Rethinking the Intersection of Cinema, Genre, and Youth

James Hay, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

The "Teen Film," Genre Theory, and the Moral Universe ofPlanetariums

In most accounts of the "teen film," particularly those accounts tracing its origins, films such as *Blackboard Jungle* (1955) and *Rebel Without a Cause* (1956) have served as crucial references, not only for assembling and defining a corpus of films as a genre but also for describing the genre's relation to a socio-historical formation/context. I begin this essay not with an elaborate reading of these films, nor with a deep commitment to reading films or charting homologies between them, nor with an abiding interest in defining teen films (though I do want to discuss how teen films and film genres have been defined), nor with a sense that these are adequate ways of understanding the relation of cinema or youth to social and cultural formation. There are in fact many good reasons to begin from other starting points than these films in order to discuss the relation of youth and cinema during the 1950s or thereafter. Because these films regularly have figured into accounts of the teen film, however, two particular scenes in these films offer a useful way to think about the objectives of film genre theory and criticism, particularly as they have informed accounts of the teen film, and to suggest an alternative way of thinking about genre, youth, and cinema.

Both of these scenes occur at sites where the films' young characters become the subjects of screenings conducted by adult figures who explain to the students the significance of what they are viewing. In *Blackboard Jungle*, the high school English teacher, Richard Dadier (Glenn Ford), projects an animated version of *Jack and the Beanstalk* to a class of boys. Four scenes in *Blackboard Jungle* are set in this classroom, but only this one involves the English teacher's attempt to provoke a discussion about what the story means and how to interpret the film. *Blackboard Jungle*'s previous three representations of teaching English in the classroom include relatively more "unsuccessful" efforts by Dadier to introduce himself by writing his name in syllables on the blackboard, to exercise/assess the students' knowledge of subject-verb agreement on the blackboard, and to practice proper pronunciation by recording and then replaying student monologues. Cumulatively, these scenes involve a gradual abandonment of the blackboard as a classroom technology. In each of the preceding scenes, the students' disruptions of Dadier's attempts at orderly drills demonstrate that they already understand the answers and the conventions of the exercise; in the scene with the tape recorder, they relentlessly press him about whether he avoided selecting a Latino student for fear that he would not provide the best example of proper diction and pronunciation. Only through the students' engagement with a film/story which they are asked to interpret and discuss, do the students enthusiastically enter into the exercise (albeit with continued displays of their "street-wise-ness"). Compared to his colleagues' methods, Dadier's use of current technologies (tape recording and film projection) make him a local pedagogical visionary, as is underscored by one of Dadier's admiring colleagues who asks him if "visual education" is the key to successful classroom discussions. For Dadier, however, the classroom film is

simply one (relatively new) technology for "rehabilitating" the classroom as an apparatus for a kind of training that links knowledge and proper conduct and for securing his own position as moral exemplar cum critic/educator within that apparatus. As he explains to his students, just before the bell signaling an end to the lesson, "All your lives you're going to hear what someone tells you, what you see in books, magazines, on television, what you read in the newspaper, but if you can just examine the story, look for what it means, and most of all fellows, if you can just think for yourselves." As if all too familiar with the manipulative techniques of all those forms that Dadier has just mentioned, the class's most unruly and alienated student and the film's most unequivocal and unredeemable "juvenile delinquent," Artie West, interjects loudly: "Ok, here it comes. Here comes the commercial." West's remark, however, is an aberration; the overwhelming success of the lesson is enacted through the visibly enlivening effect that the film and discussion have had on the students as they orderly leave the room, one of them exclaiming (only somewhat sardonically), "Hey, maybe I'll become a film critic!" Unlike blackboard exercises, film interpretation is a technology suited for managing the unruliness of the classroom through free discussion and participation, for instituting -- with missionary-like zeal -- a space of rationality and trust amidst the barbarity of jungles that youth would otherwise inhabit.

In *Rebel Without a Cause*, the film's only classroom scene occurs not at the high school but at a planetarium where students have gone as a field trip. In a scene that many accounts of this film have rehearsed as an example of the film's representation of the alienation, complacency, and urgency in the sociality of youth, the planetarium's elderly curator leads his student audience through a lesson in identifying star formations and then concludes with dazzling visual effects and a chillingly existential account of the next big bang: "Long after we're gone, the earth will not be missed. The problems of man seem trivial indeed, and man existing alone seems himself an episode of little of consequence. That is all." The planetarium lecture is conducted by projecting lines onto the simulated sky in order to highlight the connections among individual stars and thus to identify specific formations -- a technique that the students repeatedly interrupt with catcalls. The blinding bursts of color and light of the finale, however, are techniques that secure the moral dimension of the science lecture as apocalyptic spectacle. And the students are momentarily enthralled, blinking sheepishly when the lights come up.

