

# **Art in the Age Digital Reproduction: An Examination of Television and Hip Hop in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century**

West R-A Poindexter  
Philosophy  
The University of West Georgia  
1601 Maple Street  
Carrollton, Georgia 30118

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Janet Donohoe

## **Abstract**

All art forms born of the age of mechanical reproduction begin with the ability to be art-as-politics, removing centralized authority and opening critique to the masses. I argue that two phenomena affect this ability: the creation of the star cult and the co-option of art's message by capitalism. These two events lead to art's transition to politics-as-art. In an effort to illustrate this, I will begin by explaining Walter Benjamin's thoughts on aura, what is meant by politics-as-art and art-as-politics, and the influence of capitalism on film and in the creation of the cult of personality as elaborated in *Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Treating capitalism as a mindset or ordering force that seeks to use anything it can as a means of increasing profit, I will trace the effect of capitalism and its associative aura on the reassertion of central authority in television and Hip Hop. Within this trace, we witness these mediums initially functioning to disseminate art to the masses, stripping art of its central authority and redistributing it amongst the masses. However, as in the case of film, the influence of capitalism establishes not only a cult following of their personalities (celebrities), but a cult following of the mediums themselves as well, recentralizing authority. This structural parallelism between Hip Hop, television, and film functions as the basis from which I will make my argument that the influence of capitalism—an element within consumerist tradition which is implicitly challenged by challenges to that tradition—has led to the reordering of art to serve in the perpetuation of consumerist tradition. In closing, I will argue that this co-option of media by capitalism was inevitable.

**Keywords: Tradition, Aura, Capitalism**

## **1. Introduction**

All art forms born of the age of mechanical reproduction begin with the ability to be art-as-politics, removing centralized authority and opening critique to the masses. I argue that two phenomena affect this ability: the creation of the star cult and the co-option of art's message by capitalism. These two events lead to art's transition to politics-as-art. In an effort to illustrate this, I will begin by summarizing Walter Benjamin's thoughts on aura, and the influence of capitalism on film and in the creation of the cult of personality. I will conclude this section by summarizing what is meant by politics-as-art and art-as-politics. Next, I will trace the effect of capitalism and its associative aura on the reassertion of central authority in television and Hip Hop. At this point, I will explicitly make my argument that the influence of capitalism has led to the reordering of art to serve in the perpetuation of consumerist tradition. I will conclude with a brief consideration of the importance of the internet. Associative aura should be considered another form of an object-relation aura, a concept I will expand on below.

In his essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, Walter Benjamin examines the affect art in the age of mechanical reproduction has on the concept of aura. The aura of a work of art is twofold. One aspect of this aura is its uniqueness. Benjamin says:

Even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place it happens to be. This unique existence of the work of art determined the history to which it was subject throughout the time of its existence.<sup>1</sup>

This unique presence of a work of art, when confronted with a reproduction, establishes it as authentic. “The uniqueness of a work of art is inseparable from its being imbedded in the fabric of tradition.”<sup>2</sup> The whole sphere of authenticity is outside any reproducibility because a reproduction, in being a separate work, necessarily has its own presence and history related to the same. The authenticity of a work supports and founds the “historical testimony”<sup>3</sup> of the work, which establishes the authority of the work. The second aspect of this aura is “the unique phenomenon of a distance, however close [the work] may be.”<sup>4</sup> To clarify this Benjamin gives the example of, with one’s eyes, following “a mountain range on the horizon or a branch which casts its shadow over you.”<sup>5</sup> The example is meant to demonstrate distance in terms of both spatiality and alterity. Aura serves to maintain hierarchy and thus represents a distancing from the masses. The opportunity to view art fully imbued with aura does not offer the viewer the opportunity for critique, the place of the work is already established. Art of this nature, “is never entirely separated from its ritual function...the unique value of the “authentic” work of art has its basis in ritual, the location of its original value...still recognizable as secularized ritual.”<sup>6</sup>

By contrast, mechanically reproducible art leads to the denigration of tradition.

