

POPULAR CULTURE REVIEW

volume 23 number 1 winter 2012



From the Editor

Editing *Popular Culture Review* for the last 27 years has been a labor of love. I would like to acknowledge the support of UNLV's College of Liberal Arts and Department of English as well as PCA/ACA and, most recently Policy Studies Organization.

Thank you all,
Felicia F. Campbell
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Editor

Felicia F. Campbell • *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*
felicia.campbell@unlv.edu

The Editorial Board

Juli Barry • *Independent Scholar*
Lynn Bartholome • *Monroe Community College, Rochester NY*
Adam Henry Carriere • *Independent Scholar*
Simone Dennis • *Adelaide University*
Michael Green • *College of Southern Nevada*
Gary Hoppenstand • *Michigan State University*
Mindy Hutchings • *Independent Scholar*
Jarret Keene • *Independent Scholar*
Geta LeSeur • *University of Arizona*
Heather Lusty • *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*
Scott Melton • *Saint Andrew's School*
David Metzger • *Old Dominion University*
Kenneth Payne • *Kuwait University*
Daniel Ferreras Savoye • *West Virginia University*
H. Peter Steeves • *DePaul University*
Gina M. Sully • *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Associate Editor

Carol Turner • pcr.caturner@gmail.com

Technical and Copy Editor

Claire L. Hand • handc@unlv.nevada.edu

Circulation

felicia.campbell@unlv.edu

Cover Art

Laurens Tan • laurens8tan@gmail.com

*Please visit our blog at
www.farwestpca.blogspot.com*

Popular Culture Review
Volume 23, no. 1
Winter 2012

From the Editor's Desk.....	3
Arrr!!!Performing Piracy and the Origin of International Talk Like a Pirate Day	5
<i>Matthew R. Turner</i>	
Childhood Rejects: One-Eyed Willie, Pint-Sized Pirates, and the Generational Appeal of <i>The Goonies</i>	17
<i>Kathy Merlock Jackson</i>	
The Many Faces of Moriarty: A Critical Examination of the Arch- Criminal's Evolution Across the Landscape of the Popular Imagination.....	29
<i>Sarah Pawlak</i>	
Mirror, Mirror: Gender and Beauty in the <i>Twilight Series</i>	39
<i>Lauren Rocha</i>	
To My Sons: On Being a Writer in the Twenty-First Century: <i>The Crosscut Literary Award, 1968</i>	49
<i>Ross Talarico</i>	
Race, Gender, and Genre: The <i>Baroness Series</i> as Social and Literary Progression	55
<i>Jennifer Woolson</i>	
Popular Dance Music in Tennessee Williams's <i>The Glass Menagerie</i> ...	67
<i>Philip C. Kolin</i>	
Leisure Studies, the Happiness Movement, and Japanese Zen.....	75
<i>Jon Griffin Donlon</i>	
Professor Dress: Consequences of Cultural Distance in the Classroom... <i>Ellis Godard</i>	83
Driven by the Spirit: The Alcoholism of Man in <i>Boardwalk Empire</i>	93
<i>Lindsey Barlow</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	103
<i>The Films of James Cameron: Critical Essays</i> edited by Mathew Wilhelm Kapell & Stephen McVeigh, McFarland, 2011	
Reviewed by Sarah Pawlak	105
ERRATA:	
ERRATA, <i>Popular Culture Review</i> Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 2011....	109
CONTRIBUTORS.....	111

From the Editor's Desk

Welcome to Volume 23, #1 of *PCR*.

We kick off with Matthew Turner's "Performing Piracy and the Origin of National Talk Like a Pirate Day" which day is celebrated on September 19th. He builds his paper around what he calls The Ten Ps: popularity, provenance, promulgation, performance, pretending, play, paradox, plunder and pillage, and phonetics. It is a lively look at our continuing fascination with pirates of old, one that doesn't seem to carry over to romanticizing today's Somali's. This is complemented by Kathy Merlock Jackson's "Childhood Rejects: One-Eye Willie, Pint-sized Pirates, and the Generational Appeal of *The Goonies*.

Our fascination with bad guys certainly doesn't stop with pirates and Sarah Pawlak explores "The Many Faces of Moriarty" who, like Holmes, seems to have survived plummeting down the Falls to populate film and fiction, often without Holmes, his character transcending his origins. While male vampires seem to be transmuting into glamorous even heroic characters, Lauren Rocha in "Mirror, Mirror: Gender and Beauty in the *Twilight* series" shows how the series creates a backlash against feminism, the female resembling the Victorian ideal, regressive and without agency. Pulp fiction, however, provides us with plenty of people who do have agency and in "Race, Gender, and Genre: *The Baroness Series* as Social and Literary Progression," Jennifer Woolson writes of how that 1970 series reflects the social and literary progression of 1974 and 1975.

Moving away from pulp, Philip Kolin addresses "Popular Dance Music in Tennessee William's *The Glass Menagerie*" explaining how crucial William's use of dance music is to the structure of the play. Further, we see that alcoholism is crucial to *Boardwalk Empire*'s structure in Lindsey Barlow's "Driven by the Spirit."

Material culture rears its head, in Ellis Godard's " Professor Dress: The Consequences of Cultural Distance in the Classroom" which looks at its effects, both good and ill.

Finally in "To My Sons" award winning author Ross Talarico discusses what it is like to be an author in the 21st century, while Jon Griffin Donlon examines leisure studies both East and West, in "The Happiness Movement, and Japanese Zen".

Good reading!

Felicia

P.S. In our last issue, three paragraphs of Christine Photinos' article on Leigh Brackett disappeared, we know not where. They are reprinted with our apologies in the errata section of this issue.

F.

Felicia F. Campbell
Professor of English
Editor, *Popular Culture Review*
felicia.campbell@unlv.edu
<http://www.farwestpca.blogspot.com>

Arrr!!!

Performing Piracy and the Origin of International Talk Like a Pirate Day

September 19th is a special holiday set aside every year where people young and old, regardless of race, political orientation, sex, or religious persuasion forget all their differences and come together . . . to talk like pirates. International Talk Like a Pirate Day was created in 1995 by Mark Summers and John Baur, now known as The Pirate Guys, or Cap'n Slappy and Ol' Chumbucket respectively. To get a feel for Talk Like a Pirate Day, it is useful to examine one of their self-produced videos available on YouTube called "Talk Like a Pirate Day: The Five A's." This video ostensibly instructs those new to the pirate lexicon how to talk like a pirate. They introduce five pirate words that begin with the letter "A" and explain what they mean in regular English. The five words selected were glibly chosen for both their pirate sound and their humorous potential. They are: "Ahoy," "Avast," "Aye," "Aye, Aye," and "Arrr!" While "Ahoy," "Avast," and "Aye" are explained in a relatively straightforward, if comic, manner, The Pirate Guys begin to move more toward absurdity with the last two. "Aye, Aye" is a comic doubling of "Aye" that really does not feel any more emphatic than their definition of the regular "Aye," as one might expect. Essentially, they added it to fill up space and for the comically unnecessary repetition. The last word, "Arrr!" is more difficult to define. Ol' Chumbucket describes it as "a flexible word. It can mean anything you wants it to mean" (Baur and Summers). They go on to describe how it can mean, "'My team is winning.' It can mean, 'My team is losing.' It can mean that 'I'm enjoying this beverage'" (Baur and Summers). Cap'n Slappy chimes in at this point with a completely absurd definition. "I would like a muffin" (Baur and Summers). Ol' Chumbucket ends with, "It can even mean, 'I'm here and alive'" (Baur and Summers). This video sets the humorous tone and the fun to be had in playing with words that Talk Like a Pirate Day is all about.

In the spirit of the video, I have structured my paper around the ten "P's" of Talk Like a Pirate Day. Being an academic, I was unable to limit my discussion to just five. They are: popularity, provenance, promulgation, performance, pretending, play, paradox, plunder and pillage, and phonetics.

1. Popularity

First let us talk about the image of the pirate in popular culture. There has long been a fascination with pirates in literature and the arts. As early as 1724 in England there was a book *called A General History of the Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pyrates* which did much to popularize the idea of pirates (West vii-xiii). Pirates have, of course, shown up in later literary works such as Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and Barrie's *Peter Pan*. There are

numerous pirate-themed sports franchises, pirate re-enactors, pirate museums, and pirate history tours. While these and many other explorations of pirates are serious in nature, often the pirate or the pirate story is situated within what Northrop Frye would call the comic mode (43-52). Several other art works, particularly in plays and film, fall into this group including: Gilbert and Sullivan's play *The Pirates of Penzance*, and films such as *Blackbeard's Ghost* (1968), *The Pirate Movie* (1982), *Yellowbeard* (1983), *The Goonies* (1985), *Pirates* (1986), *The Princess Bride* (1987), and *Muppet Treasure Island* (1996). Others, such as the recent *Pirates of the Caribbean* (2003-2011) series, seem to straddle the world of action and comedy. Pirates also appear online in various formats including homemade and professional videos, music, and pictures. You can even change your Google or Facebook language to "Pirate." Since no one actually speaks "Pirate" and thus this "language" has no practical value, it is also clearly situated in the comic mode.

2. Provenance

Where did Talk Like a Pirate Day come from? I spoke with Mark Summers (Cap'n Slappy) and Jon Baur (Ol' Chumbucket) and asked them. Cap'n Slappy said:

It's the only holiday we know that started as a sporting injury . . . My friend John Baur, Ol' Chumbucket, and I were playing racquetball one day and one of us, (we don't remember which one of us) but one of us let out an "Arrr!" in pain and from that point on it just kind of triggered other kinds of pirate talk during the racquetball game. A hard shot we'd say, 'Aye that was a fine cannonade. You slapped that one off the mizenmast matey.' (Summers)

Ol' Chumbucket went on to say, "by the time the game was over, we realized we had much more fun talking like pirates than we ever did playing racquetball and we decided the world needed a holiday for every man, woman, and child on the planet who was not just allowed, but encouraged to talk like pirates" (Baur, Interview). The story of how they came up with the date for Talk Like a Pirate Day is also worthy of note, largely because it is just quirky enough that it helps lend to the fascination with the whole event. The date of the racquetball game was June 6. According to Ol' Chumbucket, they decided that since June 6 was D-day it was "sort of a sacred day so you don't want to mar it with something as meaningless as Talk Like a Pirate Day" (Baur, Interview). According to Cap'n Slappy, "we settled on September 19th because I was recently divorced and it was my ex-wife's birthday and the date was stuck in my head and I wasn't doing anything with it anymore" (Summers). They chose it as a date they thought they could remember and thus began Talk Like a Pirate Day. The holiday was low key initially with very few practitioners. Cap'n Slappy describes it as, "The first five or six years of this Talk Like a Pirate Day was Jon

and me and two other friends calling each other on the phone at work and yelling ‘Arrr!’ and hanging up. That was Talk Like a Pirate Day” (Summers).

3. Promulgation

One of the interesting questions in dealing with a phenomenon that can only be described as viral is how did this “holiday” go from an event celebrated by three or four people to a worldwide phenomenon. While many in the world have no doubt never heard of it, it has been, by all accounts, incredibly successful. International Talk Like a Pirate Day has been celebrated in at least forty-nine of the fifty states and in the White House. It has been celebrated on every continent, including Antarctica, and on the space station (Summers). Every year it seems to grow bigger. So what is responsible for the success? Like many things it is quite complicated, with many contributing factors, but it does have a clear starting point. Ol’ Chumbucket recalled, “During that racquetball game when we came up with the decision to have a holiday, we said you know who would be a great spokesman for the day? Dave Barry” (Baur, Interview). Getting noticed by Dave Barry, one of the best-known humor columnists in America, would be the inciting event critical for the success of Talk Like a Pirate Day. In 2002, Ol’ Chumbucket came across Dave Barry’s e-mail address and sent him an e-mail detailing the purpose and origin of Talk Like a Pirate Day. Dave Barry was interested enough in the idea to write one of his syndicated columns on the subject. It appeared September 8, 2002 and caught the world’s attention. Of the experience Ol’ Chumbucket stated:

There’s our fifteen minutes of fame. It will probably be over by about two-thirty in the afternoon. But it just got legs, took up, and started running. Within two weeks of this column appearing we’d been on the radio in Ireland and Australia and several cities around the US. We’ve been on NPR and it just kept going. And every year we think, ‘Well okay this is it. This is as big as it gets. This is as good as it gets.’ And then the next year something happens that’s even bigger” (Baur, Interview).

While Dave Barry is no doubt largely responsible for the initial success of Talk Like a Pirate Day, there are several other things that The Pirate Guys did to help make the day a success. One of the things they did (after a friend recommended it) was to get a web page, reserving the name www.talklikeapirate.com. While they have placed some significant content on the website explaining the origin of the holiday and some practical advice for talking like pirates, one of the things the site has evolved into is a clearinghouse of links to other pirate themed pages or materials. Ol’ Chumbucket stated, “It turns out one of the fun things we’ve discovered is there have been serious pirate fans and pirate re-enactors all over the place. And groups. But they were all over the place and not connected. What we did was give them a center of focus and suddenly they’re everywhere” (Baur, Interview).

Beyond giving pirate aficionados a center of focus on the web site, they have also produced several videos (like the one described earlier) on how to talk like a pirate, behave like one, misbehave like one, and the like. They have done numerous television and radio interviews, typically dozens each year around the day, written articles for pirate magazines, written some books, and even made personal appearances (*Original*). They have also moved into social medial online beyond just their website. They have a Facebook Page, a Flickr page, and a twitter account for Pirate-themed Haikus (or “Pi-Kus” as they are called) (*Original*). Cap’n Slappy said of Twitter, “I know that on Twitter, for the last two years since I’ve been on Twitter, I think this year it was 5 of the top 10 categories in different ways on Talk Like a Pirate Day. It trends pretty heavily” (Summers). It has come to a point, however, where it is self-perpetuating. Ol’ Chumbucket told me, “the whole thing has taken on a life of its own and if we just walked away from the website tomorrow, there would still be a Talk Like a Pirate Day this September and there would still be a Talk Like a Pirate Day next September. The fact that it no longer needs us is, I think, the biggest sign of its success” (Baur, Interview).

For pirates, both of the men are quite humble about the immense success of the holiday. Cap’n Slappy said, “I was in awe and still am a little bit. I had no idea where all of this would go and how big it would become” (Summers). Ol’ Chumbucket stated, “No we’re not celebrities. We’re like curiosities. . . . We were completely taken by surprise. We had no idea. ‘Shock’ I think is an excellent word for how we felt,” (Baur, Interview). Cap’n Slappy said, “This is one of those things you can’t really prepare for. It’s one of those serendipitous events that kind of comes out of left field and either you’re ready for the wave or you’re not” (Summers). Part of riding the wave is how well you do it, which brings us to our next “P.”

4. Performance

J. L. Austin, in his *Philosophical Papers*, talks about performative utterances. These are utterances, different from statements that perform something in the saying of it. He gives examples such as saying “I do” to get married (Austin 222). While Talk Like a Pirate Day does not directly fall into the category of performative utterances, it does share some of the same characteristics and overturns some of the concepts of performative utterances in interesting ways. Austin talks about the act of betting as an example. If I offer to bet money on something and no one takes me up on the offer then it really is not a bet (Austin 224). I would submit that for our purpose a performance requires the agreement of other parties or their involvement. They need to accept that we are talking like pirates and performing in a certain way.

Another important element of his discussion of performatives is convention. Austin states, “The first rule is, then that the convention invoked must exist and be accepted. And the second rule, also a very obvious one, is that the circumstances in which we purport to invoke this procedure must be appropriate for its invocation” (Austin 224). In the case of Talk Like a Pirate Day we are

overturning or subverting the appropriateness of the situation. Ol' Chumbucket addressed the issue of appropriateness directly by saying:

It's just in almost any situation you can name, talking like a pirate is inappropriate. Unless you are actually on the quarterdeck of a Seventeenth century sailing ship, then I suppose it's appropriate. You know, at the doctor's office, at work, at church, at school, on a date, when you're out at the bowling league, it's inappropriate. And inappropriate is funny I think. (Baur, Interview)

5. Pretending

Related to performance is pretending. Austin states of pretending, “*Pretendere* in Latin never strays far from the literal meaning of holding or stretching one thing in front of another in order to protect or conceal or disguise it” (Austin 208). On Talk Like a Pirate Day that is what we are doing. We are hiding the real thing behind the façade, talking like a pirate when we really are not pirates. “There is necessarily involved in pretence, or shamming, the notion of a limit which must not be overstepped: pretence is always insulated, as it were from reality. Admittedly this limit may be vague, but it must exist” (Austin 201). We of course can talk like pirates, we can swagger and curse like pirates, but we cannot act like real pirates. For instance, the limit is obviously on the near side of capturing shipping vessels on the high seas. Northrop Frye stated, “But the element of *play* is the barrier that separates art from savagery” (46). Cap'n Slappy said, “I continue to play with the metaphor, but don't play with the behavior of it. Every year somebody writes us and tells us ‘Don't you know pirates are bad people?’ It's like, well, of course, of course we know that. We just don't care because we're not trying to encourage piracy” (Summers). Clearly there is a distinction between talking like a pirate and behaving like a real pirate. In fact, when we talk like a pirate we are really imitating an image of a pirate in popular culture, not a real pirate. Ol' Chumbucket said, “If I say the word pirate, you automatically see Long John Silver, or Blackbeard that iconic image of a . . . mid-seventeenth century Buccaneer” (Baur, Interview). This icon is what we are really pretending to be or trying to perform as. It is not a real entity, but one created in popular culture through repetition primarily in literature, film, and television.

The holiday is called Talk Like a Pirate Day, but as the Pirate Guys discovered, we often require more of our performance than just sounding like something. For a performance to be really successful, we must also look the part. Ol' Chumbucket ran into this problem when they started gathering attention after the Dave Barry article appeared. They would go to events and be asked:

“Why aren't you dressed like a pirate?” “How do you dress on Talk Like a Pirate Day?” Well, you'll notice it's called *talk* like a pirate day . . . not dress like a pirate day. There's

already a dress like a pirate day. It's called Halloween. There became this expectation that we were the pirate guys and we'd "Arrr!" and all that stuff so we had to [dress like pirates].
(Baur, Interview)

He did note that, one of the benefits of having to dress like pirates was that his costume is all tax deductible.

The edge of pretending can be reached in ways other than stealing someone's boat, or legitimately threatening someone with a cutlass. It can also be taken to an extreme when the pretend becomes real. Cap'n Slappy describes one such surreal experience where the pretend has real world implications. He said that he once got a phone call to do an interview with the Wall Street Journal about piracy. He said, "It's insane and they were talking about the real pirates in Somalia and asking me for my take on this. And I was like, 'Why?' 'Who reads this?' You're the Wall Street Journal" (Summers). While the article in question did not mistakenly take him for an expert on the situation of piracy in Somalia, it is interesting that what started out as a joke and a performance, has now turned into a form of real world respectability.

6. Play

As has been mentioned earlier, Pirates are very big in popular culture. There are various reasons for this of course, but one of the most obvious is that the character of a pirate is larger than life and has a freedom that ordinary people do not have. Ol' Chumbucket suggests:

So they are that iconic image and they are blustering, swaggering. They live life by their own rules and in our society today, there's not a lot of room for that. We are constantly told by every media message we get about how we should look and how we should act and what you have to do to be cool. And pirates didn't give a damn what anyone else thought of their behavior. (Baur, Interview)

There is a freedom in the spirit of the carnivalesque where we can escape from and overturn the rules of society for a time. In laying out his theory of the carnivalesque, Bakhtin states, "As opposed to the official feast, one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions" (10). Part of the pleasure and enjoyment of comedy is found precisely in this subversion or flaunting of the rules. Umberto Eco states of the carnivalesque and comedy, "One must know to what degree certain behaviors are forbidden, and must feel the majesty of the forbidding norm, to appreciate their transgression" (6). Pirates can get away with all sorts of inappropriate behavior. Only on Talk Like a Pirate Day can I call my wife a "wench" or "me proud beauty" without having to walk the plank myself.

It is a chance to be someone else and to do something different. Ol' Chumbucket stated, "We get as much out of it as anyone else who walks into a party with a cutlass strapped to their side and a scarf tied around their forehead and saying 'Arrr! It's fun to do.' (Baur, Interview). The novelty creates its own social and psychological rewards as we behave in ways that challenge the constricted social scripting to which everyday life subjects us.

Another reason pirates are a subject of comic play and playfulness is just because of the serious role they have taken in history. Pirates were dangerous, powerful, and frightening. People were fascinated, as well as afraid, of what piracy represented. Cap'n Slappy expanded on this idea stating:

I think pirates as scary as they are as an archetype, they . . . become an object of foolery and . . . maybe whimsy is a better word. I don't think there's any boy especially who's grown up in this country who didn't at some point wish he could be a pirate. Adventure plays a part in it. Scaring plays a part in it. It's bravery. It's the act of laughing at the scary. (Summers)

Laughing at the object of our terror steals its power and puts us in a position where we are in control. That, I would submit, is one of the central reasons that pirates so often are treated in popular culture in the comic mode. We overturn the forces that exist; we remove our objects of fear and break all the rules. Ol' Chumbucket perhaps best summarized the carnivalesque spirit of Talk Like a Pirate Day when he said, "But one day a year you can swagger and pretend you don't care what the world thinks and you can be outrageous. You can be as big as you want to be. And that's a freedom that we don't usually have" (Baur, Interview).

7. Paradox

For our purposes, paradox will address the idea of a pirate in popular culture and why we are drawn to what should logically be repulsive figures. By all accounts, most real pirates were and are violent and desperate people. If actually approached by real pirates, the proper response would be fear, not laughter. Yet as a society and even across societies, we are still drawn to them. Ol' Chumbucket summed up this paradox and provided his own explanation for why it works. "I would have to say, pirates are not funny. I mean, they're not. Pirates were robbers at sea and often murderers and today they are the cause of all sorts of international concern. What's funny is someone like me being a pirate in an inappropriate way and in an inappropriate place" (Baur, Interview). This is an important point. The juxtaposition of a person, who is not a pirate, acting like a pirate at an inappropriate time and place creates humorous incongruities. As he later explained his idea in more depth he said, "A pie isn't funny, but a pie in the face is always funny" (Baur, E-mail 11 Apr.). People talking like seventeenth and eighteenth century pirates in the modern world are out of place and therefore incongruous. When that is coupled with the comic

intent and the comic aura that has grown up around the idea of the pirate in popular culture, the whole experience becomes comic.

Cap'n Slappy provides a related, but distinct idea of where the comic incongruity of talking like a pirate comes from. He stated:

Well you know we thought it was funny because we're goofy and just changing your voice, it works on the two-year-old humor level you know . . . where their parents tell bedtime stories using goofy voices and stuff and the pirate voice, it lets you be scary which I think introduces people to funny. Funny becomes the relief of the fear." (Summers)

Two points, I think, are important here. One is the basic incongruity of changing your voice, the act of sounding like someone other than who you are. The other point is this relationship between fear and comedy which we touched on earlier when discussing the carnivalesque. There is more to be said of this relationship, however. One of the major theories of comedy in philosophical literature is called the Relief Theory. One of the most important proponents of this theory was Sigmund Freud who wrote about it in his *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*. While this is a simplification of Freud's ideas, the Relief Theory is that essentially laughter is the release of psychic energies or tensions. Cap'n Slappy went on to describe his own experience with Pirates and the relationship between fear and fascination that he felt:

When I was a kid growing up in Seattle there was a group called the Seafair Pirates, part of the Seattle Seafair festival every summer, and these guys dressed as pirates. They growled. They grabbed kids off the street. They had swords. They were awesome to behold. Scary as hell and ultimately sweethearts, but as kids you were drawn to that. Terrified that they would grab you and squealed with delight if they did. I don't think that part of the brain goes away completely. I think the things that scare us, make us laugh. That's where gallows humor comes from. I think laughter is the only appropriate response to fear. I've always thought that the way to move past something is to make a joke out of it. (Summers)

Perhaps that ultimately is one of the best explanations for the fascination with pirates in popular culture. We are frightened, but fascinated with the idea of pirates and piracy. That in itself is a paradox.

8. and 9. Plunder and Pillage

Part of the performance of piracy and indeed piracy itself is the idea of what we get out of it. For real pirates, of course, this means treasure or some kind of financial gain. These were and are desperate people who hazard life and limb for the rewards that piracy offers by taking from others. Cap'n Slappy said of piracy, "You know we're all pirates at heart. Everyone that's wanted anything in

their lifetime has a bit of a pirate about them. It's just what we're willing to do to get there" (Summers). Obviously, most of us are not willing to go to the same lengths as pirates do to support ourselves.

That of course begs the question, that if people do not get financial gain from talking or dressing up like pirates, why do they do it? Obviously, we get a different kind of reward from embracing the image but not the role of piracy. Some of what we get is of course the carnivalesque release accompanied by not obeying the rules and that feeling of freedom from constraints. It is fun. It also provides recognition. Ol' Chumbucket said, "As the people in Albany, Oregon mistakenly said, they mistook us for celebrities. I'm not going to pretend that doesn't feel good. I'm a pirate after all" (Baur, Interview). We like the feeling of notoriety, celebrity, and even fame. It is nice to be noticed and recognized.

In the case of Summers and Baur, financial gain does not seem to be their main motive. While they have benefitted some financially from the phenomenon that Talk Like a Pirate Day has become, Ol' Chumbucket describes the relatively meager amount they have earned as "beer money" (Baur, Interview). They have, in fact, worked to keep it away from the controlling interests of corporations or advertisers so that it can be enjoyed by others. Cap'n Slappy stated:

It's much more a labor of love. It's not something that we've gotten rich off of . . . We haven't cluttered up our website with a lot of advertisement and we're leery of companies that use the word "partner" with us. So we've stayed away and one of the things we said early on was that we didn't want to make this a commercial venture. We didn't want to get rich off of it. We had this cool plaything that we wanted other people to have too. I think that's been part of the success of it is that although the theme is pirates we've not been out to loot anybody. I told people, "It's 'Talk Like a Pirate Day' not 'Commit Felonies Like a Pirate Day.' (Summers)

While it certainly would have been possible to make more money off of the holiday and the buzz that has surrounded it, The Pirate Guys have done something distinctly non-piratical. They have not been pirates. Austin describes a case where a person is pretending to be a hyena and takes it too far. He states that the limit that was crossed "is not a boundary between pretending to be a hyena and really being a hyena, but between pretending to be a hyena and behaving like an uncivilized tough" (204). I want to take it one step further and suggest that in pretending to be a hyena, it is also requisite that one not actually be a hyena. Part of pretending to be a pirate is not only the pretence, but also requires that one not actually be the thing one is pretending to be.

These particular pirates are fairly altruistic. Rather than take, they give and the joy of that sharing seems to be its own reward. Cap'n Slappy describes two of these rewards. The first is the enjoyment that people get out of it. "That's

what thrills us the most is that people are having fun with it" (Summers). The other comment, I think, reflects the satisfaction of being part of a creative endeavor of worldwide consequence. He said, "Just to see so many people around the world united by one idea that for one day a year everyone can just be kids and play and have fun. That's been a revelation to me, to be a small part of that, to be there at the starting of that was amazing" (Summers).

10. Phonetics

While phonetics (the study of the sounds of speech, their transmission, and reception) is technically a "P" word, it has the distinction of being the only word on the list that does not make a "P" sound. While this is partially a little tongue-in-cheek fun on my part, phonetics do play a vital role in the success of Talk Like a Pirate Day. Talking like a pirate, therefore, is properly within the realm of the study of phonetics. The success of Talk Like a Pirate Day, I would argue, is due both to the way a pirate says something as well as the pirate lexicon itself.

The things that a pirate says (as has been mentioned earlier) are really a combination of the appearances of the pirate in popular culture rather than a faithful recreation of the way early pirates spoke. Seventeenth and eighteenth century nautical terms, of course, play an important role. Other archaic language speech acts such as using the pronouns "me" for "my" and "ye" for "you" play a role as well. The inappropriateness and incongruity of this kind of terminology in the modern world, helps establish the comic tone of talking like a pirate.

However, much of the success of talking like a pirate does depend on how something is said. Cap'n Slappy introduces a word that can perhaps best describe how to pull off talking like a pirate, "pirattitude." "We coined the phrase 'pirattitude.' So we've used that and people have accepted that as an actual word now, at least in the pirate community" (Summers). It does do a nice job of explaining how to make talking like a pirate funny and rewarding. It requires a brash attitude that does not conform to the typical restraints. It requires a willingness to deal with taboo or racy subjects, lacing speech with playfully violent threats and sexual innuendos. In fact, the Talk Like a Pirate website has a section devoted to pirate pickup lines such as, "That's the finest pirate booty I've ever laid eyes on" and "Prepare to be boarded" ("Why Talk"). The lurid delivery of the lines of course are what make them most effective. (Effective of course could mean reactions ranging from laughs to slaps in the face.)

The most useful pirate word of course is "Arrr" which as described earlier is a flexible word. The very elasticity of this word and its association with pirate speech makes it so that essentially anyone can participate in the holiday by talking like a pirate. It is not mere exaggeration, when Ol' Chumbucket ends their "Five A's" video by saying "You throw those five A's in and you've got all the pirate talking you're gonna need. Arrr!" (Baur and Summers). Not only is his comment factually relevant for those who want to talk like a Pirate, but he also models the behavior, by turning "Arrr" into an interjection or exclamation at the end of a sentence.

International Talk Like a Pirate Day is a phenomenon, perhaps possible on such a scale only in the digital age. It has become a worldwide event that taps into something that speaks to many people in the carnivalesque spirit. Mark Summers and John Baur were able to take advantage of the idea and develop it into something that has taken on a life of its own. They did not plan this, but nevertheless worked hard to establish it. When I contacted Ol' Chumbucket about doing an interview for this paper, he said "Happy to stake my claim to academic respectability" (Baur, E-mail 6 Apr.). I hope that I have helped in this endeavor. To quote from one of the earliest comic treatments of pirates, Gilbert and Sullivan's *The Pirates of Penzance*, "At length we are provided, with unusual facility, to change piratic crime for dignified respectability" (*Pirates*). I hope that I have at least, to a small extent, helped with that change. For those who study pop culture, it is often difficult to justify or explain one's work to those who are used to more traditional academic research. Reactions can often range from dubiousness to disbelief to outright dismissal. Nevertheless, pop culture phenomena like International Talk Like a Pirate Day are important trends in the modern world, worthy of serious, if sometimes playful, study. To those who have difficulty accepting things like Talk Like a Pirate Day as something that belongs on the academic ship of state, I say "Prepare to be boarded! Arrr!"