These two scenes, and the films in which they occur, are examples of the school (and schooling) as a narrative convention -- a regularity in filmic representations of youth during the 1950s, and thereafter. In part, this essay is interested in the school (the classroom and the planetarium) as a regular setting in films representing youth, and in how identities of youth have been articulated through the school and other sites (such as the domestic sphere and places outside it). Indeed *Rebel without a Cause* is about, among other things, the movement of its young characters among different locations and the characters' relative attachments to and investments in these locations. Within either of these films, the classroom or the planetarium also acquire significance and value for the characters in their (the classroom and youths') relation to other sites. I am less interested, however, in using these conventions to define a corpus of films or even to identify how these conventions have produced mythic identities of youth and place (a common objective of structuralist and genre criticism), than I am in understanding film/genre as map -- guide and manual -- and as a technology integral to youth's mobility and youth's attachments to particular places. This latter objective pertains only obliquely to the common ways that genre has been understood in film criticism, and I intend to consider its relation to a different set of questions about cinema and the *premises* of

youth, about cinema and formations of knowledge, power, and social relations through particular sites.

Unlike film criticism, which assumes the centrality/ubiquity of cinema in modern societies, my approach thus begins by asking how cinema is made to matter at different sites. I invoke these scenes and have described them in this way not to demonstrate how films interpellate their viewers as ideological subjects but rather to initiate a discussion of how the techniques for engaging films and for discussing and assessing films during the 1950s pertained to particular institutional rationalities, which were shaping the knowledge *and* conduct of citizen-consumers, and to different institutional sites where film was deployed in different ways as a technique of self-realization and self-improvement. This strategy leads me to consider a variety of questions that genre analysis (at least in its most widely accepted practice) has been incapable of addressing: what has genre to do with cinema's link to particular sites, how have these sites mattered for youth (in their relation to other sites and other social formations), and how have the sites where youth and cinema intersect become manageable/governable spaces (within an environment -- a field of social spaces -- wherein that space matters and is mobilized)? Pursuing these questions involves a different consideration of cinema's relation to social formation and a different understanding of power than is typical of film genre criticism generally and accounts of the "teen film" more specifically.

Genre theory and genre criticism have played a prominent role in the formation of film theory and criticism as projects that have attempted to understand film as a distinct, if not distinguished, object of study. Film criticism, wherein genre analysis has been deployed, typically has attempted to define the textual practices that distinguish film from other narrative forms or "signifying systems" such as literature (even though doing so has perpetuated the tendencies of literary criticism). Identifying formal and structural features of filmic image and narrative rationalized the kind of distinction that Metz draws between film and cinema (with *film* as an object of semiology, and *cinema* as an object of sociology) and, in this way, legitimized the study of film in relation to more traditional Western art forms (Metz, 1974). As a form of social critique, film/genre criticism primarily has involved "reading" the social as ideology and has emphasized that the sociality of cinema has to do with its formal techniques for shaping the psyches of spectators. Furthermore, as a practice of reading the social and revealing ideology through films (as texts and signification), film/genre criticism have not been concerned particularly with how either cinema or criticism have been implicated in and instrumental to the institutional rationalities that organize and govern -- as Foucault would have it -- who can speak and about what. Charting for a rapt (and thus well-behaved) audience the vectors of meaning in a moral universe that seems to lack an outside for everyone but the critic and that is so pervasive as to make the classroom/planetarium an enclosure without limits (an anyplace and everyplace, a space of freedom), Richard Dadier and the planetarium curator thus serve as allegories about film criticism's socio-historical *place* in securing regimes of truth.

By emphasizing, however inadvertently, the difference (and thus the negativity) of film as a distinctive form or set, film criticism and film studies have failed to account for the positivity of cinema -- the installation and regulation of the cinematic through the historical and geographical intersection and assemblage of multiple practices comprising a social arrangement. I take this to be the thrust of Foucault's writing about the positivity of discursive formation and about the object of an "archaeological" project about how power and knowledge have been instituted in modern societies. Addressing this positivity involves

