THE CLUBCULTURES READER

Readings in Popular Cultural Studies

edited by

Steve Redhead

with Derek Wynne and Justin O'Connor

photographs by Patrick Henry

BLACKWELL

15 Reading Pop:

The Press, the Scholar and the Consequences of Popular Cultural Studies

Steve Jones

Introduction: (Scholarly) Material Girl

One battle in what appears to be a war between the pundit, the professor and the press, recently took place after the publication of Madonna's *Sex* book. An opening salvo in that battle came when some journalists characterized research on Madonna as contemptible. One can find played out within the ensuing debate about Madonna scholars and their scholarship elements Hanno Hardt criticizes for creating a climate that '[equates] the notion of active participation in the social structure with consumption of media presentations' (Hardt, 1993). There is indeed a struggle between scholars and journalists, but it is not only a struggle over the commodities they write about. It is also about the place each holds in the social structure and the relationships thus formed to those commodities, and as such it is a particularly fierce struggle and deserves continued attention as it reveals our investments in our commodities and ourselves.

This study is an effort to gather demographic (and other) information about scholars studying Madonna and related phenomena. It is also a brief critique of the manner in which popular culture is studied and an analysis of the criticism of Madonna scholars. Another way to put the central issue at hand is: what happens when scholars study a popular form, namely, make the popular 'academic'?

Anne Matthews has claimed that scholars and journalists have 'a mutual conviction of self-importance and sense of privileged immunity' (Sahadi, 1994), and finds that there is a 'culture war' between the two groups. Recent debates about the rise of a new group of 'public intellectuals' similarly entail

vociferous claims of selling out and transgression. Journalists point out that scholars are encroaching on territories in the popular media once reserved for cultural criticism; some scholars claim that they simply seek to leave their ivory tower, while other scholars criticize those who seek a broader audience. Theodore J. Lowi, for instance, writing in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, claimed:

> Who . . . is filling the role of the public intellectual? Most such individuals are actually idea entrepreneurs, who take a concept – their own or another's – and focus their energies on popularizing it rather than on analyzing it and coming up with a really fresh way of thinking about the subject. (Lowi, 1995)

Simultaneously, a reporter for the London *Times* can claim:

> The great thinkers of the New World sit around eating tortilla chips and watching pop videos, just like ordinary teenagers. The difference is that while ordinary teenagers consign such information to their mental trash cans, the academics feel it necessary to consign it to their word processors. (Muir, 1992)

If there is a war at hand, it is not simply scholar versus journalist, or even scholar versus scholar; it is often one that scholars and journalists wage internally, as Fernandez describes it:

> While popular-culture studies . . . are gaining more acceptance for blurring the line between highbrow and lowbrow, many scholars seem fearful of sliding into *real* low culuture . . . At the ['Icons of Popular Culture I: Elvis and Marilyn'] conference, one of the ways in which fear manifested itself was in the distinction made again and again between the conference-goer and the 'middle-aged woman with a beehive'. (Fernandez, 1994)

Compelling boundaries are drawn between being a fan, a critic or a scholar, an 'analyser' versus a 'popularizer', and so on.

However, though boundaries exist, the lines that create them are usually less than visible. It is often only when the boundaries are crossed that their place becomes clear, and one such transgression that provides particular clarity is the debate concerning scholarship about Madonna.

Of course, the study of objects popular with mass audiences necessarily resurrects the traditional high culture/low culture debate of the 1950s and 1960s.[1] In that debate, voices championing high culture traditionally have generally come from academia and from particular academic disciplines. The strongest opposition came later, from British cultural studies, including Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall and those at the Birmingham Centre for

Contemporary Cultural Studies, who '[reject] the idea that the media necessarily and inevitably produce rubbish' (Turner, 1991).

