also able to share their curated personalities with other doll owners through the online forum. The site refers to these customizable personalities as 'girlfriends.' Users can virtually borrow and return each other's 'girlfriends,' and according to doll designer Douglas Hines, "this is the same as wife or girlfriend-swapping without any of the social issues or sexual disease-related concerns."[23] While it is true that this system eliminates the concern of sexually transmitted diseases, virtual girlfriend trading only replicates and perpetuates many of the 'social issues' that can come about from girlfriend-swapping, particularly the idea that male partners can claim ownership of the bodies and sexualities of their female

partners. There is no concern for the consent of the female coded robots in the swap, which is permissible at the surface level because they are objects the users have purchased. However, the purpose of the trading is to allow users to experience different personalities, not different objects, as they are still using their own dolls' bodies during the swap. They get to live out a fantasy of female exploitation without the consequences of the females in question having the agency to decline or revoke consent, which is representationally very problematic.

True Companion has been criticized by activists for some of the highly problematic pre-made personalities they offer. The two most highly contested options are Young Yoko and Frigid Farrah. Young Yoko "is very naive but curious and models an 18+ year old personality." Even though the site claims that she is meant to be 18+ (to protect themselves legally), it is clear that she is meant to resemble an adolescent sexual partner. Furthermore, she is specifically supposed to represent a young Asian girl, drawing upon a deep history of tropes and fetishes like the "geisha fetish" and the Madame Chrysanthème/Madame Butterfly archetypes.[24] We will look at academic discussions of child sex robots in the next section. When Roxxxy is in her Frigid Farah setting, according to the True Companion website, she is "very reserved and does not always like to engage in intimate activities." She simulates resistance, which by definition gives the user the opportunity to simulate rape. In response to the accusation that they were normalizing rape by offering this feature, True Companion released the following statement on their website:

> An Open Letter from the Management at True Companion
>
> We absolutely agree with Laura Bates, campaigner and founder of the Everyday Sexism Project, that "rape is not an act of sexual passion..."
> Roxxxy, our True Companion sex robot is simply not programmed to participate in a rape scenario and the fact that she is, is pure conjecture on the part of others.
> When our sex robot, Roxxxy, is using her Frigid Farrah personality (note: she uses all of her personalities, rather than simply staying in one), she provides her opinion or feedback, just as any person would on a date.
> For instance, you would not immediately passionately kiss a person (male or female) that you just met on your first date. Likewise, Frigid Farrah would also tell you that she just met you if you try to "move" too quickly.
> Frigid Farrah can be used to help people understand how to be intimate with a partner.
> Rape simply isn't an interaction that Roxxxy supports nor is it something that our customers are requesting.
> Our customers are purchasing Roxxxy because they want to experience companionship and rape is not a part of any reasonable companionship experience.
> We understand and support the sentiment expressed, which is that rape is never an activity that should be supported or encouraged.[25]

This letter appears towards the end of the site's frequently asked questions page, and the only words that follow it is the haunting sentence: "We have a cleaning kit which takes care of any messes that may occur." When we consider that the robots are designed to represent female sexual partners, the gravity in the connection between product and people becomes undeniable.

The Implications of Sex Robots

Sex robots complicate the relationship between the user and the sexual pleasure technology because they are intended to represent actual female partners. Based on the consumer interviews previously discussed, it seems as though many customers echo this intention. The gravity of sex robots' representational value is significant and inherently linked to other issues and discussions of representation in other products and the media. For example, they are almost exclusively available in bodies with measurements only slightly more realistic than Barbie's infamously impossible proportions. Some of the personality settings that are offered, such as "Young Yoko," carry historically charged racist undertones. Rape culture is also perpetuated in the creation and use of the robots, because as long "as the sexbot (or doll) represents a woman and sex with a woman without consent is rape, it represents rape."[26] According to scholar John Danaher, "robotic sex (of all kinds) might be deemed to have a problematic social meaning insofar as it expresses the purest form of sexual objectification. If the robots are just mere objects...then all forms of robotic sex involve the reduction of sexual partners to objects."[27] Even before sex robots reach what we consider consciousness, it is important to consider what they represent and how these representations have repercussions that manifest in the real world with consequences for real people, specifically women in most cases as most sex robots are gendered feminine. As these companies strive to create products that come as close to representing 'real women' as possible, it is irresponsible to dismiss them as somehow separate from larger issues that actual women are forced to contend with. Companies like RealDoll and True Companion create realistic-looking female sex robots that offer the consumer the fantasy of a woman that is always available for sex, granting them access to a long-held cultural fantasy that acts as a pillar of rape culture.

Returning to the issue of Roxxxy's Frigid Farah setting, an important distinction about representational consent arises. Sex robot creators have to choose between building products that never deny or revoke consent, perpetuating the fantasy of the ever-available woman, or building products that are capable of resistance and therefore creating an opportunity for users to overtly simulate rape.

> If sex with a robot that fails to explicitly consent is a representation of rape then the design of such robots will most likely be morally wrong for the same reasons. If, on the other hand, sex with such robots is never a representation of rape—and especially if that's because the robots have been designed so as always to consent to sex—then the design of sex robots may well be unethical for what it expresses about the sexuality of women.[28]

In either situation, sex robot creators are evoking controversial issues that plague real women, as well as complicated conversations about

representation and its ramifications. Under contemporary, inclusive definitions of affirmative consent as enthusiastic and ongoing, both situations allow the user to simulate rape. It is neither legal or ethical to have sexual relations with an unconscious and unresponsive female body or the female body that is actively denying sexual advances. Of course, as Danaher and others concede, it is possible that some users will be able to separate relations with real women from relations with sex robots. However, these products are entering a culture in which women are already often regarded as objects and have historically been considered as such for a very long time. The choice to replicate that problem in consumer products needs to be considered critically.

There are some psychologists who have suggested that sex robots may be beneficial and productive tools for treatment for some users. Dr. Holly Richmond is a somatic psychologist and certified sex therapist who advocates for sex robots because of the benefits she believes they offer in the search for sexual health. In an interview with RT.com, Richmond explained that "all sex is good sex as long as it is consensual and pleasurable."[29] Speaking specifically on Samantha, the sex robot who was destroyed at the Arts Electronica Festival in Linz, Austria in 2017, Richmond explains that because the doll is not conscious we should not be concerned about consent and should only view her as a tool for achieving sexual satisfaction and health. Richmond acknowledges that some consumers will use the sex robots in a negative way but sees this as no different from the way people misuse alcohol or other normalized substances and technology. She also believes that the conscious and intelligent sex robots we see depicted in *Westworld* are a long way from existing in reality. Her approach to sex robots, which she claims is a "sex-positive" perspective, is too narrow, and does not take into consideration the representational implications of female-coded sex robots for users' perceptions and treatment of real women. In "The Case for Sexbots," Neil McArthur actually argues that "sexbots can help people prepare for human relationships. They can help people build a sense of comfort with sex and increase their confidence in their own sexual abilities.[30] It is clear that at this point, and as long as sex robots continue to be produced to symbolize women, we cannot consider them separate or exempt from existing gender dynamics. Some have suggested that allowing people with desires like rape and pedophilia to have access to sex robots that let them act on their desires without any direct human victims may help them overcome and correct these urges. However, this is only a corrective possibility if the sex robot is used in tandem with psychiatric treatment, and even then the risk of this access further normalizes their desires and encourages their behavior, the implications of which are just too great to risk.[31] Additionally, as far as I can tell, none of the companies that currently produce sex robots are advocating for this kind of partnership between their products and mental health professionals.

For the most part, scholars with the luxury of academic distance from the issue have adopted a reactionary attitude toward sex robots, as the technology is so new and most studies of them are still speculative.[32] However, I argue that this is a highly irresponsible approach to take because representation is not something new and speculative, and as a society we have previously acknowledged the effects of harmful representation in other arenas. Though True Companion's official response to accusations about Frigid Farrah's social implications voice a lack of responsibility for perpetuation of rape culture, as demonstrated here:

> even if one thinks that engineers are not responsible for the decisions of users to use their products, they are under an obligation not to design a product that imposes an elevated risk of rape on 50% of society when used for its intended purpose. Moreover, regardless of whether or not the rape of robots would elevate the rate of rape, the design of robots intended to allow the user to enjoy rape is unethical as a result of the sexist and morally repugnant attitudes that it expresses.[33]

As producers in a capitalist society who have the freedom to create sex robots despite their awareness of the risks, which were only brought to their attention by protestors, their choice to continue to push the boundaries of this technology without even acknowledging these risks reveals a complete disregard for the safety of the female half of the population. The Campaign Against Sex Robots, established in 2015, is an activist group who states on their website that they "believe in the benefits of robots and technologies to our society and human cultures, but want to ensure that robotics develops ethically and that we do not reproduce inequalities with their development that could further reinforce disturbing human lived experiences."[34] They acknowledge that representation is at the heart of the issue, as they do not currently believe that sex robots are conscious or deserving of human rights. They hold the companies that use their resources to produce sex robots responsible for their products and the implications and consequences of their products.

Conclusion

Some scholars have suggested that some of the representational issues present in sex robots could be negated if we regard them as marriage partners, as 'lovebots' instead of 'sexbots.'[35] However, though this approach may cover some of the more overt implications of rape and objectification, the functions the robots are designed to be capable of, which are exclusively acts of servitude, still only reinforce existing inequalities. Others suggest that sex robots could be used as affordable and safer prostitutes, but again this only reaffirms the asymmetrical relationship established in the sex work industry and replicated in human-robot relationships.[36] Still others argue that attraction to sex robots marks an entirely new sexual orientation, known as digisexuality, which could lead to a sexuality that is divorced from traditional interpersonal sexual and romantic dynamics and experiences.[37] Ultimately, any kind of simplified or monolithic representation of an oppressed or subordinate population designed for the pleasure of the oppressing population is problematic, regardless of the specific nuances the creators decide to employ or disregard. In the sex robot industry's situation, it will become necessary for consumers and producers to determine which ethical issue they prefer to contend with, or rather, which sells better. Considering this, the possibilities of sex robots in society need to be explored further, especially as sex robots are becoming increasingly accessible and advanced. While I do want to avoid technological determinism and maintain faith in consumers and producers to take responsibility for what sex robots represent and imply, people are already buying these products which are entirely linked to the products and problems of the sex industry that continue to exist. While my primary focus in this paper was on sex robots and gender inequality, there absolutely needs to be

more space to think critically about the racial issues raised by sex robots and the people who design and use them (such as the stereotypes creators called upon to build Roxxxy's Young Yoko personality and the Western beauty standards perpetuated in the physical bodies of the dolls). Class is also a relevant issue, as only a certain level of socioeconomic status enables potential creators the education and resources to create sex robots or affords consumers to access the products. I was unable to focus on these issues within the scope of this paper but hope to explore them further in the future.

Throughout this research process, I found myself feeling emotionally exhausted and more personally upset by the information I encountered than I typically do during academic projects. I think that a lot of that had to do, again, with the issue of representation. I was not necessarily disturbed on behalf of the unconscious robots, I was afraid for myself and my own female body. I recognized fears and inequalities that are familiar and real. And, as such, I would like to leave you with this:

It is 2017 and Samantha the sex robot is on display at a conference for the first time.
In minutes, her body is destroyed by tech bro fingers hungry for the future and today
her programmers decided she would not scream.
She would not scream.

The professor asks what we think and
my dinner jumps to my throat because

it is 2016 and Brock Turner only spent 3 months in prison
for raping a drunk girl
whose body he saw as passive object fantasy.

It is 2015 and I work the night shift.
My sister
who loves me very much
tells me the knife I carry in my boot
isn't big enough anymore.

It is 2012 and I am choosing avocados at the grocery store
when a man in a polo shirt has to stop to tell me
that I would be prettier if I smiled.

It is 2014 and my fourth floor apartment does not have a fire escape
still, my roommates lock every window because

it is 2011 and the boy says he might like to date me
it's just that like I talk too much?

it is 2013 and my niece's first word is no and
I vow to never take that from her because

it is 2009 and us girls are trying to knit sticky armor for each other
out of lip gloss tubes.

It is 2018 and I am a woman still learning to live in a body
I have only ever known as battlefield.

The women still go to the bathroom in pairs because
when I was 16 a man was in there waiting for me.
Before I could even try, he said remember
good girls don't scream.