Radford University

Matthew R. Turner

Works Cited

- Austin, J. L. *Philosophical Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966. Print.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1968. Web.
- Baur, John. "Re: Pirate Day Interview." Message to the author. 6 Apr. 2011. E-mail.
- . "Re: Pirate Day Interview." Message to the author. 11 Apr. 2011. E-mail.
- . Personal interview. 8 Apr. 2011.
- Baur, John and Mark Summers. "Talk Like a Pirate Day: The Five A's." *OfficialWench*. Youtube.com. 3 Jul. 2006. Web. 14 Sept. 2011.
- Barry, Dave. "Arrrr! Talk Like a Pirate – Or Prepare to be Boarded." *The Miami Herald*. 8 Sept. 2002. Web. 14 Sept. 2011.
- Eco, Umberto. "The Frames of Comic 'Freedom'" *Carnival!*. Eds. Thomas A. Sebeok and Marcia E. Erickson. New York: Mouton, 1984. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*. Trans. and ed. James Strachey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. New York: Antheneum, 1966. Print.
- Original Talk Like a Pirate Day Site*. The. TalkLikeAPirate.com. Web. 14 Sept. 2011.
- Pirates of Penzance*. The. Dir. Wilford Leach. Perf. Kevin Kline, Angela Lansbury, Linda Ronstadt, George Rose, Rex Smith, and Tony Azito. Universal, 1983. Universal, 2010. DVD.
- Summers, Mark. Personal interview. 7 Apr. 2011.
- West, Richard. Introduction. In Defoe, Daniel. *A General History of the Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates*. Carroll & Graff, New York. 1999. Web.
- "Why Talk Like a Pirate – and How." talklikeapirate.com. TalkLikeAPirate.com. n.d. Web. 14 Sept. 2011.

Childhood Rejects: One-Eyed Willie, Pint-Sized Pirates, and the Generational Appeal of *The Goonies*

Mikey: It was a retropactum!

Brandon: Rectospectum!

Mikey: See! That's what I said! You always contradict me. . . .

I know what I was saying. It was on the history of
Astoria, and these are the rejects!

Chunk: Kinda like us, Mikey. *The Goonies*.

Mikey: It's OK. You're a Goonie, and Goonies always make
mistakes. Just don't make any more.

Mikey: You know something, Willie? You're the first Goonie.

Every generation has youth movies that resonate, creating characters with whom audiences can identify and capturing the experience of growing up at a particular time and place. For those approaching adolescence in America in the mid1980s—and those who followed—*The Goonies* (1985), a tale of seven misfit kids from the struggling Astoria, Oregon, neighborhood of Goon Docks who find an old pirate treasure map and set off to find fortune and save their homes from foreclosure by bankers and developers wanting to build a golf course, proved such a movie. Pirate tales have a history of intrigue: classics such as *The Black Pirate* (1926), *Treasure Island* (1934), *Captain Blood* (1935), *The Sea Hawk* (1940), *Peter Pan* (1953), and most recently the *Pirates of the Caribbean* trilogy offer fascination and adventure with Jolly Roger characters, played by the likes of Douglas Fairbanks, Sr., Wallace Beery, Erroll Flynn, and Johnny Depp, forming vivid, if not stereotypical, images of pirates in the minds of America's moviegoers. However, among many college-age students I've encountered over the past two decades, *The Goonies*, while neither a cinematic classic nor a huge celebrity vehicle, surprisingly emerges as not only the most memorable pirate film of their childhoods, but also as one of their downright favorite movies overall.

Veteran viewers, especially males, know the film's dialogue by heart and invariably gush, "I love that movie!" (Martin). One says, "I must have watched *Goonies* forty times!" (Lindsay). Another claims he saw it "too many times to count" (Philhower). One freshman observes, "Go to any fraternity house on campus, and you'll find a copy of *Goonies*" (Lindsay). The film occupies cult status among college-age males, as evidenced by the popularity of its merchandising items. One male, who said he "became obsessed" with the film when he was thirteen and fourteen years old, recalls, "I wore T-shirts of the *Goonies* all the time until I was a freshman or sophomore in high school. My

favorite was one of Data that read, ‘I set booty traps’” (Philhower). User reviews on the Internet confirm my students’ enthusiasm. “Anyone who grew up in the 80’s,” writes one fan, “will list *The Goonies* as one of their favourite [sic] films, or at least look back at it with a misty eye” (“User Reviews”). Another opines, “I must admit I look back at it through rose[-]tinted glasses. I was in awe of it when I was a kid, and now when I watch it, it reminds me of my childhood and all the things that [were] great about it. I can[‘]t fault the Goonies, even now. I still believe it is the perfect kids[‘] film” (“User Reviews”). Even actor Zac Efron, twenty-two- year-old star of *Charlie St. Cloud* (2010), tells *Entertainment Weekly* that *The Goonies* is the movie he loves most, saying, “I’ve probably seen it 20 times at least” (qtd. in “Zac Efron: My Favorite Movies” 60).

What accounts for this seemingly unremarkable film’s remarkable appeal? Although dismissed by movie critics following its release on June 7, 1985, *The Goonies* captured the imagination of boys who became enamored with it, watching it repeatedly and considering it a—if not the—touchstone film of their youths. Later, they passed it on to younger siblings and offspring, who felt similarly connected. Tailor-made for what became known as Generation X, its name derived from a 1991 novel by Douglas Coupland of the same title (J. Arnett 4). *The Goonies* speaks to children who feel lost, marginalized, or rejected, adapting the classic pirate genre to meet the needs of a contemporary audience and reflecting the dynamics of a changing culture. Coupland claimed that Gen X was not a chronological age but a way of looking at the world (Owen 4); *The Goonies* with its outsiders who look sadly and cynically at the institutions around them reflect that vision.

Written by Chris Columbus and Steven Spielberg and directed by Richard Donner, *The Goonies* did not fare as well critically as it did popularly. Roger Ebert of the *Chicago Sun Times* panned the film, calling it “totally manipulative” (Ebert). Danny Peary, author of *Cult Films 1 and 2* and *Guide for the Film Fanatic*, placed it in his category of “Must See’ Films,” for its popularity, but described it as “extremely disappointing” and added:

The young boys who take part in the adventure are loud, vulgar, and in need of babysitters. Even director Richard Donner seems so vexed by their constant chatter that he tries to drown them out with blaring music. The villains (who are miscast) are cruel, rather than delightfully evil. In fact , there is a mean and rude, rather than good-natured, feel to the entire film this picture lacks imagination. Dialogue and characters (especially the fake kids) leave much to be desired. Sean Astin’s inspirational “let’s-not-give-up” speech is particularly lame. But the final reunion scene is the worst of all. Bad casting, weak direction. (Peary 177-178)

What the critics disparaged, the audience lauded. Although *The Goonies* just missed the list of the top ten films of the 1980, it placed a solid ninth at the

box office in 1985 (Ash 39, 43). Costing \$19,000, 000, it earned a gross revenue of \$61,000,000.

It would be easy to explain *The Goonies*' popular success by what Danny Peary calls its "Spielberg touch" (Peary 117). Indeed, in the mid 1980s, Spielberg-inspired movies dominated the box office, disseminating messages very much in sync with the times (Thompson 64), and according to Lee Goldberg, *The Goonies* is "pure Spielberg in every way but one: Spielberg isn't directing" (115). Overwhelmed with directing projects, Spielberg called his friend Richard Donner and said, "Hey, I just finished this script I loved very much. I can't do it. Will you?" (qtd. in Goldberg 115). Donner jumped at the chance, saying, "It's a wonderful adventure that borrows from every adventure ever written and yet is totally unique . . . It's the *Hardy Boys* and *Nancy Drew* and it's also Mark Twain. We've got our own Tom Sawyer, Becky Thatcher, even an Indian Joe. It's that kind of story." (qtd. in Goldberg 116). Donner shot the film with a crew of unruly, disruptive kids in fourteen weeks. "It was brutal," he said.

They've got to have school and rest periods and their attention span is about ten seconds. While you are concentrating on two in front of the camera the others in the background are looking in wrong direction or picking their nose or falling asleep. . . . I felt like a harried camp counselor. I know now why I never got married and had kids. But, at the same time, I desperately loved all of them. The energy they gave me was phenomenal.

(Goldberg 117)

Their story fits seamlessly into Spielberg's 1980s canon that explores youth experiences and their effects. As Robert Arnett notes, "The films Spielberg directed uniformly emphasize the reunification of families (*E.T. The Extra Terrestrial* [1982], the "Kick the Can" episode of *The Twilight Zone* [1983], *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom* [1984], *The Color Purple* [1985], *The Empire of the Sun* [1987], and *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* [1989]) (R. Arnett 124). *The Goonies* counts among those on which Spielberg served solely as producer, along with *Poltergeist* [1982], *Gremlins* [1984], and the *Back to the Future* trilogy [1985-1990], all bearing the same theme and exalting "suburbia and the middle class" (R. Arnett 124). Although *E.T.*, *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade*, *Raiders of the Lost Ark*, and *Back to the Future* outperformed *The Goonies* at the box office, each ranking in the top ten movies of the decade and earning over \$300 million, *The Goonies* managed to eclipse these other 1980s adventures in many people's childhood memories, proving it was more than just another work riding on Spielberg's coattails. What is most interesting about the film's audience is not the *quantity* of viewers but their *intensity*. In short, *The Goonies* proved strikingly well suited to the sensibilities of its original Generation X moviegoers, who saw in it parallels to their own lives, and embraced it.

Generation X, the children of the early Baby Boomers, faced new challenges as they grew up at the crossroads of cultural change. The birth years of this relatively small generation, sometimes called a “Lost Generation” like children born in the 1920s, have been variously defined: 1965-1978 by Municipal Research Services (MRSC), 1961-1981 by Howe and Strauss, and 1966-1981 by the US Census (Sweeney 166). Nevertheless, the same key events characterized their lives: the fall of the Soviet Union, the women’s liberation movement, MTV, grunge, the rise of home video games and personal computers, the birth of the Internet, and the dot-com era’s boom and bust (Fogg B18). However, according to Rob Owen, author of *Gen X TV: The Brady Bunch to Melrose Place*, what was most influential was a shift in the traditional family structure. “Generation X,” he writes, “was shaped by a changing society that experienced divorce rates that rose from less than 10 percent in 1950 to almost 20 percent by 1980 . . . in 1988 only 50 percent of American youth aged 15 to 17 lived with both their biological parents” (Owen 9). Owen also notes that the term “latchkey kids,” defined as “children whose parents worked who returned home from school to empty houses that they unlocked with their own keys,” did not exist until before the birth of Generation X (41).

Maxim W. Furek, in *The Death Proclamation of Generation X: A Self-Fulfilling Prophecy of Goth, Grunge and Heroin*, takes Owen’s demographics a step further to paint an extremely gloomy picture:

Parents had been less accessible than in past decades; working, divorcing, and existing. [Gen Xers] were less connected to the extended safety network of neighbors, teachers, religious leaders and social workers resulting in a generation of isolated and scared individuals falling into a black hole. This silent and lonely void was a place of home-alone desolation where survival, not nurturing and mentoring, was the goal. These feral children, a vulnerable population with the least amount [sic] of coping skills, were being forced to grow up too fast. (149-150)

Furek’s language is exaggerated, but his general point is well taken and confirmed by family counselors’ experiences: Gen Xers’ exposure to myriad family problems made them grow up faster than their Baby-Boomer parents (Owen 12). As divorces increased to an unprecedented level and single-parent and blended households became the norm, many Generation X children felt lost, overwhelmed, and wondering where they belonged.

The Goonies, with its pirate-themed story, captures the essence of what it is to feel like an outsider. What are pirates but a motley crew of outcasts who bond together, break away from society, flaunt rules, and embark on an elaborate treasure hunt? However, unlike classic pirate narratives, *The Goonies* subverts the genre by replacing the main swashbuckler hero with a group of disparate, imperfect kids from the wrong side of town who battle the dysfunctional, law-

breaking Fratelli Family for a shot at the treasure that will save their homes. Self-proclaimed misfits, the children call themselves “The Goonies,” and their quirky personalities, cleverly introduced in the movie’s opening action scene in which one of the Fratelli Brothers breaks out of jail, carry the film. This treasure-seeking crew of kids smacks of diversity and represents different strengths and weaknesses. Mikey Walsh, the intense, persevering Goonie who leads the group on the treasure hunt to win money to save the family home, wears braces, suffers from asthma and eschews his over-protective mother’s reminders that he use his inhaler. Mouth, the quick-witted, smart-mouthed Goonie who is bilingual in English and Spanish, can at times be an annoying blowhard, but he is still useful to have around because he can translate. Data—intelligent, inventive, and Asian—idolizes James Bond and has many gadgets and gizmos that at times seem crazy, but turn out to save the day. Chunk, an overweight, clumsy Goonie, cannot say no to food and regularly exaggerates the truth, but he excels at making the group laugh when he rolls his belly, performing “the truffle shuffle,” and acts with compassion and acceptance to others who are different and shunned. Brandon Walsh, or simply “Brand” as he is called, is Mikey’s older brother, who feels humiliated because he did not pass his driver’s license test and goes along on the adventure because he is a responsible care giver for his little brother. Finally, two girls who are not part of the “The Goonies” come too. Andy, who is the same age as Brand, ends up tagging along unexpectedly because, although she is being pursued by Troy Perkins, the son of the rich banker who is foreclosing on the Walshes, she really likes Brand; she plays an important role in the discovery of treasure when she plays out a secret code on a piano. Stef, Andy’s cynical friend, also gets scooped up for the journey, sparring with and eventually befriending Mouth in the process. Variously characterized by their fast talking, nerdy inventions, excess weight, braces, asthma, fears, weak musical talent, or failed driving test, these children, although possessing important attributes, see themselves in terms of their insecurities, prompting young viewers to identify with them. They are not the popular kids that everyone wants to be like, but rather the underdogs who do not really care about being in the spotlight or are left out and disenfranchised because they are slightly different.

The defective kids transform into pirates when they stumble across a Spanish treasure map in the far reaches of the house—the attic—representative of their isolation from society. As Mikey, Brand, Mouth, Chunk, and Data pore over the map, Mikey proceeds to tell his friends the story his father once told him about the pirate, One-Eyed Willie, who set out to find buried treasure but never returned. When Brand dismisses it as just a story, Mikey becomes defensive. This scene would appeal to a boy because when a father tells a story, no matter how outrageous, it seems real. The children’s intrigue turns to action when bankers come to the house to get the parents’ signature for the foreclosure that will wreak havoc on the boys’ homes, friendships, and community. Feeling helpless and not wanting to be uprooted, they take matters into their own hands,

setting off to the coast where the map points them to uncover the secret treasure, bringing along Andy and Stef. After encountering the criminal Fratelli Family, and losing Chunk in the process, they gain access to an underground cavern, representative of their underdog status, that seems consistent with the coordinates on the treasure map.

Movie writer Lee Goldberg likens *The Goonies* to the classic 1920s *Our Gang* comedies with “a band of kids who get into trouble, only this time it’s bigger, better and hipper trouble” (Goldberg 115). In the words of one college-age male, “The best part of *Goonies* was this bunch of goofy friends that joke on each other, but they’re still friends. I hung out with a big crew like that too. One kid was fat and we’d make him do the truffle shuffle. We were all different, but we hung out together and had adventures all the time, wandering off in the woods and stuff”(Philhower).

According to television producer Kimberly Costello, experiences like these especially resonated with Generation X, brought up with the daycare experience. “This generation has the ability to socialize in packs,” she notes. “At age two, they were taught how to get along with others [in day care] and what it means to respect others and somebody’s space. So they value those friendships more than family because they spend so much time with them. The people I know from that age group just love being in groups” (Owen 11-12). Further, the rising divorce rate in the 1980s caused many youths to rely on friends more often than parents or relatives (Owen 11). Generation X writer Rob Owen adds, “For Xer youth, a group of friends often became more important than their families, especially when their home lives were in turmoil” (Owen 11), a factor that relates to the growth of the punk movement (as well as to the popularity of Gen X TV favorites like *Seinfeld* and *Friends*).

In *The Goonies*, the socially rejected kids are a reflection of the damaged pirate they seek, One-Eyed Willie, whom Mikey accurately addresses as “the first Goonie.” Those ostracized and disparaged as “Goonies” accept one another’s shortcomings. Brand flunks his driver’s license exam, Data’s inventions misfire, Mouth says things that get him in trouble, and all of the Goonies make wrong moves that place them in the path of the Fratellis. Chunk, in particular, acknowledges his errors, humorously spilling out details of all his misdeeds to the Fratellis when they hold him hostage and threaten to torture him:

OK! I'll talk. In third grade, I cheated on my history exam. In fourth grade, I stole my uncle Max's toupee and I glued it on my face when I was Moses in my Hebrew school play. In fifth grade, I knocked my sister Edie down the stairs and I blamed it on the dog . . . When my mother sent me to the summer camp for fat kids and they served lunch I got nuts and I pigged out and they threw me out . . . But the worst thing I ever done—I mixed a pot of fake puke at home and then I went to this movie theater, hid the puke in my jacket, climbed up to

the balcony and then, t-t-then, I made a noise like this: hua-hua-hua-haaaaaa—and then I dumped over the side, all over the people in the audience. And then, this was horrible, all the people started getting sick and throwing up all over each other. I never felt so bad in my entire life.

Later, when Andy tries to crack the code that will open the door to the treasure chamber by playing the correct sequence of notes on the piano, she at first hits a wrong one, and Mikey reassures her, saying, “It’s OK. You’re a Goonie, and Goonies always make mistakes.” The message appeals to the audience as well: kids do not have to be perfect in order to be accepted and liked; they just have to be good enough.

Further, each of these flawed youths play an important role and contribute to the final outcome. They support one another, and even adopt into their pack the grotesque-looking, rejected but very loving member of the Fratellis—Sloth—whose family is even more dysfunctional than any of their own. Sloth helps them, giving them greater strength, and he and Chunk become like brothers. “Sloth love Chunk,” he says. This friends-as-family phenomenon makes the ensemble entertainment of *Goonies* attractive and relatable.

However, there is more is at play in *Goonies* besides friendship. The situation the Goonies face resembles that of children in a changing family situation who feel powerless but hope for happiness, not unlike many Gen Xers. In a crucial scene in the film, the Goonies think they have found the treasure but realize that it is only “false treasure”: they are at the bottom of the town’s wishing well. They want to take the coins, but Stef stops them, saying that they are someone’s wishes. Mouth steps up, picks up a coin, and says, “Yeah, but you know what? This one . . . this one right here . . . this was my wish, my wish, and it didn’t come true so I’m taking it back, I’m taking them all back.” Showing his sensitive side, Mouth reflects what a lot of children feel when they are hopeful—but end up let down and disappointed. The “false treasure” prompts Mouth to want to give up, and were it not for Mikey he would have.

The Goonies transform other elements of the pirate genre to relate to its Gen X viewers in a meaningful way. The youths in the film show a willingness to take risks when they are lost or troubled, a quality reinforced by the innovative set designs of Michael Riva, who created elaborate caves and tunnels that created suspense, giving the underground passages ambience and character, and another force to be reckoned with (Goldberg 117-118). For an audience raised on the Indiana Jones films, *The Goonies* constructs a forbidden adventure world with no parental controls for the young pirates who must seek the solution to their problems by challenging rules and taking chances. Risk-taking, which is necessary for personal growth, appeals to youths; it creates the building blocks of experience.

In *The Goonies*, Mikey is able to put himself in One-Eyed Willie’s mind and follow his trail, and he speaks for all pirates and all youth when he acknowledges danger but vows to maintain the quest, saying:

Don't you realize? The next time you see the sky, it'll be another town. The next time you take a test, it'll be in some other school. Our parents, they want the best stuff for us. But right now, they got to do what's right for them. Because it's their time. Their time! Up there! Down here, it's our time. It's our time down here.

Andy's former beau, the rich banker's son Troy Perkins, is above ground taunting, "Andy, you Goonie," and the outsiders realize that only in the underworld can they succeed. They must, for their parents, too, have failed them, symptomatic of a society in trouble, and it is a dead pirate, not a father, who leads and inspires them. The villains of the story, both the Fratelli family and the bankers, prove to be no match for the determined kids, who find the Willie's skeleton and the treasure, even though they lose it. Imperfect but empowered, the Goonies escape the cave and identify the Fratellis for police, and Mikey discovers that he has pilfered enough riches from the pirate ship to save their families' homes from foreclosure. "Dad, Dad, it's my marble bag," he says. "The Fratellis forgot to check it. I emptied out all of my marbles and put the jewels in. We don't have to leave the Goon Docks!" The children fix what their parents could not, saving their town and their way of life. Mikey may have not have gotten all the riches, but he got enough. In this climactic scene, Mikey and Brandon's father, Irving Walsh, tear up the foreclosure documents delivered by banker Elgin Perkins to his house that day and says, "There'll be no more signing today or ever again." Thanks to his children who took matters into their own hands, he is vindicated.

The narrative reflects not only the increased need for responsibility and problem-solving among Gen X children in single-parent, divorced, and two-career families but also the emphasis on riches in the 1980s, known as the "decade of greed" (Moffitt and Campbell 1). According to Grace Palladino, "teenagers who came of age in the 1980s and 1990s were already well aware that they would have to make money (and plenty of it) to live almost as well as their parents did" (Palladino xix). In *The Goonies*, the lost kids secure their bag of jewels and are heralded as heroes. However, they realize that their greatest treasures—their true pirates' bounty—are family, home, friends, and community. America's core values in the conservative Reagan era are affirmed.

A final way in which *The Goonies* speaks to its original Gen X audience regards popular culture, which, according to television critic Rob Owen, "is Gen X's specialty" (Owen xii). For 1980s youth, MTV, which debuted on August 1, 1981, was a defining event. "I thought MTV was just about the coolest thing I'd ever seen in my life," notes Jennifer Hale. "[It] turned everything up a notch" (qtd. in Owen 5). Cindy Lauper, whose song "Girls Just Wanna Have Fun," was an MTV hit, did the popular theme song for *Goonies*, adding to the film's draw. A good song, according to a recent study conducted by Robert Zatorre and Valorie Salimpoor of McGill University in Montreal, increases dopamine in the brain, giving pleasure (Ritter 2). Thus, the feel-good quality of this child-as-

pirate film operated on many levels for youths caught in troubled times. Finally, while Cindy Lauper was well known to the Gen X audience, the film's pint-sized actors were not, but several of them—Sean Astin as Mikey, Josh Brolin as Brandon, and Corey Feldman as Mouth—became recognizable talents, making it fun for viewers to go back to their early work as intractable kids on their quest for hidden treasure.

In the case of *The Goonies*, not only did the original Generation X moviegoers embrace the film, but they passed it on to others. According to one college-age male, “I learned about *Goonies* from my older brother. All of us kids did. The older guys said we had to watch it” (Lindsay). Another says, “My mom bought it for me. It was one of her favorites” (Philhower). Zac Efron tells *Entertainment Weekly*, “I wanted to watch *3 Ninjas* again, but my dad was like, ‘No, you gotta watch this’” (“Zac Efron: My Favorite Movies” 60). This underscores an important factor: Generation X, who came of age in the 1980s when *The Goonies* was released, became the first generation to grow up with VCRs and remote controls (Owen 8), enabling viewers to watch a favorite movie multiple times in video form, imprinting its characters, dialogue, and messages in their heads. They were then quick to buy, copy for, or recommend the film to younger viewers, particularly because while there are many substantive movies aimed at teens, as Timothy Shary points out in *Generation Multiplex: The Image of Youth in Contemporary American Cinema* (2002) and *Teen Movies: American Youth on Screen* (2005), there are far fewer for the pre-adolescent set. With notable exceptions, such as the recent *Pirates of the Caribbean* trilogy, most pirate films have not been wildly popular (Bond 309), but *The Goonies* with its child protagonists bucks the trend, attracting ardent supporters who watch the movie repeatedly and introduce it to others.

Through word of mouth, the growing VCR and later DVD markets, and collectibles, Generation Y (popularly called the Millennial Generation), which followed Generation X, discovered *The Goonies*, and its appeal has continued. According to Jeffrey Arnett, the 1980s decade was a watershed period, and the cultural changes it introduced, such as the redefinition of American family, are here to stay; thus, Generations X, Y, and Z are likely to encounter many of the same experiences and feelings (J. Arnett 4). Today the child’s world is characterized by the marketing sobriquet KGOY: Kids Getting Older Younger. A film such as *The Goonies*, with its serious message of children’s coping with upheaval in their lives through empowerment, may prove timeless, as well as richly reflective of its time. What pre-adolescent has not, on occasion, felt lost, marginalized, or flawed? *The Goonies*’s meaning is universal.

In conclusion, Lee Goldberg calls *Goonies* “a milestone, a defining moment in fantasy filmmaking during the [1980s] decade” (Goldberg ix). The funny, fast-paced film transforms the pirate genre by featuring a motley set of kids as the pirates, and friends, family, home, and community as the ultimate bounty, characteristics that appealed to the Generation X audience of the 1980s, who watched the film repeatedly on video and passed it down to siblings and the next

generation. Characterized by rebellious outsiders, pirate stories often attract youth, but have inter-generational appeal. According to Matt Mason in *The Pirate's Dilemma*, "Often pirates are the first to see the winds of change blowing. The answer to the Pirate's Dilemma lies in the stories of pirates sailing into waters uncharted by society . . . spaces where traditional rules don't apply. The answers lie in the history of youth culture . . . Behind youth movements familiar to us are radical ideas about how we can compete, collaborate, and coexist in an environment where old assumptions . . . do not hold" (Mason 4). The influence of *Goonies* still resonates. One aficionado of the film said, "Except for a few haircuts, it doesn't feel like an '80s film" (Lindsay). Another noted, "Because of *Goonies*, I like to hang out with very different varieties of people. Today I have groups of friends that have absolutely nothing in common with each other" (Philhower). On June 4-7 of 2010 the town of Astoria, Oregon, hosted a twenty-fifth anniversary Goonies event. *The Goonies* has become part of the lexicon of childhood. The pint-sized pirates have grown up, but, like One-Eyed Willie, their message still inspires.

Virginia Wesleyan College

Kathy Merlock Jackson

Works Cited

- Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen. *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road from the Late Teens Through the Twenties*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Arnett, Robert. "Eighties Noir: The Dissenting Voice in Reagan's America." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 34.3 (Fall 2006): 123-129.
- Ash, Russell. *The Top 10 of Film*. New York: DK Publishing, 2003.
- Bond, Richard E. "Piratical Americans: Representations of Piracy and Authority in Mid-Twentieth Century Swashbucklers." *The Journal of American Culture* 33.3 (Dec. 2010): 309-321.
- Ebert, Robert. "The Goonies." *Chicago Sun-Times* 1 Jan. 1985. Rogerebert.com. Web. 3 March 2010.
- Fogg, Piper. "One Workplace, Four Generations." *The Chronicle of Higher Education: The Academic Workplace*, 18 July 2008: B 18.
- Goldberg, Lee and Randy Lofficier, Jean-Marc Lofficier, and William Rabkin. *The Dreamweavers: Interviews with Fantasy Filmmakers of the 1980s*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1995.
- Goonies, The*. Dir. Richard Donner. 1985. Warner Brothers, 2007. DVD.
- Lindsay, Andrew. Virginia Wesleyan College student. Personal interview. 25 March 2010.
- Martin, Brad. Virginia Wesleyan College graduate. Personal interview. 15 March 2010.
- Mason, Matt. *The Pirate's Dilemma: How Youth Culture Is Reinventing Capitalism*. New York: Free Press, 2008.
- Moffitt, Kimberly R. and Duncan A. Campbell, Eds. *The 1980s: A Critical and Transitional Decade*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2011.
- Owen, Rob. *Gen X TV: The Brady Bunch to Melrose Place*. Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1997.
- Palladino, Grace. *Teenagers: An American History*. New York: Basic Books, 1996.
- Peary, Danny. *Guide for the Film Fanatic*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986.
- Philhower, Kyle. Virginia Wesleyan College student. Personal interview. 26 March 2010.

- Ritter, Malcolm. "Love Music? It's in Your Head." *Virginian-Pilot*, 10 Jan 2011, 2.
- Shary, Timothy. *Generation Multiplex: The Image of Youth in Contemporary American Cinema*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.
- . *Teen Movies: American Youth on Screen*. London: Wallflower, 2005.
- Sweeney, Richard T. "Reinventing Library Buildings and Services for the Millennial Generation." *Library Administration and Management* 19.4 (Fall 2005): 165-175.
- Thompson, Anne. "Industry: The 11th Annual Grosses Gloss." *Film Comment* 22.2 (1986): 64-67.
- "User Reviews." Rev. of *The Goonies*. IMDB. 3 March 2010.

The Many Faces of Moriarty: A Critical Examination of the Arch-Criminal's Evolution Across the Landscape of the Popular Imagination

Professor James Moriarty. In contemporary popular culture, the name alone conjures expectations of evil. And why wouldn't it? In our collective imagination, the character has appeared again and again, embodying innumerable incarnations. Cast and re-cast as the nemesis of not only Holmes—but of those who seek to emulate him—re-imaginings of the Professor have been voiced by the likes of Orson Welles and Vincent Price, have been portrayed by no less than Henry Daniell and Laurence Olivier, and have threatened as diverse heroes as Darkwing Duck, Dr. Gregory House, and Captain Jean-Luc Picard. Moreover—across the airwaves of radio, between the pages of numerous novels and comic books, and within the confines of films, television series, and video games—Moriarty has been credited with much more than running London's underworld. In popular culture, he has been responsible for creating Jack the Ripper; has become real through "belief made manifest;" has been depicted as a maligned mathematics tutor; has inspired the hero-nemesis relationship key to much contemporary fiction; has died in repeated scenarios, many of which consciously evoke the imagery of his fall at Reichenbach; and, he has subsequently been shown, on several occasions, to—like his nemesis Holmes—in fact have survived such falls. Despite his almost absence from the Holmes canon itself, Moriarty has outlived not only his author, but in some cases, his most famous foe. Fore-grounded by an overview of the character's rise through the annals of pop culture, what follows is a critical examination of several of the most interesting contemporary representations of Professor James Moriarty, who continues to flourish in the popular imagination, in spite—and sometimes even in the absence of—Mr. Sherlock Holmes.

What makes Moriarty's continual presence in the popular consciousness so much more fascinating is his virtual lack of presence in the original Holmes canon itself. First introduced in "The Final Problem," the professor's entrance and exit into the series occur within the space of give or take thirty or so pages, depending upon the edition. What's more, Watson—Holmes' only friend and chronicler, and the narrator through whom the reader's experience is colored—never comes face to face with Moriarty, having heard of him from Holmes and having later seen him only at a distance. Thus, the reader is never presented with an account of the man other than that given by his greatest enemy; it is this very narrative discrepancy that makes the premise of stories such as Nicholas Meyer's 1974 novel *The Seven-Percent-Solution* possible. Even more interestingly, the climactic moment—which H. Paul Jeffers terms, the "titanic

struggle,” between Holmes and Moriarty—is not witnessed by Watson! He later deduces the events said to have transpired, by reading the existing physical evidence via sheer Sherlockian surmise.

As Conan Doyle’s original readers would not come to learn for almost another decade, Holmes takes advantage of Watson’s failure to witness the confrontation, in order to fake his own death. So, after almost ten years, when the Great Detective reemerges to reveal to a fainting Watson “what actually happened” at Reichenbach, we as readers are, once again, left with only Holmes’ own representation of events. This has led, as Leslie S. Klinger notes in his *New Annotated Sherlock Holmes*, to numerous theories as to what “*actually, actually*” transpired at Reichenbach Falls. Among the conspiracy plots elucidated by Klinger, all but one involve Moriarty; these various “revisions of ‘The Final Problem’” (Klinger 745), include the idea that the professor is either: imaginary; innocent; murdered by Holmes, who has intentionally lured him to his death at Reichenbach; not murdered by Holmes, who has killed the wrong man by mistake; or, that he, like Holmes, has survived the infamous falls (Klinger 745-8). Since the canon never confirms these theories, popular culture has taken the liberty of doing so, again and again, often in outlandish—yet almost-always entertaining—ways.