Now, in an interesting twist, the increase in scholarship about Madonna (and related cultural phenomena like music videos, popular music and rap music) has generated opposition to the study of mass culture from within the media itself. Daniel Harris, for instance, wrote in *The Nation*:

> If co-optation involves the appropriation of a marginal artist by the mainstream, reverse co-optation involves the appropriation of a mainstream artist by a marginal group – in this case, the increasing numbers of academics who are currently flooding the country's journals and small presses with a glut of scholarship on the stylistic flamboyance – the glitz, guts and pure raunch – of a celebrity who has borne much of the brunt of the university's restless and uncertain engagement with popular culture. (Harris, 1992)

Harris goes on to characterize those studying Madonna (and popular culture generally) as doing so 'to counteract their own marginality'. Such press coverage has not, in turn, gone unnoticed by scholars. Cathy Schwichtenberg, editor of *The Madonna Connection*, an anthology of critical essays that sparked much of the journalistic writing about the scholarly study of Madonna, noted that there thus exists an opportunity 'to reveal some of the ways in which academics are constructed by the press . . . [and] these constructions further illustrate what the press thinks the common person thinks about academics and their scholarly pursuits' (Schwichtenberg, 1993a).

This study was in part inspired by Schwichtenberg's claims, and thus I have made an effort to gather demographic (and other) information to determine what construction (if any, while fully acknowledging the constructed nature of self-reports and surveys) is made from self-reported information by Madonna scholars. I also believe that, via critique of the manner in which popular culture is studied and via analysis of the criticism of Madonna scholars, it is possible to discern that 'these constructions . . . illustrate' what the press think of themselves.

And so: what happens when scholars make the popular 'academic'? The study of popular cultural icons foments a struggle for the power to produce and reproduce the meanings and typologies of those icons. Thus, another important question: is it the popular critics, news media or intellectuals who gain in the struggle to (re)symbolize from the deconstruction of the popular? That such a struggle exists is evident in the strident character of the media criticism of Madonna scholarship published in books and journals in the early and mid-1990s. But *why* a struggle? In *Representations of the Intellectual*, Edward Said provides good insight into the nature of the tensions exposed in the criticism of Madonna scholars and their work. Said borrows from

Gramsci to discuss the roles of the 'traditional intellectuals' and 'organic intellectuals', defined in the following manner:

> [T]raditional intellectuals such as teachers, priests, and administrators . . . do the same thing from generation to generation . . . organic intellectuals are actively involved in society, that is, they constantly struggle to change minds and expand markets; unlike teachers and priests, who seem more or less to remain in place, doing the same kind of work year in year out, organic intellectuals are always on the move, on the make. (Said, 1994)

Said sets off Gramsci's duality by contrasting it to Julien Benda's vision of the intellectual as a 'philosopher king': someone able to speak truth to power, a crusty, eloquent, fantastically courageous and angry individual for whom no worldly power is too big and imposing to be criticized and pointedly taken to task. However, Said goes on to write:

> Gramsci's social analysis of the intellectual as a person who fulfills a particular set of functions in the society is much closer to the reality than anything Benda gives us, particularly in the late twentieth century when so many new professions – broadcasters, academic professionals . . . and indeed the whole field of modern mass journalism itself – have vindicated Gramsci's vision.

To see a struggle in the criticism and debate surrounding Madonna scholarship is to witness the fight over fragmented roles and fracturing power, as 'organic intellectuals' raise their voices to new heights to be heard in the din of mass-mediated discourse. Said gives further weight to Gramsci, himself adopting a virtually identical position, when he writes: 'The central fact for me is, I think, that the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public.'

From such a position it is easy to see why book, film, music and media critics and others consider themselves intellectuals, and why, moreover, intellectual discourse is played out ever increasingly on a mass-mediated stage. The *raison d'etre* of a newspaper or magazine, a publisher will tell you, is to serve a public: that is, an audience. As that audience is fragmented by strenuous marketing efforts and new audiences/publics are created, more gaps open that intellectuals may fill. Intellectuals seem quite aware of this phenomenon, though they often provide rationale in terms somewhat different from those used in the commercial arena. One journal editor, for instance, bemoaning the difficulty in starting up a new publication, attributed the difficulty to 'The decline of the reading public . . . [and an] audience for educated opinion and analysis of topical issues . . . so small that it does not cast a shadow' (Taves, 1987).