References

[1]Oliver Wheaton, "Festival Denies Sex Robot Was Molested So Much That It Was 'heavily Soiled'," *Metro*, last modified September 29, 2017, http://metro.co.uk/2017/09/29/festival-denies-sex-robot-was-molested-so-much-that-it-was-broken-and-heavily-soiled-6965652/.
[2] Lily Frank and Sven Nyholm, "Robot sex and consent: Is consent to sex between a robot and a human conceivable, possible, and desirable?,"*Artificial Intelligence and Law* 25, no. 3 (2017): xx.
[3] Zara Stone, "Everything You Need To Know About Sophia, The World's First Robot Citizen," *Forbes*, last modified June 14, 2018, http://www.forbes.com/sites/zarastone/2017/11/07/everything-you-need-to-know-about-sophia-the-worlds-first-robot-citizen/#2f9ad2b946fa. 1.
[4] Delcker Janosch, "Europe Divided over Robot 'personhood'," *POLITICO*, last modified April 13, 2018, http://www.politico.eu/article/europe-divided-over-robot-ai-artificial-intelligence-personhood/.
[5] Kyle Smith, "A Male Backlash Against #MeToo is Brewing," *New York Post*, last modified February 5, 2018, http://nypost.com/2018/02/03/a-male-backlash-against-metoo-is-brewing. *The New York Post* is not a credible news source, so this article should be treated as a primary source in the way that it expresses anxieties of the author and the readers he appeals to.
[6] "Home." Realbotix. Accessed September 1, 2018. http://realbotix.com.
[7] Ry Crist, "RealDoll Sex Dolls and Their Real Owners, in Their Own Words," *CNET*, last modified August 10, 2017, http://www.cnet.com/pictures/realdolls-sex-doll-abyss-creations-owners-in-their-own-words/9/?query=sex%2Bdoll&page=1.
[8] Manu Joseph, "What Sex Robots Say About Us," *Livemint.com*, last modified July 15, 2017, https://www.livemint.com/Leisure/2GP1JdAg7Yv1yMP3MLr95J/What-sex-robots-say-about-us.html.
[9] *Metropolis*, directed by Fritz Lang (1927; Potsdam, Germany: Ufa), Film.
[10] *Westworld*, directed by Michael Chrichton. (1973; Beverly Hills, CA: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer), Film.
[11] Some specialty brothels that exist now offer hyper realistic female sex dolls as an option for customers.
[12] Dustin Abnet, "Escaping the Robot's Loop: Westworld and the Politics of Consciousness-Raising," *Process: a Blog for American History,* last modified February 16, 2017, http://www.processhistory.org/westworld-abnet/.
[13] *Westworld*, directed by Jonathan Nolan, and Lisa Joy (October 2, 2016; Burbank, CA: HBO).
[14] Abnet, Dustin. "Escaping the Robot's Loop."
[15] The only notable exception is Google's new AI call bot system, which is sexed male and designed to mimic the voice of real, recognizable celebrities. The product is called Duplex and consumers have already resisted its implementation because it does so well at passing as human over the phone.
[16] Marie Glenn, "Few Good Men: Why is the Growing Population of AI Voices Predominantly Female?," IBM IX, last modified October 26, 2017, https://www.ibm.com/blogs/insights-on-business/ibmix/good-men-growing-population-ai-voices-predominantly-female/.
[17] *Her*, directed by Spike Jonze (2013; Burbank, CA: Warner Bros.), Film.
[18] Hallie Lieberman, *Buzz: A Stimulating History of the Sex Toy* (Pegasus Books, 2017).
[19] Caitlin Petrakovitz, "Your 'Westworld' Sexbot is Right Around the Corner, Thanks to

RealDoll," *CNET*, last modified April 15, 2017, http://www.cnet.com/news/realdoll-harmony-ai-app-realbotix-sexbot/.
[20] "Home." Realbotix.
[21]Crist. "RealDoll Sex Dolls."
[22] Ibid.
[23] Jeff Salton, "Roxxxy the US$7,000 Companion/sex Robot (NSFW)," *New Atlas - New Technology & Science News*, last modified February 4, 2010, http://newatlas.com/roxxxy-us7000-sex-robot/14063/.
[24] Park, "Tracing the History of the 'Asian Woman Fetish,'" *Bitch Media*, accessed September 11, 2018, http://www.bitchmedia.org/article/the-madame-butterfly-effect-asian-fetish-history-pop-culture.
[25] "World's First Sex Robot FAQ," TrueCompanion.com, accessed September 1, 2018, http://truecompanion.com.
[26] Robert Sparrow, "Robots, Rape, and Representation," *International Journal of Social Robotics* 9, no. 4 (2017): 465-477
[27] John Danaher, "Robotic Rape and Robotic Child Sexual Abuse: Should They be Criminalised?," *Criminal Law and Philosophy* 11, no. 1 (2014): xx.
[28] Sparrow, "Robots, Rape, and Representation."
[29] Luke Holohan, "Sex Dolls Uncovered: The Kinks, Quirks and Risks of Building Robolove (GRAPHIC VIDEO)," *RT International*, last modified March 22, 2018, http://www.rt.com/news/422037-sex-dolls-samantha-robotics/.
[30] John Danaher and Neil McArthur, *Robot Sex: Social and Ethical Implications* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2017).
[31] John Danaher, "Robotic Rape."
[32] "Let's Talk about Sex Robots," *Nature* 547, no. 7662 (2017): 138.
[33] Sparrow, "Robots, Rape, and Representation."
[34] "Ethics of Robotics," Campaign Against Sex Robots, last modified September 14, 2015, https://campaignagainstsexrobots.org/.
[35] Frank and Nyholm, "Robot Sex and Consent."
[36] David Neil Laurence Levy, *Love + Sex with Robots: The Evolution of Human-Robot Relations* (London: Duckworth Overlook, 2009).
[37] Neil McArthur and Markie L. Twist, "The rise of digisexuality: therapeutic challenges and possibilities," *Sexual and Relationship Therapy* 32, no. 3-4 (2017): 32

2019 Weaver Prize

In the spring of 1993, the American Studies Student Association established the Earl James Weaver Graduate Paper Prize to honor the retirement of Earl James Weaver, Professor of American Studies, past Department Chair, and founder of the Department of American Studies at California State University, Fullerton. With an original endowment raised from the generous contributions of American Studies students and alumni, the Weaver Prize is an annual $250 cash award for the best paper written by an American Studies graduate student during the preceding year. Every spring, a panel of American Studies faculty reads submissions and selects the winning essay.

The 2019 Weaver Prize Committee decided that this year there must be two recipients of the Weaver Prize, two papers that differ greatly in their topics and their methods, yet are of equally superior merit: "'A regular morgue': American Soldiers, Death, and Dying on the Western Front" by Kai Lisoskie, prepared for Professor John Ibson's AMST 401 on War and American Culture; and "Controlling Technology and the Female Body in *Jurassic World* (2015)," by Henrik Schneider, prepared for Professor Dustin Abnet's AMST 502 on American Technocultures.

The committee found Kai's paper to be powerfully impressive in its moral weight, its graceful writing, the volume and range of research that included letters, fiction, and diaries, and in its fresh and troubling look at what the First World War did to American male bodies as well as to the European landscape. This was a work that might well serve eventually as the foundation of a doctoral dissertation.

Henrik's sophisticated work so meticulously and effectively placed *Jurassic World* into a wide and deep cultural context that it is a serious examination of technology and of the female body in contemporary American culture and of the cultural work performed by artistic expression. It not only astutely analyzed women's bodies and technology in one important film, but relied on a vast amount of secondary material, cleverly integrating those sources into its narrative. It explicitly and quite successfully sought to reflect the American Studies "habit of mind." It is also an apt foundation for a doctoral dissertation and indeed was recently mentioned by Henrik himself, in his applications to Ph.D. programs, to possibly have such a future.

2019 Weaver Prize Winner

Controlling Technology and the Female Body in *Jurassic World* (2015)

Henrik Jaron Schneider

AMST 502: American Technocultures

Science fiction narratives, more than any other genre, provide us with the tools to envision alternative imaginations of the world. When looking at pop-cultural artifacts that are designed to entertain large audiences, I often find myself disappointed because it seems to me that we are frequently exposed to established patterns that are rooted in patriarchal ideology. For my AMST 502 graduate seminar "American Technocultures," I looked at the intersections of technology, gender, and sexuality to delve deeper into the structural forces at play in the movie *Jurassic World* which reiterate archaic conceptualizations of men and sexual politics. I hope that in laying bare the elements in the movie that promote discriminatory ideology, I can emphasize the missed opportunities of science fiction to queer American myths in a future effort to embrace diversity and acceptance.

Introduction

I grew up absorbing anything related to dinosaurs, e.g., Mattel's *Extreme Dinosaur* figurines and cartoons such as *The Land Before Time*. My passion for extinct reptiles rekindled when *Jurassic World* premiered in 2015 while I was in my second year as an American Studies undergraduate, which significantly shaped the way I looked at U.S. popular culture.[1] I noticed a distinct interest in dinosaurs, technology, and premodern nature that permeates movies, cartoons, and toy aisles and represents dinosaur-technology hybrids in gendered terms. In my graduate studies, I have also delved deeper into discourses on technology in American culture and became curious about the relation of gender and sexuality to conceptualizations of technology in the U.S.

Mass-mediated images affect the way we internalize patriarchal power structures by normalizing discriminatory renderings of marginalized social groups. However, artifacts of popular culture can also challenge hegemonic ideologies. The "cultural work" such artifacts perform, as Paul Lauter writes, "helps construct the frameworks, fashion the metaphors, create the very language by which people comprehend their experiences and think about their world."[2] Colin Trevorrow's *Jurassic World* appears to perform the cultural work of perpetuating assumptions about white masculinity and technology by building on gendered assumptions about dinosaurs and science that permeate U.S. popular culture. I seek to shed light on American culture's fascination with combining the prehistoric with modern technology. In today's highly technological society, there seems to be a trend toward a fusion of nature with modern technological spaces and a turn to imaginations of the prehistoric.

Hollywood translates this fascination in American culture with nature and the prehistoric in relation to technology to the big screen, adding connotations that reflect current anxieties about our perceived impotence in the face of technological progress, hopes that relate to the capability of science as well as desires about control and domination.

Jurassic World intertwines the prehistoric with sophisticated technology in gendered terms. The movie sparked controversy as early as two months prior to its premiere because of its regressive portrayal of the female lead character and celebration of the traditional, patriarchal, nuclear family. Moreover, scholars like Robin Andersen criticize the movie for employing genetically engineered life-forms as weapons, thus normalizing "Biomimetic Killing." [3] It appears, however, as if no academic discussion exists between *Jurassic World's* preoccupation with rendering primeval animals military weapons and the movie's sexism. Thus, I argue that *Jurassic World's* simultaneous fascination with premodern nature and advanced military technologies in the form of trained dinosaurs facilitates the perpetuation of a male fantasy of control and domination over technology and the female body.

Theory and Methods

I draw on several academic fields including anthropology, Animal Studies, paleontology, and film theory. In doing so, I will connect contemporary social and cultural practices to a broader trend in American society to gender premodern nature and technology by relating them to patriarchal sexual politics. Freud's notion of fetishism is a helpful tool in the process of analyzing the relationship between such sexual politics and technology. Dino Franco Felluga defines fetishism as "the displacement of desire and fantasy onto alternative objects and body parts" which is based on Freud's theory of the castration complex.[4] Felluga's idea of fetishism, which is informed by psychoanalytic assumptions about the "fright of castration at the sight of a female genital," is crucial to understanding the displacement of male sexual desire onto technology.[5] This conceptualization of fetishism lays the foundation for my cultural discourse analysis of *Jurassic World.*

The connection between technology and sexuality establishes the framework for my analysis of the displacement of male sexual desire onto dinosaurs as military weapons as a fantasy of control and domination over technology and the female body. Ruth Oldenziel suggests that technology is considered "men's natural domain," rendering women's relationship with technology exotic. Moreover, in her study on how technology became masculine, Oldenziel "treats the absence of flesh-and-blood women in technological matters in its relation to their persistent and haunting metaphorical presence."[6] In *Jurassic World*, however, flesh-and-blood women are present; nevertheless, it seems that the connection of femininity and technology with the exotic is embodied through the metaphor of female dinosaur bodies.