recognizing the "exteriority" of cinema -- not as a space that is the antithesis of an interiority (a favorite subject for New Criticism) nor as a space representing a separate set of practices, but as the sites/space of distribution and deployment where multiple practices are imbricated in and articulated to one another. As Foucault notes, defining discourses in their specificity involves following the "whole length of their exterior ridges" in order to map them (Foucault, 1972:139). Such a move proceeds from linguistic definition to spatial definition/delineation -- the reach, dispersion, circulation, reliance upon other (indeed multiple) practices, formations, and sites. So, while it is important to understand the regularities of cinema in order to recognize the conditions for particular kinds of tasks accomplished through them, these regularities pertain to a space of exteriority where their social authority and legitimacy are produced. The "distinctiveness" (i.e., the matter or "mattering") of cinema is an issue of how it adheres to multiple practices and how they get situated. The "mattering of cinema" therefore refers not only to its materiality but to its installation, exercise, and effects at/through multiple planes of reality and multiple spheres of social interaction. In this regard, it matters not only how one moves from the question of film to cinema (as Metz formulated that distinction) but, more importantly, how one moves beyond this binary logic -- from the question of cinema, as a distinctive object with its own consistency and history, to the cinematic, as an adjective that emphasizes instituting cinema and the "mattering" of these institutions and their rationalities through a whole interplay of exchanges and intermediaries (see Hay, 1997 and 2001).

Analyzing the cinematic, as such, does not involve abandoning the idea that cinema is a modern cultural modality as much as it involves developing an alternative (counter-modern) logic of cultural mediation than the one that is implied by Metz's distinction between film and cinema and that has informed film/genre criticism for decades. As part of North Atlantic "critical theory" which developed out of European Modernism, and as part of the academic institutionalization of "film studies" through a liberal arts curriculum, film theory and criticism have abided by a pervasive Modern tendency to understand culture as a set of aesthetic, linguistic, and representational forms/rules and as primarily a domain of meaning and consciousness. According to this rationale, aesthetics, meaning, consciousness, and interpretation are what distinguish culture from other kinds of practices. Culture is thus seen as opposed to, acted upon by, or acting upon social, governmental, economic entities rather than as social, governmental, and economic mediations. Or to put it another way, the social is what lies just behind forms and texts, waiting to be revealed by someone capable of reading the social through formal structures and textual regularities. As Lawrence Grossberg has rightly noted (in an argument that indirectly recalls Raymond Williams' thoughts about culture and mediation in *Marxism and Literature*), "culture… does not mediate any more or less than any other practice. Signification and representation are merely two modes -- and not necessarily the most important ones -- in the regime of mediation" (Grossberg, 1998: 7).

"Genre" is a modern concept that, at least since the nineteenth century, has been integral in attempts to maintain an understanding of culture as a separate sphere of practice, even as discourses about cinema as a "cultural form" argued over its relation to economies of value -- as "art-," "mass-," and "popular-" form. (Thus Marcuse and Adorno may have understood cinema and other examples of "mass culture" as one dimension of the homogenizing effects of technocracies, culture industries, and administrative logics, or *Screen*-theory may have understood the "cinematic apparatus" to be interchangeable with any other ideological apparatus, even while they all were committed to the notion that cultural criticism and deconstructive aesthetics remained viable forms of political intervention because *they* somehow were practiced outside these developments.) Film genre studies, in this respect,

have been profoundly instrumental in film criticism's rationalization of film and culture as distinctive sets of formal and textual practice. As Tony Bennett has argued, understanding genre this way has led either to projects that privilege (or cannot see any alternative but) textual analysis as a strategy of socio-historical analysis, or to projects that see genre (literary, filmic, or otherwise) as merely an epiphenomenon of social or economic structure: genres (or forms such as literature) emerge "not as a mediated reflection or refraction of society, nor as a distinctive semiotic production of ideology… but as a distinctive sphere of social action . .that functions within the 'forms of life'-- the specific modes of organized sociality of which they form a part" (Bennett, 1990:108-109). The object of genre analysis therefore "is to examine what genres do within and as parts of such modes of sociality rather than to reveal how their determined conditions speak through them." The usefulness of Bennett's argument for my own project is its recognition of the positivity of genre -- its practice and productivity -- in relation to other practices, modalities, and institutions through which societies are organized and governed. Although Bennett's observations concern literature rather than cinema, and although he prefers to discuss genre in terms of reading and writing practices, rather than considering how praxis, agency, and conduct (as I indicate below) are also matters of mobility and physical access, his emphasis offers an important means of rethinking film/genre criticism.