In his introduction to what Conan Doyle had intended to be the last of the Holmes tales ever, Leslie S. Klinger explains, “Moriarty, who has achieved near-legendary status as the arch-nemesis of Holmes, appears only in ‘The Final Problem,’ ‘The Empty House,’ and *The Valley of Fear*, and so the information about him in this tale has been carefully mined by scholars” (713). Present in a mere three canonical stories, Professor Moriarty has nonetheless come to be perceived as—as Klinger so aptly terms it—the “arch-nemesis” of Sherlock Holmes. But why?

Certainly, this must be due originally to Holmes’ own attitudes toward the man. The fact that Sherlock so famously considers the professor to be not only “the Napoleon of Crime,” but to be the greatest threat facing London, and—most importantly—one which he is willing to eliminate even at the cost of his own life, contributes to Moriarty’s arch-enemy ethos. Furthermore, the Great Detective’s explanation that his foe is in charge of the London underworld—that ex-Professor James Moriarty is “the organizer of half that is evil and of nearly all that is undetected in this great city,” a figure who “does little...only plans,” and who sits like a spider in its web (Conan Doyle 719)—demonstrates what Holmes himself implies: that Moriarty has been there all along, from the beginning, although we have never known it, operating so far in the shadows that we—like the police—have never dreamt of his existence. Ironically, in nearly all of the later hero-nemesis dynamics he has inspired, it is this aspect of the professor that is most often lost.

The eventual, if not initial, loss of his anonymity within the worlds in which he is re-cast has proven an essential component in establishing Moriarty’s status as an iconic pop culture arch-villain. Although almost no scholarship exists on

any aspect of the character, let alone this one specifically, it seems likely that radio proved the means through which Moriarty transcended his limited role within the original Holmes canon. As Jim Harmon explains in his comprehensive book entitled *Radio Mystery and Adventure and Its Appearance in Film, Television, and Other Media*, “Moriarty appeared many more times on the air than in the books. Holmes put down his plots week after week” (174). Then, although it is not an aspect which Harmon himself explores, it seems likely that radio is the medium most directly responsible for giving rise to the modern mythos of Moriarty, one that would continue to be augmented by unfathomable television, film, and video game interpretations to come; like those created by the classic radio plays, each of these subsequent interpretations would derive, on some level, from the studios’ need to exploit an established arch-nemesis, around which they could craft an endless series of Sherlockian installments.

This assertion, however, seems to imply that Moriarty is needed in order to sustain Sherlock. As Jessica Page Morrell asserts in her creative writer’s reference guide, *Bullies, Bastards, and Bitches: How to Write the Bad Guys of Fiction*, the function of a “bad guy” is to make the protagonist vulnerable, which will in turn lead readers to identify with him or her; in this way, Moriarty very much defines Holmes, poignantly reminding readers of the Great Detective’s humanity, and of his consequent physical fragility. Moreover, a definite case can be, and has already been, made for Moriarty and Holmes as doubles.

David Lehman’s, *The Perfect Murder: A Study in Detection*, contains a chapter entitled “The Double,” in which he elucidates the key difference between the *doppelganger* as presented in its original, Gothic context, and as it becomes transformed when exported to detective fiction. Essentially, Lehman asserts that unlike his Gothic counterpart, a detective can survive an encounter with his double, and that it is only through doing so—through acknowledging what he could so easily become, and then defeating, and thereby disavowing, this identity—that the detective defines his own existence (95). Moreover, Lehman maintains, it is his similarity with his opponent that allows the detective to best him: “He has, in order to understand and foil the villain, looked in his own heart and found him” (95). Concluding this chapter, Lehman points out that, “Conan Doyle, trying to kill off his immortal hero, provides the ultimate proof that a truly Great Detective can emerge unscathed from a fight to the finish with his double” (100). Beyond the canon, the dual nature of Holmes and Moriarty has grown to encompass varied and complex implications for them both.

Alan Moore’s steam punk, intertextual foray into Victorian adventure fiction, emphasizing the visual nature of its comic book genre, graphically depicts the professor and the detective so similarly that, as Jonathon E. Goldman observes in his article, “Extraordinary People: The Superhero Genre and the Culture of Celebrity in *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*,” they could pass for twins (148). This physical signification is heightened by their Doyleian

dialogue, much of which has more or less been lifted straight out of “The Final Problem,” and nearly all of which serves to demonstrate their all but identical cognitive capabilities. Though emphasized throughout Moriarty’s flashback explanation of the Reichenbach incident, this striking resemblance is understated in the arc of the main story, which proves otherwise devoid of anything more than wistful allusions to the, presumably, dearly departed detective. In an ironic inversion, Moore allows James to survive when Sherlock, apparently, does not.

“It’s James. Call me James,” Moriarty states in the concluding panel of the fourth serial installment of *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*. He speaks to a colleague—his close second, Campion Bond—a figure who in Moore’s representation supplants Col. Sebastian Moran’s position in the professor’s nefarious circle. Goldman notes that, “Within the narrative, Moore incorporates moments of recognition into the narrative, making the intertextual contexts of the characters essential to the plot” (146). What Goldman implicitly argues here is that this comic relies on intertextuality as exposition; as he goes on to state, “the *League* relies on audience identification of the character’s signification beyond the immediate text” (146). Though Goldman explores this concept primarily in relation to the League’s actual members, it no less functions in regard to Moriarty. Posing as the enigmatic leader of British military intelligence, known only by the monogram “M,” and whom readers are misled to believe to be Mycroft Holmes, Moriarty manipulates the League to his own ends. It is not until the concluding panel in which he insists upon being called by his Christian name that readers are given the clues to determine his actual identity, an identity that will not be confirmed until the Reichenbach flashback that begins the fifth installment.

Moriarty, as he appears in *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*, bears a striking physical resemblance not only to his archetypal adversary, but—even more surprisingly—to his own literary forebear. As Holmes describes to Watson in “The Final Problem,” Moriarty “is extremely tall and thin, his forehead domes out in a wide curve, and his two eyes are deeply sunken in his head. He is clean-shaven, pale, and ascetic-looking, retaining something of the professor in his features. His shoulders are rounded from much study, and his face protrudes forward” (Conan Doyle 720). O’Neill’s comic book illustrations embody this description, right down to the rounded shoulders and protruding face.

Augmenting these features only slightly, for the sake of the graphic genre, O’Neill portrays Moriarty’s head as what Goldman ascribes to being inhumanly large. This itself, although potentially a minor oversight on the part of the artist, when read against Moore’s intertextual intentions, becomes a visual in-joke: during “The Final Problem,” upon appearing, quite suddenly, in Holmes’ sitting room at Baker street, Moriarty remarks to him, “You have less frontal development than I should have expected” (Conan Doyle 721). Thus, O’Neill’s depiction heightens Moriarty’s canonical phrenological crack, by visually implying that the professor’s frontal development outranks that of the Great Detective.

Moriarty is, however, depicted entirely differently in the cinematic adaptation of *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*, one about which Goldman feels it necessary to note, “The adaptation is certainly of the ‘loosely-based’ variety. Moore was famously (and understandably) unhappy with the film” (152). Hiding in plain sight rather than shrouded in mystery, the film’s plot surrounds Moriarty’s identity in layers of deception. Originally introduced as “M,” the figure responsible for calling together the League, intertextual assumptions are used to dupe the less literary, more movie-going audience, intentionally playing on their recognition of Sean Connery—who plays Allan Quartermain, the film’s true protagonist—whose most memorable role remains that of James Bond. But there are other false tells, as well, which continue to conceal M’s identity.

“The Fantom,” a character appearing, at least in this guise, only in the film, is one of the most intriguing alter egos “M” creates for *himself* because, in truth, it is not for himself he has created it, so much as for the League. In a move evocative of George Lucas’ Darth Sidious, Moriarty fashions a false arch-villain for the heroes to chase so that he can further distract them from both his true identity and true purpose. This move is made all the more symbolic by the fact that, unlike in the comics, within the universe of the film, the League does not actually exist, but is a mere ploy through which Moriarty manipulates its members. That is, the professor assembles, or constitutes, his enemies—in quite literal terms they do not exist, at least as a threat, until he does so—thereby reinforcing the concept that villains, at least, must be defined in opposition to the heroes they face, even if it cannot always be said to be true the other way around.

Like the seemingly benevolent “M,” the “Fantom” appears to be an intertextual reference to Gaston Leroux’s character, made more famous by the cinema and the stage. Upon the League’s learning of this supposed nemesis, the viewer’s false assumption concerning his seemingly obvious identity is further goaded by Quartermain’s quip, “How operatic.” The more astute viewer may recognize that—especially due to the evocative spelling—this phantom is more likely modeled on a character from French surrealist literature, one who shows up in later comic book installments of the *League*; however, within the context of the film, this itself is yet another false lead. Early on, Moriarty’s second-in-command verbally slips during a confrontation that has suddenly gone awry once the uninvited American, Sawyer, has shown up and thereby tipped the balance; passionately, Moriarty’s man cries, “Run James!”—potentially enlightening the *League* as to the Fantom’s true identity.

Despite the discrepancies—and there are many—between the comic book and the film, which share little more than a title, since indeed their very plots, as well as many of their characters, are unique—despite these discrepancies, one minor point remains the same. Moriarty’s men, his nearest colleagues, call him by his Christian name, James. In both instances this evokes an unusual aspect of the character: his humanity. Elizabeth A. Trembley in her article, “Holmes is

Where the Heart Is: The Achievement of Granada Television's *Sherlock Holmes* Films," and Fred and Wendy Erisman, in their article, "'Data! Data! Data!' Holmesian Echoes in *Star Trek: The Next Generation*," are among the many who have asserted that even more central to the canon than the mysteries, is the near-mythic friendship between Watson and Holmes. While this is certainly true, it raises interesting implications for the argument of Moriarty as Holmes' double. At that rate—shouldn't the professor have a friend as well?

While being on a first name basis alone fails to confirm friendship, it does constitute a start, especially when you pause to consider how few arch-villains are on such terms with their henchmen. Moreover, despite its many supposed failings, the film does an astounding job of capturing the compassion that Moriarty's second has for him. So, while this certainly isn't the archetypal Holmes-Watson relationship, it does convey a level of intimacy we're not typically used to seeing displayed toward our arch-nemeses. Attractive, even young—despite the post-Reichenbach timeline—the film's Moriarty uniquely reconstitutes traits other on-screen Moriartys have had. Power-hungry, with aspirations of world-domination far exceeding the run of London's underworld, unlike most Moriartys, whose actions and attitudes are often foreshadowed by their appearances, this man remains attractive despite being manipulative and unabashedly evil. In this way, the film's depiction of Moriarty perhaps most realistically embodies the "banality of evil," perhaps explaining why he is one of the only representations of the character to be killed by something so mundane as a bullet.

Unlike his unrecognizable cinematic counterpart, Moore's Moriarty dies much more fantastically, by falling into the sky. As Goldman asserts, "Moriarty is so loath to descend to the level of the crowds that he grasps the cavorite [anti-gravity material] and flies upwards and out of this installment of the story" (148). While Goldman's point emphasizes Moriarty's desire to stand out as an individual, even at the cost of his own life—after the fashion of classic mythological over-reachers such as Icarus and Phaeton—his argument overlooks the fact that Moriarty overreaches merely in an attempt to save his precious anti-gravity material; unwilling to give up his designs, James clings to the Wellsian cavorite with the same sort of psychotic frenzy with which he attacks Holmes at Reichenbach. Sacrificing himself upon the altar of his ambition, rather than that of his vanity, Moriarty stands out not only from the crowd below, but also from the typical arch-villain.

Imagery of the literal fall is also attributed to Disney's Professor Ratigan, in their feature-length animated film *The Great Mouse Detective*, which features characters based on those found in the children's book series *Basil of Baker Street*. An obvious homage to Professor Moriarty, Ratigan is voiced by Vincent Price in what has been famously attributed as having been his favorite role. Virtually no scholarship exists on the film, which is too bad because it is ripe with Sherlockian allusion, as well as an original mystery set in the Holmes style and, indeed, taking place beneath his very nose.

Although cross-cutting is employed to draw similarities between Basil and Ratigan, they are physical opposites of one another: Basil is presented as the mouse equivalent of Sherlock—tall, lean, stoically handsome—whereas Ratigan is large and imposing, aspiring to an aristocratic appearance that cannot conceal the fact that he is, as Basil states, “None other than a slimy, contemptible sewer rat.” Their opposite nature is heightened by their polemical personas—beneath Ratigan’s warm veneer he can barely contain the ruthlessness of his true nature, while, on the other hand, Basil’s own attempts to hide his emotions behind the cool mask of deductive logic are exposed when his compassion blazes forth at critical junctures.

Unlike the *League*’s Moriarty, Professor Ratigan stands alone, falling prey to the classic kid’s-story-conceit that you can always tell who the bad guy is because he’ll kill his own lackeys. Different from both Conan Doyle and Moore’s arch-villains, Ratigan believes himself intellectually superior to—rather than equal with—his great detective foe, just as he believes himself superior to his henchmen; both his arrogance, as well as his overwhelming lack of compassion, make this particular professor incapable of forming friendships. This means that at the critical moment, when he plunges from atop Big Ben in a scene evocative of Reichenbach, Professor Ratigan has no one to save him as Moriarty does in so many representations.

Shortly before his presumed death, driven mad by his inability to best Basil, Ratigan becomes bestial, ripping out of his evening dress in almost Hyde-like imagery before physically assaulting the comparably smaller mouse detective. In this respect, he does, if only metaphorically, mirror Conan Doyle’s original character, who chooses what, in another context, Lehman terms “nihilistic suicide,” rather than accept that all his plots have been laid bare. In a well-scripted reversal, *Star Trek: The Next Generation* (*TNG*) introduces a holographic Moriarty who eventually begins to plot and scheme—first in the name of self-preservation, and later, in the name of another type of self-preservation—in order to prevent himself from going mad.

First appearing in the season two episode, “Elementary, Dear Data,” in which Geordi LaForge misspeaks, instructing the holodeck computer to create an enemy capable of defeating *Data*—not Holmes—the holographic Moriarty takes a hostage in order to obtain a meeting with the captain. By some miracle defying the crew’s understanding of holodeck technology, the holograph is imbued with consciousness, which it must possess in order to meet its mandate of possessing the capability of defeating Lieutenant-Commander *Data*. This creates an interesting paradox, extending beyond the ethical dilemma facing Captain Picard, who in the end resolves it by persuading Moriarty to remain locked in protected memory, stored—and in fact quite literally *saved*—until theoretical physics catches up with the holograph’s condition.

It is this very dilemma that creates an interesting doubling relationship between this Moriarty and *Data*. They are both sentient—both are simultaneously alive, and yet, not quite alive—but they also each possess

something the other lacks. It is understated in the episode itself, and does not seem to have been explored in any of the little scholarship that exists—but the holographic Moriarty is endowed with more than mere consciousness via the computer's act of creation—he can also *feel*. The holograph possesses the emotions Data will grapple with (often due to their absence) throughout the rest of the series, whereas Data himself possesses the physicality—the “realness,” and the ability to leave the holodeck without ceasing to exist—which the hologram so desperately desires.

Because he possesses emotions, the holograph suffers in a way Data cannot. Locked away in the ship's memory bank, Moriarty experiences moments of consciousness; frustrated with his condition, and with the realization that no apparent progress has been made upon resolving it, he returns in the season six episode “Ship in a Bottle,” in which he puts the Enterprise in mortal peril as a means of motivating the crew to find a way of safely exporting himself—as well as his newly created lover—from the holodeck. Going mad from boredom, Moriarty becomes desperate to escape his unfair confinement. Portrayed as perhaps never before, he is no longer, as he explains at the end of the first episode in which he appears, the nefarious criminal he was originally programmed to be; moreover, he acts not out of any desire to rule, to conquer, or to profit, but instead, out of the mere desire for basic human freedoms.

In her article, “Holmes is Where the Heart Is: The Achievement of Granada Television’s *Sherlock Holmes* Films,” Elizabeth A. Trembley invokes a hallucination alluded to in “The Devil’s Foot;” un-described by Conan Doyle, Granada carefully scripted the event, creating a sequence which Trembley applauds for its faithfulness to not only canonical details but to the essence of the characters. In elucidating the hallucination sequence, which reveals Holmes’ own greatest fears, she explains that for him—as for many of us—insanity holds a much greater terror than does physical death (24). If, as she suggests, it is true that this unconscious fear underlies the Holmes canon, it might help to explain why insanity, or its lingering threat, recurs in so many modern representations of Moriarty, for what scares Holmes, will most typically either scare him as well, or instead prove to be what he succumbs to. Thankfully however, “Ship in a Bottle” is resolved without its incarnation of Moriarty being driven mad.

Through the combined insight of Data and Captain Picard, they are able to bring the escapade to a suitable conclusion. As Lehman asserts in discussing the double, “...the detective story relies on deliberate and artful repetition. Notice how Dupin in ‘The Purloined Letter’ foils his foil” (99); in other words, Dupin outwits his opponent by—without alerting him to the fact he is on to him—using the opponent’s own scheme against him. This is precisely what Picard and Data do to Moriarty; but, because theirs is a benevolent universe, this turns out to be for the best. Since they cannot give the holograph the physical escape he desires, they instead provide him with the illusion of such an escape, locking him in a data storage device filled with enough active memory to keep both he and his lover occupied for the rest of their lives. The episode concludes with a meta-

fictional in-joke as to the nature of perceived reality; “After all,” Picard acknowledges, “we too may very well exist only in a box sitting upon a table in someone’s home.” It is an appropriate ending to an episode caught up in so many competing realities it can give *Inception* a run for its money. That Moriarty is the author of the episode’s initial events, speaks implicit volumes about his significance to the numerous and richly varied popular culture realities that could not exist without the character, in one form or another. It likewise hearkens to an observation Goldman makes regarding Wells’ invisible man, but one which can be applied to all fictional characters, and among them Moriarty: “...it is the character’s fame and not the author’s which transcends the text, name change be damned” (151). Whether he is a man, a holograph, or a mad sewer rat—he will always be Moriarty. The multiple nature of reality—especially of popular reality—is embraced, even if unintentionally, by this episode’s own interpretation of existence, which simultaneously encompasses complementary smaller and larger realities.

In the episode, “Kif Gets Knocked Up a Notch,” during a brief non-sequitur sketch, the television series *Futurama* parodies, in one go, this episode as well as several from *Star Trek: The Original Series*. When two lovers, Amy and Kif, enter the “holo-shed”—an obvious mockery of the holodeck from *TNG*—Kif, earnestly, professes, “It can simulate anything you want and nothing can hurt you, except when it malfunctions and the characters become real.” Off-handedly, Amy replies, “That probably won’t happen this time,” and they proceed with their date. Of course, the holo-shed does eventually malfunction, and when it does, Professor Moriarty—appropriately old, yet wearing uncharacteristic white—arrives leading Attila the Hun, Jack the Ripper, and Evil Lincoln, instructing them, “Righto gents it’s another simulation gone mad so standard procedure: murder and mayhem.” The holographic culprits are, through a comedic twist of events, capable of leaving the holo-shed, and afterward, get sucked out into space, thus resolving the non-sequitur.

Although funny, even this brief sketch touches upon the idea of madness, as it relates not only to multiple realities but also, directly, to Professor Moriarty. Depicted in *Futurama* as an outlandish arch-villain, the creators are most likely satirizing the do-no-wrong Roddenberry-esq universe created by *TNG* rather than anything having more directly to do with Moriarty. Nonetheless, their implicit assertion, that evil holographs will not overcome their programming, actually echoes Holmes’ own, when he indicates that Moriarty, despite his breeding, retains a criminal streak somewhere in his bloodline, responsible for keeping him from retaining his respectability. However, the allusion is almost certainly un-intentional, since the gag is most likely meant as some combination of in-joke, homage, and satire, as evidenced by the emphasis upon the absurdity of continuing to use the holo-shed even though it consistently malfunctions; heightening this emphasis, the ship’s captain (himself an over-the-top parody of Captain Kirk), concludes the crisis only to announce, “I need some relaxation after that—I’ll be in the holo-shed.”

Whether on the page or on the screen, in 1890s London or in twenty-fourth century space, whether a man, holograph, or hulking sewer rat—Moriarty transcends Conan Doyle's original creation. It's time the scholarship caught up. The sheer volume of Sherlockiana is overwhelming, and yet, very little appears to have been written about the Great Detective's arch-nemesis—especially as he appears beyond the confines of the canon. Despite his almost absence from the original stories, Professor James Moriarty continues to define—and to redefine—not only Mr. Sherlock Holmes, but the entire landscape of the popular imagination as well.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Sarah Pawlak

Works Cited

- "Elementary, Dear Data." *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. Writ. Brian Alan Lane. Dir. Rob Bowman. 1988. Web.
- Erisman, Fred and Wendy. "'Data! Data! Data!': Holmesian Echoes in *Star Trek: The Next Generation*." *Sherlock Holmes: Victorian Sleuth to Modern Hero*. London: The Scarecrow Press, 1996. Print.
- Goldman Jonathon E. "Extraordinary People: The Superhero Genre and Celebrity Culture in The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen." *The Rise and Reason of Comics and Graphic Literature: Critical Essays on the Form*. Ed. Joyce Goggin and Dan Hassler-Forest. North Carolina: MacFarland, 2010. Print.
- Harmon, Jim. "Sherlock Holmes." *Radio Mystery and Adventure and Its Appearances in Film, Television, and Other Media*. North Carolina: McFarland, 1992. Print.
- Jeffers, H. Paul. *Bloody Business: An Anecdotal History of Scotland Yard*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1992. Print.
- "Kif Gets Knocked Up a Notch." *Futurama*. Writ. Bill Odenkirk. Dir. Wes Archer. 2003. Web.
- Klinger, Leslie S. "The Final Problem." *The New Annotated Sherlock Holmes*. Vol. I. New York: Norton, 2005. Print.
- Lehman, David. "Chapter 9: The Double." *The Perfect Murder: A Study in Detection*. Ann Arbor : The University of Michigan Press, 2011. Print.
- Moore, Alan. *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*. Vol. 1. La Jolla: Vertigo, 2000. Print.
- Morrell, Jessica Page. *Bullies, Bastards, & Bitches: How to Write the Bad Guys of Fiction*. Cincinnati: Writer's Digest Books, 2008. Print.
- "Ship in a Bottle." *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. Writ. Renée Echevarria. Dir. Alexander Singer. 1993. Web.
- The Great Mouse Detective*. Writ. Peter Young et al. Dir. Ron Clements et al. Disney, 1986. VHS.
- The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*. Dir. Stephen Norrington. Perf. Sean Connery. 20th Century Fox, 2003. DVD.
- Trembley, Elizabeth A. "Holmes is Where the Heart Is: The Achievement of Granada Television's Sherlock Holmes Films." *It's a Print! Detective Fiction From Page to Screen*. Ed. Reynolds and Trembley. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1994. Print.

Mirror. Mirror: Gender and Beauty in the *Twilight Series*

In Stephenie Meyer's wildly popular *Twilight* series (2005-2008), Bella Swan and Edward Cullen are in love. The problem is that Bella is a human and Edward is a vampire who thirsts for her blood. Rather than giving into this hunger, Edward controls himself so that he and Bella can be together; in doing so, he represents a domesticated, or self-controlled, vampire. Domesticity does not only apply to vampires in the *Twilight* series; instead, Meyer confines females, particularly Bella, to traditional female roles. In doing so, the series represents an overwhelming backlash against the struggle of feminism. The change in vampire bodies throughout vampire texts marks a change in attitudes towards women's bodies, from the sexually repressed female of the Victorian era seen in *Dracula* and *Carmilla* to empowered, contemporary females shown in modern works such as *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Yet in *Twilight*, the female is not shown as empowered, but rather a regressive figure akin to the Victorian ideal of womanhood, creating a backlash against the empowered feminist ideal.

Bella Swan, the main character of the *Twilight* series, symbolizes that backlash. Unlike Buffy whose heroine is a strong, empowered female, the heroine in *Twilight* is weak and dependent on men to give her value. In *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, Buffy demonstrates female autonomy in a male-dominated society, empowering not only herself but others. In *Twilight*, however, Bella illustrates female submission in a male dominated world; disempowering herself and symbolically disempowering women. The series does so by having Bella view herself in a negative light as well as through the largely domesticated nature of the vampires. Whereas previous vampire works depicted vampires as threats and outsiders to society, *Twilight* depicts vampire characters as accepted in society, integrating their lives into mainstream society; as such, they highlight modern society's fascination with physical appearance and the ideal of female beauty.

Bella has been at the center of an argument about the role of feminism in today's society given her submissive nature. As Bonnie Mann states in her essay, "When Bella falls in love, then, a girl in love is all she is. By page 139, she has concluded that her mundane life is a small price to pay for the gift of being with Edward, and by the second book she's willing to trade her soul for that privilege" (133). Bella sacrifices herself, "her mundane life" to be with Edward; in doing so, her actions embody Victorian values of female sacrifice for men. By being more focused on being with Edward, Bella is unable to focus on developing herself. Mann comments:

Other than her penchant for self-sacrifice and the capacity to attract the attention of boys, Bella isn't really anyone special. She has no identifiable interests or talents; she is incompetent in the face of almost every challenge. She is the locus of exaggerated stereotypically feminine incapacities and self-loathing. She has no sense of direction or balance. She is prone to get bruises and scrapes just in the process of moving from one place to another and doesn't even trust herself to explore a tide pool without falling in. When she needs something done, especially mechanical, she finds a boy to do it and watches him. (133)

Typically, men watch women, objectifying the female in viewing them as a solely sexual object. In *Twilight*, however, Bella takes on the gaze through her first person narrative where she constantly watches Edward. While this might appear empowering to have a female character assume the gaze, it is not. Mann cites feminist philosopher Simone de Beauvoir's argument about the masculine gaze, saying that "when the young girl internalizes and assumes the masculine gaze, de Beauvoir said, she takes up a perspective on herself as prey. As in the fairy tales, she becomes 'an idol,' a 'fascinating treasure,' 'a marvelous fetish,' sought after by men" (136).

The *Twilight* series does have a fairy-tale like quality with Bella as a damsel-in-distress. Like a fairy-tale, Bella has a handsome prince to fantasize about. In particular, Bella is fascinated by Edward's physical appearance which is similar to the other vampires in the series. The vampires' physical beauty is so stressed that it is the first characteristic the narrator Bella observes:

I stared because their faces, so different, so similar, were all devastatingly, inhumanly beautiful. They were faces you never expected to see except perhaps on the airbrushed pages of a fashion magazine. Or painted by an old master as the face of an angel. It was hard to decide who was the most beautiful – maybe the perfect blond girl, or the bronze-haired boy.
(*Twilight* 19)

The comparison to "airbrushed pages of a fashion magazine" and a painted "face of an angel" elevates the vampire beauty to a humanly unachievable ideal Bella compares herself to. Just as the pictures in fashion magazines are airbrushed to eliminate any flaws, the vampires have no aesthetic flaws as well. That the vampires appear "so different" and yet also "so similar" implies that while each one has their own individual beauty, this creates a uniform beauty among the group.

The beautiful vampires are the products of the vampire transformation, where their imperfect human body is turned into a "perfect" vampire one. Instead of blood being the cause of the transformation, it is vampire venom

which turns humans into vampires. When venom hits the bloodstream, it triggers the transformation process. Bella describes the venom as a “scalding pain” and a “fire” that does not stop (*Twilight* 454). The venom erases the human blemishes, flaws, and imperfections, so that the person is essentially born anew as a vampire. The skin, which is prone to aging and wrinkles, becomes frozen in time and sparkles in the sun “like thousands of tiny diamonds” are “embedded in the surface” (*Twilight* 260). Bella observes this in Edward, who she further states is “a perfect statue, carved in some unknown stone, smooth like marble, glittering like crystal” (*Twilight* 260). Edward’s description as “a perfect statue” with skin “smooth like marble...perfect texture, satin smooth” is similar to a person that has undergone Botox, where their skin becomes smooth and frozen, like a statue (*Twilight* 260).

While Edward’s vampire skin is beautiful because it is unnatural, Bella’s attractiveness stems from her scent, heightening the desire for the taste of her blood. Edward tells Bella, “you are *exactly* my brand of heroin,” emphasizing the allure her blood has for him (*Twilight* 268). Bella’s blood further contributes to the sensuality of the novels because her blood manifests itself as a scent which in return brings Edward physically closer to Bella by arousing his senses. Bella often says how she can “feel his nose sliding along my jaw, inhaling,” to which Edward responds, “Just because I’m resisting the wine doesn’t mean I can’t appreciate the bouquet [...] You have a very floral smell, like lavender...or freesia...it’s mouthwatering” (*Twilight* 306). Edward’s explanation that he is “resisting the wine” not only means he is resisting the desire to drink her blood, but also to express his sexual desire. Edward tells Bella that “on the one hand, [there is] the hunger—the thirst—that, deplorable creature that I am, I feel for you...But...there are other hungers” (*Twilight* 277-78). Among the “other hungers” he is referring to is his sexual attraction to Bella. He resists giving into his sexual desire because to give in to his desire would mean a loss of “control of his need” (*Twilight* 282). He has such a need to be in control of himself that he and Bella have a “standard of careful non-contact,” where they are careful not to get too physically passionate (*Twilight* 283). This caution can be seen in their first kiss as Bella describes:

His cold, marble lips pressed very softly against mine.

Blood boiled under my skin, burned in my lips. My breath came in a wild gasp. My fingers knotted in his hair, clutching him to me. My lips parted as I breathed in his heady scent.

Immediately I felt him turn to unresponsive stone beneath my lips. His hands gently, but with irresistible force, pushed my face back [...]

He laughed aloud. ‘I’m stronger than I thought. It’s nice to know.’

‘I wish I could say the same. I’m sorry.’ [...]

I kept my eyes on his, watched as the excitement in them faded and gentled.

(*Twilight* 282-83)

Bella's reference to her blood as it boils under her skin and burns in her lips, a vaginal symbol, alludes to her sexual desire. Bella's use of "wild" conveys her passion as raw and untamed. Edward's response, turning to "unresponsive stone," cools Bella's desire and defers the sexual moment. Bella notes this by saying that she "watched as the excitement [...] faded and gentled." Edward and Bella's sexual desire is restrained; for Edward, this restraint illustrates his self-control whereas for Bella, it represses her sexuality.

