



©iStockphoto.com/pixelfit

2

RHETORIC AND POPULAR CULTURE

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 Understand and articulate what is meant by the rhetoric of everyday life
- 2.2 Define the term sign, and how it can be a building block of culture
- 2.3 Define the term artifact, and how it can be a building block of culture
- 2.4 Explain different definitions and understandings of culture
- 2.5 Identify the three important characteristics of culture
- 2.6 Identify and explain the four characteristics of texts of popular culture
- 2.7 Describe how power is managed today in texts of popular culture

Now we turn to the second important set of concepts in this book. Following our introduction to rhetoric, let's learn about what we mean when we say popular culture and thus the rhetoric of popular culture. In comparison to traditional rhetoric, when we think about how rhetoric works in popular culture, we are concerned with the rhetoric of everyday life. How can we understand the persuasive influences that are all around us? In this chapter, we will examine the rhetorical dimension of those everyday objects, actions, and events to which we are constantly exposed. We will also see in Chapter 2 what it means to refer to these everyday objects, actions, and events as popular culture. We will learn that many, even most, of the ways in which we are influenced through signs can be observed on this everyday, minute-by-minute level of popular culture. As we go through life experiencing and enjoying music, clothing, architecture, food, and so forth, we are also participating in rhetorical struggles over what kind of society we will live in and what sort of people we will be. This book will empower you to see those struggles as well, so that you will be able to find the rhetoric in songs by Ricky Lee, the motivations on Twitter, and the arguments in RVs.

THE RHETORIC OF EVERYDAY LIFE

To begin seeing everyday experience as alive with persuasive influences, let us begin by considering power. Power is the ability to control events and meanings. We are used to thinking that certain people, groups, or classes of people have power and that others do not. We say that the Bush and Clinton families, Bill Gates, Barack Obama, Joe Biden, and so forth all have power. Perhaps you have worked in offices or on committees with individuals whom you could clearly identify as powerful. Perhaps there have been other individuals whom you thought were relatively lacking in power. Certainly, we might all agree that, compared with adults, children are relatively powerless for several reasons. But did you ever stop to wonder specifically when and where all this empowerment and disempowerment come about?

Many people believe that, compared to men, women in some fields are relatively disempowered in some societies: women sometimes earn lower salaries for the same jobs; fewer women

have high-ranking jobs and positions of prestige (e.g., US presidents or senators); there are not as many female judges, physicians, police officers, college professors, and so forth. How does this relative empowerment of men and disempowerment of women occur? It is almost as if young males were all taken aside at a certain age and initiated into certain mysteries of dominance; it would seem as if all the men working at certain companies met in secret once a month to plan dastardly deeds of disempowerment against women. But this management of power does not really happen during isolated moments of conspiracy. Instead, the relative disempowerment of women and empowerment of men at the workplace occurs from moment to moment during everyday experiences—in short, in popular culture. For example:

- In fashion, where women often have available to them largely uncomfortable shoes and clothing designed to accentuate their bodies rather than to create ease of movement and repose.
- Around the office coffee pot, where the preferred topics of conversation among men are often things like sports or sexual innuendo (and when the boss is a male sports nut, guess which sort of knowledge revealed in conversation is more empowering when it comes to impressing superiors?).
- In social expectations, as when a male who leaves work early to pick up a sick child at school is considered responsible and sensitive, whereas a woman who does the same thing is often perceived as compromising her professional “commitment” to her career.

Of course, many women do not take these moments of disempowerment quietly. Women devise strategies of resistance, refusing the disempowerment that everyday experience often offers to them and seeking alternative means of empowerment. These actions have paid off on a societal level, and there is greater equality among men and women now than ever before. Similarly, we might consider ways in which some groups defined by race, sexual identity, class, and so forth are empowered in different ways, and often through the same everyday means of popular culture’s influence. How this progress has occurred may also be studied in terms of popular, everyday sites. Everyday actions, objects, and experiences are really battlefields, sites of struggle among political and social forces. We will talk more about that struggle later in this book. Many kinds of social and political influence—empowerment and disempowerment—happen in the same way: from one moment to the next, in everyday experiences. A quick exercise will emphasize this point.

EXERCISE 2.1

This exercise is designed to help you see how some commonly held, even fundamental, notions are born and maintained in your everyday experiences. Pick, from among the following statements, the one that you agree with most strongly:

- American workers are suffering from unfair foreign outsourcing.
- In this country, urban problems are mainly economic problems.

- It is important to look nice and to smell nice.
- Pornography is a serious problem on the Internet.
- The United States is threatened by terrorists.
- Most politicians are dishonest, self-serving, or incompetent.

Now, do some thinking and reflecting on this question: Specifically when and where did you come to have that belief? Another way to ask this question would be, can you remember specific experiences that influenced you to hold that belief? To help you in your thinking, you might want to write down some specific experiences that fall under these categories:

- a. Television commercials
- b. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.)
- c. Movies
- d. Faith communities
- e. Popular music
- f. Television news
- g. Television drama or comedy
- h. Teachers
- i. Talking with friends
- j. Family discussions
- k. Internet sites
- l. Other

The earlier statements are widely held ideas; they are a sort of “party line” for many people living in the United States today. They seem for many of us to be “common sense”—statements that “grease the wheels” of everyday social interaction, allowing it to function smoothly. Perhaps not coincidentally, these statements are also what most people who are in positions of authority or established power would want the public to believe. That is because in general, these statements maintain present arrangements of power and privilege. If it is important to smell nice, then consumers will run out and buy lots of deodorant, perfumed soap, and so on that will keep the manufacturers of such products wealthy and powerful. If we are afraid of terrorists, we will tend to stick with political leaders who we believe have protected us so far. It is equally important to understand that we do not always accept what established and powerful interests want us to believe. We don’t always “go with the flow” with those beliefs that seem to be most common or easiest to hold. Which of the above statements do you disagree with? If you do disagree with any of them, do you do so with the distinct feeling that you are in a minority, or bucking the tide of public opinion, in doing so? If so, use the preceding list of commercials, articles, movies, and so forth to identify how you developed your ability to resist a popular idea or ideas. In other words, how did you learn to struggle against some widely held ideas?

There may be an opportunity for you to discuss with your class or with friends how you acquired the beliefs that you examined in the exercise above. If you are like most people, you will realize that most of what you think did not come to you in one big moment of revelation.

Instead, many of your ideas were acquired through the influence of lots of transitory, everyday experiences of the kind you listed in doing this exercise.

Power arrangements that have been around for a while and that are not often questioned may foster a sense of privilege in those who benefit from them. Although this may be changing, for centuries people of European heritage have had privilege in the United States: they have been empowered in many ways that are not often questioned. Our example of gender above reminds us that men have enjoyed privilege, and in some parts of the world they do so to an extreme extent. Paradoxically, those who benefit from privilege are usually those least aware of it, and especially least aware of how power and privilege are maintained. When our experiences in popular culture are important sources of maintaining power and privilege, being able to understand and analyze them is especially important. People who benefit from privilege need to be able to see that empowerment and its sources so they can live more ethical lives. People who are not privileged need to see precisely the sources of their lack of privilege so they may struggle against it. One remarkable fact about power in popular culture is that the empowered groups of people are often much less aware of their power than the disempowered are aware of their disempowerment. People of middle and upper economic class may not think critically about how they achieved their status through the assistance of culture, whereas people of disadvantaged groups are reminded daily of the cultural influences that keep them disadvantaged.

Consider that heterosexual people still enjoy the privilege of relative empowerment in the United States. Heterosexuals will hardly ever be denigrated or attacked for their sexual identity. Yet very few heterosexuals go around being aware of that privilege; it simply seems natural. What are the sources of this privilege? Chief among them are the messages in popular culture, such as advertisements that consistently show heterosexual rather than gay or lesbian couples or movies in which romantic storylines are far more likely to be heterosexual. These ever-present but unseen (by the privileged) voices prop up structures of power. On the other hand, popular movies and ads depicting queer people in positive ways are increasing and may be a resource in the struggle against repressive attitudes. In this book, we will come to perceive the complex network of those experiences as popular culture, and we will study ways to grasp the rhetoric embodied in popular culture. To comprehend how culture influences us, we need to develop an understanding of what popular culture is—what it is made of, and how we live in and through it.

THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF CULTURE: SIGNS

If we are going to think about the ways in which the things and events we encounter in everyday experience influence us, then we need to start by thinking about how those things and events come to have meaning. That is because influence occurs through the management of meaning. If a bigot is persuaded to treat people of all races equally, it is because the meaning of racial difference is changed for that individual. If you are influenced to vote for Senator Smith, it is because the senator (his or her ideas, positions, and so on) has taken on a positive meaning for you. Commercials are rather explicit about the link between influence and meaning; we are urged to attach meanings of glamour and mystery to a certain perfume, for example, in hopes that we will be influenced to buy the perfume.

Let's return to the idea with which we began Chapter 1, the concept of a sign (here we will follow a very sensible scheme proposed by the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce). Everything is a sign. That's because *a sign is something that induces you to think about something other than itself*—and everything has that potential.

Take the book you are holding. When you see it, you do not think only about the book itself; you think about the class in which you are enrolled, about the ideas you have been reading, about the attractive person next to you in class, about how much the book costs, and so forth. Now lift your eyes from your book and look around you. For each thing you see, other thoughts associated with that thing will arise: the cell phone on the desk will remind you of the previous one you owned, the picture on the wall will lead you to think of the shopping trip on which you bought it, and so on.

Every sight and sound, every touch, smell, and taste you experience, prompts you to think about things other than, or in addition to, itself. Therefore, everything is a sign of something else. We might also say that everything is a signifier, that everything signifies something else, or that everything has signification. And signification—or the other thing that is signified—is just another way of referring to meaning. If I say the word *professor*, and the thought of that learned individual who is teaching you pops into your head, then that thought is the meaning of the sign “professor.”

If you think about it, signification is a pretty strange fact. We hear words coming out of a friend's mouth, and ideas (meanings) start jumping into our heads; we see a cap lying on a table, and the sight makes us think of the soccer game we recently wore it to. How does it happen that when we see and hear things, ideas that are not the things themselves pop into our heads? Things act as signs in one or a combination of the three following ways:

1. Indexically (from the word *index*, referring to indexical meaning)
2. Iconically (from the word *icon*, referring to iconic meaning)
3. Symbolically (from the word *symbol*, referring to symbolic meaning)

Indexical Meaning

First, some things get you to think about something else because the “thing” (sign) and the “something else” (meaning) are linked by way of cause or association. One thing is always or often found with another thing, and so one gets you to think of the other. This kind of meaning is indexical; we say that the sign is an index, or that it is functioning indexically. Smoke is an index of fire; if you see smoke, it causes you to think of fire because you know that one thing is associated with (caused by, in this case) the other. A thermometer is a sign with indexical meaning; a rise in the mercury in the column means a rise in the surrounding environment's temperature. Why? Because the one thing is always associated with the other; in this case, too, the association is causal.