I certainly agree with recent attempts to rethink film genre criticism's longstanding tendency to understand film genre as primarily a class or set of textual/filmic practices, but I consider these efforts not to have gone far enough in imagining or demonstrating an alternative to this tendency. I agree, for instance, with Christine Gledhill's conclusion that "if in post grand theory, film studies is not to diminish into a conservative formalism or conceptual uprooted empirical historicism, the question of how to understand the life of films in the social is paramount" (Gledhill, 2000: p.221). Her suggestion that accomplishing this can occur by looking at genres as industrial mechanisms, aesthetic practices, and "an arena of cultural-critical discursivity," however, remains overly focused upon the "wider process of genre-making… as a process of *cultural identity* or socio-*imaginary* formation [to which genres are central] because they provide public *imagery* as the building material for the construction of alternative *fictional* worlds" (p. 239, emphasis added). In this respect, genre-making remains largely a matter of making meaning and identity at the level of an individual and social imaginary.

I also agree with the effort by Gledhill and others to rethink film genres in their social relation to (and emergence out of) other "cultural forms" or forms of popular entertainment -- a challenge that Steve Neale posed to film genre criticism over ten years ago (Neale, 1990). Rick Altman, for instance, has qualified his earlier view that genre formation is a process of articulating semantic elements and syntaxes by proposing that genres, as social praxis, are *situations*: "As the by-product of an extended series of events, a genre must be defined in a manner consistent with the complexity of an overall situation made up of three-dimensional events spread out over space and time" (Altman, 1999: 84). Arguing that locating the origins of film genres in other media "indefinitely defers explanation of that origin," Altman explains how the formation of Hollywood Westerns developed out of the exhibition of practices of railroad companies and of Wild West shows. Still, Altman understands genre's "overall situations" primarily as the circulation of texts--intertextual relations -- and as the sense that gets made of texts through their circulation, rather than the spaces where texts/films circulate or the institutional sites and rationalities where they are encountered. In other words, to truly consider genres as situations requires a much more carefully developed explanation of the sites of cinema in their relation to other sites and to the mechanisms for mobility. While I

therefore agree about the importance of understanding genre and cinema as part of an array of mediations that cannot be understood by focusing first and foremost on film genres, I find inadequate any study that discusses cinema's implication in those mediations (as socio-historical "context") mostly in terms of film narrative's relation to "other" forms of art and entertainment -- understood as the domain of culture proper. Furthermore, I suggest that understanding genres in relation to "overall situations" and socio-historical "contexts" is not just a matter of extending the nexus of cultural forms (e.g., to include "non-entertainment" forms) but of focusing more squarely on cinema's mattering and assemblage/articulation to and through historical and spatial mediations and on genres as one of many technical mechanisms of agency, mobility and conduct within/across regions of sociality.

I emphasize these issues in part because the few book-length studies that focus on cinema and youth have been organized around the category of "the teen film," perpetuating many longstanding tendencies of film/genre criticism. Thomas Doherty's *Teenagers and Teenpics* begins by acknowledging that "by the traditional measures of genre affiliation, teenpics are as elusive as any modernist motion picture amalgam," and that "as with scientific frameworks, when anomalies proliferate out of control, it's time for a paradigm shift" (Doherty, 1988: 12-13). The new paradigm represented by *Teenagers and Teenpics*, however, primarily involves explaining the teen film's *difference* from big-budget Hollywood films (and traditional genre criticism's preoccupation with the latter), mostly by cataloguing the narrative conventions and the "exploitative" marketing practices by small, "independent" companies producing the teen film. Thus, *Teenagers and Teenpics* is organized into chapters about "the juvenile delinquent film," "the rock-n-roll film," "horror teen films," and "the clean-teen film" (the latter of which, as in many histories of rock music, marks the moment when a raw and authentic form becomes hopelessly commercialized and sanitized). Although Doherty's account of the teen film purports to be less preoccupied with questions of classification and conceptualization than with explaining the teen film's inception, in fact doing the former becomes the book's primary way of explaining inception. Furthermore, despite the book's organization through generic categories of the teen film, it devotes no attention to considering how generic identities (e.g., "weirdies") developed through the rationalities of film marketing or through spheres of social knowledge and power.