Moreover, science fiction's embrace of technomasculinity ties sexuality to a fetishization of new technologies. Amanda Fernbach argues that in science fiction, it is not always the female body that becomes fetishized, but that it is also "men who are refitted and fetishized, and who exhibit an array of technoparts in order to define a new technomasculinity." She further argues that the reason for the displacement of male sexual fantasies is caused by "postmodern decenterings and subsequent losses of power and privilege" Although Fernbach focuses on the fragmentation of the male body and its becoming one with technology as the site of fetishization, her article reflects

on the relation between masculinity and technology as a central theme in science fiction. She further suggests that the alleged loss of power of white, heterosexual men in America facilitates the emergence of fictional narratives that employ technology to create artifacts that confirm hegemonic power structures.[7]

The prevalence of a weapons fetish in America is one manifestation of technology in fictional narratives that underpins such power structures. H. Bruce Franklin suggests that "the cult of the superweapon originated . . . in the form of future wars imagined by American authors of fiction." He claims that the "glorification of war" is deeply ingrained in American capitalist culture as a "principal business of several multi-billion-dollar industries, including movies, television, advertising, and the manufacture of toys and video games."[8] The fascination with weapons in American culture is deeply intertwined with notions of gender and sexuality. In an article on drones and popular culture, Michael Salter suggests the presence "of a 'weapons fetish' evident in popular culture" which "imbues military technology . . . with masculine fantasies of control and domination." He concludes that central to the implementation of police drones "are the feelings of pleasure and excitement."[9] James W. Gibson examines this connection of the military and male sexual fantasies in a broader context by relating representations of military technology in "thousands of novels, magazines, films, and advertisements" to anxieties about the condition of the modern world which seems to jeopardize white masculinity. He relates these representations of male fantasies about control and domination to the portrayal of military technology in popular culture by comparing literary descriptions of "bullets, grenade fragments, and knives" to hard-core pornography.[10] Salter suggests that "the increasing dominance of militaristic symbols and themes within Western culture and politics represents a defensive collective 'fantasy' by boys and men seeking to deny the crises of legitimation faced by patriarchal masculinities."[11] Thus, he links representations of weapons to fetishistic assumptions about male control and domination. The fact that drones are named after male bees reinforces the link between masculinity and military technology and this connection of weapons with animals further supports male fantasies of control.

In a book on military animals, Colin Salter draws attention to "ongoing implications of ideologies of dominionism (speciesism and human chauvinism) which enable systematic . . . violence to be perpetrated against nonhuman animals."[12] Dominionism is a theocratic ideology that grants conservative Christians the domination and control of culture, society, and political institutions.[13] Thus, academic discourse connects both weapons and animals in warfare to male fantasies of control. Moreover, "military experimenters are exploring ways to modify animals . . . through genetic engineering, or discreetly, through the fusion or attachment of robotic parts or tools."[14] Therefore, *Jurassic World's* military fantasy of using genetically engineered and technologically augmented raptors is already in practice given the exploitation of non-extinct animals in warfare.

Although prehistoric animals cannot (yet) be exploited for warfare, there is a semantic connection between dinosaurs and military technology. Sociologists Gregory McLauchlan and Gregory Hooks write about the social significance of superweapons by establishing a figurative connection between dinosaurs and military technology:

> We find the metaphor 'last of the dinosaurs' especially appro-

> priate to frame a discussion of the current conjuncture [i.e., the organization and purpose of science and technology]. Many dinosaurs were immensely successful creatures evolving to gigantic proportions at the top of the food chain. But because they were unable to adapt to dramatic change, they perished quickly.[15]

The link of military technology to dinosaurs is closely tied to assumptions about success, physical superiority, and hierarchy which are notions commonly associated with stereotypical masculinity. Moreover, these prehistoric animals may be often associated with weaponry not because of their extinction, but due to their ascribed characteristics that resonate with stereotypical masculinity.

Thus, it is no surprise that dinosaurs as animals of war are a common theme in mass-marketed toys for boys which supports the connection of dinosaurs to military technology. The 1996 Mattel toy line *Extreme Dinosaurs*, for instance, capitalized on the dinosaur craze triggered by the *Jurassic Park* franchise in the early 1990s and consisted of a collection of armed dinosaur-technology hybrids marketed to young boys. The fascination with dinosaurs and military technology, however, transcends the realm of toys for boys to include commodities targeted at adults, presumably at men. In 2014, Blue Force Gear introduced the "World's First Tactical Dinosaur," a Velociraptor wearing camouflage and night-vision goggles, as a publicity stunt. In an online article about Terry Clausen (the name of the raptor), Carolyn Cox observes that "Blue Force Gear tried something a little unusual to great success – replacing hot women . . . with 'Tactical Dinosaurs.'"[16] Thus, the existence of dinosaurs as animals of war in consumer culture both reinforces combining dinosaurs with military technology and indicates the displacement of male sexual desire onto dinosaurs as fetishized objects.

Furthermore, where much of American culture remains fascinated by the premodern as a source of authenticity, dinosaurs and related phenomena embrace an even earlier vision: the prehistoric. In her critique of the Paleo Diet, for instance, Lenore Bell argues that consuming presumably paleolithic foods "was a marker of an ideal, 'Edenic' past." She connects the Paleo Diet to anxieties about the post 9/11 era regarding America having lost its "'rugged individualism,' [and] instead settling into an excessive, gluttonous lifestyle." Therefore, the Paleo Diet constitutes a reactionary movement to regain control over one's body by returning to an authentic and prehistoric past that creates comfort based on "security and vigilance."[17]

Moreover, in suggesting that America may have lost its rugged individualism, Bell's terminology is reminiscent of traditional ideas about white masculinity of the 19th century which are rooted in frontier mythology. Technological progress and the subsequent perception of an alienation of Americans from nature seem to have created anxieties about a demasculinization of society, rendering technology itself a catalyst of that crisis. In a paper on a Chrysler commercial, Christopher Duerringer uses an article by Anne Stiles to refer to the 'West Cure' as a reaction to the demasculinization of modern society. The West Cure was a popular treatment prescribed to men in the 19th century to "travel to the Western Frontier . . . where they would learn to rope, ride, and hunt and, thereby, to re-masculinize themselves."[18] In *Gunfighter Nation*, Richard Slotkin observes that individualist men who acquire "scientific knowledge through the necessary operations of [their] native

curiosity and engagement with nature" constitute archetypical masculinity of the old Wild West.[19] The frontiersman combines traditional assumptions about masculinity with the turn to the past and emphasizes men's relationship with nature. Ultimately, Duerringer's connection of the Chrysler commercial to the West Cure links masculine anxieties about the feminizing forces of the modern world to an escape into nature. Thus, it appears that notions of prehistoric nature as the locus of assumptions about masculinity rooted in frontier ideology constitute the realm of male fantasies about authenticity, control, and domination in the face of a perceived demasculinization due to the forces of the modern world.

"You Do Everything I Say!": The Representation of Femininity in *Jurassic World*

The representation of femininity in *Jurassic World* and its connection to weaponized dinosaurs construct a male fantasy of control and domination that work against a perceived demasculinization due to the forces of the modern world by perpetuating archaic gender roles. By regarding the female lead character, Claire Dearing (Bryce Dallas Howard), I seek to highlight sexist elements that permeate the female bodies of both women and dinosaurs. Michael Crichton's novel, as well as the *Jurassic Park* movies, have been subject to critical evaluations concerning their archaic sexual politics. Briggs and Kelber-Kaye argue that Crichton's novel is "grounded in a profound antifeminism" which manifests itself through a negative representation of new genetic technologies that undermine male reproductive agency. Moreover, they observe that in *Jurassic Park*, "females learn to be mothers" by succumbing to heteronormative gender roles.[20] Yaszek's evaluation of the original movie also relates the survival of the female lead to her ability "to assume the identities traditionally associated with the nuclear family."[21] Thus, *Jurassic Park* has a history of portraying women according to heteronormative assumptions about gender by rewarding normative gender performances.

After *Jurassic World* premiered in 2015, numerous critics faulted the movie's portrayal of Dearing by suggesting that nothing has changed since the sexist representations of women in the old movies. Indeed, *Jurassic World's* introduction of Dearing is a perfect example of the concept of the male gaze. Laura Mulvey argues that viewers of film are forced to identify with the "active male figure" due to cinematographic means rooted in patriarchal ideologies.[22] Women in film are subject to the active male gaze, which renders the female body the object of male sexual desire. After the first aerial shots of the park in *Jurassic World*, the camera approaches the control center to introduce the female lead. Filmed as a close-up shot, Dearing is standing in a descending, transparent elevator. Thus, the female protagonist is deconstructed through cinematographic means that emphasize her body parts, starting from her feet, then moving up her legs to her abdomen, to finally show her torso and face. In doing so, the movie lets viewers scrutinize Dearing's body even before showing her face. Therefore, Trevorrow's movie subjects Dearing to the male gaze through means of cinematography and mise-en-scène, thus treating the female body as the scopophilic object of male sexual desire.

Jurassic World's investment in Dearing's appearance culminates in a scene where the Tyrannosaurus rex is chasing the woman, who is wearing high heels, which sparked a discussion on sexism in the wake of the film's success. Andersen observes that Dearing "defiantly pulls off remarkable feats, such as outrunning an *Indominus rex* . . . and single-handedly releasing the

T-Rex to save the remaining humans. But her character must enter the terrain of action adventure, battle sequences, and military adventures, and then wield a gun before she gets any respect."[23] The presumed respectability the female lead gains through becoming physically involved in fighting the Indominus rex, the terrorizing monster of *Jurassic World*, helps push forward the narrative. However, while running away from the Tyrannosaurus rex, Dearing's legs are almost entirely exposed and her body is covered in dirt and sweat. In 2007, Caroline Heldman first introduced the term "fighting fuck toy" for a contemporary stock character that combines an emphasis on the female body as sex object with notions of physical strength, agency, and independence.[24] In her moments of physical activity and strength, Dearing exhibits the mentioned elements of Heldman's fighting fuck toy. In doing so, it seems that even when pushing forward the narrative through action, cinematographic conventions rooted in patriarchal assumptions about the female body still objectify the female lead.

In addition to the objectification of Dearing's body, there are several instances in *Jurassic World* where men criticize her access to power and control as the park's operation manager. An early scene showing one of the park's major investors flying Dearing to the facility of the caged Indominus rex highlights the woman's struggle to give up control. The female lead is visibly uncomfortable with the inexperienced pilot and only resumes to her reserved demeanor after the helicopter has landed at the destination. In another scene later in the movie, Dearing's obsession with control becomes even more apparent when she insists on ignoring the orders of Owen Grady (Chris Pratt), the male lead. When the two discuss how to stop the escaped Indominus rex from reaching the developed part of the island, Grady criticizes the operation manager's decision to use non-lethal weapons to contain the situation and demands to call off the mission. However, Dearing responds by shouting, "You are not in control here!" thus highlighting her position of power. Moreover, the narrative juxtaposes Dearing's obsession with control with her lack of familial emotion and sympathy. Only ten minutes into the movie, viewers learn that Dearing has not seen her nephews in seven years, which underpins her focus on her job she seemingly privileges over familial bonds. When her nephews get lost on the island that is being terrorized by the escaped Indominus rex, Grady exclaims, "You don't know how old your nephews are?" as a response to Dearing asking him to help find her sister's sons but failing to provide an accurate description of the boys. Moreover, Grady criticizes Dearing for calling the dinosaurs assets instead of regarding them as living beings. Together with her incapability to maintain fundamental familial relationships, and her lack of emotions toward the dinosaurs, stereotypical assumptions about women that emphasize female empathy and emotionality do not appear to be valid for Dearing.

As the narrative unfolds and the park is turned into a war zone, however, Dearing loses control and starts following Grady's orders. As she does so, the film portrays her in a more positive, empathetic way, for she becomes a submissive woman who complies with heteronormative gender roles. The moment of Dearing's transition from controlling to being controlled occurs outside the technologically sophisticated control room in the wilderness of the park. Upon realizing that Dearing's nephews survived an attack by the Indominus rex but still are lost in the forest, Grady establishes, "I'm in charge out here. You do everything I say exactly as I say it." At first, Dearing seems irritated by Grady's dominant tone and retorts that she is not one of his

animals. When the male lead tells her to relax, however, she eventually succumbs to his authority. From that moment on, the female protagonist follows Grady's orders without questioning his dominance. Eventually, Grady succeeds in rendering the female lead, who *Jurassic World* introduced as a character obsessed with control and domination, a submissive woman who ends up in a heteronormative relationship with the movie's hero.

Dearing is not the only female character in *Jurassic World* that is represented in deeply patriarchal ways, for the dinosaurs are gendered too. Briggs and Kelber-Kaye emphasize that Crichton's book establishes that "the dinosaurs in *Jurassic Park* are . . . 'coded female'" (96) which seems to be continued in the 2015 movie.[25] Dr. Henry Wu, the head geneticist of the park, for instance, genders the Indominus rex by stating to a group of investors that "She was designed." Moreover, viewers learn that Grady's raptor pack is all-female, too. When Hoskins (Vincent D'Onofrio), who is the leader of a private security force responsible for the park, erroneously misgenders one of the raptors, Grady's sidekick, Barry (Omar Sy), rectifies that Delta is a girl alluding to the assumption that all dinosaurs are genetically modified to be female. These are only a few of numerous examples of how the dinosaurs are semantically gendered in *Jurassic World*. In doing so, the movie supports the idea that the representation of dinosaurs in gendered terms is connected to sexual politics that relate to the female body as discourse.