Every character on the miniseries *Underground* is an index of every other character because the members of that complex community are associated with (though in this case, not caused

by) each other. Some characters are more strongly indexical of certain other characters, however; the Macon 7, or Pearly Mae and Moses, are more central than characters such as William Still and Lou, so they may make you think of each other but also of Still and Lou. The same set of indexical meanings is true of other shows with groups of closely connected characters, such as the different franchises of *CSI* or *Law and Order*, or different iterations of *The Walking Dead*.

Everyone has played the word-association game in which players are supposed to say which words come into their minds upon hearing a cue word. That game can be an interesting indication of indexical meanings. The word *cat* might prompt someone to think *dog*, for instance. Does that mean that the meaning of cat is a dog? In part—indexically—it does. That linkage reveals the fact that one part of the meaning of cats really is their association, as proverbial enemies, with dogs.

Many indexical meanings are widely shared. Is there a person who has seen any sports news broadcast in the last few years, for example, who will not think about basketball upon seeing a picture of LeBron James or Stephen Curry? Baseball players Kazuo Matsui and Kenta Maeda are celebrated by many people but seem to be held in special esteem by those who share their Japanese heritage; they might be said to be an index of that community. Other indexical meanings are less widespread, being limited to particular groups of people, and some indexical meanings are even private. Sand may induce only veterans of our military involvement in Afghanistan to think of Afghanistan; to everyone else, sand may have the indexical meaning of a day at the beach. For your author, the smell of a cigar is an indexical sign of a grandfather who could sometimes be found with one, a more private meaning (an association) unlikely to be widely shared by others outside his particular family.

Iconic Meaning

If a sign makes you think of something else because the sign resembles that thing, then the sign has iconic meaning. We would also say that the sign is an icon or that it has meaning iconically. The clearest example of an icon is a photograph. You look at the photograph and think, “Aunt Griselda!” Why? Because the patterns of light and dark on the photographic paper resemble her. Computer operating systems such as Apple or Windows use icons to signify the choices available to the user (what resembles a talking mouth is the volume control, for instance). Impressionists such as Kate McKinnon, Kenan Thompson, and many of the actors on the television show *Saturday Night Live* (especially during the 2016–2017 and 2019–2020 political elections and ensuing administrations) make their living producing icons; the combination of an inflection of the voice, a few gestures, and a stance or way of walking prompt the audience to think “Hillary Clinton,” Rudy Giuliani, or “Donald Trump,” because those signs resemble the voice, gestures, and stances of the original people. Halloween is a great iconic holiday; little children, icons themselves, dress up to resemble Tucker Carlson, Dracula, ghosts, and other horrors. Many words are signs with iconic meaning. Say the words *boom*, *bang*, and *tinkle* out loud. Part of the meaning of those words is that they resemble (by way of sound) the events to which they refer.

As with indexical meaning, signs may vary in terms of how widely their iconic meaning is shared. Your author once wore a set of nose-and-mustache glasses into class and asked the eighteen-year-old students what those glasses meant. “Halloween parties!” they all replied,



©iStockphoto.com/pagadesign

giving an indexical meaning (nose glasses are found at, or associated with, Halloween parties). But this indexical meaning broke your author's heart. For him, nose glasses will forever mean Groucho Marx, because they resemble Groucho iconically. But alas, there arose a generation which knew not Groucho. Evidently, however, the group of people who share that iconic meaning is dwindling as poor Groucho recedes into late-night television movie land. Iconic meanings can also be private; your picture of Aunt Griselda may cause only you to think of her if nobody else knows her. For others, the iconic meaning of the photo may be something more general, such as "an elderly female," because that is what the photo resembles for them.

Symbolic Meaning

Finally, signs can get you to think about something else purely because of agreement or convention, because people are in the habit of connecting a particular sign with a particular meaning. When that happens, a sign is a symbol, has symbolic meaning, or is functioning symbolically. The clearest examples of symbols are words. Why does this mark:

Book

mean the thing that you are holding? Only because everyone who speaks English agrees that it does. People are simply in the habit of thinking of the kind of thing you are holding whenever they see that mark above, and they know that others have agreed to think the same thing. If everyone decided that this mark:

Glorpus

would mean the thing you are holding, that would work just as well. Symbolic meaning comes about purely by way of what people agree to do. In fact, in Spanish-speaking communities, everyone has agreed that the mark *libro* means what you are holding. One way to refer to that agreement is to say that symbolic meaning is conventional—a product of certain conventions, or agreed-upon rules.

Symbolic meaning is in some ways the most difficult kind of meaning to learn, because it is not natural and because symbolic meanings vary from one group to another. Smoke naturally means fire. The photograph of your aunt naturally refers to her. There is a strong, clear, and



©iStockphoto.com/Levente_Naghi

necessary connection. Smoke also means fire in Japan, Germany, and Zimbabwe. And once you learn that indexical meaning, it does not change.

But anyone who has struggled through learning a foreign language knows that, as comedian Steve Martin said of the French, “It’s like they have a different word for everything!” If you want to speak French, you must learn what certain signs mean for the French and assign the same meanings that they do to the words of their language. The rule for understanding symbolic meaning is to consult the group that is using the symbol to discover what the symbol means. For instance, in some geographically or culturally specific communities, the expression *fall out* means to faint or to pass out. A person not familiar with that usage might assume these words refer to a long drop from a window. A nuclear strategist, on the other hand, might assume that they refer to the radioactive particles produced by a nuclear explosion. And a soldier might assume they are an order to disperse.

Words are not the only things with symbolic meaning. The particular pattern of red, white, and blue stars and stripes that you know as the flag of the United States means this country, symbolically, because the US Congress has ordained it so, and people everywhere are agreed on this signification. In the US Army, the figure of a golden eagle on the shoulder strap, epaulets, or collar of a uniform means a full colonel for no other reason than that everyone in the army agrees that this is what it means; a figure of the sun, or a tiny Washington monument, would do just as well if everyone agreed to it.

We noted above that smoke has the indexical meaning of fire, but it can also have symbolic meaning. Cigarette smoke goes through cycles of meaning in which sometimes it symbolically means “coolness,” sometimes it is “low class,” sometimes it means “toughness,” and so forth. Think about the symbolic meanings given to cigarettes by recent movies and television shows you have seen. When the Roman Catholic Church is in need of a new pope, as in the latest election of Francis I, the College of Cardinals will meet in closed session to cast ballots. Those who wait outside the building for news of the election watch a certain chimney. The ballots are burned in such a way that if a new pontiff has been chosen, the smoke is white; if not, the smoke is black. In this way, too, smoke has been assigned symbolic meaning. The meaning of the colors could easily be reversed, or chemicals could be added to make other colors, as long as everyone understood which color meant which outcome.

Symbolic meaning differs from iconic or indexical meaning in that it can easily be altered. Nobody can decide that smoke does not mean fire (indexically). Nobody can decide that a picture of a horse does not cause you to think of a horse (iconically). With both indexical and iconic meaning, once you learn what a sign means, the meaning simply cannot change. You can discover iconic or indexical meaning, and you can forget it, but you cannot legislate it.

But symbolic meaning changes all the time. Sixty and more years ago, the word *gay* meant happy and carefree. Now it more commonly refers to a particular sexual orientation. Sixty years from now, it may mean something entirely different. Similarly, *queer* used to be a term of insult, and now it is widely embraced by queer people. That is the nature of symbolic meaning: You can mess with it. You can change it. And, for that reason, symbolic meaning is always slippery.

This changeable quality of symbolic signs (principally language) has sometimes been described as the constant “slippage” of the signified (meaning) under the signifier (word). That is, the sign (e.g., *gay*) holds still while the meaning, or what it signifies, slips around (from happy and carefree to homosexual and perhaps beyond). What something means is never precise, because there is never complete agreement among everybody as to what symbols mean. We will see that this “slippage” of symbolic meaning creates great possibilities for influence in popular culture.

Complexity of the Three Kinds of Meaning

We learned earlier that signs have meaning in one or more of these three ways: indexically, iconically, and symbolically. You may have noticed that we have already demonstrated how words can carry two kinds of meaning: all words are symbolic, and some words are indexical (as seen in the example of the word *smoke*). The point is worth stressing: Most signs do mean in more than one way; in fact, most signs have very rich meanings. Sometimes those meanings are widely shared, sometimes they are shared by a few groups, and sometimes they are very personal. But it is a mistake to ask what single thing a sign means, or in which of the three ways it has meaning, because signs are typically very complex in their meaning.

Pull out a dollar bill (if you have one after buying this book). This is a sign that has meaning in all three ways. You will see icons on it: some markings that resemble George Washington, other markings that look like a pyramid. You will find indexical meaning: you might think of shopping, of your wallet, or of your next payday, because all those things are associated with the dollar bill. You will certainly find symbolic meanings: the bald eagle clutching arrows and an olive branch in its talons means the United States by convention; moreover, the fact that this piece of paper is worth anything at all is purely conventional and by way of agreement. Congress could pass a law tomorrow saying that pocket handkerchiefs will be the unit of economic trade. If that were to happen and if everyone agreed to it, then you could blow your nose on dollar bills but slave away at your job for handkerchiefs. The fact that a dollar bill can be exchanged for a small candy bar or (at this writing) a third of a gallon of gasoline is only a matter of agreement and, therefore, symbolic meaning.

THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF CULTURE: ARTIFACTS

In this book, we will be concerned with all signs that make up messages. In this section, though, we are going to focus on a subset of particularly powerful signs known as cultural artifacts. An artifact is

1. an action, event, or object perceived as a unified whole,
2. having widely shared meanings, and
3. manifesting group identifications to us.

EXERCISE 2.2

Here is an exercise to help you appreciate how complicated the meanings of signs are. Review the signs listed below and identify whether each has indexical, iconic, or symbolic meaning. Also, determine whether those meanings are shared widely, by smaller groups, or are relatively private for you or perhaps your family.