While Doherty mostly explains the inception of the teen film through a description of its multiple generic forms, Jon Lewis, in *The Road to Romance and Ruin: Teen Films and Youth Culture*, analyzes the teen film as a genre with certain inherent qualities: "the teen film [is] seen here as the *principal* mass mediated discourse about youth as a culture… Teen films *all* seem to focus on a single social concern… These films provide at best the *principal* artifacts of youth culture; at worst they offer *proof positive* of the hegemonic effect of 'the culture industry'" (emphasis added, Lewis, 1992: 2-3). In seeing the teen film primarily as representations of youth in film ("I plan to study films about teenagers, not films targeted at teenagers"), in understanding these films and genre primarily as a set of narrative practices, in discussing youth primarily as filmic representations that are "inherently ideological, inherently social," and in making such essentialist claims about teen films, the book is ill prepared to explain how these films matter or are valued socially, except in terms of an ideological unity that the films either resist or perpetuate. Lewis' conclusion, that the "youth culture" which these films represent "resists definition," rests upon his assumption that film is primarily a site of ideological formation (and in this project, the primary site of ideological formation) and that the social dimension of culture is mostly an issue of the identity and ideology of youth. Therefore, while Lewis acknowledges that a cinematic discourse about youth had something to do with a discourse about youth among social scientists and cultural

critics, and that these discourses rationalized institutional authorities -- such as the school, the church, and the domestic sphere -- the book's assumptions about film, genre, and culture, preclude its explaining how or why cinema mattered (when and where it did) any more than, or in relation to, these other discourses and institutions. To the extent that films about youth often pertain, as Lewis suggests, to a "crisis of authority," what does that crisis have to do with governance and agency through cinema in its and youth's attachments to and usefulness for particular institutional sites and rationalities?

In order to address that question, I devote particular attention to two related concerns: how films have mapped centers of power for youth and adults (given that the relation of the identity of youth or adults to particular sites makes it impossible to essentialize those identities), and how the materiality of those sites of power necessitate understanding agency and governance in terms of the physical access and mobility of youth and cinema to those sites. How have cinematic genres -- as a set of instructions about the proper relation among places and the proper relation of identities to places -- become implicated in the role of cinema in shaping conduct at and through particular locations? Or, to put this question another way, how have the sites where cinema and youth have intersected become sites for organizing and governing behavior? Asking these kinds of questions are tantamount to developing an alternative analytic about cinema that takes into account the positivity of genres in the historico-spatial organization of societies (rather than understanding genres only in terms of their negativity -- their formation within a field of difference or their infinite relation to other texts and their infinite semiosis). (See Appendix One)

In order to make this task manageable in essay-form, I consider three particular sites: the movie theater, the school, and the domestic sphere. In doing so, I am more interested in raising a series of questions and issues and suggesting possible ways of addressing them (as an alternative analytic of youth and cinema/genre), than I am in claiming to offer a comprehensive or even adequately elaborated account of youth and cinema/genre.

Effective Criticism: The Place of Cinema, the Conduct of Youth, and a New Regime of Mobility

To the extent that film genre criticism and accounts of the teen film consider film as a socio-historical practice, they either have emphasized that genre is a historical succession of film elements, variations, and recombinations that produce or are produced by social transformations, or have understood film's social relevance in terms of a "historical context" which is read through the film as ideology, as the Hollywood mode of production, or loosely as discourse (as when Lewis relates the teen film in the 1950s to a general social scientific discourse about juvenile delinquency). In this section, I propose an alternative way of thinking about the relation of cinema and youth in the 1950s: one less interested in the teen film as a distinctive set of textual or industry practices, or in an ideology of the Hollywood/teen film, than in the cinematic as a technological assemblage that is integral to and dependent upon techniques for organizing and governing the sociality (conduct, freedom, agency, mobility) of youth at and across different sites (e.g., the school, the domestic sphere, the theater). My interest in textual articulations as they are regulated through genres is thus limited to how genre and cinema have been instrumental in the production, articulations, and governance of social spaces and networks. I am as interested in how cinema and youth have produced certain social spaces as in how these social spaces produce and rely upon certain procedures and techniques, and in this way how social space has produced the conditions for future intersections of cinema and youth. I am less concerned with the major conventions of

Hollywood feature films per se (however modest the films' production values) than with the "minor," everyday practices that make cinema and genre relevant or matter in different ways at particular sites.

The School and Classroom

The scenes from *Blackboard Jungle* and *Rebel Without a Cause* involving classroom screenings are significant in part because they represented a relation between cinema and schooling that has been ignored by film genre criticism's accounts of the teen film. By focusing primarily upon the narrative conventions and production codes of Hollywood filmmaking, and by generalizing the site of cinema (as movie theater), genre criticism not only has privileged a particular kind of film (the feature-length film) but also has been particularly ill-prepared to consider the significance of the classroom film -- both in its relation to schooling, as a deeply institutionalized knowledge integral to the shaping of citizens, and in its relation to other sites where cinema and youth intersected and where schooling became part of broad social *arrangement*. In one sense, film screenings in classrooms could just as easily be described as "teen films" as have been feature-length Hollywood films. In another sense, however, their relation to a site other than the movie-theater makes them a useful way to think about the place of cinema and youth in the organization and governance of social space. The films used in secondary schools were crafted for the institutional objectives of public education and the classroom, rather than of the movie theater and television. They did not use Hollywood stars and, notwithstanding their adherence to some of the narrative situations and logics of Hollywood films about youth, they valued different styles of performance as demonstrations.

