Editorial Statement

Colloquy is a journal of the Department of Communication Studies, funded through Instructionally Related Activities at California State University, Los Angeles. *Colloquy* aims to represent the variety of scholarship conducted in the Department of Communication Studies as well as representing different types and levels of academic thought. Writing style varies with students' experience with writing as a scholarly enterprise.

The editorial board is comprised of students in the Department of Communication Studies and a supervising member of the Communication Studies faculty. Typically, the membership of the editorial board changes with each issue. The intention of the editors is to ensure that essays appearing in the journal are checked for consistency in style and general clarity in writing. Owing to the breadth of theoretical, methodological, and rhetorical approaches within the purview of communication studies, the editors subscribe to a general ethic of inclusiveness, and they endeavor to treat all essays with this ethic in mind.

As representative of the scholarship in communication studies, a number of essays in *Colloquy* have been presented at national and regional conferences, including the National Communication Association convention and the Western States Communication Association conference. As such, *Colloquy* highlights the achievements of students in the Communication Studies department while providing a forum for scholarly discussion and innovation.

The Editorial Board wishes to thank all those who contributed to this volume, including the authors who submitted essays, the faculty members who solicited materials and mentored students, and members of the production staff.

Copyright 2015, the Authors

Colloquy

A Journal of the Department of Communication Studies
California State University, Los Angeles

Featured Articles

Women's Rights in Public Address: A Feminist Rhetorical Critique

Julie Matos

Abstract

Women's rights is still a salient issue in the 2st century. Furthermore, women's rhetorical contributions are largely overlooked within the field of rhetorical studies. As a rhetorical movement, there is little extant scholarship that analyzes and critiques modern discourse about women's rights in public address. This analysis looks at Hillary Clinton's (1995) and Emma Watson's (2014) speeches on the subject of women's rights and equality at the United Nations, and the respective use of the feminine style in their discourse. The article attempts to contribute to the field of women's rhetoric by evaluating and uncovering contemporary rhetorical strategies of women in public address. Using feminist rhetorical scholarship will allow both a critique of the arguments used by Clinton and Watson to advance feminist goals and issues regarding white, privileged women speaking on behalf of the people they attempt to help.

A recent NPR article, published on February 14th of this year, highlights another side to Valentine's Day of which many might be unaware: "V-Day, the international day of ending violence against women and girls" (Poon). This day of activism, started by Eve Ensler, the creator of the *Vagina Monologues*, focuses in on the abuse and discrimination women face on a global scale. According to data compiled by The World Bank Group online, from 2010-2014 women in the United States made up 50 percent of our population. Globally, with few exceptions, women's populations ranged from 49-53% in each country (Population, Female). Despite the fact that women are an almost equal part or in many cases the majority of a country's population, women do not enjoy the same representation of power and equality within the private or public sphere. Poon's article goes on to emphasize the many laws around the world that classify women as second-class citizens in their respective countries. From Yemen, where a husband "has the right to be obeyed by his wife in the interest of the family…she must permit him to have legitimate intercourse with her when she is fit to do so" (Poon), to Nigeria, where it is legal to hit your wife for

the purpose of "correcting" her, to Russia, where women are forbidden from doing more than 450 types of jobs, women of the world still, clearly, face a long and unique challenge for equality.

The struggle for women to be given the same basic human rights that have been afforded to men for centuries is certainly not a new pursuit but *is* still a very real struggle in the year 2015. From the decades-long struggle to gain voting rights to equal pay in the workforce, from domestic violence to access to education, women the world over have been overlooked ad nauseam. While the women's liberation movement within the United States has done much to improve the conditions of and move us closer towards equality for women, this movement benefits a select few. As bell hooks notes in her book, *Feminist Theory*, when a child is born to a white couple the "factor deemed most important is gender," but for a couple of color, there are multiple factors that impact the future of a child, not just gender, but race and class (12). Furthermore, hooks observes that the women's liberation movement primarily benefited and improved the conditions of mostly white, privileged women. Achieving not only national but global equality for women is a complex mission. For to achieve this end requires us to recognize that forward progress is not just about gender, but socio-economic, ethnic, and political factors as well. Using rhetoric to promote the advancement of the feminist cause is not only imperative to global stability. It must also be carefully examined for its inclusivity, going beyond benefiting a select few and bringing attention to the globe's most vulnerable populations of women.

Many historical figures have used their notoriety and public platform to take on the difficult task of bringing awareness and advocating change of these issues through public address. Two notable speeches in the last two decades come to mind: Hillary Rodham Clinton's 1995 address "Women's Rights are Human Rights" to the United Nations in Beijing, China and, more recently, Emma Watson's 2014 address on gender equality, also at the United Nations. These two speeches are the focus of this essay for several reasons. First, these speeches have been widely established by mass media as exemplars of women's rights rhetoric and within the broader category of public address. Secondly, both addresses were given at the launch of two major gender equality campaigns. Clinton's speech launched the United Nations "Millennium Goals" and Watson's speech launched the United Nations "HeForShe" campaign. Both of these speeches and subsequent campaigns have had a great impact on gender equality whether it be helping women around the world with basic safety and educational needs as was and is the case with Clinton's call to action,

or, in Watson's case, engaging young men and women in conversations about and advocacy of gender equality. Third, these speeches are nearly twenty years apart but both speakers are representative of the primary benefactors from women's liberation movement of the 1960s and 70s (white, middle/upper-class) that many scholars challenge for its lack of inclusivity. While both speakers have certainly experienced discrimination for being women, they have not had to experience the intersectional challenges that befall women of different races and socioeconomic backgrounds. For these reasons, Clinton and Watson constitute excellent sites for comparing, contrasting, and critiquing the rhetorical style and arguments of these two speeches.

The UN World Conference on Women, held in 1995 where Clinton delivered her address, is mentioned in this same NPR article written by Poon. In it, the author references the more than two-hundred countries that gathered and coordinated to end sexist laws still in existence. Additionally, at this same conference, the UN made gender equality one of their many "Millennium Goals" (Poon). However, both the article and a quick look at the United Nations' online progress towards this goal shows us that while some headway has been effected in the last twenty years since this pledge was made, there is still much work to be done. As Poon's article stresses, sexist, dangerous, and oppressive laws are very much a reality fifteen years into the millennium. These two speeches, given by Clinton and Watson almost two decades apart, highlight a continued need to encourage devotion to and discourse about the human rights of women around the globe.

Hillary Clinton has devoted her time and position to campaigning for women's rights. She has been consistently polarized by the media, at times praised and at others punished for her perceived masculine and aggressive approach. Emma Watson, also an advocate for women's equality as the face of the HeForShe campaign, has been largely commended within the media for her work, but also not without punishment. Since almost twenty years has passed between these two influential speeches, one wonders, in what way has the argument that *women's rights are crucial* changed over these past two decades? How do these two women, decades apart, compare in their utilization of rhetoric to move the global community to action? What are their arguments? In what style do these rhetors craft their message? Are they employing traditional Aristotelian notions of rhetoric, or more contemporary models that include the usage of feminine style? Traditional rhetoric is often characterized by the need to "have (one's) own perspectives prevail—or dominate—and to accomplish their own goals, often and the expense of the goals of others" (Foss

et al 93), while many theories of the feminine style of rhetoric are characterized by "equality, mutuality and respect" (Foss et al 93), a more "social" rhetoric where all "participate and benefit" and one that reduces the division between feelings and reason (Bordelon 14). Thus, the first part of this paper compares and contrasts these two speeches to uncover usage of traditional versus feminine styles of rhetoric.

Analyzing the rhetoric used by both Clinton and Watson is significant for several reasons. First, the traditional methods that analyze the persuasiveness of speeches have been largely and conspicuously attached to men's speeches. In Sonja K. Foss's text, *Rhetorical Criticism,* the section devoted to the neo-Aristotelian method provides two full-length examples of the method in practice as well as a long list of references to further illustrate the approach for the novice rhetorical critic. Conspicuously, each of these examples use a man's speech as its focus and all further references are of men's speeches as well. It is the attempt of this analysis to begin filling in the literature gap that focuses primarily on the persuasiveness and rhetorical strategies of men's speeches versus those of women. As women begin (hopefully) to take on larger and more prominent roles within our society, it warrants an attempt to contribute to the discipline of rhetoric by not only analyzing their discourse but including it into texts that teach young students about rhetoric from both a traditional and contemporary lens.

While uncovering and comparing the nature of these speeches is an important task in continuing the inclusion of women within the rhetorical sphere, these speeches do not exist within a vacuum. They are situated in a world where the idea of feminism is consistently being contested, where we debate whether we are third-wave or post-feminism, where some women have gained enormous amounts of equality while others still suffer greatly, and where feminists argue that in order to achieve equality we must recognize the intersections of race, sex, and socioeconomic status in order to achieve more parity. Drawing from contemporary feminist scholarship, we must examine and critique the arguments that are made in both of these speeches to ensure that we are recognizing the issues that feminism as a movement currently faces. Finally, drawing from bell hooks' notions of the marginalized rhetor we can also critique the continued usage of materially privileged white women to speak about global levels of female oppression (Foss et al. 80). Therefore, the second section of this paper takes a critical look at both the contested space in which these women attempt to assert their arguments as well as the issue in choosing spokespeople who speak on behalf of global feminist ideals, but are privileged in

never having experienced the level of oppression forced upon women of other races and classes.

In the first half of my analysis, I use the transcripts of these two speeches. Pulling from multiple sources like Hill, Williams, and Campbell that both explain and illustrate methods of traditional and contemporary rhetorical critique, I examine how these two speeches compare and contrast to each other in terms of style. The second half of my analysis is twofold. First, I pull from extant literature that addresses the most modern issues facing feminism and gender equality to evaluate the arguments proposed by Clinton and Watson. Finally, this paper uses the feminist rhetorical theories of bell hooks to discuss the continued usage of white, affluent female rhetors to represent the goals of women of whose membership they have never been a part.

It is apparent that when it comes to human rights for women, the struggle is still very much real. It is clear that neither national nor universal women's rights have been achieved. It is still the work of many women's rights activists to persuade governments and communities to include women into the discourse of human rights. It is the hope of this research that analyzing the speeches of both Clinton and Watson may help others craft persuasive arguments on the same topic. Understanding what effective and ineffective rhetorical strategies are might increase the viability of women in political discourse and persuade the global community to take practical action for women's rights. Women have consistently been disadvantaged in the political spectrum (Hsu 4), from news coverage to gender stereotypes to feminist backlash. Women are up against great odds to have their voices heard and counted (Hsu 4). By including a rhetorical analysis that examines the ways women create knowledge and truth through language, it is hoped that we can call attention to and demand change of this unfair rhetorical treatment. Finally, the feminist movement must consistently be kept in check in terms of its inclusiveness and accessibility. Using contemporary feminist scholarship and featuring bell hooks as a guide, we can examine how the global movement for gender equality could be doing more on both fronts.

Literature Review

The aim of this rhetorical analysis is three-fold. Its first aim is to compare and contrast Clinton and Watson's speeches in order to uncover the different arguments and styles these rhetors utilize, and secondly, to contribute to the extant literature that implores us to include women's speeches as exemplars. Lastly, this analysis is a rhetorical feminist critique. Therefore, in this literature

review we will first examine literature that has taken *women's rights in public address* as its focus, next, literature that argues for the inclusion of women's voices within the rhetorical canon as well as texts that exist on both Clinton and Watson. Finally, we will examine literature that illustrates the various methods I will be using to analyze and critique these two texts: Neo-Aristotelian, Feminine Style, and the feminist rhetorical theories of bell hooks.

Women's Rights in Public Address

A multiple database search reveals that little literature exists in analyzing the topic of contemporary women's rights through public address. There are several texts that examine women's rights during the first wave of feminism in the 1800's and early 1900's and the many challenges that confronted women of this time. Kendall and Fisher's article, "Frances Wright on Women's Rights," focuses in on the work of Wright during the mid-1800's and how despite the tremendous eloquence found in Wright's orations, her opposition to feminine norms of society during this era effectively lowered her ethos as a speaker (58). Zaeske points out that women attempting to break the public sphere boundary through their addresses on women's rights and suffrage had, not surprisingly, many detractors. These critics were especially disapproving of speeches given amongst crowds that were labeled as "promiscuous audiences" (191). A promiscuous audience was thought of as women of lower classes and especially mixed sex crowds. In a defense against this injunction, women had to argue that they were doing their womanly duty as opposed to arguing from a place of natural rights (203).

Other scholars have examined the rhetorical movement of first wave feminism—how it originated, how it was redefined, and how it transformed. Conrad shows us that over time the "Old Feminist" movement that focused on women's selfhood, her humaneness, and her ability to make decisions for herself transformed into the distinctively different women's suffrage movement as a result of the responses imposed upon the rhetors of this era. Campbell focuses on Elizabeth Cady Stanton's final farewell address, "The Solitude of Self," given to the National American Woman Suffrage Association to uncover the ideology of nineteenth-century feminism and the unique staying power this speech has in contemporary society (304). All of this is to say that while the topic of women's rights in the public sphere has been documented and theorized, little exists to show us how the current movement of feminism is specifically being talked about in formalized public address within politicized and public spaces.

While contemporary scholarship does not offer much in relationship to women and their contributions to rhetoric, what is abundantly clear from a literature review is the insistence that women's rhetoric not only continue to be uncovered but included within rhetorical pedagogy. Rhetoric, as a study and practice, has been and continues to be patriarchal in nature. As Thomas notes in his article, "Rethinking Pedagogy in Public Speaking and American Public Address: A Feminist Alternative," students of rhetoric are rarely analyzing artifacts outside of male-centered methods. Thomas goes on to assert that there is a bias towards rhetoric that is predominantly a masculine practice. It has been argued that feminist critiques of society can provide an important contribution to rhetoric because of the multiple and diverse voices within this area (Smith). Further, feminist rhetorical critique and theory emphasizes an inductive logic, one that is based upon the subjective, lived and real experiences of those on the margins (Smith). Campbell notes in "Hearing Women's Voices" that amongst public address and public speaking textbooks, "women are grossly under-represented in the study of U.S. rhetorical history and as models for public speaking" (34) and that this omission undermines the very goals of both public address and speaking courses (Campbell). Moreover, Campbell notes that the content of the speeches that are included in such texts highlight a division wherein "men can be experts in all manner of things, (but) women are expert only about being women" (35). Campbell also calls upon the inclusion of diverse and marginalized voices from all ethnic backgrounds and from opposing ideologies as a justification for creating lasting critical thinking outcomes within the classroom. With these strong arguments in mind, it is the aim of this research to continue to analyze and include the rhetoric of women within the field of rhetorical studies.

Aristotelian Method

While this research is taking a feminist critical perspective, it is important to understand that women who enter the public sphere through address are entering into a world constructed by patriarchal definitions of effective rhetorical techniques. One of the oldest and most frequently visited is the Neo-Aristotelian method. Rooted in the rhetorical theorists of antiquity, this method is useful for evaluating the efficacy or persuasiveness of speeches in civic discourse in front of an audience: "Rhetoric, as it pertains to speech […] is designed to accomplish a specific purpose or influence a behavior of the audience within that context […] Neo-Aristotelian criticism, therefore, attempts to judge the effectiveness of the speaker's use of the principles of rhetoric in

accomplishing his/her goals" (Hendrix 246). This method has been used countless times by other critics in evaluating speeches: "For much of the twentieth century, the methods of Neo-Aristotelian criticism prescriptively directed not only our evaluation of classical rhetoric but also virtually all manifestations of public address" (Enos 362). Its evaluative limitations have certainly been challenged by modern rhetoricians who have expanded the scope of what comprises rhetoric, but this classical method has strong staying power. As Enos notes, "There is an obvious reason why this method of rhetorical criticism persisted: Neo-Aristotelian criticism provided excellent heuristics for the evaluation of civic discourse" (Enos 362).

The Neo-Aristotelian method was first suggested by Herbert A. Wichelns in his 1925 essay, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory" (Foss 23). Wichelns differentiated between literary and rhetorical criticism by noting that unlike literary critiques, which were concerned with "permanence and beauty" (Foss 24), rhetorical critiques are concerned with effect. He then laid out tenets that critics should be concerned with that address "effect." Wichelns' tenets, along with topics proposed by Aristotle and other classical rhetoricians, provided the framework for the creation of units of analysis that we call The Canon (Foss 24). The canon includes five units of analysis: invention, arrangement, style, delivery, and memory. Since this rhetorical analysis is primarily concerned with how the argument for women's rights and equality has changed in the last two decades and in what style these women are delivering their addresses, we will utilize only two of the five Neo-Aristotelian tenants, invention and style, to analyze the speeches of Clinton and Watson.

Feminine Style

There is a clear push in recent decades to recover the rhetoric of women within public address and to include these works in collections that examine and illustrate exemplars of public address. However, while there have been gains, the primary purpose of this scholarship is to make clear the rhetorical strategies used by women within a political system that they did not create. One could argue that women are forced to adapt their rhetoric in hegemonic ways situated within patriarchal notions of what is exemplary public address (Dow and Tonn 286). There are few, if any, standardized methods like the Neo-Aristotelian Canon or Burke's Pentad that highlight and allow analysis of the ways in which women craft their messages as significant contributions to rhetoric and our notions of language and reality. An exception to this is Campbell's "Feminine Style." This method "produces discourse that displays a personal tone, uses

personal experience, anecdotes, and examples as evidence, exhibits inductive structure, emphasizes audience participation, and encourages identification between speaker and audience" (Campbell, in Dow and Tonn 287). While comparing the changes within both Clinton and Watson's arguments, I will also use these tenets of analysis to uncover what style Clinton and Watson are using. Do they situate their rhetoric within the framework of more traditional methods of public address, or are they using the feminine style in addition to or exclusively within their speeches?

Clinton and Watson

The events surrounding and the reactions to these two speeches and orators illustrate the disadvantaged position women face within public address. As the First Lady, Clinton was often ascribed the adjectives of intelligent, ambitious, aggressive, and hard-headed (Hsu 10). Hsu notes, in her analysis of Hillary as First Lady, that these descriptors are often positives when applied to men, but when used in relation to the First Lady, they become negatives in the news (10). Clinton's tenure as First Lady was contentious because as Hsu notes, "there is a deeply rooted meaning to the role of the First Lady" (11). This role speaks to the public/private sphere, where men belong to the public and women to the private. Clinton broke this "political symbol" which made her highly controversial (Hsu 11). A public opinion poll showed that her approval rating prior to the conference in Beijing hung around 55 percent,, a drop of 20 points since she first took office as the First Lady in 1993 (Burden 239). Rhetorically speaking, Hillary's speeches have been consistently compared to that of her husband's, President Bill Clinton; "Where Bill was applauded for his expression of 'feminine style,' Hillary's style has been consistent with the tougher, masculine speech of the practicing lawyer and the campaign 'fighter'" (Edwards 158). Campbell goes on to note in "The Discursive Performance of Femininity: Hating Hillary" that Clinton's style is primarily much more masculine in public address, is perceived as masculine in nature, includes few personal examples, employs largely deductive structures of reasoning, and engenders an impersonal tone. Campbell concludes that Clinton showcases her mastery of rhetorical norms, but rarely embodies elements of femininity.

In comparison, the discourse responding to Emma Watson and her speech to the United Nations has been more favorable, but not entirely so. Some have praised Emma and the *HeForShe* campaign and used the speech as an opportunity to address inequalities within their own lines of work. For example, Nick James from *Sight & Sound*, a British monthly film magazine, addressed

Watson's invitation for men to join women in the fight for gender equality by examining the deeply rooted misogyny that exists within the film industry: "Film theory teaches us that the male gaze is so deep-rooted in cinema as to be structural. The obvious answer to such a hard-wired problem is to bring more women into filmmaking and—lest we forget—film commentary, and to shout about them when we've got them" (James). Conversely, not long after Watson delivered her speech, Charlotte Alter from *Time.com* reported that a group called 4chan had threatened Watson with leaking nude photos of her on the internet and had set up a website in relation to her "stupid feminist speeches," calling her a "feminist bitch" (Alter). Additionally, others have criticized her speech on two fronts—one that it does little to address the inherent biases that men are subjected to and, more salient, that her argument is representative of first-world feminism and not of the realities facing large portions of women around the globe (Young; Alter)

Contemporary Feminist Rhetorical Critique

An important question that this analysis and any contemporary analysis of current discourse about women's rights and the advancement of feminism must ask is, "women's rights for whom?" bell hooks, in her book *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* observes that the women's liberation movement, which often purports the simplistic goal to make women equal to men, raises several problematic questions. With which men do women want equality? Can there be one unifying vision of what equality means? Who does this simplistic objective implicitly ignore? The answer is that although this definition sounds simple and straightforward, the issue is far more complex than this definition allows. As hooks notes, this designation dismisses "race and class as factors that, in conjunction with sexism, determine the extent to which an individual will be discriminated against, exploited, or oppressed" (19). This demarcation has alienated women from backgrounds of lower-classes and minority groups to the notion of women's lib because men within these same groups are often "oppressed and exploited" (19), and the simplistic ideology of this movement would "primarily affect the social-standing of white women in middle and upper-class groups" (19). hooks repeatedly recognizes the privileged position that white women hold in their feminist activism and how often their attempts to bring diversity into the fold is unsuccessful.

While hooks is adamant that all women can fight for equality, it requires the recognition by all that at the same time we are fighting for feminist advancement we must also be fighting against racism and classism. Hooks'

argument thus begs the question: Who will benefit from the women's rights arguments that Clinton and Watson offer in their speeches? Are they inclusive? Are they implicating the intersectionality of the issue? And what does it mean that two of the more popular speeches on women's equality given in the past two decades and on such a huge stage as the United Nations have had, as their speaker, white, affluent women? We are struggling to achieve equality not just for women, but for marginalized individuals based upon a racist and classist system. What does it mean through a rhetorical feminist critique that women of privilege are the ones speaking out about issues that they, themselves, have hardly had to experience?

Analysis

Aristotelian or Feminine Style

Women are forced to adapt their rhetoric in hegemonic ways situated within patriarchal notions of what is exemplary public address (Dow and Tonn 286). Prior to analysis, my assumption was that Clinton's and Watson's speeches would reveal a primary adherence to classical notions of public address. Interestingly, both of these speeches utilize the feminine style to varying degrees. Campbell's notion of the feminine style "produces discourse that displays a personal tone, uses personal experience, anecdotes and examples as evidence, exhibits inductive structure, emphasizes audience participation, and encourages identification between speaker and audience" (Campbell, in Dow and Tonn 287). The tenets of this method are noticeably evident in both Clinton's and Watson's speeches.

We start first with an examination of Hillary Clinton's address. Many rhetorical scholars might examine Clinton's UN address and come to the conclusion that Clinton is utilizing a masculine and classical style of speech. Certainly, as Edwards notes in "The 2008 Gendered Campaign," many have compared Clinton's speech style to that of her husband; "Where Bill was applauded for his expression of "feminine style," Hillary's style has been consistent with the tougher, masculine speech of the practicing lawyer and the campaign 'fighter'" (158). It would be easy to analyze this speech using the traditional tenets of the canon—invention, ethos, pathos, and logos. Those elements unmistakably exist. An Aristotelian analysis will reveal a construction that utilizes appeals to the audience's emotions, ethics, and logic. However, if we look closely at these devices, I argue that Clinton is employing a far more feminine style of speech than might be seen at first glance.

First, she discloses her participation within forums that have and will occur within the UN conference, what the focus and potential outcomes of those meetings included. She then informs the audience of her lengthy work on women's rights: "Over the past 25 years, I have worked persistently on issues relating to women, children and families. Over the past two and a half years, I've had the opportunity to learn more about the challenges facing women in my own country and around the world" (Clinton "Women's Rights"). She elaborates upon this statement by detailing the numerous countries that she has visited and the unique issues women face in each of these places. While a traditional analysis would assert this as Clinton establishing her ethos as a speaker on matters of women's rights, I would assert that this is her usage of personal experience and examples as evidence for her overall argument.

Traditional analysis would have us examine Clinton's use of pathos within her address and how well these emotional appeals relate to her audience. As Borchers notes, Aristotle believed that "effective speakers know their audience's emotions" (46). Through this classical lens, Clinton certainly utilizes emotional appeals throughout her speech. For example, one of her assertions is that, as women, we are much more alike than we are different. She proves this through an appeal to pathos, knowing that her audience (primarily made up of women) would have much in common: "However different we may appear, there is far more that unites us than divides us. We share a common future, and we are here to find common ground so that we may help bring new dignity and respect to women and girls all over the world, and in so doing bring new strength and stability to families as well" (Clinton "Women's Rights"). However, the feminine style is known for a strong encouragement of identification between speaker and audience. To this end, I believe that more than an appeal to pathos, Clinton is using this tenet of the feminine style to create a strong connection between her and her diverse audience. In order for Clinton to be an effective speaker, she would need to create this commonality for an audience of such distinct and disparate backgrounds. A further example is her seven-point declaration, where each phrase begins with, "it is a human rights violation when…" and ends with examples of the appalling global violations forced upon women. This powerful declaration would certainly resonate with a diverse group of women, many of whom were from the countries where these violations occur. Not only is this creating more identification between the speaker and the audience, but it also uses an inductive reasoning structure. She uses these specific examples to draw us to the conclusion that women's rights are, inherently, human rights.

One of Clinton's main arguments does utilize a more traditional notion of logos: If women are healthy and happy and rights are observed, families, communities, and nations will flourish, and we must take action to ensure this. She uses a deductive enthymeme to make this argument. Borcher notes that "tightly argued syllogisms" aren't often used in rhetoric (47). Instead, a speaker will rely on the audience for some of the proof. Clinton does this by pointing out the wide breadth of duties that encompass a woman's role both within and outside of the home; then stating how improving the conditions of women in all areas would not only affect families, but communities and then nations. The audience then concludes that if they take action to address women's rights, a more prosperous world will be achieved. Towards the end, Clinton argues for action: If men and women can come together to "combat tyranny" and have "seen peace prevail in most places for half a century" (Clinton "Human Rights"), they should be able to come together to solve deeply rooted problems of women's equality. Again, while there is a clear usage of a structured logical argument, the feminine style encourages audience participation, which Clinton so clearly does. By pointing out how men and women have been able to come together on other global issues that threaten stability, Clinton encourages her audience to take collective action again for women's rights.

By comparison, Emma Watson's speech relies to a heavier degree and is more explicitly reliant on Campbell's notion of the feminine style. Again, this method "produces discourse that displays a personal tone, uses personal experience, anecdotes, and examples as evidence, exhibits inductive structure, emphasizes audience participation, and encourages identification between speaker and audience" (Campbell, in Dow and Tonn 287). Watson's speech is very personal; she draws on anecdotes and personal experiences to draw inductive structures of arguments. For example, as she recollects,

> I started questioning gender-based assumptions a long time ago, when I was eight, I was confused at being called "bossy," because I wanted to direct the plays that we would put on for our parents—but the boys were not; when at 14 I started to be sexualized by certain elements of the media; when at 15 my girlfriends started dropping out of their beloved sports teams because they didn't want to appear "muscle-y"; when at 18 my male friends were unable to express their feelings. I decided that I was a feminist—and this seemed uncomplicated to me. (Watson "United Nations Address")

Her arguments come from a very personal perspective. The phrases "I think" and "I believe" are used almost exclusively throughout her address. Her personal experiences are the foundation for her belief that we need to move towards greater gender equality.

From the very beginning, one of Watson's most evident appeals is that of audience participation. From the second line of her speech, "I am reaching out to you because we need your help. We want to end gender inequality, and to do this we need everyone involved" to the very end, it is clear that Watson is imploring her audience to get involved (Watson "United Nations Address"). One of the main arguments of Watson's address, and the basis for the HeForShe campaign, is a strong encouragement for men to actively participate in helping to achieve gender equality: "Men, I would like to take this opportunity to extend your formal invitation. Gender equality is your issue too" (Watson "United Nations Address"). Again, she largely relies on personal and anecdotal evidence to encourage participation from the men in the audience. She speaks about male caretakers being valued less than women, that men are not able to show or express emotions, and that men should make gender equality their issue so they may break free from many of the gendered stereotypes that imprison them as well.

Contributing to the extant literature analyzing the speeches of women requires us to also examine the style in which women speak. It is important to recognize that even though women enter into a male-dominated and constructed world of public address, which might lead one to think they must adapt their speech to this paradigm, they *are* utilizing of a feminine style of speech. It is also vital that we recognize that this style does not mean these speeches are any less valuable or exemplary. There are many paths to "truth" through the use of language. This is the crux of rhetorical studies. It has been well documented that men's rhetorical strategies have been historically prized over those of women. As Joshua Gunn notes in his exceptional work, "On Speech and Public Release," dating as far back as Plato and Aristotle there is a persistent binary, or split, between male and female speech, wherein women are relegated to the body, men to the mind, women to emotions, and men to reason. This has characterized women as inferior: "a hatred of the body funds an ideology of the spiritual superiority of men" (11). By recognizing a different approach to public address, one that "deviates away from dominance to one of equality and respect" (Foss et al. 93), we are attempting to create a new space, a place of resistance against hegemonic rhetorical discourse. This style of rhetoric is neither better nor worse than traditional methods of persuasion and

discovery of truth. It allows the body to be a place where reason and truth can reside. The feminine style, as noted by Borderlon, allows for a more social rhetoric that reduces this centuries-old divide between emotion and logic. This analysis shows us that this style could be beneficial in terms of women's rights. If we reduce the divide between emotion and logic and stop seeing one as superior over the other, and instead allow that at times logic should prevail, emotion at others, and often a combination of both, maybe the battle to decrease the distance between genders and equality would also benefit.

Argument and First-World Feminism

While the comparison of these speeches has revealed a similar style of speech spanning two decades, the primary arguments between Clinton's and then Watson's addresses have diverged. Clinton's speech centers largely on global issues of inequality facing women. It is concerned with two primary arguments. First, and quite simply, when it comes to the discussion of human rights, women's rights *are* human rights, and therefore, women should be treated with a greater deal of care and consideration. Secondly, if we start to consider and improve the conditions of women around the globe, we will see families, communities, and countries flourish and this will provide the world with greater stability. Clinton focuses on a diverse range of issues, not just first-world issues but those of third-world and developing nations. By comparison, Watson's speech focuses on a newer issue of communication studies in the 21st century, that of gender equality. Specifically, she highlights the recognition of gender as something not biologically oriented but instead socially and discursively created, and how that manifests itself through socializing agents and then the body (West and Zimmerman; Butler; Tortajada and Van Bauwel). This argument focuses on expressions and representations of gender, as Watson notes in her speech: "Both men and women should feel free to be sensitive. Both men and women should feel free to be strong. It is time that we all perceive gender on a spectrum instead of two sets of opposing ideals" (Watson "United Nations Address"). Watson is encouraging us to allow more freedom in the ways that men and women should be able to express and perform their gender identity.

While achieving gender equality would certainly encompass elements of achieving greater rights for women, to a large degree the ability to focus on freedom of gender expression and arguing for a greater resistance towards conservative ideals of gender as a binary assumes that we have abolished many of the issues that were a primary focus in Clinton's speech twenty years earlier. McRobbie, Tortajada, and Van Bauwel suggest that a focus on representation

and expression of gender is a decidedly post-feminist notion, whereby "feminism is only incorporated to the point where it can be used to prove that its objectives have long been achieved" (144). This raises an important question for feminism in the 21st century: Are we in a post-feminist era? I would argue that we are most certainly not. Unfortunately, while gains have been made, as noted in Poon's NPR article above, and on an almost daily basis in the news media, there is still a great deal of work to be done both locally and globally before the argument of gender equality can truly be addressed. Implicit in Watson's argument for gender parity is an assumption of first-world feminism, a privileged space that many individuals, even within first-world countries are not privy to (Alter). While fundamentally the assertion that gender is socialized and should be recognized as a spectrum is widely, and rightly, accepted, using this as an argument to advance women's rights around the globe must be treated cautiously. This claim gives the impression that we are somehow post-feminist and can move towards an exclusive examination of gender and its representations. The truth is that we are not there yet. bell hooks reminds us in *Feminist Theory* that for many women and men these arguments create an even greater distance from the movement because the argument, unconsciously perhaps, disregards a much deeper and complex system of inequality, one that will be discussed next.

Women's Rights for Whom?

While Watson briefly recognizes her own privileges and that, globally, many women are not afforded the same, the speech generally overlooks the larger structures at play in being able to achieve greater equality. Watson, like many feminists, are concerned that the word feminist connotes too many negatives in current society and attempts to simplify the function of feminism by providing the audience the basic dictionary definition towards the beginning of her speech. "For the record," she states, "feminism by definition is the belief that men and women should have equal rights and opportunities. It is the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes" (Watson "United Nations Address"). While this definition can certainly help in reducing many of the negatives, long held by men and women, associated with the word "feminism," hooks interrogates this strategy, stating, "implicit in this simplistic definition of women's liberation is a dismissal of race and class that, in conjunction with sexism, determine the extent to which and individual will be discriminated against, exploited, or oppressed" (19). Before men and women can begin to feel free to express themselves in non-hegemonic ways, the argument that women's

rights are human rights needs to do more to address the connections between equality and hierarchical systems of race, sexuality, and socio-economic status.

In contrast, Clinton's speech does more in addressing these intersections by specifically calling out some of the worst offenders of human rights violations around the world, but still does not go far enough. hooks reminds us in *Feminist Theory* that we need to be asking the question "equal to whom?" When men of different classes and races are not afforded parity in white supremacist, capitalist, patriarchal class structures, we are not looking at deeper structures of oppression. So while Clinton does an exceptional job in declaring the human rights violations women face on a global level, hidden within those issues are the root causes of oppression—racism, capitalism, supremacy, and patriarchy. Many women around the world are still attempting to secure their personal safety and the health of themselves and their children, let alone political or economic equality, and the source of these issues lie in the larger structures that hooks so aptly points out. Unless we begin to overtly point to the connections between a woman's rights, her health, her safety, and global and oppressive structures of politics, race, and economics, we will not see equality achieved.

Speaking from the Margins.