Sign	Indexical Meanings (How widely shared?)	Iconic Meanings (How widely shared?)	Symbolic Meanings (How widely shared?)
Guitarist Jack White			
Rolex watch			
Diamond ring			
A tattoo			
Statue of Liberty			
Nike shoes			
Star of David			
Willie Nelson			

Now, work through some examples that you or your classmates or teacher can suggest. Whenever possible, try to find at least one meaning per category.

Everything in your experience—every object, action, or event—is a sign. But that statement, although correct and important, is so broad that it does not go far enough to help us to understand how the things we experience in everyday life influence us. So we must go on to consider even more specific ways in which signs have meaning.

This definition of an artifact is meant to be rather wide; nevertheless, not everything is an artifact. Let's look more closely at that definition. It will take us a little while to go through it carefully and unpack its meaning.

An Action, Event, or Object Perceived as a Unified Whole

You may have heard the word *artifact* associated with an actual object, something you could hold in your hand. An archaeologist who digs up a pot might claim to have found an artifact of Minoan culture, for instance. That idea of an artifact as something that represents a culture will become important when we discuss the third clause of the definition (“manifesting group identifications to us”) later. But in this first clause of the definition, notice that by *artifact*, we

mean not only a material object that is tangible but also an event or action that is perceived as a unified whole; in this sense, events and actions occurring in the material world are also material. Nike shoes are artifacts and they are concrete, physical objects. But slam dunks, stealing second base, the latest popular song, and the Fourth of July are also artifacts.

It is also important to notice that the artifact must be some action, event, or object that is perceived as a unified whole. In other words, perceptions of a whole “thing” or “happening” that has some identity or character in itself make an artifact. The bottom stripe on the United States flag is not an artifact because, although you can perceive it all by itself if you make the effort, it is not usually seen as a thing in itself with its own separate meaning. Neither is the field of stars in the flag’s upper left-hand corner perceived as a unified whole. Rather, the whole flag is perceived as a unit, and that makes the flag itself an artifact.

This first clause in the definition of an artifact is based on an old, but still controversial, idea that the reality in which humans live and move is one that is fundamentally socially created. The idea here is that people live in a world of perceptions. For instance, the French have more words for different kinds of bread and pastries than do most Americans. Bread is more important to them, and they appreciate subtle differences in the size and texture of loaves. That means that they perceive differences in bread that Americans might not (“It’s all baguettes to me!”). That does not mean that we cannot learn to see all those distinctions ourselves (in fact, American tourists must learn to recognize more kinds of bread so that they can order lunch more accurately). On the other hand, people living in the United States today have many different words for vehicles: Teslas, Fords, Chevys, 4 by 4s, pickups, SUVs, RVs, Jaguars, and on and on. People in a part of the world that does not have so many vehicles may not need to perceive so many different kinds and so may think of all vehicles as being pretty much the same thing.

We see certain things and not others because of the social contexts that we grew up in; the people around us have called our attention to certain things but not others. People organize the world in ways that fit the physical and social environment they are in. That means that perceptions are adaptive mechanisms to help us adjust to the situations in which we live. If you live next door to a snarling Doberman Pinscher, your perception of the dog as dangerous is an adaptive mechanism that causes you to avoid the animal and thus live another day.

Furthermore, groups of people that live and work together try to adapt to their shared situations; thus, perceptions are also socially grounded. And so we grow up organizing the world, perceiving the world, in the ways that our social context encourages us to. For example, an important part of most Americans’ situations is the need to recognize different kinds of vehicles. In addition, most Americans have the same, shared need to adapt to an environment in which vehicles are prominent. Football fans can see a bunch of people running around on a field and identify all kinds of things going on: an option play, the pass rush, and so forth. These fans have a recreational need to perceive lots of different plays, and they talk about the plays among themselves, encouraging each other to perceive the plays similarly. People who are not fans do not perceive the world of a football game in the same way because they do not need or want to; for them, a football game may look like just a bunch of people running around on a field.

... Having Widely Shared Meanings

To become an artifact, a sign must be more than just a perceived, unified whole. The second clause of the definition tells us that an artifact is a sign that has become charged with widely shared meaning, just like a battery that has been charged with energy.

Take the expression “Not that there’s anything wrong with that!” That expression has an ordinary, straightforward meaning. It says that there is nothing wrong with “that,” whatever “that” may be. But in the mid-1990s, it was an expression used on a popular episode of the *Seinfeld* television show in which the male characters were trying to put down rumors that they were gay. They were not, in the story, actually gay and did not wish to be perceived as such, but every denial was followed by the expression “Not that there’s anything wrong with that!” It was delivered in such a way, with a sweeping gesture of the arms, as if to imply that they were leaning over backward to express liberal, tolerant sensitivities on an issue with which some might indeed still find “something wrong.” Soon the expression was picked up and used as a follow-up to all kinds of similar denials. To “work,” it depends on people understanding the humorous, ironic intent of the expression. It is remarkable the extent to which this expression, delivered in just the right way, still carries these ironic meanings decades after the fact. People will know how to read such a declaration, given with the right intonation and gesture, even if they have never seen *Seinfeld*. It is now part of the culture.

What happened was that those words, a simple English expression, became charged with widely shared, additional meanings. They meant something beyond the ordinary meaning derived from just combining those words. The phrase “Not that there’s anything wrong with that!” has a definite symbolic meaning stemming from the conventions of the English language. But it picked up complicated indexical meanings when it became associated with a cute television episode, eccentric and classic television characters, and an ongoing social issue.

In another example, Kanye West has always meant something to his friends and family, just as you do. But you are not a cultural artifact because you are not charged with the extra meanings that West has picked up as a popular music star, tabloid fodder, political player, and notable rapper. So one necessary condition for an ordinary sign becoming an artifact is that it becomes charged with more meanings than it had before and with more meanings that are widely shared.

Now, it is possible that the “Not that there’s anything wrong with that!” example reads like ancient history to some of you. That’s because this expression has by now lost some of its status as cultural artifact. As *Seinfeld* fades into syndication obscurity and fans move on to other, newer shows, the impact of that particular phrase (with its accompanying expression and gesture) will at some point fade. Eventually the phrase will not have that unity as a whole and particular thing, nor the widely shared meanings, that once made it a cultural artifact. And, likewise, someday there will arise a generation that does not remember Kanye West.

These examples demonstrate that there is a threshold at which objects, events, or actions become artifacts. Furthermore, that threshold can be crossed in either direction; in other words, things, actions, and events are often in the process of either becoming, or declining as, cultural artifacts. Because perceptions change, the artifactual status of any sign must be changeable as well.

In contrast to Kanye West, think about yellow ribbons. Before the 1970s, they had no special unity, no particular meaning in themselves beyond just being yellow ribbons. An early 1970s song by the group Tony Orlando and Dawn proposed the idea of tying a yellow ribbon around a tree to indicate to someone who has been gone a long time that they are still wanted back. Although the song was popular and catchy, the song itself was more of a perceptual unity, more of a cultural artifact, than was the idea of a yellow ribbon.

But when sixty-three Americans were taken hostage at the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, in 1979, yellow ribbons came to be used as a gesture of remembrance by the American public. They began to appear everywhere, with the specific meaning of (1) a demonstration of solidarity with those who were absent (the hostages) and (2) a desire to have them back. Since then, foreign political crises involving absent or missing Americans have repeatedly been accompanied by widespread, spontaneous sproutings of yellow ribbons around trees, lampposts, and traffic signs. People wear them as pins on their clothing. They may be seen as tokens of solidarity with troops in the Middle East even now. They have crossed the threshold into the realm of cultural artifacts, and they are being maintained in that status by continuing social customs that encourage people to perceive them as artifacts—as things that have special meanings, as unified whole entities. And other causes have taken up the idea of ribbons as artifacts, as sporting ribbons of different colors is a way to show support for those with different kinds of cancer, AIDS sufferers, and so forth. Whether yellow or not, the wearing of ribbons as charged with meaning grew out of the original reference.

One consequence of becoming charged with widely shared meanings is that artifacts can be very complex; sometimes an artifact might even be composed of other artifacts. The Beatles were (in fact, still are, even if half of them are deceased) a cultural artifact as a group, but John Lennon, Paul McCartney, George Harrison, and Ringo Starr are cultural artifacts each in their own right. (John Lennon and George Harrison, individually, remain so even after their deaths.) The same has been true of the New York Yankees during several periods of their history. The television show *The Tonight Show* is so popular that it is an artifact, but so are some of its more visible characters, such as the host, Jimmy Fallon, as well as his studio band, the venerable The Roots. The Kansas City Chiefs are an artifact, but so are quarterback Patrick Mahomes and coach Andy Reid. Complex artifacts are charged with meaning, and if they comprise artifacts, then those constituent artifacts are also charged with meaning. This creates some very elaborate webs of meaning, and thus of influence.

... Manifesting Group Identifications to Us

The third and final clause in the definition of a cultural artifact identifies all artifacts as signs of group identifications. We have noticed that the charged meanings of an artifact must be widely shared; let us turn now to a consideration of how the shared nature of an artifact's meanings relates to group identifications. Here we will learn that artifacts are the material signs of abstract groups.

Part of the meaning of an artifact is its connection with a group. All of us belong to many groups. Some of those groups are ethnic or racial: you might identify yourself as Italian-American, African-American, Polish-American, or Southern white, for example. Some

of those groups are geographical: you are an American, a Kansan, a Brooklynite, a resident of your neighborhood. Some groups are social: you might be a member of the Latin Kings, of a bridge club, of a tennis team. Some groups are religious: you might be Catholic, Methodist, Rastafarian. Some groups are economic: you might be wealthy, middle class, working class. Male and female are two large group identifications. Identifications sometimes have emotional or aesthetic bases: allegiances to particular sports teams or to clothing or product brands or designers are very often the grounding for group identifications, as with “Packer Backers” or those who buy only Calvin Klein jeans.

All of us, in other words, have many different group identifications. But, in fact, we very rarely see those groups in total. If you are a member of a local motorcycle club, you might very well see the whole group together at the same time. But most of our other group or social “memberships” are much larger or more abstract.

Perhaps you think of yourself as a Quaker; how, where, and when are you ever in touch with the Quakers? You see particular other Quakers, but never all of them and never at once. Perhaps you think of yourself as an African-American and identify with other African-Americans, but when and where does that identification occur? Another way to put this question would be, when does the “group” of African-Americans touch you? When does it speak to you? How are you reminded of what to do, how to act, and what to believe, so as to identify with that group? Many of us identify ourselves as “American”—a very broad identification—but how does that identification occur? Are you being American as you sit here reading? If you stop for coffee? When does that group, “American,” speak to you?