Although films designed for secondary schools in the United States were produced before World War Two, they became an integral technique of schooling immediately following the war, as their number soared. By the early 1950s, several thousand of these films were in circulation, with most secondary schools in the U.S. having acquired the films and projection equipment. By the early 1970s, however, production and use of the films subsided considerably. Explaining the widespread but relatively brief use of these films in secondary education lies beyond the scope of this essay, though a project such as that would certainly have to consider factors other than the films' generic conventions or production codes.

As Ian Hunter has proposed, the modern public-*popular* school is a "cultural technology" that, through a broad regimen of highly institutionalized techniques for individuals to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for self-improvement, shapes a citizenry's conduct. Hunter notes that culture, cultural criticism, and aesthetic education more generally were part of an array of technical skills/knowledge for improving, shaping, and thus managing behavior in programs of public education: "By attaching the formation of the cultural attributes of a citizenry to the formation of a corrective knowledge of the individual citizen, this organization made 'man' available as a systematically educable being… by a powerful pedagogical apparatus." (Hunter, 1988: 212-213). For Hunter, aesthetic criticism intersected with the educational imperatives of the human sciences through the "psychologisation" of the pedagogical disciplines that provided both with a similar object, an individual defined by an immature sensibility: "It made for the first time in a systematic fashion an individual whose responses were governed by laws which escaped his knowledge, and an apparatus in which the clarification of these laws would be made obligatory for an important social stratum… But [for the individual defined by an immature sensibility] this sensibility was one whose maturation criticism might allow the individual himself to become responsible for:

reconciling his ideas and feeling, his didactic and sensuous impulses, on the testing surface of the literary text" (Hunter, 1988: 216). Hunter's account of public schooling thus offers a historical and theoretical perspective about the role of criticism in an apparatus of governing through the techniques of self-improvement available to individuals defined by an immature sensibility.

Classroom films in the 1950s, were a technology adapted, by all kinds of professionals (educators, psychologists, sociologists, home economists, clergy), to making the school and classroom a proper setting for linking moral and behavioral training about fashioning, developing, and conducting oneself properly in different social settings and activities. As generic exercises and demonstrations, films for the classroom made available various techniques suited to the different subjects and activities of schooling and to representing the different ways that schooling was linked to other sites in the everyday lives of teenagers. These films demonstrated techniques for courtship, driving, home life, sexuality, citizenship, and other tasks represented as necessary for forming proper social relations through proper self-improvement, self-fashioning, and self-control. The classroom film genres were thus deeply practical resources -- demonstrations, maps, guides, instructions -- for collecting oneself as a full and capable individual across a range of activities. As lessons about conduct, the films often linked the care and management of oneself to social responsibility--for a partner, family members, friends, classmates, adults, or a general citizenry. The public responsibility of self-improvement is evident in titles such as *Are You a Good Citizen?*, *Are Manners Important?*, *As a Boy Grows*, *Care of the Hair and Nails, Developing Self-reliance*, *Emotional Health, Emotional Maturity, Effective Criticism, Good Grooming for Girls*, *Helping Johnny Remember, Holiday from Rules?, How to be Well-groomed, How to Say No: Moral Maturity, Lunchroom Manners, Manners in Public, Maintaining Classroom Discipline, Manners in School, Mealtime Manners and Health, Mind Your Manners!, Pattern for Smartness, Responsibility, Responsibilities of American Citizenship, The Self-Conscious Guy, Understanding Your Emotions, The Well-Mannered Look*. As maps for living, some of the films pertained to proper conduct at particular sites (e.g., the school, the domestic sphere, leisure sites), and some pertained to the mobility of youth (e.g., vagrancy as a condition of delinquency, and road conduct and safety), though separating these dimensions of youths' lives in the 1950s misses how important these films were to shaping youth *as* free citizen-subjects. Proper care and management of oneself was, after all, crucial to governing a society increasingly and rapidly organized/mobilized through new techniques of auto-mobility -- of governing youth through their mobility and through their attachment to places beyond school and home. To the extent that classroom films often were about gendered regimens for self-improvement and often were used for gender-specific screenings (e.g., *As Boys Grow*, *Molly Grows Up*, *The Story of Menstruation*), their demonstrations of the proper conduct and safety of being mobile were about the differential mobilities of young men and women -- "looseness" referring to the risks of vagrancy by young women, to a young woman's ethical conduct and social responsibility in her mobility away from the domestic sphere and from other mechanisms of adult/moral supervision.