The last critique of these two speeches we will examine is the continued use of privileged, white women afforded the opportunity to speak on behalf of marginalized groups. bell hooks is critical of the privileged speaking for the "other"; "they make us objects of their privileged discourse on race. As objects, we remain unequals, inferiors" (13). She notes in "Choosing the Margin" that speaking about the "other" also hides the realities of oppressed people, realities that would be revealed if the "other" were there to speak for themselves. One must wonder if the absence of these voices contributes to a stagnation in achieving feminist goals, failing to mobilize the populations being spoken about because the words being used are not fully representative of their experiences and realities. Implicit in this choice of the white, privileged woman speaker is the message, "no need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you speak about yourself [...] I am still the colonizer, the speaking subject, and you are now the center of my talk" (hooks 241). It continues to relegate the oppressed into margins, where their words, struggles, and realities go unheard and unnoticed. Perhaps this is another issue in making greater gains in women's equality.

hooks speaks from the margins. Her work has done more for my understanding of the complexity and connectedness of feminism than any other feminist scholar I have read before. The margins are a place of resistance; they are productive, and they can produce counter-hegemonic discourse. hooks' understanding and assertion of the productive power of the margins is important in the context of this analysis. While women's rights involves a concern for women from all backgrounds, the most oppressed groups are often not afforded the platform to speak, nor do they even associate themselves with the movement because the movement fails to recognize them. If we are going to continue to talk about women's rights in public address, we must include a broader range of discourse. We need women who, through lived experience of the struggles that are being talked about on their behalf, are given the opportunity to speak for themselves. Even within my own and other scholars' attempt to assert feminine style as a valuable contribution to the study of rhetoric, to normalize it, we continue to unconsciously hide the voices of others. Reid-Brinkley's "Mammies and Matriarchs" criticizes the feminine style for being a "rhetorical strategy that has largely been limited to studying the discourse of white, middle-class women" (37). She notes, then, that this theory becomes particularly raced and classed. We must listen to the call of hooks. White women rhetors and scholars must be reflexive about their place of privilege and how they use language to talk about women who are oppressed. They must recognize the distinct possibility that until those women in the margins are afforded the same space to contribute to the body of rhetoric that discusses women's rights, we may be spinning in an endless circle.

Conclusion
Studying women's rhetoric is a worthwhile and necessary endeavor. It is the hope of this analysis to not only contribute to the body of rhetorical works that analyze women in the field of public address, but to showcase how the feminine style in both form and substance should be acknowledged for its contribution to knowledge and truth as has been done for all male rhetorical theorists since the classical period. Rhetoric that focuses on women's rights is and continues to be a salient issue into the 21st century. While gains have been made, there is still much work to be done. Why does this issue continue to persist? Using a rhetorical feminist critique, we can begin to uncover the "why." There is a clear relationship between rhetoric and power. As Foucault notes, those in power use discourse to create divisions and binaries, distinguishing good versus bad, superior versus inferior (199). Groups of people a*nd* issues are branded through

rhetoric. How we think about women as a people, and Women's rights as an issue, is not a natural occurrence, it is discursively formed. Thus, when we critique both the arguments used when trying to combat women's inequality and the people who have the agency to speak on such matters, we uncover the power structures that continue to create a world where women do not have equal access to education, public office, jobs, *and*, more pressing, a world in which their health, their safety, their economic well-being, and their corporeal independence are at constant risk.

It must be clearly stated that this critique is in no way attempting to demote the work of Clinton and Watson. We need women, such as these, who have the agency and use their platform to consistently fight for gender equality. Clinton's work has been and continues to be profoundly impactful in improving conditions around the world. Without her address and the subsequent "Millennium Goals" set forth from that United Nations conference twenty years ago, it stands to reason that global women's rights would have stagnated indefinitely. Watson's work is creating dialogues amongst individuals who at one point considered themselves reluctant feminists, and who are now advocates for feminism and unafraid to label themselves as such (James). The hopeful impact of this critical analysis is an understanding that "we can always do more." We can always find new ways to make these issues more effective, more inclusive, and more transparent. Future studies should continue to examine women's rights in public address, but seek out rhetors who embody the margins and not just those individuals who are in the privileged center. We need to normalize counter-hegemonic discourse, we need individuals from the margins to be given the space to contribute to our understanding of the world's realities, and to recognize how their perspectives change our assumptions of truth and knowledge. Most importantly, by including these diverse voices we can move into a more peaceful and equitable world, where men and women have the kind of freedom that Watson is urging us to move toward: gender as a beautiful spectrum of many voices and experiences, given equality in agency, autonomy, opportunity and equality in their contributions to the world.

Works Cited

Alter, Charlotte. "Emma Watson Asked Men to Support Women and Here's How They Responded." *TIME.* Time Inc. Network, 23 Sept. 2014. Web. 16 Feb. 2015.

____. "Game of Thrones Maisie Williams Isn't Buying Emma Watson's
    'First World Feminism.'" *TIME*. Time Inc. Network, 15 Dec. 2014. Web 16
    Feb. 2015.

Borchers, Timothy. *Rhetorical Theory: An Introduction.* Prospect Heights, IL:
    Waveland, 2006. Print.

Bordelon, Suzanne. *Feminist Legacy: The Rhetoric and Pedagogy of Gertrude
    Buck.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2007. Print.

Burden, Barry C., and Anthony Mughan. "Public Opinion and Hillary Rodham
    Clinton." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 63.2 (1999): 237-250. Print.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "The Discursive Performance of Femininity: Hating
    Hillary." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1.1 (1998): 1-19.

____. "Hearing Women's Voices" Communication Education 40.1 (1991): 33-48.
    Print.

____. "Stanton's 'The Solitude Of Self': A Rationale For Feminism." *Quarterly
    Journal of Speech* 66.3 (1980): 304-312. Print.

Conrad, Charles. "The Transformation of the "Old Feminist" Movement."
    Quarterly Journal Of Speech 67.3 (1981): 284-297. Print.

Clinton, Hillary R. "Remarks to the U.N 4th World Conference on Women Plenary
    Session." *American Rhetoric.* 2001. Web. 14 Oct. 2013.

Danner, Lauren, and Susan Walsh. "Radical' Feminists and 'Bickering' Women:
    Backlash in U.S. Media Coverage of the United Nations." *Critical Studies in
    Mass Communication* 16.1 (1999): 63-84. Print.

Dow, Bonnie J., and Mari Boor Tonn. "Feminine Style and Political Judgment In
    the Rhetoric of Ann Richards." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79.3 (1993): 286-
    302. Print.

Edwards, Janis L. "The 2008 Gendered Campaign and the Problem with "Hillary
    Studies." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 14.1 (2011): 155-167. Print.

Enos, Richard Leo. "Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Rhetorical Criticism:
    Classical Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism." *Rhetoric Review* 25.4 (2006):
    361-365. Print.

Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration & Criticism*. 2nd ed. Long Grove, IL:
    Waveland, 1996. Print.

Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. Ed. *Feminist Rhetorical
    Theories.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland, 1999. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York:
    Vintage, 1977. Print.

Gunn, Joshua. "On Speech and Public Release." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13.2
    (2010): 1-41. Print.

Hendrix, J. A. "In Defense of Neo-Aristotelian Rhetorical Criticism." *Western Speech* 32.4 (1968): 246-252. Print.

hooks, bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge: South End P, 2000. Print.

____. "Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness." *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End P, 1990. Print.

James, Nick. "The Equalizers." *Sight & Sound* Nov. 2014: 5. Web. 14 Dec. 2014.

Kendall, Kathleen Edgerton, and Jeanne Y. Fisher. "Frances Wright on Women's Rights: Eloquence versus Ethos." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60.1 (1974): 58-68. Print.

McRobbie, Angela. "Post-feminism and Popular Culture." *Feminist Media Studies* 4.3 (2004): 255-264. Print.

Poon, Linda. "Valentine's Day Has another Side: Fighting for Freedoms for Women." *NPR.ORG.* 14 Feb. 2015. Web. 15 Feb. 2015.

"Population, female (% of total)." *The World Bank Group.* 2015. Web. 5 Feb. 2015.

Reid-Brinkley, Shanara Rose. "Mammies and Matriarchs: Feminine Style and Signifyin(g) in Carol Moseley Braun's 2003-2004 Campaign for Presidency." *Standing in the Intersection: Feminist Voices, Feminist Practices in Communication Studies.* Ed. Karma R. Chávez and Cindy L. Griffin. Albany: SUNY Press, 2012. 35-58. Print.

Smith, Craig R. "Multi-perspective Feminist Critiques and Their Implications For Rhetorical Theory." *American Communication Journal* 4.3 (2001).Web. 25 Feb. 2015.

Thomas, Douglas. "Rethinking Pedagogy in Public Speaking and American Public Address: A Feminist Alternative." *Women's Studies in Communication* 14.2 (1991): 42-57. Print.

Tortajada, Iolanda, and Sofie Van Bauwel. "Gender and Communication: Contemporary Research Questions." *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies* 4.2 (2012): 143-153. Print.

Tyler, Patrick E. "Hillary Clinton, In China, Details Abuse of Women." *The New York Times.* 6 Sept. 1995. Web. 17 Nov. 2013.

Watson, Emma. "Be The He For She." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 80.11 (2014): 348-349. Print.

Young, Cathy. "Sorry, Emma Watson, But Heforshe Is Rotten For Men." *Time.Com* (2014). Web. 26 Feb. 2015.

Zaeske, Susan. "The 'Promiscuous Audience' Controversy and the Emergence Of The Early Woman's Rights Movement." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81.2 (1995): 191-207. Print.

The Discursive Implications of Sexuality in the Final Scene of *The Legend of Korra*

Greg Langner

Abstract
The final scene of The Legend of Korra*, an animated children's television series, projects that Korra, the lead character, establishes a romantic relationship with another female character. The purpose of this article is to critically analyze the discursive implications of the rhetorical displays of sexual orientation and gender identity represented through the theoretical framework of Kenneth Burke's Pentad. The central focus is on how this site gives evidence to the transformational potential of animation, particularly in children's television.*

Introduction and Rationale
The discursive implications of the rhetorical displays of sexuality and gender identity in the final scene of the animated television series *The Legend of Korra* mark the purpose of this study. Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pentad marks the theoretical approach. *The Legend of Korra* casually generates a paradigmatic shift in the collective expectations of mediated identity with regard to sexual orientation, giving evidence to the transformational potential of animation, particularly in children's television. The series has widespread demographic influence, appealing strongly to young children, teens, and young adults (Acevedo, 2014). Serving as an intersection between rhetoric, animation, and queer identity, this analysis contributes to the larger field of communication studies by highlighting the ways in which the unique components of Burke's Pentad interconnect with one another to serve as a theoretical lens through which to better understand sites and texts that are often unconsidered, unrecognized, or even disregarded. This study characterizes the series itself in order to clarify the text for the reader. It details the functions, meanings, implications, and interpretations of Burke's Pentad. It addresses the immediate contributions to social discourse, and the potential long-term implications of the occurrence of the final scene of *The Legend of Korra*, which aired on 19 December, 2014 (Robinson, 2014), in the multiple contexts of the show as a

whole, the multi-faceted society in which it was presented, and the trajectory of the children's television industry.

I identify as a fan of *The Legend of Korra*. I avidly watched each episode of the series chronologically, and like others, reflected in excited anticipation during the spans of time between seasons and between weekly episodes. My reasons for appreciating and admiring the series are akin to many of its critical acclaims. The world depicted in *The Legend of Korra* is seen by many as aesthetically intricate and boldly vivid. Its creators draw on inspirations from multiple cultures from around the world. Stylistically, however, the art in the series is very much like Japanese anime, demonstrating the overall dominance of the influences of Eastern cultures on the visuality of the show. The structure and delivery of the story and its respective plots are in most cases concise, and while formulaic and often predictable, maintain an effectively necessary fluidity. Not only because of my own interest in the *The Legend of Korra* as a means of entertainment and artistic emulation, but also because of the extensive nature of its popularity, I believe myself inclined to better understand its varied functions that impact its fan base, and its indirect influence on society as a whole.

An in-depth analysis of the entire series would exhaust itself in its myriad cultural implications. What was necessary for this research was to recognize a singular element or occasion of the show that epitomizes its depth and range of social leverage. The sexuality of Korra, the lead character, is thick and ambiguous. The series as a whole depicts her as multidimensional and complex. The social presence of a main character in a children's cartoon who is both female and very much an anti-cliché of the average "super-powered" and over-sexualized heroine subject to the male gaze warrants discussion and examination. Korra's complexity of character is in many ways distilled into the final scene of the show's series finale, in which the story projects that Korra establishes a romantic relationship with another female character, Asami. That occurrence is the impetus for this study. *The Legend of Korra* is a children's television series. Children's television, particularly in the West, has long been a form through which reality is visually warped and inverted to a subversion of reality, rather than a reflection (Napier, 2005). Characters and their respective worlds are depicted as radically different and other in multiple ways. In contrast, characters, landscapes and objects in *The Legend of Korra* are generally drawn much closer to actual proportions. Barring its fantastical nature, it is set in a more realistic world contrasting other Nickelodeon shows like *Spongebob Squarepants* and *The Fairly Oddparents* (Nicktoons). These

factors give *The Legend of Korra* more potential for garnering identification with viewers who can more readily imagine themselves as the characters.

What I am aiming to understand from this study are the possibilities for social awareness and ultimately for social change; those possibilities that now exist as a result of an active decision by the show's creative team to defy assumptions about what is and what is not acceptable for a cartoon on a children's network. I have a close relationship with the potential kind of change being stimulated, and with the discourse being generated. I believe that if I had witnessed the final scene of *The Legend of Korra* in the context of the show as a whole at a much younger age, my perspectives on the world and my expectations for myself could have progressed at a radically greater rate, even in a different manner altogether. At my own actual witnessing of the scene, I cried. At a younger age I may have accepted my own sexuality more readily and with more hope for my future. Rather than through social and familial torment, but instead through a mediated social reflection, I may have come to terms with the fact that I was gay much earlier in life. The implications of that possibility are, themselves, far-reaching and complex. The greater implication is that an occurrence like this, in the context of the present day, may have such an effect on young individuals with like experiences and circumstances.

Explicating *The Legend of Korra*

The Legend of Korra is the successor to another series, *Avatar: The Last Airbender*. In both shows there exist humans with the special ability to "bend" or control one of four elements: air, water, earth, and fire. The Avatar in this world is a unique individual with the ability to control all four; an individual who is reincarnated each lifetime and is always reborn into a different nation; an individual who is viewed and views himself or herself as the "bridge" between the "human" and the "spirit" worlds. In *The Legend of Korra*, Korra is that Avatar. *The Legend of Korra* depicts a world comprised of only four nations and one city-state, each with a myriad of cultures and an array of styles of governance. There is one nation for each of the four elements, and Republic City is a city-state that was established in part by Korra's Avatar predecessor in order to garner lasting peace between the nations. Korra's time is undergoing its own unique style of an industrial revolution: the equivalent of the automobile has been invented, as have airships, motorbikes, and even large mechanical combat suits. The series depicts a world that is eager for availabilities and possibilities for new forms of mass communication: radio technology is a prominent plot device in the show, for example.

As the Avatar, Korra is tasked with protecting both benders and non-benders, while striving for spiritual balance. Throughout the first season she confronts a violent uprising against benders, who cry oppression. During the second season she battles an immense spiritual force epitomizing evil, and after overcoming that struggle, makes the decision to allow for free travel by both humans and spirits between their respective worlds. Through the third season she faces a team of covert terrorists who aim to end her life along with the cycle of the Avatar in order to bring their ideal chaos into the world; they nearly succeed and leave Korra badly wounded. The final season focuses on Korra's physical and psychological recovery as she struggles to defeat a rogue dictator who has leveraged control over the entirety of the Earth Nation. Throughout the whole series, however, Korra is not alone in her struggles. She is accompanied by mentors, family, and close friends, all who support her both emotionally and in battle. When the series begins, Korra is in her late teens; when the series ends, she is in her early twenties. As a character she is strong-willed, determined, enthusiastic, at times judgmental, and at other times necessarily or overtly self-reflexive. She is each of these, at times to her benefit and at others to her detriment. She is rich with character, and flawed nevertheless. She is human. She is identifiable.

The notion of a character like Korra actually unsettled some executives from Nickelodeon (Acevedo, 2014). In *Avatar: The Last Airbender*, the main character was an adolescent boy. The argument against Korra was that actual young boys, who are a major swath of Nickelodeon's audience, would supposedly not engage in a show featuring a main character that was female. The implied argument is that young boys would not find interest or relevance in a show featuring a main character that is both female and often aggressive toward other characters, regardless of sex. The show's immense success proved Nickelodeon's supposition to be wrong (Robinson, 2014). Beyond establishing a television series with a premise that broke boundaries, the show delved deeply into subject matter that usually seems reserved for a different kind of television entirely. The series' evolving story progressed through plots that revolved around different sects of terrorism, blatant prejudices, the convoluted realities of government and corporate corruption, torture, and a great deal more. The show displayed acts of murder on multiple occasions, and even displayed suicide. The story of *The Legend of Korra*'s second season unraveled through a civil war within one of the world's nations (the Southern and Northern Water Tribes); a civil war laden with feelings and expressions of animosity between the nation's two tribes. The series' recurring depictions of war in many ways

reflected contemporary conflicts in the Middle East (Muqaddimah, 2014). Much of the subject matter that shapes the overall discourse for *The Legend of Korra* is not only rare or unheard of in children's television, it is seldom seriously displayed or addressed in mainstream television at all.

Initial Analysis and Literature Review

In order to effectively establish a rationale for framing this study through the theoretical lens of Burke's Pentad, I make reference to works by and about Burke, himself. I incorporate analyses of Burke's theory of Dramatism, of which his notion of the Pentad is a part. I use the Pentad because it allows for a structured framing of a deceptively simple occurrence with a multitude of complex implications. In this instance, the act, agent, agency, scene and purpose—the interrelated frames that make up the Pentad—are all fairly clear, and this allows me to more directly address the circumstances and implications involved. The Pentad, which has been used as a frame through which to reconceptualize multiple sites beyond instances of verbal speech, has been employed as a means for understanding comic art, in particular, political cartoons. I address previous research that examines and highlights the special value of animation as a unique medium, examining through past studies the plasticity of cartoon animation, and the implications of its essentially fantastical form. I further expand on the notion of socially mediated identity by drawing from Judith Butler's work on performativity, elaborating through reference to Erving Goffman's conception of performance in day-to-day life. I also address research that discusses the role of the media in shaping and contributing to similar discourse. Lastly, I draw on multiple media analyses as well as direct media sources that candidly discuss the show itself, the final scene of the series and its implications, and some of the tangible reactions that resulted.

Burke, Dramatism, and the Pentad

Kenneth Burke developed the notion of Dramatism, which can be understood as both method and theory (Burke, 1969a). The term refers to the consideration of life as drama. Dramatism is often viewed through the contexts of identification, form, and the tool of the Pentad. Identification refers to experiential patterns that occur in our lives and that we seek to recognize in the lives of others. It is through that active recognition that we find comfort and validation; that we shape our rhetorical selves in a manner that can continue to garner identification. Form is the directionality of rhetoric; the means by which what is said and *when* it is said can either appease, disappoint, or neutralize the

expectations of the audience. In that sense form refers to the actual shape the conveyance of rhetoric takes (Lindquist, 2008). The creation of meaning through rhetoric expands into virtually any communicative act. The Pentad is a specific tool through which to attempt to understand rhetorical situations altogether. The five lenses of the Pentad are act, agent, agency, scene, and purpose.

The idea of the Pentad is to use each lens to assess a rhetorical circumstance according to the likely and potential factors that comprise it. It gives us a means through which to ask ourselves what action seems to have occurred in a situation; who or what the agent, or arbitrator, is; what agency she or he or they had to carry out the act; what the action was or appears to be; in what scene, or in what context did the act occur; and what might be the motivation behind, the purpose of the act (Kimberling, 1982). While a handful of studies can be found that make use of Burke's Pentad to understand works like short-form comic strips, studies evaluating the discursive implications of cartoon animation through the Pentad appear very few and far between. The Pentad has often been used, however, to evaluate and understand rhetorical situations, instances, or forms that are literary, artistic, and political, but not necessarily grounded in or derivative of a direct speech-act (Kimberling, 1982). In this sense, *The Legend of Korra*'s final scene is a rhetorical act.

Performativity, Gender Identity, and Scandal

The term speech-act, as in speech-act theory, refers to the notion of the performative; the notion that by making certain statements we can actually generate external action or change (Austin, 1962). Those who say and do things have resulting power to produce tangible reactions. A waiter or waitress in a restaurant who conveys more immediacy and attentiveness to customers potentially produces the effect of receiving a larger tip. Judith Butler expanded performativity into the concept of the fluid performance of identity in conjunction with or in contrast to social leverage (Butler, 1988). The concept of performativity is that modes and instances of communication are not only actions, but they have the power to produce action outside of their originators; they have the power to reaffirm or to defy social appetites.

"In order to describe the gendered body, a phenomenological theory of constitution requires an expansion of the conventional view of acts to mean both that which constitutes meaning and that through which meaning is performed or enacted" (Butler, 1988). The theory of performativity has been used to expand queer theory and the myriad notions of gender identity. The implication of performed identity is that all of the various aspects of identity,

including gender, are in constant flux. For Butler, gender is adherent action; it is the act of changing the self into that which society dictates or implies the self should be (Tuhkanen, 2009). Hence, we go out of our way to become something that others expect us to be, and we become aware of this expectation based on how society *depicts* it. As Goffman observes,

> We often expect, of course, a confirming consistency between appearance and manner; we expect that the differences in social statuses among the interactants will be expressed in some way by congruent differences in the indications that are made of expected interaction role. (Goffman, 1956, p. 15).

However, those expectations are dynamic and constantly intersecting one another, and therefore that which we attempt to transform ourselves into, the gender or role according to others that we attempt to be or consciously contrast, is constantly adapting to those changing expectations.

However, as those expectations change, so do the manners in which we adapt. Changes in identity that adapt against expectation can generate social disruption. Changes to the expectations themselves give new agency with which identities can change. When expectations are broken, scandal can occur (Poiana, 2010). Scandal can be viewed as a social phenomenon; as a defiance of social expectations brought to the forefront of the collective consciousness. As Poiana notes, "There is, however, a property that is common to all forms of scandal and that fully conveys its human significance—its peculiar relationship with language" (Poiana, 2010, p. 28). Scandal potentially generates new discourse through communicative occurrence. The more frequently any given type of scandal occurs, the more desensitized the public becomes to the factors that contribute to it. The more often public figures are caught in sex scandals and affairs, fraud, bribery, et cetera, the less impact such events have over time on the collective consciousness. The final scene in *The Legend of Korra* demonstrates through story the fluidity of gender and sexuality. A new discourse is generated. Never before has a character, let alone a lead female character in a mainstream children's television series, held hands so closely and looked so intimately into the eyes of another character of the same sex. This study examines whether or not, or to what extent, the final scene in *The Legend of Korra* is scandalous, by comparing and contrasting it with the context of its time in modern history.

Discourse on Queerbaiting

As a result of the Korra and Asami relationship, *The Legend of Korra*, which is not unique in this circumstance, has been accused of queerbaiting (Rogers, 2014). Queerbaiting can be defined as "the concept of introducing a character using well-known codes of queerness in order to appeal to a queer audience" (Sindu, 2014). Essentially, it is about actively *alluding* to queerness in characters, without going so far as to threaten the status quo by actually allowing them to *be* queer. Queerbaiting has supposedly manifested itself in other animated forms, such as the films *ParaNorman* and *Frozen*, and the television series *Powerpuff Girls* and *Scooby Doo* (Osterndorf, 2014). Of the inadequacy of resonant but incomplete queer identities in cartoons, Osterndorf (2014) states, "Undertones and subtext in animals and robots no longer make for progressive LGBT[Q] characters where animation is concerned."

However, in the instance of the final scene of *The Legend of Korra*, it is important to note that the nature of Korra and Asami's relationship sends a different message. There was a buildup toward their relationship, though admittedly it was not as straightforward as the buildup between Korra and Mako, her male romantic interest from the first season. Sindu (2014) states, "When *The Legend of Korra* started teasing the Korrasami ship by showing significant glances between the two characters, by having an increasing closeness between them, and later by showing moments of physical intimacy, I assumed that they were [queerbaiting]." She goes on to question the creators' intentions for the series, as part of a children's network: "Why would they do what all the other shows hadn't done? But they did. They did the thing. They went there. They pushed it further than I ever expected them to go." The fact is that, while more ideally could have been done, *The Legend of Korra* nevertheless actually follows through with establishing the same-sex romance. It achieves, as far as I see it, queer representation.

Still Life Cartoons to Cartoon Animation

Burke's works have been used to analyze the intended implications and perspectives of political cartoons, to explore their argumentative use of tropes, and the complexity of imagery as sites for meaning (Moss, 2007). Political cartoons have the potential to influence popular opinion because they so frequently draw on and make use of scenes in popular culture (Conners, 2007). Cartoon animation, like many art forms, influences through its heightened retellings of socially accepted realities and stories that reaffirm the collective metanarrative. Animation is fabric. It can appear to do or to be anything at all.

As a remarkably plastic and malleable art form, animation is an attractive means through which escapism becomes excitingly easy (Napier, 2005). "Animation challenges our expectations of what is 'normal' or 'real,' bringing up material that may seem more appropriately housed in dreams or the unconscious, and this can be a deeply disconcerting process" (Napier, 2005, p. 73). The value in recognizing animation as a site of exploration lies in its agency to neglect the presumed barriers between what is real and what is fantastical. Animation is viewed by certain scholars as its own form of text, as a series of consciously constructed and ordered symbols and signs (Greenberg, 2011). Cartoon animation exists as a rich area of examination, the sites of which offer heretofore unknown perspectives on social agency. Had the couple formation between two women occurred in a live-action format, the discursive and rhetorical implications would be vastly different. The fact that animation has such a unique appeal affirms the necessity of this study.

Sexuality and Mediated Discourse

Media's impact on the development of identity in younger children has long-term effects on various factors including self-confidence and self-acceptance. Literature for young readers who are homosexual, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, or any "non-standard" gender, has the potential to foster constructive or destructive self-perceptions (Thomas, Crisp, & Knezek, 2010). However, the mere presence of texts that focus on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) groups or individuals does not adequately support the social needs of LGBTQ youth (Thomas et al., 2010). For many, the necessary next step is to consciously integrate a standard presence of LGBTQ characters and situations into mainstream media, in order to better reflect the actual societies in which we live. Thomas et al (2010) states that "one text cannot carry the burden of representing a diverse population and our classrooms and bookshelves must represent a range of LGBTQ identities" (p. 79). Television and similar contemporary forms such as online streaming have the capacity to influence the learning and behavioral patterns of youth (Linebarger, 2011). *The Legend of Korra* does not overtly highlight the deviation of sexual norm. In fact, it casually presents the situation.

Applying the Pentad

In order to establish how each of the five perspectives of the Pentad appear to apply to the final scene of *The Legend of Korra*, what actually happens in the scene needs to be understood. The scene begins during the reception following

the marriage of two of the show's supporting characters. Korra talks with another character, Mako, her first love interest in the series. Without going into great detail, their conversation cements a lasting bond of friendship, defying the expectations of many fans that she would reestablish a romantic relationship with him (Konietzko, 2014). Korra then talks with Tenzin, her mentor. She expresses her desire to continue learning and growing, and he expresses his solemn elation in response. Korra then talks with Asami, a supporting character with whom her relationship has seen the greatest range of growth. In their meeting in the beginning of the series, Korra does not trust Asami; Asami becomes irate with Korra regarding accusations against her own apparently prejudiced father; the two become jealous of each other over Mako. As the series progressed their friendship became stronger, and their time spent together appeared more meaningful. Korra would trust Asami with information or insight that she did not reveal to others in "Team Avatar," and Asami would come to Korra's moral defense more often and more readily than others as well (Robinson, 2014).

In the final moment of the series the two sat at water's edge and reflected on the sacrificial death of Asami's once estranged father. In Korra's comforting of Asami, she offered that the two travel somewhere together, anywhere that Asami wanted to go. Asami, in a softly smiling response, replied, "I've always wanted to see what the Spirit World's like," followed by Korra's response: "Sounds perfect." Cast over by a light, slow, and uplifting musical score, the two are then seen walking through the desolated, beautiful terrain of the show's recent, final battle. At the center is a beaming portal of green and yellow light, leading to the spirit world. Korra and Asami approach the portal, and look to their sides at each other, smiling. They reach out and hold hands, walk into the portal, turn and face each other, join their other hands together and stare closely into each other's eyes as the camera pans up into the projected center of the light. It is worth noting that this specific occurrence in *The Legend of Korra* reflects multiple opposite sex depictions throughout the series and its predecessor, *Avatar: The Last Airbender* (Robinson, 2014). This analysis establishes that the final scene, through its storied illustrations, is the rhetorical act within the Pentad.

The Act
The final scene of the *The Legend of Korra* is a series of actions that collude into a singular, implicative act that serves to alter or affect the perceptions of the humans who experience it. The final scene, the act, is rhetorical. Burke defines

the function of rhetoric as "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or induce action in other human agents," (Foss et al, 1985, p. 173). However, the final scene is an artistic amalgamation of symbols not remotely limited to words but rather inclusive of words, imagery, and music. It is the result of a conscious decisions by the show's creative team, stemming from the standards of the show as a whole: the scene was animated, voice actors were recorded, music was composed, promotional marketing tactics were implemented, and everything together was produced into a final segment of a larger product. Rhetoric is purposeful, according to Burke, who says of an old prose piece, "The prose reference is clearly rhetorical. It occurs in a work written with a definite audience in mind, and for a definite purpose" (Burke, 1969b, p. 4). The final scene of *The Legend of Korra* required active effort. That scene was purposeful; rhetorical; an act and a tool for generating change. It is the performative act of changing in contrast to expectations that riles the social flow of order and can potentially change the direction of social flow altogether.

The Agent(s)

Agents as Formed; Induced. In Burke's frame there are two planes at which human agents act through or upon rhetoric: those who initiate symbolic action, and those towards whom symbolic action is directed. Those human agents who serve as the initiating actors in this instance will be further discussed. Those human agents in whom attitudes have potentially been formed and action potentially induced should be recognized primarily as the show's audience, and secondarily as those who indirectly experience the reverberating effects of the act. There are those who witnessed the scene. Among them are those like myself who have been avid fans of the series. Among those are fans representing myriad ages and demographics, each with respective conditions and complexly different rationales. Some who witnessed the scene may well have not necessarily been "fanatical" about the show, but had any number of reasons for witnessing it.

There are also those who have no active connection with the series, let alone with its final scene; those who did not and had no particular reason to witness it, but in some way were affected by it. Some may have heard about it second-hand. For instance, I actively expressed my affirmation for the act to a number of individuals who had never heard of the show, and to some who knew what it was, but had never experienced it. Further, knowing that *The Legend of Korra* easily falls under the league of "nerd" culture, there are any number of individuals who either through social media, videogaming and anime blogs, or

other like sources heard about the resolute act (Robinson, 2014). Each of these individuals, in some manner, has had their attitudes altered. Rather than directly aiming to quantify the degree or direction to which those attitudes have changed, and to which new action can then occur, it should be understood that the form of any mass-mediated act that decisively affirms a social quality in turn promotes and perpetuates that social quality. McQuail (1977) states that "there is a continuing and selective interaction between self and the media which plays a part in shaping the individual's own behavior and self-concept" (pp. 13-14). Id est, *The Legend of Korra* says to the world that same-sex romantic partnerships are acceptable and rational, thereby the world in general is more inclined to agree with that assertion than it otherwise would have been. However, there is no agreeability, no controversy, no discussion, if the act is not initiated.

   Agents as Initiating Actors. Within Burke's Dramatistic Pentad, the agent is generally referenced as the individual, body, structure, et cetera that initiates the act. Burke (1969a) elaborates: "We may think of voting as an act, and of the voter as an agent" (p. xx). The analysis above conceptualizes an expanded view of the position of agent, attempting to better understand the intent of those agents who generate the act. Those agents, at this site of analysis, are Bryan Konietzko and Michael Dante DiMartino, the creators of *Avatar: The Last Airbender* and *The Legend of Korra* (Acevedo, 2014). They made the conscious decision not only to establish couple formation between two characters of the same sex in their popular children's cartoon, but to do so only in the final scene of the second and presumably final series of the franchise. That couple formation and the implications that are carried with it are the final contributions at which the creators leave their mark. That final scene is their statement. The value of the statement does not rise out of whatever discussion or controversy then revolves around Konietzko and DiMartino. Rather, the value is laden within the scene. They seem to have been fully aware of what they were aiming to do with this act:

> As Tenzin says, "Life is one big bumpy ride." And if, by Korra and Asami being a couple, we are able to help smooth out that ride even a tiny bit for some people, I'm proud to do my part [with Bryan Konietzko], however small it might be. (DiMartino, 2014).

Agency
According to Kimberling, "In the Dramatistic model, the medium of presentation would be a 'sub-Agency' used by the artist as agent. The primary agency would

be human language and conventional form, the latter differing somewhat depending on differences in medium" (Kimberling, 1982, p. 81). Konietzko and DiMartino could only act as agents through the allowance afforded to them. What forces, both abstract and tangible, gave them the power to execute the act, to display non-heterosexual romantic behavior in a children's television show? First, the network on which the show originally aired, and through which the show continued to be contracted, is a key source of agency. The Nickelodeon Network, which itself is afforded agency through its conglomerate parent company Viacom Media Networks, is the literal mode through which the act could occur. Nickelodeon signed off the first season of the show, and renewed it one season after another through to its fourth and final (Robinson, 2014). On some level Nickelodeon had to agree to the act. Konietzko (2014) affirmed and elaborated: "We approached the network and while they were supportive there was a limit to how far we could go with it."

An extended source of agency is the internet, particularly nick.com, which is the primary platform on which the final season aired. The final season did not air on Nickelodeon's primary network, but instead was shown almost exclusively on their website (Robinson, 2014). There are some who believe that this is because of the socially mature content already appearing in the series—suicide, murder, war, terrorism, and prejudice. There are others who argue that Nickelodeon was wary of how such a scene would be received on their primary network. A simple counter to these arguments is that due to a number of scheduling decisions in a quickly evolving television landscape, the show dropped steeply in ratings, and the network no longer considered it viable to keep it on the air. Put plainly, re-runs of a different show would make more money. Of course, online there is less possibility for causal or coincidental viewing. If the act were to cause a notable controversy, Nickelodeon would at least have the opportunity to keep it from as many viewers as possible, and thus the opportunity to protect themselves, their reputation, and their bottom-line. Whatever the rationale for taking *The Legend of Korra* off television, the fact that it appeared online added to its viability, made the show and the event less likely to be considered for outright cancellation, or for being indefinitely pulled from all platforms.