Interestingly, this occurs during a time when it is argued that public intellectuals have virtually disappeared. Russell Jacoby, whose book *The Last Intellectuals* serves as a milestone in that argument, even juxtaposes the intellectual against the media when he writes:

> To declare an intellectual generation 'invisible' is fraught with difficulties. The statement seems to accept the judgment of the 'public sphere' – newspapers, book reviews, talk shows – as truth itself; it risks confounding glitter with substance, TV exposure with intellectual weight. (Jacoby, 1987)

Indeed, Jacoby's own position is quite clear:

> My argument of a missing generation [of intellectuals] might be challenged by proposing that the new intellectuals thrive in journalism. I agree that the new and no-so-new journalism (personal reportage, muckraking, rock criticism) testifies – or once testified – to a vigorous younger generation. Moreover, by virtue of abdication elsewhere journalists have assumed a critical, and increasing, importance. Yet the constraints of living solely from the press – deadlines, space, money – finally dilute, not accentuate, intellectual work.

Yet intellectuals in academia operate within the same constraints. Deadlines for articles and papers are, perhaps, not *daily*, but they do give an important structure to academic life. Space is, of course, an issue, as journal editors, reviewers, publishers and others largely seek to achieve the same ends and economies of scale as newspaper editors. And money . . . well, it would be hard to argue that either journalists or intellectuals are generally well paid.

But it does not appear that Jacoby is interested in savaging journalists, and in fact later in his book he believes he sees a connection between journalists and intellectuals: they both engage in public writing. And, Jacoby goes on, there is evidence of the same pattern among journalists as among intellectuals: once there were many, now there are few, and our society is the worse off for it.

Of course, both groups, journalists and intellectuals, are under attack by the public, and in a later article Jacoby does a much better job of examining the struggle between them although his conclusion, that it is often only a matter of writing styles that distinguishes them, is weak at best. The stronger point Jacoby makes is that 'the lingo of theoretical breakthroughs and explosions partakes of the language of the market because it is a market' (Jacoby, 1993), thus noting that, whether each group once had a golden age or not, both are engaged in activities buffeted, if not driven, by market forces. What potentially occurs, then, is, as with any marketing effort, an attempt to differentiate oneself or one's work from that of others, and in a fragmented market place serving a fragmented audience it is no wonder that the struggle quickly turns to one of 'positioning' and identity (whether by oneself or by others, who position and identify themselves in opposition).

Who's That Scholar?

As Madonna herself moved across various media (first music, then video, then film, then print and photography), her work was encountered by critics specializing in, as Said put it, 'representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public' attending to those media. Madonna's use and manipulation of media became clearer over time, and her work allowed for self-reflection by some of those critics, but it also created an opportunity for popular culture to be taken seriously beyond the confines of the mediated object. Thus not only did critics writing in the mass media find themselves shaping a contemporary object of study (Madonna), they also found themselves shaping the discourse about the media, its cultural and political roles, within which Madonna worked.

Along the way, critics began to shape the image of the scholars who were studying Madonna, and were themselves taking popular culture seriously. So, for instance, Harris claims:

> Madonna has been drafted into the staggeringly implausible role of spokeswoman of the values and professional interests of university instructors . . . Just as members of the left often sentimentalize the proletariat, so academics have begun to sentimentalize popular culture by ascribing to it all sorts of admirable characteristics that it does not have – in particular, the potential to radicalize the huddled masses by providing typically quiescent MTV viewers with what it is now fasionable to term 'a site of contention' (or, in Charles Wells' marvellous malapropism, a 'cite of contention'). (Harris, 1992)

Harris' critique combines comments about popular culture that one might expect from cultural criticism with comments about university instructors (itself an interesting occupational description, eliding the label 'scholar' and even that of 'teacher'). That *The Nation* chose this particular side of this battle is itself interesting, given its openness to cultural criticism and its generally 'left'-leaning intellectual position. Laurie Ouellette counters in *On The Issues*:

> What will ultimately emerge is a situation where the right no longer needs to tell those scholars – feminist, gay and lesbian, and people of color – who are not part of the white male establishment that their work is not appropriate for the academy. (Ouellette, 1993)