The situations into which the product of mechanical reproduction can be brought may not touch the actual work of art, yet the quality of its presence is always depreciated... The technique of reproduction detaches the reproduced object from the domain of tradition. By making many reproductions it substitutes a plurality of copies for a unique existence. And in permitting the reproduction to meet the beholder or listener in his own particular situation, it reactivates the object reproduced. These two processes lead to a tremendous shattering of tradition.<sup>7</sup>

The reproduction lacks the uniqueness that contributes to the aura of the original. “Every day the urge grows stronger to get hold of an object [work] at very close range by way of its reproduction.”<sup>8</sup> In substituting “a plurality of copies for a unique existence”, the reproduction replaces the singular authority of the work with the plural authority of the masses. This substitution represents a transition from tradition to traditions. The existence of reproductions, leads to mass dissemination, allowing the work to be viewed outside of its traditional place. The work is, in effect, removed from the distanced relationship aura creates and opened to critique by the masses. Benjamin describes this difference in the engagement of art with aura and reproduction in terms of absorption. “[One] who concentrates before a work of art [with aura] is absorbed by it,” the individual is subjected and submits to the authority of the work.<sup>9</sup> However, when “the distracted mass absorbs the work of art [the reproduction],” the reproduction is subjected and submits to the authority of the masses.<sup>10</sup> It should be noted in the latter situation, that the absorption of the reproduction and the contemporaneous elevation of the masses to the position of critique is a passive occurrence. Instead of cult-ritual value, art takes on an exhibition-political value. This shift in value can be observed if we consider the difference in which one engages with the *Mona Lisa* as a portrait and the *Mona Lisa* as a postcard. The encounter with the portrait, which resides behind glass and velvet ropes, is one fully couched in aura. The activity of queuing up for the opportunity to view it mirrors the activity of queuing up for an audience with a monarch. The encounter with the postcard differs greatly. The presence of the *Mona Lisa* is secondary, accidental even. It is merely glimpsed as the postcard is turned over to dwell with the message on the back. This example also illustrates the change in the direction of absorption. The portrait absorbs, the postcard is absorbed.

Benjamin continues to say that mechanically reproducible film, unlike a portrait, is a rapidly changing, rapidly developing piece, which requires an increased attentiveness towards it in order to understand its whole. Film has the ability to shock, to evoke an emotional response. It has the effect of elevating every viewer to the role of critic decentralizing the authority of and for critique. While film has the ability to dissolve aura, “the cult of the movie star, fostered by the money of the film industry, preserves not the unique aura of the person but the “spell of personality,” the phony spell of commodity.”<sup>11</sup> In fact, Benjamin continues to say:

So long as the movie makers capital sets fashion, as a rule no other revolutionary merit can be accredited to today's film than the promotion of a revolutionary criticism of traditional concepts of art.<sup>12</sup>

The influence of capitalism restricts film's critique to the concept of art, rather than allowing it to critique Tradition. The "cult of the movie star" represents capitalism's "[denial of] consideration to the modern man's legitimate claim to being reproduced," in effect a denial of the authority of the modern man.<sup>13</sup> Instead, capitalism tries "hard to spur the interest of the masses through illusion-promoting spectacles and dubious speculations."<sup>14</sup>

Both the Fascist and the Communist, creating two expressions of the relationship between art and politics, politics-as-art and art-as-politics, use reproduction. In Fascism, the relationship between politics and art is one in which politics becomes art, politics-as-art.

The masses have a right to change property relations; Fascism seeks to give them expression while preserving property. The logical result of Fascism is the introduction of aesthetics into political life... The violation of the masses, whom Fascism, with its *Führer cult*, forces to their knees, has its counterpart in the violation of an apparatus which is pressed into production of ritual values.<sup>15</sup>

Through the manufactured aura of the cult of personality, reproduction is co-opted to reinforce hegemonic tradition. Reintroducing the ritual value of art re-distances the ability for effect-yielding critique. "All efforts to render politics aesthetic culminate in one thing, war."<sup>16</sup> War is the substitution of the substantive for the vapid and illusionary. Through war, politics as art unites the masses against the other. Two effects of this are the reinforcement of tradition, by means of the "us vs. them" mentality of war, as well as a self-alienation of humankind. Humankind's "self-alienation has reached such a degree that it can experience its own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order."<sup>17</sup> Communism, by contrast, politicizes art, art-as-politics. While the influence of capitalism restricts film, and by extension, art of reproduction's criticism to the concepts of art, communism injects social-political criticism directly into the art. This both relies on and maintains the heightened consciousness that opens the possibility for critique to the masses. Authority is disseminated amongst the pluralistic traditions.