Large or abstract groups of people (and nearly all of the groups with which we identify are large and abstract) connect with us, and influence us, through cultural artifacts. There are objects, actions, and events that manifest those groups to us that make the groups real, particular, and material. Artifacts represent groups to us, they show us what it is like to be part of or to identify with those groups, or they remind us of those groups and of what we are committed to by our identification with them. Artifacts are charged with meaning, but many of those meanings bespeak (e.g., speak of or speak for) our identifications with groups. You need not be a member of a given group to understand an artifact that manifests that group identification, but it helps. That is to say, being a member of the group allows you to appreciate more of the meanings and to understand the ways in which the artifact is standing in for the group as a whole. In that way, a cultural artifact is a sort of an “in-joke.” Others may understand something of what it means, but it is really the people “in the know,” those who identify with the group (or groups) for which the artifact speaks, who find the richest meanings in an artifact.

Artifacts span the continuum from those that are quite obviously associated with a specific group identification to those that do not so clearly bespeak a group. Often, you may see more clearly how an artifact manifests a group identification if you are not part of that group (although then, paradoxically, you probably will not fully understand the meanings that the artifact conveys).

For instance, think about the form that cable television takes in the United States: a widely available opportunity to choose among hundreds of channels, many of them with very narrow, specific purposes, even as alternatives to cable such as Hulu and Netflix are widely offered. Now, this artifact (cable television) is part of being in that very large and abstract group, “American.” Nearly all Americans have access to cable, or if not that, one of the other services such as Netflix, or to satellite or Internet television. Because so many of the readers of this book are part of that group, because we so rarely step outside of it or confront in any meaningful way the people who do not identify with that group, the artifacts that bespeak “being American” to us may seem natural, universal, or even invisible. Those artifacts may simply seem the only way to be. We do not notice how they create a group for us. It may take going to another country, with different patterns of television broadcast and consumption, to see American cable TV as not universal but a particular way of doing things, as our “American” way of doing things, as our sort of entertainment in-joke. Seeing alternatives to such a distinctive cultural artifact helps us to realize that widespread access to cable TV is peculiarly American.

Americans are defined in many ways, and we have many points of identification with being “American,” but one of them is that we are the people with ready access to that kind of cable TV. What is useful about recognizing the ways in which cultural artifacts manifest groups to us is that we can then begin understanding the meanings of the artifact, and at that point we begin to understand our groups as well. To pursue the present example a bit further, think about what all those cable choices mean, especially in terms of what it means to be an American. We can tell from what cable TV means that being American has something to do with an abundance of choices. You might consider other distinctly American experiences that display the same embarrassment of riches (such as large restaurant menus or giant supermarkets)—the availability of more choices than anyone can possibly use.

Cable TV is one of those artifacts not obviously connected to a group, yet, as we have seen, it does manifest the group identification of being “American” to us. Consider a narrower example. I once went into a small-town delicatessen in a Pennsylvania Dutch county and asked for a pound of the salami displayed in the case. The woman behind the counter was dressed (as were all the other clerks) in the traditional long dress and hooded bonnet that the Mennonite or Amish women wear in that part of the country. She looked at me with dark suspicion: “What are you calling salami?” she asked. It turns out that all hard sausage there is called “bologna.” What I wanted was “Lebanon bologna” (made near Lebanon, Pennsylvania). For this store clerk, “Lebanon bologna” is an artifact that is a material sign of her group identifications, and manifests that group so strongly and so often that she has ceased to think of that sausage as in any way special to her group. Lebanon bologna now seems natural and universal to her. Now, it’s flatlanders like me who ask for artifacts that bespeak our group identifications, artifacts such as “salami.”

Certain artifacts very clearly are the material signs of group identifications; they manifest specific groups to all sorts of other people. Take African-based hairstyles, for instance. One such style is dreadlocks, that style of long, twisted skeins that originated in Jamaica and in Africa

before that. Plenty of people who are not of African heritage imitate such styles to an extent—and on the other hand, most African-Americans do not wear dreadlocks—but the artifacts of that hairstyle are firmly and unchangeably African-based. It is a style grounded in African heritage: African people have been wearing dreads for centuries. Dreads are even best suited physically to the characteristics of African hair.

Let's summarize what we have covered so far. We have seen that everything is a sign, but that not every sign is a cultural artifact. We have defined an artifact as

1. an action, event, or object perceived as a unified whole,
2. having widely shared meanings, and
3. manifesting group identifications to us.

EXERCISE 2.3

Identify yourself as a member of at least two broad social groups (e.g., Hispanic and a union member, American Southerner and a motorcycle club member, male and United Methodist). For each group, identify:

- a. An artifact that “belongs” only to the group that only members of the group are likely to see as charged with meanings. Identify some of those meanings. (e.g., Only college professors are likely to know about and use the term *curriculum vitae*. Ask your instructor about it.)
- b. An artifact that is closely identified with the group but that persons outside the group know about, use, and appreciate. Identify differences in what the artifact means for those inside the group and for the public at large. (e.g., What does “Mexican food” mean for members of that ethnic group as well as for the general public? Does what is considered “Mexican food” differ between Mexicans or Mexican-Americans and the public at large?)

In elaborating on this definition, we discovered some important characteristics of artifacts:

1. Artifacts are a socially created reality.
2. Signs become artifacts as they become charged with meaning, thus crossing a threshold into artifact status.
3. An artifact can be very complex, even being made up of other artifacts.
4. Artifacts are the material signs of group identifications.

We have learned about signs and about the “supersigns” that are cultural artifacts. Both ordinary signs and cultural artifacts are key components not only because they are components of messages but also because they are also components of culture, and culture is the stuff out of which you and I are made. Let us turn now to the idea of culture.

DEFINITIONS OF CULTURE

In learning about signs and artifacts, we are studying the building blocks of culture. Now we need to turn to the term *culture* itself to understand what that means. Throughout history, culture has been a central concept with a number of definitions. As the scholar Raymond Williams put it, “culture is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” (*Keywords* 76).

Elitist Meanings of Culture

Perhaps the most widely known definition of culture has an elitist flavor to it: culture is the very best, the finest, and most refined experiences that a society or nation has to offer. This sense is found in the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition of culture, as “the training, development, and refinement of mind, tastes, and manners; the condition of being thus trained and refined; the intellectual side of civilization.” This definition of culture underlies Moe’s recurring complaint to Larry and Curly of *The Three Stooges*: “Mind your manners! Ain’t ya got no culture? What would Emily Post say?” This idea of culture is often referred to as high culture.

This first, elitist sense of culture sees relatively few artifacts as making up culture. Only those objects or events having meanings associated with the very best, with high intellectual, aesthetic, or spiritual achievement, would be considered cultural artifacts under this definition. By exposing ourselves to them, we “become cultured.” Those who are not exposed to those artifacts are not cultured, in this view. Some familiar artifacts that would be subsumed under this sense of culture would include the ballet, the symphony orchestra, public television, music by Bach or Beethoven, paintings by Rembrandt and Van Gogh, and sculptures by Michelangelo and Rodin. Some objects or events that would certainly not be considered cultural artifacts by this first definition would include heavy metal rock, polka bands, cage fighting, Rihanna, and corn dogs.

Often, those who talk about culture with this first definition in mind have what might be called an edifying impulse. In other words, they hope to improve people (which is not necessarily a bad thing) by exposing the public to the right artifacts. For these people, there is a sense that if you listen to Brahms rather than Common, if you see Shakespeare plays rather than *Friday Night Fights*, if you eat gourmet cuisine rather than Ho Hos, you will be a better person for it (and, by extension, our country will be a better place as well). This edifying impulse has been around for centuries and can be found in nearly every instruction from parents or teachers to do certain things because they are good for you. The edifying impulse is not necessarily limited to conservatives or those in power, either. It can also be found among certain Marxist scholars; for example, theorists such as Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse (who were part of the so-called Frankfurt School around the middle of the twentieth century) thought that the pleasures to which the masses of ordinary Americans were addicted (things like television, pro football, and church bingo nights) were contributing to the oppression of those people (Adorno; Alford; Modleski ix; Mukerji and Schudson 56).

When it comes to empowerment and disempowerment of people, one could hardly imagine a stronger (and more brutal) understanding of culture. I once heard that business executives make summary judgments about prospective hires by observing whether they know which forks and spoons to use at a fine cuisine restaurant. Applicants who may have grown up poor will have little chance with such executives. Most if not all high culture is expensive, and so under the control of wealthier people. Someone who grew up in a disadvantaged neighborhood-loving hip-hop is likely to be left out of a boardroom discussion of the relative merits of Stravinsky and Hindemith.

On the other hand, there have been radical twists to this first definition of culture. Some people have argued that it is the radical or subversive elements of culture to which people should be exposed, and that high culture offers those subversions. This effort to “turn the Frankfurt School on its head” to celebrate the liberating power of popular culture involves identifying experimental or alternative forms and experiences—such as guerrilla theatre, alternative rock or folk music, performance theatre, and so forth—as the kinds of cultural artifacts that will liberate the common people so as “to achieve dignity and to make life full” (Buhle xx). The particular artifacts identified by this school of thought as desirable, as the right things to do or hear or see, are very different from those included in the concept of high culture. But the edifying impulse is the same. In both of these versions of what culture is, the focus is on a very limited set of artifacts, such as the objects and experiences of art, that deserve to be called culture. In its 1987 supplement, for instance, the *Oxford English Dictionary* updated its old definition of *culture* to emphasize “the civilization, customs, artistic achievements, etc. of a people especially at a certain stage of its development.”



©iStockphoto.com/Eugene_EM

EXERCISE 2.4

Consider the following questions for individual thought or group discussion.

1. If paintings, opera, poetry readings, and so forth are the products of high culture, what is everything else? Have you heard any particular terms (such as *low culture* or *mass culture*) used to refer to everything else?
2. What kind of power is created by calling certain things high culture? Who gets to wield that power?
3. Has anyone ever tried to “improve” you by referring to the idea of culture? Think about the specific ways in which that happened. How did you feel about those efforts?

Popular Meanings of Culture

There is a second meaning of culture that is also fairly widespread, although perhaps not as well known as the first. Raymond Williams explains this second meaning of “Culture’... as the growth and tending of crops and animals, and by extension the growth and tending of human faculties” (*Marxism and Literature* 11). In other words, culture is that which sustains and nourishes those who live and move within it. We see one aspect of this meaning of culture in biological science: The culture within a petri dish is what allows microorganisms to grow and multiply. It feeds them and supports them; it is by consuming the culture, by living in that culture, that the microorganisms grow.