For Bella, it is difficult for her to understand why someone as "perfect" as Edward would love her. She tells Edward: "I'm absolutely ordinary—well, except for bad things like all the near-death experiences and being so clumsy that I'm almost disabled" (*Twilight* 210). Bella devalues herself, highlighting a physically negative attribute—clumsiness—as her only distinctive quality. Debra Gimlin explains the relationship between the physical body and the internal self in her book *Body Work*, stating that, "the body is fundamental to the self because it serves to indicate who an individual is internally, what habits the person has, and even what social value the person merits" (3). Unlike Buffy, Bella is internally "disabled", needing romantic relationships to give her value. When Bella is not involved in a relationship, she loses self-value; as a result, Bella devalues her physical body by engaging in risky behavior. For instance, in *New Moon*, after Edward leaves her, Bella decides "to be as reckless as" she can "possibly manage in Forks" (147). She finds that as she engages in risky behaviors, she hears Edward's voice warning and berating her. Although she is physically endangering herself, she is so amazed by the "sheer beauty" that she decides she can't "allow [her] memory to lose it, no matter the price" (186). This price she is willing to pay is her own life, as her final risky act is jumping off of a cliff into the water below:

I knew that this was the stupidest, most reckless thing I had done yet. The thought made me smile. The pain was already easing, as if my body knew that Edward's voice was just seconds away [...]

'Don't do this,' he pleaded.

You wanted me to be human, I reminded him. *Well, watch me...you won't stay with me any other way [...]*

I didn't want to fight anymore. And it wasn't the lightheadedness, or the cold, or the failure of my arms as the muscles gave out in exhaustion, that made me content to stay where I was. I was almost

happy it was over. This was an easier death than others I'd faced. Oddly peaceful [...]

I saw him, and I had no will to fight... My subconscious had stored Edward away in flawless detail, saving him for this final moment. I could see his perfect face as if he were really there; the exact shade of his icy skin, the shape of his lips, the line of his jaw, the gold tinting in his furious eyes [...]

Why would I fight when I was so happy where I was? Even as my lungs burned for more air and my legs cramped in the icy water, I was content. I'd forgotten what real happiness felt like. (357-361)

Bella values Edward, "his perfect face" and "flawless detail," so much that she is willing to literally die to be with him. The juxtaposition of "real happiness" with the description of her drowning suggests that for Bella, "real happiness" is masochism. Yet just as the Edward she sees here is not real, neither is her happiness; it is just a temporary relief from her emotional pain. According to Gimlin, "What women look like becomes symbolic of their characters—indeed, of their very selves" (4). After Edward leaves, Bella feels "lifeless" inside; as a result, she intends to make her physical body "lifeless" as well (95). Bella believes that by endangering herself, she is proving her love for Edward by demonstrating the extremes she is willing to go to be with him and thus feel special. She tells him "*you won't stay with me any other way*," meaning that she is so desperate to be with him, she is willing to kill herself even though he has left her.

Bella is desperate to be with Edward because he tells her she is special. Although Bella has a hard time believing she is anything but ordinary, Edward tells Bella, "you are the opposite of ordinary" and "you are my life now" (*Twilight* 314). Despite these reassurances from Edward, Bella still feels insecure about her value to Edward. Her insecurity stems from the fact that as a vampire, Edward will never grow old, but as a human, Bella will. Her anxiety about aging is expressed on her eighteenth birthday when she wakes up from a nightmare:

It had hit, it was even worse than I'd feared it would be. I could feel it—I was older. Every day I got older, but this was different, worse, quantifiable. I was eighteen.

And Edward never would be.

I was almost surprised that the face in the mirror hadn't changed. I stared at myself, looking for some sign of impending wrinkles in my ivory skin. The only creases were the ones on my forehead.

It was just a dream, I reminded myself again. Just a dream...but also my worst nightmare. (New Moon 7)

For an eighteen year old to have this fear of aging is ludicrous and troubling. Yet for Bella, who has the ideal vampire beauty to compare herself to, aging is a concern. While there are no “impending wrinkles” on her “ivory skin” now, she fears that soon she will resemble her appearance in the nightmare and be “ancient, creased, and withered” (6). Her fear of looking “ancient, creased, and withered” reflects her deeper concerns that as she ages, her value will decrease because Edward will no longer love and desire her. The “impending wrinkles” on her skin she worries about not only symbolize a decline in beauty, but also a decline in value. That she will become “ancient” implies that she will be of no use to the eternal vampires who suggest a continuity of life. Eventually, she will be “withered” and have no aesthetic appeal. Naomi Wolf comments on the relationship between beauty and social value in her book *The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty Are Used Against Women*, saying that “without ‘beauty’” women slide “into nothingness and disintegration;” similarly, Bella feels that “without ‘beauty’” she too will descend into “nothingness and disintegration” because Edward will not be attracted to her (230). Bella understands that “to someone in the know” about the immortal vampires, growing old does not conform to the “devastatingly, inhumanly, beautiful” ideal the vampires embody (*Twilight* 19). She feels that staying human, aging, will endanger her future with Edward because Edward will not be attracted to her as her looks fade. As she says, “If I could be sure of the future I wanted, sure that I would get to spend forever with Edward, and Alice and the rest of the Cullens (preferably not as a wrinkled old lady) . . . then a year or two one direction or the other wouldn’t matter to me so much. But Edward was dead set against any future that changed me. Any future that made me like him—that made me immortal, too” (*New Moon* 10). Being human and aging do not ensure a future; it ensures losing value in society as an old woman. Being a vampire means having a future and more importantly, value.

Bella’s yearning to become a vampire implies a desire to be beautiful and have value. Her desire for the unnatural vampire beauty can be compared to women who choose cosmetic surgery not only to enhance their physical appearance, but also to enhance their lifestyles by increasing their self-value. Wolf states that “Women choose surgery when we are convinced we cannot be who we really are without it [...] Women’s fears of loss of identity are legitimate. We ‘choose’ a little death over what is portrayed as an unlivable life, we ‘choose’ to die a bit in order to be born again” (258-59). Bella chooses to become a vampire because she can not live without Edward just as women choose surgery because they feel they cannot be themselves without it. Bella chooses “a little death” so as to avoid “an unlivable life” without Edward. To live without Edward, just as to live without surgery, would mean a loss of identity for Bella. She reflects on this idea when Edward temporarily leaves her in *New Moon*, “It was depressing to realize that I wasn’t the heroine anymore,

that my story was over" (106). To not be a vampire would mean she would not truly have value.

Modern society's fascination with the ideal of female beauty is what Wolf terms the "Iron Maiden" (17). Wolf defines the Iron Maiden as "the modern hallucination in which women are trapped or trap themselves (that) is [...] rigid, cruel, and euphemistically painted. Contemporary culture directs attention to imagery of the Iron Maiden, while censoring real women's faces and bodies" (17). The Iron Maiden produces a beauty backlash that "is spread and reinforced by the cycles of self-hatred provoked in women by the advertisements, photo features, and beauty copy in the glossaries" of magazines (73). While Bella does not have magazines to compare herself to, she does have the vampire beauty which she compares to "the airbrushed pages of a fashion magazine" (*Twilight* 19). As a result, Bella has a self-hatred for her human body, which she views as so clumsy that it makes her "almost disabled" (*Twilight* 210).

Just as the Iron Maiden traps women in an ideal of perfect, inhuman beauty, so too does being a vampire trap women in a perfect, inhumanly beautiful body. While the vampire body is perfect, the body comes at a price: a lack of choice. As Rosalie tells Bella, "once it's done, it can't be undone" meaning that once Bella is turned into a vampire, she can never go back to being human (*Eclipse* 167). Rosalie emphasizes the importance of this to Bella in telling her own past as a human. While Bella thinks that becoming a vampire means a happy ending, Rosalie has a different view, saying that "if we had happy endings, we'd all be under gravestones now" (*Eclipse* 154). Being a vampire does not imply a happy ending to Rosalie, but rather, being human implies happiness. To be human is to have a choice in life whereas being a vampire means being entrapped in an eternal body and yet without eternal possibilities. Rosalie exclaims to Bella:

'You already have *everything*. You have a whole life ahead of you—*everything* I want. And you're going to just throw it away. Can't you see that I'd trade *everything* I have to be you? You have the choice that I didn't have, and you're choosing *wrong!*' (*Eclipse* 166)

Rosalie is trapped in the body of a vampire, the ideal beauty; as such, she is trapped in the vampire version of the Iron Maiden, an ideal of perfect beauty. "The real problem is our lack of choice," Wolf writes; similarly, the real problem with being a vampire is the lack of choice as well. While vampires have an eternity ahead of them, it is not a true life marked with experiences and aging; rather, it is a monotonous life that restricts individuals to limited roles: the high school student, the doctor, the housewife.

Rosalie is the most appropriate character to advise Bella regarding the seriousness of becoming a vampire. Rosalie is "the incarnation of pure beauty," the most beautiful Cullen (*Twilight* 304). Even as a human, Rosalie was blessed with a beautiful appearance. She explains: "I was thrilled to be me, to be Rosalie

Hale. Pleased that men's eyes watched me everywhere I went, from the year I turned twelve. Delighted that my girlfriends sighed with envy when they touched my hair" (*Eclipse* 155). While beauty was important to Rosalie as a human, so too was something else. She explains: "I yearned for my own little baby. I wanted my own house and a husband who would kiss me when he got home from work" (*Eclipse* 156). While Meyer's emphasis on Rosalie as an example of the beauty myth and the male gaze might seem like a critique of misogynist practices, Meyer ultimately recedes into a conservative view of women's roles in Rosalie's desire for the traditional female roles of wife and mother.

Rosalie's vision never became real; instead, she was turned into a vampire. When she first sees her vampire reflection, she is relieved to see that she is still beautiful. Yet she soon realizes the serious ramifications of being a vampire:

'It took some time before I began to blame the beauty for what had happened to me—for me to see the curse of it. To wish that I had been...well, not ugly, but normal [...] So I could have been allowed to marry someone who loved *me*, and have pretty babies. That's what I'd really wanted, all along. It still doesn't seem like too much to have asked for.' (*Eclipse* 162)

Rosalie blames her being a vampire on beauty. Carlisle turned Rosalie into a vampire, saying that "It was too much waste. I couldn't leave her" (*Eclipse* 161). To let Rosalie die would have been a "waste" of beauty, of value. Rosalie feels vampire beauty is a "curse," a vampire version of the Iron Maiden; here, the Maiden traps Rosalie into a beautiful body, making her conform to a life she did not choose. She would trade everything to be Bella, to be "normal" instead of "the most beautiful thing (she's) ever seen" (*Eclipse* 162).

Rosalie's conversation with Bella, highlighting the severe implications of becoming a vampire and achieving the beauty ideal, serves as a warning in the novels that beauty comes with a steep price: a lack of choice. Rosalie's background highlights Wolf's main argument that society's message is "that a woman should live hungry, die young, and leave a pretty corpse" (231). Wolf says that the problem with cosmetics is "our lack of choice...the problem with cosmetics exists only when women feel invisible or inadequate without them" (231). This argument is illustrated in Rosalie's warning to Bella that the problem with being a vampire is the lack of choice in lifestyle. While Rosalie's warning is important in stressing a feminist argument, Bella unfortunately feels that not being a vampire would make her feel the way women without cosmetics can feel: "invisible or inadequate" (231). Bella choosing to become a vampire reveals Meyer's feminist stance as hollow and conservative. Bella tells Edward that "it just seems logical...a man and woman have to be somewhat equal...as in, one of them can't always be swooping in and saving the other one. They have to save each other *equally* [...] I can't always be Lois Lane [...] I want to

be Superman, too" (*Twilight* 474). Bella feels that staying human implies a type of inequality, or inadequacy, since she is powerless; she remains Lois Lane while Edward, with all his vampire powers, gets to be Superman.

Bella, however, does not end up as Superman in the end, but rather a domesticated female vampire in her role as wife and mother. She marries Edward and soon afterwards becomes pregnant with a half-human, half-vampire baby. Only after Bella gives birth to the baby, and thus solidifies her domestic role, does Edward turn her into a vampire. The birth scene is described:

It was a blood-curdling shriek of agony. The horrifying sound cut off with a gurgle, and her eyes rolled back into her head. Her body twitched, arched in Rosalie's arms, and then Bella vomited a fountain of blood.

Bella's body, streaming with red, started to twitch, jerking around in Rosalie's arms like she was electrocuted. All the while, her face was blank—unconscious. It was the wild thrashing from inside the center of her body that moved her. As she convulsed, sharp snaps and cracks kept time with the spasms [...]

In the bright light, Bella's skin seemed more purple and black than it was white. Deep red was seeping beneath the skin over the huge, shuddering bulge of her stomach [...]

Her legs, which had been curled up in agony, now went limp, sprawling out in an unnatural way. (*Breaking Dawn* 347-351)

The description of Bella's thrashing body "streaming with red" is similar to the description of Lucy's body when she is staked by Arthur in *Dracula*. Both bodies highlight male dominance over females; here, Edward's choice to turn Bella into a vampire after she has suffered through this horrific scene emphasizes his control (here over her body). Bella is experiencing the "sharp snaps and cracks" as she fully transitions to her role as mother, cementing her identity as domesticated female. As Jacob states, "She'd willingly sacrificed herself to be torn apart by that monster's young," (*Breaking Dawn* 356). Although the "monster" Jacob refers to is Edward, the larger monster at work is this backlash against feminism, where the "heroine" of the story is domesticated and oppressed as the male controls the female.

By making Bella a vampire Meyer not only immortalizes Bella, but symbolically immortalizes the backlash against feminism presented in the novels. Unlike *Buffy* where females are shown as free and unchained, emphasizing feminism, *Twilight* creates a backlash against feminism, showing Bella as a chained, domesticated female. At the end of the series, Bella says, "And then we continued blissfully into this small but perfect piece of our forever" (*Breaking Dawn* 754). Her statement about her future with Edward is similar to the fairy-tale ending, of "then they lived happily ever after" as she can

literally live forever with Edward. Meyer's fairy-tale like ending is not, however, a happy ending for females; instead, it is a throwback to Victorian ideals of female submission and domesticity. Today, this female ideal is beyond outdated—and yet one that will not die.

Independent Scholar

Lauren Rocha

Works Cited

- Gimlin, Debra L. *Body Work: Beauty and Self-Image in American Culture*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2002. Print.
- Mann, Bonnie. "Vampire Love: The Second Sex Negotiates the Twenty-first Century." *Twilight and Philosophy: Vampires, Vegetarians, and the Pursuit of Immortality*. Eds. William Irwin, Rebecca Housel, and J J. Wisnewski. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2009: 131-46. Print.
- Meyer, Stephenie. *Breaking Dawn*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company, 2008. Print.
- . *Eclipse*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company, 2007. Print.
- . *New Moon*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company, 2006. Print.
- . *Twilight*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company, 2005. Print.
- Wolf, Naomi. *The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty Are Used Against Women*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial, 2002. Print.

To My Sons: On Being a Writer in the Twenty-First Century: *The Crosscut Literary Award, 1968*

To try and explain, Joey and Anton, both now in your twenties and still “my boys,” how recalling a small event in my life when I was your age had an everlasting impact on my life . . . well, I guess that’s why I’m a writer and words usually fail me. I guess too that that’s why you Joey, with the keen mind and sensitivity of a writer, imploring me to do something else in my lifetime, never write down anything that’s personal, and maybe too why you Anton, with your anger pulling at your deep love for the world, call me from the university and read me your poems.

There was a time, when I was just twenty or so, when I loved poetry more than anything else in the world -- although I loved June, your mother, who came for one year to Wisconsin when I transferred there from a junior college in my hometown (she went back to get her degree in my senior year -- the year I am writing about.) and I loved riding my motorcycle too, my green and cream Triumph 500, which I had packed and shipped to me from the east coast that year. My father had died two years earlier, and I know those words fail me, because I’ve tried but can’t quite express how much I loved and missed him, with his warmth and intelligence, his disappointment with his own life as a shoe factory worker, and his kindness that was, along with his smile, a thing of beauty.

I chose Wisconsin University’s branch in Superior, despite its penetrating cold weather, because someone, I don’t remember who, said the English department there hired some writers from the University of Iowa’s graduate writing program. The other reason was that the school did not charge extra for out-of-state students, so despite the fact that I had little money and was living with my mother in upstate New York, who also worked in a shoe factory, I could afford it. I mention these details, sons, because I want you to know that even at that young age, there were important decisions to be made, and no one was there to make them for me -- or for your mother, who became pregnant by me the year earlier, and together, without anyone knowing it, made plans for her to go to Philadelphia to a Catholic home for unwed mothers to have the baby safely and have our little girl (we named her Jill) adopted by a family. Oh, I know, I’m losing my focus here -- this is a story about winning a college literary award -- but there are some details that just have to emerge over the years if you really want to tell a story someday, so, yes, you boys have a sister somewhere, and she’s about ten years older than you, and yes, I think about her often.

George Gott and Phil Gallo were the poets at the Wisconsin college, and there were a couple of other fiction writers there too, but it was George and Phil

that I got to know and work under. Either every day or every other day not only would I show them something I was writing, but after awhile they would show me their poems as well. We'd meet for coffee in late afternoons in the cafeteria when no one else was around, or we'd meet for beers at one of the local bars early in the evening, and we'd talk about life and literature knowing for us, in our world of words, however they served us, there was no separating them. George was older than Phil, and he was my mentor, teaching me both the care for language and the need to clarify ideas. He questioned everything, and when I questioned why he wore nice suits to all his classes, he told me that the frat students, sitting in the back and not listening to anything he said, appreciated the nice clothing...and that as an educator he felt he needed to give something to every student, and that's how he impressed them. Like many things George said, there was something wise underneath the humor, and I learned from it, especially as an educator. Phil introduced me to the poet James Wright, and I remember my afternoon trip to the library when I took Wright's books *The Branch Will Not Break* and *Shall We Gather At The River* off the shelf and read them, and felt my life change forever. Phil's poems too were music, and he taught me the power of the deep image as well. I saw him again years later, his unique Greek chiseled face with all that black hair, on the cover of a *Parade Magazine* that's inserted in Sunday newspapers; it was the annual "salaries" issue and under his photo were the words "printer, \$22,000 a year." I'm not surprised, Anton, as you will find out if you keep writing serious literature, that Phil's talent did not lead somewhere in the literary world of this consumer culture in America; in fact, Anton, that's the norm. Recently, another poet I know who's spent his life writing charming, clever poems void of ideas and insights, won the Pulitzer Prize. It is often the case that we reward artists whose work never requires more than a shift in an easy chair to relieve the pressure on the tailbone, work utterly forgettable, and comfortable enough to read to a group of Christian Republicans. And those writers who passionately investigate issues and challenge the status quo, no matter how lyrically, whose work leads to some illumination or epiphany, aren't really welcome in the appeasing world of literary politics. My best work, Anton, such as the book-length poem about the golden age of the human species passing because there is a force greater than humanity that drives us, goes unpublished, sitting on the shelf, collecting dust until I too become the dust on it. Okay, one for you Joey. Your cynicism is well-noted. The serious writer is always a threat, hardly ever a factor. I remember when I won *The Shaughnessy Prize* from The Modern Language Association for outstanding book of the year on language, literature, and the teaching of writing, and you asked "how much did the award pay?" When I told you five hundred dollars, and showed you my royalty check from Duke University Press for \$47.50, you smiled and handed me the car insurance bill. Don't be smug, Joey; these honors mean something. But it's another honor, another award, years earlier I want to write about. So let me begin.

Back to Wisconsin. Sharing poems over coffee with George and Phil on a cold Spring afternoon under the grey skies of Superior, a city whose population had declined steadily since the beginning of the century. It was that afternoon that they told me that I was invited to read poems with them during Faculty Week at the college -- the first time a student was ever asked to take part in the festivities. I was thrilled of course. It had been a great year for me. I started publishing poems in places like *The Minnesota Review* and *Carleton Miscellany*, and a couple of other significant literary magazines. I had straight A's and was on the Dean's List. I had accepted a fellowship for the graduate writing program at Syracuse University (from where you, Anton, call me and read your poems!), complete tuition for the entire degree and a generous stipend for just writing poetry. I had received a fellowship from Columbia University's writing program as well, and a modest scholarship from Iowa's Writing Workshop along with a personal note from poet Paul Engle who said if I came there he'd provide me with an additional stipend for working with the fine printing press he ran there.

I'm not sure what's changed over the years, but when I think about the power of poetry in our times compared to the culture of the sixties and seventies, I sense a difference. I'm talking about the written word, the single distinctive collection, the poet whose work takes the reader deep within the reflective moment where people become one another, where language cannot be overwhelmed by personality, or celebrity posturing, or sensational event, or nostalgia, or romantic cliché. "It's rap," says Joey, "or slams...get with it Dad, open your eyes." I open them, but even then a line of a new poem I am writing appears in them, and the voice speaks then as well...*close your eyes and take a good look at me.*

"He's right, Dad," adds Anton, though his words settle on the page like pebbles in the sand. A day earlier he had read a poem he's written about me, perhaps for me. It began with the lines, "*I thought you had something to give me, offer me, like a belief or two.*" I almost stopped right there, not sure I wanted to hear more. Those two first lines already hit me, because, yes, I thought I had something to give, as a father, as a writer, as a teacher. I always thought I told a story, like this one, to make some point, or clarify some insight, to someone else or myself. These first lines did their job -- I listened as Anton continued with his poem.

His poem documented my separation from his mother (June), and my trip to San Diego to take a teaching position, leaving him with his mother (Joey came with me). In one of my early books of poetry I have a section called "Guttural Lyrics," and I firmly believed then, and still do, that there comes a moment in a poem when nothing seems appropriate except a sigh or an exasperation, a straight-forward utterance that puts all that poetic language into perspective. In one poem from that section of the book, a poem called *Relationship*, where I describe love as two people being tied up with ropes -- "when we stumble to the ground bound by our desires to contain ourselves..." -- I seemed to have sensed

early on the failure of words to convey the immediate, perhaps like Joey does. I write at the end of the poem, after being tied up and asking for the gags:

*Then, muffled, incoherent,
the poems will come forth;
and we'll repeat it. Louder,
more private than before.

And between the two of us
struggling toward each other
that guttural lyric will become
all the belief and desperation we were
unable, ever, to put into words.*

I know now, as I listen to Anton's poems, there is something of me in him. In his description of me leaving home, he writes "It was your choice, god-damned irresponsible asshole." And along with his guttural outburst, the lyrical lines "the wind blows west, and blows back nothing, my resentment calmed in the cool." I picture Joey sitting there, saying nothing, knowing everything. Anton ends his poem with the lines "I learned from your mistakes, and I'll always love you for it."

Perhaps I am trying to say that it is the impact of literature, a short poem, or a novel, that should remain constant -- something that makes a difference in our lives not only for the moment, but for the long subconscious haul as well. What stayed with me, going back to my final year in Wisconsin, when poetry seemed to be everything, were the moments when writing and sharing words had a purpose and made sense. I won the literary award from the university student literary magazine that year, *The Crosscut Literary Prize*. To tell the truth, I don't remember the poems I published in the magazine to win the award; I do remember thinking that a sophomore at the time, some kid named Scott something or other, was a better poet than I was, and probably deserved the award. But even then the system was in force, and I've seen it happen over and over with significant awards for writers throughout the years -- and I was the right person, did the right things, made myself sound confident and self-important, and the award came my way. But when I close my eyes to remember the event (...*and take a good look at myself*), I see the thing that gives this "literary moment" its true meaning: *a blue and red, button-down, paisley shirt!*

During the week I won the award George Gott and his wife Dorothy invited me over for dinner. Before dinner George handed me an envelope which contained the official certificate for the award with my name written beautifully across it. Then he handed me a brown paper bag tied with a red bow. He told me in his kind and humorous way that usually the award didn't come with anything,

but this time was an exception. Inside the bag was a shirt -- a kind of bright blue with this strange red design repeated all over the shirt. It was one of the worst looking shirts I had ever seen. But of course, Joey, Anton (excuse this syntax change -- this is both to you and for others), that's just it. It was the gesture, the meaning behind it. It was the *Crosscut Literary Prize Shirt!* And, you see, it's as vivid in my mind as it was thirty years ago. I came to understand through a couple of conversations with friends just before I got on my motorcycle and headed cross-country home with my degree and blue shirt packed in my saddlebags that some people thought I was very poor while I was a student there. I'm not sure if I was or not -- I know I didn't have a lot of clothes and never ironed one piece of clothing. But I worked part-time in a gas station and part-time tutoring other students in the college writing lab, and I had money to buy books, and have a few beers at the bars (a quarter each!) where we met several times a week with professors to talk about the world in which we lived. I do remember Sunday nights not having any cereal or milk left and being a bit hungry, but on Monday mornings I could make it to the cafeteria at school where I could get two meals a day. No. I was not poor -- it's just that the things that mattered at that time were not clothes, or video games, or cell phones, or Big Macs. And maybe that's what's different, and maybe that's why the lessons of literature seem less clear to us now, and why I'm always trying to say something about the intent of a poem and the purpose of telling a good story. The kindness behind the giving of that blue shirt gave me more incentive as a writer -- and, Joey, as a human being -- than a slew of workshops or any awards.

And in the end, I'm not sure why I wrote this, although I want my sons to make a connection between what they feel about life and how they choose or not choose to share their thoughts with others. Words or no words, the same intensity can be seen in Joey's and Anton's eyes, as they get a glimpse of what the world has in store for them. All of us learn to cherish moments in our lives, experiences which made us more human instead of less (yes, I'm fighting the message of my long, unpublished poem). This may be, after all, just a story about a shirt, but our minds play tricks on us...and for a moment I see that strange blue and red paisley thing buttoned across your chest, Joey, and one just like it on you Anton, and both of you looking completely befuddled, annoyed, shaking your heads, wishing once and for all Dad would just send you some cash for the holidays.

Christmas, 2004

Springfield College, San Diego Campus

Ross Talarico

Race, Gender, and Genre: The *Baroness* Series as Social and Literary Progression

The pulp fiction of the 1960s and 1970s is easy to dismiss as “throw away” literature. Some would even argue that the cigarette ads placed in many of the texts demonstrates that these books were created as a means of producing a new avenue of marketing and that the novels themselves are just as effortlessly cast in the role of “product” to be sold, consumed, and disposed of. While such texts may or may not have their place in the literary cannon, they have another much more enduring role. Pulp fiction is ultimately reflexive of the society which produces it, and because it is produced so quickly, it can show a culture what it looks like at that exact moment. For these reasons, *The Baroness* series by Paul Kenyon shows the social and literary progression of 1974 and 1975.

Due to the common practice of using house pseudonyms and the large output by Paul Kenyon at the time, the books of *The Baroness* series may or may not share an author. Whether Kenyon was one writer or many is of little consequence. The texts are best examined as genre fiction of the mid-1970s. The series follows a spy on many missions. In the first text, *The Ecstasy Connection*, the spy must track down a dangerous drug that kills people with an excess of pleasure. In the second, *Diamonds are for Dying*, the spy must intercept Nazi plans to build a nuclear war craft. *Death is a Ruby Light*, the third installment, sees the spy foil communist Chinese plans to start a war between Russia and the United States by framing the US for killing Russian astronauts. In *Hard-core Murder*, the spy tracks down a dangerous pornography ring that produces snuff films and has political connections that may destroy the US. The spy stops the Russians from opening a lunar capsule which contains a virus deadly enough to kill everything on Earth within fifty days in *Operation Doomsday*. The sixth novel, *Sonic Slave*, sees our spy defeat an Arab Emir hell-bent on using sonic technology to control the world’s oil supplies and enslaving the human race. *Flicker of Doom* relays the spy’s success in thwarting the plans of a scientist with dangerous political backers who has created a means of dominating the human psyche with light. The last installment, *Black Gold*, deals with the spy overthrowing the strategy of an evil conglomeration that has set out to destroy the world’s oil reserves with oil-eating bacteria. While these plots may seem campy, they each contain a plot that would lead to an end of the human race and belie an obvious 1970s fear of a resurgence of the Cold War, anti-communist sentiment, and obsession with tactics that will cause global doom. What makes them extraordinary in content and worthy of study is that the spy that the novel follows is a women.

The Baroness of the title is Penelope St. John-Orsini, an American “model, millionaires, and international beauty” (*Ecstasy* 34). Her family was wealthy, and she gained a large inheritance. Her first husband was killed in a jet crash

while on a mission for the National Security Agency (NSA) and left her with another fortune. Her second husband, the Italian Baron from whom she gained her title, died while auto racing in Monte Carlo leaving her with a third fortune and several villas in Italy. While even the wealthy Emir of *Sonic Slave* exclaims, “You’re one of the world’s wealthiest women!” (67), Penny, as she is sometimes called, “never thought about money if she could help it. It was there, that was all” (*Flicker* 43). Some readers may wonder about the gender implications behind a series in which the female millionaire lead character has earned none of her money. Although this is important to note, the focus should remain on what the money allows her to do. Her fortune-gaining back story is only to give a reason for the enormous wealth that allows her to party as hard and spy as effectively as she does. Similarly, International Models, Inc. serves as her corporate cover and manages to profit well. As owners, she and her NSA boss, John Farnsworth, act as Coin and Key respectively. He gets the calls from the higher ups, and she gets the missions. After the death of her second husband, she used the contacts of her first husband to set up the Key/Coin operation. She was given special training in the deadly arts and a small operating budget. Readers see that she is a classic excitement junkie who values her self-made position as the first call made when the world is about to end. But luckily Farnsworth does not send her out alone. International Models, Inc. is made up of many exquisite espionage employees.

In *Cracking the Hard-Boiled Detective: A Critical History from the 1920s to the Present*, theorist Lewis Moore recognizes the years 1964 through 1977 as a period of transition in detective fiction and its tropes. As espionage is in large part solving a crime before it happens, many of these tropes can be used to define the same period in spy fiction. One of the seven major shifts Moore notes is the addition of friendship. While “early hard-boiled detectives have employees or acquaintances but few friends,” the genre progresses to tentatively incorporate “friends as well as lovers” in the ‘60s and ‘70s (Moore 155). The Baroness certainly has plenty of both and therefore typifies the modernization of the genre as well as acting as an example of emerging ideas of a new modern womanhood and inclusion of minorities.

The series seems to force itself to be as multicultural as possible. Her team consists of Joe Skytop, a Cherokee Indian street fighter who masquerades as one of the world’s premier fashion photographers; Tommy Sumo, a first-generation Japanese American technophile posing as a fashion consultant; Dan Wharton, white weapons expert and former Green Beret who has no concealed identity under International Models, Inc.; Eric, a white spy and model who is rarely seen; Inga, an Eastern European model/spy; Fiona, a white American model/spy; Yvette, a Haitian model/spy; and Paul, an African American model/spy and former Black Panther. When confronting the Nazi mastermind in *Diamonds are for Dying*, Penny must pretend to “despise ‘inferior races’ as much as he does” (113). However, from the treatment of the racial minorities in the text, it might

seem as though the people involved in the creation of the texts did believe in “inferior races” to some degree.