Others quickly followed Harris and Ouellette. Four letters to *The Nation*'s editors quickly followed Harris' article. Camille Paglia, for instance, in one letter, congradulated 'Harris for his splendid dissection of the pretension and ineptitude of the academic Madonna exploiters, with their comical Rube Goldberg theoretical apparatuses' (Paglia, 1992). (Unfortunately, Paglia does not give insight into her feelings about non-academic Madonna exploiters.) A second letter found a scholar (apparently) distancing himself from Madonna scholars:

> [N]ot all academics do criticism, and of those who do, not all study popular culture. Of those who study popular culture, not all do cultural studies. Of those who do cultural studies, not all are postmodernists, and of the small group of postmodernists doing cultural studies, only a handful study Madonna, and only a few are idiots. (Erlich, 1992)

(One can imagine, someday, the creation of an endowed chair in non-Madonna, non-postmodernist, non-cultural studies, non-popular culture criticism.) A third letter took to 'off-loading' the issue on to students. Its author claimed that scholars must study Madonna because students are familiar with her and her work, and she thus 'get[s] students interested and talking' (Rand, 1992). The fourth letter was from Harold P. Schlechtweg and Schwichtenberg herself, with the postscript, 'Cathy says to tell Dan, "Kiss my grits."' (Schlechtweg and Schwichtenberg, 1992).

Some reviewers of *The Madonna Connection* were cognizant of the tensions between scholars and journalists (in some part probably due to the near-simultaneous publication of Madonna's own *Sex* book). Paul Burston made note, for instance, of the 'apparent tension between the practitioners of slanted journalism (Madonna-haters) and the defenders of unbiased critical engagement (Madonna-scholars)' (Burston, 1992). A reviewer for the *New York Times* found Schwichtenberg's book 'laughable' and 'point[ing] up the distressing state of academic scholarship' (Kakutani, 1992). The reviewer was quick to point out, however, that the book's 'observations could easily be made by any number of Madonna's fans', and indeed many have 'already been laid out – often *ad nauseam* – in the popular press and on television'.

Still other critics found in Madonna scholars the ammunition they needed to load into their anti-higher education *ProfScam* guns and fire charges that anyone studying Madonna has 'too much time on their hands' (Sheldon, 1992) and that the book is 'littered with academic jargon that will make it impenetrable to most *Sex* readers'. *ProfScam*'s author, Charles Sykes, weighed in on the side of Madonna critics by stating that she is 'almost too easy a target' (Bailey, 1992), and Madonna scholarship 'fall[s] under what I would call junk scholarship. You're dressing up very routine subjects in the garb of academic seriousness' (Singleton, 1992).

From these articles and reviews of *The Madonna Connection*, as well as from other articles too numerous to abstract here, a particular image of the Madonna scholar (and the scholar's position in the academy) emerges. Madonna scholars are typically women, feminist, marginalized (such a characterization not without redundancies). That last characterization, as marginalized, in particular speaks to the ways in which the press understands and translates academic debate, as a kind of intellectual wrestling match which, like the World Wrestling Federation, has its share of heroes and losers united via hype, but lacking greatly in actual effect.

Schwichtenberg, reflecting on her experience after publication of *The Madonna Connection*, noted that it is claimed that Madonna scholars are assistant professors in search of something with which to spice up otherwise dreary lives, 'young opportunist[s] . . . supposedly validated by virtue of esoteric theory, jargon, and real world object' (Schwichtenberg, 1993b).

The Immaculate Collection (of Data)

Though surveys have their own pitfalls, assessing not the state of Madonna scholars or scholarship, but their status via demographic information seemed one way to approach an alternative construction to that built by the press. An extensive literature search was conducted using the following keywords: Madonna, videos, MTV, music television, music videos, rap, rap music. Then, bibliographic and references sources and databases were searched between 1980 and 1994 using those keywords.[2] The search resulted in 336 references. The authors from each reference were compiled in a separate list, resulting in 138 individuals' names (since some published more than one article, or had an article reprinted as a book chapter, and the like). A variety of association directories and guides to scholars, and this author's personal sources and resources, were used to find a mailing address for each author.