The fact that the final season aired online also gave agency to the reach and impact of the act. Not every fan of the series has cable television. The internet is, for many, a much more accessible medium of mass communication. In this way virtually anyone could have the opportunity to witness the act. A financial investment had also already been made in the final season (Acevedo, 2014). The

fact that ratings may have been dropping in the second-to-last season was irrelevant to the fact that season four was already in post-production. Online viewing may not be as financially lucrative as on-air ratings, but not putting the show online would have been wasteful. The fact that the series had already been paid for was, itself, agency.

All of the investment in *The Legend of Korra* stemmed from the extensive popularity of the *Avatar* franchise. Its predecessor series, *Avatar: The Last Airbender*, was critically acclaimed and incredibly popular, garnering high ratings (Robinson, 2014). *The Legend of Korra* was only picked up by the network for these reasons, hence, the popularity of *Avatar: The Last Airbender* is agency through which the act could eventually occur. The first season of *The Legend of Korra* garnered record-breaking ratings itself (Robinson, 2014), adding to that form of agency. The series' fan base grew, and with that growth came more critical acclaim and more discussion around its merits as a show that was technically made for younger viewers. Fans might argue that the quality of storytelling on par with the creativity of aesthetic and character-depth is a basis for the show's success, and thereby one might argue that such quality and creativity are modes of agency working in tandem with one another.

Scene

The context of the final scene begins with its air date: 19 December, 2014 (Robinson, 2014). The act took place at the end of a year that contextualized the deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner and the resulting protests and controversies; an outbreak of Ebola, and its resulting and often unnecessary panic; the rapid prevalence of a self-declared Islamic-State in the Middle East; and a great deal more (Leitsinger, 2014). This study does not aim to argue that the final episode of *The Legend of Korra* is an event that is somehow on par with national and international tragedies. Rather, I am aiming here to position the final scene of *The Legend of Korra* within a world that that is already situated to face and reflect on such large-scale social events.

Again, the final season of the show was already in post-production. Mainstream animation is a fairly long process (Acevedo, 2014). The events of 2014 could not have a viable impact on what was to happen in that season, let alone in the final episode and scene. Rather, it is the events of 2014, and the respective contexts on which each of them is built, that add to how the act could impact social discourse. We live in a world that is often fixated on sensationalism, focused first on tragic happenstance and intended occurrence, and more rarely on evidence of social progress and collective success. Few are

likely to compare the intimate bonding of two female cartoon characters to tragedy, though some have come close. Klett (2014) references activist Janet Boynes' response to the act: "Let me say this in plain English: the gay community wants to indoctrinate an entire generation of American children with pro-homosexual propaganda and eliminate traditional values from American society." The final scene of *The Legend of Korra* stands out for many as a spark of hope (DiMartino, 2014), something to be praised in contrast to so much of what we are shown in the media that degrades. *Avatar: The Last Airbender* and *The Legend of Korra* expand on expressions of equality:

> I cannot and should not speak for how both series portrayed characters that are a part of other marginalized groups, though it seems many fans and critics alike agree that both series have done an excellent job of portraying women and people with disabilities. (Ruuska, 2015).

What is blurred between serving as either agency or scene is the reality that in the United States support for gay rights and for marriage equality has grown exponentially in recent years (Saad, 2012). In this case the act serves to further perpetuate that momentum, adding to the likelihood that social equality will continue to expand. The act also occurred, however, in a world that does still struggle over rights for LGBTQ individuals and groups. There are those who expressed distaste and even disdain over the act. "Some parents have criticized the network for the decision, saying it was inappropriate to bring such a political and controversial subject onto a children's [television] program" (Klett, 2014). The struggle continues on multiple planes, and within multiple cultural, social, and familial contexts. People throughout the world continue to fight for equal rights; continue to hide in fear of persecution; continue to wait and hope that those with agency will fight on their behalf.

A part of the scene is also the industry landscape. There is a wide spectrum of styles and depicted forms of what constitute the animation industry. There are other, differently obscure children's cartoons; there are more "tame" children's cartoons; there are multiple forms of adult-oriented animation that can be starkly serious or purposefully crude; there is Japanese animation (anime) as a widely popularized and varied genre; there are big-budget animated feature films. *The Legend of Korra* has never quite matched what is expected of Nickelodeon, standing out in comparison with other shows and genres. In the same sense that events that occur outside of ourselves intersect with one another to create our means of knowing, to create our respective

scenes, we all intersect with one another to create each others' ways of knowing, each others' scenes. The young viewership and many of their parents that were available to witness the act, and the strong diverse fan base that took part in the experience: each of these individuals intersect with their respective social worlds, adding to the myriad scenes in which the act could be experienced. "While the move has been praised for 'exposing positive LGBT[Q] representation' by numerous media outlets, some parents feel that Nickelodeon exploited children as a means of winning the national debate" (Klett, 2014).

Purpose

Konietzko and DiMartino have directly addressed the rationale of the act. According to them, they executed that final scene with the intention of demonstrating greater inclusivity of their diverse fan base (DiMartino, 2014). Konietzko (2014) stated, "Mike and I talked it over and decided it was important to be unambiguous about the intended relationship." He has also gone so far as to sell specialized artwork depicting Korra and Asami cuddling happily together in order to donate his proceeds to a LGBTQ suicide prevention hotline (Konietzko, 2015). However, there are implications that stem from the fact that the act occurred specifically as the final scene of the show that expanded on the possibility for what may have been a more extensive likely purpose.

Because they knew that the act was landmark in many ways, they clearly had some understanding of the act's implications. Either these implications simply did not deter them from acting, or they actively sought them. In other words, they knew that there was a possibility for controversy, and they knew that lively discussion was a virtual absolute, and they executed the act expecting and wanting those things to happen. Knowing that *The Legend of Korra* might be their last big project for that franchise (Acevedo, 2014), they purposely wanted to end on a note of contrast—they wanted that very last moment to stand out so that the series as a whole would stand out, so that it would remain noticed.

Impact on Discourse

The Act. What makes the act socially significant is the fact that something parallel has never before been done. There are acute acts that mark a similarity with the one at the end of *The Legend of Korra*. The animated film *ParaNorman* similarly ends on a note of LGBTQ inclusivity, and like *The Legend of Korra*, it is a product that was made and marketed for children, but it had a wide appeal to a diverse audience (Anderson-Minshall, 2012). *The Legend of Korra*, however, is an animated series with a fan base grown out of nearly a decade of work. Each

such act leaves open the possibility for later acute acts, those that go just a little bit further. I am not situating that one joke at the end of *ParaNorman* is responsible for the final scene of *The Legend of Korra*, nor am I situating that the final scene of *The Legend of Korra* will be solely responsible for a subsequent, potentially more progressive act. Instead, I am asserting that such action does change the greater discourse, and the greater discourse is a means through which more progressive action can, in fact, later occur.

The Agent(s). In the same way that the act itself leaves open the possibility for similar and more progressive acts in the future, the fact that Konietzko and DiMartino found agency with which to execute the act lends credence to the possibility for future agents to act similarly. As Konietzko and DiMartino added to multiple current discourses, later agents might feel more inclined to take such action and thereby influence the direction of discursive practices. In the same way that whenever one person comes out of the closet it provides an abstract albeit very visceral agency for others to do the same, the fact that DiMartino and Konietzko executed this kind of action provides agency for future agents; it allows individuals to have greater personal power to shape our social discourse.

Agency and Scene. The birth of controversy appears to have been minimal; in fact, the act quickly gained media praise (DiMartino, 2014). The forms that agency took in the instance of this rhetorical action stood the test of the contemporary; that is, the agency that allowed for the final scene of *The Legend of Korra* to occur successfully fits into the context of today. As previously stated, the act does not really change the scene, but instead occurs within it. Future scenes, and future contexts in which such acts occur, however, are built on social movement. Social movement is given agency through a basis of initial actions. The final scene of *The Legend of Korra* could not have been executed, at least not successfully, in another period of time. Even today it could not have occurred in many places around the world. Its occurrence was built on actions of the past that affected the scene of today. In tandem with later intersections of additional and related discourse, actions of today, like this one, affect the scenes and the agency of the future.

Purpose. The impact of the act on present and later discourse should not necessarily be separated from the rationale of the purpose itself. Konietzko (2014) stated, "Just because two characters of the same sex appear in the same story, it should not preclude the possibility of a romance between them." Both creators took a moderate approach to executing the act. Konietzko (2014) elaborates:

However, we still operated under this notion, another 'unwritten rule,' that we would not be allowed to depict that [same-sex romance] in our show. So we alluded to it … working in the idea that their trajectory could be heading towards a romance.

If the purpose is blatant activism, it is likely that the resulting discourse would expand too quickly. The more quickly a controversy is lit and its resulting debates fueled, the more quickly interest in that debate dies, and its purpose forgotten. If Konietzko and DiMartino had not expressed any sentiment on their rationale for the act, if they had not given any reason whatsoever on their intentions, discussion would likewise build quickly, but fade sooner than necessary through public frustration.

Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to structurally frame the final scene of *The Legend of Korra* as subtly, socially disruptive. "DiMartino also mentioned […] that he took it as a compliment that Joanna Robinson at Vanity Fair described the Nickelodeon show […] as subversive" (Karlin, 2014). I believe that the creators had a clear purpose, which was to upset the social standard. They had no intention of fostering feelings or expressions of animosity, though they knew they would. I see them as more aware and active players in a larger social drama. Dramatism allows in many ways for a clearer and more formulaic analysis of sites such as this. Each perspective of the Pentad correlates to the others, and those new ratios then correlate with one another as well. As efficient and effective as the Pentad can be as a tool for garnering stronger modes of identification, it also limitlessly unravels the rhetorical implications of event. It gives justification to an even further expanded study, interrogating more the myriad contexts in which the act was executed. It is important to recognize that what has happened through *The Legend of Korra* is both a signifier of changing discourses on gender identity as well as a catalyst for further, more progressive, and more impactful change.

The Legend of Korra's final scene may be, within itself, a casual occurrence. But the implications beyond the world of the Avatar into our world are very real. They are worth examining, not because of the notion that they somehow deviate from our reality, but because even in a world of the dynamically and intensely fantastical, *The Legend of Korra* manages to very nonchalantly and very beautifully capture a more real image, a reflection, of what our society actually contains: an endless variance of identity, subject only to the self and to

her or his own situational actions. The final scene of *The Legend of Korra* undermines the expectations of animation and generates a powerful new discourse about the nature of children's cartoons. It does not attempt to distract from reality, but instead to emulate and amplify it.

References

Acevedo, A. (2014, August 19). Nerdist writers panel #154: Legend of Korra/Avatar: The Last Airbender. *Nerdist.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2015.

Anderson-Minshall, D. (2012, November 29). Why ParaNorman featured the first gay character in an animated film. *Advocate.com*. Retrieved March 18, 2015.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burke, K. (1969a). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1969b). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal, 40*(4), 519-531.

Conners, J. (2007). Popular culture in political cartoons: Analyzing cartoonist approaches. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 40*(2), 261-265.

DiMartino, M. (2014, December 22). Korrasami confirmed. *Tumblr.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2015.

Foss, S., Foss, K., & Trapp, R. (1985). *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Geidner, C. (2014, February 21). The moment on "House of Cards" when we paid very close attention to Edward Meechum. *Buzzfeed.com*. Retrieved March 18, 2015.

Goffman, E. (1956). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Edinburgh, Scotland: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.

Greenberg, R. (2011). The animated text: Definition. *Journal of Film and Video, 63*(2), 3-10.

Hardy, M. (2013). Marriage equality: Same-sex marriage in the United States. *College and Research Libraries News, 74*(6), 304-314.

Karlin, L. (2014, December 23). "Legend Of Korra" creators confirm Korra and Asami are a couple. *Huffingtonpost.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2015.

Kimberling, C. (1982). *Kenneth Burke's dramatism and popular arts*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

Klett, L. (2014, December 26). Nickelodeon's "The Legend of Korra" creators confirm Korra and Asami are gay, Christians respond. *Gospelherald.com*. Retrieved March 19, 2015.

Konietzko, B. (2014, December 22). Korrasami is canon. *Tumblr.com*. Retrieved March 19, 2015.

Konietzko, B. (2015, March 4). Turtle-duck date night. *Tumblr.com*. Retrieved March 6, 2015.

Kreitzer, R., Hamilton, A., & Tolbert, C. (2014). Does policy adoption change opinions on minority rights? The effects of legalizing same-sex marriage. *Political Research Quarterly,* 795-808. Retrieved March 18, 2015.

Leitsinger, M. (2014, December 31). Year in review: The top stories of 2014. *NBCnews.com*. Retrieved March 19, 2015.

Lindquist, H. (2008). Composing a gourmet experience: Using Kenneth Burke's theory of rhetorical form. *The Journal of the Kenneth Burke Society, 4*(2). Retrieved February 25, 2015.

Linebarger, D. (2011). Teaching with television: New evidence supports an old medium. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(3), 62-65.

Lovett, J. (2015, March 5). Legend of Korra creator reveals Korrasami art to be sold for LGBTQ prevention. *Comicbook.com*. Retrieved March 6, 2015.

McQuail, D. (1977). The influence and effects of mass media. In J. Curran, M. Gurevitch, and J. Woolacott (ed.), *Mass Communication and Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moss, D. (2007). The animated persuader. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 40*(2), 241-244.

Muqaddimah. (2014, December 8). Avatar: Legend of Korra…and the Middle East? *Wordpress.com*. Retrieved March 19, 2015.

Napier, Susan J. (2005). The problem of existence in Japanese animation. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 149(1), 72-79.

Nicktoons. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2015, from http://nicktoons.nick.com/

Osterndorf, C. (2014, June 18). Animation's gay revolution isn't as progressive as you think. *The Week*. Retrieved July 10, 2015.

Poiana, P. (2010). The discursive and narrative implications of scandal. *Cultural Critique, 76*, 24-48.

Robinson, J. (2014, December 19). How a Nickelodeon cartoon became one of the most powerful, subversive shows of 2014. *Vanityfair.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2015.

Rogers, A. (2014, December 24). Subversive queer representation in "The Legend of Korra." *Nerdcaliber.com*. Retrieved July 19, 2015.

Ruuska, L. (2015, January 6). Why representation matters: A thank you letter to Bryan Konietzko and Michael Dante DiMartino. *Huffingtonpost.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2015.

Saad, L. (2012, May 14). U.S. Acceptance of gay/lesbian relations is the new normal. *Gallup.com*. Retrieved March 19, 2015.

Sindu, S. (2014, December 21). Korrasami, queer representation and saying goodbye to the "Legend of Korra." *Autostraddle.com*. Retrieved July 19, 2015.

Tassi, P. (2014, October 22). The strange, sad abuse of "The Last Airbender" and "The Legend of Korra." *Forbes.com*. Retrieved March 18, 2015.

Thomas, P., Crisp, T., & Knezek, S. (2010). Challenging texts: "Just don't see myself here": Challenging conversations about LGBTQ adolescent literature. *The English Journal, 99*(3), 76-79.

Tuhkanen, M. (2009). Performativity and becoming. *Cultural Critique, 72*, 1-35.

An Analysis of the Differential Meanings Embedded in Two Main Areas of Los Angeles Union Station

Alice J. Marianne Fritz

Abstract

Built environments have the power to affect users' emotions, behavior, and even how they see themselves. This paper examines the spatial texts of two principle sections of Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS): Union Station West and the East Portal. The author argues that messages involving socio-economic status embedded within the physical elements of the two spaces (together with their associated connotations) hail different kinds of users. Those messages may then be internalized by the users, and aid in the construction of their identities.

Introduction

For many out-of-town visitors stopping by Los Angeles, it constitutes their gateway into the city, their first impression of it as they arrive, and possibly their last impression of the city as they leave. For many long-time residents of L.A., on the other hand, it may simply be a transitional space, to be traversed through swiftly; a pit stop on their way to or from work, perhaps. While most tourists may experience only one section of the terminal—the portion situated at the western edge of the structure—for many locals, the Union Station they know tends to be based upon their impressions of the eastern tip of the station.

Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) is located in downtown Los Angeles, between Alameda Street, Cesar Chavez Avenue, Vignes Street, and the Hollywood Freeway. The original terminal, which opened in May, 1939, now constitutes the station proper (hereafter designated "Union Station West"). The tourist exiting the station from the Alameda side will be greeted with the sight of the quaintly ethnic Olvera Street and El Pueblo de Los Angeles State Historic Park across the way. A second, much smaller central area, added in 1995, can be found at the eastern end of the station, the side bounded by Vignes Street. This is the Gateway Transit Center, also known as the East Portal, also known as "Union Station's backdoor." The two main areas of this transportation hub are connected by (one might also say separated by) a long (measuring 500 feet)

underground walkway. A traveler who visits Union Station from the Alameda side and one who enters and leaves through the East Portal will form very different impressions of the terminal. While this by itself is not a reason for concern, the situation becomes problematic when, through their differential experiences of LAUS, users come to arrive at differential conclusions not only concerning the terminal itself, but about *themselves*. The places we visit, and especially, the sites in which we feel we *belong*, contribute to shaping our notions about our own identities. The present paper examines the meanings embedded within the architecture of LAUS from an ideological perspective. Specifically, Union Station West and East Portal are viewed as socio-economically dichotomous spaces that convey differential messages to their users. Those messages, implicitly conveyed by the forms, surfaces, spaces, textures, colors, etc. that passengers experience either from within or outside the terminal, influence their perception of where they belong, not just within the physical space delineated by the walls of the station, but, in a larger and more profound sense, where they fit within society.

Background and Review of Literature
With the exception of advertisements, most visual images tend to be processed less critically than discursive texts, since people generally don't expect such images to contain persuasive messages. In their defense of a theory of visual argument, Birdsell and Groarke (1996) acknowledge that "visual images are frequently vague and indeterminate," (p. 2) but maintain that this characteristic in no way prohibits images from presenting persuasive arguments to an audience. Similarly, Jencks (1980) argues that while buildings do not convey messages with the precision of language, certain architectural signifiers do lead to particular signifieds, which "can be just about any idea or set of ideas as long as they aren't too long or complex" (p. 74).

While visual images may not be able to convey messages in an explicit or precise manner, they nevertheless do, as Birdsell and Groarke (1996) point out, have the power to persuade, and their persuasive effects may be heightened precisely because their audiences do not approach them with critical skepticism. Few people, for instance, who venture into a building would consider the possibility that the architecture around them may influence them into adopting certain worldviews. However, buildings are often designed with the goal of communicating certain meanings as one of its functions, perhaps even one of its primary functions. Sklair (2010) observes that iconic buildings that are readily recognizable to the public and have some "special symbolic/aesthetic

significance attached to them" (p. 136), such as those that house government institutions, corporate offices, or consumerist spaces (e.g., shopping malls). They are always designed to convey particular messages that their creators (in an economic or political sense, not necessarily the architects themselves) wish to impress upon the public. LAUS, as a major transportation hub serving more than 60,000 passengers per day (Musicant), is just such an iconic structure, famous not only for the residents of the city, but also for tourists from around the country. Its original creators wanted a building that would "project an image of commercial and industrial success" (Musicant, 2014, p. 11). From the outset, Union Station was planned as a structure that would impress tourists from other states and nations and symbolize the economic and commercial potential of the then emergent metropolis of Los Angeles. Though that intention remains to this day part of the "meaning" of LAUS, the "producers" of the current meanings embedded within the architecture of LAUS have changed, and with that change, new meanings have been added that audiences are encouraged to extract from the spatial text of LAUS. As Sklair (2010) claims, whereas iconic architecture in the pre-global era tended to reflect the perspectives of the state and/or religion, "in the era of capitalist globalization the dominant force driving iconic architecture is the transnational capitalist class" (p. 138).

Situated in the heart of Los Angeles, a city where homeless indigents languish in cardboard boxes hardly a block away from the most affluent capitalist strongholds, ideologies embedded within LAUS (among others) help to dispel doubts in the mind of the public over whether ours is truly the best of all possible worlds. It is the purpose of the present paper to uncover those hidden ideologies which may be derived from the architecture and interior design of LAUS. As Hattenhauer (1984) writes, "Architecture is a persuasive phenomenon, and therefore deserves to be studied by rhetorical critics" (p. 71). Because LAUS serves so many people each day, it is uniquely suited to influence the worldviews of a large portion of the public. As such, the present paper attempts to provide an ideological analysis of this building, to expose the ways in which buildings like LAUS work to "create limiting social realities about the way the world works" (Makus, 1990, p. 495).

Historical background of LAUS

The Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal was finally built after a battle lasting over two decades between the Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and Salt Lake railroads, who opposed the erection of a central terminus, and the pro-union station faction of civic leaders, near the original center of civic life in Los Angeles.

"The Plaza had immense significance as the original heart of the city, evoking romantic if not entirely realistic notions of its Spanish past" (Musicant, 2014, p. 8). The choice of this particular site, while attractive in a symbolic sense, and imparting a nostalgic link to the city's past as it did, necessitated the forceful eviction of residents who occupied the land on which the new terminal would be built. Thus it was that the residents of the original Chinatown, and the Mexican neighborhood nearby, were summarily kicked out of their homes, and "two poor, ethnic neighborhoods… that did not create an inviting first impression for tourists and potential investors" (Musicant, 2014, p. 8) were demolished and their former residents forcibly displaced. Their removal, however, mollified the fears of those who believed the Chinese and Mexican communities would prove a distasteful sight to greet visitors to Los Angeles.

In 1933, the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal Agency, charged with overseeing the construction and operation of the new terminal, contracted the services of prominent L.A. architects John Parkinson and his son, Donald B. Parkinson, to design this important building (Musicant, 2014). Several other architects, engineers, and designers were hired to assist the Parkinsons, including chief designer Edward Warren Hoak, and color consultant Herman Sachs, who, besides being responsible for Union Station's color palette, also created the harlequin tiles that adorn the station's ceilings and walls. The collaboration of this team of architects and designers resulted in a "Spanish Revival building of massive splendor that reflects Los Angeles' Spanish-Mexican heritage as well as the prevailing style of the 1930s, Streamline Moderne" (Koenig, 2000, p. 82). The architectural style generally referred to as Spanish Revival actually encompasses two phases: the earlier Mission Revival and a second Mediterranean phase (ca. 1910 to early 1930s). This later phase incorporates elements of Spanish, Mexican, Italian, and North African architecture, and it is this style that has come to exemplify "Spanish Colonial Revival" architecture (Gebhard, 1967). The Spanish Colonial Revival style was inspired by the architecture of the missions erected in California by Spanish missionaries starting in 1769, although, as Gebhard (1967) points out, "one of the unique qualities of this regional architecture is that it had little, if any, real roots in the historic past of the area" (p. 131). The ecclesiastical settlements that provided the inspiration for so many structures in Southern California were established by Franciscan priests in an attempt to solidify Spanish control of the region (Musicant, 2014). It was the intention of the Franciscan *padres* as well to bring civilization and religion to the "wild Indians" who inhabited the area. At any rate, the Native Americans were put to work, building California's 21

missions. The decision to build the terminal in an architectural style reminiscent of that episode in the region's history was calculated to induce associations with a highly romanticized past, one not necessarily founded upon historical facts.

The other architectural style heavily relied upon by the Parkinsons and their team in the design of LAUS was that of Streamline Moderne, a type of Art Deco architecture. Art Deco as a decorative style was introduced to the world at the Exhibition of Decorative and Industrial Arts held in Paris in 1925 (Janson & Janson, 1995). Since then, it has influenced the design of many public buildings in Northern America. In the 1930s, when LAUS was built, the Art Deco style was at the height of its popularity in this country (Bayer). It is an architectural movement characterized by an eclectic aesthetic which sought inspiration in a variety of architectural and decorative traditions, including Mayan, Aztec, and Native American.

In 1990, the aging Union Station was bought by a property developer, Catellus Development Corporation, who restored the terminal to its former glory, added a transit center and a 26-story office building to the property, and then sold the lot to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) in 2011 (Musicant, 2014). Today, LAUS is a busy transportation hub, serving more than 60,000 passengers daily travelling via both train and bus.

Ideological Criticism of Visual Artifacts

In every society, there are various sets of beliefs and value systems to which the different subgroups within that population subscribe. Among those diverse belief systems and perspectives, however, some are privileged over others, in direct relation to the economic (and therefore), political, and social power wielded by those members of that society who hold those particular perspectives. To quote Marx and Engels (1976), whose writings on how ideas come to hold sway in capitalist societies have influenced the work of countless other scholars, "the class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production" (p. 59). In short, the ideas of an elite ruling class emerge as the most heavily circulated, most widely promoted ideas in that society, thereby gaining a hegemonic dominance. Elaborating upon Hall, Hebdige (1979) has defined the concept of hegemony, originally proposed by Antonio Gramsci, as "a situation in which a provisional alliance of certain social groups can exert 'total social authority' over other subordinate groups, not simply by coercion or by the direct imposition of ruling ideas, but by 'winning and shaping consent so that the power of the

dominant classes appears both legitimate and natural'" (p. 129). In order to quell competing voices, the dominant ideology must present itself as beyond question, beyond contestation—it must present itself under the normative guise of *common sense*, and in this manner obtain the acceptance of the ideology by other members of that society (Fiske, 1993). Furthermore, "to maintain a position of dominance, a hegemonic ideology must be renewed, reinforced, and defended continually through the use of rhetorical strategies and practices" (Foss, p. 210). Rhetors with the (conscious or otherwise) aim of "renewing, reinforcing, and defending" a hegemonic ideology employ a variety of rhetorical media to do so, and it is the task of the ideological critic to "look beyond the surface structure of an artifact to discover the beliefs, values, and assumptions it suggests… to make visible the ideology embedded" within that artifact (Foss, p. 209–213).

Textual artifacts are certainly not the only ones with the capacity to convey ideological messages, a fact which communication scholars have only taken into serious consideration since 1970, when the National Conference on Rhetoric made a formal recommendation to expand the study of rhetoric to include "the non-discursive as well as the discursive, the nonverbal as well as the verbal" (Sloan *et al.*, p. 221). Scholars who have advocated for more thoughtful examination of the rhetorical potential of nonverbal symbols have included such highly esteemed names as Kenneth Burke, Roland Barthes, and Sonja Foss. Burke's (1966) broad definition of rhetoric allowed for the inclusion of "mathematics, music, sculpture, painting, dance, architecture styles, and so on" (p. 28) as possible sites for the performance of "symbolic action." In *Mythologies*, Barthes conceives of non-discursive images and artifacts, such as food, toys, and even haircuts as capable of conveying ideologies, through the connotations associated with them.

Olson, Finnegan, and Hope (2008) have termed such meaning-laden nonverbal texts "visual rhetoric," which the authors explain are "symbolic actions enacted primarily through visual means, made meaningful through culturally derived ways of looking and seeing and endeavoring to influence diverse publics" (p. 3). Because of this potential of visual artifacts to influence, Olson *et al*. stress the need for more scholarship in this important subcategory of rhetoric. In fact, the power of visual artifacts to influence may be no less potent than that of verbal texts. Built environments may be included in the larger category of visual artifacts, although they have also been referred to as spatial text (e.g., McMurtrie, 2012). The way audiences interface with built environments are a special case: while people engage with two-dimensional

images visually, buildings are experienced on both a visual and a dynamic level as users move through them and are affected by them (McMurtrie, 2012). Hence, the potential of built environments to promote certain patterns of thinking may be amplified due to people's perception that they are "unlikely" sources of ideologies, and due to the profound manner in which people experience those spaces on a visual, dynamic, tactile, and affective level. As Betsky (1994) notes, buildings may be uniquely suited to represent ideas and values which may lose some of their suasive power when stated overtly. Viewing architecture as a "representation of power" because it "houses the central institutions of any society, commands enormous physical resources, and imposes itself on the daily life of the user or observer as a physical fact" (p. 65), Betsky asserts that architecture is the physical embodiment of the socioeconomic status quo.

Umberto Eco (1997) has noted a tendency for semioticians (and this tendency is certainly evident in the general public) to overlook architecture as a communication medium. Eco points out that besides its more obvious denotative functions (to house, to contain, to protect from the elements, etc.), a building has the ability to convey connotative ideas as well. In fact, insofar as architecture is "a communicative operation directed toward large groups of people and confirming certain widely subscribed to attitudes and ways of life" (p. 195), architecture might even be categorized as a form of mass communication. Eco (1997) enumerates several similarities between architecture and mass communication. Both architecture and other mass communication media are designed primarily to appeal to a mass audience. Rarely does the design of a building so deviate from accepted conventions that it directly challenges our expectations. Architectural discourse is also similar to messages transmitted via mass communication in that it is "psychologically persuasive"— it imparts its worldviews gently and imperceptibly onto its audience, who are largely unaware of the deft transfer of ideas which has taken place. Another significant characteristic of both architecture and mass communication is that the discourse that inheres in each medium is "experienced inattentively," without the concentration and cognitive processing we tend to reserve for "more demanding messages" (p. 196). One final similarity identified by Eco (1997) that should be noted here is the fact that decisions to produce architecture or any other product of mass culture is invariably based upon economic considerations: "architecture is a *business*" (p. 196). Eco's contention that architecture functions similarly to mass media has important implications, since the mass media is a crucial tool used by dominant forces to disseminate beliefs

and values that reflect their own interests, and not necessarily those of other groups. As Paletz and Entman (1981) write:

> The general impact of the mass media is to socialize people into accepting the legitimacy of their country's political system; lead them to acquiesce in America's prevailing social values; direct their opinions in ways which do not undermine and often support the domestic and foreign objectives of elites; and deter them from active, meaningful participation in politics—rendering them quiescent before the powerful. (p. 149)

Previous Research

The rhetoric of architecture remains a largely overlooked area within rhetorical studies. Noting the potential of architecture to encourage "the establishment and maintenance of certain attitudes, values, and beliefs," Kanengieter (1990, p. 6) stresses the importance of adding to the "miniscule" extant literature in architectural rhetoric. Of the few scholars who have examined this artifact, Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki (2009) are notable. Their ideological analysis of the Buffalo Bill Historical Center (BBHC) revealed that the museum drew upon the myth of "Buffalo Bill" Cody and the "wild west," as well as the concept of manifest destiny, to recreate American history into one that contemporary, white Americans can feel good about. Dickinson *et al*. (2009) observe that there are foundational myths circulated in our society which reveal "how Americans view themselves as 'Americans' and informs the actions they take on a local and global stage'" (p. 225). Museums are uniquely positioned to shape collective memory and thereby contribute to the construction of national and individual identity. By exhibiting certain historical artifacts—and omitting others—museums instruct their audiences on their collective past. The specific manner in which items are displayed also directs audiences to read those artifacts in particular ways. Through their analysis of the BBHC, Dickinson *et al*. found that the path visitors are directed to take in the museum, and the particular artifacts they encounter in each room of the museum, contribute to reinforcing the myth of the beneficent, White male who brings civilization to the savage Native Indians.

The Southern Californian city of Old Pasadena uses a manufactured set of associations and memories to authenticate itself as a site where a legendary, romantic past "really happened," and visitors are situated within that "warmly remembered past" (Dickinson, 1997, p. 7). Old Pasadena, in spite of its name, is designed to be a place of consumption, a place to buy new clothes, new

furniture, new cars—a place, in fact, where one can, through the purchases of multiple commodities, acquire a whole new identity. The nostalgia evoked by the landscape and buildings, and the inscriptions and legends that delimit readings of those spaces, work to construct this identity for visitors, such that they become "part of the aesthetics of the commodity system" (p. 16). Like the Buffalo Bill Historical Center and the city of Old Pasadena, LAUS (at least the original terminal that was built in the 1930s) communicates an Old-World charm that takes visitors away from the here and now, and places them in a romanticized past in which travelling for pleasure was a sign of wealth and leisure.

Aiello and Dickinson (2014) examined four Starbucks stores that had been redesigned following the corporation's 2009 decision to reinvigorate its brand-defining aesthetic. Their visual-material analysis revealed that the newly-renovated stores highlighted the materials they used to build the stores and store fixtures, through such strategies as using texturally intriguing materials. Those interesting textures invite the scrutinizing gaze and exploring touch of patrons. Combining this deliberate use of unusual materials with strategically placed furnishings, ceramic service ware, and other visual and linguistic stimuli, Starbucks was able to construct its newly designed stores as social spaces where customers are encouraged to linger and engage with one another as community members, rather than move through swiftly. Hence, the store designs were found to possess the capacity not only to interpellate and compel patrons, but also to "limit and constrain specific actions and identities" of those customers (Aiello & Dickinson, 2014, p. 305). Similarly, the different sensorial stimuli that greets visitors to the different sections of LAUS interpellates those users and affects their actions and identities in different ways.

McMurtrie (2012) analyzed the spatial texts of two socio-economically antithetical high-rise apartment buildings, and how they impact users differently due to the differential ways in which users dynamically experience those two spaces. Using the semiotic principle of Binding, the author examined how users' sense of (in)security was heightened or diminished in relation to how *Bound* or *Unbound* their surroundings were. Spaces are said to be Bound (along a continuum) when the overhead, vertical and base planes are situated close to each other, and/or when opaque building materials are used (McMurtrie, 2012). Conversely, Unbound environments have plenty of space between ceiling, walls, and floor, and use transparent building materials such as glass (McMurtrie, 2012). Depending on the individual user's personality and the degree of Binding, a user may be made to feel more or less comfortable and secure as a result of

dynamically interacting with the spatial text. In addition, sharp fluctuations in the degree of Binding as users move through a space is assumed to "create uninviting, uncomfortable spatial texts" (McMurtrie, 2012, p. 527–530), while the opposite effect is hypothesized for smaller fluctuations. For a workable unit of analysis, McMurtrie (2012) isolated users' dynamic experience of a built environment into what he termed a "Promenade," which is conceptualized as the path a user creates by moving through a space. It is an invisible rather then a physical pathway, although the physical features of the space (e.g., walls, stairs, etc.) necessarily guide a user's creation of a Promenade. The path that users are most likely to take within a given space is referred to as the principle Promenade. For example, visitors to a high-rise building would be most likely to create a path from the street, through the main entrance, to the elevators (since elevators constitute the easiest and fastest access to the floors above). It is the argument of the current paper that while the Promenades users create in Union Station West are more complex, visitors to East Portal, guided by cues in their surroundings, follow a more predetermined, set path in order to hasten their exit from the station and prevent idling.

In spite of the above discussion of the extant literature on the persuasive power of nonverbal texts in general, and architectual sites in particular, visual rhetoric remains an under-research area. The dearth of literature examining the rhetorical impact of architectural structures point to this lack of scholarship. The present paper seeks to add to this scant body of literature with an ideological analysis of the architectural rhetoric embedded within two principal areas of LAUS.