It should be noted that the use of reproduction by Fascism and Communism are two aspects of art's propagandistic effect. The ability to evoke emotional response alludes to this. Propaganda seeks, on one level to convey information, and on another to persuade opinions through appeals to the emotions of the consumer.

## 2. Media in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

While Benjamin views art in the age of mechanical reproduction as capable of being a tool for the destruction of aura and by extension consumerist tradition, a phenomenon mentioned in Benjamin's essay, the creation of the cult of personality surrounding the movie star, raises the question of capitalism's influence on art. For clarity's sake, capitalism is used in my essay to refer to a mindset or ordering force, which seeks to use anything it can as a means of increasing profit.<sup>18</sup> Capitalism itself is an element within consumerist tradition and is implicitly challenged by challenges to that tradition. In an effort to explore capitalism's influence on art, I will look at the dissemination of art in television and Hip Hop, two media forms of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Within the following sections, we will see the rise of media that initially function similarly to film as described by Benjamin serving to strip the objects of dissemination of their authority and redistribute it amongst the masses. However, as with film, we will see the influence of capitalism establish, not only a cult following of the personality, but also of the media themselves. While it does not affect my overall argument, it should be noted that in film, television and Hip Hop there is no "original" in an equivalent manner to that of a portrait. Thus the aura associated with these forms of art is always akin to that of the manufactured aura surrounding the star.

### 2.1 Television

In television, a new form of narration takes place. As opposed to radio, which only engages the ears and cinema, which required the individual to live in proximity to it, television combined the fuller sensory engagement of cinema with the in-house accessibility of the radio. Television, the latest in a line of expressions of narration beginning with oral narration, continues and accelerates the mass dissemination begun by Gutenberg with his printing press. Television

opens the narrative to the illiterate, a similar openness it held and holds as oral narration that is closed somewhat when the narrative becomes written. While it is certain that as oral narration, any who could speak had the possibility to hear and understand the narrative, dissemination was reliant on proximity to an individual who knew the story and thus, aura was maintained. There was almost a priest-ritual object like relationship, some intermediary between the masses and the object. Preceding television, the radio program and its broadened dissemination interjected alongside the narrative the influence of capitalism in the form of the advertisement. Television would see that interjection, over time, become a fusion as the narrative and the advertisement melded together. This is an interesting development in terms of aura, but to understand it better, it will help first to illustrate how advertizing is an expression of capitalism.

As has been previously stated, capitalism motivates the masses through “illusion-promoting spectacles.” In capitalism, the masses are reduced to means of increasing profit, not just in terms of being labor to produce products, but being consumers for the consumption of the same. It is the aim of promoting this instrumentation that produces the advertisement, which has the appearance of being an expression of art-as-politics, seeming to be a condensed film, but serves more to reinforce tradition than to critique it.

On one hand, television disseminates not only narrative, but also information of both current and past events as well as locations near and far, removing them from the distance that typifies aura. On the other hand, however, television itself becomes a status symbol, its shows gain cult followings, and the television personalities — actors and actresses, anchor persons, reality show contestants and participants — gain their own cults of personality, similar to that of the film star. Into this simultaneous destruction of one form of aura and construction of others, advertisement is thrust, gaining associative aura, which relies on the television shows they run during, the star personalities that advocate them, the aura of the brand names, and their adherence to traditional American values; freedom, liberty, independence, and the like. Owning one’s own home becomes freedom, time saving appliances are the path to liberty, and the personal vehicle becomes the symbol of independence, however lurking behind this reassuring symbolism is the drive to increase profit. The influence of capitalism associates these material objects with immaterial concepts and offers the consumer the ability to obtain these concepts through the purchase of the objects. If we focus on the television shows themselves, we observe a transition from explicitly scripted sitcoms and dramas to a mixture of these and implicitly scripted “reality” shows. The lattermost type uses the appearance of depicting reality to reinforce the values of tradition in a more subtle manner. The popular television show “Survivor” presents itself as an actual playing out of the sociological thought experiment in which an assemblage of individuals from differing backgrounds are thrown together into a situation and challenged to work together to survive and overcome it. However, at its core it is a game show for a million dollar prize. What the show plays out, is what its participants are willing to do and under go for money. The effect of this is to reinforce the value of money as an object of supreme desire.