As *Blackboard Jungle* affirms through teachers who marvel over Dadier's ability to reach his students through film, movies in the classroom were instructional techniques articulated to/through the most progressive experiments of public education in the U.S. during the 50s. *Rebel without a Cause* represents the field trip as a common practice for linking the school to local cultural and civic sites such as museums. Both scenes, moreover, represent conduct at these sites through lessons in sociability, with student conduct as one objective of reading social relations through screenings. Like the classroom film, the school field trip is a

demonstration of "effective criticism" -- the social responsibilities that adhered to self-improvement and self-conduct, at school and in public places. Culture and science, through the English class and the planetarium as settings for instructional movies, were technical rationalities (and ethical rationalizations) of a kind of social governance practiced through public schooling. While some classroom films were about working through problems and arriving at techniques for coping and living responsibly, other films frequently were open-ended, asking questions that became the basis for discussion after the film concluded. The use of films in classrooms also was neither entirely didactic nor recreational since they represented a disruption in the routine of classroom lectures and exercises, even as they extended those lectures and exercises (e.g., a dramatization of good penmanship as a technique of "fitting in"). Classroom films were progressive in that they were about student participation in exercising skills in self-improvement and social responsibility and in that they assumed the mobility (the freedom and independence) of youth beyond the traditional sites and mechanisms of adult supervision. *Rebel Without a Cause* was one of the first Hollywood films to emphasize the dual importance, for youth, of social responsibility and managing oneself in an environment being reorganized through suburbanization and (after *On the Loose*, 1951, and *The Wild One*, 1954) through forms of auto-mobility -- an environment increasingly reliant upon techniques for living and governing at a distance.

The Domestic Sphere

As Raymond Williams has noted, television emerged most rapidly through a new regime of mobility and privacy (Williams, 1974/1992). To the extent that "mobile privatization" refers to the historical relation among television's situatedness, its circulation, the development of communication networks and transportation systems, and the mobility of social subjects, the broad social reconfiguration that accompanied them is decidedly a spatial issue. Mobile privatization referred to a changing set of spatial distinctions and definitions, most notably for Williams (and others who have cited him) between the public and private sphere. Also, mobile privatization involved a material repositioning -- a spatial redefinition -- of the home, increasingly situated "at a distance" from other sites, from its earlier locations, and from earlier concepts and material embodiments of the city, yet conjoined through broadcasting and other kinds of "flows" among places (such as automobile travel on newly constructed highway and freeway systems). In this regard, mobile privatization--the convergence of new regimes of mobility and privacy -- concerns the spatial redistribution and rearrangement of social subjects. Television, as cultural technology, becomes a valuable technique for living within this social arrangement and material environment. (See Appendix Two) But "living within" this arrangement involves, as Williams repeatedly suggests, issues of power, control, and governance.

As a domestic technology integral to the emerging regime of mobility and privacy, television intersected with the everyday lives of youth through the domestic sphere's relation to other new sites to which youth were becoming attached. Like the school and classroom, home was a space of adult supervision. But the household as a micro-economy -- a space organized and governed through a distribution of family members' activities, exchanges, and responsibilities -- relied upon a different array of technologies for managing the knowledge, conduct and mobility of youth than did the school, the theater, or other public places. Whereas during the 1950s, when most households in the U.S. had only one television set, local and national television did not support programming for teen audiences specifically. The notable exceptions were dance programs such as *American Bandstand*, which was broadcast nationally on weekday afternoons, and the dance programs broadcast locally in a few U.S.

cities on Saturdays. Although the dance programs may have transformed "television rooms" into dance floors for young audiences dancing with the dancers on the TV screen, dancing at home to television was subject to the rationalities governing the household, as a space of particular kinds of labor, leisure, and sociality (and thus particular kinds of responsibility, security, and disciplinarity) that were apart from the public sites where teens "went out" to dance.