Analysis

Following the procedure laid out by Foss (2009), the present ideological analysis will first identify the most salient physical features of LAUS (i.e., the presented elements, or signifiers), after which the connotations suggested by those presented elements (i.e., the signifieds) will be discussed. Finally, the presented elements and the connotations associated with them will be used to piece together the meanings they offer to their audiences. The analysis is divided into two sections, corresponding to the two spatial texts under examination: Union Station West and the East Portal.

Union Station West (original terminal)

A traveller who arrives at LAUS has a choice to make (assuming the choice has not been made for him/her): Which of the two primary entrances should be

used? Which entrance is s/he *supposed* to use? Our traveller might look for clues in the building's façade that frames the doorways. Standing outside the Alameda Street entrance, a visitor will observe the following physical features: smooth white walls, a clock tower (rising to a height of 125 ft.), massive arched windows, and a double-arched portico that leads to five doors of glass and bronze (see Figure 1). These doors, although of unremarkable dimensions, appear small in contrast to the scale of the entire façade, and are certainly

Figure 1: Exterior of Union Station West, showing the clock tower and the main entryway

much smaller than the Romanesque windows. The walls, tower, and arched windows call to mind the exterior of a church. The evenly spaced arched windows, each with five identical doors underneath, connotes order and symmetry in its repetition. Furthermore, the Spanish Revival architecture manifested so clearly in the building's façade, suggests a historical link. Like Old Pasadena discussed by Dickinson (1997), Union Station West is made a

"memory place" through the connection to the Spanish missionaries that provides a context for visitors to use in the construction of their own identities. This connection links the building to a romanticized past in which beneficent European settlers brought religion and civilization to a "savage" people.

Once a visitor approaches the doors in the entryway, any ecclesiastical associations are replaced with a different signified: the glitzy doors reminds one of the entrances to an exclusive club or restaurant. Because the façade is relatively opaque (with only the glass doors at the entryway offering any clue to what lies beyond—the other exterior openings are too dark to reveal much to an observer standing outside), the individual who ventures through those doors must be confident, in spite of the relative lack of any explicit indication, that s/he "belongs" inside. Althusser (1970) asserted that "ideology 'acts' or 'functions' in such a way that it 'recruits' subjects among the individuals, or 'transforms' the individuals into subjects" through the process of hailing. The façade of Union Station West hails a particular kind of user: one who is accustomed to entering establishments of privilege and exclusivity. The immense size of the windows relative to that of the doors also conveys a sense that while those within are afforded ample opportunity to view those without, only a select few are admitted entry and allowed to join that visually advantaged group.

Entering through the glass and bronze doors takes one into the foyer of Union Station West, where a wooden (walnut) information booth stands in the middle of the room, accessible from whichever direction a traveller may happen to approach. To the left is the ticket concourse, no longer in use and cordoned off; to one's right, the upscale Union Station restaurant and cocktail lounge, Traxx. Beyond the foyer is the waiting room (see Figure 2). In these main areas of Union Station West, the following salient physical features can be noted: high, vaulted ceilings, with steel trusses painted to resemble heavy wood beams, from which hang enormous wrought iron chandeliers; floors inlaid with marble and travertine, creating geometric patterns; large windows (through which one can discern the south garden patio on one side, and the north patio on the other); abundant seating accomodations, and plenty of barrier posts and ropes. The expansive dimensions of the foyer, and especially the waiting room (and the ticket concourse) connote stateliness and opulence, as do the massive Art Deco chandeliers. The steel trusses on the ceiling, disguised as timber to downplay its modern origins and to make them more evocative of Old-World grandeur, cross each other to form individual squares; within each square are painted geometric floral designs. This decorative detail may connote wealth, as the individual

Figure 2: Waiting room in Union Station West

partitions formed by the crossing trusses are reminiscent of sections in a jewelry box or a display tray in a jewelry store. The brightly painted geometric "flowers" may represent the jewels on display. The repetitive patterns of the same floral motifs in each square also suggest order and conformity. The implied message here is that "If you do not fit nicely into the square provided, you do not belong here." The criteria for inclusion may be based upon socio-economic status, or perhaps on how well the individual is able to adhere to societal norms.

The geometric shapes formed by the marble and travertine tiles on the waiting room floor suggest a Native American influence. Like the European priests who appropriated land inhabited by Native Americans and "made it better" with their missions, the implied message here may be that the (European American) borrowed Native American motifs (found in their textiles, headdresses, etc.) and "made it better" through the use of European materials and through the merger with an European aesthetic.

One marked difference between Union Station West and East Portal is that the one space has an abundance of seats, while the other has hardly any. The comfortable leather armchairs in Union Station West have oversized arms, to create a sense of separation between one occupant and his/her neighbor, even when the two chairs are placed adjacent to each other. Like most train station waiting rooms, this is, in Hall's (1966, cited in Eco, 1997) terminology, a "sociofugal" space in that the seating provisions inhibit interaction between people. The barrier ropes are, of course, also suggestive of separation. Additionally, their presence discourage those who have "no business to be in this part of the station" (i.e., those not holding tickets to ride the higher-priced Metrolink or Amtrak trains) from loitering in this area.

Time moves slower in this part of the station. Here, one is invited to sit on a luxuriously upholstered chair, to take a stroll around the quaint patios, to wait. To order a cocktail from Traxx while one waits. This space hails those who are able to afford not only the financial costs of a trip aboard, say, the Coast Starlight, but cost in terms of time as well. When all the disposable time of the labourer is "to be devoted to the self-expansion of capital" (Marx and Engels, 1867), it is the mark of the truly wealthy to enjoy the luxury of inactivity.

East Portal

Just as the façade of Union Station West hails a certain class of traveller, so too the façade of the East Portal interpellates a particular type of user. The visitor facing the exterior of the East Portal is provided a multitude of clues as to whether s/he "belongs" in this section of LAUS; in fact, one might say that his/her membership into the "East Portal crowd" is overdetermined.

East Portal opens out to the Patsouras Transit Center. To the right stands the 26-story Metro headquarters. Except for the portion of East Portal's façade that is made with glass panels, the chief material used in the construction of East Portal and the transit center is cast stone. The sand-colored stone, cut into square or rectangular chunks, conjures associations with the structures built by the Pueblo tribes of the American Southwest. The hyaline portion of the façade forms a large semicircle; two glass doors located at the far ends of this semicircle provide access into building. The transparent semicircle formed by the glass panels, taken together with the opaque canopy above it, reminds observers of a gigantic eye. The message suggested by this association is, "All visitors, be warned! You must remain on your best behavior as you enter these premises, for you will be constantly watched and monitored."

In one respect, this back entrance seems to be a more inviting entryway into the terminal than the western entrance. Here, the glass façade allows visitors to peer into the space they are entering before they enter it, which, according to the principle of Binding, should result in feelings of comfort and security (McMurtrie, 2012). What they see from this vantage point, however, is not actually the main lobby or waiting areas of East Portal. In fact, those areas are below ground level, and can only be accessed by going down either one of four flights of stairs (or by using the elevator). What visitors standing outside the building do see is a large mural (*City of Dreams/River of History*) that dominates this section of LAUS (see Figure 3). Given its monumental scale, its prominent

Figure 3 – Mural in East Portal

placement, and its status as one of the few features of the interior of East Portal that can be seen, and seen with clarity, from ground level outside the building, it is obvious that this mural possesses great rhetorical significance. There are ten figures foregrounded in this 80-foot wide mural by Los Angeles-based artist Richard Wyatt (Zeller, 2013). Reading from left to right, they are the portraits of what appear to be a Hispanic man, an elderly Native American woman, an elderly Native American man, an African American woman, a young Hispanic girl

(center), an elderly Asian woman, a Hispanic youth, a young Asian girl, a young Caucasian (or possibly light-skinned Hispanic) girl, and finally, an African American man. Although these figures show no overt signs of poverty, the simplicity of their attires suggests they are members of the middle- or working-classes. The deeply creased faces of the elderly figures, in particular, suggest a lifetime of taxing labor. The preferred reading of this artwork is that it reflects the ethnic diversity of Los Angeles. The muralist himself explained that his inclusion of people from different races and time periods was intended as an homage to the city's history (Sonksen, 2014). However, it is interesting that the White race is represented so insufficiently in this mural (if at all) in which all the "minority" races are so well accounted for. An alternative interpretation that could be offered for this mural is that it serves as a visual announcement of who the intended users of East Portal are, not unlike the iconic signs for men and women that indicate which gender a public restroom is intended for.

Portraiture as an artform was historically the sole purview of the rich and powerful, as only the very wealthy could afford to commission artists to capture their likenesses. In more recent historical times, portraiture, especially on the monumental scale of murals, have been appropriated by oppressed peoples to memorialize the heros of their community. As LaWare (1998) writes, "The size and scale of wall murals, and their location within public spaces, enhance their ability to make visible and relevant concepts and historical events and to link them to present struggles in the community" (p. 143). In the 1960s and '70s, for instance, murals were used by the Mexican American community to help further the goals of the Chicano civil rights movement (LaWare). Other subaltern groups have also used the once elitist medium of art to express anti-establishment ideas. But what happens when an artform like mural painting, so often associated with subversive goals, is re-appropriated by the dominant group and employed for its own purposes? In the case of the East Portal mural, the artwork hails those travellers who see their own likenesses reflected in the mural, and they then answer that interpellation by acknowledging that yes, this is the proper section of Union Station for them to be in, and they should not aspire to lounge in any areas of the terminal meant for people of a different race or a different class.

The very way in which visitors gain access into East Portal holds implications for how it impacts those individuals' self-concepts. While users of Union Station West can walk directly into the building from the front door, while remaining on the same level, users of East Portal must not only use a back way to enter the terminal, but the entryways are located to the side, and lead down a flight of

stairs to a lower level. The associations that arise from this manner of entry includes that of a servant's entrance into the house of his/her master, to whom more direct, "intrusive," means of access is usually denied.

Once having reached the principle space of East Portal through the means described above, the visitor realizes that the semicircular motif of the façade is echoed within, by the domed-shaped interior. East Portal is not, however, a true dome; while it does (and no doubt is meant to) conjure associations with that most well-known prototype of all domed structures, the Pantheon, what one finds in the East Portal is but one half of a dome. Full circles, spheres and hemispheres connote unity, inclusiveness. Semicircles and incomplete domes, therefore, signify that only a portion of a whole is included (while other portions are not).The original Pantheon was dedicated to all the pagan gods of ancient Rome, but the half dome of East Portal suggests that this structure is not dedicated to (welcoming of) all users. This is another physical element in the built environment of LAUS that conveys, through metaphor and connotation, the idea that people are (should be?) separated into subgroups, and not merged into one all-inclusive amalgamation.

Other prominent manifest features in this spatial text include an information counter, a clock, a square column displaying departure times of Metro trains, a cascading water fountain, an aquarium, and a conical mound. This last feature is attached to a ceramic bench, whose shape somewhat resembles that of a curving river.

In contrast to the open information booth in Union Station West, the receptionists behind this information counter are separated from visitors by a wall, which is transparent down to waist level. All interactions between visitor and receptionist are mediated through this plastic wall. If documents, money, or other items need to be transferred between the two parties, it must be done so through a small opening in this wall. What this implies, of course, is that the users of East Portal are untrustworthy, even potentially dangerous individuals, from whom the staff need to be protected.

Academics may discuss architectural and design elements in terms of first and second level significations, or in terms of architectural styles alluded to, or classical conventions evoked, etc. For the passengers who pass through LAUS as they travel toward their various destinations, most of whom may be lay people unversed in the intricacies of architectural evaluation, their assessments of what they encounter may be generally expressed as "This reminds me of—." It will not take an observer long to decide what one conspicuous "decorative" mound in the lobby of the East Portal reminds them of. This sculptural assemblage,

placed, rather inexplicably, adjacent to one of only two (very uncomfortable) seating accomodations in this part of the station, is about five feet in height, conical in shape, and made from brown terra cotta. Embedded within the sculpture are rocks and glass bottles, and other miscellaneous bits and pieces. According to the Metro website, the miscellany embedded within this mound are "artifacts" excavated from the original Chinatown (City of Dreams/River of History, 1996). Its color, shape, and junk-encrusted surface easily justifies an association with refuse. As a decorative object, this sculpture serves no utilitarian purpose. Yet, its unappealing appearance renders it aesthetically useless as well. How then, to explain why it is given such a prominent position in the waiting area of East Portal? Out of this tiny hill of garbage, oozes a fountain of sorts, fashioned into an "S" shape vaguely reminiscent of a river. An unbroken tile-covered bench runs the length of this artificial "rivulet." Although water often carries the connotation of "purity" and "cleanliness," the tiny stream of water that springs from this metaphorical river, which is apparently sourced from a mound of refuse, carries instead connotations of "contamination" and "pollution." In fact, according to Metro's official blog, the aquarium (see Figure 4) and the "river fountain" are meant to represent the Los Angeles River (City of Dreams/River of History, 1996). The analogy may be quite apt: the L.A. River is today little more than a "concrete ditch" (Rosner, 2014). Perhaps an analogy can also be drawn between the L.A. River, which has been artificially diverted from its original path, and certain marginalized residents of the city, who have been diverted by dominant ideologies deeply internalized, away from a path more natural and advantageous to them.

As mentioned elsewhere in this essay, the principle Promenade (McMurtrie, 2012), or the expected path users create within the space of East Portal, is heavily influenced by the sensorial stimuli they are subjected to here. As they come down the stairs to the lobby area of East Portal, travellers are bombarded with a myriad cues urging them to hurry. The clock reminds them of the time. The Metro train departure times displayed on the square column produces anxiety that a train may be leaving without them on it. Flashing lights and sounds add to this anxiety: along the wall beside the escalators that lead down to the subway tracks, light sticks flash intermittently, accompanied by the sounds of an operating train. Announcements flashing across the information counter further adds to the fast-paced ambiance. The ideal path for visitors to take is clearly this: From the transit center, down the stairs, quickly through the lobby, and down the escalators to the platforms, preferably with no detours. The paucity of seating accomodations in this section of the terminal has already

Figure 4 – Aquarium in waiting area of East Portal. The aquarium is bordered by a tile-covered bench

been mentioned; both benches are covered with ceramic tiles and extremely uncomfortable to sit on. In fact, they are barely recognizable as benches. These visual and sensory cues help to construct an identity for the user of this space as someone who must hurry on to the next opportunity to be productive. As Althusser (1970) stated, "the reproduction of labour power required not only a reproduction of its skills, but also, at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order, i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology" (p. 1485). The user who answers the interpellation of this space and assumes the role assigned becomes the perfect representative of an endlessly on-the-move working class, who keeps their miseries and troubles discretely hidden from an elite ruling class lounging in a posh waiting room a few hundred feet, and yet, a world, away.

Conclusion

Important public spaces have the power to shape private identities. The preceding analysis revealed that the spaces at the west and east edges of LAUS are so dissimilar in terms of their respective architectural signs as to constitute a set of binaries: Modern/historical, romantic/real, upper class/working class, leisurely/rushed. In fact, LAUS may be seen as a microcosmic model of Los Angeles itself, a city in which the rich and the poor, the privileged and the marginalized, co-exist in uncomfortable proximity. Analogous to the way in which an individual may express his/her personality through his/her dress, a society expresses its collective personality, including the values it upholds, through the architecture of its public spaces. The architecture of this important public space, this transportation hub that is visited by so many on a daily basis, has the power to condition the behavior and contribute to constructing the identities of its users. Union Station West and East Portal each invites users to experience its space in a certain way; each of the two spaces commends certain behavior in some users but not in others, and each elicits intended reactions in the users it hails.

In 2013, Metro announced plans that it would conduct a major overhaul of LAUS and the surrounding property it owns. The L.A. architectural firm Gruen Associates and the London firm Grimshaw Architects have been finalizing their plans for this future version of LAUS (Hawthorne, 2014). Among the changes proposed, the architects wish to demolish theTransit Center outside East Portal. Given such a rare chance to rebuild this important transportation hub, one hopes the architects will embrace this opportunity to fix past errors, and to demolish the sharp dichotomies that currently reside in the western and eastern ends of the terminal.

References

Aiello, Georgia and Greg Dickinson. "Beyond authenticity: A visual-material analysis of locality in the global redesign of Starbucks stores." *Visual Communication* 13.3 (2014): 303–321.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and ideological state apparatuses." *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch, et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. 1483–1509.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. New York: Noonday Press, 1972.

Bayer, Patricia. *Art Deco architecture: Design, decoration and detail from the Twenties and Thirties*. London: Thames & Hudson Ltd, 1992.

Betsky, Aaron. "James Gamble Rogers and the pragmatics of architectural representation." *Critical architecture and contemporary culture*. Ed. William J. Lillyman, Marilyn F. Moriarty and David J. Neuman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. 64–86.

Birdsell, David S. and Leo Groarke. "Toward a theory of visual argument." *Argumentation & Advocacy* 33.1 (1996): 1–10.

Burke, Kenneth. *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

City of Dreams/River of History, 1996. 25 March 2015 <http://www.metro.net/about/art/artworks/city-dreamsriver-history/>.

Dickinson, Greg. "Memories for sale: Nostalgia and the construction of identity in Old Pasadena." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83.1 (1997): 1–27.

Dickinson, Greg, Brian L. Ott and Eric Aoki. "Memory and myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum." Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practive*. 4th. Long Grove: Waveland Press, Inc., 2009. 225–245.

Eco, Umberto. "Function and sign: The semiotics of architecture." *Rethinking architecture: A reader in cultural theory*. Ed. Neil Leach. New York: Routledge, 1997. 182–202.

Fiske, John. *Power plays, power works*. London: Verso, 1993.

Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice*. 4th. Long Grove: Waveland Press, Inc., 2009.

Gebhard, David. "The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California (1895–1930)." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 26.2 (1967): 131–147.

Hattenhauer, Darryl. "The rhetoric of architecture: A semiotic approach." *Communication Quarterly* 32.1 (1984): 71–77.

Hawthorne, Christopher. "Metro's Union Station master plan a significant shift." *Los Angeles Times* 26 September 2014.

Hebdige, Dick. "From culture to hegemony." *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks*. Ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner. 2nd. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. 124.

Janson, Horst Woldemar and Anthony F. Janson. *History of art*. 5th. Vol. II. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc, 1995.

Jencks, Charles. "The architectural sign." *Signs, symbols, and architecture*. Ed. Geoffrey Broadbent, Richard Bunt and Charles Jencks. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1980. 71–118.

"Jiang Qing." 2014. *Encyclopaedia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Online Academic Edition*. 15 March 2014 <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/303751/Jiang-Qing>.

Kanengieter, Marla R. "Message formation from architecture: A rhetorical analysis." August 1990. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database* (UMI No.9111148).

Koenig, Gloria. *Iconic LA: Stories of LA's most memorable buildings.* Glendale: Balcony Press, 2000.

LaWare, Margaret R. "Encountering visions of Aztlan: Arguments for ethnic pride, community activism and cultural revitalization in Chicano murals." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34.3 (1998): 140–153.

Makus, Anne. "Stuart Hall's theory of ideology: A frame for rhetorical criticism." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54 (1990): 495–514.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. "Capital: A critique of political economy, Volume I." *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch, et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001. 776–786.

McMurtrie, Robert James. "Feeling space dynamically: Variable interpersonal meanings in high-rise apartment complexes." *Visual Communication* 11.4 (2012): 511–534.

Musicant, Marlyn. *Los Angeles Union Station*. Ed. Marlyn Musicant. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2014.

Olson, Lester C., Cara A. Finnegan and Diane S. Hope. "Visual rhetoric in communication: Continuing questions and contemporary issues." *Visual rhetoric: A reader in communication and American culture*. Ed. Lester C. Olson, Cara A. Finnegan and Diane S. Hope . Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2008. 1–14.

Paletz, David L. and Robert M. Entman . *Media power politics*. New York: The Free Press, 1981.

Rosner, Hillary. *Los Angeles River: From concrete ditch to urban oasis*. 18 July 2014. <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/07/140719-los-angeles-river-restoration-kayaking-greenway/>.

Sklair, Leslie. "Iconic architecture and the culture-ideology of consumerism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 27.5 (2010): 135–159.

Sloan, Thomas O., et al. "Report of the Committee of the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism." *The prospect of rhetoric: Report of the National Development Project*. Ed. Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971. 220–227.

Sonksen, Mike. "Richard Wyatt: Artist for Los Angeles." 7 February 2014. *KCET website*.   <http://www.kcet.org/socal/departures/columns/la-letters/ richard-wyatt-artist-for-los-angeles.html>.

Zeller, Heidi. *"Dreaming" in full color*. 22 April 2013. <http://thesource. metro.net/2013/04/22/dreaming-in-full-color/>.

How the Leaking of the Pentagon Papers Was Framed by Mainstream, Conservative, and Liberal Print Media

Michelle Cornelius

Abstract

The leaking of the Pentagon Papers by Daniel Ellsberg in 1971 was a major news event that led to a landmark Supreme Court decision that advanced press freedom. This study uses textual and content analysis to examine how the leaking of the Pentagon Papers was framed by a mainstream newspaper (The New York Times), and mainstream, conservative, and liberal news magazines (Newsweek, Time, National Review, U.S. News & World Report, The New Republic, and The Progressive). It also examines who was used as sources for their stories and how many statements were supportive of publication versus how many were critical. The study found that there were more frames that supported publication than those that opposed it. With the exception of U.S. News & World Report, all the media sources offered more or equal statements supporting publication as compared to opposing statements. Finally, those sources that are easily accessible to journalists constituted the majority of all sources cited: current government officials, judges, and other members of the media. This study can serve to help guide framing research on more recent leaks of classified information by Chelsea Manning (formerly Bradley Manning) and Edward Snowden.

Introduction

Framing theory is used in political communication and journalism research because of the media's role in shaping public perception of news and its ability to identify different framings of a single story across many news outlets (Volkmer, 2009). Gans (1979) has argued that journalists use framing in order to reduce the complexity of issues (as cited in Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007). Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007) contend that research in framing may inform "how news reports portray, and how people understand, issues" (p. 17). Framing research has shown that "news coverage can strongly influence the

way news readers or viewers make sense of news events and their major actors" (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 338).

Gamson and Mogdigliani (1987) define a media frame as "a central organizing idea or storyline that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events…The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue" (qtd. in *Media Framing*, 2013). Media frames are critical to every news story as they shape "how the public thinks about the issue, whether they should care, and/or how they should act (e.g. as a citizen or a consumer)" (*Media Framing*, 2013).

Framing research has demonstrated that news frames can affect attitudes on issues of great social and political significance such as the women's movement (Terkildsen & Schnell, 1997), how an individual evaluates the president's performance (Iyengar, 1987), and how an audience evaluates a protest (McLeod & Detenber, 1999). Other studies analyzing what frames are used by the media have found that dissenters of the 2001 invasion of Afghanistan and the 2003 Iraq war were severely criticized or marginalized (Ryan, 2004; Luther & Miller, 2005). Researchers have also found differences in the way U.S. and international news sources frame issues and events (Dimitrova & Connolly-Ahern, 2007; Kolmer & Semetko, 2009; Papacharissi & Oliveira, 2008).

How the media frames the leaking of classified information has not yet been explored by scholars. This study attempts to fill that gap by examining how the leaking of the Pentagon Papers by Daniel Ellsberg in 1971 was framed by various news sources. *The New York Times* was chosen because it is considered a newspaper of record in the United States that chronicles the important events of the day (Martin & Hansen, 1998, pp. 7-8) and was a central figure in the publication of the Pentagon Papers.

News magazines were selected for analysis because they "offer a unique source of news information, as the publications are circulated weekly, typically giving journalists more time for crafting a story after the event has occurred" (Harp et al., 2010, p. 472). The magazines used for this study were selected because they are prominent, visible, and mass circulated publications that make them powerful shapers of their readers' understanding of the leaking of the Pentagon Papers. *Time* and *Newsweek* were selected as mainstream news sources, while conservative magazines *National Review* and *U.S. News & World Report* and liberal magazines *The New Republic* and *The Progressive* were selected for comparison.

My research questions are as follows:

RQ1: How was the leaking of the Pentagon Papers by Daniel Ellsberg framed by the newspapers (*The New York Times*) and magazines (*Newsweek, Time, National Review*, *U.S. News & World Report, The New Republic,* and *The Progressive*)?

RQ2: Are there differences in the coverage between mainstream news sources (*The New York Times, Newsweek,* and *Time*), conservative magazines (*National Review* and *U.S. News & World Report*), and liberal magazines (*The New Republic* and *The Progressive*)?

RQ3: What types of sources (government officials, civil liberties groups, etc.) were cited?

RQ4: How many statements were supportive of publishing the Pentagon Papers and how many were critical?

Historical Background

While working for the RAND Corporation, Daniel Ellsberg worked on a study ordered by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara called "U.S. Decision-making in Vietnam, 1945–1968," which later became known as the Pentagon Papers. Ellsberg described the study as "evidence of a quarter century of aggression, broken treaties, deceptions, stolen elections, lies and murder" ("Daniel Ellsberg," 2015). Throughout 1969, Ellsberg worked as a foreign policy consultant regarding Vietnam for President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, but he became increasingly frustrated at their determination to expand on the Johnson Administration's "policies of escalation and deception in Vietnam" ("Daniel Ellsberg," 2015). Inspired by the actions of Vietnam War resisters and their willingness to go to prison, as well as the writings of peace activists like Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Ellsberg decided to end his complicity with the Vietnam War policy and do something to help bring the war to an end ("Daniel Ellsberg," 2015).

In 1969, Ellsberg and Anthony Russo, a fellow RAND colleague, secretly photocopied the classified study and gave it to Senator William Fulbright, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but he never held a hearing on the documents for fear of reprisal from the Nixon Administration (Ellsberg, 2006). After the invasion of Cambodia in 1970 and Laos in 1971,

Ellsberg leaked the study to the *New York Times*, which began publishing them in June 1971 (Ellsberg, 2006).

After *The New York Times* printed three days of articles based on the Pentagon Papers, the U.S. government went to federal court seeking a permanent injunction against further publication, arguing that it "could prolong the Vietnam War and threaten the safe return of U.S. prisoners of war" ("New York Times Co. v. United States"). While the government was not granted a permanent injunction, they were issued a temporary restraining order that forced *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*—which had also printed stories based on the Pentagon Papers—to suspend publication of new articles based on the secret study while they fought the order in the court ("New York Times Co. v. United States"). In a landmark Supreme Court ruling that advanced press freedom, the Court ruled 6-3 that "prior restraint could not be imposed on the publication of the Pentagon Papers," noting that the government carries the burden of justifying why prior restraint is necessary and they had failed to meet that burden ("New York Times Co. v. United States").

New York Times journalist R.W. Apple wrote in 1996 that the report "demonstrated, among other things, that the Johnson Administration had systematically lied, not only to the public, but also to Congress" about the Vietnam War. President Nixon, fearful that Ellsberg had other classified information that he could release, supported the criminal prosecution of both Ellsberg and Russo (Ellsberg, 2006). Ellsberg was indicted on 12 felony counts, but the case against both him and Russo was dismissed just before closing arguments because of government misconduct, which included the illegal wiretapping of Ellsberg's phone and the "Plumbers" breaking into his psychiatrist's office in order to steal records in an effort to discredit him (Ellsberg, 2006; Woodward & Lardner, 2011).

Recent publication of classified information leaked by Chelsea Manning (formerly Bradley Manning) and Edward Snowden have elicited comparisons to Daniel Ellsberg and the Pentagon Papers (Thompson, 2013). An examination into how the Pentagon Papers was framed by the media in 1971 may help us better understand what is happening today. Also, as political scientists Henry Farrell and Martha Finnemore (2013) point out, "in the age of the cell-phone camera and the flash drive, even the most draconian laws and reprisals will not prevent this information from leaking out" (pp. 22-26), so this study may also provide context for future leaks of classified information.

Literature Review

According to Harp, Loke, and Bachmann (2010), "Framing is a process of highlighting, packaging, and retelling the story, which results in constructing a reality from the selections and, in the process, also increases its saliency" (p. 468). Robert Entman (1993) states that framing involves the selection of certain aspects of a perceived reality that are made salient in a way that "*promote[s] a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation* for the item described" (p. 52; italics in the original). Entman further notes that frames can be defined by what they exclude as well as what they include. Price and Tewksbury (1997) have argued that "Framing focuses not on which topics or issues are selected for coverage by the news media, but instead on the particular ways those issues are presented" (qtd. in Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007, p. 15). Through the use of framing, the media influences what issues people think about and how they think about them (Valkenburg, Semetko, and DeVreese, 1999). As Dimitrova and Connolly-Ahern (2007) have pointed out, "Making certain aspects more salient than others in media content leads to different construction of reality" (p. 155).

Framing research has shown that frames have an effect on news audiences (Iyengar, 1987; Iyengar, 1996; Iyengar, Peters, Kinder, & Krosnick, 1984; Iyengar, Peters, & Kinder, 1982; Krosnick & Kinder, 1990; McLeod & Detenber, 1999; Nelson, Clawson, & Oxley, 1997; Terkildsen & Schnell, 1997). For example, Nelson et al. (1997) found that those who watched a TV news report that framed a KKK rally as an issue of free speech were more tolerant of the Klan than those who watched the story through a public order frame that emphasized a potentially violent clash between the Klan and the people who protested their rally.

In an experiment conducted by Shanto Iyengar (1996), subjects were asked to watch news reports on social problems and attribute responsibility for the problem. Iyengar found that with regards to poverty, those who watched episodic news reports (i.e., where the focus was on an individual poor person) were more likely blame the individual for their economic situation, while those who watched thematic news reports (i.e., where poverty was explained as a result of economic conditions) were more likely to make societal attributions. In an earlier study, Iyengar (1987) found that when individuals made systemic or structural attributions to problems, they were more critical of then-President Reagan, but those who made dispositional attributions (where they blamed the individual) were "less likely to treat the administration and its actions as causal agents" (p. 830).

McLeod and Detenber (1999) examined the effect television news coverage of an anarchist protest had on the audience. The subjects were assigned to three different groups and watched a news reports framed with low, medium, or high support for the status quo. They found that those who watched the report with a high level of status quo support were: 1) more critical of the protesters; 2) less likely to identify with the protestors; 3) less critical of the police; 4) judged the protest to be less effective; 5) were less supportive of the protestor's right to express themselves; 6) judged the protestors to have less support than they really did; and 7) judged the protest to be less newsworthy.

The way in which sources are portrayed is also important to this framing process. As Dan Berkowitz (1987) noted, "sources play a large part in the building [of] the television news agenda, and ultimately, in shaping information from which people unconsciously build their images of the world" (p. 513). Hovland and Weiss (1951) demonstrated that sources with high credibility are more likely to produce attitude change. Since journalists frequently rely on information from official sources, such as elected leaders, members of the political elite are in a unique position to frame the news (Harp et al., 2010). Studies have found that official sources dominate the media discourse (Bennett, 1990; Dickson, 1992; Harp et al., 2010; Hayes & Guardino, 2010; Ryan, 2004), which has the effect of excluding the point of view of non-official sources.

Methodology

In order to analyze how the Pentagon Papers was framed and who was cited as sources, both a textual analysis and a content analysis were performed. The first article based on the Pentagon Papers appeared in *The New York Times* on June 13, 1971 and the Supreme Court made their landmark ruling on June 30, 1971 ("Daniel Ellsberg and the Vietnam War"). Because of this short time frame, and because magazines vary in their publication dates (weekly, bi-weekly, monthly), all articles related to the Pentagon Papers which were published between June 13, 1971 and August 31, 1971 were included for analysis. Articles from *The New York Times* were retrieved by entering the key words "Pentagon Papers" and "Daniel Ellsberg" in the *ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times* database. After limiting the search results to "Front Page/Cover Story," at total of 58 stories were selected for inclusion. *Academic Search Premier* and *Reader's Guide Retrospective: 1890-1982* databases were queried using the key words "Pentagon Papers" and "Daniel Ellsberg" to find articles in *Time* magazine, *Newsweek*, *New Republic*, *National Review*, and *U.S. News & World Report*. With the exception of *Time* magazine, whose archive is digitized, the results were

checked against the table of contents in each magazine and with the subject index if one was provided. The final number of magazine articles were six for *Time*, 16 for *Newsweek*, eight for *U.S. News & World Report*, five for *National Review*, four for *The New Republic*, and one for *The Progressive.* A total of 98 articles were chosen for analysis in this study.

Findings

RQ1 asked how the leaking of the Pentagon Papers was framed by newspapers and magazines. Overall, there were more frames that supported publication than those that opposed it. In *The New York Times* specifically there was also a focus on the congressional hearings that were being called for as a result of the revelations.

Those who opposed the disclosures used several frames, the most frequent of which were that publication posed a "threat to national security" and "unauthorized possession" of the classified study which "violated the law." Included in the "threat to national security frame" were arguments that publication would prolong the war, delay the release of American prisoners of war, and offer aid and comfort to the enemy. Eventually a new frame was added: the concern that publication would "impair diplomatic relations." This frame was used by government lawyers and officials to argue that disclosure of the secret documents "would impair American diplomatic relations around the world [because] the United States could not maintain the security of confidential communications from its own diplomats and from other governments" (Graham, 1971a).

Supporters of publication focused on the First Amendment guarantee of freedom of the press and the "public's right to know." The argument that publication was *not* a threat to national security was used by several supporters, including conservative Senator James L. Buckley (R-NY), Paul Warnke, the former Assistant Secretary of Defense under the Johnson Administration, lower court judges who heard the case against *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, and the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, which allowed publication of the study to resume.

Some politicians tried to "play it safe" by welcoming the revelations while at the same time condemning its publication or by adding the qualifier that they only supported publication within certain limits. Some Democrats who used this frame either did not pass judgment on the legal challenge or only supported publication if dishonesty was revealed and it did not jeopardize national security. Republicans welcomed the revelations insofar as they could use the opportunity

to place blame for the unpopular war on the Democrats while at the same time describing *The New York Times* as irresponsible in publishing the study. Republican Senator Hugh Scott said that Nixon had been candid with the American people and the newspaper should use its judgment to decide whether to continue publication (Frankel, 1971).

Another frame used in the debate was the criticism that the government classifies too much information. Several senators, mostly Democrats, used this frame in their discussion of the Pentagon Papers. The pressure was so intense that even before the Supreme Court decision was handed down allowing publication to resume, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird told reporters that they were reviewing the Pentagon Papers in order to determine which documents could be declassified (Rosenbaum, 1971). There is evidence that this was a political issue prior to the leaking of the Pentagon Papers, as President Nixon had issued a directive on January 15, 1971—six months before the first article appeared in *The New York Times*—instructing all agencies to review their classification procedures (Rosenbaum, 1971).