A questionnaire was developed, asking for demographic information and information about the authors' experiences, attitudes and beliefs concerning their own scholarship and scholarship in popular culture generally. The questionnaire consisted of thirty questions, three of which were open-ended. Then 138 questionnaires were mailed and subjects were given three weeks to respond. In all, 106 questionnaires were returned completed, for a return rate of 76.8 per cent.

Results

Several generalities can be made from the completed questionnaires. Virtually all of the respondents (96.2 per cent) had earned a Ph.D. A slight

majority, 51.9 per cent, are female and a vast majority, 95.3 per cent, categorized themselves as white. All of the respondents held an academic post at a college or university. The majority (76.4 per cent) were tenured at schools in the United States of America, at the associate and full professor level. Respondents who held positions in departments of communication outnumbered those in other departments, and if one includes those who reported their positions as being in a department of journalism and radio-TV-film the majority, 74.5 per cent, are communication scholars of one stripe or another. The age of the respondents ranged from 36 to 55 (median age of 42 and mean age of 43.6), with a majority (61.3 per cent) in their forties.

The demographic picture painted by the survey responses hardly coincides with that painted by Harris, which sees them as somehow marginal; nor does it match up with Harris's claim that 'Madonna scholars see themselves as iconoclasts rebelling against the suffocating strictures of High Art, as devilish pranksters shocking prudish humanists who hurl themselves melodramatically in front of the canon in order to shield it maternally from assault' (Harris, 1992). And it particularly does not fit the image portrayed by Henry Allen in the *Washington Post*, who believed that nearly all Madonna scholars are opportunistic assistant professors (Allen, 1992).

Indeed, Allen was probably the Madonna scholars' harshest critic, writing of 'the despair of assistant professors' who live in a world where 'the only people getting tenure these days are Pakistani electrical engineering professors, who have "real world" appeal'. Allen makes clear what other critics and reviewers hint at, that studying Madonna is the potential on-ramp to the tenure highway that all assistant professors seek to navigate:

> It has that sound. That tenure sound. That publish-not-perish sound. Maybe even a get-yourself-on-TV sound, if you use the secret language to write about something people actually care about, something real world like the Material Girl herself, the woman is everything that a despairing assistant professor is not.

Allen thus combines several of the issues currently engaging scholars, journalists and critics, by claiming that assistant professors (1) claim objectivity but want publicity, as, it seems, do journalists, and (2) want out of their hopeless existence, as, it seems, do fans. It simply will not do for an intellectual to be either. Allen seems to be saying, although given that he's circumscribed the extremes, one can hardly find fault with a scholar who falls into the (human) ground in-between.

It is too easy to refute Allen's claims by simply looking at the demographic data collected for this study. The more interesting data, and questions, are related not to the demographic information, but rather to the respondents' comments in answer to questions about their opinion of research in Madonna studies, music videos, etc. A five-point Likert-type scale was used to ask those surveyed to respond to several questions related to their own status and that of the popular cultural phenomena they have studied. More than two-thirds of those surveyed do not believe that their research on music videos, Madonna, rap, popular music and so on is what they are best known for in their field. Also, many more (52.9 per cent versus 22.1 per cent) do not find their research in this area more satisfying than other research in which they are engaged. In regard to the status of research in these areas of popular culture within academia, only 10.9 per cent of the respondents reported that they had been counselled to abandon their research as it would not 'count' toward tenure. Most respondents also believed such research central to the study of popular culture. Interestingly, the respondents seemed only slightly more likely than not to believe that their colleagues had interest in their work in this area.

Perhaps the most interesting results are that, in response to questions about their own consumption of the popular cultural texts they have studied, more (59.4 per cent versus 41.5 per cent) agreed or strongly agreed that they are fans of rock music than that they are fans of Madonna (music videos, MTV and rap music also came in behind rock music, but well in front of Madonna). Four times as many disagreed or stongly disagreed that they are fans of Madonna as disagreed or strongly disagreed that they are fans of rock music (again, Madonna seems to be last among the respondents' choices). Finally, many more of the respondents purchased rock music than had purchased items in the other categories, and nearly half of the respondents reported that they did not watch MTV at all during a typical week.