The window of the masses has quietly been re-appropriated by tradition, a re-appropriation paralleled by the reduction in the pluralism of media providers. If we look at this consolidation, we find the influence of capital, instrumental in the construction of the “cult of the movie star”, at work. In 1983, 50 companies controlled 90% of the media in the country; as a result of the deregulation of the Reagan era and the telecommunications Act of 1996, that number was reduced to 6 by 2011.<sup>19</sup> The plurality of content presenters and by extension perspectives is reduced. Authority is re-centralized. Authority is further concentrated by the rise of, in all but name, media monopolies.

Let us suspend our trace of television here and turn to view the effect of capitalism on music, specifically Hip Hop from the 1980’s onward.

## 2.2 Music

In music, capitalism influences art’s two modes of being as well. This influence is carried out through capitalism’s motivating of the masses through the “illusion-promoting spectacle”, in terms of the indirect attainment of immaterial concepts through the direct attainment of material objects. In music, the revolution of these two modes is expressed both within the music industry, on the larger scale, and within the lyrics of the songs themselves, on the smaller. I will trace these mutations through Hip Hop, beginning in the 1980s as this is the time-period when its form’s modes of being is most closely aligned with art-as-politics. Hip Hop at this point resembles film as described by Benjamin. It functioned to confirm the individual in his or her claim to being reproducible. And just as the influence of capital leads to the creation of the star cult in film, so too did it lead to this creation in Hip Hop. It should be noted that, in 1979, what is considered the first song in Hip Hop, “Rapper’s Delight” and by extension, the first group in Hip Hop, The Sugarhill Gang, are both the products of manufacturing by capitalism. The record label assembled the members of the group and the lyrics were purchased from other MCs. This seemingly trivial fact foreshadows the influence capitalism would come to have.

The 1980s represents the point in which Hip Hop takes on the form most recognizable today, the MC gains greater prominence and as a result, lyricism is given a greater emphasis. Proclaimed the voice of the people, “our way of communicating with one another”, Hip Hop saw added to it lyrical lexicon, slang<sup>20</sup>, elaborations of the “Black Experience”, and critique of the US government and Western society as a whole. Ice-T’s “6 ‘N the Morning” (1987), relayed the experience of the drug and gang raids in Los Angeles in the 1980s and ‘90s. Grandmaster Flash and the Furious Five’s “The Message” (1982), as well as Slick Rick’s “Children’s Story” (1988), gave accounts of the struggle of inner-city life in 1980s New York City. Public Enemy’s “Fight the Power”, “911 is a Joke”, and “Bring the Noise” all represent critiques of tradition. The first and third are similar in sentiment to Rev. Jesse Jackson’s “I am somebody” slogan, serving as reaffirmation of Black worth and Black pride. The second is a criticism of the police and their under service, and abuse of Black neighborhoods. Hip Hop allowed these messages, through an infusion of politics in to art, to reach people who were not especially politically focused. As a result, these songs represent art-as-politics, in that their aim was to encourage activism in an effort to affect change. This is not to present Hip Hop as a purely political tool. Contemporaneously within this were themes of hedonism and early inklings of the materialism to come.

Into and throughout the ‘90s, plurality flourished as different artists from different regions engaged these themes with differing emphasis. At the same time that 2Pac, Snoop Dogg, and Dr. Dre’s West Coast “G-Funk”, was flourishing, A Tribe Called Quest, The Fugees, and Arrested Development’s more conscious, in terms of being socially so, Hip Hop was also thriving on the East Coast. Not only was the listener given the opportunity to critique, but the music itself became self-critiquing as well. Common Sense’s “I Used to Love H.E.R (hearing every rhyme)”, 1994, reflects on and critiques the history of Hip Hop, coming to an exceptionally critical view of the rise of gangster rap. Larger record companies took notice of this growing genre and decided to become a part of it. By 2004, Hip Hop as an industry generated more than \$10 billion a year.<sup>21</sup> The effects of this subsumption are multiple, but I would like to focus on two, the reduction of plurality in terms of themes and sounds, and the increased status of the Rap Star, coinciding with an increase in materialism, peaking during the first ten years of the new millennia, as Hip Hop becomes a commodity. This commodification is demonstrated by the payola scandal of this time-period, in which stations were literally paid to play songs.<sup>22</sup> It should be noted that this commodification is not a phenomenon unique to Hip Hop, Bob Marley’s One Love, being used in advertisements for Sandals resorts, Cream’s Sunshine of Your Love being used to sell insurance. In both instances we find an associative aura at play in which the aura of the song is used to elevate the product as well.