Like Dearing, the dinosaurs are enmeshed in a narrative about control and domination. Just like the gendering of the bioengineered animals, *Jurassic World* establishes notions of control and domination on a semantic level when Dearing reveals the Indominus rex which she describes as the park's "first genetically modified hybrid." Although the term indominus seems to be coined by the writers of *Jurassic World*, the word is reminiscent of the Latin adjective *indomitus* which translates to untamed, making the Indominus rex the untamed King. Moreover, the word *dominus* has striking similarities to the English verb *to dominate* which further suggests a relation of the Indominus rex, which should be Indomina regina in accordance to the gendering of *Jurassic World*, to notions of power and control. Therefore, the escape of the Indominus rex and the subsequent quest to capture and control the beast is a literal manifestation of the threat of uncontrollable technology in gendered terms. Yaszek suggests that "dinosaurs become threatening creatures... [because they] reflect our culture's increasing anxiety that masculine authority... may be displaced by the very technology it creates."[26] Although she refers to *Jurassic Park*, the gendered portrayal together with notions of the uncontrollable consequences of excessive bioengineering in the form of the Indominus rex reiterate the same anxieties that Yaszek ascertained in the '90s. John O'Neil gets to the heart of the presence of female bioengineered dinosaurs in Spielberg's movies by arguing that they represent a threat to white masculinity due to an "unconscious fear of loss of control" based on the omnipresence of in-vitro reproduction that "completes the end of patriarchy."[27]

Grady's profession as a raptor trainer and his position of power over the female dinosaur body, however, appears to counteract the fear of loss of control posed by the Indominus rex. The cinematography of the scene that introduces the raptor pack as trained animals places the dinosaurs in a subordinate position with high-angle shots which are complemented by corresponding low-angle shots showing their trainer standing on a bridge above the cage. Grady uses a clicker and treats to train the raptors, which is a strategy used to teach obedience and commands to dogs. Moreover, he

employs the same sharp commands and gestures to train the raptors that, when used to talk to the female protagonist, causes her indignant response, "Hey! I'm not one of your damn animals!" When Grady enters the enclosure to rescue a staff member who accidentally fell into the cage, it is ambiguous whether the raptors will attack their trainer, thus complicating the hierarchy between man and beast at the beginning of the movie. During the showdown of *Jurassic World*, this ambiguity shifts in favor of the Indominus rex, who seems to be able to communicate with the raptors to turn them against their trainer. In doing so, the movie further facilitates anxieties of products of technology overpowering men. Eventually, however, the raptors follow Grady's commands and attack the Indominus rex, thus reestablishing the hierarchy of the beginning of the movie which resembles the narrative's trajectory from disobedient to submissive regarding the relationship between Grady and Dearing.

In addition to Grady's assertion of dominance over the raptors which mirrors the way he treats the female protagonist, the female raptor pack becomes subject to Hoskins's fetishizing gaze in the context of using the dinosaurs as military technology. When Grady saves one of the park's staff from the raptors, Hoskins is lurking in the background while everybody else is trying to contain the situation. A wide shot of Grady trying to hold three raptors at bay is contrasted with a close-up of Hoskins who gazes at the female raptor bodies in action. Although one may argue that Hoskins is just interested in seeing the results of the raptor's training as military weapons, his facial expressions as well as him biting his lower lip suggest a fetishizing dimension to his actions. It is Hoskins, too, who renders the raptors cinematic Terri Clausens to fight the Indominus rex and to test the ground for using dinosaurs as military technology, thus playing into the connection of dinosaurs and weapons in American culture. His obsession with using the genetically engineered dinosaurs as weapons and praising their physical and mental capabilities in a manner that supports the presence of a weapons fetish in American culture also becomes apparent at the end of the movie when Hoskins raves, "Imagine that one: a fraction of the size, deadly, intelligent, able to hide from the most advanced military technology. A living weapon unlike anything we've ever seen!" His preoccupation with weaponizing dinosaurs is further reinforced by Andersen who observes that "*Jurassic World* enacts the current high-tech military research into biowarfare – weaponizing animals and defining nature as the ultimate killing machine."[28]

Moreover, Andersen adds nature as another critical aspect to the portrayal of dinosaurs in *Jurassic World* in relation to military technology and the displacement of sexual desire as a male fantasy of control and domination. Yaszek, too, regards nature as a critical element by arguing that the dinosaurs are "monstrous precisely because they embrace the organic and technological, the 'natural' and the 'unnatural.'"[29] In *Jurassic World*, however, the protagonists make a clear distinction between what is deemed natural and, therefore "authentic," and what is an embodiment of excessive technology. At the beginning of the movie, Dearing criticizes Lowery (Jake Johnson), an employee who works in the control room, for wearing a shirt with the 1993 *Jurassic Park* logo. Lowery defends himself by retorting that the "first park was legit. . . . They didn't need these genetic hybrids. They just needed real dinosaurs." Thus, he suggests that the creation of the Indominus rex as a hybrid of several animals diminishes the authenticity of Jurassic World. Grady, too, expresses his discontent for the seemingly unnatural in-vitro creation of the Indominus

rex when he asserts that "that thing out there – that's no dinosaur." It is Dr. Henry Wu (Bradley Darryl Wong) who lays bare the fallacy in the protagonist's thinking. He clarifies that "nothing in Jurassic World is natural. We have always filled gaps in the genome with the DNA of other animals." Nevertheless, Grady treats his raptors as "the real thing" and distinguishes them from the creature that the scientists produced in the laboratory to create a monster that satisfies the park's visitors' sensationalism. If nothing in the park is natural, however, why does the movie construct the raptors in a way that resonates with the contemporary American interest in prehistoric nature as a space of masculine authenticity? To answer this question, I will look at the representation of white masculinity in *Jurassic World* to connect the portrayal of Dearing and the raptors, as well as the Indominus rex, to my assumption that the movie provides a space for the displacement of male desire onto the weaponized female dinosaur body to counteract the perceived demasculinization of American society.

"Who's the Alpha?": The Representation of White Masculinity in *Jurassic World*

Crichton's novel, as well as Spielberg's films, established *Jurassic Park's* investment in white masculinity through the portrayal of its exclusively Caucasian male lead characters, thus laying the foundation for a manifestation of masculinity in *Jurassic World* that succeeds in controlling both the female protagonist and the all-female raptor pack. Briggs and Kelber-Kaye note that "[s]cientific knowledge and masculine tool-using are heroic activities in the novel." They connect these activities to the male protagonist of the 1990s movie who saves the women through his scientific and practical knowledge.[30] Although in Spielberg's film it is a teenage girl whose computer literacy contributes to the characters' escape, the male lead still constitutes the locus of dominance through his knowledgeability and his heteronormative relationship with the female protagonist. *Jurassic World* taps into this preoccupation of white masculinity by glorifying the male lead and emphasizing the overall presence of stereotypically masculine themes such as the military, motor vehicles, and violence. As early as the beginning of the movie, viewers of *Jurassic World* see a sequence of close-ups showing dinosaur toys, action figures, robots, rockets, and other stereotypically gendered toys in a boy's bedroom which establishes the predominance of masculine themes in the movie. Furthermore, the only significant female characters besides Dearing are her assistant Zara (Katie McGrath) and employee Vivian (Lauren Lapkus). The female characters, however, are significantly outnumbered by men, which contributes to the movie's investment in masculinity.

Hoskins and Grady, in particular, provide two manifestations of white masculinity that are crucial in the context of the displacement of sexual desire onto weaponized dinosaurs as a fantasy of male control and domination. *Jurassic World* establishes Hoskins as Grady's foil to juxtapose Grady's masculinity through rendering Hoskins physically inferior to the protagonist and positioning him outside heteronormative behavior. The movie never shows Hoskins engaged in a physically sophisticated activity which, together with his non-athletic physique, is in stark contrast to the movie's emphasis on Grady's muscular body in action. Moreover, when the Indominus rex breaks into the aviary, the movie cuts to a close-up of Hoskins's face, who appears to be content by the fact the park is turning into a war zone. He approaches Lowery, who sits in the control room watching the park

deteriorate into chaos, and massages the young man's shoulder. Lowery's confusion about Hoskins's physical touch gives this scene homoerotic undertones that contribute to the demasculinization of Hoskins by challenging heteronormative assumptions about sexuality and gender performance. Later in the movie, when Hoskins is overseeing the military operation, he approaches Lowery while gently whispering into his ear, "Awesome." A few minutes later, Hoskins invades Lowery's privacy once more by sipping from the young man's drinking cup. Again, Lowery is visibly uncomfortable with Hoskins's physical proximity which further underpins the homoeroticism that demasculinizes the war-obsessed man. Eventually, the narrative punishes Grady's foil by having him devoured by one of the bioengineered raptors he is so obsessed with. Hoskins's ambiguous homosocial behavior and the portrayal of his physique, thus constitute a representation of masculinity that fails to assert control over the techno-dinosaurs. In contrast, Grady seems to succeed in gaining control over the raptor pack through embodying a type of white masculinity that is tied to the turn to prehistoric nature and stereotypical male behavior.

Jurassic World employs a narrative and iconography that is reminiscent of the genre of the Western, thus connecting archaic notions of white masculinity to frontier ideology and nature. The first scene that introduces viewers to Grady renders him a silhouette through a low-angle shot and dramatic backlighting. This introduction of the male protagonist resembles "the figure of the mounted horseman outlined against the sky" which constitutes a popular cinematic trope in the genre of the Western. Moreover, in a study on Westerns, Tompkins ascertains that the "heroes want to dominate the land, and sometimes to merge with it completely," which also resonates with male fantasies of control and the turn to nature in *Jurassic World*.[31] Richard Dyer observes that the male protagonist of the 2015 movie "can handle himself in a difficult situation, but he also has the ideal relationship to nature."[32] When Dearing visits Grady to convince him to work with the Indominus rex, viewers learn that he lives in a motorhome outside the civilized part of the island which can only be reached by pulling off the road and driving into the woods. Moreover, it is not until Dearing and Grady leave the control room and enter the forest, that the male lead asserts his domination over Dearing. Thus, Grady inhabits the frontier between the park and the forest on the island which, together with his rugged individualism, his athletic physique, his skills as a "former Navy soldier," and his connection to nature, renders him a quasi-frontiersman on the edge of a highly sophisticated technological landscape bordering the wilderness. Andersen, too, relates *Jurassic World* to this terminology by arguing that the movie embraces "military's new *frontier* [emphasis added] of biowarfare with enthusiasm."[33] In addition, Grady's insistence on bifurcating the dinosaurs into the categories of natural and in-vitro hybrids works seamlessly within the assumption of turning to prehistoric nature in the quest for authentic masculinity. Consequently, the narrative structure of *Jurassic World* and the geography of the island itself provide a landscape for Grady to emerge as the embodiment of authentic white masculinity which the movie achieves through connecting him to frontier ideology and prehistoric nature.

Grady's specific masculinity renders him capable of controlling seemingly authentic dinosaurs which complies with his assumption that the raptors in the park are natural and the Indominus rex is an in-vitro creation of technological excessiveness. Although he initially opposes the idea that he

dominates over his pack of dinosaurs by telling, "I do not control the raptors, it's a relationship," he establishes his domination and control prior to the showdown of the movie. When Dearing's nephews meet the male protagonist during the mission of incapacitating the Indominus rex, one of the boys asks, "Who's the alpha?" to receive the answer, "You're looking at him, kid!" In doing so, Grady confirms his dominant position within the all-female raptor pack. Moreover, despite his initial rejection of Hoskins's idea to employ the trained dinosaurs to fight the Indominus rex, Grady eventually uses the raptors as weapons anyway, thus tying into Hoskins's fetishization of the weaponized dinosaur body. Before he puts the raptors to use at the end of the movie, however, Grady takes off the military equipment used by Hoskins's team to augment the dinosaurs during the mission. Thus, Grady seemingly opposes Hoskins's obsession with rendering dinosaurs animals of war by transforming the raptors back to their seemingly natural state. Nevertheless, "*Jurassic World* enacts the current high-tech military research into biowarfare – weaponizing animals and defining nature as the ultimate killing machine," for regardless of the augmentation of the raptors with military gear, they are still a product of biogenetic technology used to fight.[34]

The movie's ending complicates the fantasy of control and domination over dinosaurs as products of technology, for it is a team-effort of Grady's raptors, the Tyrannosaurus rex, and, ultimately, the Mosasaurus that leads to the death of the Indominus rex. It appears as if the resolution of the narrative undermines Grady's dominant position concerning technology in the form of bioengineered dinosaurs, for he cannot contribute to the fight between the monsters which suggests his own impotence in the situation. However, in considering the assumption that the creators of *Jurassic World* conceptualized the movie as a franchise with the release of the sequel *Jurassic World: Fallen Kingdom* in 2018, the emphasis on the power of the dinosaurs in juxtaposition with Grady's impuissance at the end of the film constitutes an effective cliffhanger. The looming threat of demasculinization by technology embodied through dinosaurs who are seemingly more potent than men raise the question of whether Grady will succeed in defending his position in the hierarchy in the second movie. Nevertheless, fighting dinosaurs, even without Grady's control, play into a weapons fetish in U.S. culture that subjugates dinosaurs as military animals to male fantasies of displaced masculine desires, and it remains to be seen if the second movie will fundamentally take issue with this ideology.