Discussion: What Becomes a Commodity Most

The picture of popular culture scholars engaged in studying Madonna, music videos, rap music, rock music and the like created by the popular press does not match up to that which can be composited from the responses to this survey. Of course, it cannot be claimed from the survey that critical scholars are not marginalized despite (or become of?) their generally tenured, established academic positions.

But there are still more interesting facets to the picture, one of which is: what prompts academic interest in *any* area?[3] By way of their work, popular culture scholars create second-order commodities from the ones they study. Annalee Newitz believes that:

> intellectual cultural critics['] . . . endorsement[s] of Madonna . . . no doubt lend an aura of legitimacy to Madonna's work; and academics such as John

> Fiske and E. Ann Kaplan have represented Madonna to their academic audiences as a moment in which popular culture imitates critical theories of history, knowledge and human identity. (Newitz, 1993)

The obverse seems implicit – 'non-intellectual' cultural critics, the press for instance, do not legitimize Madonna (perhaps because they strive for 'objectivity'?), and so the press is not a complicit actor in the 'star' system. And yet the claims by critics in the press seem to imply (at least) that scholars are legitimizing *themselves* via Madonna. Contradictions abound, as Schwichtenberg noted:

> [T]he academic constructed by these journalists is a repository of contradictory directives . . . [and] pilfers in journalistic territory but belongs in the ivory tower which is irrelevant to life, so that when the academic transgresses and enters the public arena, he/she is analyzing popular culture for advancement and social relevance. (Schwichtenberg, 1993b)

Russell Jacoby would agree with Schwichtenberg, and does so in *The Last Intellectuals*. According to him:

> Journalists have sustained – more in their books than in their daily writing – the general culture . . . As academic life and writing have grown wan, journalism has expanded, appearing bigger than life: vigorous, committed, public. Journalists themselves have been romanticized in countless movies . . . Journalists search for truth, for which they risk their lives or careers; they are unswervingly devoted to a public. They are everything professors are not. (Jacoby, 1987)

Additionally, Jacoby believes that another struggle, that between print journalists and television journalists, affects the relationship that journalists and intellectuals have, and that print journalists feel 'squeezed' on both sides.

It is interesting, then, not only that academics and journalists are engaged in a debate about the public intellectual, a debate whose import may have waned since the 1980s, but that the trajectories of both professions seem to mirror one another. There are not only the parallels that Jacoby (explicitly or inadvertently) draws, but ones that are of even greater consequence for individuals in those fields, such as the increase in freelancers and adjunct instructors. Why this struggle, why now?

Among the possibilities: it is a struggle for fame by two groups that have acknowledged the slim availability of fortune (and fame's appearance as a prerequisite for fortune), a struggle among those whose egos are stroked only by recognition (hence a need to publish), and/or a struggle to *matter* by those

working in two professions whose influence seems to be on the wane. It may also be a struggle against an enemy without, by professions who have several enemies within. As Jacoby indicated, journalists working in different media are at odds, and academics have their own inside critics in the shape of people such as Charles Sykes and Allan Bloom. And yet, as one study has pointed out, 'public opinion [of universities, higher education and faculty members] has remained consistent, despite criticism in the media' (Land, 1995). How seriously, then, can one take these possibilities? Are intellectuals and journalists either (1) so thin-skinned as to believe their critics and/or (2) out of touch with the public?