Skytop is portrayed as a strong, enormous, lumbering alcoholic. He often appears at rendezvous intoxicated, and each novel contains a scene depicting his longing stare at a bottle of liquor. He is also shown to be stupid despite never being described as such. For instance, when Sumo explains a new device to the team, Skytop needs further clarification: “All right, Tommy,’ Skytop boomed. ‘Let me in on it” (*Sonic* 56). Although he is not said to have a position of power within his tribe (with whom the audience never sees him), many characters call him “Chief.” He responds to Penny by saying, “‘You’re the chief” (*Ecstasy* 40) and warns the others by claiming that “‘Nobody calls me Chief!... Except the chief” (*Diamonds* 27). Villains also call attention to his race: “‘Don’t get funny, injun” (*Hard-core* 145). Positive stereotypes are also called into play. When a rope is needed, “Skytop’s wise Indian hands [get] busy” (*Hard-core* 208). When an intruder is in his room, “his Cherokee instincts [alert] him” (*Sonic* 71). When he is fighting assailants in the woods, readers are told that they “didn’t have a chance in the world against a full-blooded Cherokee Indian in an outdoor environment” (*Ecstasy* 140). The racial epithets used by both his teammates and the villains they fight, as well as the use of stereotypes negates any positive feeling gained by Skytop’s acceptance into the group.

As the only black characters involved in Coin-oriented NSA missions, Paul and Yvette make an interesting pair. They are romantically involved and have thus segregated themselves from the rest of the group. The Baroness goes one step further. When assigning her teammates their parts in the missions, Paul and Yvette are almost always given missions together. Thus, they are systematically segregated from the rest of the group as well. On top of this, their covers (if necessary) are often to work in menial positions. In *Hard-core Murder*, for example, they go undercover as a maid and butler for one of the politicians being extorted. Paul, as a former Black Panther, often makes comments on his assignments. When told he will be acting as an archeologist, Paul asks, “Any excuse to get a pick and shovel back in our hands, right?” (*Sonic* 52). As he is the only one to ever bring up racial injustices within the group, the tone set by Paul’s questions and proclamations is often seen as militant and obtrusive, the same way many in the 1970s viewed the black power movement itself.

Tommy Sumo, as the technological expert of the group, plays into the stereotypical idea of Japanese superiority in the sciences. However, he is the only one to use his status as a racial minority to his advantage. When the Red Army overtakes Penny and her cohorts in *Death is a Ruby Light*:

she [flicks] her eyes over the milling Chinese soldiers. One of them was a small, skinny fellow in an ill-fitting uniform, marching stolidly with his AK-47... It was Tom Sumo (160).

While he serves his purpose as the gadget-maker of the group, Sumo is able to do what the other team members cannot: look Asian. His race may be a

detriment to his being able to fit into greater American society in the years following World War II and the Civil Rights Movement, but ultimately he is able to use his race to the advantage of the very country that marginalizes him. By virtue of his genetics, he is able to help his team by taking down the Red Army from within. However, a mention of his Japanese looks being adequate to pose as a Chinese soldier is never brought up.

The series does its fair share of belittling people based on gender as well as race. First, modeling and domesticity, as women's domains, are often ridiculed. After the death of the Baron, it is said that Penny "couldn't go back to her former life of vapid international beauty, fashion model, society hostess. She wanted to do something useful. Something dangerous" (*Ecstasy* 96). While this narration exhibits her inner action addict, it may or may not be the voice from within her. Yet whether these words are her own or the narrator's, they speak of the perceived vapidity and uselessness of the spheres most women were only just able to break out of upon the novel's publication. True to this sentiment, none of the novels depicts a fashion shoot or runway show despite the fact that this is always the cover that the famous Baroness uses to travel to foreign settings. For example, when traveling to Russia, the Baroness is supposed to attend a fashion show while Coin is supposed to be infiltrating Baikonour, a highly secured aeronautical research facility. When questioned by her team, Penny states, "'There's nothing dumpier than Russian fashions, darling. I'd rather take my chances at Baikonour'" (*Death* 49). The audience gets both a sense of her fashion knowledge as well as her preference of her spy work which is the ultimate point of the plots. Designers are often mentioned by name and clothes are often described but the novels never get any more overtly "fashionable." Thus the novels are able to focus on traditionally male areas and relegate traditionally female areas to a lesser area of importance.

The texts do a good job of belittling all women and their bodies, not just models' careers. While the Baroness is often described as tough and powerful, she knows she is being viewed and often contorts herself around non-NSA to appear more appropriately feminine. When a lover arrives at her home while she is practicing sword fighting with Sumo, "a subtle change" comes over her; "it was something about the way she held her body. It made her look softer, less dangerous" (*Black* 3). In combining her job as an agent with her presence as a woman, readers are told that "the graceful curves of her body were as *functional* as the lines of a jet aircraft" [italics added] (*Diamonds* 25). The texts go beyond defining physical femininity. They also promote the idea of women's bodies being material goods for male viewership: "a material substance. Like her" (*Sonic* 172), "But then, who cared about her face?" (*Death* 53), "She stood there for his inspection" (*Ecstasy* 19). The Baroness is also likened to an animal several times. When confronted with a group of assailants, the narrator tells readers that "she stood like a wild creature at bay, eyes flashing, teeth bared" (*Hard-core* 186). She is even complicit in her animalization. When a potential lover/foreign spy asks her how she found him in the Siberian wilderness, she

states, “Darling, I just followed your scent, like any bitch on a trail” (*Operation* 118).

The texts may both covertly and overtly undermine women’s physical presences, they do celebrate women’s customary knowledges. Penny is able to foil the plans of the villains she faces by having gendered information and abilities. For instance, she knows she is being followed because she repeatedly spots a set of unique headlights: “one lamp a fraction of a shade yellower than the other. Only someone with the Baroness’ superb color sense could have picked them out at all” (*Hard-core* 156). She also has an advantage over the Nazi ringleader who tells her that diamonds are a part of his plan for global domination: “she knew more about diamonds than he did; she’d bought enough of them” (*Diamonds* 112). In part due to her feminine pursuits of fashion and jewelry, she is able to save the day and bring her nemeses to justice.

Although Coin is always effective in her duties, the Baroness often is underestimated due to her gender. Mafiosos in *The Ecstasy Connection* have a hard time accepting her physical prowess:

A woman was by definition an inferior being, in their society.
To see one manhandling their Don was impossibility. Their
minds were slow to comprehend it. (72)

Their dialogue betrays their sexism: “She’s just a broad” (74), “She can’t do no damage” (74), “A broadly never hit you when she’s aiming. It’s when they don’t mean it that you hafta watch out” (75). After killing them all, the Baroness again finds herself underestimated when drugged and kidnapped. “They’d underestimated her magnificent physical condition, her reserves of strength. The drug had worn off before it was supposed to” (166). The first book sets up a running theme throughout the novels; the always male villain undervalues her and pays the ultimate price for it. In *Death is a Ruby Light*, Professor Thing believes that he is “hardly in danger of one small unarmed female person” (168). In his estimation, being female is just as much of a weakness as being alone and weaponless. He does, however, grant her one respect. He tells her, “You’re more intelligent than I thought” (169). She outsmarts and kills him. In *Hard-core Murder*, a hand-to-hand fight with a heavily muscled man causes him to say, “You ain’t got a chance... I’m stronger than you” (216). She overpowers and kills him. The Emir of *Sonic Slave* states that “a man’s word is worth the word of two women” (44). She kills him. Even in death one of her foes thinks “it couldn’t be happening, to be killed by a woman” (*Sonic* 118). But the Baroness doesn’t always kill sexism through sexists. Before an auto race in Monte Carlo, a potential lover claims that he will beat her time because he’s “got balls.” She retorts, “And I’ve got ovaries, darling. We women get just as much mileage out of them, you know. Where the hormones, there moan I” (*Operation* 14). Despite her pithy comment, she is still standing up for herself and femininity. She winds up saving her partner in flirtation from a fiery accident on the track. Sexism also allows her to maintain

Coin's anonymity from CIA operatives opposed to the Key/Coin system. One agent states that field reports have claimed that Coin is a woman. His deputy director retorts, ““We know better now”” (*Death* 70). By virtue of the socially recognized belief of female weakness, Penny is able to get her man both in the bedroom and in battle while sustaining her anonymity as an agent.

Despite her obvious ability to overcome and overpower all of her opponents, the texts still betray a sexist need to explain her physical prowess, assumedly because Penny is a woman. Sometimes this is done by explaining her adversary’s weakness: “But she was stronger than he was. Tall as he was, he was a sedentary type” (*Ecstasy* 206). On occasion, her emotions make up for her womanhood: “She lifted the impaled man high into the air, her fury giving her strength” (*Hard-core* 201). However, she is strong. “The cable-hard muscles of her forearms” are mentioned several times (*Hard-core* 167). Readers see her “strong elegant thumbs... that ... could crack walnuts... now [crack] a human larynx” (*Operation* 56). Her toughness is also demonstrated when she kills a snake and eats “the flesh raw” (*Hard-core* 163). At times her physicality even borders on the ridiculous. When jumping over a fence, she notes that it was “a good fifteen inches below the women’s Olympic record. It would have been easy if she hadn’t been so dehydrated” (*Hard-core* 163). She is not only strong; she is fast: “She was the fastest runner” (*Death* 121). Skytop, an expert in unarmed combat, believes that “she moved faster than anybody he’d ever seen” (*Hard-core* 8). Even her “superbly keen” (*Sonic* 39) ears and “superbly sensitive skin” (*Sonic* 89) are more highly tuned than most people’s. In training:

They taught her to pick locks, kill a man with a hairpin or a rolled-up newspaper, use explosives. They taught her how to resist interrogation, pass out under torture, kill herself with both hands tied. (*Diamonds* 46)

Even though her tough and able bodily abilities are requirements for her line of work, the narrator still needs to fit in these minor explanations of her feats of strength because she is a woman.

While readers may or may not accept her strength, it is entertaining to note the equipment a woman is given on spy duty. The Mont Blanc pens of James Bond are clearly male territory. Instead the Baroness is given a band-aid, a bra, shoes, lipstick, fake hair, a ring, pantyhose, hairspray, a watch, a cigarette lighter that shoots black widow venom, and – best of all – fake nipples. These items all turn into weapons or communications technologies, but their covers are highly representative of what 1970s society thought a rich woman naturally owned. But readers wonder if the Baroness even needs the weapons. She would appear to do well with the items they pretend to be:

They were perfectly ordinary things, the things you’d expect to find in the luggage of a rich, beautiful woman. Lingerie, for instance. But you could garrote a man with a lace bra, cosh him with a weighted stocking, break his neck with a pair of

pantyhose. Then there was the jewelry. The pin in the emerald brooch was only two inches long, but that made it long enough to slip between the first and second cervical vertebrae into the base of the brain. The prongs of the diamond ring stood straight out when you pried the diamond loose, sharp enough to sever one of the major arteries. And there was a platinum bracelet, a thin hoop that didn't have its ends joined. Straighten it out and you have a nine-inch stiletto (*Flicker* 64).

While this list shows the deadly side of feminine objects, it also shows that the Baroness can be more capable as a spy because she is expected to have certain articles on her in travel. Upon making her a set of transmitters and receivers that look like uppers, Sumo says, “Rich, beautiful women take pills... Nobody will think twice about them” (*Ecstasy* 93). Although she has her lethal knowledge of everyday items; her hidden technology; and “the edges of her hands, the heel and side of her foot, a sharp elbow or knee,” Penny is still given an actual gun. She carries a .25 caliber Bernadelli VB that carries five rounds but is known as “the smallest automatic ever made” (*Diamonds* 26). The gun both packs a punch and is easily concealed in plain sight but is hard to take seriously, much like the Baroness herself.

Penny is as mentally prepared for espionage as she is physically ready. She is all but completely emotionless. When she is abducted in *Death is a Ruby Light*, she awakens to what would normally be a startling and completely life-altering event for any woman: “There were finger marks on her breasts and thighs. There was a burning sensation in her vagina. She'd been raped. She wondered how many times” (137). Readers never see her lament this violation, seek therapy, or even discuss it. Instead, she discovers which men were involved in the gang rape, kills them, and moves on with her mission. There is no “processing” the ordeal. As a female agent, she is threatened with rape on several occasions to the point where she “[expects] a brisk rape by some two hundred men, torture, and then some ultimate disposal” (*Sonic* 183). Readers are led to believe that this is how a female agent copes with what is seemingly inevitable. Her dearth of feeling extends to death as well. When a civilian lover dies in a shootout, “she knelt beside him. His body was still warm. She ran her fingers through his hair. His blue eyes stared up at her, unblinking. She closed them” (*Hard-core* 95). And thus the grieving process ends. There is no mourning, and she only mentions him once more in the text. Upon facing her own death, “there [is] a brief twinge of regret for all she [is] going to miss” (*Sonic* 118). Indeed the Baroness never pleads for her life, screams, or struggles. She appears to be eternally resigned for the worst. She does show emotion under the influence of drugs (“It was the pot, exaggerating the swing of her moods” [*Operation 30*]) and when affected by villainous machines (“She was suddenly... sobbing with an emotion she couldn't explain” [*Sonic* 129]) but never under normal circumstances.

Another of Moore's tropes of the Transitional Period is the addition of pervasive violence. The series has an extraordinarily high death count. The Baroness fills her fair share of body bags. Her emotionlessness allows her to do her work better. She matter-of-factly tells Farnsworth, "By the way, John, we're going to have to kill Enzio" (*Sonic* 38). She does. In *Flicker of Doom*, she discovers that a local she befriended has given up information on her that put her in danger. "Sorry, Qasim," she tells him as she kills him, "[making] it as quick as she could" (*Flicker* 153). Penny's lack of feeling not only aids her work, it helps her to step away from preconceived notions of femininity.

One of the most interesting dynamics of gender at play in the series is the relationships between the female spies. Fiona, as an American and a Caucasian, is able to walk into dossier meetings late without any reprimand. She is clearly favored by the author(s) as well as her boss, Penny. After a battle that leaves most of the team wounded, "Fiona had nothing worse than some blood stains and grease smudges" (*Flicker* 181). Yvette gets little air time with the Baroness and is most often away with Paul. Inga, however, can be both close to the Baroness as a white woman and subservient to her as a foreigner. Inga acts mostly as a servant to Penny and is never asked kindly to prepare meals, pack for travel, gather information, or do the Baroness' hair and makeup; rather, she is ordered.

The women are set aside from the men of the group in the extent of their espionage backgrounds. Each of the men has a legitimate background that could logically lead to a career in spying. Wharton and Skytop are both ex-Green Berets. Wharton is a weapons expert, and Skytop (as mentioned before) is an expert in hand-to-hand combat. Paul is ex-CIA. Sumo is a technological innovator and moonlights for IBM. Eric has worked for the Gehlen organization. However, "the three girls, Inga, Yvette and Fiona, [are] legitimate models" (*Death* 100). This continues a precedence that was and is widely upheld; no matter how accomplished a woman is, she must first and foremost be attractive. Although these women are all capable as spies, their primary job description is set: being beautiful. Espionage will always be something that came after they proved themselves to the world via their beauty, no matter how dedicated to NSA they become. This situation may also leave readers confused as to which is more improbable – a spy becoming a model or a model becoming a spy.

If the women of the Coin operation all share one thing aside from beauty, it is their potential to be sexual victims to the constantly changing cast of male villains. The Baroness acknowledges the probability of rape, and this probability extends to each of the female agents. Fiona is threatened with rape in *Flicker of Doom* but is able to overcome her assailant (115-6). After Inga and Yvette are kidnapped in *Sonic Slave*, Inga is gang raped. The scene is chilling:

They were sitting like awkward marionettes, backs against the stone, legs splayed stiffly outward. Inga's large pale breasts caught the feeble light spilling through the barred archway;

her blouse had been ripped down to her waist. Yvette's maid's uniform was still fairly intact; the jailer and his assistants were having a little rest before they raped her too. (176)

Readers may wonder why the jailors have chosen to assault one victim at a time. If there is a racial element involved, it seems to promote the idea that Inga's whiteness makes her more "worthy" of rape at least to her Arabian attackers. In any case, within this context the characters involved acknowledge the severity of rape as a physical violence. Yvette offers her sympathies to Inga as a victim by saying, "'Don't you worry, honey, when that man gets close to me, I gonna kill him with my elbow'" (176). Inga, in the suppressive fashion of the Baroness, states, "'It doesn't matter'" and helps to steer the conversation toward plotting an escape (176).

A third trope of Moore's is the addition of love and sexuality into a previously chaste genre. In this way, *The Baroness* series more than makes up for its predecessors. Readers quickly learn that Penny will eventually bed any man that the narrator describes as "handsome" with the only exception being La Sourd, a villain in *Sonic Slave*. Of course, as she is willing to do anything to protect US interests, she is aware of the possibility that she may need to sleep with a criminal in order to garner information or gain access to restricted sites. To be fair, her team is expected to do this as well. Sumo, after infiltrating the Red Army, seeks out details on the army's plan by asking a female soldier, "'Where have you been assigned to sleep tonight, comrade?'" (*Death* 167). Thus, when Farnsworth tells Penny that the Emir in *Sonic Slave* has "been known to pay a hundred thousand dollars or more for a one-night stand," she readily asks, "'And you've arranged for me to come [to his] attention?'" (37). However, this is no surprise to readers who have already read *Diamonds are for Dying* in which she puts a theoretical ability to sleep with the enemy to the test by bedding the lead Nazi in order to get him alone and kill him. She does so with a dart of Black Widow venom. This appears to be a most appropriate tool in light of the after-scene:

The phonograph needle was stuck, repeating the same phrase from the Liebestod over and over. She could see herself in the big mirror suspended above her, an erotic fantasy in black corset and garters, an old man in the stylized posture of death lying beside her. (140)

For a twice widowed woman, this experience carries more weight than it would otherwise. With her gendered knowledge, hyper sexuality, and willingness to kill, dark-haired Penny is able to become a zoomorphic character. Just like the spider whose poison she utilizes, Penny is deadly for her sexual partners especially when they are playing the other side of the field.

Perhaps knowledge of her lethal capabilities is what allows her to heedlessly bed men she feels may be enemy agents. None of the men ever turns out to be a danger to her or her missions, but it is clear from the start that her

eagerness for sexual conquests might put her and her team in danger. In the first installment, it is said that “friend or enemy, she and Nigel Pickering were going to share a bed together” (*Ecstasy* 111-2). The second novel tells us that “she’d done it before – killed a lover who was an enemy” (*Diamonds* 70). She may be capable, but readers may not be able to forgive her recklessness. In *Operation Doomsday*, she suspects a “handsome” man of being a Russian agent. She sees that “she might have to kill him tomorrow, but tonight they were going to enjoy one another” (120). Her seduction immediately takes precedence over the mission: “To hell with it, she thought. She didn’t care if he *was* a Russian agent!” (120). Her hormones lead readers to wonder how seriously she takes her position with NSA. As she tells Farnsworth when late to a spy rendezvous due to a sexual rendezvous, ““There are just some things that are more important than saving the world”” (*Ecstasy* 35).

The Baroness series offers a telling glimpse into the social ideology of the American masses in the mid-‘70s although they are clearly not high literature. The books are poorly edited, often including spelling mistakes and punctuation errors as egregious as missing quotation marks. The continuity of the plot is also haphazard. Sometimes her parents are alive, sometimes they’re both dead. While Penny always has a cover for being in whatever locale the books are set in, her team is often called upon to go undercover. Despite the fact that they are the world’s top models and therefore highly visible global citizens, they are never recognized while on a mission. And even for readers willing to suspend belief, too many blunders appear in the plots. For example, in *Flicker of Doom*, she winds up being imprisoned, and her Bernadelli falls into the hands of her opposition. She retrieves the gun after a madcap escape. Even non-spies know to check for ammo in such a situation. Penny doesn’t and is forced to compensate for being unarmed later in the text.

The texts are not legitimate literature, but they make many references to texts that are. In detailing her path toward espionage via flashback, *The Ecstasy Connection* mentions “the novels she liked to read... her favorite, Baroness Orczy’s *Scarlet Pimpernel*. She never dreamed she’d be a spy herself. Or a Baroness” (96). Later in the novel, she witnesses obese arch-villain Mr. Sim eat a lunch that could only be rivaled in description by the feasts of Anthony Burgess’ *Tremor of Intent* (135). Not all of the literary allusions are to espionage fiction, however. She mentions a “womb with a view” in a pun that would likely shock E.M. Forster (*Ecstasy* 143). In *Flicker of Doom*, she is invited to sample some of her nemesis’ sherry, ““a fine Amontillado – [his] last cask of it”” (53). Such phrasing immediately brings Edgar Allan Poe’s famous short story to mind. While in Tangier, she is told that Anais Nin has recently moved out of the city (87). The series is not canonical, but it shows a wide knowledge of texts and authors that are.

Yet, an engagement with pulp fiction is just as telling about a society as its high literature. Regardless, the books of the series offer a compelling character study of what a rich, beautiful, famous, titled, white female spy would look and

act like. Penny is, contrary to her actions, serious about her work. She examines a piece of jewelry and thinks that it is “exactly the kind that the Baroness Penelope St. John-Orsini would wear” (*Hard-core* 46). This meta-awareness is suspect. Who is the alter-ego: Penny or Coin? In playing her roles, both as society woman and protector of society, well, the Baroness shows that women are just as capable as men in rigorous, dangerous occupations. Each of the paperback covers depicts her with a weapon in hand or with the upper hand in unarmed combat. Her team is always loyal and trusts her instincts although she is a woman. Her friends include many minorities although they may often be disrespected by the author(s). The novels also give several winks and nods to the literatures that have influenced them, if not in Canonical endurance, certainly in scope and type. Yet while the series offers a good look at the 1970s’ burgeoning developments in the espionage genre as well in society, it shows a modern readership just how far we still had to go to become what we are today.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jennifer Woolson

Works Cited

- Kenyon, Paul. *Black Gold*. New York: Pocket Books, 1975. Print.
---. *Death is a Ruby Light*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
---. *Diamonds are for Dying*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
---. *The Ecstasy Connection*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
---. *Flicker of Doom*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
---. *Hard-core Murder*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
---. *Operation Doomsday*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
---. *Sonic Slave*. New York: Pocket Books, 1974. Print.
Moore, Lewis D. *Cracking the Hard-Boiled Detective: A Critical History from the 1920s to the Present*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2006. Print.

Popular Dance Music in Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie*

Music was essential to the success of Tennessee Williams's *Glass Menagerie* (1944). As he emphasized in his "Author's Production Notes", music, like lighting and the screen devices announcing each scene, evoked the nostalgic and the elegiac, the characteristics that made *Menagerie* a "memory play" (132). As Williams's persona, Tom Wingfield, speaking as the Narrator in *Menagerie*, claims, "In memory everything seems to happen to music" (145). The music in *The Glass Menagerie* thus becomes a part of the dramatic metaphors that Tom's memory generates. With music introducing or playing in the background of so many scenes in *The Glass Menagerie*, Tom recalls the events in St. Louis during the late 1930s when his mother, Amanda, and sister, Laura, anxiously awaited the arrival of a Gentleman Caller whom, they hoped, would marry Laura and deliver her from her dreary life. As he would do with the *Varsouviana* (waltz music) in *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947), Williams included several popular musical scores from the 1920s and 1930s, or before, in the *Menagerie* script, the most significant being the *Glass Menagerie*, or Laura's, theme, the "recurring tune . . . to give emotional emphasis to suitable passages" ("Author's Production Notes" 133).

Describing the kind of music that he thought would be appropriate for this signature song, Williams pointed out that:

This tune is like circus music, not when you are on the grounds or in the immediate vicinity of the parade, but when you are at some distance and very likely thinking of something else. It seems under those circumstances to continue almost interminably as it weaves in and out of your preoccupied consciousness; then it is the lightest, most delicate music in the world and perhaps the saddest. It expresses the surface vivacity of life with the underlying strain of immutable and inexpressible sorrow. (133)

The sound of far away circus music—the "surface vivacity"—suggested vanishing childhood and innocence, the world in which Laura lives. But at the same time this carnival tune carried with it the "immutable and inexpressible sorrow" that the Wingfield family suffers. This strain of popular music perfectly evoked the conflicting emotions central to Williams's memory play—its dreamlike quality as well as its haunting pathos. Like Lara's music, scored by Maurice Jarre for *Doctor Zhivago*, the recurring theme music in *Glass Menagerie* is a rich melody containing, paradoxically, both the promise and the pain of desire.

Two of Williams's most significant symbols in the play are associated with the popular music he cued to the script—Laura's victrola (and her record collection) and the Paradise Dance Hall located in the back alley facing the Wingfield apartment. Emanating from these two sources, popular dance tunes float into the Wingfield apartment reflecting America's taste in music during the 1920s and 1930s as well as establishing the historical setting of the play. The 1920s-1930s marked the era of the big bands—Paul Whiteman, the Dorsey Brothers, etc.—that recorded the songs America listened and danced to at ubiquitous dance halls, like the Paradise, across the country. In the Acting Edition of *Glass Menagerie*, published by Dramatists Play Service, Williams specifically asks the director to include “*Old popular music of, say, the 1915-1920 period*” (9). *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?*, the 1969 film starring Gig Young and Jane Fonda, fiercely captures the paradoxes of these hubs of popular entertainment—the exhilaration, the exhaustion, and, ultimately, the destructive force they exerted on a Depression-weary audience.

Many of the songs that Laura plays on her victrola come from dance hall tunes as well as other popular sources. Williams associates these melodies with different characters in key scenes of *The Glass Menagerie*. In fact, these songs serve as an expressionistic guide, an interpretation of the memories Tom recalls, and a way to convey those memories—through his flashbacks—to Williams's audience. True to a memory play, the popular songs in *Glass Menagerie* resonate with the dreams, the loneliness, and the heartbreaks of Williams's characters. The Acting Edition of *Menagerie*, for instance, contains nearly 20 musical cues, but almost all of them are to generic dance scores, e.g., “dance music,” “a waltz.” And even though Williams commissioned his composer-friend Paul Bowles to score the original music for the Broadway premiere of *The Glass Menagerie* in 1945 (Leverich 554), he nonetheless included references to specific songs in the poetic stage directions in the reading version of the play, published by New Directions. In this essay, I will examine three popular dance songs called for in the reading version of *The Glass Menagerie* to show how they encouraged the characters to hope while at the same time defeated any prospect of it for Laura, Amanda, Tom, and America as well, shortly before and during World War II. Even if audiences in the 1940s heard only the melodies, or just a line or two, from these popular songs, it is likely that they still would have had a fairly good recall of the lyrics.

The first named popular song in *Menagerie*, “The World is Waiting for the Sunrise,” plays at the beginning of Tom’s monologue in Scene Five describing the Paradise Dance Hall and the menacing political events leading up to World War II. “Waiting for the Sunrise” was written in 1919 by Eugene Lockhart, with music by Ernest Seitz, and popularized through John Steel’s instrumental version brought to Broadway musicals, as well as through recordings done by Isham Jones and his band in the 1930s (Edwards). Patrons would have heard the song at the Paradise Dance Hall and at similar establishments nationwide. In fact, “Waiting for the Sunrise” boasts a long history of success. It made it to the

“Best Seller Chart” in the 1950s through the rendition done by Les Paul and Mary Ford, and in 1994 even Willie Nelson recorded it. The lyrics for “Waiting for the Sunrise” suggest a lover’s aubade, a happy anticipation of a fulfilling love affair:

Dear One, the world is waiting for sunrise
Ev’ry rose is covered with dew
And while the world is waiting for the sunrise
And my heart is calling you.
The second stanza repeats these words but adds:
The thrush on high his sleepy mate is calling
And my heart is calling you.

Dancing to “Waiting for the Sunrise,” the “unsuspecting” couples at the Paradise would have easily gotten lost in the illusions of love encouraged by the bucolic setting of the song. Yet the buoyant desire evoked by the natural landscape of “Waiting” poignantly contrasted with the reality of St. Louis in the 1930s. As Tom Wingfield tells his listeners: “Across the alley from us was the Paradise Dance Hall . . . the orchestra played a waltz or tango, something that had a slow and sensuous rhythm. Couples would come outside, to the relative privacy of the alley. You could see them kissing behind ash pits and telephone poles. This was the compensation for lives that passed like mine without any change or adventure” (179). The couples who danced to the song at the Paradise created an ersatz bower amid the ruins of the city, the “ash pits” and behind “telephone poles.” Yet the illusions promised by the song, and for which these couples waited, would never come true in their mundane lives.

What was waiting for them in 1938 was the conflagrations of World War II. As Tom explains at the end of his monologue:

Adventure and change were imminent this year. They were waiting around for the mist over Berchtesgaden, caught in the folds of Chamberlain’s umbrella. In Spain there was Guernica. But here there was only hot sing music and liquor, dance halls, bars, and movies and sex that hung in the gloom like a chandelier and flooded the world with brief deceptive rainbows . . . All the world was waiting for bombardments.
(179)

One of the last lines of *The Glass Menagerie* poetically fulfilled his prophecy, “for nowadays the world is lit by lightning” (237), referring, of course, to the worldwide blitzkrieg World War II initiated. Tom’s proleptic words, therefore, challenged the amorous melody and lyrics of “The World is Waiting for the Sunrise.” Though often dismissed as a non-political writer,

Williams incorporated this popular song to chastise the complacent generation that looked for “compensation” in dance halls instead of world affairs. His reference to British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain’s umbrella, his signature symbol carried to the appeasement meetings with Hitler in Munich in September 1938, foreshadows rainy, threatening weather for the couples at the Paradise Dance Hall. It wasn’t a dewy sunrise awash with romantic passion that awaited Tom’s generation but, rather, the terror of war caused by Chamberlain’s folding before Hitler’s demands.

“The World is Waiting for the Sunrise” resonates deeply on an autobiographical level as well. When Tom describes the interior of the dance hall, he emphasizes that “Sometimes the lights were turned out except for a large glass sphere that hung from the ceiling. It would run slowly about and filter the dusk with delicate rainbow colors” (179). That glass sphere, a trademark of dance halls in the 1920s and 1930s, equivalent to strobe lights illuminating dance clubs in the 1970s and 1980s, suggested illusory romance and happy times, just as the descending glass ball in Times Square does every New Year’s Eve. But, symbolically, the large Paradise glass sphere in *Menagerie* is analogous to Laura’s smaller glass collection where she invested her time and her hopes, her solipsistic dream world. Thus Tom links his sister’s menagerie to the larger world of the Paradise Dance Hall, both promising the escape that Tom himself sought. Yet the glass ball at the Paradise could not “filter the dusk” (the hardships) any more than Laura’s glass collection could. Glass and hearts both break in *Menagerie*.

But “Waiting for the Sunrise” suggests an even more intimate connection between Tom and his sister and his mother. The dance tune allows Williams to further express the tender, loving relationship he sought with his older sister, Rose. In almost every play, he honored Rose by including her name in the title or the script. In *Menagerie*, I contend he did this through the first line of “Waiting for the Sunrise”—“Ev’ry rose is covered with dew.” Rose Dakin Williams waited years for a gentleman caller to convey to her what the singer in “Waiting” promises his mistress. But Tennessee’s Rose is covered with a different kind of dew, a brilliant, subtle trope transforming the moisture on the ground in the song into tears—for Tennessee and for his sister. The “thrush’s” call on his “sleepy mate” in the second stanza might also be a submerged reference to Williams’s guarded love for Rose, lost forever to him through her lobotomy. A mythology of intimacy was built up around this bird. As Walt Whitman pointed out in “When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom’d” (1868), “Solitary the thrush, / The hermit withdrawn to himself avoiding the settlement, / Sings by himself the song.” Although Williams was often accused of harboring an incestuous desire for his sister, there is no doubt that on some psychoanalytical level “Waiting for the Sunrise” enabled him to express his love for Rose, in one of his most popular self-fashioning plays, without compromising himself. “Waiting” may contain a further allusion, albeit comic, to a recurring, frustrating event in *Menagerie*, and doubtless in Williams’s own

life. “Waiting for the Sunrise” seems an ironic antidote to Amanda’s nagging wake-up call, “Rise an’ Shine” (167), unsettling Tom each morning.