RQ2 asked if there were differences in the coverage between mainstream news sources, conservative magazines, and liberal magazines. The "threat to national security frame" was only present in the mainstream news sources (*The New York Times*, *Newsweek*, and *Time*), while the "unauthorized possession" that "violated the law" frame was present in the mainstream news sources, one conservative magazine, *U.S. News & World Report*, and one liberal magazine, *The New Republic*. The "impair diplomatic relations" frame was present in all three mainstream news sources, both conservative magazines, and in the liberal *New Republic*. The lesser used "prolong the war" and "delay the release of American prisoners of war" frames were only present in *The New York Times* and *Newsweek*.

The supporter frame that publication was *not* a threat to national security was found in the mainstream news sources and the two conservative magazines, but not in the liberal magazines. The First Amendment frame appeared in *The New York Times*, *Time*, and the liberal *New Republic*, while the "public's right to know" frame only appeared in *The New York Times* and *Time* magazine.

The "government classifies too much information" frame was found in *The New York Times*, *Time* magazine, and both conservative magazines. *The New York Times* cited several senators who criticized what they perceived as the over-classification of documents. *Time* magazine cited conservative William F. Buckley's magazine *National Review*, which argued that the government over-classifies information, and *U.S. News & World Report* quoted former Secretary

of State Dean Rusk, who said that government documents are over-classified and remain classified too long.

While the *New York Times* gave current and former government officials who opposed publication an opportunity to voice their concerns, they provided significantly more column space to those who supported publication and to congressional hearings and proposed amendments to end the war—the latter two coming about as a result of the disclosures—adding to the perception that the publication was having a significant impact on foreign policy. Statements of support came not only from current or former government officials but also from non-government sources like civil liberties groups and other reporters and editors. The newspaper offered a variety of pro and con statements in their articles, but they had a total of nine articles that featured *only* statements of support versus four articles that featured *only* statements of opposition.

In the early stages of the controversy, *Newsweek's* coverage was critical, stating that some of *The New York Times* reporting was dishonest and distorted and the leak amounted to treason. But in the same issue, they featured an anti-war political cartoon that showed two soldiers in a bunker with explosions and missiles all around them and bullets whizzing by. One of them is holding a newspaper and tells his fellow soldier: "The government says publication of those documents on the war can be injurious" ("In the Courts," 1971, p. 27).

Soon after, when it became apparent that Nixon's image was being damaged and a poll conducted by *Newsweek* revealed that 48 percent disapproved of the government's efforts to halt publication (versus 33 percent who approved), the magazine became less critical of the leak and offered Daniel Ellsberg the opportunity to explain his actions.

Time magazine had more balanced coverage and offered both sides of the legal debate involving *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* and legal analysis regarding what charges Ellsberg might face and what his defense lawyers would likely argue. As in other media sources, Ellsberg was allowed to explain himself, and one article offered a personal history of him.

The conservative *National Review* supported publication, but at the same time expressed concerned that the disclosures would impair diplomatic relations. The magazine also supported charges being filed against Daniel Ellsberg and pointed out that Ellsberg's lawyer was the father of a young woman who survived an explosion in New York City where a bomb being made by the radical left group the Weather Underground exploded prematurely.

One issue of the *National Review* featured an article, which also served as the magazine's cover, titled "The Secret Papers They Didn't Publish." The article

featured memos and other documents that the magazine claimed was part of the leaked Pentagon Papers. However, it was later revealed to be a hoax by the magazine's editor, William F. Buckley Jr., who admitted the memos and documents were fabricated. The magazine did manage to insert part of their conservative ideology into the fake memos by writing that the communists "will be able to use [the] antiwar movement as a transmitting mechanism through which their ideas, slogans and proposals of the moment can reach and influence the broad US public" ("The Secret Papers They Didn't Publish," 1971, p. 808).

While *U.S. News & World Report* allowed Ellsberg to explain himself, it provided more opportunity for those who opposed publication to express their views and focused on the violation of law and the impairment of diplomatic relations.

Although the liberal magazines had very few supporting frames in their articles, *The New Republic* described the publication as a "service to history performed by the *Times*" (Osborne, 1971, p. 11), and *The Progressive* stated, "We know, thanks to the 7,700 pages of history and documentation compiled in the Pentagon, thanks to the newspapers that seized the opportunity to make the record public, how we were enticed, frightened, cajoled, deceived, seduced into waging aggressive and brutal war in Indochina" (Knoll, 1971, p. 11). *The New Republic* also noted how the Pentagon Papers helped to support anti-war proponents:

> Though the Pentagon Papers hurt the Democrats as a party more than they do the Republicans, they chiefly benefit the war critics of both parties, and that is a major reason why the Nixon administration has reacted so strongly against the disclosures. Now the critics can buttress their case with piles of official documents that, secretly, have been agreeing with them all along. (Windchy, 1971, p. 21)

RQ3 asked what types of sources were cited. In the mainstream news sources, current government officials—including members of Congress—were cited most frequently, followed by people in the media (which included quotes from various newspaper publishers, editors, and reporters as well as quotes from other news outlets), and judges in the legal cases surrounding the leaking of the Pentagon Papers (see Figure 1). With regard to members of Congress, Democrats were cited more often than Republicans in *The New York Times* (34 to 24), but

Republicans slightly edged out Democrats in *Newsweek* (4 to 3) and *Time* magazine (3 to 2).

Other frequently used sources included the government's lawyers, former government officials, lawyers for *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, and Daniel Ellsberg himself. *The New York Times* was the only media source who cited civil liberties groups and that was only in connection with a lower court hearing in which the ACLU and the National Emergency Civil Liberties Union asked for permission to argue as a friend of the court, which was granted.

Conservative magazines used sources much less frequently with *U.S. News & World Report*, constituting the majority of the results because the *National Review* only cited Daniel Ellsberg. Results show that the most frequent source type used by *U.S. News & World Report* was judges, but that was in relation to the Supreme Court ruling in which all nine Justices were cited. The next most frequent source was current government officials, followed by members of Congress, former government officials, and Daniel Ellsberg. The media was only cited twice in reference to editorials, which had appeared in *The Washington Post* and the *Washington Star*.

The liberal magazines did not use very many sources either, with *The Progressive* only citing Ellsberg's former chief in Vietnam, Major General Edward G. Lansdale, who was being quoted from a *New York Times* article. The most common type of source in *The New Republic* was judges, but, just like in *U.S. News & World Report*, it was in relation to the Supreme Court ruling in which several of the Justices were cited. Two current government officials, one former official from the Johnson Administration, one government lawyer, and one editorial from *The Washington Post* were also cited.

RQ4 asked how many statements were supportive of publishing the Pentagon Papers and how many were critical. Overall, there were a total of 85 statements in support of publication and 57 statements in opposition (see Figure 2). Figure 3 offers a graphic breakdown by news outlet. The *New York Times* featured more statements in favor of publication by a factor of nearly 2 to 1 (54 statements in support, 31 statements in opposition). *Newsweek* also had more statements of support, while *Time* magazine and the *New Republic* had equal number of statements for and against publication. Both the conservative *National Review* and the liberal *Progressive* had one statement in favor of publication and zero in opposition, while *U.S. News & World Report* was the only news source to have more statements in opposition (six) than in favor (two).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine how the media framed the leaking of the top secret Pentagon Papers in 1971. Many of the frames that developed were in relation to the legal case, which went all the way to the Supreme Court. Because the time frame between the date the first article was published in *The New York Times* (June 13) and the Supreme Court decision allowing publication to resume (June 30) was only 18 days, daily publications had more of an opportunity to shape public perception than news magazines. The *New York Times* was able to print more stories and statements that supported their position that the Pentagon Papers should be published, while news magazines, with their variable publication dates (weekly, bi-weekly, monthly), were mostly only able to print articles that reported on the outcome of the Supreme Court case. This could explain why so few frames of support were found in the liberal magazines.

With the exception of *U.S. News & World Report*, all the media sources offered more or equal statements supporting publication as compared to opposing statements. Unlike the pressure the media felt to be patriotic and supportive of the government in the wake of 9/11 ("Some Critical Media Voices Face Censorship," 2003; Ryan, 2004; Luther & Miller, 2005), the Vietnam War was so unpopular by 1971 that it had critics from both political parties, which may have eased any pressure the media felt to toe the line of the Nixon Administration.

It is also important to recognize that all news media outlets and journalists had a vested interest in the outcome of the Supreme Court case. In an affidavit filed on behalf of *The New York Times*, Washington bureau chief Max Frankel argued that unofficial disclosures of secrets to members of the press by government officials is routine and is part of the job ("In the Courts," 1971). If unofficial disclosures to reporters were routine, a decision against the *Times* would have had a significantly adverse impact on journalism throughout the country.

The fact that more supporting frames and statements of support were published by the media may be one of the reasons why the Nixon Administration's image was damaged by their efforts to suppress publication ("Government vs. the Press," 1971). A Gallup poll initiated by *Newsweek* found that 48 percent of people surveyed disapproved of the government's attempts to stop publication, while only 33 percent approved ("Government vs. the Press," 1971). Another Gallup poll taken just before the Supreme Court announced its decision found that 58 percent of respondents believed it was right for the

newspapers to print the story ("Victory for the Press," 1971). The pressure was so great on the government's lawyers that U.S. Attorney Whitney North Seymour complained about the hostile courtroom atmosphere and publicly acknowledged that what the government was doing was "a terribly unpopular thing," adding, "We are vilified on all sides" (Graham, 1971b).

The unpopularity of the government's attempt to suppress publication in 1971 likely influenced the government's handling of the more recent cases involving Chelsea Manning and Edward Snowden. Even though the U.S. government impaneled a grand jury to investigate WikiLeaks, in November, 2013 Justice Department officials acknowledged that they had what they described as a "New York Times problem;" if they indicted WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange, they would also have to prosecute other news organizations and reporters who published classified information, like *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Guardian* (Horwitz, 2013). So instead of prosecuting the media, the government has focused its efforts on criminal charges against the leakers of classified information—Chelsea Manning and Edward Snowden— just as they had against Daniel Ellsberg.

Not surprisingly, differences were found between the conservative and liberal magazines. While the liberal magazines were clearly against the war and focused on the human cost, *U.S. News & World Report* published more statements in opposition to the leaking and publication of the Pentagon Papers and also blamed the communists for starting the war and its escalation. Although the conservative *National Review* supported publication, its conservative ideology was evidenced by its attempts to link communism to the U.S. anti-war movement and by associating Daniel Ellsberg with the radical left by identifying his lawyer's daughter as a member of the Weather Underground.

National Review's editor, William F. Buckley Jr., said at a press conference that one of the goals of the hoax story they printed was to demonstrate that the Pentagon and CIA was not full of incompetent people, which he perceived was the conclusion many people had reached after portions the Pentagon Papers were published. Another possible reason may be that they wanted people to trust their government again; a citizenry who does not trust its government will question everything it does, making it more difficult for a group, like the conservatives or corporate lobbyists, to push through an agenda favoring wealthy elite, which often occurs at the expense of the majority.

Most of the media sources allowed Daniel Ellsberg to explain himself, and *Time* magazine offered a personal history that gave readers the opportunity to better understand his gradual evolution from war supporter to war critic. Both

The New York Times and *U.S. News & World Report* described the crowd outside the court building where Ellsberg turned himself in as "cheering supporters" and "well-wishers" which, in the absence of protesters, contributed to the perception that the public supported publication.

Finally, those sources that are easily accessible to journalists constituted the majority of all sources cited: current government officials (including government lawyers) accounted for 47 percent, judges accounted for 19 percent (reporters were covering the legal case), and members of the media (reporters, editors, other publications) constituted 16 percent. Civil liberties groups, who typically do not have regular contact with the media, constituted the smallest group cited: out of a total of 365 sources, they were only cited three times, which is slightly less than 1 percent. These findings support one of Herman and Chomsky's (1988) five filters they identify in their propaganda model. The "Sourcing Mass-Media News" filter argues that the economics of reporting demands that "they concentrate their resources where significant news often occurs, where important rumors and leaks abound, and where regular press conferences are held" (p. 213). These places tend to be where political power is concentrated like the White House, Pentagon, Capitol Hill, and state capitols.

One of the limitations of this study is that *The New York Times* was part of the story and had an incentive to portray their actions as legal and justified. Another limitation is the short time frame of the news story—just 18 days— which was not enough time for magazines to craft stories to greatly influence the public's perception; in this regard daily publications had a clear advantage. Because of this limitation, further research into the Pentagon Papers could examine how other daily newspapers throughout the country framed the leaking of the secret study.

Future research may examine how Daniel Ellsberg himself was framed as his case made its way through the courts, or how the leaking of classified documents by Chelsea Manning and Edward Snowden were framed by the media. Lastly, experimental research that examines how media frames used in the Edward Snowden story affects readers' and viewers' attitudes towards the NSA surveillance program would help to advance scholars' understanding of media framing.

References

Apple, R.W. (1996, June 23). "Lessons from the Pentagon Papers." *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/books/97/04/13/ reviews/ papers-lessons.html

Baran, S. J. & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*. 6th ed. Boston: Wadsworth.

Bennett, W. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal Of Communication*, *40*(2), 103-125.

Berkowitz, D. (1987). TV news sources and news channels: A study in agenda-building. *Journalism Quarterly*, *64*(2), 508-513.

Daniel Ellsberg. (2015). The Biography.com website. Retrieved from http://www.biography.com/people/daniel-ellsberg-17176398.

Daniel Ellsberg and the Vietnam War. (n.d.). *PBS*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/pov/mostdangerousman/timeline.php

Dickson, S. H. (1992). Press and U.S. policy toward Nicaragua, 1983-1987: a study of the New York Times and Washington Post. *Journalism Quarterly*, 69, 562-571.

Dimitrova, D. V., & Connolly-Ahern, C. (2007). A tale of two wars: Framing analysis of online news sites in coalition countries and the Arab world during the Iraq War. *Howard Journal Of Communications*, *18*(2), 153-168.

Ellsberg, D. (2006). Extended biography. *Daniel Ellsberg's Website*. Retrieved from http://www.ellsberg.net/bio/extended-biography

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal Of Communication*, *43,* 51-58.

Farrell, H., & Finnemore, M. (2013). The end of hypocrisy. *Foreign Affairs*, *92*(6), 22-26.

Frankel, M. (1971, June 15). Court step likely. *New York Times (1923-Current File)* Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/ 119286065? accountid=10352

Frequently asked questions—press (n.d.). First Amendment Center. Retrieved from http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/faq/frequently-asked-ques-tions-press

Government vs. the press. (1971, July 5). Newsweek*, 78*, 17-19.

Graham, F. P. (1971a, June 22). 8 judges to sit. *New York Times (1923-Current File)* Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/119150528? accountid=10352

Graham, F. P. (1971b, Jun 23). Times case heard, restraint extended; U.S. action halts a Boston Globe series. *New York Times (1923-Current File)* Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/119126671?accountid=10352

Harp, D., Loke, J., & Bachmann, I. (2010). Voices Of dissent In the Iraq War: Moving from deviance To legitimacy?. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *87*(3/4), 467-483.

Hayes, D., & Guardino, M. (2010). Whose views made the news? Media coverage and the march to war in Iraq. *Political Communication*, *27*(1), 59-87.

Herman, E. & Chomsky, N. (2012). A propaganda model. In Durham, M.G. & Kellner, D.M. (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies: KeyWorks* (2nd ed.) (pp. 204-230). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Horwitz, S. (2013, November 25). Julian Assange unlikely to face U.S. charges over publishing classified documents. Retrieved from http://www. washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/julian-assange-unlikely-to-face-us-charges-over-publishing-classified-documents/2013/11/25/ dd27decc-55f1-11e3-8304-caf30787c0a9_story.html

Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *15*(4), 635-650.

In the courts: The government vs. the press. (1971, June 28). *Newsweek, 77,* 27-32.

Iyengar, S. (1987). Television news and citizens' explanations of national affairs. *American Political Science Review*, 81, 815-831.

Iyengar, S. (1996). Framing responsibility for political issues. *Annals Of The American Academy Of Political & Social Science*, *546,* 59-70.

Iyengar, S., Peters, M. D., Kinder, D. R., & Krosnick, J. A. (1984). The evening news and presidential evaluations. *Journal Of Personality & Social Psychology*, *46*(4), 778-787.

Iyengar, S., Peters, M. D., & Kinder, D. R. (1982). Experimental demonstrations of the "not-so-minimal" consequences of television news programs. *The American Political Science Review, 76*(4), 848-858.

Knoll, E. (1971, August). What we know now. *The Progressive*, 11-18.

Kolmer, C., & Semetko, H. A. (2009). Framing the Iraq War: Perspectives from American, U.K., Czech, German, South African, and Al-Jazeera news. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *52*(5), 643-656.

Krosnick, J. A., & Kinder, D. R. (1990). Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. *American Political Science Review*, *84*, 497-512.

Luther, C. A., & Miller, M. M. (2005). Framing of the 2003 U.S.-Iraq War demonstrations: An analysis of news and partisan texts. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *82*(1), 78-96.

Martin, S. E. & Hansen, K. A. (1998). *Newspapers of record in a digital age: From hot type to hot link*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

McLeod, D., & Detenber, B. (1999). Framing effects of television news coverage of social protest. *Journal Of Communication*, *49*(3), 3-23.

Media Framing: When Journalists Keep It Real and What it Means for Advocates: Blog post. (2013, January 10). *FrameWorks Institute*. Retrieved from: http://frameblog.org/2013/01/10/media-framing-when-journalists-keep-it-real-and-what-it-means-for-advocates/

Nelson, T. E., Clawson, R. A., & Oxley, Z. M. (1997). Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance. *American Political Science Review*, 91, 567-583.

New York Times Co. v. United States. (n.d.). In *The Free Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/ New+York+Times+Co.+v.+United+States

Osborne, J. (1971, July 3). "Trouble with Secrets." *New Republic, 165*, 11-12.

Papacharissi, Z., & Oliveira, M. (2008). News frames terrorism: A comparative analysis of frames employed in terrorism coverage in U.S. and U.K. newspapers. *International Journal Of Press/Politics*, *13*(1), 52-74.

Rosenbaum, D.E. (1971, June 23). Review of report proposed by U.S. *New York Times (1923-Current File)* Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/119160762?accountid=10352

Ryan, M. (2004). Framing the war against terrorism: US newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan. *Gazette: International Journal For Communication Studies*, *66*(5), 363-382.

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal Of Communication*, *57*(1), 9-20.

Some critical media voices face censorship. (2003, April 3). *Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting*. Retrieved from http://fair.org/press-release/some-critical-media-voices-face-censorship/

Swaine, J. (2011, June 13). The impact of the Pentagon Papers 40 years on. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/8573899/The-impact-of-The-Pentagon-Papers-40-years-on.html

Terkildsen, N., & Schnell, F. (1997). How media frames move public opinion: An analysis of the women's movement. *Political Research Quarterly*, *50,* 879-900.

The secret papers they didn't publish. (July 27, 1971). *National Review*, 798-811.

Thompson, N. (2013, June 10). From Daniel Ellsberg to Edward Snowden. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2013/06/daniel-ellsberg-and-edward-snowden.html

Trust in government nears record low, but most federal agencies are viewed favorably. (2013, October 18). *Pew Research Center for the People & the Press*. Retrieved from http://www.people-press.org/2013/10/18/trust-in-government-nears-record-low-but-most-federal-agencies-are-viewed-favorably/

Valkenburg, P. M., Semetko, H. A., & DeVreese, C.H. (1999). The effects of news frames on readers' thoughts and recall. *Communication Research*, *26*(5), 550-569.

Victory for the press. (1971, July 12). *Newsweek, 78*, 16-19.

Volkmer, I. (2009). Framing theory. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (pp. 408-410). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Windchy, E.G. (1971, August 7). On reading the Pentagon Papers." *New Republic, 165*, 21-25.

Woodward, C. & Lardner, R. (2011, June 13). Pentagon Papers being released 40 years later." *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/06/12/pentagon-papers-released_n_875691.html

Electronic Dance Music Festivals: A Promise of Sex and Transnational Experience

Oscar Alfonso Mejia

Abstract

The popularity of Electronic Dance Music (EDM) festivals continues to rise in the United States and worldwide. EDM's assumed utopic idealism is propagated by the production of recap videos and commercial advertisements of live DJ sets promoted on different companies' YouTube channels and websites. Two companies in particular, Ultra Music Festival and Tomorrowland, have benefitted from the rhetorical use of identity, sex, and nationality/ies. A critical methodology is employed to understand the hegemonic process that is occurring within these productions. The analysis of images and videos draws upon cultural studies-based interpretations of multiculturalism/transnationalism and bell hooks' culture of domination adherent in "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" ideology. This key theoretical framework reveals the guise of utopian ideology to expose how EDM companies perpetuate normative heterosexual allure for profit. The hope for this research is to influence EDM participants and others to engage with this phenomenon critically.

Introduction

In recent years the prevalence of Electronic Dance Music (EDM) festivals worldwide as well as within the United States has become part of popular culture, both through its display in alternative electronic media and also mainstream media like National TV Networks and radio stations. Mainstream attention to EDM festivals on national TV is highlighted by a parody on Saturday Night Live (SNL) in a skit with a song titled "When Will the Bass Drop?" in which ridiculous characterizations of an EDM concert are portrayed to make fun of the audience, the artists, and the environment itself (thelonelyisland). The appeal for this event experience is reaching an even wider, ever more diverse audience. Increasingly, at EDM festivals participants demonstrate both a national and transnational presence by displaying flags that represent their diverse national origins. The EDM environment is meant to concentrate and form a cohesive body of thought and movement through the experience of the participants

(May 8). The multiethnic and multinational identities represented in this music are comprised of an increasingly globalized market and are a direct reflection and reception of those who participate in EDM festivals. Ultra Music Festival (Ultra), an EDM company established in Miami, puts on festivals in nine different countries and reaches people through social media and other Internet based information hubs. Its influence worldwide is reflected in the over 62 million YouTube views that are displayed in Ultra's channel, which displays all performance and recap videos of their events. These events are capitalistic in nature, promoting and reaching huge audiences that pay more then three hundred dollars just to gain admission to the event. It is important to critically understand how these festivalgoers use their national flags in a youth movement that accepts capitalist connotations of their events and in turn also markets their national identities as a globalized sense of themselves in a "glocalized" space, communicating the commodification of transnationalism and the promise of sexual encounter.

The purpose of this research is to try to explicate how EDM aggregated its elements of euphoric utopia and how Ultra and Tomorrowland reiterate them as organizations. This experience is appropriated and reconstituted by the amalgamation of video clips with depictions centered on sexualized ethnic bodies and the brandishing of national flags. This research focuses on critically analyzing the communication of transnationalism and the desire for ethnic sexual encounters in commercial websites and YouTube videos that are configured to attract consumers.

The methodological framework for this research is first explained in connection to critical theory and bell hooks' understanding of "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" within a Western culture of domination. Second, to understand how the movement came to be and has grown, a literature review of EDM and its phenomenological characteristics is presented. Third, an explication concerning identity, culture, transnationalism, and "Otherness" is offered in order to frame and explain how popular culture is an active process of construction. Fourth, a critical lens is applied to three sites in order to dissect the connotative or structured distortion EDM participants have of themselves and what they have experienced. Following this analysis is a discussion about what this phenomenon is constitutive of, and how it can be explored further. Finally, this research concludes with a discussion of what the analytical framework has brought into perspective about the Ultra's EDM festival and the ideology it perpetuates.

Methodology

The preponderance of media in society is pervasive and it wields extensive power. It can help dictate concurrent discourses and interpretations of social life within our globalized world (hooks, *Outlaw Culture* 5). Cultural studies' emphasis on the production and consumption of popular media provides a useful footing for a critical analysis (Littlejohn and Foss 400). Concepts and interpretations about popular media and identity will be drawn predominantly from a critical cultural studies perspective. One such concept, coined by Antonio Gramsci, is "hegemony," which is characterized as the process through which ideologies are disseminated and then accepted by a larger mass of people within a cultural power structure that is capitalist in nature (Howell 78-80). In other words representations, ideologies, identities, and agency are dictated by a "dialogical process" that is imminent within "historical materialism" according to a long-standing critical perspective (Howell 79). This research draws upon assumptions of subjectivity that are characterized as "neomarxist," as they reject Marx's predicted revolutionary force of the proletariat and instead understand the circuit that is culture in the power dynamic of "hegemonic ideology" (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 58; Howell 79).

Subjectivity, for the purpose of this research, can be understood as the constant formation of "social realities" in which people participate to create their own populist conception of themselves, otherwise known as their identity (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 399). People have the ability to form their identity from the representations, language, and other symbolic forms that they wish to identify with from media that contain dominant ideologies (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 399). This process becomes problematic once these realities or practices are subsumed, reiterated, and taken for granted by economic forces and even political agendas. Critical theory understands this as the "superstructure" that facilitates and surrounds a population (Howell 79). The agency granted by the public's choices in everyday life through reflection of media and use of rhetoric leads this research to incorporate hooks' critical and participatory call for change. The analysis of the EDM corporations, rhetorical images, and videos is enacted by directly naming their situated "superstructure" as hooks' "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (Littlejohn and Foss 362). Such analysis is undertaken in order to educate and reinforce a critical cultural studies perspective of the hegemonic process that has shaped the cultural product known as Ultra Music Festival (UMF) and Tomorrowland. This cultural product is grounded in the use and dissemination of media that can manipulate ideology.

Taking into account the fluidity of identity within postmodern theory is important in order to understand how these images and websites engender hooks' theory of a "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" within EDM values of unification. Before moving on to a review of EDM literature, it is useful to explore how hooks situates the "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" in Western culture. As hooks explains, Western culture is laden with misogyny and white supremacy within understandings of sex, race, class elitism, capitalism, and heterosexism, which is the normalized "practice of sexist domination" that reinforces heterosexuality through presumed heteronormativity (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 274; hooks, *Outlaw Culture* 116). The critical lens that is employed is associated with hooks' critique of media and its power over cultural production, appropriation, and consumption, in a social framework—in this case primarily Western culture's ideology of domination (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 273). This ideology of domination, as defined by hooks, is the idea that superiority and inferiority amongst citizens or people within Western culture is normative and their positions are meant to exist in a hierarchical fashion (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 274). The superior are deemed rulers over the inferior. This has consequences of pervasive exploitation and the "devaluation of reciprocity, community, and mutuality" (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 274). This system is what hooks calls "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy." It promotes elitist values within the hierarchies of race, gender, and economic status (Foss, Foss, and Trap 274).

This paper is interested in the hegemonic process that combines issues of identity, race, multiculturalism, transnationalism, and profit, as well as being critical of Western media disseminating the "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" and constructing identities for profit. Consonant with hooks' approach to combating the ideology of domination, this research uses what hooks terms *critique* and *invention* to help illuminate contradictions within the EDM festivals' representations of identity and experience (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 279; *Outlaw Culture* 4). Critique is meant to contest the dominant ideologies and structures that are normalized and consumed through popular culture in mass media. hooks' calls for rhetorical theorists to engage with popular culture because the "politics of domination inform the way the vast majority of images we consume are constructed and marketed" (Foss, Foss, and Trap 279). The goal of producing this rhetorical criticism is to "decolonize" the minds of oppressed people that have been shaped by the dominant culture, whereby they can assert their own interpretations and understanding of a particular social reality and reject the values and assumptions in "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 278). hooks places great emphasis on

invention, which is the "enactment" or active performance of rejection in the culture of domination in people's own lives to create "nondominant alternatives" (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 282). This paper encourages critique and invention by individuals that are participating in the EDM festivals' assumed representations to help motivate a change in the mindset inculcated through the experience.

This study employs rhetorical and cultural theories and concepts within the purview of identity, sex, and transnationalism, and draws upon theoretical scholarship centered on popular culture and media by previous scholars including Keith Negus, Robin Kelly, Dick Hebdige, and bell hooks. Three themes are uncovered through the rhetorical analysis of the live footage, websites, and recap videos that weave throughout this work. They are *multiculturalism in association with ethnicity and nationality*; *vicarious experience of unification*; and *voyeurism of heterosexism*.

Electronic Dance Music's Allure
It is important to understand what the environment and atmosphere mean to the audience members as well as the online community that participates in viewing and disseminating EDM-centered video productions that emphasize the role of the audience. Beverly May, a Canadian House and Techno writer and event promoter, describes the creation of these events and categorizes them according to a phenomenological approach that she has absorbed through her years of being part of the events. May refers to a theater-type feel in describing what House and Techno events are trying to encapsulate through their specialized settings, settings that are meant to provoke a "collective transformation" amongst participants (8). May sees this theater in a holistic way: "'Theater' in this sense refers to a cathartic or strongly emotive collective experience through an artistic medium: a search for heightened reality through fantasy. It means an exploration of lived or ideal experience rather than an artifice" (8).

According to May's observation, the experience that festivalgoers attract themselves to is that of a utopian characterization that is then projected and represented as being part of their experience at the festivals. May describes the appeal in terms of a carnival, where the music adds to the intoxication of the audience, but the aesthetics of the event are like a "carnival—at its best, a celebration of youthful, wild energy; at its worst, a chaotic barrage of sensory titillation" (8). She sees the events as existing through the "thoughts and actions of the participants" that creates a "here-and-now" through a "collective heightened sense of living that the event signifies" (May 9). This collective

utopian sense of living with an added element of a globalized world can be clearly seen with the waving of national flags in recent recordings at events such as Ultra (2014) in Florida and Tomorrowland (2013) in Belgium.

Melanie Hill-Cantey writes about EDM as an overtly globalized form of music that originated from Chicago as the "offspring" of Disco. Hill-Cantey points to the African diaspora and the influence that it has had on African American music such as Blues, Jazz, and other musical genres that helped to sculpt Disco and in turn formed House music (4). House music venues in New York and Chicago in the 1980s, according to Cantey, were spaces in which the gay Latino and Black communities congregated and found acceptance, away from other mainstream music venues that were not necessarily sensitive to their homosexual identity. These clubs became a revolution for their respective gay communities where listeners of House—"House Heads"—from different places in society and ways of living came together to "celebrate life, love, and community" (Hill-Cantey 5). In the 1980s House music remained mostly underground in the United States but received much acclaim in the United Kingdom. Hill-Cantey also notes that the "House Movement" today is something that has "universal appeal" and has influenced many forms of music and pop culture (22). She also states that it provides "stylistic cues" on how to assimilate to today's globalized society, because it is still composed of people from all "walks of life" and from all over the world, which connects back to May's "collective" utopian living (Hill-Cantey 22).

House music itself is also categorized under the umbrella of EDM and has had over 300 different reiterations in magazine and record label publications between 1998 and 1999. This categorization is due to the various technologies that are implemented and which keep the music evolving, leading to the creation of new subgenres. Hill-Cantey credits EDM's creation to Techno as an African American creation originating in Detroit (8). It is an innovation by "sonic futurists" and is described as a combination of the polyrhythms of African cultures with "alien sounds of new technology to form their music" (8). According to Hill-Cantey European Techno is disconnected from its roots in Detroit and is associated with the drug-fueled rave scene of the 1980s, lacking the soulful vocals and melodies of African American influences like Detroit's Motown sound. Hill-Cantey adds, however, that Techno is not generally acknowledged as a Black genre by many African American writers on popular music, "as Techno is clearly produced transnationally and intercultural[ly]" disqualifying it as solely Black music (8). On the other hand, she acknowledges

its influence in the international community and accepts it as a creation by those of the African diaspora (Hill-Cantey 5).

Transnationalism

Transnationalism, as described by Victor Roudometof, involves complex layers and understandings that play into the lives of what in the 21st Century is understood as "cosmopolitanism," which he defines as "a new moral and ethnic standpoint suitable for global life" (113). Roudometof writes about customs and activities that cross borders freely with different immigrant cohorts and multicultural manifestations that are now openly accepted and transformed in the urban landscape of cities (114). He looks at the globalized/glocalized landscape that encourages the intermingling and acceptance of all people and/or customs such as specialty stores and cuisine. By "glocalized," he means the "internal globalization" of urban areas both public and private that create a transnational social space that changes peoples' lives, regardless of them being transnational or not (Roudometof 114). He further explains "internal globalization as the process of creating the room or the space for these interactions […] that is, it provides the preconditions, the material and non-material infrastructure for the emerging spaces of human interaction" (Roudometof 119). These spaces, according to Roudometof, in turn cannot be restricted to transnational labor markets; they actually extend into other spaces, "including spaces of transnational sexuality, popular music, journalism, as well as spaces fostering the construction of a multitude of identities" (119).

Cosmopolitanism or transnationalism is facilitated by social spaces that give people the available skills and understanding of the glocalization of the area and what it means to participate (Roudometof 115). On the grounds of EDM festivals it is the flags, artists, how the EDM sound is global itself, clothes, and ethnic bodies that communicate this to the participants. Referring back to the 62 million views on Ultra Music Festivals YouTube Channel and its parodying on SNL, the distribution of video imagery via the Internet also helps to educate the audience regarding their role as participants before ever stepping into the glocalized space.

Global Community in Cultural Studies

In "Understanding Global Communities in Cultural Studies," Inderpal Grewal explains that the use of the term "transnational" is connected to terms like "global community" and "international community" (332). The terms are taken from other fields of study like geography and political scholarship that connote

different expectation and details in congruence with their respective studies. For the purpose of this research, rooted in cultural and communication studies, they will reference the spatial and historical notion of the "West" in terms of the technological connectivity that has propelled their use (Grewal 334). The terms are reflective of the geographical, political, and power-driven empire that requires an interdisciplinary approach to help wrestle with the phenomena in order to enhance theoretical approaches in cultural studies and communication studies (Grewal 334). It is important to also note that news media, such as those on the Internet and internationally distributed print, usually connect the idea of the "international community" to the "West" as a "moral community" (Grewal 335). This conception of the "West" is also congruent with what hooks calls "Western culture." This highlights where EDM festivals primarily access their audience, which is from Internet based advertisement and blogs that are used to propel an enhanced notion of normative values. The formation of power described by these terms emanates from the repeated iterations of their meanings that create the global consensus and a moral community (Grewal 335). This understanding of the Internet-based global community lends itself to the concept of transnationalism because of the reiterations that formulate underlying assumptions and a connection to the idea of the West—a culture where media, according to hooks, is under the primary direction of a white supremacist ideology.