What would this sense of culture mean for people? We must remember that people do not live by bread alone; unlike microorganisms, we require more than simply physical nourishment to support us. We need to be able to talk to people, to entertain and be entertained, to enjoy all kinds of diversions and distractions, to work at something we find meaningful, and to meet with other people. In short, for us, culture is our “whole way of life” (Williams, *Marxism and Literature* 17). Williams defines culture as “a very active world of everyday conversation and exchange. Jokes, idioms, characteristic forms not just of everyday dress but occasional dress, people consciously having a party, making a do, marking an occasion” (Heath and Skirrow 5). Does Williams’s definition sound familiar? It should; he is really talking about the artifacts to which we are exposed.

We must be careful in how we understand the relationship among signs, artifacts, and culture, however. If you took a random collection of signs and artifacts from all around the world and piled them in a building, you would not have a culture within the building. When Williams defines cultures as “whole ways of life,” he is implying a kind of connectedness among artifacts rather than simply a motley collection of many different artifacts. What turns a group of artifacts into a culture is that they are systemically related: they make up a system of artifacts anchored in group identifications.

Individuals identify with other people and see themselves as parts of groups, as we have already noted. Sometimes those groups are very small and completely present to the individual. More often, however, the groups are large and abstract, extending over wide geographical areas and broad reaches of time. Culture is the integrated set or system of artifacts that is linked to a

group. The linkage between artifacts and a group occurs because the artifacts are how the group is manifested to its members. The artifacts are systematically linked to each other as they are linked to culture.

Culture is the system of material manifestations of our group identifications (remember that artifacts are actions and events as well as objects, and that what people do is just as material as are the objects that people can touch or see). Part of the culture of your local motorcycle club is the mangy mutt that is your mascot. Part of the culture of being Norwegian Minnesotans is eating lefse and lutefisk; even if any particular Norwegian Minnesotan never eats those, their consumption is still part of that culture.. But the club mascot is also part of a system of artifacts that includes your club insignia, the meeting place, certain eccentric characters who are members, the kind of motorcycles you have, your rituals and practices, and so forth. That system of artifacts, all of which are interrelated through their link to the group of the motorcycle club, is the club's culture. Similarly, lutefisk and lefse are part of a system of many other things that bespeak being Norwegian.

EXERCISE 2.5

This exercise is designed to help clarify the idea of culture as a system of artifacts linked to group identifications. When you read the words *sauerbraten* or *Tannenbaum*, what comes to mind? Germany, of course. Not only that group identification, however, but other artifacts that make up the interrelated (and vast) system of German culture: Wagner, schnitzel, beer, lederhosen, Berlin, Munich, and so forth. To think further about culture as systems of artifacts, sort the following group of terms into what you consider the appropriate cultures:

grits	the IRA
corned beef and cabbage	Stone Mountain
shillelagh	the Mississippi
kudzu	the Blarney Stone
Guinness stout	stars and bars
Catfish	peat moss
Leprechauns	Spanish moss
William Butler Yeats	antebellum mansions
NASCAR	Catholics versus Protestants
rebel yells	y'all

Take a look at Exercise 2.5. Most likely, you had no trouble discerning that certain artifacts in this list were part of the system of Irish culture and the rest were part of the system of Southern (United States) culture.

Popular culture refers to those systems or artifacts that most people share and that most people know about. For those who identify with playing for a symphony orchestra, there is

an interrelated system of artifacts made up of rehearsals, performances, instruments, and so forth. But that culture is not popular culture because most people neither identify with symphony orchestras nor know about their systems of artifacts. But television, and other streaming services accessed on television, like Netflix, is an immensely rich world of popular culture, as nearly everyone watches television, and even if not everyone sees the same shows, they are likely to know in general about the shows they do not see. In speaking of popular culture, then, we are concerned with things, like television, that are part of the everyday experience of most people.

We now need to refine our exploration of meaning to realize that few meanings are truly individual. Instead, meaning usually comes from a cultural context. What a given sign means, especially as an artifact, is determined in large part by the system of signs (the culture, the system of artifacts) in which it is placed. For instance, what a candle means is largely shaped by the system or cultural context in which you find it. It means one thing within the system of signs that make up a movie about a haunted house, where it might flicker and then go out in the night. It means something else within the cultural system of a given religion, as a votive candle or an altar candle, for instance. And it means something else within the system of a dinner for two people in courtship, as it casts a low, warm light over the proceedings. In sum, to understand what a sign means as an artifact, we must consider that sign within the context of the system of artifacts in which it appears.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURES

The idea of a culture as an integrated system of artifacts needs further development and explanation. Let us explore three important characteristics of cultures:

1. Cultures are highly complex and overlapping.
2. Cultures entail consciousness, or ideologies.
3. Cultures are experienced through texts.

Cultures Are Highly Complex and Overlapping

When we say that cultures are highly complex, we mean two things. First, there are a great many things that go into making up the system of artifacts that is a culture. Remember that cultures can be very broad (American) or very small (this particular monastery), but even the small ones will be made up of quite a few interrelated artifacts: the food, clothing styles, ways of walking and sitting, architecture, forms of entertainment, sayings and expressions, moral and ethical norms, religious practices, and other artifacts that are the material manifestations of the group. So when we think about cultures, we are thinking about many different artifacts that are still related to each other through being part of a system.

There is a second, more interesting way of thinking about the complexity and overlapping nature of cultures. Ordinary language usage sometimes causes us to think that we belong to

only one culture. But that is not the case; we identify with many different groups through the many different cultures that nurture and support us. We can approach this second point by returning to Williams's definition of a culture as "a whole way of life." This definition is actually problematic; there really isn't a single, whole way of life for most of us today. To understand why, let's take a brief detour through history.

It probably used to be the case, many centuries ago, that any given person lived within one large, overarching culture. Such a culture may have been complex, but it was not very multiple. If you had lived in Britain during the Dark Ages, for instance (say, around 900 C.E.), everything around you, everything you encountered during the day, probably even everything you knew about, would have been part of the same system, the same group identification, and thus the same culture. You saw and spoke only to others of your own group. Different aspects of life, such as work, religion, and government, were all closely interrelated; they all manifested the same overarching culture to you. This kind of social situation may still be found in some tribal cultures around the world, where people are primarily enveloped in a small, single group of people and surrounded by the artifacts that represent that single group. Perhaps the clearest modern version of this kind of immersion in a culture would be a cloistered monastery or convent, in which the members encounter, almost exclusively, the experiences having to do with just their own, single culture.

But clearly, few of us live in such an extremely monocultural situation today. Communication and transportation have become much easier and more common, especially over long distances. We are therefore exposed to a bewildering variety of messages and signs, often originating materially in other cultures. People of many different backgrounds live with or near each other. We may now belong to a number of groups rather than one large, overarching group that surrounds us. For instance, you can become deeply involved with simulations such as a game in the versions of *Call of Duty*, or with electronic/email "bulletin boards" that are spread out all across the country or even the world, such as the Nextdoor system. Such a group need not have anything to do with the company you work for, which may have very little connection with where you go for recreation, which may have little to do with your ethnic or cultural identification, and so forth. In short, because there are many different groups with which you identify, you belong simultaneously to many different cultures. Because of this abundance of group identifications, many people today feel that their lives are fragmented. Some social observers have called this fragmentation the postmodern condition.

You might also see this experience of complexity called *intersectionality*. Just because most of us are positioned at the intersection of different cultures, it is important for people trying to understand our social world to keep in mind a complex view of cultures. Women may be one kind of culture, but the intersectionality of women and, for instance, race introduces complexity to the idea of identification and belonging with certain cultures. Mix in other cultural dimensions such as class and sexual identity, and the idea of cultural identification can become quite complex indeed. This means that not only is the critic's task complex, but that there is an obligation for the critic to think about the intersectionality of those being studied.

To return to Williams's definition, for nearly all of us in today's postmodern world, there simply are not any "whole ways of life" in which we immerse ourselves exclusively. We stand

within a complex structure of ways of life, identifying with many different groups that may have very little in common with each other. This is especially likely to be true for people who travel a great deal, who associate with many different kinds of people, and who hold a variety of jobs. A person who lives in a largely Hispanic neighborhood, attends a local, largely Hispanic Roman Catholic church, works in a local bodega, and hangs out at the nearby community center is much closer to living within a single, overarching culture than is the person who moves out of that neighborhood, works downtown, watches French and German films, eats in Thai and African restaurants, and becomes a Buddhist. It would be a mistake to say that everyone today is one way or another, but increasing numbers of people are becoming like the second person in this example. At any rate, the more you are like that second person—the more you move around, the more you vary your experience and your environment—the more different cultures you will find identifications with. That variety is, increasingly, the condition of most people's lives today.

It is also important to understand that our identifications with different cultures are one important source of contradictions in terms of what artifacts mean. For instance, if your business requires you to go in to work on Sunday while your religion requires you to attend Mass, you will be torn in two directions. What it means to skip Mass will mean one thing to your business and another thing to your religion. Thus, our location in different cultures creates contradictions in what a given sign or artifact means.

This complexity can create tensions and struggles within us as we negotiate social struggles among different groups, and the complexity has much to do with the empowerment and disempowerment of different groups. Suppose you identify as queer, but also as of a religion that frowns on non-heterosexuality. Suppose you identify with a particular cultural group that is relatively new to this country, and you also want to succeed in the world of business management. If your group is marginalized in the current business atmosphere, do you identify more with your group or do you commit to a business career that might pull you away from your group?

Throughout American history, new immigrants have experienced a tension between the old culture from which they emerged and the new American culture, one of many, into which they may want to move. How to integrate while at the same time keeping identity is an age-old problem in this and other countries, and may have a lot to do with how rhetoric works in different communities.

Cultures Entail Consciousness, or Ideologies

The second important characteristic of culture is that cultures entail consciousness, or ideologies. Let's start with the second of these terms, ideology, which has traditionally been associated more closely with culture.