Williams instructs that another popular song from the 1920s and 1930s, “Dardanella,” play when Tom brings the Gentleman Caller home in Scene Six. Several versions of this ragtime/waltz, with and without lyrics, can be heard on YouTube. Afraid to open the door when she hears Tom and Jim, Laura *“returns through the portieres, darts to the victrola, and winds it frantically and turns it on.”* As Laura answers the door, Williams’s stage direction reads: *“A faraway, scratchy rendition of ‘Dardanella’ softens the air and gives her strength to move through it. She slips to the door and draws it cautiously open. Tom enters with the caller, Jim O’Connor”* (197-98). Like “Waiting for the Sunrise,” “Dardanella”, with lyrics by Fred Fisher and music by Johnny Black and Felix Bernard (Edwards), was one of the most popular songs of the 1930s. A popular dance hall tune, it was made famous by Ben Selvin’s orchestra and later recorded by Bing Crosby and by Louie Armstrong in renditions that still draw an audience’s applause. Like “Waiting,” too, the lyrics and the melody jarringly contrast with and comment on the action in the Wingfield apartment. “Dardanella” chronicles the desire of a “lonesome Armenian” maid to reunite with the man of her dreams as she looks “across the seas and sighs.” The “Dardanella” singer croons, “Prepare the wedding wine,” and adds “Soon I shall return to Turkestan/ I will ask for her heart and hand.” But nothing like this is in the cards for Laura Wingfield. As she painfully learns, Jim is already engaged to Betty and by playing a *“scratchy rendition”* of “Dardanella” Williams emphasizes the awkward, unharmonious news the Gentleman Caller brings. But unlike Dardanella’s lover, Jim has no intentions of courting and marrying Laura. Instead, having the song play at his entrance only subverts, forebodingly, any hopes she has of romance. Using a musical pun that also alludes to one screen device labeled “String for my Sister,” Jim jokes with Laura that, “I’ve got strings on me” (229), referring, of course, to his betrothal to Betty.

“Dardanella” also helps audiences understand why Tom refers to Jim as an “emissary from a world of reality that we were somehow set apart from” (145). Jim’s sense of reality—exemplified by his self-promotion and interest in new technologies such as television and electro-dynamics—are far removed from Laura or Amanda’s romantic view of the world. As Penny Farfan claims, musically “Laura’s difference from other girls is underscored by an ominous-sounding tango” (157) earlier in the script. The peppy and raffish “Dardanella” succinctly signals how far apart Laura really is from the world of success Jim selfishly pursues. A sexual entrepreneur, he fulfills his narcissistic drives at Laura’s expense (Kolin “Family of Mitch”). The first stanza of “Dardanella” emphasizes the sexual dimensions of the relationship that Jim desires:

Oh, sweet Dardanella, I love your harem eyes,
I’m a lucky fellow, to capture such a prize.
Oh, Allah knows my love for you, and he tells you to be true,

Dardanella, oh, hear my sigh, my Oriental,
Oh sweet Dardanella, prepare the wedding wine
There'll be one girl in my harem, when you're mine.
We'll build a tent just like the other. (Edwards)

How incongruous to compare the sheltered, introspective Laura, fragile and shy, to a “harem” girl. But callow Jim has no intention of committing to love as the singer does—“There’ll be one girl in my harem, when you’re mine.” Laura may be recast as the “lonesome Armenian maid” in “Dardanella,” but Jim is hardly her heart-broken paramour. When Laura confesses to him that she has been playing her victrola, Jim responds: “Must have been playing classical music on it! You ought to play a little hot swing music to warm you up!” (198). As Nicholas Moschovakis points out, Jim’s sexually overt reference to “hot swing music” links him with the primitive music associated with the African American presence found elsewhere in Williams’ canon (Crandell).

Williams’s specific cue to “Dardanella” further alerts the audience to the disparity between the fate of the romantic heroine in the song and his forlorn sister, Laura/Rose. As with the circus music used for the *Glass Menagerie* theme song, “Dardanella” incorporates, in its rhythms and lyrics, both a sense of the “vivacious” and the “underlying strain of inexpressible sorrow.” The popular tune thereby becomes the site at which romantic longing and its self-destructive consequences meet. Though quite different from the elegiac *Glass Menagerie* theme music, “Dardanella” nonetheless reveals Jim’s cavalier attitude toward love while uncovering Laura’s fervently sincere hope that love may in fact find her. Sadly, Jim leaves to pick Betty up at the “Wabash depot” (234); he is not going to Turkestan.

Williams directs that another popular song—“La Golondrina”—come from the Paradise Dance Hall in Scene Seven when Jim asks Laura to “cut the rug a little” (224), thus giving him the occasion to dance with her (Farfan). Though this Mexican waltz was written in 1862 by composer, Narciso Serradel Seville (1843-1930), the song was used as background music in silent movies and remained popular in the 1930s and beyond in versions by Xavier Cugat, Roy Orbison, and even Elvis. Like “Dardanella,” this Mexican tune about a “sleek and graceful” swallow looking for a nest elicits deeper pathos in Tom’s memory play about his fragile, vulnerable sister. There have been numerous translations of “La Golondrina,” but all agree that the singer, an exile looking for a home, wants to “keep his heart close” to the swallow and to keep the bird “secure from danger.” Like the bird, the singer rhapsodizes, “I am also in the region, / Oh, Holy Heaven, and unable to fly” (“La Golondrina”). As in “Dardanella,” this soulful troubadour is a wanderer, a designation that applies to Tom Wingfield as well as to his sister, searching for what the Paradise Dance Hall deceptively promises but fails to deliver. Laura, then, is like the couples at the dance hall

who earlier in Tom's memory play built their dreams on "Waiting for the Sunrise."

Analogues between Laura and the swallow shed further light on her fate and Tom's painful memory of his sister's plight. Like the swallow, Laura has trouble "flying" (her crippled leg prevents her from being like regular girls) and she certainly desires a home in someone's heart. But when Jim asks her to dance, she responds "I—can't dance . . . I've never danced in my life" (224). But for a few fleeting moments in Jim's arms Laura becomes the "graceful" bird happy in his embrace. Reassuringly, he urges her on "Just let yourself go," "Not so stiff—easy does it," and "Lots, lots better" (225). Thinking she has found her Gentleman Caller, Laura relaxes and believes she is freed from a lonely future. But her flight is short-lived as she and Jim "*suddenly bump into the table, and the glass piece on it falls to the floor. Jim stops the dance*" (225). Then ensues his feigned courtship, telling Laura she is "very different from anyone else" and that "being different is nothing to be ashamed of" (227). He insists that "Somebody needs to build your confidence up and make you proud instead of shy and running away—and blushing. Somebody —ought—to kiss you, Laura" (228). All these promises occur as "La Golondrina" plays hauntingly across the alley at the Paradise Dance Hall, transforming the Wingfield's shabby, small St. Louis apartment into a magic space for Laura. For a few minutes it is as if the song became her self-fulfilling prophecy. But, of course, it does not. As soon as Jim, kisses her, he brands himself a "Stumblejohn," and confesses that he is engaged, abandoning Laura, leaving the swallow alone, heartbroken, denied the homeland promised by the singer of the Mexican waltz. Through the music of this song about the swallow, the memory of his lonely sister will haunt Tom Wingfield in every production of his *Glass Menagerie*.

As with the two other popular tunes Williams includes in his stage directions, "Waiting for the Sunrise" and "Dardanella," he discovers in "La Golondrina" even more symbolic ways to express his nostalgic memory of the past. Mining the significance of the swallow in classical mythology, Williams was afforded with yet another way to characterize his sister's pain through this popular music. Ironically, the bird was associated with fertility, a talisman of Venus, a role never fulfilled by the reclusive, self-negating Laura. Further intensifying Williams's painful memory of his sister, the swallow in "La Golondrina" calls to mind the Christian symbolism associated with the bird. For centuries, the swallow stood for fertility, as well as the Incarnation, the Word becoming flesh ("Swallows"). The Christian allusions that the swallow offered Williams thus complemented the other religious symbolism he wove throughout *Menagerie* (e.g., the candelabrum from the Church of the Heavenly Rest [210]; Jim's arrival being likened to the Annunciation). "La Golondrina" thereby gave him another opportunity to blend the secular (Jim's coming into Laura's world) with the sacred (the Incarnation). However, this beloved Mexican melody may be the cruellest song in the play, for it does not transport the wounded Laura

Wingfield into the paradise she briefly thought was hers but, instead, the song marks her finale, and her brother's, to make a dream come true.

Over the decades, numerous composers have scored original compositions for stage and film productions of *The Glass Menagerie*. Max Steiner wrote the music for the first *Glass Menagerie* on film (1950), starring Jane Wyman and Kirk Douglas; and Henry Mancini provided scores that heightened the performances of Joanne Woodward and John Malkovich in *The Glass Menagerie* screenplay released in 1988. Moreover, numerous songs and dance productions have been inspired by Williams's memory play, including the works of the pop/punk band from Boston christening itself *The Glass Menagerie*. But, however creative and evocative these musical and choreographed performances have been, they must all defer to Williams's intentions to include three titled popular dance hall tunes at key points in the script of *The Glass Menagerie* that brought him worldwide success.

University of Southern Mississippi

Philip C. Kolin

Works Cited

- Crandell, George. "Misrepresentation and Miscegenation: Reading the Racialized Discourse in Tennessee Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*." *Modern Drama* 40 (Fall 1997): 337-46.
- Edwards, Bill. *Old Time Instrumentals From 1920 to the 1950s*. <http://www.perfessorbill.com/pbmidi10.shtml>. Accessed 30 Aug. 2011.
- Farfan, Penny. "Music." *The Tennessee Williams Encyclopedia*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2004.
- Kolin, Philip C. "The Family of Mitch: Unsuitable Suitors in Tennessee Williams." *Magical Muse: Millennial Essays on Tennessee Williams*. Ed. Ralph Voss. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama Press, 2002. 131-46.
- "La Golondrina." *World Reference Forums*. <http://www.forum.worldreference.com/showthread.php?t=27379>. Accessed 1 September 2011.
- Leverich, Lyle. *Young Tom: The Unknown Tennessee Williams*. New York: Crown, 1995.
- Moschovakis, Nicholas. "Tennessee Williams's American Blues: From the Early Manuscripts Through *Menagerie*." *Tennessee Williams Annual Review* 7 (2005).
- "Swallows." www.Catholic-Sainta.info/catholic-symbols/swallow-Christian-symbol.htm. Web. 2 Sept. 2011.
- Whitman, Walt. "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd." Eds. Walter Kalaidjian et al.
- Williams, Tennessee. *The Glass Menagerie*. Vol 1. The Theatre of Tennessee Williams. New York: New Directions, 1971.
- . *Glass Menagerie*. Acting Edition. New York: Dramatists Play Service, 1973.
- Understanding Literature: An Introduction to Reading and Writing*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004. 762.
- "The World is Waiting for the Sunrise." <http://www.JazzStandards.com>. Web. 7 Sept. 2011.

Leisure Studies, the Happiness Movement, and Japanese Zen

This article very briefly illuminates the roots of leisure theory in the Western hemisphere, seeking common threads with a number of sources including Buddhist philosophy, especially referring to Zen. It devotes some time to discussing the multiple meanings of leisure in the academic setting. Finally, it fetches up with contemporary discourse circulating around Positive Psychology informing today's so-called "Happiness Movement."

Based on its reliance on a pantheon of Greek philosophers including Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates, academic Leisure Studies is often considered to have a fundamentally Eurocentric bias. Now, Aristotle has renewed relevance because of the emergence over the last one or two decades of the "Happiness Movement" under the aegis of Positive Psychology. Framing this discourse, and providing a kind of triangulation, is the continuing exploration of Eastern wisdom—certainly including Buddhism which entered the West in great waves from India, but also especially Japanese Zen.

According to Aristotle, a life of "virtue" leads to what is often called "happiness," meaning by that *eudaimonia*—usually roughly translated as "happiness" yet maybe somewhat less imbued with hedonic immediacy and more with personal satisfaction than our quotidian usage. Apparently, much of the emphasis in today's Positive Psychology is a call for a species of happiness, if we are to summarize from the coverage in *The Chronicle Review* of the Association's meeting with more "than 1,500 people from 52 countries [who] came to listen" (Ruark, 2009).

According to the *Review's* Jennifer Ruark, "they packed the ballroom of the Philadelphia Sheraton for the keynote speakers, Martin E.P. Seligman and Philip G. Zimbardo, whose talks were projected onto four giant video screens. They filled the aisles for a lecture by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, until hotel security arrived to dislodge them" (Ruark, 2009). The reporter goes on to explain that "in the past decade, positive-psychology [sic] research has drawn hundreds of millions of dollars in grants. Studies of emotional well-being and its many facets, once next to impossible to find, are now routinely presented at meetings of the Association for Psychological Science and published in the discipline's leading journals. Dozens of colleges offer courses in positive psychology . . ." (Ruark, 2009). While activity in academic Leisure Studies may have crested in the last third of the last century, many such scholarly departments broadening their orbits into sport and tourism in order to maintain a competitive edge in the new corporate-style institutions, *happiness* has increasingly become a hot topic.

In spite of a long history of interest in the US, there seems to be an absence of Buddhist philosophy in the field of Leisure Studies, and now in the emerging discipline of "Happiness Studies" under the general rubric of Positive

Psychology. This paucity seems clear testimony to the perceived Eurocentric orientation of the field. The popular biography of the spiritual founder of Buddhism is well known, presumably too well known to belabor here. As the folk biography relates the narrative, after almost starving himself to death he collapsed in a stream while bathing. During his search for enlightenment, Siddhartha identified meditation as proper. Motivation for meditation in traditional Buddhist practice is to achieve insight, not necessarily create physiological change.

Nor, for that matter is meditation seen as a therapeutic intervention. Meditative practice is said to deal with the 5 hindrances—agitation, aversion, craving, doubt, and sloth. Still, Buddhism, as is perhaps typical of such social structures, exists in an array of varietal forms, Zen being especially common in Japan.

It may be intuitive that people anywhere searching for “happiness” would in due course investigate Eastern philosophy. Although there is no immediately apparent explanation for why the Zen form of Buddhism was one of the varieties well introduced into the US, it is possible to speculate on mechanisms such as the Arts & Craft movement, which provided such an impulse toward cultural exchange, or the effects of the occupation of the Japanese archipelago in the late forties and early fifties.

In keeping with the normal exploratory nature of human curiosity, much New Age activity loosely bound to Happiness Studies is patent balderdash, with easily enumerated suspicions and “problems” plaguing the enterprise, such as:

- One finds during a careful literature survey by topic in Positive Psychology that much, perhaps too much, of the research on happiness is based on self-report questionnaires. Unless this has not been mentioned in the methods discussion, there is little or none of the traditional test-test-retest imposed by independent inquiry into random samples of these pools of responses.
- A good portion of Positive Psychology is uncomfortably frequently extrapolated from correlation rather than experimental data. Because the subject pool is comprised of human beings, it is often difficult and on occasion illegal to construct experimental protocols to “get around” this. Still, although this is a realistic explanation for the lack of some purely experimental data, it does not “raise” the desired confidence level afforded by the existing data pack. Poor data does not become good because better data is not available.
- Positive Psychology is at this point necessarily based on short-term rather than longitudinal research. Time will tell. Perhaps some longitudinal evidence will enter the research flow.

- The compelling complaint that “outcomes” related to Positive Psychology is being and has been marketed beyond what can be legitimately supported by “the science” can hardly be disputed. However, by whom has it been sold in this way? Academic journals do legitimately insulate activity from the commercial market place. However, when speaker’s fees are correlated with publication history, there is the suggestion of segue from “publish or perish” to “publish and profit.”
- On occasion, it is pointed out that specific research exists that contradicts earlier widely reported findings. In a certain sense, that the base of the research program is broad, including occasional frankly contradictory publications sustains rather than nullifies the process of seeking understanding in this domain. After all, that’s the process of Baconian science: test, retest, and correct.

Anyway, *The New York Times* has reported on new information carried in the journal of *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*. According to the journalist, “those who meditated for about 30 minutes a day for eight weeks had measurable changes in gray-matter density in parts of the brain associated with memory, sense of self, empathy, and stress” (Bhanoo, NYT, 2011). Adherents have long described anecdotal benefits of meditation.

Syndya Bhanoo in her story, *How Meditation May Change the Brain* (2011) explains that “previous studies have also shown that there are structural differences between the brains of mediators and those who don’t meditate, although this new study [in *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*] is the first to document changes in gray matter over time through meditation” (Bhanoo, NYT, 2011). Still, David Eagleman, head of the Laboratory for Perception and Action at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston has pointed out bluntly in an interview that “the assumption that all brains have the same capacities is charitable but demonstrably false” (Slate, May 7 2011). Perhaps leisure should be defined in some ways after the manner we define tourism: the primary characteristic being possession of the resources which allow actual participation in the thing itself.

The *middle way* is a path of moderation between the extremes of self-indulgence and self-mortification (indeed, the balance between such polarities as are available). It is a telling detail that a woman (or, in some versions of the folkloric narrative, a girl) had the good sense to bring food and drink—what I will always consider to be markers of domestic happiness—into Siddhartha’s thoughtful orbit of contemplation.

That great champion of contemplation and music as leisure, Aristotle, was a seeming supporter of the *Golden Mean* with its apparent similarity to the middle path. None-the-less, he also seemed convinced that this did not extend only to bare essentials. “It is held that equality of wealth, by ensuring that no one need

resort to stealing clothes or food because he is cold or hungry is a sufficient cure for such crimes" Aristotle argued or explained. "But to secure the necessities of life is not the only purpose for which men commit crimes against property. They also wish to enjoy things which they have long coveted; and if their desire goes beyond mere necessities, they will seek a remedy in crime" (Aristotle/ Sinclair, 1962, p. 75). He noted that humans desire much beyond what Maslow eventually called the necessities, foreshadowing the famous diagram beginning at food and traveling toward self-actualization.

Three currents, then: leisure studies based in Greek antiquity, Eastern wisdom contained in Buddhist philosophy, and today's Positive Psychology, seem tantalizingly close to concordance in spite of important and powerful, if subtle, individuation. For example, it is very clear that Aristotle is a great believer in contemplation (which focuses on knowledge of first principles; that is, the Gods, mathematics, metaphysics, logic, as opposed to practical reason which involves the mere affairs of men and women), which we may see as active—quite dissimilar to the clarity of vision and free-mindedness sought in Zen's rigorous though passive meditation, the meditation I most understand. Zen, a school of Mahayayana Buddhism is indeed the Japanese pronunciation of chan, Chinese for what would approximately be "meditation" or perhaps that state attained during meditation. As practice, Zen does strive for experience—it includes walking meditation—in preference to a theoretical approach toward self-realization.

Aristotle and Socrates were often at some fairly strong disagreement. If I follow the narrative correctly, Aristotle powerfully disagreed with Socrates who was of the opinion that knowledge would necessarily lead to what he called "right action." For Aristotle, "living well," that is, properly, was an "every day" aspect of appropriate human life experience. Right living was not a thing to be cherry-picked as convenient, an option that one can do on special occasions. Thus, predictably, the philosopher felt that the greatest foul deed was to know the proper action, but fail to do it.

Greek philosophers speculate about the highest goal of life, concluding that a well-lived life leads to "happiness" (eudaimonia) meaning satisfaction with existence; they are not describing an emotional state. Eudaimonia is more about struggling to be the best that particular human being can be, fulfilling one's intrinsic human "duty" as engaged in social communities. The idea is that by living in a way that reaches whatever potential a person has—like a horse being allowed to run at its best speed—the display of a best version available outside the thrall of answering basic needs. Because the Greek city-states rested on a slave economy, and there is little regard for the idea of the necessity of earning a living, this is not the same as saying that leisure is ultimately elite or composed of disengaged contemplation.

These matters are discussed by John Hemingway in his important 1988 paper, *Leisure and Civility: Reflections on a Greek Ideal* (1988). While noting

his disappointment in much of what he considers to be misinterpretation of the general Classical foundation in the field of Leisure Studies in particular referencing Sebastian deGrazia's canonical *Time, Work, and Leisure* (1964), the scholar says that two basic misunderstandings tend to exist in today's academic literature.

Hemingway claimed that because leisure scholars often fail to explore the original source material, they are likely to make one or both of two important mistakes. For Hemingway, careless readers may conclude that (a) "freedom from the necessity of labor for daily bread makes of leisure a strictly patrician or aristocratic privilege" (p. 180) and (b) that leisure thus necessarily becomes a "largely contemplative state arising from this freedom" (Hemingway, 1988, p. 180). If statement one is not accurate, as Hemingway says, statement two, bound as it is to the first, is not likely to be accurate. Importantly, for Hemingway and others, I think, who read these texts carefully the Greek philosopher's counsel, as does Josef Pieper (1952), active intellectual productivity: leisure is not a void state which seeks filling. Human life is, from this perspective, opportunity pressing for expression.

Perhaps a decade ago, while interviewing a group of sport hunters, it occurred to me that there was no pressing need to "hunt" for food. Nor, by any stretch, was legitimate effort made to maximize success of their harvest—though planned failure wasn't usually a feature, either. What these individuals "secured" by their choices was occasional game, but routine opportunity for contemplation (separated from practical reason, reflecting on the metaphysical) in a quiet, tranquil, setting.

Buddhists call a path of thoughtful moderation the *middle way*. This active avoidance of the extremes of self-indulgence is a middle path between polarities and certainly reminds some readers of the Aristotelian notion of virtues which equate generally with happiness: in the sense of being all you could be by calmly applying yourself to identified areas of interest. Aristotle meant by virtue the act of achieving balance and moderation. For example, courage would be the moment of balance and moderation between rashness and cowardice—the point of harmony where the proper amount of hazardous risk and prudent caution are at play. Generosity would be the mid-ground between being a wasteful spendthrift and being an odious miser.

Both the Greeks and the Buddhists seem to assume a great deal of freedom of action, especially, too, that the individual is properly informed and willing to do what is, in the end (even though we call it *leisure*) a great deal of labor: live a life of "virtue," the good life, the well-lived life, or choose the middle-path between those understood and avoided edged of excess. Freedom here is not less, but more effort than just flowing along.

Meanwhile, as simply as Aristotle seems to frame leisure, explaining its features related to the good life, first principles, and actions taken for their own sake(s), leisure specialists struggle for meaning.

Cara Aitchison provides a wonderfully concise review of leisure studies in relation to disability (space limits more than a few examples here but I do direct those interested to this paper for a better understanding of the topic; Donlon, 2001, for issues related to Civil Rights). According to Aitchison (2009), a major problem with our conceptualization is that leisure scholars have—I might say in addition to being Eurocentric—enduringly defined the subject in terms of the established and normal (or, as Gramsci might say, in terms of the hegemony).

For Aitchison, this results in at least two fundamental errors “. . . because [definitions] are drawn exclusively from the able-bodied world, the definitions prevent a full understanding of the relationship between leisure and disability and of disabled people’s experiences of leisure” (Aitchison, 2009, p. 381). In turn, this failure creates a definition which is “fundamentally flawed” (p. 381), starting a cascade effect preventing the meaning to ever be more sharply pulled. Importantly, Atchison’s *Exclusive discourses: leisure studies and disability* (2009), with its focus on the role of special populations within leisure studies, underscores the frequency with which leisure is poached by adherents of the medical model: converting time and again contemplation into practical reason.

If Aitchison perhaps conflates leisure and recreation, Godbey et al tease out the separate fibers in their *Contributions of leisure studies and recreation and park management research to the active living agenda* (2005). Again, the paper presents a broad but concise read of the texture of recent leisure studies history from a particular perspective. Quickly, these authors say “the intellectual content of leisure studies and recreation and park management [these topics are often housed in the same curricular setting in American universities] evolved from different, but related perspectives” (Godbey et al, 2005, p. 151). For our purposes, there are central salient differences. Recreation is seen as responsive to environmental circumstances (the need for access to the outdoors, relief from labor degradation). Oddly, the authors state that “leisure studies emerged from a different, but related, set of traditions” (Godbey et al, 2005, p. 151). Again, in a certain sense, leisure is seen as being essentially responsive—no Aristotelian contemplation of the Gods here—resulting from a need. “Social problems” and general benefits stimulated academics to action. In support, the authors explain the emergence of leisure studies curriculum since the 1940s and the growth of the field’s main journals. There can be little doubt that scholarship was strongly motivated by desire to deal with perceived social problems and thus improve quality of life.

Just as the dark underbelly of Aristotelian/Platonic Leisure is the acceptance, even demand, for a slave class (today, this would probably be constituted by those groups of people addicted to the work-spend-work-spend cycle James Oliver (2008) calls victims of “affluenza,”) which might even attenuate to hatred of democracy, Buddhism’s understanding of life’s suffering might be tasked with the sobriquet of “utilitarian fatalism.” And many critics have pointed to the sharp failings of commercial (not to say fraudulent)

components of “Happiness Studies” perhaps here better called happiness marketing.

Can there be any legitimate question that mainstream academic research “has advanced alongside the mushrooming of a hungry popular market for guidance on what ‘happiness’ really is” (Ruark, 2009)? One organization of several which have become self-appointed codifiers and indexers of the “life coaching” field, a spin-off of happiness research, grew from two-thousand members in 1999 to more than 13,000 in 2009. National Public Radio aired a piece in 2007 which took as its prime example of the field the then best seller *The Secret*. In this enormously popular book (very thickly larded with quotes from other “specialists in the field,”) television producer Rhonda Byrne explains that everything in the universe vibrates on a particular frequency. According to Byrne, by tuning thought to the same frequency as, for example, companionship or money, the thinker will attract wealth, love, health, and, of course, unlimited happiness.

Byrne’s tissue of fantasy is a very far cry from acknowledging the suffering of the natural world and reducing this suffering, or managing the impact of such suffering as exists, by one’s acceptance and comprehension of reality, as Buddhism might suggest. Or, for that matter, from the “hard work,” of *leisure* in the sense given it by the philosophers of antiquity in which a well-lived life provides one the opportunity to pursue what is best in one’s self, in spite of how difficult this task might be.

Tokai University, Tokyo, Japan

Jon Griffin Donlon

Works Cited

- Aitchison, C. (2009). Exclusive discourses: leisure studies and disability. *Leisure Studies* 28, 375—386.
- Ben-Shahar, T. (2008). *Happier: Can you learn to be happy?* London: McGraw Hill Books.
- Bhando, Sindya N. (2011, January 28). How meditation may change the brain. *The New York Times*
- Braverman, A. (2003). *Living & dying in Zazen*. Tokyo: Weatherhill.
- De Grazia, S. (1964). *Of time, work, and leisure*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Donlon, Jon G. (2001) [Winter 2000]. Accessibility, the Americans with disabilities act, and the natural environment as a tourism resource. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11.1, 101-110.
- Dumoulin, H. (1992). Zen Buddhism in the 20th Century. Trans. Josph S. O’Leary. Tokyo: Weatherhill.
- Ehrenreich, B. (2009). *Bright-sided: How positive thinking is undermining America*. New York: Picador.
- (2006) *Dancing in the streets: A history of collective joy*. New York: Holt.
- Gilbert, D. (2005). *Stumbling on happiness*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Godbey, G.C.; Caldwell, L.L.; Myron, F.; Payne, L. (2005). *Contributions of leisure studies and recreation and park management research to the active living agenda*. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 28, 150-158.

- Hemingway, J. L. (1988). *Leisure and civility: reflections on a Greek ideal*, *Leisure Science*, 10, 179-191.
- McNulty, S. (2011, May 7). Target practice with David Eagleman: The neuroscientist thinks everyone should know how to use a gun. *Slate*. Retrieved from <http://www.Slate.com/>
- Okakura, K. [1906]. *The book of tea*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Oliver, J. (2008). *The selfish capitalist: Origins of affluenza*. London: Vermilion.
- Pieper, J. (1952). *Leisure: The basis of culture*. New York: Pantheon.
- Ruark, J. (2009, August 9). An Intellectual Movement for the Masses: 10 years after its founding, positive psychology struggles with its own success. *The Chronicle Review*.
- Sinclair, J.A. [translator] (1962). *Aristotle: The Politics*. London.
- Sucitto, A. (1995/2010). *Turning the wheel of truth: Commentary on the Buddha's first teaching*. London: Shambala.

Professor Dress: Consequences of Cultural Distance in the Classroom

The dress code of professors, such as it is, is presented in popular culture as somewhere between semi-formal and aloof. Despite temporal variations—from black robes to business suits, and patched corduroy elbows to black turtlenecks—there is something approaching a constant: We are led to understand that academics distinguish themselves as interesting at least partly through their clothes. Even elementary school faculty are said to have a particular look, such that “clothes make the teacher” (Weber and Mitchell, 1995:54-71).

The attire of faculty—and particularly how professors dress in the classroom—has been linked primarily to how they are perceived. But less research has examined how these variations are reacted to behaviorally. And indeed, it is (or should be) student behavior rather than perceptions that guide our choices and, in some instances, policies. This article will review the literature on attire, summarize data from an initially inadvertent experiment, and provide concluding thoughts about how the physical materials we don may offset consequences of the cultural and virtual changes that presently complicate teaching and learning.

Making Teacher Attire Important

There are increasing concerns about learning outcomes as well as behavioral problems in schools ranging from bullying to violence. All have been tied to attire. At the extreme, some “school shootings” have been both explained and reacted to with variations in attire (Ogle et al., 2002). Meanwhile, school uniforms have been credited with dramatic reductions in school violence (King, 1998). At far less extremes of student behavior, but to a much greater degree in both popular and academic attention, behavioral conformity has been sought through regularity of attire. One way in which some schools, communities, and cultures have attempted to reign in and normalize student behavior has been through dress codes. The expectation is that by standardizing student attire, behavioral differences are both minimized (through a socialization of similarity) and more easily identified (in the sense that other variation, particularly gang-related clothing, is minimized). Within limits of case law and common sense, the expected result is “a better school environment” in all regards (Stover, 1990).

Cross-culturally, there *is* some evidence that regulating student attire is associated with behavioral regularity (McVeigh, 1997). A cross-national study similarly concluded that attire (among other variables) may play an important part in the organizational culture of educational institutions, independent of local or national culture (Dedoussis, 2004). However, as one review of the literature

on school uniforms noted, despite “enthusiastic anecdotes”, the “empirical evidence is scant” (Pedzich, 2002). Even one of the earlier studies to identify positive effects on student behavior recommended caution and further investigation (Stanley, 1996). One of the few studies to assess behavioral outcomes of student uniforms found no significant effect (Brunsma et al., 1998), and one of the most extensive studies of school dress codes found that students actively *resist* them (DaCosta, 2006). At best, the evidence has been mixed even within the same study, such as findings that school uniforms lower perceptions of gang presence but also lower students’ perceptions of themselves (Wade et al., 2003). One opponent of the concept has even mocked student attire as a panacea, titling a published teaching exercise, “Will dress codes save our schools?”—and encouraging a resoundingly negative answer (Alvez, 1994).