If we trace the effect on aura through these transitions, we see that Hip Hop first serves to replace tradition with traditions. Similar to the blaxploitation film genre, it offers voice to a silenced minority. This represents an opportunity to not only contribute to, but also alter and reshape the narrative. However, as it gains in commercial success its lyrics increasingly become a parody of themselves, serving more to reinforce stereotypes than to challenge them. The message has been hijacked by the same expression of capitalism we saw in effect in television. Here the star cult leads to the elevation of the image of the artist over their lyrical content, as a result, child rappers such as Lil’ Bow Wow, Lil’ Zane, and Lil’ Romeo gain popularity, marketed directly to white suburban teens.<sup>23</sup> Rappers increasingly associate with, and place an increasing importance on, brand names in their lyrics and their fashion. Hip Hop songs as well as the style of the genre in general are used in advertisements. During the 2000s, McDonalds regularly ran advertisements featuring raps about their products.

This one time voice of the people has become, in the mainstream, a voice of hedonism and consumerism. This turn in mainstream Hip Hop, this suppression of its critical element in favor of presenting a fantasy of wealth and power, has re-distanced traditions giving rise to a new Tradition in which “a whip and a chain” become the new Black American Dream.

### **3. Dissolution of Hegemony and its Reassertion**

An interesting pattern emerges as we trace these changes, one that questioned the dichotomy, art-as-politics and politics-as-art. Let me explain. If we return to the example of Hip Hop, and its transition from tradition augment to tradition reinforcer, we can observe the transition from art-as-politics to politics-as-art. It is in the transition from being an elaborator of the “Black Experience” to a promoter of the “Black American Dream”. This is not just a transition from reporting on a plurality of experiences to the promotion of a dream, it is the subtle re-introduction and subsequent re-expression of tradition’s values. It is capitalism once again motivating the masses through illusion towards consumerism. These art forms, music and television, function as cultural exports, communicating societal values to their consumers. Capitalism, an ordering force in tradition, re-orders the tools of tradition’s dissolution to serve as its perpetuators.

At the same time this co-option of the media is occurring, the aura of the star, television and music alike, rises. This aura can be seen as a form of object-relation.<sup>24</sup> The actor or actress plays characters who garner the love of the viewer. That actor or actress, in being the vehicle of that character, gains an aura through his or her relation with the character. The musician is engaged in a similar relationship with his or her persona. In both instances, it is a situation of a private individual *as* some persona, who gains aura through their direct relation with the persona. This aura is used to lend aura and authority to the products they advocate, including politicians. The fact that their advocacy is publicized is evidence of their aura and authority. This lending too, can be seen as a form of object-relation in which the product/politician in being directly related with the star, through advocacy, is viewed by the masses with the same favorability as the star. This relation, between star and product or politician, allows the masses an indirect relationship with the star through a direct relationship with the product or politician, by purchase or vote. This aura infused relationship is politics-as-art, as the aura of the star is used to influence choice rather than promote critique. In its political implementation, politics becomes a popularity contest rather than a contest of policies.

However, this is not the extent of the effect of capitalism's rendering of art as politics-as-art. If we recall, Benjamin says that the ultimate effects of such a rendering are war and self-alienation, and if we look amongst the effects of 20<sup>th</sup> century media forms, we find these effects as well.

In Hip Hop and the media surrounding it, an effort to drive sales of both albums and magazines, turned a dispute between two artists- 2Pac and The Notorious B.I.G.- into an "East Coast vs. West Coast War", which only ended after the subsequent deaths of both artists.<sup>25</sup> Advertising has given us "brand-wars", in which consumer loyalty through brand allegiance reaches the point of being a constructor of identity. It is not uncommon to hear phrases such as, 'I am a Ford man or woman', 'I am team PS4', or 'I am a Democrat'. Any competing brand can be substituted into these phrases, the point is that it is no longer enough to have a preference, there now comes with it an antagonistic relationship towards those of a rival preference. We see the effects of this in the increasingly partisan nature of (American) politics today, as well as in internet forums, which see the discussion of rival products, given enough time, devolve into attacks on the products respective users. This new fandom mimics "war" in organizing and stirring the masses to action in trivial matters. We find self-alienation expressed not just in an estrangement of humankind from its self, but in the individual from its self as well. If we considered the increase in body image issues, evidenced by the rise of Anorexia and Bulimia in Western media saturated nations as an example of this alienation on the level of the individual, we find that the increase in incidents coincides with the contemporary increase in media saturation.<sup>26</sup> The idol becomes the ideal. The illusion presented in the re-touched image becomes the standard of beauty in reality.