Ideology is a widely used term today. There are so many different uses for it that you should expect to find little agreement among scholars as to what it means. For some thinkers, such as Karl Marx, ideology referred to a false set of beliefs and perceptions that the ruling classes attempted to impose upon lower classes in an attempt to make those in lower classes cooperate in perpetuating the power of the rulers. This meaning of the term is explained in one definition given by Raymond Williams, "a system of illusory beliefs—false ideas or false

consciousness—which can be contrasted with true scientific knowledge” (*Marxism and Literature* 55). Marx’s idea was to get rid of false ideas, of ideology, so that people could see things the way they really are. Then, he thought, oppressed people would see the flimsy premises upon which ruling classes built their power and would rise up and overthrow them. For instance, if the “divine right of kings” could be revealed to be a lot of ideological humbug, then people who had been bowing to kings and queens for centuries could be enabled to see that in reality all people are equal, and they would overthrow their kingly rulers.

That view of ideology as a system of false ideas that hide reality is still held by some, but increasingly the term has come to mean something else. Williams also gives two other definitions of the term that are now more widely used: (1) “a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular class or group,” and (2) “the general process of the production of meanings and ideas” (*Marxism and Literature* 55); furthermore, Williams suggests that these two definitions can be combined. This more recent notion of ideology is more consistent with the understanding of culture and artifacts that we have been developing here. To distinguish these senses of ideology from the older sense of false ideas, it may be more useful to think of the term *consciousness*, which is more clearly implied by Williams’s last two definitions. To grasp what consciousness (or ideology) should mean, we need to integrate several of the ideas we have covered so far.

First, recall that people live in a world of artifacts that are accessible only by perceptions. That means that people might change their perceptions or trade some perceptions for others, but it is not possible to do away with perceptions to discover some bedrock reality underneath. We may struggle over meanings, but to search for the “one right meaning” can be a power move favoring your side in the struggle. To think that kings rule by divine right is one perception; to think that they do not is another. There are legitimate social and political reasons to prefer one perception over another, but because we as human beings can be aware of only that which we perceive, it is impossible to identify one set of perceptions as “natural” or “simply the way things are.” You will recall our earlier discussion of empowered privilege as being propped up by just such a perception of what is natural.

Second, recall that all signs are meaningful, and that artifacts in particular are signs that are charged with extra meaning. Third, recall that the meaning of an artifact is significantly determined by its link to groups. Finally, recall that culture is a system, or interrelated group, of artifacts. An ideology or consciousness is an interrelated system of meanings that is generated by the system of artifacts that constitute a culture.

The idea of systematicity is key to ideology or consciousness. To return to Williams’s definitions of ideology, consciousness is a system: The beliefs that make up consciousness (or ideology) relate to each other; they are part of an interrelated set. Consciousness, or ideology, is a system of beliefs—not the way things “really, truly are,” but what people perceive to be true. Consciousness is the production of meanings (through artifacts) that are “characteristic of a particular class or group.” Ideology is based on a sense of what ideas go with other ideas. It is the system of meanings linked to a system of artifacts that is a culture.

This last idea needs some further explanation. It points to the fact that cultures, or systems of artifacts, are the locations of meanings (beliefs, values, ideas, perceptions). A sign becomes an artifact as it becomes charged with particular meanings that belong to a system. That meaning

relates to the meanings of other artifacts in the cultural system; the whole group or system of those meanings is consciousness or ideology. Let's take a cross as an example. This simple sign made up of two sticks becomes charged with meanings of one sort when it is considered as a Christian artifact, or when one places it or thinks about it within that system of artifacts. The cross has one set of meanings when considered in the context of baptism, grace, communion, Christ's crucifixion, and so forth.

The cross takes on a different set of charged meanings for fans of vampire movies, although those meanings are certainly related to the meanings derived from Christianity. This smaller and less cohesive group is nevertheless a system, for the cross relates to the undead, to magical protection, to Count Dracula, and so forth. Finally, consider the meanings that the cross takes on within the system of fashion accessories. Here the sign becomes an artifact as it is linked to earrings or necklace pendants; meanings having to do with design or material (gold or cast iron, slim or stubby) become more important than they are in religious usage. It is realistic to say that the cross is perceived very differently—that, in fact, it becomes a different artifact—for the different groups that use it within their system of artifacts (Christians, vampire movie fans, fashion-conscious people). We will examine in later chapters how the meaning of an artifact can become quite complex as it shuttles back and forth among these cultural systems. But, for now, it is important to understand that artifacts, such as the cross, mean what they mean according to their placement in a system of artifacts, a culture that is the manifestation of a group.

But those meanings are also often contradictory. We noted previously that contradictions in the meaning of artifacts arise as a result of our identification with different cultures, different groups. We noted how the different meanings read into a sign by different cultures will cause contradictions in what that sign means. But even within single cultures, contradictory meanings arise. When we say that meanings of artifacts arise from groups, we are not saying that those meanings are always simple and straightforward. For instance, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., is surely an American cultural artifact. But within that "American" cultural system, he means several things, some of them contradictory. He stands for racial harmony and understanding but also for a turbulent and violent period of our nation's history. For white Americans, he is a promise that they can get along with black people as well as a reminder of what white people have done to prevent such getting along. For African-Americans, he is a moral exemplar of nonviolent civil disobedience, as well as a reminder—through his own violent death—of the frustrations that may make violence seem justifiable. Many cultural artifacts are contradictory in similar ways.

Consciousness or ideology is the sum of meanings, or the system of meanings, that is most obvious or most strongly implied by a system of artifacts. We often refer to such meanings as preferred meanings. These are simply the most popular, or the easiest, meanings to attach to signs. There is a Christian consciousness that is the sum of what the artifacts of Christianity mean. The meaning of baptism is linked to the meaning of grace, which is linked to the meaning of the Eucharist or communion, and so on. To become a Christian is to enter into that system of meanings, to know them, to see their relationships.

Preferred meanings also tend to be those meanings that prop up already established interests and powers in any culture—meanings that maintain privilege. If Christianity is empowered in

a culture (relative to, say, Hinduism), then the Christian meanings of the cross are more likely to come to mind first when one sees a cross. A key component of power is the ability to control preferred meanings that are widely shared.

That is not to say that Christianity has no contradictions or that every Christian embraces the Christian consciousness wholly and completely. But it does mean that there are preferred meanings that make up the Christian consciousness. Since the meanings of many of the artifacts constituting a culture are contradictory, consciousness or ideology also contains the seeds of potential contradiction and instability. In this book, we will pay special attention to the ways in which signs, artifacts, and whole messages may become sites of struggle because of conflicting, multiple meanings, and we will learn methods that help us to understand how those struggles proceed in the rhetoric of popular culture.

In an earlier exercise, you were asked to identify some group that you are a part of and to name artifacts that materially manifest that group to you. Take a second look at that list of artifacts. Can you identify a consciousness that “fits” with a group that you are part of, a set of meanings that you use to make sense of the world, a set that would probably be different if you were part of another group?

We will see in Chapter 3 that people do not necessarily accept the consciousness of a culture to which they belong totally and uncritically. In fact, several factors that we will examine (such as contradiction) make it necessary for people to struggle over what artifacts mean, to pit the meanings of one cultural identification against another. For now, however, keep in mind that whether one accepts it wholeheartedly or not, there is a consciousness, or an ideology, implied for most people by the artifacts of a given culture.

EXERCISE 2.6

To understand where you fit into a network of cultures, you might take an inventory of yourself. If you really want to understand how cultural artifacts affect people, you need to understand what your own cultural artifacts are and how they are shaping you. On a sheet of paper, construct the chart below, leaving plenty of space to write in.

Artifacts			
Groups	Typical Events	Typical Objects	Other Typical Artifacts
Group 1:			
Group 2:			
Group 3:			
Group 4:			

Now, start thinking about some of the groups with which you identify the most—in other words, the cultures to which you belong. If you are like most people, there will probably be more than one. Fill in your names for these groups on the lines in the “Groups” column, and for each group, identify some of the artifacts that most clearly manifest that group for you.

For example, if Group 1 for you is Indian, which typical events most clearly make that group real and material for you? Which typical objects? Which other typical artifacts? Make similar lists for several other groups of which you are a part.

Now go back and compare the groups of artifacts within each column. Do the typical events of Group 1 relate to the typical objects of Group 2 in any way? Are the events of Groups 3 and 4 connected with each other in any way? Do you find any examples of the same artifact meaning very different things as defined by different groups? In other words, do you find contradictions? To the extent that you find a lack of connectedness, your cultures are complex, fragmented, and overlapping. Later in this book, we will consider what that complexity, fragmentation, and overlap mean in terms of how power is shared and how social and political struggles are managed today.

Cultures Are Experienced Through Texts

The third characteristic of cultures that we need to understand is that they are experienced through texts. We have learned that we hardly ever experience the whole of the groups with which we identify, and that cultural artifacts are the material manifestations of those large, abstract groups. Similarly, we rarely experience the entirety of a culture. While there is a set of artifacts that makes the large and abstract group of Polish-Americans materially present for individuals within that group, the individual Polish-American person is still unlikely to experience that entire set of artifacts, and certainly never all of them at once. Instead, we experience smaller, interrelated sets of signs and artifacts. It will be useful for us to call those sets *texts*.

The term *text* is important to the study of the rhetoric of popular culture. It is probably most familiar to you as a set of words, in the sense of a linguistic text; and, in fact, very many cultural texts are linguistic, since words and expressions can also be cultural artifacts. This textbook is a text. A newspaper article or editorial is a text. A letter is a text. We speak of the text of a poem or of a novel.

But, as we have seen, words are not the only signs, the only entities with meaning. Things other than or in addition to words can be texts as well. A text is a set of signs related to each other insofar as their meanings all contribute to the same set of effects or functions. All the words and parts of this book make a set because they work together to produce certain effects in you at this moment. But a baseball game is a text, too, because all the signs you see within the game work together to produce several effects: relaxation, exhilaration, allegiance to a team, and so forth. On the other hand, a group comprising your wristwatch, the potted palm on my desk, and Jay Z in all likelihood is not a text, because (unless something very strange is going on) their meanings are not contributing to the same effects or functions.

A text is usually a set or group of signs, as noted above, but that group can be large or small. To the extent that a single artifact is complex, comprising several signs within itself that all contribute to the same effect, a single artifact can sometimes be read as a text. Beyoncé, for instance, is certainly a complex enough artifact to be readable as a text in her own right. More often, larger groups of signs and artifacts, contributing to the same effect, are read as texts; an entire Beyoncé video might be analyzed in that way, for example.