Students, however, are of course not the only ones in any classroom; and their attire is not the only attire that might matter. If one is interested in structuring classroom demeanor by regulating attire present, attention to faculty attire is worth considering. Indeed, dress codes for both K-12 and collegiate faculty have not only been suggested but have also been a matter of dispute for many decades. At least one observer, in a list of suggestions to increase student respect, argued that “professional dress codes would have the greatest effect on campus climate and culture” (Lemos, 2007). Although “casual dress” for teachers is presented as inappropriate in popular media (Freeburg et al., 2010), dress codes for faculty are unusual in modern America. Most K-12 schools do not have a dress code for teachers (Million, 2004), and the proportion of universities and colleges without such a code is probably higher. One reason is negotiated: Unions have actively opposed such codes. Another is external: While employers have generally prevailed in court cases regarding personal appearance (Maher et al., 1986), administrators may be legally limited as to whether they can restrict what *teachers* wear (Hudgins, Jr., 1971). Although the bulk of cases have concerned facial hair, not attire *per se* (Maher et al., 1986), local policies have met resistance at various levels of legal review.¹

Understanding the Effects of Attire

Regardless of the success of *regulating* faculty attire, there is little doubt that it matters, somehow. Indeed, attire perhaps always matters—it *is* an observable, and observed, variation which conveys social information. The question is *how* it matters.

Various studies indicate that attire affects perceptions and evaluations of nurses (Page et al., 1992), doctors (Lill et al., 2005), dentists (Brosky et al., 2003), therapists (Mercer et al., 2008), rehabilitation personnel (Pratt et al., 1997), service workers (Nickson et al., 2005), coworkers (Dellinger, 2002), musical artists (Griffiths et al. 2006), and university administrative personnel (Rafaeli et al., 1997), as well as personnel administrator evaluations of employees (Easterling, 1992), administrator evaluations of teachers (Lang, 1986), and student evaluations of faculty (Chowdhary, 1988). Students, too,

recognize the importance of their instructors' attire, particularly at higher levels of instruction and in disciplines where attire has traditionally been important: MBA students, for example, report (as they are taught) that professional attire is useful for impression management (Peluchette et al., 2006). *Most* of these studies, however, have been based on surveys, and therefore assess what respondents *report* to be important. Their reports may differ from their beliefs, their beliefs may differ from reality, and, regardless, their perceptions are rarely related to actual behaviors.

Even in terms of perceptions, there is ambiguity in the empirical evidence on the consequences of any attire. For example, while white lab coats have long been a symbol of physicians—one of the most historically lasting, and possibly most sociologically persuasive instances of regulated attire—at least one study found no significant difference in perceptions of physicians based on their attire (Fischer et al., 2007). Another found that wearing a tie did not matter as long as the physicians were dressed neatly (Dobson, 2003). In educational settings, the evidence is even more divergent and ambiguous: While teachers wearing formal attire enhances perceptions of their credibility and knowledge, it works against other qualities such as approachability and fairness (Rollman 1980; Leathers, 1992; Lavin et al., 2009). The perceptions themselves are of course not the intended outcomes of the attire, and whether credibility or approachability creates a more learning-centered environment is not clear from either the data or most of those who report it. There appears to be little, if any, research that has measured what students actually *do* in relation to faculty attire, as opposed to simply what they *say* they do.²

Recording Attires' Outcomes

The data summarized here began as a pedagogical exercise and evolved into an inadvertent experiment. For the first four weeks of lectures in an upper-division course in Sociology research methods, I wore a tie on Tuesdays and did not wear one on Thursdays, as the basis for a midterm examination question assessing whether students understood hypotheses. The first time I did this, the question asked for a prediction of what I would wear on a Tuesday. I repeated the exercise the second time I taught the course, but altered the midterm question to suggest rather vaguely that “student behavior differed” between the two days. After grading that second instance of the examination, I realized that student behavior might *have* differed—but that I didn’t know. I immediately decided that in the next and future instances of the course, I would begin to investigate whether the examination question was a complete lark or whether there *were* behavioral differences—years before I considered the relevant literature.

In the ensuing decade, I both continued and elaborated the process, teaching a similar course eleven times, to 262 students (with an average class size of 23.8) at four institutions and in three different disciplines (Sociology, Psychology, and Communication). In the first several terms, I tracked whether

or not I wore a tie. Then I began compounding the exogenous variation (that is, my attire)—partly to make the exam question more interesting, partly from growing curiosity about the explanatory power of attire, and partly, frankly, on larks. In later semesters, I alternated wearing a necktie with a solid-colored shirt, not wearing a tie but with a similar shirt, and wearing a floral-print button-up. On several occasions, I even wore the necktie *with* a floral-print shirt.

For each of the lectures where data was collected, I did my best—while delivering a lecture, managing a classroom of students, and, particularly in the earlier of those eleven courses, learning *how* to deliver a lecture and manage a classroom—to record simple counts of a small number of student behaviors that I considered at the time to be inappropriate but which I now recognize as variable reactions of dissonance and avoidance. In particular, I counted how many students each class period left the classroom (whether for the restroom or for the duration of the period; I did not distinguish), how many read a newspaper (particularly common at the first institution where I taught), and how many fell asleep (more common at the later two institutions). Ultimately, I observed a total 1,501 attending students and recorded 42 instances of students leaving, 36 of students reading, and 9 of students falling asleep.

Table 1: Instances Observed

Instance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Institution	A	A	A	A	B	C	D	D	D	D	D
# Students	12	12	24	24	19	46	27	25	25	24	24
# Days	8	8	8	8	4	8	4	4	4	4	4

Although I had *whimsically* proposed to students on those first two examinations that the exogenous conditions of my attire might make a difference, I was surprised at the extent to which they make a *systematic* difference. I lumped the three counts (leaving, reading, and sleeping) as a composite measure; calculated, for each class day measured, that lump sum as a percentage of students present; and then averaged those percentages according to the exogenous variation (such as whether or not I wore a tie). As Table 2 below shows, the percentages were more than twice as high (11.5% vs. 5.0%) when I wore a necktie as when I did not. In other words, wearing a tie more than doubled the incidence of behaviors I had hoped to avoid or at least reduce. Wearing a floral-print shirt was associated with a small (but statistically significant) reduction over wearing a solid-colored shirt without a tie (4.5% vs. 5.9%), and a larger reduction when the floral-print condition is compared with the conditions of a solid-colored shirt both with and without a tie (4.5% vs. 8.7%). The highest incidence of problematic behavior occurred on the two dates when I wore both a floral-print shirt *and* a tie (12.5%)—which, I soon realized,

was too unconventional, and may have involved too much (and, of course, conflicting) culture.

Table 2: Incidence Percentages by Condition

Condition	Tie	No tie	floral	Non-Floral	No Floral or tie	Floral and tie
Trials	28	36	13	51	25	2
Incidence	11.5%	5.0%	4.5%	8.7%	5.9%	12.5%

Attire and Cultural Distance

Attire is one aspect of culture, which also includes dance and music, medicine and food, floral arrangement and architecture, and much else in between. Because the term is so far-reaching, and because it has been understood to mean something “super-individual” and amorphous, the idea of a Cultural Sociology was long ago considered impossible (Abel, 1930). However, culture need not be seen as something amorphous and incalculable. Rather, culture can be counted, and measured (Black, 1976:63). It can even be used *geometrically*, to locate social actors or agents, as well as to identify distances between them. Various aspects of this approach—its epistemology of pure sociology (Black 1979, 1995), its explanatory strategy of social geometry (Black 1990:854, 1995:851), and its theory of social control (Black, 1976)—have been used to study a wide range of settings, including executives (Morrill, 1995), the mentally ill (Horwitz, 1984), children in a day-care center (Baumgartner, 1992), and even reality show interactions (Godard, 2004).

Black has theorized two types of cultural distance, resulting from variations in amount and in degree of conventionality. Black uses these distances to predict legal behavior, variation in the application of law (1976:3) In the first type, legal action is greater in a direction towards less culture—such as from a professor towards a student—rather than the reverse (Black, 1976:65). In the second type, law is greater in a direction towards less conventionality—such as from a professor towards a palm reader—than towards more (Black, 1979:69). Professors are thus more likely to apply law against a student or palm reader, than either would against a professor. Professors, then, have theoretically high immunity to law, due both to their high cultural quantity and their relative cultural conventionality. Moreover, both the predictions about law and the summary expectation of professorial immunity are enhanced as cultural distance increases: A professor would be even more immune from legal complaints by an elementary school student. But law varies inversely with other forms of social control (1976:9), all of which are explained with the same body of theory. A professor with maximal cultural distance from potential complainants might thus be more exposed to gossip, ridicule, or simply avoidance.

This body of theory helps makes sense of what happened when I varied my attire. When wearing a necktie, I displayed a greater quantity of culture, and more so fit the part of what at least once was a conventional professorial look. I thus exacerbated my cultural distances (of both types) from students, and

attracted more negative reactions. In the language of Black's "social structure of right and wrong" (1995), I was more wrong. Without the tie, and then with more casual shirts, I reduced that distance—and reduced incidence of concern. The implication is that, for some outcomes, for some populations, or for some faculty/student differences, faculty should *not* wear a necktie.³

Consequences and Conclusions

Even in professions where attire has been standardized to the point of uniforms, empirical norms have changed. Medical professionals, for example, have long been distinguished by their (typically white) lab coats, with potentially important symbolic implications. However, their use is becoming less common (Harnett, 2001), recently dropping from 70% (Farraj et al., 1991) to 13% (Douse et al., 2004) of hospital-based physicians. And this may be with beneficial effect: A comprehensive review of 31 studies on variation in physician attire suggested that the traditional attire "may not have totally salutary effects on patients' comfort levels or their health parameters, and there may be caveats to consider when one is about to don this symbolic attire" (Brandt, 2003:1278). One caveat might simply be changing fashion—not merely in what casual attire constitutes, but when it is appropriate. Even consumers at restaurants were once expected to "dress up," but that norm began to slip decades ago (Nicosia et al., 1976:71). Casual dress is now more acceptable in many settings. In the last decade, with an increase of "business casual" attire and the influence of Silicon Valley successes, even *corporate* dress codes have relaxed (Zielinski, 2005). Another caveat might be that the "identity ambivalence" of options such as blue jeans (Davis, 1989) may serve a utility in the classroom, permitting faculty to hedge between the status difference needed to maintain authority, and the behavioral problems which pronounced cultural distance may encourage.

Whatever the situation, if there are to be dress codes, they should be based on an intersection of empirical knowledge and desired outcomes. They should not simply assert archaic norms, vague qualifiers such as "professional," or formality in any other sense. Faculty attire does matter, but perhaps not as in the same ways or to the same degree that it does in other professions or even disciplines. Indeed, to invoke the conventionality of other professions, particularly corporate expectations such as neckties, is to attract the ire of many who oppose corporate management systems and theories in an educational context.

It may well be, as my experience has shown, that we could improve environments for student learning if we could first learn how we should dress, and that that may mean learning to dress less like "us" and more like "them." We are already becoming more distant from our students in many ways. Their cultural diversity is increasing, and their interactions with us are augmented *at a distance* through technological innovations ranging from email to learning-management systems. As the formality of attire lessens across so many settings,

the importance of casual attire in classrooms may increase. The necktie itself may already be archaic, and the marginal benefit of not wearing one may well hint at larger benefits to be had by dressing even (and ever) more casually. Contrary to the popular images on which I was reared and trained, and somewhere between navigating expectations and exploring academic freedom, I have come to learn that what generates a classroom environment conducive to learning is to dress not less like students, but perhaps more so. Rather than costuming as a player in the proverbial ivory tower, we should instead watch, if not follow, the fashion trends of our audience. Rather than simply *teaching* about popular culture, we should consider wearing it *when* we teach.

California State University, Northridge

Ellis Godard

Notes

1. Federal Courts have been divided on many issues of teacher dress codes (Waggoner, 2008:120). Requirements that men wear neckties, for example, have been affirmed by one court as expressing the authority of an instructor (Blanchett, 1969) but rejected by another as infringing on a First Amendment right to groom as one desires (East Hartford, 1977).
2. One relatively ambitious study concluded that teaching assistants in “high professional dress” were associated with “student misbehaviors” being “less likely”—but the students self-reported their likelihood of misbehaving (Roach, 1997).
- 3 Attire for women is clearly more complicated, both pragmatically and culturally, than relatively simple choices such as whether or not to wear a tie (Gilman, 2002), and particularly for women in ethnic minorities (Huisman et al., 2005). Moreover, there may be circumstances in which formal attire for females is pedagogically advantageous (Chesler et al., 2007:16). However, multivariate analysis of extensive experimental conditions suggests differences not only in how each gender is evaluated based on their attire, but finds that those differences may be particularly pronounced when the genders of the evaluator and evaluated differ (Blouin et al., 1987). Recommendations for faculty attire may, thus, vary by the gender of the faculty, as well as by situational circumstances such as whether the students are unisex. Perhaps, that is, casual dress may better reduce cultural distance between male teachers at an all-male institution than female faculty at a women’s college, and/or perhaps for both of those situations more so than in any mixed-gender situation.

Works Cited

- Abel, Theodore. 1930. “Is a Cultural Sociology Possible?” *The American Journal of Sociology* 35 (5): 739-752.
- Alvez, A. 1994. “Will Dress Codes Save the Schools? Teaching Strategy.” *Update on Law-Related Education* 18 (2): 9-13.
- Baumgartner, M. P. 1992. “War and Peace in Early Childhood.” Pp. 1 -31 in *Virginia Review of Sociology, Volume I*, James Tucker. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Black, Donald. 1976. *The Behavior of Law*. New York: Academic Press.
- Black, Donald. 1979. “A Strategy of Pure Sociology.” Pp. 149 -168 in *Theoretical Perspectives in Sociology*, Scott G. McNall. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Black, Donald. 1990. “The Elementary Forms of Conflict Management.” Pp. 43 -69 in *New Directions in the Study of Justice, Law, and Social Control*, School of Justice

- Studies at Arizona State University. New York: Plenum Press.
- Black, Donald. 1995. "The Epistemology of Pure Sociology." *Law and Social Inquiry* 20: 829-870.
- Blanchett v. Vermillion Parish School Board.* P. 434 anonymous. La., 1969.
- Blouin, David, Bonnie Belleau, Eleanor Kelley, Robbie Romaine, Jochen Jungelges, and Karen Thomas. 1987. "Sex-role Differences in Appropriate Multiple-role Attire." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 6 (1): 42-48.
- Brandt, Lawrence J. 2003. "On the Value of an Old Dress Code in the New Millennium." *Archives of Internal Medicine* 163 (11): 1277-1281.
- Brosky, M. E., O. A. Keefer, J. S. Hodges, I. J. Pesun, and G. Cook. 2003. "Patient Perceptions of Professionalism in Dentistry." *Journal of Dental Education* 67 (8): 909-915.
- Brunsma, D. L., and K. A. Rockquemore. 1998. "Effects of Student Uniforms on Attendance, Behavior Problems, Substance Use, and Academic Achievement." *Journal of Educational Research* 92 (1): 53-62.
- Chesler, Mark, and Alford A. Young, Jr. 2007. "Faculty Members' Social Identities and Classroom Authority." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (111): 11-19.
- Chowdhary, Usha. 1988. "Instructor's Attire as a Biasing Factor in Students' Ratings of an Instructor." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal* 6 (2): 17-22.
- DaCosta, Kneia. 2006. "Dress Code Blues: An Exploration of Urban Students' Reactions to a Public High School Uniform Policy." *The Journal of Negro Education* 75 (1): 49-59.
- Davis, Fred. 1989. "Of maids' uniforms and blue jeans: The drama of status ambivalences in clothing and fashion." *Qualitative Sociology* 12 (4): 337-355.
- Dedoussi, Evangelos. 2004. "A cross-cultural comparison of organizational culture: Evidence from universities in the Arab World and Japan." *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal* 11 (1): 15-34.
- Dellinger, Kirsten. 2002. "Wearing gender and sexuality 'on your sleeve': Dress norms and the importance of occupational and organizational culture at work." *Gender Issues* 20 (1): 3-25.
- Dobson, R. 2003. "Doctors Should Abandon Ties and Avoid Nose Rings." *BMJ* 326: 1231-a.
- Douse, J., E. Derrett-Smith, K. Dheda, and J. Dilworth. 2004. "Should Doctors Wear White Coats?" *Postgraduate Medicine* 80 (943): 284-286.
- East Hartford Education Association v. East Hartford Board.* P. 838 anonymous. Conn., 1979.
- Easterling, Cynthia R. 1992. "Perceived Importance and Usage of Dress Codes among Organizations that Market Professional Services." *Public Personnel Management* 21 (2): 211-219.
- Farraj, R., and J. H. Baron. 1991. "Why Do Doctors Wear White Coats?" *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 84 (1): 43.
- Fischer, R. L., C. E. Hansen, R. L. Hunter, and J. J. Veloski. 2007. 'Does Physician Attire Influence Patient Satisfaction in an Outpatient Obstetrics and Gynecology Setting?' *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 196 (2): 186.e1-5.
- Freeburg, Beth Winfrey, and Jane E. Workman. 2010. "Media Frames Regarding Teacher Dress: Implications for Career and Technical Education Teacher Preparation." *Career and Technical Education Research* 35 (1): 29-45.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 2002. *The Dress of Women: A Critical Introduction to the*

- Symbolism and Sociology of Clothing.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Godard, Ellis. 2004. "Reel Life: The Social Geometry of Reality Shows." Pp. 73-96 in *Survivor Lessons*, Matthew J. Smith and Andrew F. Wood. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Griffiths, Noola, and Jane Davidson. 2006. "The Effects of Concert Dress and Physical Appearance on Perceptions of Female Solo Performers." in *9th International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition*, anonymous.
- Harnett, Paul R. 2001. "Should Doctors Wear White Coats?" *Medical Journal of Australia* 174 343-344.
- Horwitz, Allen V. 1984. "Therapy and Social Solidarity." Pp. 211 -250 in *Toward a General Theory of Social Control, Volume I: Fundamentals*, Donald Black. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Hudgins, H.C., Jr. 1971. "Are Teachers Subject to Dress Codes." *NASSP Bulletin* 55 (352): 79-84.
- Huisman, Kimberly, and Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo. 2005. "Dress Matters: Change and Continuity in the Dress Practices of Bosnian Muslim Refugee Women." *Gender and Society* 19 (1): 44-65.
- King, Keith A. 1998. "Should School Uniforms be Mandated in Elementary Schools?" *Journal of School Health* 68 (1): 32-37.
- Lang, Richard M. 1986. "The Hidden Dress Code Dilemma." *The Clearing House* 59 (6): 277-279.
- Lavin, Angeline M., David L. Carr, and Thomas L. Davies. 2009. "The Male Professor's Attire and Student Perceptions of Instructional Quality." *Research in Higher Education Journal* 4 1-15.
- Leathers, D. 1992. *Successful Nonverbal Communication*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lemos, Ronald S. 2007. "Etiquette for the Professoriate." *Academe* 93 (1): 46-49
- Lill, Marianne M., and Tim J. Wilkinson. 2005. "Judging a Book by its Cover: Descriptive Survey of Patients' Preferences for Doctors' appearance and mode of address." *British Medical Journal* 331 1524-1527.
- Maher, Pat Marie, and Ann C. Slocum. 1986. "Freedom in Dress: The Legal View." *Home Economics Research Journal* 14 (4): 371-379.
- McVeigh, Brian. 1997. "Wearing Ideology: How Uniforms Discipline Minds and Bodies in Japan." *Fashion Theory: The Journal of Dress, Body, & Culture* 1 (2): 189-213.
- Mercer, Erin, Marilyn MacKay-Lyons, Nicki Conway, Jennifer Flynn, and Chris Mercer. 2008. "Perceptions of Outpatients Regarding the Attire of Physiotherapists." *Physiotherapy Canada* 60 (4): 349-357.
- Million, June. 2004. "Dress Codes for Teachers?" *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review* 59 (5): 59-61.
- Morrill, Calvin. 1995. *The Executive Way: Conflict Management in Corporations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Nickson, D., C. Warhurst, and E. Dutton. 2005. "The Importance of Attitude and Appearance in the Service Encounter in Retail and Hospitality." *Managing Service Quality* 15 (2): 195-208.
- Nicosia, Francesco M., and Robert N. Mayer. 1976. "Toward a Sociology of Consumption." *Journal of Consumer Research* 3 (2): 65-75.
- Ogle, Jennifer Paff, and Molly Eckman. 2002. "Dress-Related Responses to the Columbine Shootings: Other-Imposed and Self-Designed." *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 31 (2): 155-194.

- Page, Johnsie G., and Patricia A. Lawrence. 1992. "Attitudes Toward Dress Codes." *Nursing Management* 23 (12): 48-50.
- Pedzich, Joan. 2002. "Student Dress Codes in Public Schools: A Selective Annotated Bibliography." *Law Library Journal* 94 (Winter) 41
- Peluchette, Joy V., Katherine Karl, and Kathleen Rust. 2006. "Dressing to Impress: Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Workplace Attire." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 21 (1): 45-63.
- Pratt, Michael G., and Anat Rafaeli. 1997. "Organizational Dress as a Symbol of Multilayered Social Identities." *Academy of Management Journal* 40 (4): 862-898.
- Rafaeli, Anat, Jane Dutton, Celia V. Harquail, and Stephanie Mackie-Lewis. 1997. "Navigating by Attire: The Use of Dress by Female Administrative Employees." *Academy of Management Journal* 40 (1): 9-45.
- Roach, K. David. 1997. "Effects of Graduate Teaching Assistant Attire on Student Learning, Misbehaviors, and Ratings of Instruction." *Communication Quarterly* 45 (3): 125-141.
- Rollman, S. 1980. "Some Effects of Teachers' Styles of Dress." in *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association, Birmingham, Alabama.*, anonymous.
- Stanley, M. Sue. 1996. "School Uniforms and Safety." *Education and Urban Society* 28 (4): 424-435.
- Stover, Del. 1990. "The Dress Mess." *American School Board Journal* 177 (6): 26-29.
- Wade, Kathleen Kiley, and Mary E. Stafford. 2003. "Public School Uniforms: Effect on Perceptions of Gang Presence, School Climate, and Student Self-Perceptions." *Education and Urban Society* 35 (4): 399-420.
- Waggoner, Charles R. 2008. "Aligning Leadership and Community Standards: The Dilemma of Dress Codes for Teachers." *John Ben Shepperd Journal of Practical Leadership* (Spring): 114-128.
- Weber, Sandra, and Claudia Mitchell. 1995. *That's Funny, You Don't Look Like a Teacher: Interrogating Images and Identity in Popular Culture*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Zielinski, Dave. 2005. "Cracking the Dress Code." *Presentations* 19 (2): 26-31.

Driven by the Spirit: The Alcoholism of Man in *Boardwalk Empire*

The television drama *Boardwalk Empire* is an historical drama that seeks to prove first and foremost that the cities of the United States never desire to be wet more than when they are dry. Alcohol — according to the series — never has more power than in the time of Prohibition, and Prohibition brings to life the very thing it attempts to destroy. This ironic flourishing of alcohol after it is banished and killed is illustrated in the very first episode, and then throughout the first season, with the inordinate chaos that erupts in New Jersey over alcohol's metaphorical corpse. That chaos includes the instantaneous rise in organized crime, the increase in corrupt politicians' power, the fatal poisoning of consumers, and the multitude of murders used to sustain illegal operations and supplies — all of which arise from the attempt to slake the cravings of those banned from their thirst. *Boardwalk Empire* documents this state of chaos extensively, while simultaneously committing a far more important action: The series relates the deceased and powerful alcohol to other more personal items of its characters — children, lovers, and God — with the implication that these things are interchangeable. The comparison of these items in the show occurs both visually and dialogically and, though unorthodox, argues for a familiar psychoanalytic premise. Jacques Lacan's theories of lost objects and repression bloom forth in *Boardwalk Empire*'s relating the condition of alcohol in the 1920s to the condition of man for all time. Those theories, hand-in-hand with the series, ultimately explain why Prohibition failed and always will.

According to Lacan, the human who is not psychotic chooses/is forced to choose to separate the mother from desire, and that makes desire a separate sort of monster that one must deal with (Fink 90). Lacan, in addition, describes the nature of this separate desire by stating, "Man's desire is the desire of the Other" (*The Four* 235). Bruce Fink in *The Lacanian Subject* expounds upon Lacan's meaning when he states, "Desire . . . does not seek satisfaction, but rather its own continuation and furtherance: more desire, greater desire! It wishes merely to go on desiring" (90). In other words, desire strives to become an end to itself — a sort of fulfillment through not being fulfilled. Still, for desire to be, Lacan says there must be an object that causes it, even if the object only exists as absent. States Fink on Lacan, "The only object involved in desire is that 'object' (if we can still refer to it as an object) that causes desire. Desire has no 'object' as such. It has a cause, a cause that brings it into being, that Lacan dubs object (*a*), cause of desire" (91). According to Lacan, the only type of object that causes desire and really exists is the "object that has been fundamentally lost" (*Écrits* 34). The lost object, according to Lacan, is "essentially phantasmic in nature" — it only exists in what is remembered and felt to be lacking by the individual (Fink 94). The vital thing to remember about the lost object is that it

never existed. According to Fink, “There never was such an object in the first place: the ‘lost object’ never was; it is only constituted as lost after the fact, in that the subject is unable to find it anywhere other than in fantasy or dream life. Using Freud’s text as a springboard, the object can be viewed as always already lost” (94). In other words, the only time one can truly have a lost object is when it is dead, which means that one never has a lost object at all.

There are multiple lost objects/object *a*'s that exist within *Boardwalk Empire* and which drive its characters to seek what cannot be had. The two most notable lost objects are those within scenes that concern the main character, Enoch “Nucky” Thompson. The first lost object is liquor. Just eight minutes into the first episode of *Boardwalk*, the audience is shown a parade in which a giant casket with the corpse bottle of John Barleycorn is marched down the street in a mock funeral. Shortly thereafter, Nucky is discussing with his corrupt league of fellow politicians how the control of the liquor business is about to plop into their hands. What is shown in these short introductory minutes is that Prohibition has literally killed liquor, and it is Nucky who is to become the owner of its corpse and ghost. What is important to note is that, in Lacanian fashion, the only time Nucky possesses liquor, this lost object, is when it is dead. In addition, he never really has it. Later in the series, once the initial celebration dies down, trouble with the illegal liquor production begins. The “alcohol” that is created, it turns out, is a cheap imitation that often kills its consumers with the ingredients added for forgery. Not only this, but Nucky’s supply is repeatedly stolen from him by the character Jimmy, by Van Alden’s raids, and by competition. Nucky may own the corpse of alcohol, but he can never truly grasp that which he owns. His alcohol is a disappointment and unobtainable. This owning of alcohol only once it is deceased (and yet never really having it) is a perfect representation of Lacan’s object *a*, and because of that, brings one’s focus onto the lost object of liquor for a bit more analysis.

The substance of alcohol itself — and not simply in how it relates to Nucky Thompson — is an appreciable representation of the lost object as well. Alcohol, after all, is only created when part of what is inside it has died and fermented. In other words, only in death and fermentation is the drink produced, preserved, and desired. Later, it will be seen how the preservation of alcohol and the preservation of humans become linked. For now, it is important to note that this lost object of liquor contains the combination of death, preservation, and desire that it evokes.

Liquor is not, however, the only focus of *Boardwalk Empire*, nor is it the only lost object of Nucky’s. One other most important object *a* that drives Nucky’s character through the show is the other thing that he had only once it was deceased (and thus, never really had): his baby boy. In the last episode of the first season, Mrs. Schroeder enters Nucky’s suite in her last attempt to discover who Nucky really is. Nucky in this scene, most unlike himself, finally willingly submits. The scene begins with a removal of Nucky’s defense systems,

as he moves away from the three-way mirror — a symbol of Nucky's move away from his social self, towards his inner one. In addition, he removes a party mask that he had been trying on — a veritable shedding of camouflage. Lastly, he crosses the room to Mrs. Schroeder and sits beside her — closing physical distance as well as the emotional distance between them. Nucky then tells Mrs. Schroeder that which defines him utterly. According to Nucky, after his child was born, he did not hold him until after a week had passed. On the day he finally did take his child in his arms, his baby was dead, and he had been so for days. His wife, Nucky says, having suffered from melancholia, cared for the baby as a corpse. "I took him from her," he tells Mrs. Schroeder about his baby, "and I cradled him in my arms. That was the only time I ever held him" (*Boardwalk*). Nucky Thompson only truly had his child when he was already dead. In other words, he never got to have him, and it is in this scene that one begins to understand Nucky as a character. His constant search for children, his murder of Mr. Schroeder for killing Mrs. Schroeder's child, his nostalgia at the baby incubators, and his care for Mrs. Schroeder and Nan Britton are all easily explained by this one profound revelation in the last episode. There is a void in Nucky, punched into him by his first experience with his child, which begs to be replaced by another. This is a perfect physical representation of Lacan's lost object, or object *a* — the object never had that begs to be replaced.

The series draws major connections between the two lost objects of Nucky Thompson — his baby boy and liquor — and these notable connections are represented visually and dialogically. The first association is the visual provided in the first episode after the casket of John Barleycorn passes. What is seen is a man who is pushing a baby stroller, within which — rather than a baby — there are a multitude of wine bottles. This stranger's wife is walking beside him, and she is carrying the baby for whom the carrier was intended. In this scene, the alcohol is in the place of the baby, or the baby and booze are synonymous: both can cause addictions, both cause voids, and both die.

A second way in which dead alcohol and the dead child are connected in Nucky's life, is by a telling scene between Mrs. McGarry and Nucky in the first episode. Mrs. McGarry informs Nucky of Mrs. Schroeder's hospitalization and the subsequent loss of her child, and she implies that it was Mr. Schroeder who is responsible for the ordeal. While informing Nucky of these unfortunate events, she simultaneously hands him a framed poem she had written about the abolition of alcohol. Again, as shown in this exchange, the death of alcohol and the death of a child are connected dialogically and visually. Not only this, but the exchange between Nucky and Mrs. McGarry occurs spatially just a few yards from the baby incubator store featured in the show. This location is extremely important, for it is the place of the final connection of Nucky's two lost objects.