It is more likely that the intention of scholars is not so much to legitimize Madonna as to legitimize critical theory. Only two of the respondents to this study's survey expressed that their initial interest in music videos, Madonna, etc. was the result of those phenomena being 'convenient sites' for their theoretical work. Many, many more were drawn to these topics by their own children, or by their students, and several claimed that scholarship in these areas was 'a nice change from other research interests'. None of the responses showed evidence of interest directed forcefully by the ability to publish, gain tenure, gain recognition and the like. In its way, this mirrors rather clearly the *modus operandi* of the popular critic, legitimizing and commodifying social, aesthetic and artistic observation and analysis with references to particular works, events and, ultimately, sources (via quotation) as part of what is understood as the ongoing construction of individual and collective reality. In that sense, both groups can be understood as public intellectuals, or at least may be considered as engaged with intellectualizing the public. As there appears to be less and less of the public (or at least less of its attention singularly forcused) to go around in a fragmented media-world, it should be no surprise that both groups' voices struggle to be heard, though it remains surprising that each is so at odds with the other.

Notes

1 Chapters in Rosenberg and White's *Mass Culture* and *Mass Culture Revisited* provide archetypal examples of that debate. See also Jensen (1991).

2 Many different sources were used, including the Humanities Index 1982–93 and the Social Sciences Index 1982–93.

3 Jacoby (1995): 'academics face a crisis of dwindling materials; classic books have been studied to death. With the added allure of subverting Western hegemony, post-colonial studies opens up a new turn and allows the re-examination of old ground.' This is an ingenuous claim, for it measures the worth of academic work by its novelty, and positions academics as intellectual scavengers (perhaps another inadvertent attempt at a parallel between intellectuals and journalists).

References

Allen, Henry (1992) 'The other Madonna book', *Washington Post*, 1 November.

Bailey, Martin (1992) 'American scholar deconstructs a "metatextual girl"', *Observer*, 15 October.

Burston, Paul (1992) 'Immaterial girl', *Modern Review*, December.

Erlich, Richard (1992) 'Papa don't preach', *The Nation*, 17–24 August.

Fernandez, Sally (1994) 'The iconography of Elvis and Marilyn', *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 27 January.

Hardt, Hanno (1993) 'Authenticity, communication and critical theory', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* vol. 10, no. 1, March.

Harris, Daniel (1992) 'Make my rainy day', *The Nation*, 8 June.

Jacoby, Russell (1987) *The Last Intellectuals*, New York: Basic Books.

(1993) 'Journalists, cynics and cheerleaders', *Telos*, no. 97, Fall.

(1995) *Lingua Franca*, September/October.

Jensen, Joli (1991) *Redeeming Modernity*, Newbury Park: Sage.

Kakutani, Michiko (1992) 'Essays by "Madonna scholars" laughable', *New York Times*, 21 October.

Land, M.J. (1995) 'Critics' use of the media and public opinion of faculty members at universities', paper to annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington DC, August.

Lowi, Theodore J. (1995) 'Media fascination with self-styled public intellectuals', *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 27 January.

Muir, Kate (1992) 'The face that launched a thousand theses', *The Times*, 8 November.

Newitz, Annalee (1993) 'Madonna's revenge', *Bad Subjects*, no. 9.

Ouellette, Laurie (1993) 'Let's get serious: the attack on Madonna scholarship', *On The Issues*, Spring.

Paglia, Camille (1992) 'Material girls', *The Nation*, 17–24 August.

Rand, Erica (1992) 'Get into the groove', *The Nation*, 17–24 August.

Sahadi, Jeanne (1994) 'Dissecting the culture wars between media and academe', *Communique*, July/August.

Said, Edward (1994) *Representations of the Intellectual*, New York: Random House.

Schlechtweg, Harold P. and Cathy Schwichtenberg (1992) 'Express yourself', *The Nation*, 17–24 August.

Schwichtenberg, Cathy (ed.) (1993a) *The Madonna Connection*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

(1993b) 'The Madonna connection: academics, the press and popular culture', unpublished paper presented at the First International Scholarly Conference on Rock and Rap, University of Missouri, 5 February.

Shelden, Michael (1992) 'Set on dropping her frock', *Daily Telegraph*, 9 December.

Singleton, Janet (1992) 'Celebrity research: some say it's important work', *College Press Service*, 7 May.

Taves, Michael (1987) 'Missing and accounted for: public intellectuals', *Telos*, no. 73, Fall.

Turner, Graeme (1991) *British Cultural Studies*, Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.