Nationalism within Transnational Arenas

Transnationalism is not a stand-alone concept. It plays into a moral conception of Western culture that is hegemonic and rampant across the globe, owing to globalization and "international communities." Transnationalism must be understood as simultaneously standing for and next to in for and next to nationalism, as the primary site to be discussed is in Florida, on U.S. land. Grewal's research examines postcolonial concepts in order to explain how the spatial and historical iconicity of "the West" continues to maintain its sovereignty through the colonizing practice of consumption of the Other, non-white subjects (536). This is made possible through the new technological advances that create discursive connectivities that in turn ground hegemonic practice (Grewal 356). As previously noted, YouTube and other Internet platforms are the primary tool for its creation and dissemination.

Grewal points to the concept of "multiculturalism" in America and how it affects the "self-producing and regulation" of U.S. nationalism's ability to produce subjects (537): "As superpower and policeman, multicultural nation as

well as a site of hierarchical racial and gendered formations, America, the nation-state, and American nationalism produce identities within many connectivities in a transnational world, whether as an imperial power or as a symbol of freedom and liberty" (Grewal 335). The overarching purpose of Grewal's work is to explain that in the twenty-first century the idea of nationalism in different sites is being constructed by media or new forms of technology within a transnational scope (536). This is also seen as an action of creating normative definitions of what those nationalities are within transnationality. Grewal points to sites in "social life" where everyday commonplaces and cultural experiences seem to have nothing to do with "state power" in creating a normalization of race and gender (535). The EDM festivals have this effect on national and transnational identities that are created by participating in the synthesized spectacles that they are. The subjects themselves are not fully aware of what the formulation of the event actually imposes on their identities: an event built on the desire to experience multiculturalism through sexual venture.

Sexuality in Transnationalism
The discussion about gender, sexuality, and the ramifications of how they can be perceived from an ethnic or racial perspective is important to understand through critical theory. bell hooks has understood the notion of sexual desire and experience to be one of fetish and consumption of the Other—with "Other" in this formulation being synonymous with non-white bodies and/or perspectives (hooks, "Eating" 367). It is the white supremacist ideology that imposes itself as the domination of any other ethnicity or race in order to enhance experience. The "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy," through hooks' lens, is understood as interlocking structures of sexism, racism, class elitism, capitalism, and heterosexism (Foss, Foss, and Trap 274). This system is not only perpetuated by "white folks," it is also internalized by Others, and then those values are enforced onto the social realities of everyone in Western culture. This self-imposed cultural domination is enacted in a ritualized fashion through everyday events and/or situations (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 275). This connects to what Grewal (2007) discusses about sites in the social sphere that are used to encompass similar hegemonic values and interests in nationalism and transnationalism.

hooks' research points to the "experiencing" of the Other as one of sexual consumption and domination—as hooks put it, "fucking" the Other as a shopping fetish to grow out of white American innocence ("Eating" 368). The

description that hooks provides is one of college age white males who are under the assumption that Others have "more life experience" and are more worldly, sensual and sexual ("Eating" 368). The encounter that is sought after by the white males is one of a "claiming," or using the colored Other's body as a symbolic frontier that will allow them to transgress and reconstruct their masculine norms (hooks, "Eating" 368). The transformation for whites that ensues is one of breaking with their white supremacist past and the affirmation that they are progressive in their "cultural plurality," seeing themselves as non-racists that wish to grow from being acted upon through sexual experience instead of dominating (hooks, "Eating" 368). This again resonates with Grewal's idea of multiculturalism and how it is used as an identifying feature of nationalism within transnational sites. This critical approach will be further explicated subsequently.

Gender only further complicates the misdirecting of the consumer to the desire for contact or experiencing of the Other in the internalized mechanism that exists in the white supremacist ideology that is experienced and then imposed in a transnational space. In line with hooks, this current work sees the commodification of certain experiences and identities as nullifying critical consciousness or political integrity that exists in those experiences ("Eating" 375): "The over-riding fear is that cultural, ethnic, and racial differences will be continually commodified and offered up as new dishes to enhance the white palate that the Other will be eaten, consumed, and forgotten" (hooks, "Eating" 380). This is the interconnection of critical and cultural studies within the conceptualization of transnationalism that is highlighted in the rhetorical analysis that follows.

EDM, Drugs, and "Tribal Consciousness"
Bryan Rill explores how identity in "Electronic Dance Music Culture" (EDMC) helps participants (re)form their understanding of themselves (139). Rill tries to see how "in-the-moment" experiences are difficult to fully understand and put into words. He calls this the EDM trance state, which is experienced while in "Temporary Autonomous Zones" (TAZ) that are created in the central part of the dance floor at EDM festivals (140). Rill goes on to identify the drug induced experiences as "an alternate reality of dancing, release, and free expression" (141). Citing many accounts of being immersed in this movement, freedom, and self-identity, he describes it as an intensely cultural experience after which participants come out changed. Such identities are created from an array of cultural availability in a global market that has many images for what an

individual can constitute as himself or herself. In his recounting and categorizing of people's understandings of themselves within the festivals' dancing arenas, most of Rill's research participants, and including himself, are from the state of Florida, the state that is the host for Ultra Music Festival in the United States. The self, according to Rill, experiences more about the world through bodily, sensory experience (Rill 144). This sensory experience comes from the music hitting and vibrating, creating a moment in time that is disconnected and aiding in experiencing the totality of one's own body while on a filled dance floor (Rill 149). The drug of choice for participants, methylenedioxy-methamphetamine (MDMA), facilitates these euphoric understandings of one's self within the dance floor and their surroundings, creating what Rill calls a "tribal consciousness" (156). For Rill, the creation of a tribal consciousness explains how, although participants are in autonomous spaces, they are also aware of their surroundings as a collective body.

Such an understanding of space and self-identity are a bit controversial. For Roudometof, transnationalism is focused on the understanding of one's symbolic cues and assimilation to a global world (114). Rill argues that the drug-induced euphoria is really what brings the community together (153). It is understood that Roudometof is considering spaces that can include popular music, but he is not specifically dealing with that topic; he is more concerned with urban cities that have a large global community of immigrants. Rill, on the other hand, is examining qualitative accounts of experiences on the dance floor and how understanding of one's self is more important than an understanding of the global aspects of the space. For the purposes of this research, the focus is primarily on the transnational and glocalized approach. Although drugs are prevalent, they do not answer the question of how the participants understand their transnational participation by using flags to dictate their predisposed social capital on the dance floor—a dance floor that is videotaped and then streamed via the Internet to help connect the participants to their nations of origin. This creates an exciting and voyeuristic portrayal of ethnic bodies at the mercy of each other's sexual desires.

EDM as a Global Force
The viewers' and participants' portrayals of themselves are important to the socially constructed understanding of the festivals' and flags' meanings in relation to being a glocalized space. EDM as a movement and musical genre has influenced citizens of many countries. The conglomerate of flags is their display of what has moved them to not only understand to some extent how EDM has

circulated around the globe, but how it is a rich global force. The African diaspora that helped cultivate Blues, Rock-n'-Roll, Jazz, and Disco has promulgated understanding among globalized people that music can freely move between countries and cultures with the help of electronic mass media. Mass media that changes formats, what once was in the form of vinyl, tapes, CDs, is now archived on the Internet. This hyper-understanding of a globalized movement and sound is what influences participants to don national flags in a spirit of unity at these festivals.

Sites of Analysis
The primary sources that are relevant for this research are mostly Internet based sites that display videos, pictures, and blogs about the crowd's participation on the dance floor during the performances of different DJ sets and performance times. These types of recordings are essential to the designs of this paper because they show how this phenomenon is happening at different events that are in separate spaces and on separate continents in multiple countries. The separation and connection provides the ability to be global and also local, providing festivalgoers a glocalized space in which to interact and participate. Participation is the bringing of an eclectic assortment of national flags to the event and waving them superficially. Considered from a critical perspective, participation is more of a desire to experience the Other and become a transnational citizen or to vicariously participate in doing so by watching online. It grants the festivalgoers access to self-regulated growth, what hooks describes as the domination of Others and what Grewal calls an inclusive multiculturalism in nationalism through transnational sites. The constructed hegemonic ideology is hooks' reference to maturing from "white innocence" ("Eating" 368), a maturing that is internalized and can occur regardless of race, nationality or ethnicity within Western culture.

Music Festivals
The focus here is on pictures and videos of two events, Tomorrowland and Ultra Music Festival. Tomorrowland is in its eleventh year, originating as an event that takes place in Belgium in a town called Boom. It also has a sister festival called Tomorroworld in Chattahoochee Hills**,** Georgia, which launched two years ago (Tomorrowland.com). Ultra Music Festival is in its seventeenth year and has events in Miami, Chile, Buenos Aires, Brazil, Ibiza, Europe, South Africa, Korea, Japan, and soon, Taiwan (Ultramusicfestival.com). Ultra has recently started to offer online streaming of the events for those who wish to watch at home. Both

of these events evidence an overwhelming number of National Flags that are taken to and shown off at the festivals. Ultra also releases recap videos after their festivals. One such video is analyzed below in order to demonstrate the rhetorical production enabled by the organization's idealized distortion of participants' identities.

YouTube Live Performances

In a YouTube video provided by Ultra of the performance of Martin Garrix, it is apparent that national flags are being waved and shown off by dozens of festivalgoers. During the clip, at seventeen minutes into the video, there are Latin American flags being raised and waved alongside European flags as well as US and Canadian flags (see Figure 1), all dispersed on the dance floor. The video

Figure 1

has over 23.4 million views and has been available for viewing since April 1, 2014 (Garrix, YouTube.com). The magnitude of the viewing audience of a fifty-seven minute live performance is immense. Consonant with May's view, the social construction that is occurring is one of cohesiveness and unity. It is very apparent, as everyone is moving in unison with the music and waving their flags with flamboyant pride. There are many close-ups of people holding their flags and wearing clothing with their flag's colors. The audience responds by yelling into the camera, knowing that they will be recorded and broadcast via the Internet, globally connecting them to the nation and people their flags represent. The event is held in the metropolitan area of Miami, which has heavy migrant populations. The space in the middle of the city surrounded by

skyscrapers is a glocalized space that contains all the necessary elements for Others to partake in the global community. U.S. flags are also waved as part of this global community. The children of immigrants or immigrants themselves display flags of both their nations of origin and the U.S. flag. They understand themselves to be part of a new global world where cultures can intermingle and places like Miami can be associated with more than one identity. This multiculturalism in connection to EDM's utopian idealism is exemplified by lyrics such as, "raise you' hands up and drop your guns" (Garrix, YouTube.com). The choice of these words is strategic in creating the utopian idealism that is part of the glocalized space, which is harboring National Flags known to be waved during wartime and that in turn brings thoughts of military arsenals, hence guns. The bricolage of flags is continuous throughout the whole performance.

There is one obvious and voyeuristic heterosexual tone in the selected scenes, apparent in the whole audience as the prominent gender association in the festival. This is something that should be pointed out especially since the creation of these places once was attributed to a widely gay community of Blacks and Latinos. The mainstream appeal is geared aggressively toward heterosexual audiences through the predominant portrayal of young women in skimpy outfits. There are also female models dancing on stage next to the DJ. This exemplifies hooks' perspective regarding the desire to experience the Other to consume who they are in order to become multicultural and create new attributions to one's self identity—the desire for experiencing Others in a sexual manner. This sexually driven experience's huge corporate sponsorship is apparent by the sheer magnitude of the stage and dance floor that is riddled with advertisements for different companies.

A joint performance by David Guetta, Nicky Romero, and Afrojack at Tomorrowland in 2013 shows an even bigger stage that is green, mimicking a forest theme, and features huge screens. The audience is enormous, and just like in the 2014 Ultra video, the national flags are from the Americas and European countries. They are displayed proudly in the air (Afrojack, YouTube.com). This video has received over 11 million views on YouTube. The audience is again very conscience of being filmed in this glocalized area, and they welcome it. The festival is located between multiple countries that are known for the EDM movement: Germany, France, and The Netherlands. This centralized area provides people with the ability to come from all over Europe as well as the world. The title itself, "Tommorrowland," presents a utopic ideal of unification and is an allusion to the future and not the present, to a movement that is global. Two minutes into the video it can be seen that there

are dozens of flags draped over guardrails on display for everyone to record and see. There is a bigger Israeli presence as well in this video, as access to the concert is closer than that of the Ultra Music Festival in Miami.

Website Platforms

The Internet websites that display these festivals to the world again provide a utopic ideal in their imagery that allows for a vicarious experience of the events. When users log on to Tomorrowland.com, it takes them to a home page donning a map of the globe, on which is shown the events that the company offers, Tomorrowland in Belgium and Tomorroworld in Atlanta (Tomorrowland.com). After a user chooses the event, s/he is taken to a page with all the information that a participant needs for travelling to and staying at the festival for the weekend. There are different packages tailored to a participant's budget and location. This tourist approach is meant to increase the monetary gain from the festivalgoers while also facilitating their utopic experience. Corporations are aiding in the participation of this idealized and glocalized space. There is even a section of the Internet page that is called People of Tomorrow, where the backdrop is a picture of countless flags at the festival and the message on the forefront is about a bridge being built in honor of the diverse international participants who attend the festivals (Tomorrowland.com). They are encouraged to write a message to the world on this bridge. They are celebrating "global unity," once more giving the participants the available tools to see themselves as participating in this glocalized space; to see themselves as being part of a movement for global unity through the EDM festivals along with the vicarious experiences elicited through the websites.

Evident on Ultramusicfestival.com, there is a hyper-international-connectivity feel to the design and layout of the website. Some content includes the constant streaming of EDM festivals that are taking place in different parts of the world at one of the nine international events. The website emphasizes the global effect that these musical festivals have on the EDM world. At the bottom of the webpage, there are links to various festivals in different locations around the world. This is set up to help participants see themselves as being part of a global force that can easily disseminate information worldwide to a huge EDM audience. It again gives perspective to the participants of the Miami Ultra Music Festival and their willingness to bring the flags of their national origins, designating the universality and worldwide connectivity of EDM culture through electronic media as its main goals. There is an option that shows the

various corporate sponsors of these events that highlights its capitalistic associations around the world. Both the audience and the festival organizers understand the corporate role in facilitating funding for the events. Participants choose to use this corporate money, which helps pay for the festivals and the live streams, to facilitate their own "glocalized" portrayals of unity through multiculturalism by the carrying of flags.

Finalized Sexual Tonality

All of the previous participant-attributed qualities of EDM festivals are interesting and, it can be argued, broaden the experiences of many people, but they fall short of critically dissecting what is being created by the organization. After most of these events, Ultra releases a recap video that shows highlights of experiences and interviews of some DJ's and mostly white participants that were at the Miami festival (UMF TV, YouTube.com). This synthesized 2014 Ultra recap video is concerning because of the hegemonic undertones that it carries (UMF TV, YouTube.com). One scene in particular demonstrates all of the previously mentioned criticisms of U.S. transnationalism. It communicates the connotations of its production that engulfs all of Ultra's images and corporate affiliations. Screen shots of the scene (see Figures 1and 2) show a row of eight

Figure 2

bikini-wearing multi-ethnic female bodies that are carrying distorted flags of different countries that participate in hosting Ultra Music Festivals. The flags feature the same colors and shapes as they normally do, but embedded in their centers is Ultra's logo. This portrayal is key in connecting to the idea that

multiculturalism is available to an audience that is located under the subordination of the "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy," as theorized by hooks (Foss, Foss, and Trapp 274; Grewal 537). It is also connoting the chance to experience the full contact with Others in order to fulfill new normative assumptions within a transnational setting. This scene depicts what is actually being sold to audiences and participants. It is a forgery or perverted association of past phenomenological aspects of EDM via depictions of multiculturalism, vicarious experience of unification, and voyeurism of heterosexism.

It is important for critical and cultural studies scholars to see these events' landscapes as amalgamations that distort many of the previously discussed perceptions into the simple buying of a three hundred dollar ticket—a ticket that is selling women represented as ethnic/racial bodies ready to be consumed and shopped for by prospective festivalgoers. The ideology of consuming the Other is circulated aggressively here. Most importantly, it is noted that this white supremacist ideology is projected onto the Other's own identities and their desires. Immigrant children are consumed by the assimilation of capitalism and the performance of this maturing out of "white innocence" through their representation via a distorted National Flag (hooks, "Eating" 368). This is a product of transnationalism in Western culture. The vicarious experience and hegemonic rhetoric in images is perpetuated and indiscriminately taken in by ethnic identities and all who participate. This can be seen as troublesome when we consider that it is a three hundred (plus) dollar ticket that is being sold in order to experience this first hand. It is selling a type of transnational sex tourism to American and global youth under the ideological guise of unification through multiculturalism and transnationalism.

Discussion
The attention, and the profit, that has come from EDM festivals has led to a new social construction of a "glocalized space" within the festivals as an expected part of the experience. The corporations and the overall "digital capitalism" involved in the advertisement and portrayal of the festivals lend understanding to a new form of "globalized containerization" (Lipsitz 251). This containerization is meant to appeal to everyone that has access to electronic media. Therefore, providing live streaming of these festivals is essential to glocal/global idealism. It is the capital gains that encourage the increased portrayal of international audiences not in a naïve way by either party, but rather, as a symbiotic relationship. It is an uncritical acceptance by the audience that makes this type of multicultural containerization an agreed portrayal, and

thus, a new social and capitalistic construct that characterizes the EDM movement. Perry Finley created a list on an EDM blog, stating that a national flag is one of the key objects to have when one wishes to participate at these festivals (Thatdrop.com). The audience is responsible for taking the flags along with their utopic idealism, as EDM is a long-standing musical genre that has reached out globally, encouraging people to understand their own national identity as being created as part of that global world—a global world that is connected electronically through the Internet and other forms of electronic mass media.

Gender and other identities are communicated in an overtly sexual manner. This is problematic because of the mass consumption and overall acceptance of the EDM experience as one of spirituality and self-growth. The distortions that are portrayed by the organizations that promote these festivals have only monetary compensation in mind. The actual cultural and ethnic enrichment is not clearly defined or even given an actual voice by the consumers. It is decided for them and then distributed in a "containerized" fashion. Heightened awareness of sexually transmitted diseases and unwelcomed sexual encounters in the form of "date rape" escalating within organizations such as universities and the military is something to consider when looking at this movement, which primarily consists of a college-age demographic. EDM began as an empowering site for Black and Latino gay communities and other marginalized communities and is now a commodity in the form of a ticket pass. A pass to ritualize and expect to be met with half naked encounters of the Other reinforcing the "white supremacist capitalist patriarchal" ideology within all ethnic enclaves and populations. Is this really a site of new forms of global unification, or is it just a rebranding of "Othering" in the form of sexual subjugation that has taken advantage of the historical background of EDM? This research views the latter as the obvious answer.

Conclusion

This research is important because it brings a critical approach to a cultural perspective about a cosmopolitan movement within the popular music arena of EDM and sexualized transnationalism. The participants and their flags are communicating something new about their presence on the dance floor for the world to view via the Internet, YouTube, or any site that promotes or pays for the recorded footage of the event. By lending their image and communicating their ethnic power, EDM festival participants are allowing organizations to use their bodies to propagate desire and distort nationalities in the name of profit

and capitalism. Since cameras are now more prevalent at the events through new technologies such as smartphones and online streaming, recognition of these transnational identities is part of the events' ambience, as EDM is known to be an ethnically and internationally welcoming genre. It is important to maintain a critical perspective on how audience members and consumers are subjected to reformulations of hegemony under the veil of new transnational idealisms in the "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy."

Works Cited

Afrojack. "Afrojack x David Guetta x Nicky Romero- LIVE at Tomorrowland (28.07.2013)." *YouTube.* YouTube, 30 Jul. 2013. Web. 19 May 2014*.*

Finley, Perry. "10 must have items for music festival season." *That Drop.* Ambition Insight, 1 Mar. 2014. Web. 19 May 2014.

Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric. 30th Anniversary Edition.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland P, 2014. Print.

Garrix, Martin. "Martin Garrix—Ultra Music Festival Miami (2014)." Online video clip. *YouTube*, 1 Apr. 2014. Web. 19 May 2014.

Grewal, Inderpal. "Understanding 'Global Community' in Cultural Studies." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *4*.3 (2007): 332-335. Print.

Grewal, Inderpal, and Caren Kaplan. "Global Identities Theorizing Transnational Studies of Sexuality." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 7.4 (2001): 663-679. Print.

Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style.* London and New York: Routledge, 1979. 5-29. Print.

Hill-Cantey, Melanie. *Cross-cultural Musical Simulations: Taking Techno Back*. Long Island U, The Brooklyn Center, 2013. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing, 2013. Print.

"Home Page." *Tomorrowland*. n.p., n.d. Web. 19 May 2014.

"Home Page." *Ultramusicfestival*. 2014 Ultra Enterprises, Inc., n.d. Web. 11 June 2014.

hooks, bell. "Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance." *Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks*. Ed. Meenakshi G. Durham and Douglas M. Kellner. Malden Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001. 424-438. Print.

____. *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Howell, Kerry E. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Methodology*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2012. Print.

Kelley, Robin D.G. "Notes on Deconstructing 'The Folk'." *American Historical Review* 97.5 (1992): 1400-1408. Print.

Langlois, Tony. "Can You Feel It? DJs and House Music Culture in the UK." *Popular Music*, 11.2 (1992): 229-238. Print.

Lipsitz, George. *Footsteps in the Dark: The Hidden Histories of Popular Music.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2007. Print.

Littlejohn, Stephen W., and Karen A. Foss. *Theories of Human Communication*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland P, 2010. Print.

May, Beverly. "Participatory Theatre: The Experimental Construct of House and Techno Music Events." *Canadian Theatre Review*, 103 (Summer 2000): 9-13. Print.

Negus, Keith. "Identities." *Popular Music in Theory: An Introduction.* Hanover and London: Wesleyan UP, 1997. 99-135. Print.

"People of Tomorrow." *Tomorrowland*. n.p., n.d. Web. 19 May 2014.

Rill, Bryan. "Identity Discourses on the Dancefloor." *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 21.2 (2010): 139. Print.

Roudometof, Victor. "Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization." *Current Sociology*, 53.1 (2005): 113-135. Print.

thelonelyisland. "When Will the Bass Drop? (ft. Lil John)." Online video clip. *YouTube.* YouTube, 17 May 2014. Web. 11 June 2014.

UMF TV. "United we dance (relive Ultra Miami 2014: Official 4K aftermovie)." Online video clip. *YouTube*, 29 Sept. 2014. Web. 11 June 2014.

CHAOS

Greg Langner

Characters

GO: Forthright, stubborn leader. Older brother to WO and YO. Should be played by an actor/actress who looks to be in his/her late teens or very early twenties.

WO: Intelligent and cautious sister to GO and YO. Youngest sibling. Should be played by an actor/actress who looks to be in his/her late teens or very early twenties.

YO: Passionate and energetic brother to GO and WO. Middle sibling. Should be played by an actor/actress who looks to be in his/her late teens or very early twenties.

MADA: Loving, strong-willed mother to GO, WO, and YO. Can potentially be played as their father. Should be played by an actor/actress from his/her twenties to early forties.

Original Production

Dates: February 20, 21, 22, 28, 2014
Venue: The Mosaic Lizard Theater, 112 West Main Street, Alhambra, CA 91801
Cast: GO played by Dominic Duran
        WO played by Jamie Risch
        YO played by Ryan Perez
        MADA played by Sophie Avedikian

Author's Note

CHAOS may be produced, without royalty, only with the explicit permission of the author.

Prologue

CHAOS is an original performance that blurs the line between theater and dance. It has a story, but the themes, values, and messages are not bound by the doctrine of drama. While maintaining the distinct narrative nature of traditional theater, it builds on the rough and instinctive physical expressions of its performers to generate a staging of fluid and vivid action that is designed to

capture and excite the psyche, while embracing deep feelings of empathy and compassion. Balancing the conventional with the experimental, while putting on display our unconscious aspirations and doubts, it provides audiences with a unique account of life in a physically animated spectrum. The original performers—Dominic Duran, Jamie Risch, Ryan Perez, and Sophie Avedikian— find themselves in an imagery of action, embodying human states of intensity, magnitude, and vitality. *CHAOS* is a carefully choreographed history of the human condition. It is a metaphor for transformation and love, embodied and elusive. It is an imaginative flash of the subtle, the curious, the undefined.

This is a performance piece that aims to highlight the grand weight carried by interpersonal communication, internal communication, and the complex relationship between the two. What we say matters very deeply to those with whom our relationships are strongest. The lives we are born into establish a powerful trajectory that outlines how we come to know others, and how we resolve knowing ourselves. *CHAOS* is linear yet open-form, so that those who witness it will readily conceptualize their own stories, reflect on their own relationships, and more thoroughly understand their own communicative trajectory through life.

The motivation for creating this piece is multi-faceted. It began as a short-form one-act, what is now positioned as "Chapter 1: K.O. Chaos." *K.O. Chaos* was an opportunity to indulge in my artistic impulses. Because it was short-form—about twenty minutes—I felt comfortable taking the risk of being unconventional among the theatrically conventional. In addition to embracing the opportunity of merging the narrative practices of theater with the nonlinear expressions of postmodern dance, I actively developed *K.O. Chaos* as an homage to adventure. In particular, I wanted to honor adventure-themed Japanese anime, Shonen, which in my adolescence helped me to feel a sense of freedom in an otherwise restrictive social environment. The success of *K.O. Chaos* motivated me to expand; to make the original piece richer and to give the story a wider and more influential arc. The expanded work helped me to reflect on the cyclical nature of human life, allowing me to be self-reflexive about my own experiences, while revering those that I do not yet, and may never have. A critical component of *CHAOS* is the individuality of the performers. While it was initially written for a specific group of artists, in the same sense that the story and messages are meant to be open to interpretation, the delivery of the work is meant to bend to the unique strengths and values each performer brings to the stage, wherever or in whatever form that may take.

With respect to this piece, and more, I am deeply grateful to the Mosaic Lizard Theater where it was produced, and of which I am a part. I am grateful to my loved ones, both here and gone; to my mentors, both academic and artistic; and to the performers, whose energies and presence brought to life something that was and continues to be intimately important to me.

Chapter 1: K.O. Chaos

[A "steady high- or low-pitched tone" is heard. GO, WO, and YO enter.]

GO (to YO): Shhhhhh! (To WO): Shhhhhh!

WO and YO (to each other): Shhhhhh!

GO: We have to find it, before it's too late.

YO: We have to find it, or else we're done with.

WO: We have to find it, or this will be the end.

YO: The end.

GO: The end of all of us.

WO: This is only the beginning...

YO: The beginning of the end...

GO: Okay! Enough! We need to stop being so down! We can do this! We. Can. Do this!

WO: Hell yeah!!!

[Two loud bangs are heard offstage.]

WO and GO: Ahhh!

GO: What the heck was that?!

YO: It's here!!!

[YO runs to the corner and curls up in fear.]

GO: It's here!!!

[GO runs to the corner and curls up in fear.]

WO: It's here!!!

[WO runs to the corner and curls up in fear.]

[GO, WO, and YO begin breathing heavily. The "steady, high- or low-pitched tone" fades away.]

GO: Shh!!! ... Do you hear that? It stopped!

YO: Does that mean we're safe?

GO: No! We will never be safe...

WO: We will never be safe...

YO: We will never be safe... Going on an adventure was a terrible idea! (Begins sobbing.)

GO: That! Out there! That is our enemy! We have to face our enemy!

WO: We have to face our enemy head on!

YO: We have to face our enemy head on, and not back down until our enemy is no more!

GO and WO: Yeah!!!

GO: We can do this! ... Oh, but, our enemy is too powerful.

WO: Our enemy is way too powerful... This was a terrible idea! I'm so afraid!

GO: Agh! This is not supposed to be about fear! This is supposed to be about adventure!!!

WO: Well, this adventure was a terrible idea!!!

YO: What can we do?

GO: We can fight!

YO: Yeah!!!

WO: But won't that just make things worse?

GO: Oh, yeah...

YO: Well, one of us has to do something.

GO: Who is it going to be?

WO: I'll do it.

GO: Are you sure?

WO: No.

GO: Oh.

WO: Yes! I have to! It's the only way! If I don't make it, promise me that you will find adventure without me.

GO and YO: I promise!

    [Two loud bangs are heard offstage.]

MADA (from offstage): Go!!! Wo!!! Yo!!!

GO (panicked): Our enemy is coming for us!

YO (panicked): It's now or never!

[WO begins to walk toward the exit.]

MADA: Wo!

[WO stops abruptly and runs back to the corner.]

WO: I can't do it! I'm too scared!

YO: I'll go!

[YO runs toward the exit.]

MADA (from offstage): Yo!!! Get down here!!!

YO: Nevermind!

[YO runs back to the corner.]

GO: Enough! One of us has to go out there! And if you two are too scared, then I'll go! I'll go and face our enemy! I have the strength! I have enough power! I have to! Ready, here I go! Ahhhhhh!!!

[GO runs to the exit as he screams.]

[GO's yelling can be heard offstage. GO re-enters almost immediately, no longer running or screaming.]

GO (continued): Nobody's there...

WO: What do you mean?

YO: Does that mean we're safe?

GO: I think so...

[YO cautiously exits to check, then re-enters.]

YO: Go is right! Nobody is there!

[WO exits to check, then re-enters.]

WO: Nobody is there! We're safe!

YO: We're safe!

GO: We're safe!

GO, WO, and YO: We're safe!!!

[Two loud bangs are heard offstage. WO and YO panic. YO begins screaming.]

YO (fading out of his scream): Oh, Wo! I thought we were safe!

[WO and YO hold each other, sobbing.]

GO: Agh! Stop it! You two are acting like a bunch of crybabies! We can't hide forever! And we can't just sit here and cry! We did not go through all of this just so we can be defeated!

WO: Go! No! Mada is too powerful!

GO: No, she's not!

WO: Yes, she is!!

GO: No!!! (Begins sobbing.)

WO: Yes!!!

GO (thrashing around): No! No!! No!!!

YO: Go! You have to get ahold of yourself!

[YO slaps GO. GO spins and falls. GO begins sobbing.]

GO: It isn't fair! It just isn't fair, Yo!

YO: I know, Go, I know! (Hugs GO.) Wo, go and see if Mada is still out there.

WO: Of course Mada is still out there!

YO: Of course Mada is still out there!

GO: Of course Mada is still out there, and we're all done for!

MADA (from offstage): Yo!!!

YO: I think she's getting closer.

MADA (from offstage): Wo!!!

WO: This is it. This is the end.

MADA (from offstage): Go!!!

GO: It doesn't have to be.

WO: Go, we've been through this! We can't fight back!

YO: We have to give up, Go.

GO: She's coming. Mada is coming. And when she gets here, it's Game Over, man! But I am not giving up. I am going to fight!

WO: But Go, you'll never win!

GO: No, I won't win... Not by myself. Yo?

YO: ... I'll fight...

WO: You both are going to make things worse!

YO: Wo, we need you. Any one of us, alone, could never do this. But together...

GO: Together...

WO: Together we stand a chance...

MADA (from offstage): Go! Wo! Yo! No more!!!

    [The "steady, high- or low-pitched tone" fades back in. GO, WO, and YO prepare to charge into battle.]

GO: Get ready! ... Go!!!!!

    [Blackout. An epic, slow motion fight scene with GO, WO, and YO against MADA proceeds to occur through a light montage. The following dialogue takes place throughout the fighting.]

WO: She's too powerful!

YO: Go! Wo!

GO: We have to fight together!

YO: We don't have enough power!

WO: Go!

YO: Go!

MADA: Go!!!!!

GO, WO and YO: Ahhhhhhhhh!!!!!

    [Lights fade to black. The "steady, high- or low-pitched tone" fades away. Pause. Lights slowly fade up to full. The stage is silent. GO, WO, and YO are

collapsed on stage. They slowly begin regaining consciousness, vocalizing moans and grunts.]

WO: Is it over?

GO: Is it over?

YO: Is it over?

WO: I don't see Mada.

GO: Ugh... Does that mean we won?

YO: Does that mean we defeated our enemy?

WO: Does that mean-

[MADA barges in.]

MADA: Hey! Go, Wo, Yo! What's going on? I've been calling you to come down for like fifteen minutes!

[Pause.]

YO: But Mooooooooom! Moooom!!!

MADA: Don't "but Mom" me, young man. It's dinner time—let's go! Get your butts downstairs!

GO: But Mom! We're playing "Adventure"!

WO: Yeah, Mom, we're playing "Adventure"!

MADA: It sounds a lot more like chaos up in here than like an adventure. Come on. Wash up and get downstairs. (Pause.) I made macaroni and cheese. (Exits.)

YO: Macaroni and cheese?!

GO: Macaroni and cheese?!

WO: Macaroni and cheese?!

GO, WO and YO: Ah, yeah! Macaroni and cheese!

GO: Let's go!

[GO, WO, and YO exit. Lights fade to black.]

Chapter 2: Curious Chaos

[The sound of a 'ticking clock' can be heard. GO re-enters and looks around the stage with a sense of irritation. He crosses downstage and stops. Pause.]

GO: What the hell was all that?! I mean, you all came here expecting to see a "play" and all you see for the first twenty minutes is all of us running and jumping and flipping all over the stage and screaming like a bunch of crazy people, and it turns out we're just supposed to be a bunch of kids playing adventure and running around after macaroni and cheese!

[If the audience laughs.]

It's not funny!

[If the audience does not laugh.]

I know! It's not even funny!

GO (continues): Look! Look, look, look, look, look, look! Just look! Just- Just listen! Just look- Just listen- Just look and listen! Just listen! Just listen for a second! Alllll of that! Yeah, it's not even done yet! My brother Yo and my sister Wo are about to come back out here, and this show is going to get even weirder. And believe me! I know all about weird! You know why? 'Cause I'm not even a kid anymore! Yeah, it's been like two minutes since the macaroni and cheese bit, and suddenly in this part of the show I'm supposed to be a hormone-raging teenager! And man, you know, it really sucks. You know why?

[WO and YO enter, performing subtly expressive gestures. Both cross downstage. WO stands opposite to GO at the lip of the stage, while YO stands center-stage.]

GO (continues): Like, stuff... Yeah, stuff starts, like, growing... On your body! And all of a sudden I'm like, interested in girls and stuff. Like, when I was a kid, I thought girls were weird. And I still think they're weird and everything—I mean, who gets girls, right? But like, now I think they're weird in a good way. But it really sucks, you know? It's like, you know when you're a kid and you don't know how to pet a cat the right way so they just run away 'cause they're scared of you? Yeah, that's how it is with me and girls.

[Insert additional dialogue developed by the actor in collaboration with the director.]