In the show's first episode, "Boardwalk Empire," the boardwalk's baby factory, or baby incubator store, is where Nucky is depicted staring nostalgically

and sadly at the creatures within, and there is an atmosphere of mystery in his act. Across the store's window are the words, "We Save the Lives of Babes." When Nucky looks in the shop, the song "Some of These Days" plays in the background in a slow, melancholy tempo, but also with a cooing sound, like a mother singing to her child (*Boardwalk*). The use of this particular slow tempo and melancholy sound is not accidental, for "Some of These Days" was a popular song in the 1920s and one which Sophie Tucker sang in many different tempos and melodies (Lambert). A faster tempo and brighter key could have been chosen, but the slower, somber one with a motherly, cooing sound was preferred in reference to Nucky and babies. The audience hears:

Some of these days you'll miss me, honey
Some of these days you're gonna be so lonely
You'll miss my huggin'; you're gonna miss my kissin'
You're gonna miss me, honey, when I'm far away
I feel so lonely, for you only . . . (Lambert)

The song is about nostalgia that results from loss, and it vocalizes that which Nucky feels for his own son. This is not, however, where the connections end. Much like the coupling of alcohol and children in the scene between Nucky and Mrs. McGarry, liquor is related to babies once again in terms of the store itself. Within the shop, the babies are seen with bows wrapped around their waists — like many bottles of wine — and the incubators in which they are placed have glass doors, much like a liquor cabinet. Not only is there this visual connection, but there is a dialogic one as well. In episode ten of the series, outside of the incubator store, there is a scene where Jimmy — Nucky's ex-protégé — and his wife Angela and their son are standing outside of the incubator store, looking in. Jimmy jokingly says to his son, "Look, Tommy. Look. This is where we got you. They cooked you up in one of those incubators, wrapped you up in a diaper, and then we took you home" (*Boardwalk*). This reference to the illegal alcohol distilleries, in which batches of beer or wine are "cooked up" — the alcohol of which was not meant to have survived in the first place (is illegal) — is not difficult to connect to premature babies, who would not have survived either, had the incubator stores not intervened. The creation of alcohol and the creation of human lives are linked in their precariousness, their fragility, and the fact that they are that which would be deceased were it not for the intervention of others. In terms of the lost objects of Nucky, this connection of liquor and babies show that the desire provoked by alcohol and by children in life is great and in death is greater. For Nucky, the two objects become inextricably linked and interchangeable. What drives Nucky to seek out children is the same thing that drives alcoholics to drink — to fill a void left within by

the first remarkable experience they have had with an object, an experience which never actually occurred, but is only believed to have.

Nucky is not the only character through which alcohol is related to the human subject. Just twenty-nine minutes into the first episode, the first illegal distillery to which Nucky and Jimmy are introduced is set up in a morgue/funeral home. There is a dead woman being prepared for viewing beside the room in which alcohol is being forged. In addition, formaldehyde is used within that alcohol for the bead necessary in higher proofs. In this particular scene, the preservation of dead humans is linked to the preservation of dead liquor. This is a connection between man and alcohol as lost objects, though again not necessarily in terms of Nucky's life. The connection is meant to be broad — it applies to Nucky, as well as to every other character.

In addition to this broad connection between mankind and liquor, the character of Angela Darmody — Jimmy Darmody's wife — is the center of yet another connection between alcohol and man. This connection, though, is broader and references an additional idea of Lacan's — that of repression. The scene that illustrates this new and interesting association is in episode eleven and involves Angela going to the Dittrich's photography shop — spatially just two stores from the baby incubators. In this scene, her child is at her side, and Angela intends to leave her husband Jimmy to go to France with her lover Mary. When Angela enters the shop, however, it is emptied, and a stranger is sweeping the floor. She talks to this stranger who tells her that Mary has already left for France with her husband. Angela is heartbroken when she realizes she has been abandoned and deceived. In this same moment, her son finds a photo forgotten in a distant part of the empty store, brings it to her, places it in her hand and says, "Look mommy. Ghosts" (*Boardwalk*). The picture is blurry, worn, and scratched, giving the people within a ghostlike quality, but it is also obviously a picture of a bride and groom.

The play of the photograph and the term "ghosts" here occurs on multiple levels, and it is through these various metaphors that Lacan's theories of repression are brought forth in connection with liquor and mankind. The blurred picture of the married couple is symbolic first and foremost of the fact that the traditional lines of a marriage have been blurred greatly by the adultery and lesbianism of Angela and Mary. In another sense, the photo is blurred because it is a symbol of the true state of the Dittrichs as husband and wife. Angela never saw the truth of the couple until the Dittrichs were gone, and this is symbolized by the lack of clarity in the photo. Another way of saying it would be that the haziness is the truth. This relates to Lacan's lost object, for Angela only has the truth of the Dittrichs when they are gone. She can only know that Mary is the type of person to abandon her only once she has abandoned her. Thus, the only time Angela can have the true Mary, is when Mary has related the truth of herself by leaving.

The last thing that this photo symbolizes is what is most important in terms of Lacan. “Ghosts” — the word used to describe the figures in the photo — imply death. Not only this, but ghosts imply haunting — or possessing — and most importantly, a lack of existence. All four are characteristics of the lost object, and all four relate to Angela in that, even though it may have been a lie, she longs for the relationship she had with Mary. Angela is haunted by the absence of someone who was a lie to her. The haunting is physically represented by the blurred photo, much in the way that the death that causes the lost object is represented by physical death in terms of “ghosts.” The physical proof of Angela missing and desiring Mary is in the last episode when she cuts off her long hair — partially as a symbol of mourning, partially as a sign to Jimmy that things can never be as though her relationship with Mary never happened. It does not really matter if the Mary she thought she knew was a lie, just like it does not really matter if ghosts don’t really exist. Both still haunt.

The fact Angela’s child called the figures “ghosts” is important for one more reason in terms of Lacan. Another word for ghosts, which little Tommy could just as easily have said, is “spirits.” Spirits are ghosts; and, of course, spirits are also liquors. This is a point at which a double entendre, or Freudian slip, seems to appear within the historical drama. In other words, within the *madness* of linking ghosts that are symbolic of dead relationships to dead alcohol through the word “spirit,” there is *method*, and one that is carried out gracefully by *Boardwalk Empire*. Of such Freudian slips, Bruce Fink states, “[w]hile in most cases a person who just made a slip would probably endorse the following statement, ‘I just made a random, meaningless goof,’ Freud’s retort would be ‘The truth has spoken’” (4). The truth that has slipped into the viewer’s lap is that the lost objects — Angela’s lover, liquor, Nucky’s baby, etc. — within *Boardwalk Empire* are linked, no matter how covert or hidden the link may be. It is much like the building blocks of the unconscious, described by Fink on Lacan and Freud as the following:

. . . when repression takes place, a word, or some part of a word, ‘sinks down under,’ metaphorically speaking. The word does not thereby become inaccessible to consciousness, and it may indeed be a word that a person uses perfectly well in everyday conversation. But by the very fact of being repressed, that word, or some part thereof, begins to take on a new role. It establishes relations with other repressed elements, developing a complex set of connections with them.
(8)

The word “spirit” is one of those repressed words that make up the web of the *Boardwalk Empire* subconscious. Alcohol in the movie is never referred to as a “spirit,” just like the word “ghost” is used by Timmy, and — what will soon be seen — “Holy Ghost” is always used with Agent Van Alden instead of “Holy

Spirit." "Spirit" is the basis for what seems to be an underbelly network of hidden lost objects. As said before, alcohol and Nucky's little boy are lost objects, both of which are spirits —"spirit" in terms of liquor and "spirit" in terms of the soul of the little Enoch boy. Likewise, Angela's lost object, Mary, is a "spirit" within the photo. The way in which Angela is affected by her lost lover is identical to the way Nucky is affected by his lost boy and the way all characters are affected by alcohol. These dead things will not go away. Rather, they become more effective, more valued, and more desired by the characters. In addition, the spirit/ghost is perfect to represent the object *a*, for just like the object *a* is questioned to exist in the first place (the only thing that makes it real is that it is experienced as real), so too are spirits and ghosts questioned to exist.

One last thing to note about the photograph shown to Angela is a characteristic of photography itself. Much in the way alcohol represents a combination of preservation and death, so does the photograph. It can only preserve what has already passed, what is dead. In addition, what photography captures is something completely fabricated — the manipulated and orchestrated pose — something that never truly existed in the first place. Photographs are also nostalgic and mass-produced, much like people and liquor. Photography and liquor are two comparable elements used to represent nostalgia, lacking, and death in the film.

Apart from Nucky and Angela Darmody, there is one last character through whom alcohol, the "spirit," and the underlying subconscious web are connected. That character is Agent Nelson Van Alden. Van Alden is the puritanical character of the show, who — due to his religious beliefs — commits a great number of atrocities, including torture and murder in the name of God. One of those atrocities is when Van Alden, in a depressed state, goes to a speak-easy, drinks, and has an affair with Lucy Danziger in episode ten. The repercussions of these particular failings by Van Alden are important to note. In the last episode, Lucy finds Van Alden at his office and tells him that he made her pregnant, and a link is made yet again between liquor and children. The one night Van Alden imbibes liquor, a baby is associated with the night as well. In addition, the "spirit" is involved, but not just any spirit. It is the Holy Spirit. Prior to Lucy's informing Van Alden of his possible child, Van Alden tells his wife of his plans to quit the FBI. He states, "I'm unhappy, Rose. Unfulfilled. Increasingly so these last few months." His wife then responds to console him by saying, "You're doing God's work there, Nelson." Nelson's challengingly reply is, "Then if God wants me to stay in Atlantic City, let him give me a sign" (*Boardwalk*). Lucy Danziger, twenty minutes later in the episode, in memory of the night in which Van Alden both drank and had sex, comes to him, pregnant, and tells him that it is his child. Lucy Danziger is that godly sign. Thus, alcohol, babies, and the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit are connected, and the repressed web of things that drive and haunt *Boardwalk*'s characters flourishes once again

under the word “spirit.” It is the Spirit that drives Van Alden, and the more it drives him, the more he feels unfulfilled.

Van Alden’s need to feel the power of the Lord grows increasingly frantic and violent throughout *Boardwalk*. One of the reasons for this frenetic faith is that Van Alden’s character feels trapped in — and powerless to destroy — a city which he deems a Sodom and Gomorrah. New Jersey is so sinful, in fact, that Van Alden fully believes God Himself has died off within the area. This sentiment materializes in episode eleven when Van Alden speaks with Deacon Cuffy and adamantly asks, “You think Christ hears you in this forsaken place?” (*Boardwalk*). The Holy Ghost is a lacking, lost object to Van Alden, much in the way that Nucky’s baby boy and Angela’s lover are lost objects. As a result, he is willing to do anything to bring God back to the area and to feel God’s presence again. It is why he murders the Jewish Agent Sebsø, and perhaps why he drinks and has sex with Lucy — to either replace God with another “spirit” he can feel, or to become the lost God in Atlantic City. In any case, Van Alden feels a great lack — like Nucky’s lack, like Angela’s lack — of God, and his character has a void that must be filled. Though Van Alden is the most religious and puritanical character of *Boardwalk Empire*, God is his lost object, and it is the Holy “Spirit” that haunts him. It is most important to note that once more we see a flash of the word “spirit” — this time in terms of God, rather than liquor, the dead, or ghosts — and the workings of the unconscious web of *Boardwalk Empire*. Lost objects are connected beneath the surface of the film yet again.

Once the web of lost objects has been recognized — that is, the link between alcohol, child, man, woman, and God is acknowledged — the question then becomes the purpose of their being linked in the first place. The answer lies with Lacan’s theories of repression. In *The Ego in Freud’s Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis*, Lacan writes about the modern social occurrence where the disbelief in God actually causes a rise in regulation and prohibition. In other words, the more one outwardly believes something, the more one inwardly acts as though the opposite (repressed) is true (*The Ego* 128). If one believes in God, he acts as though God does not exist, that everything is permitted. If one does not believe in God, then nothing is permitted. Reality is no different for the web of *Boardwalk* characters’ repressed lost objects.

In terms of alcohol and repression, the connection is obvious. Alcohol is celebrated no more than during Prohibition, when alcohol is socially repressed. In the first episode of *Boardwalk*, as soon as Prohibition begins, there is a celebratory party with endless amounts of champagne — a visual created to encapsulate the irony of the situation. In addition, characters in the show are willing to pay the highest prices for liquor — only once it is repressed — and slipshod distilleries multiply like never before. The connection between Nucky and his dead child with repression is the same. Though Nucky attempts to hide, overcome, and repress the truth of his dead child, he nevertheless is forced to action on behalf of it. The memory of his dead baby is the reason he has Mr.

Schroeder murdered and why he takes Mrs. Schroeder under his care. His deceased child is why he stares nostalgically at the babies in incubators, and it is why he provides for Nan Britton — the mistress of soon to be President William G. Harding and mother of Harding's illegitimate child. Again and again, Nucky is moved to help those that easily symbolize his lost son, despite his attempt to secret that part of his life. What he represses asserts control.

In terms of the character Angela and repression, Angela attempts to repress her lesbian sexual desires and hide them from her husband, Jimmy, by attempting to be the average wife for him and by hiding her relationship with Mary. Because that side of her is repressed, it asserts itself more thoroughly in Angela, and eventually — even though Mary leaves and Angela promises Jimmy that she will try to return to normalcy — she is forced to do the exact opposite: embrace what is lost. Her relationship with Mary is dead, but it does not know it. Similarly, Van Alden's drive towards God causes atheistic leanings to be repressed and thus to dominate him. Lacan speaks about the repression of God directly, and what he says is particularly useful in the analysis of Van Alden's repression. Lacan states in his second seminar with the example of Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*:

As you know, [the father Karamazov's] son Ivan leads the latter into those audacious avenues taken by the thought of the cultivated man, and in particular, he says, if God doesn't exist . . . — If God doesn't exist, the father says, then everything is permitted. Quite evidently, a naive notion, for we analysts know full well that if God doesn't exist, then nothing at all is permitted any longer. Neurotics prove that to us every day.
(*The Ego* 128)

According to Lacan, if God does not exist, nothing is permitted, and if God fully exists then all is permitted. This explains the argument made by Agent Van Alden's character entirely. Van Alden is the most frightening and immoral character of the entire show, and he is the Christian. Like the other characters, he is driven towards what he represses, and what he represses is not love or alcohol or family, but rather the complete lack of prohibition, security, and Godliness. Thus, he murders, tortures, commits adultery, and challenges God.

The point of *Boardwalk Empire*'s relating these multiple repressed lost objects of desire is to illustrate the structural reason for why Prohibition failed in the 1920s and always fails. The failure of Prohibition is not because alcohol is the greatest commodity ever created, or because society ultimately realized the thing it deemed evil was actually innocent. The failure is rather due to the fact that people's minds do not allow what dies in their hands to disappear. When a thing like alcohol dies within the public's arms, it is the first time people feel they ever had it, whether or not the phenomena is really true (as said before,

there is question as to whether “spirits” even exist in the first place), and thus they seek it like they never did before.

The failings of Prohibition are also true in terms of repression. When prohibition — of any sort — becomes the prevailing rule for peoples’ lives, what is naturally repressed is complete lack of inhibition; and what is repressed is also what governs. Thus, killing alcohol is impossible, because once it is prohibited, it becomes repressed and thus governs covertly. The object of alcohol acts as though it was never dead in the first place, and reality continues on as though the death never was. Again, it is not that alcohol is particularly remarkable, but rather that it is the nature of the human subject to deem it so. As *Boardwalk Empire* shows, ridding the world of alcohol through Prohibition would be like trying to rid a parent of his or her desire for a child, when the first one born quickly dies. Likewise, it would be like trying to force a man or woman not to be gay or lesbian after his or her first experience with a lover. It would also be like trying to ask a man to give up on a search for a God he believes might be dead. Prohibition, of alcohol, of man, of theism, or atheism, will not happen because it is not natural for the human subject to let anything truly disappear. This is the point of *Boardwalk*: that alcohol can be like a baby, like a God, like a lover in that, when it is lost, it grows all the more great.

University of Texas at Arlington

Lindsey Barlow

Works Cited

- Boardwalk Empire*. Dir. Martin Scorsese. Created by Terence Winter. Perf. Steve Buscemi, Michael Pitt, and Kelly Macdonald. HBO, 2009.
- Fink, Bruce. *The Lacanian Subject*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995. Print.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits*. 1st ed. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007. Print.
- . *The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Sylvana Tomaselli. Notes by John Forrester. New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.
- . *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998.
- Lambert, Katie. "Vaudeville's Red Hot Mama." *Stuff You Missed in History Class*. How Stuff Works, 9 Apr 2010. Web. 18 July 2011.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Films of James Cameron: Critical Essays

Mathew Wilhelm Kapell & Stephen McVeigh, eds.
McFarland, 2011

Continuing its tradition of pop culture excellence, McFarland has recently published a collection of critical essays, edited by Mathew W. Kapell and Stephen McVeigh of Swansea University UK, centering upon the films of one of Hollywood's now legendary filmmakers. Ironically paralleling its own subject matter, Kapell and McVeigh's compilation of essays—like the eponymous films of James Cameron—proves similarly filled with minor flaws, unexplored implications, and portions not as immediately accessible to the un-initiated—which, nevertheless—fail to undermine the exceptional, thought-provoking, and highly original content of the total work. Despite a few overlooked grammatical errors, or instances of stylistic awkwardness, nearly all of the ten essays included present highly engaging, entertaining, and effortlessly readable examinations of varying aspects of Cameron's oeuvre, based in theories ranging from the political, historical, philosophical, and psychological, to the stylistic, gendered, othered, and mythical.

Encompassing a wide range of cross-disciplinary perspectives, the collection holds insights applicable beyond pop culture studies, and many of the essays—especially those on representations of the Other, both in terms of gender and of culture—could be advantageously incorporated into courses concerned with such subjects. For the most part, the essays included provide well-balanced, strikingly readable marriages of critique and theory, explained in such a way as to neither demean readers nor leave them in the dark. Understandably, an inherent knowledge of and familiarity with the films of not only Cameron, but of his past and current contemporaries, is implicitly assumed of readers. Allusions to Cameron's dialogue are seamlessly woven into the various arguments themselves. Nonetheless, brief—relevant—plot summations are almost always provided, necessarily contextualizing the authors' respective assertions.

Many of the authors cite the same key scenes from Cameron's body of work—even going so far as to quote verbatim dialogue in several places—however, these moves avoid redundancy because of the ways in which each scholar re-interprets the scenes' significance, providing similar, but ultimately different, summations of, and implications for, the same content. Doing so showcases the ways in which Cameron's work truly can be read—as the conclusion asserts—in a mythic fashion, readily supporting multiple readings based in far reaching critical perspectives.

However, despite the comparative readability of the other eight essays, Kaufman's contribution on “The Emergence of Archetypal Homosexual Themes,” as well as Isaacs' contribution on “Art, Image and Spectacle,” proved

less immediately accessible to a reviewer not possessing pre-existing understandings of Uranian psychoanalysis and of film theory, respectively.

Additionally, Elliott's article concerning "Perspectives on the Truth in *Aliens* and *Titanic*" appears to put forward a seemingly insupportable claim, when he essentially asserts that *Aliens*' Cpl. Hicks is among those who enter into an ideological clash with Ripley concerning her knowledge of the creatures in question. Elliott further suggests that Hicks "dismiss[es] her [Ripley's] unique perspective as...ignorance/cowardice" (77). However, within the film itself, Hicks appears to do no such thing, reacting—unlike his fellow "grunts"—to Ripley's briefing merely by inquiring, "What exactly are we dealing with here?" In doing so, he expresses far more concern—and far less skepticism—toward the insight offered by Ripley, than do any of the other characters, including the company man, Burke, and Lt. Gorman. Upon re-evaluation, it seems more likely that Elliott has—like Lt. Gorman himself—conflated Hicks with the openly disdainful *Hudson*. Such a disparity, however, could itself prove a useful starting point for class discussion or other critical engagement, an opportunity for problematizing and critically examining this essay.

Presenting diverse scholarly readings of the films of James Cameron—emphasizing those texts rather than the man himself—Kapell and McVeigh's collection showcases a multiplicity of both perspectives and approaches to the iconic, mythic, and commercially successful films of one of Hollywood's most impactful directors to date. Engaging enough to read for entertainment, but academic enough to read for research or to assign to your students, *The Films of James Cameron: Critical Essays*, is well worth the forty-dollar price tag. Though the work contains minor, admitted, shortcomings—as with the texts it examines—these flaws themselves hold the potential to spark further intellectual inquiries and debates.

Sarah Pawlak, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

ERRATA

ERRATA

The Crime Fiction of Leigh Brackett

In *Popular Culture Review* Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 2011, page 40A, last three paragraphs

In the crime novels Brackett published in the 1950s, she dispensed with hard-boiled protagonists and built her stories around ordinary mid-century family men thrown into extraordinary—and extraordinarily violent—circumstances. In *The Tiger Among Us*, a man is beaten by teenage hoodlums and becomes obsessed with revenge, and with overcoming the fear and anger the attack has instilled in him. In *An Eye for an Eye* (also 1957), an attorney is compelled into the role of investigator when his wife is kidnapped by a psychopath.

These later crime novels have fallen into obscurity, unlike *No Good from a Corpse* and several of Brackett's other hard-boiled stories, which periodically find their way back into print. The greater interest in the earlier stories probably has partly to do with the enduring popularity of the hard-boiled style, although it is also the case that Brackett's later novels are weighted by a kind of psychoanalytic exposition that has fallen out of popular favor.

But these later novels nevertheless problematize a common understanding of Brackett as having dabbled in crime fiction without mastering the conventions that produce fully satisfying instances of the genre. The choices she made in her detective fiction, rather than revealing an incomplete control of the genre, appear within the context of her other work to have been quite deliberate. Her stories—western, crime, or sci-fi—do not allow the kind of comfortable hero-identification that has helped sustain the popularity of the hard-boiled writers that initially inspired her. In place of vicarious power and certainty, Brackett offers readers protagonists that, in spite of strength, cynicism, and cunning, are not immune to the conditions of helplessness, terror, and wonder.

National University, San Diego

Christine Photinos

CONTRIBUTORS

Lindsey Barlow is in the English MA program at the University of Texas at Arlington. She graduated Summa Cum Laude with a BA in English at Texas A&M University. Previously, she has had flash fiction published in Oak Bend Review. She is interested in the study of rhetoric and Jacques Lacan.

Dr. Jon Griffin Donlon was born in the American Deep South. A practicing artist and writer before returning to the University of Illinois to take his Ph.D. in Leisure Studies, Donlon is now primarily an academic following an international career. The Tokai University faculty member is very interested in leisure and disaster recovery in addition to his continuing research in controversial leisure & tourism, and leisure consumption. He wishes to acknowledge the many useful contributions of his colleagues, especially his friends and faculty partners at Tokai University.

Dr. Ellis Godard received his MA in Sociology and Government, with a minor in philosophy, and his PhD in Sociology from the University of Virginia. He is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at California State University, Northridge, where he primarily teaches courses in statistics and criminology. Dr. Godard's research focuses on patterns of social control among those who know relatively little about each other, in various settings ranging from reality shows to cyberspace.

Dr. Kathy Merlock Jackson, who holds a Ph.D. in American culture with concentrations in radio-television-film and popular culture from Bowling Green State University, is Professor and Coordinator of Communications at Virginia Wesleyan College, where she teaches courses in media studies and children's culture. She is the author of *Images of Children in American Film* and has published four other books, three on Disney-related topics. She is a past president of the American Culture Association and currently edits *The Journal of American Culture*.

Philip C. Kolin, the Distinguished Professor in the College of Arts and Letters at the University of Southern Mississippi, has published more than 40 books and over 250 scholarly articles on American playwrights, including Tennessee Williams, Adrienne Kennedy, Suzan-Lori Parks, Edward Albee, David Rabe, August Wilson, and on Shakespeare. Among his books on Williams are *The Tennessee Williams Encyclopedia* (Greenwood), *Williams: A Streetcar Named Desire* (Cambridge UP), *The Influence of Tennessee Williams: Essays on Fifteen American Playwrights* (McFarland). He has also written a widely used textbook on business writing, *Successful Writing at Work*, soon to be in its Tenth Edition (Wadsworth/Cengage). Also a poet, Kolin has published four books of poems, most recently *A Parable of Women* (Yazoo River Press). He is currently the Editor of "The Southern Quarterly" and the publisher/editor of "Vineyards: A Journal of Christian Poetry."

Sarah Pawlak earned an AA with honors from Antelope Valley College before transferring to Cal Poly Pomona where she earned, first her BA, also with honors, and later her MA, both of which are in English Literature. She is now at UNLV pursuing her PhD in the same subject. Her wide-ranging interests include 19th and 20th century British literature, drama of all periods, genre fiction, and popular culture. In addition to her two contribution to this volume, she is also currently at work on her first novel.

Lauren Rocha graduated from Bridgewater State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English. Her research interests include 19th and 20th century vampire literature with a particular emphasis on depictions of female characters in the vampire genre. She is pursuing graduate study in English starting in the fall.

Ross Talarico is an award-winning author and Professor at Springfield College, San Diego campus. The epic poem he alludes to in his article was eventually published, nominated for a Pulitzer Prize, the topic for a keynote speech at the 2009 Far West Popular Culture Conference, and the subject matter of a panel discussion at that same conference.

Dr. Matthew R. Turner is currently an Assistant Professor in the School of Communication at Radford University in Radford, Virginia. Dr. Turner is an interdisciplinary scholar with diverse research interests. His article, “Performing Pop Parody: Lady Gaga, ‘Weird Al’ Yankovic, and Parodied Performance” will be published in *The Performance Identities of Lady Gaga* a collection forthcoming from McFarland (2012). Another article “Orpheus in Brazil: Culture, Race, and Representation in Three Retellings of the Orpheus Legend” is scheduled to be published in *Hogar, Dulce Hogar: Ideologies of Home and the Latin American, Latino/a Experience* (In circulation. Expected 2012). He has also published articles on comedy westerns and the Marx Brothers.

Jennifer Woolson hails from the Jersey Shore. As an undergraduate at Penn State, she double majored in English and Journalism, while minoring in Women’s Studies. She is currently a student in the English M.A. program at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. Her interests include contemporary prose by American women of color, as well as feminist and race theories.

Popular Culture Review

Popular Culture Review, the refereed journal of the Far West Popular and American Culture Associations (sponsored by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas) is published twice yearly. It is indexed in the MLA Bibliography and the Modern Humanities Research Association's Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Members of the FWPCA/FWACA receive each issue as part of membership. Single copies may be purchased for \$10.00 domestic and \$15.00 international. Yearly subscriptions for institutions and libraries are \$25.00. Requests for back issues should be submitted to the editor.

Please note that the journal is now all electronic and all requests for submission guidelines and/or submissions should be sent to Felicia Campbell (Department of English, University of Nevada, Las Vegas) at felicia.campbell@unlv.edu. Documentation may take the form appropriate for the discipline of the writer; the current MLA style sheet is a useful model. The editorial staff will defer to the current *Chicago Manual of Style* to resolve stylistic differences.

The journal invites articles on all aspects of both popular and American culture. Correspondence about membership in FWPCA/FWACA, which includes a subscription to *Popular Culture Review*, should be sent to Felicia Campbell at felicia.campbell@unlv.edu.

Popular Culture Review gratefully acknowledges the contributions made to this journal by the UNLV College of Liberal Arts and the UNLV Department of English.

Articles published do not necessarily represent the opinions of and are not the legal responsibility of *Popular Culture Review*.

ISSN 1060-8125

Studies in Popular Culture

Studies in Popular Culture, the journal of the Popular Culture Association in the South and the American Culture Association in the South, publishes articles on popular culture and American culture however mediated: through film, literature, radio, television, music, graphics, print, practices, conditions of life. Its contributors from the United States, Canada, France, Israel, and Australia include distinguished anthropologists, sociologists, cultural geographers, ethnomusicologists, historians, and scholars in mass communications, philosophy, literature, and religion.

Please direct editorial queries to the editor: Dennis Hall, University of Louisville, Department of English, Louisville, KY 40292. Telephone: (502) 588-6896/0509. Fax: (502) 588-5055. Bitnet: DRHALL01@ULKYVM. Internet: drhall01@ulkyvm.louisville.edu.

All manuscripts should be sent to the editor care of the University of Louisville, Department of English, Louisville, KY 40292. Please enclose two double-spaced copies and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Black and white illustrations may accompany the text. Our preference is for essays that total, with notes and bibliography, no more than twenty pages. Documentation may take the form appropriate for the discipline of the writer; the current MLA style sheet is a useful model. Please indicate if the work is available on computer disk. The editor reserves the right to make stylistic changes on accepted manuscripts.

Call For Papers

**Far West Popular Culture
and
American Culture Associations**

Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting

February 22 – 24, 2013

Las Vegas, Nevada

**Sponsored by the College of Liberal Arts
University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

We cordially invite you to our Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting. Papers on all aspects of Popular Culture worldwide and American Culture as well as readings by creative writers are welcome. Those interested in submitting proposals for either papers or readings or creating either conference sessions or Sunday round table discussions for either FWPCA or FWACA should send abstracts of less than 50 words and titles by December 15, 2012 to:

Felicia Florine Campbell
Department of English
University of Nevada, Las Vegas 89154-5011
(702) 895-3457 or e-mail: felicia.campbell@unlv.edu
FAX (702) 895-4801

The registration fee of \$185.00 includes a light buffet at the opening reception, morning coffee and rolls, lunch on Saturday, a subscription to *Popular Culture Review* (our refereed journal), plus additional conference events to be announced. Student registration of \$85.00 includes all events scheduled on the program and one issue of PCR.

Popular Culture Review
Volume 23, no. 1
Winter 2012

From the Editor's Desk.....	3
Arrr!!!Performing Piracy and the Origin of International Talk Like a Pirate Day	5
<i>Matthew R. Turner</i>	
Childhood Rejects: One-Eyed Willie, Pint-Sized Pirates, and the Generational Appeal of <i>The Goonies</i>	17
<i>Kathy Merlock Jackson</i>	
The Many Faces of Moriarty: A Critical Examination of the Arch- Criminal's Evolution Across the Landscape of the Popular Imagination.....	29
<i>Sarah Pawlak</i>	
Mirror, Mirror: Gender and Beauty in the <i>Twilight Series</i>	39
<i>Lauren Rocha</i>	
To My Sons: On Being a Writer in the Twenty-First Century: <i>The Crosscut Literary Award, 1968</i>	49
<i>Ross Talarico</i>	
Race, Gender, and Genre: The <i>Baroness Series</i> as Social and Literary Progression	55
<i>Jennifer Woolson</i>	
Popular Dance Music in Tennessee Williams's <i>The Glass Menagerie</i> ...	67
<i>Philip C. Kolin</i>	
Leisure Studies, the Happiness Movement, and Japanese Zen.....	75
<i>Jon Griffin Donlon</i>	
Professor Dress: Consequences of Cultural Distance in the Classroom... <i>Ellis Godard</i>	83
Driven by the Spirit: The Alcoholism of Man in <i>Boardwalk Empire</i>	93
<i>Lindsey Barlow</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	103
<i>The Films of James Cameron: Critical Essays</i> edited by Mathew Wilhelm Kapell & Stephen McVeigh, McFarland, 2011 Reviewed by Sarah Pawlak	105
ERRATA:	
ERRATA, <i>Popular Culture Review</i> Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 2011....	109
CONTRIBUTORS.....	111

cover design: Happy Toy, Laurens Tan 2012