Conclusion

Jurassic World grants Grady a particular kind of seemingly authentic white masculinity that is tied to the preoccupation in contemporary U.S. culture with the turn to premodern nature, which helps him control and dominate both Dearing and the all-female raptor pack. Thus, the movie's investment in white masculinity lays bare the discriminatory forces that target women, and through silencing marginalized racial and ethnic groups, the film also provides inspiration for future research. Furthermore, the connection of sexuality to the representation of dinosaur bodies appears to constitute a means of displacing male sexual desires that are tied to the fetishization of control and domination over technology. The bioengineered dinosaurs embody a kind of technology which, in the course of the movie, becomes intertwined with a weapons fetish that underpins the connection of sexuality, technology, and *Jurassic World* as a fictional place that provides men with a

prehistoric landscape to act out fantasies of control and domination.

Cultural theorist Stuart Hall offers a theoretical take on the varied issues related to power struggles that are at stake concerning any cultural artifact. He argues that in artifacts of popular culture, there is a "double movement of containment and resistance." Hall further elaborates on popular culture as "a sort of constant battlefield" where the struggle between the dominated and the dominant is continuously contested and redefined.[35] *Jurassic World* constitutes such a battlefield through representing the tensions that arise from contradictions involving nature and technology, domination and submission, and the human and the machine. However, the movie perpetuates male fantasies of control and domination in the face of exponential technological growth by situating weaponized raptors at the nexus of prehistoric nature, technology, gender, and sexuality. Moreover, *Jurassic World* reiterates sexual dynamics which are based on old-fashioned assumptions about gender and deep-seated American myths such as imaginations of the frontier. Thus, the 2015 film bolsters patriarchal ideology rooted in archaic sexual politics and reinforces patterns in American culture and society that inform the understanding of new forms of technology in gendered terms.

References

[1] *Jurassic World*, dir. Colin Trevorrow, perf. Chris Pratt and Bryce Dallas Howard, Amazon Prime <accessed March 31, 2018>.
[2] Paul Lauter, *From Walden Pond to Jurassic Park: Activism, Culture, & American Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press, 2001), 11.
[3] Robin Andersen, "Learning to Love Biomimetic Killing: How Jurassic World Embraces Life Forms as Weapons," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 76, no. 2 (2017): 458, https://doi.org/10.1111/ajes.12183.
[4] Dino Franco Felluga, *Critical Theory: The Key Concepts* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2015), 106.
[5] Sigmund Freud, "Fetishism," in *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. James Strachey, vol. 21 (London: Hogarth Press, 1927), 154.
[6] Ruth Oldenziel, *Making Technology Masculine: Men, Women and Modern Machines in America, 1870-1945* (Amsterdam, NL: Amsterdam Univ. Press, 1999), 10-11.
[7] Amanda Fernbach, "The Fetishization of Masculinity in Science Fiction: The Cyborg and the Console Cowboy," *Science Fiction Studies* 27, no. 2 (July 2000): 235, 251.
[8] Howard B. Franklin, *War Stars: The Superweapon and the American Imagination* (Amherst, MA: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 2008), 5, 4.
[9] Michael Salter, "Toys for the Boys? Drones, Pleasure and Popular Culture in the Militarisation of Policing," in *Critical Criminology* 22, no. 2 (2014): 163, 173.
[10] James William Gibson, *Warrior Dreams: Paramilitary Culture in Post-Vietnam America* (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1994), 13, 6.
[11] Colin Salter, "The Military-Animal Industrial Complex," in *Animals and War: Confronting the Military-Animal Industrial Complex*, ed. Anthony J. Nocella II, Colin Salter, and Judy K. C. Bentley (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013), 166.
[12] Ibid., 17.
[13] Frederick Clarkson, "Dominionism Rising: A Theocratic Movement Hiding in Plain Sight," *The Public Eye*, (Summer 2016): 12.
[14] Bill Hamilton, and Elliot M. Katz, "The Future of War and Animals," in *Animals*

and War: Confronting the Military-Animal Industrial Complex, ed. Anthony J. Nocella II, Colin Salter, and Judy K. C. Bentley (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013), 109.chapman.edu/wla-ww1/.
[15] Gregory McLauchlan and Gregory Hooks, "Last of the Dinosaurs? Big Weapons, Big Science and the American State From Hiroshima to the End of the Cold War," in *Sociological Quarterly* 36 (1995): 750, doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1995.tb00463.x.
[16] Carolyn Cox, "Blue Force Gear Wants Velociraptors to Fight For Our Freedom," *The Mary Sue*, themarysue.com/tactical-velociraptor/ <accessed April 23, 2018>.
[17] Lenore Bell, "Caving In: The Appeal of the Paleo Diet in the Wake of 9/11," in *Food Cults: How Fads, Dogma, and Doctrine Influence Diet*, ed. Kima Cargill (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017), 131, 124.
[18] Anne Stiles, "Go Rest, Young Man," in *Monitor on Psychology* 3, no. 1 (2012): 32, www.apa.org/monitor/2012/01/go-rest.aspx.
[19] Richard Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-century America*, 2nd ed. (Norman, OK: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1998), 75.
[20] Laura Briggs and Jodi I. Kelber-Kaye, "'There Is No Unauthorized Breeding in Jurassic Park': Gender and the Uses of Genetics," *NWSA Journal* 12, no. 3 (2000): 92, 97, www.jstor.org/stable/4316764.
[21] Lisa Yaszek, "Of Fossils and Androids: (Re)Producing Sexual Identity in 'Jurassic Park' and 'Blade Runner,'" in *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 30, no. ½ (1997): 56, www.jstor.org/stable/1315426.
[22] Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," in *Introductory Readings*, ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999), 838.
[23] Andersen, *Biomimetic Killing*, 473.
[24] Caroline Heldman, "The Beast of Beauty Culture: An Analysis of the Political Effects of Self-Objectification" (paper, Western Political Science Association, La Riviera Hotel, Las Vegas, NV, March 8, 2007).
[25] Briggs and Kelber-Kaye, *Breeding*, 96.
[26] Yaszek, *Fossils and Androids*, 54.
[27] John O'Neill, "Dinosaurs-R-Us: The (Un)Natural History of Jurassic Park," in *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Minneapolis, MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1996), 303-304.
[28] Andersen, *Biomimetic Killing*, 458.
[29] Yaszek, F*ossils and Androids*, 54.
[30] Briggs and Kelber-Kaye, *Breeding*, 104.
[31] Jane Tompkins, *West of Everything: The Inner Lives of Westerns* (Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993), 6.
[32] Richard Dyer, "Jurassic World and Procreation Anxiety," *Film Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (2015): 21, doi: 10.1525/fq.2015.69.2.19.
[33] Andersen, *Biomimetic Killing*, 458.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Start Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing 'the Popular,'" in *Popular Culture: A Reader*, ed. Raiford Guins and Omayra Zaragoza Cruz (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2016), 65, 67.

2019 Weaver Prize Winner

"A regular morgue": American Soldiers, Death, and Dying on the Western Front

Kai Lisoskie

AMST 401T: War in American Culture

Between 1914 and 1918 the First World War ravaged the landscape of Europe in ways never before seen. With the advent of new technologies that would make warfare more devastating, outdated modes of combat clashed with new forms of military technology in ways that would come to haunt and harm the male psyche and body. This paper examines literature of the post World War I (WWI) era, along with personal memoirs, diaries, and letters, in order to construct an historically grounded study of masculinity, the male body, and the ways in which male soldiers experienced and interpreted death during and after WWI.

"In a wood they call the Rouge Bouquet.
There is a new-made grave to-day,
Built by never a spade nor a pick
Yet covered with heart ten metres thick.
There lie many fighting men,
Dead in their youthful prime,
Never to laugh nor love again
Nor taste the Summertime.
For Death came flying through the air
And stopped his flight at the dugout stair,
Touched his prey and left them there,
Clay to clay.
He hid their bodies stealthily
In the soil of the land they fought to free
And fled away…" — Joyce Kilmer, "Rouge Bouquet," 1918[1]

On May 24, 1918, as the first Americans began to settle on the Western Front, Joseph William Guyton was struck in the temple by German machine-gun fire, dying immediately. Guyton would become one of thousands of United States (US) military casualties in a war that the US had very little to do with, yet were integral in the ensuing victory in late 1918. The First World War, often remembered as The Great War and the "War to end all Wars," lasted four long years — between 1914 and 1918 — killing tens of millions of people across the globe, only being eclipsed on a global scale by its successor, World War II. This Great War would hold distinct and often conflicting meanings for many of those that fought in it. In memory, World War I (WWI), as Paul Fussell argues, would cause an "anxiety without end, without purpose, without reward, and without meaning…"[2] For those that

experienced WWI, the memories of all that they saw — the death, the destruction — would haunt their psyches, acting as constant reminders of their harrowing experiences.

Most of the men and women that set off for war, as detailed in this paper, did so under the guise of a "great adventure." These soldiers, nurses, and chaplains saw an opportunity to defend democracy abroad and sprang at the possibility of aiding like-minded countries in their pursuit of winning the "war to end all wars." In a letter to his son back home, General John Pershing, commanding general of the US Army in France, argued that service to country enabled many young men like his son Warren to learn the values of patriotism. In his letter, General Pershing states, "I want you to see some of the battlefields of France with me, over which the American soldiers have fought in carrying out the greatest purpose of our people. It will enable you to realize later in life just what sacrifice means and just what degree of sacrifice our army is called upon to make and which they have made and are making bravely and courageously."[3] To men like General Pershing, service to country is of utmost importance. What young men did in France was integral in not only the dispelling of harmful monarchies and empirical ideologies, but also in the spreading of democracy abroad. General Pershing whole-heartedly believed in the sacrifice of body, mind, and soul for the American ideals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Like the work of Drew Gilpin Faust, my focus for this study is to examine the ways in which soldiers fighting in war experienced and articulated the death and destruction around them. In focusing on American soldiers' experiences on the Western Front in France, key questions still remain: In what ways did American service men experience the death and destruction at the front, and how did they articulate it? How did these soldiers express themselves when dealing with the death of a comrade? Did soldiers become disillusioned with the war or their mission to save democracy? And, how was the Western Front reclaimed in the one hundred years since Armistice Day on November 11, 1918? By answering these questions, I hope to construct a story centered on the delicate nature that death and its effects have on soldiers who experience it. Furthermore, I will engage not only literature to facilitate my discussion of death and destruction during WWI, but also letters, diaries, memoirs, and photographs, in order to argue that death, destruction, and rebirth play an integral part in the shaping of memory surrounding the First World War for American soldiers.

"Dying Well": Patriotism and the Good Death

Those US soldiers fighting under General Pershing in the US Army in France were not only imbued with a sense of service to country, but also an evolving idea of a heroic death in combat. For some of those that served in the US military during WWI, grandfathers and fathers might have fought in the Civil War and the Spanish American War. America's views on service to country and death in combat would become shaped by those that spent time on the battlefield. In the years after the Civil War, as argued by Drew Gilpin Faust, views surrounding death and death in combat drastically changed. Because of mass death during the Civil War, the American ideal of the Good Death — that dying was to be done nobly and one would find the immortal embrace of the Lord upon one's death — would become intertwined with death in combat. Americans' understanding of death came to dominate soldiers' reasons for joining the army and dying for their country during and af-

ter the Civil War. According to Faust, dying "bravely and manfully became an important part of dying well."[4] Because of Christianity's reliance on the idea of the Good Death and the idea that the soul was immortal, many men saw their death in battle during the Civil War to be beneficial to their entrance in heaven. Some went so far as to "risk annihilation" on the battlefield in order to enter the afterlife and the loving embrace of the Lord and their dead family members.[5]

The lingering effects of the Good Death and "dying well" can be seen in letters sent home from the Western Front. Writing to former President Theodore Roosevelt after the untimely death of Roosevelt's youngest son, Quentin, General Pershing imparted strong sentiment and honorable service onto the character of Quentin for his service to country. General Pershing wrote, "Quentin died as he had lived and served, nobly and unselfishly; in the full strength and vigor of his youth, fighting the enemy in clean combat. You may well be proud of your gift to the nation in his supreme sacrifice[,]" and in lieu of any physical token of his gratitude, General Pershing finished out his letter to President Roosevelt by stating that "[the] brevity and curtness of the official words paint clearly the picture of [Quentin's] service, which was an honor to us all."[6] General Pershing found Quentin Roosevelt's death troubling nonetheless, but he understood the deaths of his soldiers to be just and actionable. Quentin Roosevelt's death embodies the act of "dying well" that the Good Death imparted on early modern American society. Through Quentin's service to country, his death became an honor, showered in bravery. Through this correspondence with his dear friend President Roosevelt, General Pershing was able to convey sentiment regarding the value of Quentin's time in service, something not easily bestowed. Although General Pershing's words act as a friendly reminder to the Roosevelts of their son's bravery in combat, it could not replace the emptiness felt upon losing their youngest boy to the war.