GO (continues): And like, these guys— (gestures toward WO and YO) —they don't even get it. Like, I'm the oldest, so, like, I'm automatically too cool for them. And they should know that, you know? But no, instead they cramp my style, like, *all* the time. I'll be like, you know, ready to pick up on some babes, and Yo will be all like, "Go, let's play Mario Kart and eat some macaroni and cheese!" And I'll be like, "God, Yo, leave me alone! We're not kids anymore! You're totally cramping my style! You're such a loser!" Cha, yeah, and Wo, my sister   don't even get me started on my lame little sister Wo, because she—

[GO proceeds to mumble incoherently while continuing to perform expressive gestures that become more and more subtle as WO begins talking.]

WO: Oh my god, sometimes all I want is for Go to shut up! Like, maybe when we were kids I thought he was, like, inspiring or whatever, the way he made us feel like we could overcome our enemy and stuff. But like, we are not kids anymore, and this is not some imaginary adventure. This is real life—this is the era of *high school* and *underage substances*—and the last thing I want is to be stuck in the past obsessing over macaroni and cheese and playtime. I have real issues to worry about, like *world hunger* and *going to Beyonce concerts*.

[Insert additional dialogue developed by the actor in collaboration with the director.]

My brother Go doesn't get any of that; he doesn't even get me. All he seems to care about anymore is picking up on "babes" and thinking that he's *so* smart and *so* cool. I hate to say it, but I totally don't hate to say it at all: Go doesn't even know what he's talking about. He doesn't know anything! And the only one who bugs me as much as Go is Yo. Don't even get me started on Yo! Just last week he—

[WO proceeds to mumble incoherently, while continuing to perform expressive gestures that become more and more subtle as YO begins talking.]

YO: No! No, no, no, no, no!!!, you know what?! I am not a loser. I mean, yeah, I may lose every time that Go and I play Mario Kart,

YO (continues): but I'm no loser! Like, maybe I've never won a coin toss or a game of rock-paper-scissors before, but I'm *definitely* not a loser! Like, okay, yeah, I missed that final shot in the big basketball game and made the whole team lose the championship, but even when all my teammates told me that I was a loser, and even when the coach kicked me off the team and said, "You are a loser!" and even when I got that note on my locker from my now-ex-girlfriend that said "Peace Out Loser," you know, even then I didn't feel like a loser!!!

[Pause.]

The only time I start to kind of feel like a loser is, you know, is when my own brother and my own sister act like they don't even know that I exist. But hey, you know what? Maybe I- Maybe I don't exist. Maybe- Maybe the reason I don't feel like a loser is because I just don't feel anything at all.

[Insert additional dialogue developed by the actor in collaboration with the director.]

I mean, I'm not five years old anymore. No, at this point in the show I'm apparently a rambling teenager, like all teenagers, I guess. The only difference between me and everybody else seems to be that I don't have anyone to ramble to. I don't have anyone. Maybe I don't deserve anyone. Maybe there's some reason that I belong in the background where nobody can see me. Maybe that's why Go was always the leader when we were kids. Maybe—

[Throughout the following dialogue, whenever one character is not speaking, she or he continues to mumble incoherently, while continuing to perform expressive gestures.]

GO: Maybe I should go to the gym! Yeah! That way I could get totally ripped and all the girls would be all like, "Ah yeah, you go, Go! Ha, yeah, you get it? "You go, *Go*"? Ha, 'cause my name is Go. Ha, yeah. Wait, no! Maybe—

WO: Maybe if I run for A.S.B. class president I could have an excuse to quit cheerleading. It's just so time consuming and sweaty—ew. And besides it's just not as fun as it used to be. Nothing really seems to be like it used to be. I mean, what if being a teenager turns out to be worse that it was being a kid? What if—

["Ticking clock" sound gets louder.]

YO: What if all this really never gets any better? What if—

GO: What if I never get a real girl to like me? Or what if I do and she realizes that I'm nobody?

WO: What if I never get Go to shut the hell up?

YO: What if—

[YO proceeds to ramble incoherently while pacing the stage.]

WO: What if—

[WO proceeds to ramble incoherently while pacing the stage.]

GO: What if—

[GO proceeds to ramble incoherently while pacing the stage. The rambling of all three gets louder as the "ticking clock" sound gets louder as well. MADA enters upstage carrying a laundry basket. MADA drops the laundry basket, which makes a slamming noise. GO, WO, and YO fade their voices out but continue to move their lips as if they are still rambling, their bodies

now moving in slow motion toward the Left and Right edges of the stage, and then stopping movement as they reach either side. The "ticking clock" sound fades out.]

MADA (sarcastically): I sure do love my kids... (Begins stepping downstage.)

MADA (continues): But they sure do piss me off like you wouldn't believe. All they seem to do is complain—complain about each other; complain about growing up. Do you remember, literally, it was like five minutes ago, when they used to be so sweet and playful, and cute and confusing... and weird? Yeah, exactly. All that mattered to them was whatever crazy, fun, strange adventure they could come up with. And it didn't have to make sense. Believe me, it didn't have to make sense.

[Looks around the stage.]

Does any of this really make any sense? It just had to happen. I was so happy to be a good mom and to give them everything they needed, even if it meant I had to be the villain in their little games, because god, I hated that. But you know what I'm not happy about? I'm not happy about coming home every day to three empty bodies that don't talk to me and don't even talk to each other. I'm not happy that I have these kids who I used to be able to hold whenever anything bad would happen, but who now won't even let me help them with their stupid, hormonal problems. I'm not happy, that even worse than that, they won't even help each other. And it breaks my heart to have these three beautiful kids who went from doing everything together to barely living together. It's like— (starts crying) —they're barely even kids anymore. They will keep growing, and life will keep moving, and they will leave me sooner than later. At this rate, I give it five minutes.

[Insert additional dialogue developed by the actor in collaboration with the director.]

It feels like life happens in a flash—

["Ticking clock" sound briefly fades back in.]

MADA (continues): —and then, fuck, it's gone. (Snaps fingers.)

[Lights bump to full. MADA slowly walks back to the laundry basket.]

GO, WO, and YO (reacting to the light): Ah!

GO: Hey, it's too bright.

MADA (sarcastic, sad, and loving): Hey, come get your clean cloths.

GO, WO and YO: Finally, Mom!

WO: God, it's been forever!

[MADA exits. GO, WO, and YO cross to the laundry basket and start changing on stage through a light montage. "Ticking clock'" sound fades back in at a faster rate.]

YO: Hey, do you hear that?

GO and WO: Hear what?

["Ticking clock" sound gets louder.]

GO: Oh...

WO: Oh, no...

YO: Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no...

GO: Go, go, go, go, go!!!!!

[GO, WO, and YO begin to scramble around the stage in a panic, physicalizing through a connected series of expressive gestures their growth out of being teenagers, into, and through adulthood. They periodically exit the stage and re-enter with props. They periodically mumble, mostly incoherently. All three are offstage toward the end of this section as MADA enters. She looks at the empty stage, then makes a final exit upstage-center, into a bright light. GO, WO, and YO re-enter and make their way downstage-left.]

Chapter 3: Cold Chaos

[The "ticking clock" sound slowly fades out. For the remainder of the performance the voices of GO, WO, and YO are somewhat raspy.]

GO: Do you hear that? It stopped.

YO: Does that mean we're safe?

    [GO, WO, and YO stare at each other for a moment.]

GO and WO: Yes.

YO: Oh, good.

WO: Okay, now what?

GO: I think... I think we have to find it before it's too late.

YO: We have to find it, or else we're done with?

WO: We have to find it, or this will be the end?

GO: Uh... Yeah.

WO and YO: Oh, okay.

    [GO, WO and YO begin wandering around the stage as if looking for something. A "chaotic, ambient" sound fades in and can be heard at a low volume. WO and YO bump into each other.]

YO: Oh...

WO: Yo, do you know what we're looking for?

YO: What?

WO: Do you know what we're looking for?

YO: Yeah, uh... Hey, Go, what are we looking for?

GO: Uh... Oh, I know! ... Oh, no, wait... What? Oh, yeah. That. That, out there. That is... Something. And we have to face... Something.

WO: We have to face something head on.

YO: We have to face something head on, and not back down until...

WO: Until...

GO: Until—

    [The "chaotic, ambient" sound abruptly and very briefly spikes up in volume.]

GO, WO, and YO: Ah!

GO: Okay, enough, we need to stop being so... whatever. We can do this. We. Can. Do this.

    [The "chaotic, ambient" sound abruptly and very briefly spikes up in volume.]

YO: It's here.

GO: It's here.

WO: It's here.

    [GO, WO, and YO take one deep breath in sync.]

GO (abruptly): Oh, I got it!!!

    [WO and YO are startled and grip their chests tightly.]

YO: What?!

GO: This—This is supposed to be about something! It's not supposed to be about fear, or fighting, this is supposed to be about... something... About...

GO, WO, and YO: Adventure!!!

YO: That's it! All this! All of this was an *adventure*!

WO: Wait, but I thought this was a play?

   [The "chaotic, ambient" sound fades out as GO, WO, and YO slowly turn their heads to look out at the audience. As YO begins talking, the "chaotic, ambient" sound fades back in.]

YO: Yeah! Play! We've been *playing* 'Adventure'!

GO: Yeah!

   [The "chaotic, ambient" sound abruptly and very briefly spikes up in volume.]

GO (continues): Uh oh... It's coming for us.

YO: It's coming for us?

WO: It's coming for us?

GO: Yeah...

WO: Yeah...

YO: Yeah... Does that mean we're safe?

GO: I think so... Yeah.

WO: Yeah?

YO: Yeah?

GO: Yeah! (Begins laughing.)

WO and YO: Yeah!!!

GO: Yeah!!!!!

    [GO begins laughing uncontrollably. He falls to the ground.]

GO (continues): We're totally safe!

YO (kneeling down to hold GO): I know, Go! I know!

    [The "chaotic, ambient" sound abruptly and very briefly spikes up in volume.]

GO: It's here.

WO: It's here?

YO: It's here.

WO: So, is it over?

YO: Is it over, Go?

GO (pause): Yeah... It's over.

WO: Go. Yo.

GO and YO: Hm?

WO: This was a great adventure.

    [GO, WO, and YO nod their heads once in sync.]

GO: Are you ready?

[GO, WO, and YO slowly begin walking upstage-center. As the stage fades to black, a bright light appears upstage-center, creating a silhouette with their bodies.]

GO: (to WO): Shhhhhh! (to YO) Shhhhhh!

[Lights fade to black. End.]

The West Wing and *House of Cards*: A Comparison of Narrative Strategies of Two Politically-themed Dramas

Alice J. Marianne Fritz

Abstract

Politically-themed shows have gained popularity in recent years. This paper analyzes two politically-themed shows, The West Wing *and* House of Cards*, in terms of their narrative strategies and episode architecture. Two key persuasive objectives of the shows' respective producers are identified through the examination of the narrative structure and devices used. On one level, the narrative devices are used to perpetuate certain ideas about our nation's political leaders. However, on a more fundamental level, any narrative strategy employed by the producers of the two shows is ultimately connected to the economically-based need to increase and maintain viewership. Contextual factors that inform the shows' production and subsequent reception by audiences are also considered.*

Introduction

Narrative, as Abbott (2008) observes, is present in virtually all human discourse. The communicative act of telling a story is frequently intended to achieve certain goals, and hence contains a persuasive aspect. Specific narrative strategies are employed in order to accomplish the communicator's objectives, and what strategies are used will depend upon the objectives sought. The storyteller makes specific choices in terms of which particular events to include in telling the story, the order in which those events are presented, and the point of view from which those events are recounted (Ryan & Lenos, 2012) that will increase the likelihood that communicative aims are attained. For television narratives, these goals invariably include stimulating viewership (and thereby generating profit) and can sometimes include the promulgation of certain worldviews.

Traditionally, television dramas have followed the classic hero narrative template: The protagonist(s), who embodies qualities valued by mainstream society (i.e., the good guy), is pitted against a villain(s), someone who breaches

established rules or violates social norms (i.e., the bad guy). Disposition-based theories of audience enjoyment (e.g., Raney, 2004; Zillmann, 2000) explain why narratives employing this basic outline are popular with audiences: viewers tend to like characters who demonstrate moral correctness, that is, the viewer's subjective sense of moral correctness, and dislike characters who exhibit moral turpitude, or morals antithetical to those of the viewer. Media enjoyment is the result of watching liked characters succeed and disliked characters defeated. Shows like *The West Wing* (*TWW*)*,* which aired on NBC from 1999 to 2006, employed this traditional protocol, in which the protagonists are good guys who are in each episode called upon to overcome the obstacles posed by various antagonists, in the form of aggressive foreign nations, ultra-Conservative groups, natural disasters, and so on. In recent years, however, viewers have been seen to embrace non-traditional narratives like Netflix's *House of Cards* (*HOC*) that defy conventional screenwriting wisdom by featuring morally questionable protagonists. (Although audiences in the past have occasionally found themselves captivated by particularly intriguing antiheroes, the current televisual landscape is evidencing a remarkable proliferation of morally ambiguous characters.)

The purpose of this paper is to examine how different narrative strategies are used by two popular politically-themed shows, *The West Wing* and *House of Cards*, to achieve the dual objectives of maximizing viewership (and hence, profit) and promoting certain political beliefs and attitudes. Specifically, I examine the producers' discourse decisions in terms of setting, characters, focalization, themes, and episode structure in order to discover how these elements function in both *TWW* and *HOC* to achieve their respective goals. Finally, the historical context surrounding the production of the two shows is discussed, which further sheds light on factors that informed the producers' creative decisions, and also influenced how the shows were received by their respective audiences. The choice of *TWW* was due to its significance as the first prime-time program to successfully utilize the political-drama formula to gain accolades from critics and viewer loyalty from the public. The show's first season, which the present paper focuses on, was awarded nine Emmys, including one for Outstanding Drama Series. *HOC* was selected for analysis not only because it is a more current example of politically-themed dramas, but because in several key respects it is the polar opposite of *TWW*, featuring a protagonist who is a far cry from the moral exemplars on *TWW*. Television producers who wish to embrace the opportunities offered by the apparent shift in audience reception of morally questionable characters and create potentially

popular shows of their own featuring such characters might use the insights provided by the present investigation to gauge how specific narrative strategies help to maintain audience engagement with such shows.

Politically-themed Dramas

Television shows with a political setting have seen a steady rise in popularity in recent years. Jones (2010) noted this trend, observing that television programs featuring political themes or settings, once a "formula for ratings death," had gained popularity with producers with the critical and ratings success of shows like *TWW*. This network series could perhaps be seen as the show that started the trend. In its most successful season, the show ranked tenth in the Nielson ratings, averaging 17.2 million viewers weekly ("How did your favorite show rate?" 2002). Since *TWW*, there have been other politically-themed programs that have performed well either critically or commercially, or both. Politically-themed shows currently on the air include dramas such as *Scandal*, *Homeland*, *The Americans*, and *House of Cards*, as well as the comedies *Veep* and *Alpha House*. A recent *New Republic* article commented on this phenomenon, attributing the popularity of these shows to the public's desire to know more about what our elected public servants are *really* up to in Washington (Frank, 2013). Often, these programs appear to offer audiences an insider's view into the mysterious political maneuvering and intrigue that goes on in our nation's capital. As may be expected, the "reality of Washington" as constructed by the producers of the various politically-themed shows on television results in an inconsistent picture for the viewer who wonders what our politicians are "really like."

Generally speaking, there are two opposing depictions of Washington that emerge from these politically-themed television programs. These two contrasting portrayals correspond to the two contradictory masterplots being simultaneously circulated in our society: the first portrays politicians as honorable people truly dedicated to the task they have been elected to do (namely, to serve the public), while the second portrays them as selfish individuals who will do or say anything to get elected, and thereafter give little thought to the needs and well-being of those who voted for them.

As Fiske (1989) observes, dominant institutions such as the television industry are in a unique position to disseminate and popularize certain perspectives and ideas. Therefore, political scientists and cultural monitors often express their concern at the degree to which perspectives reflected on TV shows are being internalized by the viewing public. Taking seriously the

potential for even fictional programs to influence viewers' political beliefs, Gans-Boriskin and Tisinger (2005) examined the depiction of terrorism-related issues on *TWW*, concluding that "Messages in fiction matter; they matter in real and political ways. The depictions of terrorism and other public issues in fictional media affect how people think about the world" (p. 100). While the argument can certainly be made that shows such as *TWW* and *HOC* have the potential to influence viewer attitudes towards our political leaders in certain ways, and that this attempt to influence viewer opinion may even be one of the goals of the show's creators, ultimately, of course, all programming has but one end goal: to generate the most amount of profit possible.

The Functional Perspective
Bordwell (2004) advocates a functional explanation of narratives. Narratives, according to Bordwell, "are designed to fulfill certain purposes. These purposes can largely be conceived as aiming at certain effects—effects registered by a perceiver prepared to grasp a narrative" (p. 204). The author points out the deficiencies in a neo-structuralist approach that attempts merely to identify and classify narrative features without taking into account what function(s) the inclusion of such features into a text is meant to accomplish. Bordwell observes that it is inadequate to simply highlight, for instance, moments of overt narrational presence without also providing an explanation for why they were included in the discourse. The beginning of many films have employed a strategy of moving inward in the opening shot, a device that Bordwell explains serves to gradually initiate the spectator into the world of the film, as well as motivate the viewer to discover the "target of [the] narrowing field of view" (p. 209).

   Events in a narrative are either major turning points—what Chatman (1980) terms *kernels*, which "drive the story forward and lead to other events"—or supplementary incidents (*satellites* in Chatman's terminology), which help to make a narrative richer and more interesting but which do not alter the course of events in any significant way. The current paper takes a functional approach to the narratives under discussion, and seeks to explain narrative devices found in those two programs by speculating on the reactions those devices were designed to elicit from viewers. Following Rowland (2009), in examining the persuasive rhetorical function of *TWW* and *HOC*, attention is paid to the way the two shows engage and maintain audience interest, encourage audience identification with the characters, use particular settings to transport audiences

to another place and/or time, and tap into the audience's values and needs in order to evoke emotional reactions.

Analysis

In terms of setting, insofar that both shows are set in the world of the politically powerful in Washington, one could group *TWW* and *HOC* under the common heading of "politically themed dramas." Viewers familiar with both shows, however, will know that the two programs are in fact vastly different in terms of, among other things, characters and the attitudes that seem to be espoused towards those in high political office. *TWW* portrayed our nation's highest elected official and the people working for him in a very sanguine and sympathetic light. Each week, viewers could tune in to watch the erudite and honest President Josiah Bartlet—played by Martin Sheen, an actor who possesses both the gravitas appropriate for the role and an easy-going likeability—conquer obstacles that threaten his White House and/or the American people and American values. With the help of his able executive team, who are all as good and honorable as the president himself, challenges ranging from belligerent and ornery foreign entities to natural disasters that threaten American lives are dealt with through the tireless efforts of those admirable characters.

Because of its bold (considering it is the product of a network station) discussions of touchy issues such as gays in the military, hate crimes, racist laws, racial profiling, interracial relationships, and campaign finance reform, among others, *TWW* has often been said to reflect more liberal values. However, although assessments of the show by critics ranged from the perception that it is a "product of its liberal writer Aaron Sorkin and of a left-leaning Hollywood community" (Gans-Boriskin & Tisinger, p. 100) to the conviction that it amounts to "political pornography for liberals" (Podhoretz, p. 223), several aspects of *TWW* in fact indicates a conservative worldview. In the pilot episode, for instance, an antagonist is introduced in the character of Mary Marsh and the Christian Right she represents. Even while the climax of Story A shows President Bartlet putting this ultra-conservative character in her place and kicking Marsh and her allies out of his White House, viewers are also told within this episode that Bartlet is a "deeply religious man" who tours the United States urging young women not to resort to abortion.

That *TWW* simultaneously reflects *both liberal and conservative values* is due to the show's need to attract the most numbers of viewers possible. As a program airing on a network station, the ultimate goal of *TWW*, as is that of any

network television program, is to deliver the greatest number of viewers to advertisers: "Considered as a business, television works on a basic exchange. For a fee, television delivers audiences, measured in thousands, to advertisers. That is, the business of television is showing ads to audiences" (Browne, p. 587). Despite the fact that *TWW's* attempts to appeal to a politically-diverse audience were mostly veiled under the guise of liberalism, an analysis of its narrative strategies reveals that, besides the objective necessitated by the business nature of all television, one major objective of *TWW* was to legitimize the hierachy of political power in our society. While the show does acknowledge that the system is flawed, it portrays the people at the top of that system as being noble, selfless, and trustworthy individuals who certainly deserve to occupy their positions of power.

In contrast to *TWW*, the narrative strategies employed by the creators of *HOC* are even more directly related to the show's profit-making objective. Unlike network programs, Netflix (and premium cable stations) are concerned not with delivering audiences to advertisers but with appealing to subscribers (Smith, 2011). Hence, any narrative strategy used could be seen in light of this consideration. Through the shows created exclusively for Netflix (*House of Cards*, *Orange is the New Black*, the new episodes of *Arrested Development*), the company tries to put its origins as a video delivery service behind itself and establish the Netflix brand as a producer of quality programming. With so many channels and shows on network stations to choose from, why would viewers pay to subscribe to Netflix? Netflix's answer to that question would be: because their shows are strikingly different from anything one could find on regular TV channels. Netflix's producers work hard to distance itself from regular television, and to stress that the shows they produce are not the usual, family-friendly, traditional values-affirming fare one would find on network channels, but rather, they are artistically-superior products well worth a monthly fee to enjoy. As Smith (2011) notes, a common perception among audiences and critics alike is that "only when extracted from the context of television can a series hope to obtain 'artistic legitimacy'" (p. 37).

We see this attempt to achieve artistic legitimacy driving the narrative decisions in Netflix's shows, such as *HOC*. In essence, Netflix is attempting to establish itself as an auteur. Thompson (1996) enumerates a list of possible traits that "quality TV" often exhibit. The first of these features is that shows worthy of the descriptor "quality" is conspicuously unlike "regular" TV. "In a medium long considered artless, the only artful TV is that which isn't like all the rest of it. Quality TV breaks rules" (Thompson, p. 13). This clear distinction from

regular TV is exactly what Netflix and its programs are trying to achieve. Another feature is that quality TV is usually made by directors more associated with films. Several episodes of *HOC* are helmed by well-known film directors, including David Fincher (*Fight Club*, *The Social Network*) and Joel Schumacher (*Falling Down*, *A Time to Kill*). The casting of the Academy Award-winning Kevin Spacey, an actor previously associated with films and not television, also adds to the show's impression of prestige. One other criteria of quality TV that *HOC* meets is that it "aspires toward 'realism'" (Thompson, p. 15). Of course, the Sorkin-helmed *TWW* also presented itself as a "quality" alternative to "regular" programming, but this distinction was especially emphasized by the producers of *HOC.*

Underlying economic considerations aside, the storytelling techniques used on *TWW* are most often employed to help achieve the show's objective of promoting certain worldviews, while narrative devices used on *HOC* are used to distinguish the show from "regular television" and thus to solidify the prestige of the Netflix brand. Another primary objective of the producers of *HOC* is to keep viewers tuned into a show in which the main character is morally reprehensible.

Setting

On *TWW*, characters are most often shown at their place of work, the White House. Rowland (2009) notes that setting within a story can, in addition to the particular place specified, also refer implicitly to other places relevant to the audience. In this case, viewers of *TWW* are encouraged to think of their own workplaces (and their own performances at those workplaces) as they watch the exemplary employees on the show model the proper spirit appropriate to the labor force. This is in keeping with one of the show's major themes: the responsibility of every good citizen to perform the job that has been allotted to him or her to the best of his or her ability. While working to enrich oneself or to advance one's own ambitions is frowned upon in the series, working for the collective good is one of the values privileged on *TWW*. In the rare instances when the action takes place away from the interior of the White House, the characters are shown as either conducting work-related business anyway despite being physically removed from their place of employment, or they are portrayed as being uncomfortable in their surroundings.

When viewers first encounter the main characters in the pilot episode, they are situated away from the office, except for Josh Lyman, the White House deputy chief of staff, who is shown sleeping on his desk. Subsequent episodes

suggest that Josh often spends his nights at his office, through such details as that he keeps spare shirts there, etc. The other members of the White House staff who viewers will come to recognize as the main characters are then introduced one by one: Toby is on a plane, arguing with a flight attendant because she has asked him to turn off his computer during landing. Though Toby is far from being portrayed as a difficult character on the show, his discomfort at being forced to stop working for even five minutes is so extreme that the normally mild-mannered Toby reacts testily to the flight attendant's request. Viewers first encounter C.J., the White House Press Secretary, on a treadmill at her gym. She is apparently attempting to flirt with the man using the machine next to hers. She insists that despite her job, she does have time for a personal life. "Every day from 5 am to 6 am," C.J. brags, "is my time." However, what happens next undermines C.J.'s claim to personal time away from the cares of work: her beeper goes off, there has been an emergency at the White House, and she is needed there immediately.

In a subsequent episode, viewers are shown a rare sight when the entire staff assembles at a restaurant outside of the White House for breakfast. It was apparently the idea of Leo McGarry, the White House chief of staff. As the others arrive, they complain to Leo about his decision to take them so far away from their office:

Josh: "We couldn't meet closer to the office?"
Leo: "I didn't want people coming to our table."
Josh: "We couldn't meet *in* the office?"
Leo: "I was hungry."
Josh: "We couldn't have food sent to the office?" (Sorkin, 1999)

These objections show the characters' annoyance at being dragged away from their place of work. Leo's assistant deals with the inconvenience by bringing a bunch of office supplies with her to the breakfast—essentially, she manages the micro-trauma of being away from the White House by bringing her office with her. Leo, Toby, and Sam cope by discussing work issues at the restaurant. Ironically, though it was Leo's idea to meet at the restaurant because he "was hungry," he is so engrossed in the work-related discussion that he ignores the waitress trying to take their order. Josh and his assistant, Donnatella, are the only ones present who are engaging in non-work related dialogue—and for this, they are reprimanded by Leo. "I'm beginning to regret hiring any of you," he

exclaims in frustration, directing everyone's attention back to the issues they are working on.

While the characters on *TWW* are usually shown in their work environment, we seldom see the protagonist of *HOC*, Francis Underwood, in his office. Some scenes find Francis inside the U.S. Capitol Building. However, Francis is most often associated with his home, an elegant environment that clearly attests to the wealth of its residents. Even when Francis is shown performing work-related activities, he is often depicted as conducting his work from the comfort of his own home, and his employees often accommodate him by going to his house to report to him. While viewers of *TWW* are meant to deduce that the characters' earnest labors benefit and enrich the general public, the frequent use of Francis' home as a backdrop on *HOC* suggests that everything Francis does is intended to augment his own personal wealth and power. Location on *HOC* is often used to illustrate a character's personality. Francis and Claire's home is tastefully decorated, the rich mahogany and clean lines of the furniture reflecting the quiet strength of their owners. Zoe's run-down apartment reflects the reckless aspects of her personality, as well as the "messiness" of this character's life.

Characters

As Kozloff (1992) points out, "it is characters and their interrelationships that dominate television stories" (p. 75). This observation is echoed by Porter *et al.* (2002) who claim that, along with continuous storylines, the fact that viewers tuning in to a particular TV program can expect to encounter many of the same characters each week is what sets television narratives apart from other narrative forms (p. 23). Writing well-rounded characters who seem "real" and whom viewers come to care about is one tactic program producers use to secure loyal viewership. According to the affective disposition theory (ADT) of drama (Raney, 2004; Zillmann, 2000), enjoyment of media is contingent upon our positive affect toward the characters (i.e., the protagonists), which in turn is dependent on our moral evaluations of those characters. Simply put, drama viewers like and root for characters they perceive as morally correct, and they tend to dislike characters they see as morally incorrect (Raney, 2004). One possible explanation for the ratings success of *TWW* is that the major characters are portrayed as ethical and compassionate individuals, and are thus highly likeable characters. Furthermore, the producers take pains to make these characters "real" by giving them histories and backstories, and by hinting at their lives beyond what is shown within each episode. For example, in Season One viewers are introduced to the White House communications director Toby

Ziegler's ex-wife, Andrea. The reason their marriage ended was not revealed in this season, but although divorced, Toby and Andrea obviously enjoy a very amicable relationship. Upon hearing that Andrea was on a date with a man who drove her home despite being drunk, Toby tells her that she could have called him to come pick her up rather than risk her life being driven home by a drunk driver. Watching their harmonious exchange, the viewer's curiosity is piqued, and s/he is motivated to continue watching the show to discover why two people who obviously still care about each other would have gotten divorced.

Though *TWW* is told from the perspective of his White House staff, arguably the most important character on the show is that of President "Jed" Bartlet. An "honest, fair, and ethical Democratic president" (Jones, p. 10), Bartlet is the nicest and most caring boss (and, as President of the United States he is, in effect, the boss of every American) anyone could wish for, one who takes an avid interest in the well-being of everyone in his White House, from his most senior White House aide to his chauffeur. In the pilot episode, Josh makes an offensive comment to a member of the Christian Right on TV, and the only recourse, from a public relations standpoint, as another character reminds Josh (and the viewer), is for Bartlet to fire him. This, however, Bartlet refuses to do, and instead he sticks his neck out for his employee, at the risk of alienating a significant portion of religious voters. Bartlet's protectiveness toward his employees provides ample explanation for why they in turn are so devoted to serving him. Every episode gives viewers further proof of why Bartlet deserves the loyalty and devotion of his staff. In "Mandatory Minimums," a sleeping Bartlet is awakened by Leo, walking into the president's bedroom at midnight. Leo is seeking a sympathetic ear to relate his internal conflicts to, and this he finds in Bartlet, who shows no irritation at being woken up from his slumber. Presently, C.J. enters the bedroom as well. She had committed a political faux pas that morning, and it had been weighing on her mind all day. Finally, C. J. had summoned the courage to confess her mistake to the president, and he readily forgives her and relieves her disquiet. Toby and Sam join the group already assembled in the president's bedroom, to talk about work. Finally, Josh enters. It turns out that all he needed to tell the president, past midnight in the president's bedroom, was that he had given a girl he liked a gift. It is consistent with the dominant themes of the show that Bartlet is so accessible a boss that his staff feels no qualms about waking him up in the middle of the night to relate minute developments in their love lives.

In sharp contrast to the idealized storyworld of *TWW*, the viewer of *HOC* is hard-pressed to find a decent person amid the show's characters. The main

character, Francis Underwood (Kevin Spacey), is insatiably ambitious and irredeemably evil. He is a House Majority Whip who will stop at nothing, including cold-blooded murder, to advance his political career. The people he associates with are scarcely better equipped than himself in moral fiber: his assistant Doug shows no hesitation (indeed, he shows great initiative) in carrying out despicable deeds at his boss' instruction, and Francis' wife, Claire, doesn't bat an eye as she makes her office manager fire half her staff, and then personally fires the office manager at the end of the day. Francis' mistress, Zoe, is sleeping with him in exchange for the insider news from Washington that his position allows him to leak to her once in a while, always to his advantage. Francis uses, and ultimately destroys, the alcoholic Congressman Peter Russo, who, while not a vicious character, gets high and patronizes prostitutes, and generally conducts himself in a manner very different from how we'd like our politicians to behave.

Although the president on this show is not a well-rounded character and does not have a great deal of screen time, viewers are given indications that he is not a terribly noble character either. In this revenge drama, Francis is primarily motivated by his desire to thwart President Walker's plans and to undermine Walker's administration. As revealed in the first episode, however, Walker is by no means blameless, and there is ample justification for Francis' anger, if not his extreme retaliatory measures. He had backed Walker during the latter's presidential bid, and had been led to believe that in exchange for his support, Walker would name Francis as his Secretary of State. Walker's betrayal was revealed soon after his election. In a kernel scene revealing the initiating event that serves as the driving force for the main plot of the entire show, Francis is told that he will not be named Secretary of State after all, and that Walker prefers he remain in Congress. A stunned Francis barely manages to protest, "Let's be absolutely clear: You wouldn't have won without me... Donations, endorsements… I wrote the campaign's entire foreign policy platform. I bring years of foreign affairs committee—" before he is cut off.

The depiction of such wholly unlikeable characters may seem to be at odds with the producers' goals of increasing Netflix subscribership. Rather than entice viewers through the depiction of likeable characters, the producers of *HOC* attempt to achieve that objective through other, more unorthodox, means. First, by portraying a main cast comprised almost entirely of villains or morally ambiguous characters, Netflix is again taking on the role of the hip, anti-establishment producer of unconventional narratives. (Even Walter White, another notable antihero of contemporary television, is off-set by the other

likeable characters on *Breaking Bad*.) Many of the characters on *HOC*, and their personality flaws, are based on those from the original BBC series. However, while the British version tends to provide some sort of justification, however unconvincing, for the characters' less honorable undertakings, when the Netflix version bothers to offer any motivation for a character's bad behavior it is often lame and indefensible. For example, while Zoe's British prototype, Mattie Storin, engages in an affair with a married Urquhart out of (what she perceived to be) love, Zoe sleeps with Francis to further her career as a political reporter.

Second, the portrayals of these profoundly problematic political figures function to heighten the impression (at least in the minds of those who believe D.C. to be generally run by morally corrupt individuals) that *HOC* is offering viewers no less than the "truth" about our political institutions and the leaders who inhabit them. Thus, the pleasure in watching the show lies mainly in a kind of voyeuristic thrill at being allowed to witness what actually goes on behind closed doors in Washington. Early in the first episode, viewers are introduced to the character of underappreciated reporter Zoe Barnes as she is pitching a writing project to her supervisor. She proposes to undertake the task of writing exposés of political leaders in Washington. "We lift the veil," Zoe explains, and reveal "What's really going on." In fact, this is what the producers of *HOC* hope their viewers will believe is the show's function: we are encouraged to make an analogy between Zoe, a journalist (i.e., a writer) exposing the corruption of Washington, and the writers of the show, performing the same public service. Finally, the producers of the show employ various creative narrative strategies to deal with the tremendous challenge posed by the fact that the show's protagonist is also its villain.