A text is something that people perceive, notice, or unify in their everyday experiences; it is also something that critics or students of popular culture create. A text is something that people

put together out of signs, insofar as people unify the meanings of several signs. You might go to the movies and understand the large collection of signs that you see and hear as the text of the latest *Fast and Furious*, because you can see that the meanings of those signs work together to create the same set of effects in you and the rest of the audience. On the other hand, you might not think of the next meeting of a class in which you are enrolled as a text. But suppose a critic were to point out to you how the arrangement of desks, lecture techniques of the instructor, clothing styles of the students, and subject matter somehow all work together as a set of signs with interconnected meanings, all contributing to the same effects or functions. Suppose you had not thought of your class in this way before. In that case, the critic has identified the text, and having had it identified for you, you now can identify it as a text yourself. We will see later in this book that one of the primary reasons for the informed criticism of popular culture is that it can help people to identify texts of which they were not aware.

As we rarely or never experience the whole of a culture (the entire system of artifacts), we can extend our definition of a text by noting that texts are the ways in which we experience culture. Suppose we take the whole of country-and-western to be a kind of culture, a system of artifacts, always remembering that its fans are also involved in many other cultural systems. Music, of course, is an important part of that set of artifacts, but so are certain practices such as dancing, going to concerts, and styles of dress and grooming. In addition, there are several subcultures of country-and-western that are more specialized systems of artifacts within the larger culture; such subcultures might include country gospel, bluegrass, and so forth. Clearly, we might identify ourselves as “country-and-western fans” and yet never experience that entire system of artifacts.

Instead, we might go out one evening and attend to a Taylor Swift concert, or download some of her songs to our phones; we experience her music as a text, and that is how we also experience the country-and-western culture at that moment. If we go to a concert, the whole experience of the concert can function as a text as well, a text made up of the crowd, the security system, dancing in the aisles, whiffs of cigarette smoke floating around, and so on. For another example, the country music star Tim McGraw could be perceived and studied as a text: what he does, how he dresses, how he moves, his music, his public image, his romantic affairs, and so forth.

There is an important continuum in types of texts between those that are diffuse and those that are discrete. A discrete text is one in which all its signs are together in time and space, relatively tightly bounded. If you get a letter in an envelope in the mail, that text is relatively discrete. You do not expect it to be part of the wallpaper or the tune you are hearing through your earbuds. On the other hand, a Facebook page is a relatively diffuse text. Any Facebook home page that has any degree of complexity is full of links to other texts, comments, websites, photos, and so forth. You begin with one Facebook wall, and pretty soon you are three or four pages away from it. The original Facebook home page is thus a diffuse text in that it bleeds out, chains out, into many other signs, potentially without limit.

For many of the texts of popular culture, it can be difficult to identify the textual boundaries. In the musical concert, for instance, where does the concert begin and end? What is and is not the concert? Some signs—such as the music being played—are clearly constituents of that text. Some signs may be questionable: Is the difficulty in finding a parking place before the concert, or the

ringing in the ears after the concert, part of that concert as a unified experience, as a text? Some signs, such as the bird you see flying on your way home from the concert, may clearly not be part of the text. We will think about how to identify and define texts more carefully at a later point.

EXERCISE 2.7

To better understand the idea of a text, think about the following examples (two of them your own) and answer the questions below the examples that can help in identifying something as a text.

- a. Your lunch today
- b. Latest episode of *The Daily Show with Trevor Noah*
- c. Local baseball game, seen live
- d. Your own example (#1)
- e. Your own example (#2)

Answer the following questions for each example:

1. How is this composed of a set of related signs? How do those signs work together to contribute meanings to the same effects or functions?
2. What are some artifacts that make up this text? In other words, what are its constituent artifacts?
3. How does this text “stand in for” other texts or signs in a larger cultural system? How does it represent other cultural artifacts in the same system?

EXERCISE 2.8

To understand this point, consider an example of a possible text that you considered earlier in the chapter: your lunch today. Think about two texts, or two lunches, that two people sitting at the same table might have.

Lunch #1	Lunch #2
Double martini	Hot herbal tea
Twelve-ounce T-bone steak	Pita bread sandwich with avocado, alfalfa sprouts, and cheese
French fries	
Corn on the cob	Raw vegetables and yogurt dip
Apple pie à la mode	
Stoneware plate, bone-handled knife and fork, plenty of paper napkins	Simple china plate, stainless steel knife and fork, cloth napkin

Of course, an entire consciousness or ideology would be absorbed only after prolonged and repeated exposure to the meanings of a wide range of artifacts within a cultural system. But each of these lunches nevertheless has a “voice” of its own, and the voice speaks both to and about the diners. Would you say that either lunch shows a consistent set of meanings, beliefs, attitudes, or values? Does either lunch allow you to say something with some measure of assurance about either of the two diners? Could you make an “educated guess” in response to any of the following questions?

1. Which of these diners is more concerned about the environment?
2. Which of these diners is a fan of professional football?
3. Which of these diners is female and which is male?
4. Which diner is a Republican and which is a Democrat?
5. Which diner is over fifty-five and which one is under thirty?

Now stop and think: most of us likely assign meanings rather quickly. Why? Are we rushing to judgment or using unfortunate stereotypes? Why do we feel so sure of our answers, as I suspect most of us do? The purpose of posing these questions is not to perpetuate stereotypes but to demonstrate that you probably felt that you could answer at least some of them. In order for you to have this sense that you could know the answers to such questions, the text of each lunch must mean something (at least approximately); each lunch must somehow fit into larger systems of artifacts and meaning. This is what we mean by stressing the systematic nature of culture, of its artifacts, and of the ideologies that come from cultures.

Of course, if something is a text, then it can be read. What do we do when we read? We examine signs and artifacts and identify their meanings. That is clearly what we do when we read words. We do the same thing when we experience other kinds of artifacts, so it may be useful to retain the term *reading*, even when the texts we are examining include things other than words. A text, in other words, is something that has meaning, a meaning grounded in the culture behind the text, a meaning that can be examined and understood. We will see that those meanings are complex and are often struggled over, since what a text means has a lot to do with power.

Because they cohere around meanings, texts are the ways in which we are exposed to consciousness. A text is the mouthpiece for a culture; it is a representative sampling of the overall system of meanings that constitute an ideology or consciousness that is linked to a group. Texts urge a consciousness on us (and thus they also contain the contradictions that are part of a consciousness.) We do not always accept that consciousness in its entirety, but the urging to do so is there nonetheless.

So we have come full circle, back to the question of your blue jeans with which this book began. Suppose you see a man of about age seventy, wearing faded blue jeans and a tie-dyed shirt, his long hair pulled back and tied in a ponytail. Furthermore, suppose he is sitting on the hood of an aged Volkswagen Beetle plastered with Grateful Dead stickers, selling homemade jewelry from a battered display tray.

The picture just described is a unified experience—it is a text. Just like the text of an editorial in the newspaper, or the text of a speech by the president, the text of this seventy-year-old

man is speaking to us. It has meaning, and it is articulating a certain consciousness for us. That picture has a voice—what is it saying? What do the blue jeans this man is wearing add to that voice that would not be there if he were wearing pleated wool slacks?

These questions have to do with rhetoric, with how the meanings that we would find in or assign to that text are being managed so as to influence people. In the next chapter, we will examine in more detail some methods for drilling down into rhetorical texts, and arrive at a better understanding of how to apply and detect the concept of rhetoric to the texts of popular culture.

FOUR CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEXTS OF POPULAR CULTURE

In the following chapters, we will look more closely at how the rhetoric of popular culture works, and how to study it and examine it. By way of preparation, though, we need to think very broadly about how the texts of popular culture differ from traditional texts. We have just learned that popular culture is experienced via texts. The differences between traditional and popular culture text can be best understood in reference and contrast to the four characteristics—*verbal, expository, discrete, and hierarchical*—of traditional texts.

First, in addition to verbal texts, the rhetoric of popular culture will be manifested more often in *nonverbal* texts. People are influenced not only through words but also through the images they see. Furthermore, the struggle over power can be conducted nonverbally as well as verbally. One person flies an American flag proudly while another person wears it on the seat of his or her pants; both are rhetorical attempts to use signs to influence others and to manage what it means to be American. A coal mining company shows pictures of a beautifully restored former strip mining pit, while opponents to mining show pictures of devastation and ruin; here, too, is the use of nonverbal signs, in this case as part of the struggle over how the public business of energy and land use is to be managed.

Second, in addition to *expositional* texts, the rhetoric of popular culture will be manifested more often in texts that are *metonymic* and *narrative*. Metonymy is the name of a classical *trope*, or way of thinking, that means reduction. When you think about something by reducing it to a simpler, smaller, more manageable image that leaves out certain details of the larger whole, you are using metonymy. The president is a metonymy of the whole executive branch of the government, for example. The executive branch is actually many, many offices and officers, aides, and advisers, all hard at work behind the scenes. But when we say, “President Biden decided that...” or “President Biden sent to Congress...” we are using metonymy to describe this very complex institution in terms of a person. In reality, President Biden’s appropriate Cabinet secretary and a hundred of that person’s aides executed the action with the president’s approval. The idea of an individual, solitary president is understandable; the web of officials and offices that actually make up the executive branch, however, is much harder to grasp.

Metonymy is a reaction to the problem of the explosion of knowledge, which we have already discussed. The political problems of the Middle East, for instance, are vast and complex. It is unlikely that most of the public could claim to understand the intricacies of those problems or of the relationship of that region to the United States. Therefore, we often find metonymy



©iStockphoto.com/shironosov

at work in reducing the Middle East and its problems to images, stories, or quick explanations that allow the public to “get a grasp” of a complex situation. Metonymy is crucial to the aspect of power management that controls meaning. Part of the metonymy of the Middle East will be a focus on American or European hostages; any time one of “our people” is taken prisoner in the Middle East, the event will dominate media attention for a while. That is because our frustrations about dealing with so-called terrorists, with a seemingly unending conflict over which we have little control and with people who do things differently from us, can all be reduced to stories about the abduction of hostages. Through metonymy, American fears about uncontrollable political forces in the Middle East can also be reduced to images of feared leaders of states or organizations that allegedly sponsor terrorism or threaten war; such leaders have included figures such as Kim Jong-un and Bashar al-Assad.

One of the most important ways in which metonymy is used to deal with complex issues is through *narrative*, or the telling of stories. Instead of developing complex arguments and amassing proof, as in expository texts, many texts of popular culture either tell stories or are storylike, using both words and images. Think about the various complex social issues that have been struggled over through the means of popular films, for instance, such as race relations in the 2014 film *Black or White*, or in *Friday Night Lights*, or the management of intimate or social relationships in *La La Land* and the *28 Days/Weeks Later* series, or *The Walking Dead* on television. Television shows will often air episodes that deal with complex social issues in thirty-minute installments by turning them into stories (this week will address alcoholism, next week will take on child abuse, and so forth). Through metonymy and narrative, texts in popular culture participate in struggles over power and disempowerment and manage issues that were (and sometimes still are) debated in lengthy, expository arguments elsewhere.