Service to country epitomized recruitment for many of those that joined the US Army. Posters called for soldiers to "do their bit," "to go over the top," and to "shake hands with your pal in the trenches."[7] Righteous servitude to country came to dominate the rhetoric for both those that served and those at home. Yet, in young men's drive to seek adventure they forgot what awaited them: death and destruction. Through propaganda, the Good Death, and honorable service, the US Army was able to sell soldiers on a war that had ravaged Western Europe for over 3 years. What these three things failed to address was that a "chasm between combat as imagined by civilians and the reality experienced by soldiers" existed.[8] Both the US Army and the young men that filled its ranks failed to recognize that France held only misery and despair. Through their experiences with war, the men detailed in this paper would find that combat on the Western Front was wrought with only death and destruction.

Death's Toll: The experiences of those that served

Death permeated the First World War, much like the wars that preceded and succeeded it. An atmosphere of destruction and rot came to haunt those soldiers that fought on the Western Front between 1914 and 1918. This death and destruction is encapsulated in Dalton Trumbo's 1939 novel *Johnny Got His Gun*. The novel is centered around Joe Bonham after he suffers horrific injuries that take all his limbs, his hearing, his sight, and his voice. The plot follows the memory recollection and the mental progress of a man

that has lost all human faculties, and his questioning of the justness of war. One particular passage early on in the novel captures Joe's recollection of the sounds of a man dying from a gun shot wound: "…the yells of a guy trying to explain to somebody that he's got a bullet in his belly and that his breakfast is coming out through the front of him and why won't somebody stop going froward and give him a hand only nobody can hear him they're so scared themselves. The hell with it."[9] This grisly display of the destructive nature of a bullet is what makes Trumbo's novel so vivid. Trumbo catapults the reader into Joe's memory of a soldier screaming for help while his organs come tumbling out of his body after a severe gunshot wound. Such a horrific sight would be commonplace on the Western Front; a stretch of trench in which millions of men died in the line of duty. Joe's recollection of a man dying from a gunshot wound to the stomach is but a frank reminder of the brutality of war. In his silence, this memory is comparable to Joe's own screams into the void of his consciousness.

Similar to the destruction that Joe recollects in *Johnny Got His Gun*, Arthur Guy Empey also recalls the dreadful sight of a trench and the surrounding area after an all-out assault. Empey states, "I never saw such a mess in my life…dead bodies, why that ditch was full of them, theirs and ours. It was a regular morgue. Some were mangled horribly from our shell fire, while others were wholly or partly buried in the mud…"[10] Soldiers fighting on the Western Front experienced the destruction that Empey discusses on a daily and weekly basis. Empey, Joe Bonham, and the soldiers fighting in the trenches on the Western Front might have seen so much destruction and death that they were unable to properly articulate it. Empey's description of the trenches allows the reader to understand just how confusing an ordeal it was to run across no man's land into the arms of the enemy. Confusion that began with explosions, gunfire, and mass graves, and ended with the haunting reminder that death was always looming for the soldiers at the front.

Death and the destructive factors of war, as we have seen, seeped into the daily rituals of every man at the front. Each man that fought in Europe was "…a victim of war…"[11] These men were victims of disease, rot, death, and destruction. Their victimization took its toll in many different ways. In his diary, Corporal Quiren M. Groessl of the US Army found it hard to believe that man could kill one another. In his diary, Groessl states, "It was in [Beaumont] that I saw the first casualties of war, in the forms of killed and wounded. I found it hard to believe that human beings could and are deliberately killing one another. I began to wonder what sort of propaganda could make young people want to fight a war such as this."[12] By questioning the motives of both those in charge of the military and those that were actually tasked with the killing, Groessl examines the motives of those that participated. Groessl examines the savage nature of man as he is placed in a life or death situation. And, as Groessl attests, is it possible that the soldiers on the Western Front were conned by propaganda of some sort? Well, according to the sentiments of General Pershing and Quentin Roosevelt, that would indeed be the case. Soldiers at the front were imbued with nationalistic fervor and a want to serve their country. For some soldiers fighting in the US Army, killing a German enemy was but a way for them to defend democracy. Yet, it does beg to question the very real effects that killing another man had on those that fought, and what toll the mass destruction took on the psyche of every man that fought in WWI. Were men in fact changed by the ordeal? Groessl alludes to the fact that it takes a certain kind of man to kill.

That, even faced with imminent death, Groessl cannot fathom how any sane human could kill another human in cold blood. For soldiers like Quiren M. Groessl and Arthur Guy Empey, the Western Front symbolized death incarnate, and their time spent at the front was filled with the wasteful remnants of both man and the modern machinery of war.

This wasteful nature of war alluded to by Groessl and Empey can be seen in Thomas Pynchon's 1973 novel *Gravity's Rainbow*. Pynchon's novel, which deals with the destructive nature of the Second World War, does elaborate on Brigadier Pudding's memories of the First World War. In his recollection of the destruction he witnessed while fighting in the trenches of the First World War, Brigadier Pudding likens the trenches and the mud that filled and surrounded those trenches to that of shit. The rot, foul smells and death that Pudding saw is equitable in his mind to the stinking piles of shit left by those that fought. As Pudding recalls, "…the twelve spokes of a standard artillery piece — a mud clock, a mud zodiac, clogged and crusted as it stood in the sun its many shades of brown…The mud of Flanders gathered into the curd-crumped, mildly jellied textures of human shit, piled, duck-boarded, trenches and shell-pocked leagues of shit in all directions, not even the poor blackened stump of a tree…"[13] Though odd to discuss in a paper surrounding the act and function of death on soldiers fighting in the First World War, a very real association between the trenches of the Western Front and shit does exist. Shit, or human feces, is human excess and rot — feces is human waste — and the trenches of WWI were filled with waste in all directions. Not only the actual waste left by soldiers, but the waste of human life and the waste of human thought and existence. In Pynchon's analogy, the First World War was just one giant pile of feces, it was waste incarnate and Brigadier Pudding remembers only the smell and feeling of shit in all directions because he can only recall the waste of everything around him.

In similar fashion, Wesley F. Diedrich sarcastically recalls exactly what Pynchon describes: "[Oh] it's a great life wandering around in mud up to your knees & over your head in some [of] the larger shell holes for the greater part of the night…but it is war & I am quite convinced that Sherman was right when he said that war was hell."[14] For Diedrich, just like for Groessl, war is destruction incarnate and neither can fully comprehend why they have been tasked with fighting in such a horrific place as France. The mud alone is aggravating to Diedrich, and the constant rain and shelling that occurs seems to be enough to drive a man insane. In an earlier letter, Diedrich tells his family back home "[b]elieve me I have seen enough, more than enough of was to last me the rest of my life. I believe & hope however, what it will soon end."[15] Diedrich hopes for the end of a war that has brought nothing but death and destruction into his life. For Diedrich, the constant destruction around him, along with him spending most of his time in rain and mud filled trenches, is not what he signed up for. The war was supposed to be an adventure, yet it forced Diedrich to clamber amongst the rot and the stench of the dying and the dead. For Diedrich, just like for Groessl, the First World War encapsulated the very essence of human suffering, it was the literal embodiment of shit, in the words of Thomas Pynchon.

The effects of death and destruction experienced during WWI were far reaching, touching the lives of many soldiers and nurses, both male and female. For those that experienced this death and destruction first hand it could leave them with feelings of dread and anti-war sentiment. The recordings of Second Lieutenant Arnold Stephen Hoke of the US Army are rather

interesting as far as anti-war sentiment goes. Hoke recorded his memories of the First World War in the mid-1960s, at the beginning of the war in Vietnam. Through his recollection of the soldiers that died under his command, Hoke comes to the conclusion that WWI, in its totality, was something that could have been avoided. As Hoke states, "I apologize for a rather unpleasant war story, but let me assure you, there is nothing pleasant about war in any shape or manner and I hope that nobody will ever see another one…"[16] Hoke was proud of his service to country, yet he espoused anti-war sentiment late in life. Hoke wished to dispel the mythic quality of war through his simple yet elegant wording. Hoke thoroughly believed that the destruction and death that he witnessed in Europe in 1918 was something that could have been avoided, and that such devastation should always be avoided if at all possible. This feeling of disillusionment with the First World War is not something felt only by Second Lieutenant Arnold Stephen Hoke, it was felt by many who served in Europe during WWI.

For those soldiers, nurses, and Chaplains that saw death first hand, their experiences were usually wrenching and left a rather indelible mark on their psyche. Writing in his diary while lying in a hospital bed after the death of his four comrades, Lieutenant Maury Maverick recalled his years as a child growing up in San Antonio, "[Their deaths] reminded me of nothing I had ever seen before…except Christmas hog butchering back on the Texas farm. The only difference was that the hog butchering was done methodically, and the liver and [lungs] and hearts were properly saved. In other words, the hog butchering was relatively humane."[17] To Maverick, the killing of a hog was far more humane than the ways in which his four comrades had died. There was no preservation of those precious organs when killing in war. Man killed one another in wartime haphazardly without any thought or respect for their enemy. In a similar sentiment to that of Quiren M. Groessl, Lieutenant Maverick cannot fathom the savagery that goes into human warfare. Both men were unable to fully comprehend their experiences with killing and the death of their comrades. Furthermore, Army Chaplain Melville Montgomery addresses the cruelties of war in a letter home to his family. In his letter, Chaplain Montgomery recalls the destructive habits of war by describing the death that he had personally witnessed. Chaplain Montgomery states, "Since then I have been seeing the gruesome results of war…I have seen graves torn open with the remains of decaying men scattered about. I have seen wounded men and dying…I have seen enough to do me…Truly war is hell."[18] Through his experiences — which are many — Chaplain Montgomery has seen enough to last him a lifetime. Chaplain Montgomery found the results of war to be highly disturbing, a truly gruesome sight to behold. Both Lieutenant Maverick and Chaplain Montgomery have witnessed what Westley F. Diedrich states, that war is hell. Through the haphazard ways in which man slaughters one another, to the desecration of gravesites, both Maverick and Montgomery have witnessed the brutal nature of man.

Like Chaplain Montgomery, Army Chaplain Francis Duffy writes about his first- hand experiences with wounded and dying soldiers on the battlefield. In his journal, Chaplain Duffy states that his duties "like his feelings, still lay in the past. With men from all the companies I went round the battlefield to pay as far as I could my late duties to the dead, to record and in a rough way to beautify their lonely graves, for I knew that soon we would leave this place that their presence hallows, and never look upon it again."[19] In Chaplain Duffy's words, the memories of war would be forever tied to

those that died and the battlefields on which they died. The gravesites left in each soldiers' stead would be the only way for those that died to be remembered. For the destruction of war was so great, according to Chaplain Duffy, that no man would care to set foot on a WWI battlefield ever again. Chaplain Duffy is forever haunted by the men that he gave last rights to as they lay dying on the field of battle. He feels obligated to help the dying and the dead in any way he can because his mind is constantly assaulted by the vivid memories of those that died on his watch.

For those that fought and for those that assisted in the rear during the First World War, the memories of what they saw haunted them. When the fighting ceased, feelings of relief permeated the letters, diaries, and memoirs of those that saw, first hand, the destructive nature of WWI. In a letter home to his family, Elmo Culbert summed up his sentiment on not having to face the trenches in Europe by stating that "[there] was a time when I probably would have felt like that too, but in this work here I have had brought home to me in a forceful manner the brutal, unruthlessness of this great war game, so I can feel as I never have before for the boys 'Over There', and I can truthfully say that I'm very glad it is over. Although my heart was set on getting over myself, I won't be half as dissapointed [sic] as I might have been a month or two ago."[20] Although Culbert felt disappointment that he would not be able to experience the fighting in Europe first hand, he is nonetheless relieved. To him, the brutality of the war is something that he is glad to not have faced. And it is rather interesting that he refers to the war as "this great war game," lending insight into how those that fought might have felt like pawns being placed strategically by those in charge. This sentiment of war as a game is interesting because it can be interpreted as mistrust in those in charge by the soldiers tasked with doing the actual fighting. Nevertheless, feelings regarding the war in its aftermath were rather different for each individual.