As mentioned above, the disposition theory of drama posits that viewers prefer characters who perform moral acts, and they tend to dislike those who commit immoral acts (Raney, 2004). Based upon these assumptions, the character of Francis Underwood should be one whom most viewers will find unlikeable. How, then, to maintain viewer engagement when the main character is such an unlikeable one? The challenge in this case is even greater given that the producers of *HOC* have so little time to get the viewer "hooked" on the show before Francis'moral ambiguity (which turns into downright immorality in the final episodes of the first season) is revealed. The producers used their alloted time well: The pre-credit teaser of the pilot episode, which concludes at 3:40, manages not only to establish Francis as the sympathetic, even heroic protagonist of the show, but attempts to initiate a bond as well between Francis and the viewer. This scene begins with sounds rather than

images: the screeching of a car, the terrible sound of impact, followed by the plaintive howling of a dog. A door opens, and Francis walks through it, towards the viewer. He sees the dog lying hurt on the ground, and immediately recognizing it as his neighbor's pet, he instructs his bodyguard to tell the owners what has happened. This seemingly insignificant detail is in fact calculated to provide a (misleading) clue to Francis' character. The viewer gathers at this early point that Francis is a good neighbor, the kind who knows his neighbors' pets on sight, and who doesn't hesitate to help when one of them has been hurt. Less than a minute into this scene, Francis breaks the fourth wall and begins to talk directly to viewer (the show's use of direct address will be discussed further below). He talks about pain, in a manner which leaves the viewer in no doubt that it is something he himself is intimately acquainted with. Upon examining the run-over dog and finding it fatally wounded, Francis does the most compassionate thing one could do in such instances, and yet his action is one that demands a courage few possess—he puts the poor animal out of its misery using his bare hands. This action establishes Francis as a heroic figure, someone who is capable of carrying out whatever needs to be done, no matter how unpleasant.

We next see Francis in his bathroom, where he is washing canine blood off his hands. He casts a glance right at us (i.e., into the camera), thereby situating the viewer at home inside this, the most private room in Francis's home. These glances directly at and the asides to the viewer serve to strengthen the impression that an intimate relationship exists between this character and the viewer watching. In this same scene, the viewer is shown Francis interacting with his wife. After introducing Francis as a good neighbor, another (misleading) side of this character is presented to the viewer—that he is an affectionate husband. Through the use of such ingenious narrative strategies, the producers of *HOC* manage to create a positive first impression of the show's protagonist, within a short amount of time. Although Francis' moral ambiguity is revealed before the end of the first episode, the initial introduction of Francis as a positive character allows viewers to form a favorable judgment of this character early on. This increases the likelihood that viewers will have become invested in the show by the time they recognize their initial impressions is mistaken, and will therefore continue to watch even as the protagonist's immorality becomes apparent.

Focalization

Abbott (2008) defines the narrative technique of focalization as "the lens through which we see characters and events in the narrative" (p. 73); essentially, it is the point of view from which the story is told. Focalization is important because it "determines whose values the audience will be invited to endorse" (Ryan & Lenos, p. 127). *TWW* is told from the perspective of the president's core staff. They are: Leo, his White House chief of staff; Josh, his deputy chief of staff; C.J., the press secretary; Toby, the communications director; Sam, deputy communications director; Mandy, public relations; and Charlie, the president's personal aide. So, why is the story told through their eyes, if the most important character in the show is actually President Bartlet? The answer lies in the fact that the staff members are surrogates for the viewer at home. Seeing and evaluating Bartlet through their perspective, viewers come to admire his character the way the staff does. The White House depicted on *TWW* is an ideal organization headed by a wise leader who cares about all of his employees. Perhaps viewers are meant to draw an analogy between this fictional organization and the companies they themselves work for. If Bartlet represents the ideal CEO, then surely viewers are hailed to see themselves in, or at least urged to emulate, the ideal employees depicted on *TWW*, that is, people who gladly labor for the good of their organization and leader, often at the expense of their own free time and personal life.

Unlike *TWW*, viewers watching *HOC* see the story unfold through the eyes of its main character, Francis. Normally, viewers are invited to empathize and identify with the protagonist of a show. This is one reason to present a story from the point of view of the protagonist, as we naturally tend to identify with the character with whom we occupy the same perspectival position. However, the character of Francis is soon revealed to be so reprehensible that any attempt to invite the audience to identify with this character is doomed to failure, and the producers are, of course, well aware of that fact. Rather than try to encourage viewer identification with their main character, then, the producers of *HOC* needed to resort to other tactics to maintain audience engagement with the character of Francis Underwood (and therefore with the show).

One unusual narrative device used in this show is that of *direct address*. Kozloff (1992) defines direct address as that "situation that occurs when someone on TV—a news anchor, a talk show host, a series host, a reporter—faces the camera lens and appears to speak directly to the audience at home" (p. 81). Although the American version of *HOC* differs quite significantly from its

British progenitor, the narrative device of the direct address is one borrowed directly from the earlier BBC series. While a few network shows have previously used unconventional narrative strategies that render a narrator's presence more overt (e.g., *The Wonder Years*, *Scrubs, Arrested Development*), the use of a homodiegetic narrator who speaks directly to the viewer is highly unusual. Mittell (2006) lists this breaking of the fourth wall as a sign of narrative complexity, and the use of this uncommon narrative device again sets Netflix apart as a company which produces extraordinary shows that use such extraordinary storytelling techniques. However, the decision to let Francis Underwood (and Francis Urquhart in the original British series) address the viewer directly is based on the need to maximize the likelihood that audiences will be engaged with this morally bankrupt character. While we cannot be made to identify with or even to like this character, who is completely devoid of any redeeming qualities, by situating us as his *confidant*, we are involuntarily made complicit in this character's affairs. Early research into parasocial relationships (non-mutual, non-dialectical relationships with mediated personalities) focused on the imaginary bond some viewers perceived between themselves and television newscasters or talk show hosts precisely because direct address was thought to encourage the formation of such relationships (e.g. Horton and Wohl, 1956; Levy, 1979). Francis' way of talking directly to the viewer, then, may be seen as a conscious attempt on the part of the show's producers to foster parasocial relationships with this character. Francis is like the friend whose actions we disapprove of; however much we may disapprove of Francis' doings, we cannot disown him completely (by turning off the TV or changing the channel) because we are his accomplices.

Themes

As mentioned earlier in this paper, one dominant theme that emerges from *TWW* is *the proper attitude toward work*. Everyone in the White House, including the president himself, appears to work non-stop from morning until night, and to get by on very little sleep, not to mention very little recreational time. An oft-parodied and now clichéd narrative device, the "walk and talk," an innovation developed by Sorkin in which characters are shown conversing about the pressing political issues of the day as they walk from one part of the White House to another, is used to demonstrate the dynamic, productive, and multitasking work lives of the characters. Rather than waste precious moments of the day by walking to one's destinations without accomplishing any other tasks on the way, the White House staff in *TWW* is comprised of people who

fully devote their energies to getting the greatest number of things done during their hours at work. There may also be another reason why Sorkin continued to use, several times each episode, this very device, even after it had already become cliché. In short, it had become one way for this auteur to sign his signature on his products. This was important as Sorkin's name had become associated with quality TV, and therefore, the frequent reminder that "this is an Aaron Sorkin joint" is another way to "sell" the program and attract viewers.

One oppositional binary related to this theme is that of career vs. personal life. Every character is shown to have sacrificed or to be sacrificing his or her personal life in order to devote themselves more completely to their jobs. Toby is already a divorced man when we meet him in the first season, and we see Leo's wife leaving him and contemplating a divorce because Leo places his job before his marriage. Viewers can guess that Toby's wife divorced him for similar reasons. C.J. is being courted by the White House correspondent, Danny, and she evidently reciprocates his feelings and wishes to be with him, but she suppresses her desires because going out with a reporter would compromise her position as White House press secretary. Sam befriends a call girl, Laurie, but is unable to maintain any kind of relationship with her due to the potential scandal it might prove for the president and the White House. Another binary that can be detected in *TWW* is that of working for the collective good (which is affirmed by the show's implied author) vs. working for personal gain or to realize selfish ambitions. In all his official decisions, Bartlet chooses the course of action that will produce the greatest good for the American people rather than for himself. The character of vice-president Hoynes is often presented as a contrast to Bartlet. Hoynes' actions often seem to be guided by a desire to increase his viability as a contender when his turn comes to run for president, rather than from any consideration of what is best for the American public.

Another major theme in *TWW* is the idea that *America is the greatest nation*. Frequently, comparisons are made between ours and a foreign nation, and America invariable shines by the comparison. Other countries are shown to be inexplicably aggressive, appallingly dictatorial, or simply petty and ridiculous. When Syria commits an unprovoked act of aggression against the United States by shooting down an American plane, Bartlet, though furious, ultimately decides that retaliating, but limiting the retaliatory attacks to military targets who likely expect the attacks, is a "proportional, reasonable, responsible, and merciful" response. This display of American magnanimity justifies our claim to the right to oversee the affairs of other nations.

The most prominent theme that can be discerned in *HOC* is, of course, that *most politicians are cold, calculating and corrupt individuals*, and if they aren't, they will eventually be destroyed by someone who is. When Francis is accused by another character of lying, his response is simply that it is "politics," suggesting that lying is part of the job. The few characters on the show who are politicians yet are not explicitly portrayed as immoral are shown to be particularly vulnerable to unscrupulous men like Francis. He shows no mercy or remorse over destroying the careers of other politicians, such as Michael Kern and Donald Blythe, though those men have done nothing to provoke his ill will. The underlying suggestion is that Washington is no place for principled individuals, who will not last long in it.

Another dominant theme that emerges from *HOC* is the idea that *our country is run by the powerful and/or the rich*. Democracy, according to the implied author of this text, is just a veneer for the system we really have—an oligarchy. The storyworld of *HOC* is ruled by people like Francis, who is politically powerful, or by people like Remy Danton and the SanCorp CEOs he works for. These elite few at the top of the social pyramid do not care what the powerless people at the bottom have to say. A significant scene in the second episode involves Francis discovering that a crazed civilian was trying to enter the Capitol Building. The man was screaming and tearing off his clothing because he was denied entrance. When Francis hears about the incident, he approaches the man and tells him, "Nobody can hear you. Nobody cares about you. Nothing will come of this." The mentally-ill man represents the regular people of America, who try to make their opinions count, but possess neither the money nor the political muscle to amplify their weak voices. A third theme in *HOC* is that *the needs of the individual trump the needs of the group*. Francis puts his own ambitions above anything else, above even the wishes and desires of his wife.

Narrative Structure

A comparison of the narrative structure of the two shows revealed a surprising fact. One episode was selected from *TWW* and one from *HOC*. The episode selected from the former, "Mandatory Minimums," was chosen because it contained several of the themes and tropes for which the show is known. Because this episode was the third to the last episode in the series' first season, one of the final episodes from *HOC'* first season was also selected. The comparison revealed that *TWW* had a total of six storylines, while in the *HOC*, the number of plots was three. Somewhat surprising given these numbers, the number of scenes in the *HOC* episode was actually higher (32 versus *TWW's* 27).

The higher number of scenes in *HOC* can be attributed, first, to the greater length of the show itself (cable dramas, shown as they are without commercials, are typically 55 minutes long, compared to the approximately 40 minutes of running time for network dramas), and second, the show's use of parallel montage in the climactic moments in the fourth act. The cutting back and forth between the three storylines heightened the connections between them, as well as offered a contrast. For example, Russo's drunken fling with the hooker in the hotel room, which viewers realize by that point but the character himself does not (dramatic irony) will soon lead to his ruination, is juxtaposed with Zoe's tender moments with Lucas. While the hotel scene can only lead to catastrophe and grief, Zoe's reciprocation of the affections of an appropriate love interest promises to lead to a more hopeful future for these two characters.

Historical Context
On the one hand, American viewers are conceived of as persons that long for positive portrayals of our elected leaders that provide "a much-needed counter to the anti-Washington stereotyping and presidency-bashing that is so much a part of pre-9/11 American political culture" (Levine, 2003). This sentiment is echoed in a comment by Bill Press, cohost of CNN's *Crossfire*, as he sought to explain the popularity of Martin Sheen's fictional president: "Americans still want to love their president"(qtd. In Ezell, 2003). On the other hand, Americans have time and again demonstrated a prurient obsession with political scandals, "sensational exposés of political figures and falls from grace" (Pompper, 2003). What factors determine which tendency is ascendant at a given period, resulting in the successful reception of narratives that depict American politics in either a positive or negative light? To answer this question, we must take into consideration the historical context of the a narrative's production and consumption. Although it would be reductionist to claim that products of popular culture invariably reflect the zeitgeist of their time, one would be even more remiss to claim that no connection exists between television programming and the societal issues and concerns that form the context surrounding their production. Hence, an examination of the differential use of narrative strategies in *TWW* and *HOC* would be incomplete without a consideration of the historical context that formed the backdrop against which the two shows were created and consumed. More than a decade separates the premieres of the two shows, and significant historical events and global conditions informed the narrative choices made by the producers of *TWW* and *HOC*, as well as the reception by audiences of the resulting televisual products.

TWW has been called America's "fantasy of what we wished our government could be," while *HOC* embodies our fears over what our government has become (Sternbergh, 2014). When *TWW* debuted in September, 1999, it had been ten years since the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, which precipitated the end of the Cold War. The dissolution of the Soviet Union two years later established the United States as the world's only super-power (Quart & Auster, 2011). Still, anxieties lingered in the collective American conscious over potential foreign enemies, anxieties which were not always unfounded, given the rise in the Middle East of Islamic fundamentalism (Quart & Auster, 2011). Long before 9/11, Osama bin Laden and his fanatic followers had already provided America good reason to worry. The 1993 bombing of New York City's World Trade Center, and the 1998 bombing of two American embassies in Africa, were attributed to the work of Islamic fundamentalists (Quart & Auster, 2011). Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles (2006) noted America's increasing obsession with fictional narratives of the presidency starting in the 1990s. It was a decade in which fictional presidents would feature prominently in various popular media, including film, television, and novels, a trend which reflected the "cultural preoccupation with this institution and its place in our national culture" (Parry-Giles & Parry-Giles, p. 2). This increasingly marked focus on the presidency may be partly explained by the need to rally behind an (perhaps the most) important symbol of our nation against external forces that threaten it.

Furthermore, in 1999, when *TWW* premiered, audiences were willing to accept the plausibility of a heroic, sincere, morally upright president in the White House. After all, William Jefferson Clinton, then in his second term as president, was, despite scandals involving real estate investments and troubles involving female interns, a popular Commander-in-Chief, under whose administration the country experienced an unprecedented economic expansion (Quart & Auster, 2011). Given this context, it would perhaps not be taxing the audience's ability to suspend disbelief too much to buy the idea of a Clintonesque president without the flaws and foibles of the real Clinton. On the other hand, some scholars have argued that *TWW* was as successful as it was precisely because it presented the fantasy of an ideal president to an audience disillusioned with the one they actually had (e.g., Ezell, 2003; Finn, 2003; Sternbergh, 2014). Ezell (2003) explains that viewers disappointed with the Clinton presidency enthusiastically embraced *TWW* because "Bartlet and his cadre of loyal, idealistic aides seemed the perfect antidote for a nation weary of human frailty in its ultimate leader" (p. 160).

In addition to a general anxiety over external threats to the United States, and the Clinton administration, a third factor may have contributed to why *TWW* aired when it did, and why it was then met with such devoted viewership. The years leading up to *TWW*'s premiere witnessed "the quickening pace of financial and business globalization," (Quart & Auster, p. 165) as America exported its McDonalds and Nikes all over the world, and American corporations took over foreign companies through several highly publicized mergers (Quart & Auster, 2011). The passing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) by President Clinton in 1993 further facilitated the exploitation of economic opportunities in Mexican and Canadian markets by American companies. Contemporary globalization, which more often than not benefits American businesses, has its critics among many foreign markets. American advocates for global free trade pressure other nations to make their markets available for American imports, while striving to protect our own manufacturers from foreign competition (Crothers, 2013). The unchecked mass exportation of American popular culture products have similarly led to pessimism among some foreign nations (particularly Canada and France), who list cultural corruption, cultural imperialism, and cultural homogenization as potential negative effects from the global domination by American popular culture (Crothers, 2013).

Thus, amid an environment characterized by criticism from foreign entities resentful of contemporary globalization, and uncertainty in its own citizens regarding the same phenomenon, the idealized vision of America in the form of its noble government is a welcome anodyne. As a popular American TV show that like many other hit American television series is broadcast in several other countries, *TWW* presents "the best parts of American civic culture" and spreads "its vision of American democracy in practice around the world" (Crothers, pp. 68–71). The intellectually and morally superior Bartlet and his excellent staff are certainly fitting leaders for America. However, as the text of *TWW* implies, they would serve equally well as the overseers of the entire planet. Given the United States's interventionist style, this is, in fact, a role that we appear to have tacitly presumed to take upon ourselves. Storylines on *TWW* frequently portray foreign nations as rash or belligerent entities in need of America's wise and peace-promoting guidance. For example, in a storyline that spans two episodes in the first season of *TWW* ("Lord John Marbury," "He Shall from Time to Time…"), 300,000 Indian troops suddenly decide they had had enough of Pakistani "thuggery" and march into Pakistani-held territory with the intention of starting a war. Bartlet and his team are understandably alarmed, since, as

Communications director Toby Ziegler puts it, a war between those two nations, even if it starts with conventional weapons, "will not end with conventional weapons." To prevent two such aggressive and irresponsible countries from using nuclear weapons and possibly destroying not only each other but the rest of the planet into the bargain, Bartlet and his people enlist the help of British diplomat Lord John Marbury. After careful investigation into the nuances of the situation, Marbury finally concludes that, in order to avert the unthinkable, the United States should approach India and… "buy them off." The suggestion that India can be dissuaded from their purpose with nothing more than a check adds to the list of the country's shortcomings: not only are the Indians reckless and combative, they are mercenary as well, willing to abandon their convictions at the first mention of money. Such narratives promote the idea of American superiority and work to legitimize American domination in terms of, among other things, a dominant share of the global free market.

As the above discussion illustrates, *TWW* was a show that aired serendipitously during a political moment that was highly conducive to its successful reception. As Parry-Giles and Parry Giles (2006) suggest, *TWW* offered a "cathartic rhetoric in a post-cold war global environment that simultaneously embraces the presidential and national faults yet instills a renewed and nostaligic patriotism lost in the aftermath of Vietnam, Watergate, Iran-Contra, the Clinton impeachment, and the 2000 presidential election" (p. 136).

If the show were to debut today, would it enjoy the same ratings success? Sternbergh (2014) does not think it would, claiming that the idealized fictional president would have no appeal for audiences in our "post-the-Obama-many-hoped-they'd-elected, post-hope political landscape." On the other hand, the current moment is ripe for a culmination of the antihero trend that has distinguished quality television shows since *The Sopranos*, a trend that saw producers creating "a gamut of criminals whose offenses would come to include everything from adultery and polygamy to vampirism and serial murder" (Martin, 2013) and audiences nevertheless tuning in to watch these characters' exploits. Although the success of the original BBC series in the United Kingdom must have contributed to the confidence of the producers of *HOC* that the formula would work here in the United States as well, the character of Francis Underwood would likely not be so irredeemably iniquitous without precedents like Tony Soprano and Walter White.

Conclusion

One insight that was revealed from this examination of the narrative strategies used in both *The West Wing* and *House of Cards* was that several of the themes extracted from each show were antithetical to themes in the other. These themes and other narrative elements that emerged from the analysis of the two shows represent the persuasive objectives of the shows' creators on one level: to disseminate a certain view of our nation's political leaders. On the other hand, one basic motivating force behind the narrative decisions made was found to be essentially the same: Both *TWW* and *HOC* used narrative devices in ways that maximized their potential to appeal to mass audiences. The objectives on this more fundamental, economic level were the same for both *TWW* and *HOC*: to persuade viewers to watch, and continue watching, the show. Insights gleaned from studying how particular narrative strategies are used on *HOC* hold implications for future producers of shows featuring morally exceptionable characters.

As a final note, it should be acknowleged that the contrasts between *TWW* and *HOC* are also explained in part by the differential American and British tendencies regarding political television fiction. As *HOC* is based upon an earlier British series (although it deviates from the British version significantly in characters and plotlines), certain aspects of the show reflect British political television conventions. Meanwhile, *TWW* can also be said to follow an established American tradition, i.e., it can be described as a "Capraesque" political fiction. Zoonen and Wring (2012) point out that characters and narratives on British political television shows tend to "present a rather gloomy understanding of how politics works and what individuals can achieve" (van Zoonen & Wring, p. 275), while American political television is by contrast more optimistic about the ability of committed individuals to overcome obstacles to effective and ethical government and prevail. That *HOC* is currently so popular with an American audience, however, suggests that our expectations for political fiction has undergone a transformation. Can it be that our erstwhile "Hoping for Change"collective mentality has truly declined into one that has resigned itself to "No Hope for Change"? Has it shifted from a collective faith in "Yes We Can" to "Yes, We Can… Give Up"?

References

Abbott, H. P. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to narrative* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Aiello, G., & Dickinson, G. (2014). Beyond authenticity: A visual-material analysis of locality in the global redesign of Starbucks stores. *Visual Communication , 13* (3), 303–321.

Althusser, L. (2001). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In V. B. Leitch, W. E. Cain, L. A. Finke, B. E. Johnson, J. McGowan, & J. J. Williams (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (pp. 1483–1509). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies.* New York: Noonday Press.

Bayer, P. (1992). *Art Deco architecture: Design, decoration and detail from the Twenties and Thirties.* London, UK: Thames & Hudson Ltd.

Betsky, A. (1994). James Gamble Rogers and the pragmatics of architectural representation. In W. J. Lillyman, M. F. Moriarty, & D. J. Neuman (Eds.), *Critical architecture and contemporary culture* (pp. 64–86). New York: Oxford University Press.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (1996). Toward a theory of visual argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy , 33* (1), 1–10.

Bordwell, D. (2004). Neo-structuralist narratology and the functions of filmic storytelling. In M.-L. Ryan (Ed.), *Narrative across media: The languages of storytelling* (pp. 203–219). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Browne, N. (1984). The political economy of the television (super) text. *Quarterly Review of Film Studies , 9* (3), 585–599.

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chatman, S. (1980). *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film.* New York: Cornell University Press.

City of Dreams/River of History, 1996. (n.d.). Retrieved March 25, 2015, from Metro web site: http://www.metro.net/about/art/artworks/city-dreamsriver-history/

Crothers, L. (2013). *Globalization & American popular culture* (3rd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Dickinson, G. (1997). Memories for sale: Nostalgia and the construction of identity in Old Pasadena. *Quarterly Journal of Speech , 83* (1), 1–27.

Dickinson, G., Ott, B. L., & Aoki, E. (2009). Memory and myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum. In S. K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practive* (4th ed., pp. 225–245). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Eco, U. (1997). Function and sign: The semiotics of architecture. In N. Leach (Ed.), *Rethinking architecture: A reader in cultural theory* (pp. 182–202). New York: Routledge.

Ezell, P. (2003). The sincere Sorkin White House, or, the importance of seeming earnest. In P. C. Rollins, & J. E. O'Connor (Eds.), *The West Wing: The American presidency as television drama* (pp. 159–174). New York, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Finn, P. (2003). The West Wing's textual president: American constitutional stability and the new public intellectual in the age of information. In P. C. Rollins, & J. E. O'Connor (Eds.), *The West Wing: The American presidency as television drama* (pp. 101–124). New York, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Fiske, J. (1993). *Power plays, power works.* London: Verso.

Fiske, J. (1989). *Reading the popular.* Cambridge, MA: Unwin Hyman, Inc.

Foss, S. K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice* (4th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Frank, T. (2013, November 25). America's least-favorite city has become television's favorite subject. *The New Republic* .

Gans-Boriskin, R., & Tisinger, R. (2005). The Bushlet administration: Terrorism and war on The West Wing. *The Journal of American Culture , 28* (1), 100–113.

Gebhard, D. (1967). The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California (1895–1930). *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians , 26* (2), 131–147.

Hattenhauer, D. (1984). The rhetoric of architecture: A semiotic approach. *Communication Quarterly , 32* (1), 71–77.

Hawthorne, C. (2014, September 26). Metro's Union Station master plan a significant shift. *Los Angeles Times* .

Hebdige, D. (2012). From culture to hegemony. In M. G. Durham, & D. M. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks* (2nd ed., p. 124). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Horton, D., & Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry , 19*, 215–229.

How did your favorite show rate? (2002, May 28). Retrieved December 7, 2014, from USA Today: http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/television/2002/2002-05-28-year-end-chart.htm

Janson, H. W., & Janson, A. F. (1995). *History of art* (5th ed., Vol. II). New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams Inc.

Jencks, C. (1980). The architectural sign. In G. Broadbent, R. Bunt, & C. Jencks (Eds.), *Signs, symbols, and architecture* (pp. 71–118). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Jiang Qing. (2014). Retrieved March 15, 2014, from Encyclopaedia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Online Academic Edition: http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/303751/Jiang-Qing

Jones, J. P. (2010). *Entertaining politics: Satiric television and political engagement* (2nd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Kanengieter, M. R. (1990, August). *Message formation from architecture: A rhetorical analysis.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No.9111148).

Koenig, G. (2000). *Iconic LA: Stories of LA's most memorable buildings.* Glendale, CA: Balcony Press.

Kozloff, S. (1992). Narrative theory and television. In R. C. Allen (Ed.), *Channels of discourse, reassembled* (pp. 67–100). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

LaWare, M. R. (1998). Encountering visions of Aztlan: Arguments for ethnic pride, community activism and cultural revitalization in Chicano murals. *Argumentation and Advocacy , 34* (3), 140–153.

Levine, M. A. (2003). The West Wing (NBC) and the West Wing (D.C.): Myth and reality in television's portrayal of the White House. In P. C. Rollins, & J. E. O'Connor (Eds.), *The West Wing: The American presidency as television drama* (pp. 42–62). New York, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Levy, M. R. (1979). Watching T.V. news as parasocial interaction. *Journal of Broadcasting , 23*, 69–79.

Makus, A. (1990). Stuart Hall's theory of ideology: A frame for rhetorical criticism. *Western Journal of Speech Communication , 54*, 495–514.

Martin, B. (2013). *Difficult men: Behind the scenes of a creative revolution: From The Sopranos and The Wire to Mad Men and Breaking Bad.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2001). Capital: A critique of political economy, Volume I. In V. B. Leitch, W. E. Cain , L. A. Finke, B. E. Johnson, J. McGowan, & J. J. Williams (Eds.), *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism* (pp. 776–786). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

McMurtrie, R. J. (2012). Feeling space dynamically: Variable interpersonal meanings in high-rise apartment complexes. *Visual Communication , 11* (4), 511–534.

Mittell, J. (2006). Narrative complexity in contemporary American television. *The Velvet Light Trap* (58), 29–40.

Musicant, M. (2014). *Los Angeles Union Station.* (M. Musicant, Ed.) Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Olson, L. C., Finnegan, C. A., & Hope, D. S. (2008). Visual rhetoric in communication: Continuing questions and contemporary issues. In L. C. Olson, C. A. Finnegan, & D. S. Hope (Eds.), *Visual rhetoric: A reader in communication and American culture* (pp. 1–14). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Paletz, D. L., & Entman , R. M. (1981). *Media power politics.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Parry-Giles, T., & Parry-Giles, S. J. (2006). *The prime-time presidency: The West Wing and U.S. Nationalism.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Podhoretz, J. (2003). The liberal imagination. In P. C. Rollins, & J. E. O'Connor (Eds.), *The West Wing: The American presidency as television drama* (pp. 222–231). New York, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Pompper, D. (2003). The West Wing: White House narratives that journalism cannot tell. In P. C. Rollins, & J. E. O'Connor (Eds.), *The West Wing: The American presidency as television drama* (pp. 17–31). New York, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Porter, M. J., Larson, D. L., Harthcock, A., & Nellis, K. B. (2002). Redefining Narrative Events: Examining televsion narrative structure. *Journal of Popular Film & Television* , 23–30.

Quart, L., & Auster, A. (2011). *American film and society since 1945* (4th ed.). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Raney, A. A. (2004). Expanding disposition theory: Reconsidering character liking, moral evaluations, and enjoyment. *Communication Theory , 14* (4), 348–369.

Rosner, H. (2014, July 18). *Los Angeles River: From concrete ditch to urban oasis*. Retrieved from National Geographic: http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/07/140719-los-angeles-river-restoration-kayaking-greenway/

Rowland, R. (2009). The narrative perspective. In J. A. Kuypers (Ed.), *Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action* (pp. 117–142). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Ryan, M., & Lenos, M. (2012). *An introduction to film analysis: Technique and meaning in narrative film.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Sklair, L. (2010). Iconic architecture and the culture-ideology of consumerism. *Theory, Culture & Society , 27* (5), 135–159.

Sloan, T. O., Gregg, R. B., Nilsen, T. R., Rein, I. J., Simons, H. W., Stelzner, H. G., et al. (1971). Report of the Committee of the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism. In L. F. Bitzer, & E. Black (Eds.), *The prospect of rhetoric: Report of the National Development Project* (pp. 220–227). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, A. N. (2011). TV or not TV? The Sopranos and contemporary episode architecture in US network and premium cable drama. *Critical Studies in Television: The International Journal of Television Studies , 6* (1), 36–51.

Sonksen, M. (2014, February 7). *Richard Wyatt: Artist for Los Angeles.* Retrieved from KCET web site: http://www.kcet.org/socal/departures/columns/la-letters/richard-wyatt-artist-for-los-angeles.html

Sorkin, A. (Director). (1999). *The west wing* [Motion Picture].

Sternbergh, A. (2014, January 31). *The post-hope politics of "House of Cards".* Retrieved July 21, 2015, from The New York Times Magazine web site: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/02/magazine/the-post-hope-politics-of-house-of-cards.html?_r=0

Thompson, R. J. (1996). *Television's second golden age.* New York: Syracuse University Press.

vanZoonen, L., & Wring, D. (2012). Trends in political television fiction in the UK: Themes, characters and narratives, 1965–2009. *Media, Culture & Society ,* 263–279.

Zeller, H. (2013, April 22). *"Dreaming" in full color.* Retrieved from The Source: http://thesource.metro.net/2013/04/22/dreaming-in-full-color/

Zillmann, D. (2000). Basal morality in drama appreciation. In I. Bondebjerg (Ed.), *Moving images, culture, and the mind* (pp. 53–63). Luton, UK: University of Luton Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS AND EDITORS

Michelle Cornelius graduated with an M.A. degree in Communication Studies from California State University, Los Angeles in June 2015. Her thesis examined how various media outlets framed the leaking of classified information by Edward Snowden. She has been accepted into the Ph.D. program in Political Science at USC, where she plans to specialize in political communication.

Alice J. Marianne Fritz recently received her M.A. degree in Communication Studies from California State University, Los Angeles. She is very glad that her years in the program have exposed her to such exciting fields within Communication Studies as rhetoric, cultural studies, and media studies. She is even more grateful to have met the wonderful CSULA professors who introduced those subjects to her. Her latest research project examines the parasocial relationships some viewers experience with fictional TV characters, and the potential social consequences of such relationships.

Greg Langner is a candidate for the M.A. program in Communication Studies at California State University, Los Angeles, where he earned his B.A. degree in Theatre Arts and Dance. While teaching for the Department of Communication Studies, he serves as the Associate Artistic Director of the nearby Mosaic Lizard Theater, where he directs and produces professionally. His scholarship centers on the intersections of Performance, Queer Identity, and Cartoon Animation.

Moya Márquez is a senior undergraduate student in the Honors College at California State University, Los Angeles, majoring in Communication Studies with an emphasis on Organizational Communication and Public Relations. He has previously worked for several nonprofit organizations, including Plaza de la Raza (through the Getty Multicultural Undergraduate Internship program) and Mixed Roots Stories. Upon graduation, he hopes to continue working in the nonprofit industry.

Julie Matos is a second-year M.A. student and Graduate Teaching Associate in the Communication Studies Department at California State University, Los Angeles. Julie graduated Summa Cum Laude from CSULA in 2014, earning her B.A. degree in Communication Studies with an emphasis in interpersonal communication. Her areas of research interest lie in gender and performance studies as well as feminism. Upon graduation, she hopes to continue with her

passion for teaching communication studies, and some day, pursue a Ph.D. degree.

Oscar Alfonso Mejia is a second-year student in the M.A. program in Communication Studies at California State University, Los Angeles. He is a hard working, first generational son of a laborer/immigrant man that once lived in a hut and started working at the age of ten to support his family after the death of his father. He holds his family close to his heart's aspirations. Growing up, he gained access to a computer, which was the gate that opened every door for his family's future as well as his own.

Phindi Mthimunye is a second-year graduate student in the Communication Studies M.A. program at California State University, Los Angeles. She received her B.A. degree in Communication and Media Studies from Fordham University, and has a deep interest in Cultural Theory and Performance Studies. Upon completion of her M.A. degree, she plans to pursue a career in critical writing and community-based higher education.

Shawn O'Rourke is an Associate Professor and the Co-Director of Forensics in the Speech Department at Saddleback College. His has a B.A. degree and an M.A. degree in History and has returned to graduate school at CSULA to complete a second M.A. in Communication Studies. A scholar of comic book history, he has had numerous articles and reviews published for the online magazine, *Popmatters*, and has presented multiple papers at a variety of academic conferences, including the Comics Art Conference, Phi Alpha Theta, and the Florida Conference of Historians. His essay on comic book historiography was recently included in the anthology, *Ages of Heroes, Eras of Men: Superheroes and the American Experience,* published by Cambridge Scholars.

Call for Submissions

Colloquy solicits manuscripts related to a variety of scholarship conducted in the Department of Communication Studies as well as representing different types and levels of academic thought. The journal invites submissions using any appropriate methodology for the question being investigated. Articles should focus primarily on issues related to communication studies.

Manuscripts submitted to *Colloquy* should subscribe to the National Communication Association (NCA) guidelines for publication. These guidelines request that the authors use inclusive and non-defamatory language. In addition, submissions should meet the following standards for publication:

(1) The manuscript is original work and proper publication credit is accorded to all authors;

(2) All legal, institutional, and professional obligations for obtaining informed consent from research participants and for limiting their risk are honored;

(3) The scholarship reported is authentic.

Submitted manuscripts should conform to the most recent edition of the *Style Manual of the American Psychological Association* or the *Modern Language Association Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing*. Article manuscripts should generally not exceed twenty double-spaced pages. The submission may be an excerpt of a longer work, but it should stand alone.

Papers submitted for consideration of inclusion in *Colloquy* will be reviewed following a blinded peer review protocol. All submissions should be accompanied by a cover letter that includes a 75-word biographical statement for the author(s) and full contact information including an email address.

Manuscript submissions should be sent to:

D. Robert DeChaine
Supervising Editor, *Colloquy*
Department of Communication Studies
California State University, Los Angeles
5151 University Drive
Los Angeles, California 90032-8111
ddechai@calstatela.edu