As we have sighted capitalism co-option of art as the cause of this rendering of art as politics-as-art, we must examine if this co-option is inevitable. To answer this we must explore capitalism as it is expressed today. The action of capitalism is the acquisition and subsequent transformation of commodities for the purposes of generating profit. Here commodity is used, both in the sense of a raw material and in the sense of a useful and valuable thing. Capitalism, which requires exponential growth in order to meet the demands of interest on debt, requires exponential consumption to fuel that growth. As illustrated above, media is a medium, which represents access both for and, most importantly to capitalism, *to* the masses. As a result, media represents a commodity of the lattermost sense, as it offers capitalism access to consumers. In light of this, it was inevitable that capitalism would co-opt media, if only for the sake of its own perpetuation.

#### 4. Conclusion

While the danger of Fascism's use of art has receded, the danger of capitalism's use of art remains. In the age of mechanical reproduction, art-as-politics and politics-as-art seem to be engaged in an ever-continuing revolution. A medium evolves and is subsequently co-opted to maintain the illusion. It is an insidious process, resultant of the aura the medium gains. The masses come to value and trust the medium, both in terms of being a status symbol and as a provider of information. At the heart of these revolutions are the re-centralized control of these media and the rise of the star cult, each the effect of capitalism. Art itself in the age of mechanical reproduction appears to be at a constant risk of appropriation by capitalism. The ultimate effect on aura is unclear. While capitalism is deeply entrenched in the media forms of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the media form of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the internet, is still a relatively open medium. The ultimate effect of capitalism on art may rest on its ability to centralize control of the internet, through either data caps or legislation to destroy "net neutrality".

## 5. Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to Janet Donohoe for steering me away from my more convoluted tendencies why still allowing me to do my own thing.

## 6. Works Cited

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1986), 222

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. 225

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. 223

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. 224

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. 225

<sup>6</sup>Ibid. 226

<sup>7</sup>Ibid. 223

<sup>8</sup>Ibid. 225

<sup>9</sup>Ibid. 241

<sup>10</sup>Ibid. 241

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. 233

<sup>12</sup>Ibid. 233

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. 234

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. 234

<sup>15</sup>Ibid. 243

<sup>16</sup>Ibid. 243

<sup>17</sup>Ibid. 244

<sup>18</sup> This is not to present capitalism as solely a mindset. Capitalism is indeed a system of social, political, and economic relations and structures with material expressions and consequences. What I focus on in my essay in referring to it as a "mindset", are the behavioral patterns rewarded and reinforced by these structures and relations.

<sup>19</sup>"Who Owns the Media?" <https://www.freepress.net/ownership/chart>

"Media Conglomerates, Mergers, Concentration of Ownership" <http://www.globalissues.org/article/159/media-conglomerates-mergers-concentration-of-ownership>

"United States Press, Media, TV, Radio, Newspapers" <http://www.pressreference.com/Sw-Ur/United-States.html>

<sup>20</sup> Slang is an interesting phenomenon that parallels the generation and re-appropriation of language in general. The rapidity with which it is configured, disseminated, adopted, adapted, and reconfigured mirrors, on a smaller scale, the dynamic nature of language as a whole.

<sup>21</sup> Julie Watson, "Rapper's Delight: A Billion-Dollar Industry" [http://www.forbes.com/2004/02/18/cx\\_jw\\_0218hiphop.html](http://www.forbes.com/2004/02/18/cx_jw_0218hiphop.html)

<sup>22</sup> Jeff Leeds and Louise Story, "Radio Payoffs Are Described as Sony Settles" <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/26/business/radio-payoffs-are-described-as-sony-settles.html>.

<sup>23</sup> Julie Watson, "Rapper's Delight: A Billion-Dollar Industry"

<sup>24</sup> Object-relation is a term loosely based on Heinz Kohut's theory of self-object relations. Kohut holds that there are three basic types, mirroring, idealizing, and twinship. The term is used to describe a relational acquisition of characteristics.

<sup>25</sup> *Beef*. Dir. Peter Spiner. Image Entertainment, 2003. DVD. IMDB: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0361354/>

<sup>26</sup> Steven J. Heine, "Eating Disorders" in *Cultural Psychology* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2012), 464-465