Death elicited many conflicting emotions in those that witnessed it during the First World War. For men like Chaplains Montgomery and Duffy, death became a haunting reminder of all that war entailed. In researching the Second World War, Christina S. Jarvis posits that the hyper-masculinized images of war were, in fact, complicated by destruction and death.[21] In witnessing death on a mass scale, men often times expressed unusual sentiment about their comrades. As is the case of Lieutenant David Arthur, who, in a letter home to his father regarding the remains of his brother Joseph, states that "The poor kid prayed for peace and God gave it to him, Dad. How thankful I am that God gave it instantly. He was prepared to die, and did not suffer. I am happy over the thoughts of it, but God knows I miss him. I loved him so much."[22] Lieutenant Arthur is not only relieved that his brother died painlessly, but that he misses him dearly. In a rather unusual act of sentimental longing, Lieutenant Arthur states his love for his brother, letting his masculine guard down so to speak. And by reinterring his brother Lieutenant Arthur finally feels that he has accomplished what he set out to do; his mind is at rest. For men like Lieutenant Arthur emotional sentiment was elicited when it pertained to someone very close to them. Some men could cry or state love for another man upon their death because that dead or dying comrade was very dear to them.

As has been discussed, antiwar sentiment became a common occurrence amongst those that experienced the war first hand. Both Dalton Trumbo's novel *Johnny Got His Gun* and Ernest Hemingway's novel

A Farewell To Arms grapple with antiwar ideals and the weight that WWI placed both physically and psychologically on those that fought in and experienced it. Trumbo's character Joe Bonham asks the simple question "But what do the dead say?" as he posits the validity of "death before dishonor." For Joe Bonham, "If a man says death before dishonor he is either a fool or a liar because he doesn't know what death is."[23] Trumbo uses his main character to argue that there is no honor in death and that those who believe that war is an honorable venture are simply naive. Furthermore, Ernest Hemingway also tackles death and honor. Near the end of his novel, Hemingway's main character, Frederic Henry, states, "That was what you did. You died. You did not know what it was about. You never had time to learn. They threw you in and told you the rules and the first time they caught you off base they killed you…Stay around and they would kill you."[24] For Hemingway, death in war was commonplace, it was something that occurred if you stayed around long enough. Death was unavoidable for the characters in his story, just like it was for those that served. According to Hemingway, you either died yourself or lasted long enough so that death touched you in another way, by taking a close friend or loved one. Hemingway's novel ends with the death of both Frederic Henry's wife, Catherine, and their newborn son. In rather somber fashion, the character of Frederic could never outrun death, no matter how hard he tried. In his fruitless attempts to outrun the war, Frederic ended up alone and without those that he loved. To both Trumbo and Hemingway, there is no honor in war or in death. Both authors posit that death will eventually catch up with us all, but to believe that death in wartime is honorable is simply nonsense.

For a majority of those that fought in the First World War, the time spent in the trenches on the Western Front imparted nostalgia for a period of peace when war had not touched them. This nostalgia is alluded to in an entry in the diary of Sergeant G.F. Schreader of the US Army, in which he details the finding of a letter left in the pocket of dead German, "Letter from pocket of dead Fritz: Written by his wife. My dearest Fritz, etc. …Hoped the war would end so that he could come home and sleep with her in their little bed.'"[25] What Schreader found was a sentiment that many soldiers read in letters from home, that of their family and loved ones longing for their return. This little piece of information must have been important enough to Sergeant Schreader himself, for he put it in his journal. Sergeant Schreader must have felt similar to that of Wesley Diedrich and Chaplain Montgomery, in that war is hell, because he included the sentiments of a German wife missing her husband in his journal. Yet, this is the only instance in his journal in which he alludes to a longing for home. Nevertheless, many soldiers fighting in WWI longed for the day that they could leave behind all that they had seen and experienced during their time in Europe for the simplicities of home.

The death and destruction wrought by four long years of fighting in France left behind millions of dead and wounded soldiers, displaced civilians, destroyed and contaminated regions, and years of rebuilding. In the years that followed the governments that participated in WWI erected monuments and grave sights on the battlefields ravaged by the destructive capabilities of a more modern war. And in the one hundred years since the signing of the Armistice and cease fire that ended the First World War on November 11, 1918, the French countryside — the nature that inhabited the area — began to reclaim all that was destroyed by man.

"Glory of the dawn": Rebirth and WWI's Centenary

For the millions of soldiers and civilians that experienced the First World War armistice might have ended the fighting but it did not fix what was killed and destroyed in four longs years of war. The soldiers that saw fighting on the Western Front usually came back with physical or mental complications, and those that assisted these soldiers in their recovery experienced the war through the destroyed and mutilated bodies and minds of the soldiers that came back in pieces. Much like many of the individual stories we have explored in relation to the viewing of death and destruction wrought by WWI, it is also important to understand how those that returned from the French battlefields accepted the ruination of war. Furthermore, through the medium of photography it is also pertinent to facilitate a discussion of how nature has gone about reclaiming the French countryside in the one hundred years since the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918.

Soldiers returning from the Western Front were, at times, not entirely whole. In some instances soldiers came home deformed, mutilated, disfigured, and mentally impaired. For those soldiers that returned home with physical and mental complications, a process of understanding and rebirth would need to take place. A rebirth that signaled a lifelong undertaking centered on adapting to their war-torn bodies and minds. Upon reflecting on his physical mutilation and deformity, Joe Bonham posits, "All the parts that were gone from him were gone forever. That was the thing he must remember. That was the thing he must try to believe. When that sank in he could calm down and think."[26] Because the war had completely destroyed Joe Bonham's body, rendering him blind, deaf, and quadriplegic, he would need to reassess his state of existence and his ability to properly function in a society that rendered him "lost" — lost from the normalized ideal of a whole functioning adult male in society. No more could Joe Bonham walk, or talk, or hear, or dance, or hold those that he loved, he was trapped in his body forever, and how he came about understanding his position was what ultimately lead to his salvation. Many soldiers returning from WWI would find similar tasks to that of Joe Bonham ahead of them. Like Jen Roberts has argued, the effects of "battle fatigue" were far reaching for those that returned from WWI. Many doctors that treated soldiers returning from the front would often times explain soldiers' irritability and aggressive nature in terms of shot nerves, largely due to the "hell of fire" that many of these soldiers had experienced.[27] Those men that returned home with missing body parts or impaired minds would not only need to reclaim their agency, but also find ways in which they could reenter American society. And returning soldiers were not the only individuals that had to deal with loss, their families had to as well.

The families of those soldiers that never returned had to deal with the vacancy and heartfelt sorrow of losing a dear family member. Parents of those that fell in combat would, in some cases, exult the heroism of their deceased son. In a letter to a Mrs. H.L. Freeland, President Roosevelt writes of his son Quentin's sacrifice and praises his son's upbeat demeanor through all that he had seen in war. In his letter, President Roosevelt states, "…but Quentin's last letters, written during his three weeks at the front, when his squadron on an average a man was killed every day, are written with real joy in the 'great adventure'…He and his crowded hour, he at the crest of life, in the glory of the dawn…"[28] Although filled with heartache at the loss of his youngest son, President Roosevelt shows pride in his son's service to country. The war and Quentin's service, to President Roosevelt, is but an adventure fitting for a

young man in his prime. By remembering Quentin's heroism, President Roosevelt is also able to disassociate the horrific way in which his son was shot down in his plane, resulting in a most gruesome crash. The memory of Quentin is reborn in glory and adventure; Quentin's service is seen as a reward for a life well lived.

Rebirth took many different shapes in the aftermath of the First World War. As we have seen, it took the shape of acceptance of one's own physical and mental complications. By adapting to the destruction of one's own body and mind, according to Joe Bonham, one is far more capable of moving on from the horrors of war. Furthermore, remembrance is often a powerful tool for the families of those that had died. As is the case with President Roosevelt, who chose to remember his son as a hero, a brave soul off on a great adventure. Memory is a powerful tool utilized by those who lost so much. Either by forgetting or by remembering — though sometimes choicefully — the life and actions of those that have returned home from war are often haunted by what they have seen and done, yet it is fascinating to see the ways in which individuals recall the First World War.

The process of rebirth is not something that wholly pertained to humans either. In the one hundred years since the ending of the First World War, nature has done its own work of reclamation. During the four years of fighting, numerous towns ceased to exist from constant warfare and shelling. In areas surrounding Verdun, whole towns are only remembered by signposts. And in some areas, chemicals and unexploded ordinance prevent individuals from ever living there again. Through a lack of human interaction, the battlefields of France have become beautiful reminders of not only what occurred in the past but also nature's ability to reclaim the destroyed. Through this reclamation, nature has turned destruction into beauty. The photographs shed light on the process of reclamation and rebirth that nature has evidently taken part in in the one hundred years since the end of WWI.

The first image shows a beautiful field of poppies, the first flower to sprout on many of the battlefields of the First World War. As Alan Taylor states, "The red poppy was one of the first flowers to bloom in the churned up soils of World War I, and was soon widely accepted throughout the allied nations as the flower of remembrance to be worn on Armistice Day."[29] The poppy with its red flower petals resembles that of the blood spilt on the battlefields of WWI. The blood red nature of the poppy flower seems to grow from the dead and decaying bodies that lie under the soil. In their beauty, the poppy comes to signify not only peace, but also death. The poppy acts as a resonant metaphor for those millions of men, women, and children that perished in the four long years of fighting during WWI. Through the birth of the poppy flower on the battlefields of Europe comes a constant reminder of all that was sacrificed between 1914 and 1918.

The second image furthers the idea that nature is in a process of reclamation. This image shows one of several fields at which the battle of Verdun took place. This photo was taken in the early 2010s and shows the process of reclamation by nature that I have discussed previously. What is rather striking about this scene is the combination of natural overgrowth and the remaining identifiers of where shells exploded. Right away the eye is drawn to the small ponds that have nested in the remaining shell craters all throughout the image. In these shell holes life has been renewed through the collection of water, the growth of reeds, and the gathering of microbes. From death came life in each one of these deep craters. Furthermore, what used to be a barren and

muddy wasteland has been taken over by trees and grass. From the proverbial shit of the battlefield has sprouted the green, rejuvenating grass of rebirth. The battlefields of Verdun have been reclaimed by nature and now resemble a serene, calming field rather than the killing fields of old. What was once the gravesite of millions of men is now the birthplace of life. Verdun has encapsulated the circle of life wherein death begets life.

The third image, which also captures a battlefield outside Verdun, shows the forest that now stands on the hollowed ground of the village of Fleury. This image furthers the process of reclamation that has occurred in and around Verdun over the past century. In his photographic journal Alan Taylor sublimely captures the essence of this photograph by stating, "A hundred years after the guns fell silent in World War One, nine villages wiped out by fighting on France's bloodiest battleground continue to lead a ghostly existence. Their names still appear on maps and in government records. Mayors representing them are designated by local authorities. But most of the streets, shops, houses and people who once lived around the French army stronghold of Verdun are gone."[30] Those towns that once existed around Verdun leave their trace in memory, be it physical or metaphorical. France remembers that which was destroyed by the war through trace evidence on maps and in those government records pertaining to the history of these nine towns. But what is most interesting about this photograph is not the history that accompanies it, but rather the composition of the photograph itself. Nestled amongst the green rolling slopes and the trees are the phantasmal rays of sunlight that seep through the canopy. These rays seem to be representative of rejuvenation and the holiness of this hallowed ground. Through means of religious metaphor, the rays that puncture the canopy almost seem to be the hands of God paying reverence to those that fell at this exact spot. Though decimated by war, the town that once existed on this very spot has now been reclaimed by nature, its memory forever associated with the beauty of the surrounding forest. The forest now lays dormant and protective of those memories rested at this very spot. And those that died here now exist in the "glory of the dawn."

What was decimated by the destructive nature of the First World War has since been reclaimed. In its habit of ruination, WWI did allow for life to spring from death. War acted as the progenitor of nature on the many gravesites of battle from the First World War. Through the circle of life, grass, trees, plants, microbes, and animals again declare what was once theirs. The forests and rolling fields of poppies that now lay claim to these sites facilitate a memory of the First World War far different than what it was one hundred years ago. Through the beauty and rejuvenating essence of nature, WWI's destruction can now symbolize rebirth.