In addition to discrete texts, the rhetoric of popular culture will be manifested in *diffuse* texts. Several points must be understood here. First, many texts of popular culture do take the

form of discrete texts, although they often do not share the other characteristics of traditional texts (e.g., they are largely nonverbal or are not expository). A discrete text, you will recall, is a group of signs that is perceived to be discrete in time and space with clear boundaries and clearly separate from its context. A diffuse text will sometimes not be recognized as a text by those who experience it, and at other times, it will be recognized by them as a very complex experience. A diffuse text is a collection of signs working for the same rhetorical influence or related that is not discretely separated from its context. Many of the texts of popular culture occur in diffuse form.

One good example of a diffuse text would be the whole experience of watching televised football. Most people who are fans will watch televised football with other people in small groups. Think about what typically goes on during such an experience: people talk with each other, both about the game and about issues relating to other dimensions of life; the television set is broadcasting both images of the game and an overlay of the commentators' talk about the game; people come and go between where the television is situated and other parts of the house or bar (for refreshments, bathroom breaks, and so forth); people often switch rapidly among several channels to check on other games as well. All of these signs and artifacts, mixed together in an incredible jumble, contribute to the same rhetorical effect of enjoyment, of involvement in football, of being a fan. Yet we would be hard-pressed to identify where this text begins and where it ends, to put boundaries in time and space on this system of signs. Thus, the experience of watching televised football is a diffuse text. Yet it has rhetorical influence, and because so many people are so enthusiastically involved in following football, it even manages what has become some of society's important business. Contrast this kind of text to the relatively more discrete experience of reading a newspaper article about the previous night's football game by yourself over coffee the next morning. That text is more bounded in time and space.

EXERCISE 2.9

In the preceding paragraph, it was suggested that spectator sports manage some of our society's important business. On your own or in class, consider these questions carefully: When people follow their favorite sport on television, in the newspapers, or at the stadium, are some important public problems being addressed? Which problems do today's spectator sports industries help to manage? In other words, when people become sports fans, are they *just* sports fans or are there wider implications to what they are doing?

The following points may help you to think about the questions posed above:

1. Criticism or praise of the performance of some African-American athletes, such as Colin Kaepernick, Richard Sherman, or Venus or Serena Williams, is sometimes read as being based on race. Criticism or praise of white athletes is rarely assumed to be race-based.
2. When sports figures are involved in various scandals such as gambling, steroid use, or sexual abuse, sports commentators often sadly claim that it is especially tragic that sports figures should be involved in such activities.
3. Bicyclist Lance Armstrong has admitted using performance-enhancing drugs. This led to his being stripped of his Tour de France titles, losing endorsements, and so forth. It prompted discussions of drug use and the extreme importance of winning at all costs in American society.

Finally, in addition to texts that are hierarchical, the rhetoric of popular culture is manifested in texts that are *democratic*. In the preceding example of watching televised football, who makes the text? Who puts it all together? Clearly, the fans, the viewers, the audience, or receivers of communication do. Of course, a person reading a book or listening to a speech has a choice in how to experience those traditional texts to some extent, but, relatively speaking, the football viewer has more choice and control. The fan is not placed in a situation where time, place, and procedures for experiencing texts are constrained as much as they are in the case of most public speeches. The fan is more actively at work assembling many related signs into a diffuse text. This is how much of the rhetoric of popular culture occurs: people walk through the crowded sea of signs that are available today (down a city street, for instance), assembling diffuse texts to suit their needs and desires in ways over which they have more choice and control.

Because the rhetoric of popular culture is (relatively) democratic, it may be found to be at work in marginalized areas of society where traditional rhetoric is not so likely to reach. Some scholars, such as John Fiske (*Reading the Popular, Understanding Popular Culture*) and Malcolm Barnard (*Fashion as Communication*), even argue that popular culture springs *mainly* from groups of people who have been oppressed and marginalized. It is true that the texts of popular culture often emerge from, and do their work among, the young, the poor, women, racial minorities, and others who have not been officially empowered. This is a relative difference as well, but a real one. The upper classes from Nob Hill watch ballet, while the disempowered from South Boston go bowling.

In general, then, texts of popular culture will be relatively more nonverbal, metonymic and narrative, diffuse, and democratic than are more traditional texts. Increasingly, because of the changes in real-life conditions that we have discussed in this chapter, the important business of society is managed in those texts of popular culture. In this chapter, we have seen what the rhetorical tradition is and why changing conditions are moving us away from it.

MANAGING POWER TODAY IN TEXTS OF POPULAR CULTURE

What kind of business is managed through the texts of popular culture? That question raises the whole issue of what popular culture is and why it is worth studying. Earlier we learned that people grow in and are sustained by popular culture, by the artifacts and experiences of everyday life. Furthermore, we considered the idea that empowerment and disempowerment in our society do not occur only in grand, isolated moments but are enacted in the artifacts and experiences of everyday life. Because of the growth in population, technology, pluralism, and knowledge that we have been discussing in this chapter, it is increasingly the case that public business is not being managed, and cannot be managed, in occasional, single moments of rhetoric (the “great speech,” the “important essay,” the “pivotal book,” and so forth). Because of the growth in these four areas, more of the important business of our society is now done from moment to moment in people’s experiences of popular culture.

This is a relative difference: there has always been some public business done within the realm of popular culture, even if theorists did not recognize it; and today, there is still some business conducted through the “great speech” and so on. A century ago, the business of managing

the problem of racism would have depended to a great extent on the impact of significant, occasional rhetorical efforts by leaders such as Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. DuBois. But today many of the problems of racism are managed in Spike Lee films, with different styles of clothing and grooming, and in moment-to-moment interactions in public schools.

Let us pursue the example of racism further. Earlier in this book (Definitions and the Management of Power in Chapter 1), we discussed the meaning of the management of power. How do the ideas we explored there apply to the public problem of racism as it is managed in popular culture? People must decide what to do and how to behave in relation to people of other races. We must also decide what cultural differences mean: for example, is it threatening or disrespectful when people of another race speak more loudly or more softly than we do, walk in a different way, stand too close to or too far from us, or use eye contact differently? Are such decisions managed, or influenced, by stirring speeches or lengthy essays today? Probably not so much. Instead, the problem of racism is being managed in the plots of television sitcoms and dramas, in movies, that take racism as an occasional theme and urge certain audience responses to it. Racism is managed in the increasingly common advertisements that feature couples, families, and friendly groups of different races interacting. Racism is managed in fashion, as shirts and caps with the name or photograph of a popular hip-hop group, or slogans of racial pride (e.g., “La Raza”), are worn in public and seen by people of all races. And racism is managed in athletics, as people of color are elevated to heroic, even mythic, status by their exploits on the field. Racism is being managed and struggled over every time two twelve-year-old white kids debate whether the latest The Weeknd download is worth spending this week’s allowance on. There, in the everyday texts of popular culture, is where racism is increasingly managed today.

The same holds true for the management of many other public issues. Earlier, we discussed the increasing inability of traditional texts to manage the problem of how we develop and market pharmaceuticals. For the public at large, concerns about prescription drugs may be



©iStockphoto.com/Alina555

embodied in the plots of movies that champion lawsuits against drug companies or that feature exciting quests to find new antibiotics in the Amazon. Comic books or video games influence young minds with depictions of monsters created by drug company programs gone awry, and many jokes are made on television comedy shows about drugs, like Viagra, for more “personal” problems. These texts of popular culture shape many of today’s arguments over the issue of pharmaceuticals.

If we want to understand how people are influenced on these and other issues, and how public affairs are nudged in one direction or another, we need to look at least as much at what is happening in movies than on the Senate floor. The theory of rhetoric today is increasingly recognizing the important business that is done through popular culture, as we will see in upcoming discussions in this book. In short, more important business is being done in the culture of everyday life, and theory has begun to recognize that business more fully than it ever has before.

SUMMARY AND REVIEW

To understand what culture means, we began with its building blocks: signs. Signs have meaning in three ways: indexically, iconically, and symbolically. In discussing symbolic meanings, we noted that because symbols are arbitrary and conventional, their meaning is easily changed. And because they are not naturally or permanently connected to their meanings, symbols are imprecise and changeable in meaning.

We defined an artifact as (1) an action, event, or object perceived as a unified whole, (2) having widely shared meanings, and (3) manifesting group identifications to us. In discussing that definition, we reviewed some important characteristics that contribute to this idea of an artifact:

1. Artifacts are a socially created reality.
2. Signs become artifacts as they become charged with meaning, thus crossing a threshold into artifact status.
3. An artifact can be very complex, even being made up of other artifacts.
4. Artifacts are the material signs of group identifications.

We defined culture as the integrated set or system of artifacts that is linked to a group and noted that culture in this sense is what we grow in, what supports us and sustains us. Popular culture, more specifically, is made up of those systems of artifacts to which most people are exposed. We noted three important characteristics of culture:

1. Cultures are highly complex and overlapping.
2. Cultures entail consciousness, or ideologies.
3. Cultures are experienced through texts.

We learned that a text is defined as a set of signs related to each other insofar as their meanings all contribute to the same set of effects or functions. Furthermore, texts are the ways in which we experience culture.

We learned that relative to traditional texts, texts of popular culture are more nonverbal, metonymic and narrative, diffuse, and democratic. We saw how these characteristics match a state of affairs in which more important rhetorical work is done in popular culture.

LOOKING AHEAD

We have left many questions unanswered. So far, we have only a general idea of the basic characteristics of the texts that enact the rhetoric of popular culture. We need a clearer idea of *what to look for* in texts of popular culture. Thus, one important question in the next chapter will be “what does the critic look for in identifying the texts of popular culture?”

Critical analysis of rhetoric is never a lockstep procedure, though. Different critics will be interested in different aspects of a given subject or will want to ask different questions about a text. Thus, a second question for us in the next chapter will be “what choices are available to the critic of popular culture?”

We also need a clearer sense of how texts work to manage society’s business through popular culture. Thus, an important final question for us will be “what is it about texts that persuades people?” And since most texts are complex and exert influence in several different ways, we will also want to know how to analyze texts on several different levels. These and other questions will be taken up in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

Do not copy, post, or distribute