"The War to End All Wars": Concluding Thoughts

This paper has posited that death and destruction was a harrowing experience for all involved in the First World War and that, ultimately, nature reclaimed the destroyed landscape of the Western Front in the one hundred years since Armistice. What can be taken from this exploration of the effects of WWI is antithetical to the previously mythical proportions of the war. As Paul Fussell argued in the early 1970s, "Indeed, a striking phenomenon of the last twenty-five years is this obsession with the images and myths of the Great War among novelists and poets too young to have experienced it directly. They have worked it up by purely literary means, means which neces-

sarily transform the war into a 'subject' and simplify its motifs into myths and figures expressive of the modern existential predicament."[31] Through public memory, the First World War has come to symbolize a great crusade, a triumph of democracy. But what did the First World War really bring other than death and destruction for all who experienced it? In supplying the world with his nineteen points to facilitate democracy, President Woodrow Wilson and the US Congress ultimately rejected the League of Nations, with a majority of the nation vowing "never again" and preferring isolation over that of possible globalization. In their rejection of the League of Nations, the US became complicit in the rise of Adolf Hitler and the factors that caused the Second World War.[32] And although General John Pershing encouraged his soldiers in a bulletin dispatched on November 12, 1918, to "carry home your high ideals and continue to live as you have served — an honor to the principles for which you have fought and to the fallen comrades you leave behind[,]" many came home from the war disillusioned by what they saw and experienced.[33] For some, the war, with all its death and destruction, became a negative experience, something that they regretted ever taking a part in.

"For some soldiers, return prompted a restless discontent, an escalation of emotional and behavioural problems and an estrangement from family and community life."[34] The war haunted those that served. In their personal memory, the war was not a great heroic adventure, as President Roosevelt proclaimed it was for his son. The war symbolized death, destruction, and fear for many of those that served. In *A Farewell To Arms* a discussion about the war between Frederic Henry and one of Frederic's ambulance drivers Passini occurs early on in the novel. Passini succinctly sums up the feelings of disillusionment that many American soldiers felt after their time in Europe, "'There is nothing as bad as war. We in the auto-ambulance cannot even realize at all how bad it is. When people realize how bad it is they cannot do anything to stop it because they go crazy. There are some people who never realize…There is no finish to war.'"[35] For Passini, just like for many who served in Europe, fighting did not cease after the war ended, the war haunted their minds or left markers on their bodies. The war never ended, it simply just carried on in secret, suppressed by those that vowed "never again."

Those that wrote about their experiences in the First World War lend insight into just why WWI was so destructive both physically and mentally. In a passage in his personal memoirs, US Army Sergeant James Nelson Platt writes,

> I cannot say enough about these miles of rough roads over French countryside to make anyone reading this description realize what it was like. I hope I never have to see its like again. When the term 'destruction of war' is used, this strip of country is a good example. I saw it not only with others, but also when alone when I was not sure that I would ever find my company before nightfall would end, further walking about, I even sat down on steps that formerly led into a hole resting a few minutes looking about at the desolation. Then I would try to imagine what the countryside might have looked like in peacetime.[36]

Sergeant Platt attempts to examine the differences of the French countryside before and after the fighting. As he sits on the edge of a shell hole, where a

town might have once stood, Platt questions the need for fighting. He tries to comprehend how it all might have been if the fruitless ventures of war had never touched the spot in which he sits. In his contemplation, Platt hopes that he never has to witness again what he saw in war, capping off a thorough explanation of the destructive habits of man.

The wounds of war came in many forms, shapes and sizes. For some, the wounds exhibited themselves as physical maladies or mutilations as was the case for the fictional character Joe Bonham in *Johnny Got His Gun*. For others, the mental anguish of all that they had seen haunted them for the rest of their lives, as could have been the case for the numerous soldiers examined in this paper. In all, the memories left by those that served, be them letters, memoirs, diaries, recordings, photographs, gravesites, or monuments, allow society to never forget the death and destruction that came out of the First World War, and these memories demarcate the hallowed grounds of those that served, fought, and died in the line of duty.

References

[1] Joyce Kilmer, "Rouge Bouquet," poets.org, accessed November 19, 2018, https://www.poets.org/poetsorg/poem/rouge-bouquet.
[2] Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 320.
[3] Andrew Carroll, *My Fellow Soldiers: General John Pershing and the Americans Who Helped Win the Great War* (New York: Penguin Books, 2018), 304.
[4] Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 25.
[5] Ibid., 175.
[6] Carroll, *My Fellow Soldiers*, 253.
[7] "Posters of WWI," *Library of Congress*, accessed November 28, 2018, http://www.loc.gov/pictures/collection/wwipos/related/.
[8] Glen Jeansonne and David Luhrssen, "World War I (1914–1918)," *War on the Silver Screen: Shaping America's Perception of History,* (University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 6, http://www.jstor.org.lib-proxy.fullerton.edu/stable/j.ctt1d9nn1r.5.
[9] Dalton Trumbo, *Johnny Got His Gun* (New York: Bantam, 1984), 10-11.
[10] Arthur Guy Empey, *Over the Top: An American Soldier Who Went* (Scott's Valley, CA: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2016), 183.
[11] Jen Roberts, "The Front Comes Home: Returned Soldiers and Psychological Trauma in Australia during and after the First World War," *Health and History* 17, no. 2 (2015): 17-36, doi:10.5401/healthhist.17.2.0017.
[12] Quiren M. Groessl, "Big Boy: A Diary of World War I," found at "Experiencing War: World War I, The Great War," *The Library of Congress*, accessed November 28, 2018, https://www.loc.gov/vets/stories/wwi-trenches.html, 26.
[13] Thomas Pynchon, *Gravity's Rainbow* (New York: Penguin, 1973), 81.
[14] Wesley F. Diedrich, "Letter 44," "CAWL Archives: First World War," *Chapman University Digital Commons*, accessed September 24, 2018, https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/wla-ww1/.
[15] Diedrich, "Letter 37," https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/wla-ww1/.
[16] Arnold Stephen Hoke, *Personal Experiences in WWI*, performed by Arnold Stephen Hoke, audio recording, "Experiencing War: World War I, The Great War," *The Library of Congress*, accessed November 28, 2018, https://www.loc.gov/vets/stories/

wwi-trenches.html.
[17] Carroll, *My Fellow Soldiers*, 296.
[18] Ibid., 317.
[19] Ibid., 318.
[20] Elmo Culbert, "Letter 9," "CAWL Archives: First World War," *Chapman University Digital Commons*, accessed September 24, 2018, https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/wla-ww1/.
[21] Christina S Jarvis, *The Male Body at War: American Masculinity During World War II* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004), 4.
[22] Carroll, *My Fellow Soldiers*, 324-5.
[23] Trumbo, *Johnny Got His Gun*, 85.
[24] Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms* (New York: Scribner, 2014), 279-80.
[25] G.F. Schreader, *Sergeant Doughboy: Journal of a WWI American Soldier* (Denver: Outskirts Press, 2015), 661.
[26] Trumbo, *Johnny Got His Gun*, 86.
[27] Roberts, "The Front Comes Home," 27.
[28] Carroll, *My Fellow Soldiers*, 255.
[29] Alan Taylor, "World War I in Photos," *The Atlantic*, published April 27, 2014, https://www.theatlantic.com/projects/world-war-i-in-photos/.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, 321.
[32] Jeansonne and Luhrssen, "World War I (1914-1918)," 7.
[33] Carroll, *My Fellow Soldiers*, 327.
[34] Roberts, "The Front Comes Home," 21.
[35] Hemingway, A Farewell to Arms, 43-4.
[36] James Nelson Platt, "World War I Memoirs of James Nelson Platt: An Autobiography," 213, found at "Experiencing War: World War I, The Great War," *The Library of Congress,* accessed November 28, 2018, https://www.loc.gov/vets/stories/wwi-trenches.html.

Meet the Authors

Shreshta Aiyar is a senior pursuing a BA in History and American Studies. She currently works at CSUF's WoMen's and Adult Reentry Center and Asian Pacific American Resource Center, and she has previously worked with Housing and Residential Engagement. When she's not writing or working, she enjoys window shopping, reading, and re-watching sitcoms.

Christina Brown is a second-year graduate student in the American Studies department at California State University, Fullerton. She obtained her B.A. in English with an emphasis in creative writing and a minor in performing arts from California State University, Channel Islands. She plans to use her M.A. to pursue a career in teaching.

Danielle Bruncati graduated Magna Cum Laude with a bachelor's degree in Cinema and Television Arts and American Studies in May 2018. During her junior and senior year she took a special interest in American Studies because to allowed her to understand how popular media impacts American culture and society. Danielle would like to thank her family and professors for their support during her undergraduate career. She would also like to thank Gloria Grace Kellet and Mike Royce for creating *One Day at a Time* which became the backbone for this research paper.

Priscilla Carcido graduated with honors from Cal State Fullerton in 2018. Being a double major in American Studies and journalism allowed her to explore her love for words and people. As a first-generation college student, Priscilla knows the importance of sharing your perspective and being heard. Wherever the future takes her, she hopes there will be wonderful people to meet and astounding stories to be told.

Nicole Corliss completed her undergraduate work at CSUF in 2018, where she received BA degrees as a double major in American Studies and Communication with an emphasis in Advertising. Her primary research interests include California culture (counterculture, pop culture, entertainment/tourism), American memory, monster/horror theory and culture, & social media.

Evelin Franco is a first-generation, second year graduate student at CSUF in the American Studies Master's program. She received her Bachelor's from Cal Poly Pomona in Gender, Ethnicity and Multicultural Studies with an emphasis in Women's Studies. She is on an academic journey to one day become a gender and ethnic studies professor at a community college. Her academic and professional goals are fueled by her passion for feminism and social justice. Throughout her educational career, she has done and presented research on Body Image in Latinas between the ages of 30 to 60 and had the opportunity to present her research at the 2017 NACCS conference. Outside of being a student, Evelin enjoys, shopping, watching wrestling and spending time with her puppies. She has a tremendous love for dogs, so much so, that her day is instantly made better if she is able to take her dogs for a run.

Michael Gandara is a third-year transfer student majoring in American Studies and Asian American Studies finishing up his last year as an undergraduate student. He is highly involved on campus: as President of the American Studies Student Association, as Chair for the Humanities and Social Sciences' Inter-Club Council and as a Titan Ambassador/Tour Guide for the office of Outreach, Recruitment and Orientation. He has also served as editor for the 2017-2018 edition of *The American Papers* and participated in a roundtable discussion on college activism as it relates to Asian American Studies at the 2018 Association for Asian American Studies Conference.

Because of his experiences as a student leader on campus, Michael is committed to pursuing a career in student affairs and will continue his education in a graduate program focusing on student affairs/higher education. When he isn't on campus, Michael enjoys spending time with his family and relaxing at home enjoying memes, YouTube and video games.

Emily Ledezma is a young woman who aspires to help her family, community and others. Miss Ledezma was born and raised in Santa Ana, California. Miss Ledezma graduated May of 2018 from California State University, Fullerton, having completed her Bachelor of Arts in American Studies and Bachelor of Arts in Communication with an emphasis in Public Relations.

Kai Lisoskie received his Bachelor's in History and American Studies (2016) and his Master's in American Studies (2018) at California State University, Fullerton. He plans to pursue his Ph.D. in the Fall of 2020. His research interests focus on cultural representations of masculinity and the male body, specifically how masculinity shapes and is shaped by the urban environment, as well as the culturally shifting views of death in America during wartime.

Kaycee Moser was a student at Cal State Fullerton between 2015 and 2018. In the spring of 2018, she graduated magna cum laude with a double major in American Studies and Human Communication Studies. In her time in college, she was inspired by many of her professors to become the change she wished to see in the world. She plans to continue writing and someday go to graduate school. She is grateful to the American Studies department for providing her with her first publication!

Stephanie Ramirez is a CSUF senior, studying Cinema & Television Arts and American Studies. She enjoys films, tv shows, and pop culture.

Henrik Schneider received his B.A. in American Studies with a minor in Communications from Johannes Gutenberg-University, Mainz, Germany, in July 2016. During the 2017-18 academic year he studied at California State University, Fullerton, in the American Studies Graduate Program on a Fulbright grant, and is currently writing his masters thesis at his home institution in Germany. His research focuses on a queer approach to the representation of American myths in popular culture. In the future, Henrik hopes to come back from Europe and attend a doctoral program in the United States in order to further pursue his academic career.

Bahar Tahamtani received her Bachelor's in Psychology (2015) and her Master's in American Studies (2018) at California State University, Fullerton. She is currently working on her doctorate degree in American Studies at University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests focus on cultural representations of violence, specifically how violence is imagined and reimagined in American culture.

Destenee Thomas was raised in Georgia and moved to California in 2010. She is a senior double majoring in American Studies and Cinema, Television, & Art. While attending Cal State Fullerton full-time she has been working on campus as a receptionist in the Department of Politics, Administration, and Justice for three years. In her free time she enjoys spending time with friends and family, going to the beach, and baking.