Teen and young adult characters on television were more commonly articulated through representations of families whose regular and primary setting was the two-storey, para- or proto-suburban house. Many of the most popular domestic comedies on TV from the mid-50s to the early-60s (e.g., *The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet*, *Father Knows Best*, *Bachelor Father*, *Love That Bob*, *The Burns and Allen Show*, *Leave It to Beaver*, *The Donna Reed Show*, *My Three Sons*) represented families comprised of teen or young adult characters. Many episodes of these TV series -- and some of these series more than others -- represented the teen and young adult characters' relation with friends, their movement and attachment to places outside the home (including the school and classroom), and their negotiation of the relation between home and these other spheres of sociality. By the late-1950s, the teen characters had begun to figure more prominently in these TV series. By its fourth season in 1958, episodes of *Ozzie and Harriet* regularly concluded with a musical performance by Ricky for a teen audience someplace away from the Nelson home. *Dobie Gillis* (1959) became the first program wherein the adolescent protagonist's relation to nuclear family and home figured less prominently in episodes than his activities at school and his on-going monologues or encounters with friends in front of a park statue resembling Rodin's "The Thinker". Mostly, however, television and its genres were mechanisms that, for a brief period and more than any other social space, articulated the separate responsibilities and mobilities of adults and youth from a common space (the TV room) in the domestic sphere.

One way of considering how television/genre represented and operated within the moral economy of the 1950's house(-hold) is through "America's favorite family": the Nelsons. In a 1957 episode of *Ozzie and Harriet*, the Nelson's two adolescent sons, Rick and Dave, argue over their respective right and access to the family record player in order to indulge their very different tastes in musical genres. Dave prefers classical music, which he contrasts to the "low-brow" and immature tastes of his brother, and the younger Rick prefers "jazz," which he distinguishes from the boring and "square" taste of Dave and which the older characters repeatedly equate with "bop" and "rhythm and blues". When the two sons gradually increase the volume of separate phonographs to drown out the other's music from different rooms (Dave with the downstairs family phonograph, and Rick with a small portable model in his bedroom), Ozzie, their father, intercedes. The rest of the episode is devoted to Ozzie's effort to restore harmony and tranquility to the house by guiding both sons to appreciate the other's taste in music, and to restore the household's openness to new and old aesthetics by demonstrating to his sons the maturity of being fair and "broad-minded". Ozzie's guidance is made pressing in part because Rick's personal record player has expired after being played at such a high volume and because the entire family temporarily will have to share the remaining downstairs phono. As a model of progressive pedagogy, the parents' never scold or overtly direct their sons' choices; Ozzie is willing to display his tolerance to the volume and brashness of Rick's music by walking around the house with cotton in his ears. In the episode's finale, each son, after voluntarily learning to act more responsibly at home, attends concert performances of the kinds of music that they were intent on listening to earlier at home. At a piano concerto, Dave's female date remarks on his maturity, he explains that his whole family is mature, and the couple decides to head off to a "quiet" jazz club. Attending a

rhythm and blues concert at the civic auditorium, Rick's female date also remarks on his maturity at having been willing to go to a piano recital, but when Rick asks if it would be "unsophisticated" to attend the dance contest following the rhythm and blues concert, the couple opts to dance. While the dance scene displays Rick's mastery of jitterbug shuffle, the discourse about maturity, the civic auditorium setting, and the highly regulated and supervised nature of a dance contest all affirm the safety of their conduct. At the Nelson home, the parents settle in for an evening of television-watching after the sons have returned home -- safe, on time, and ready for bed. However, when Harriet insists that she has been looking forward to watching a televised movie, Ozzie, who has just begun watching a program on a different channel, realizes that being broad-minded will involve giving in to Harriet. So he phones his next-door, male neighbor to ask if the neighbor would mind letting him watch TV next door.

As a demonstration of progressive strategies for shaping youth, this episode resembles the classroom film. Classroom films and tele-films for home consumption even share certain narrative situations (both kinds of films dealt with home life) and performance styles (demonstrations of applying oneself at home). But as genres (or collections of genres) suited for particular sites, their narrative regularities pertained to the rationalities (the techniques of knowledge and conduct) of those sites and to the mobility of youth among them. Consequently it is worth trying to understand how the reasoning of TV narrative upholds the rationality of particular spheres of sociality (rather than a general and all-pervasive ideology). In the 1950s, the episode of *Ozzie and Harriet* demonstrated progressive strategies for shaping youth through the management of households, as particular and "private" spaces and economies for responsible and self-reliant individuals (young and old). What Dave and Rick take to and from their house is guided in part by their father, who in the episode's second half, takes them to a record store, so that when the sons venture on their dates, to more public spheres of leisure, their conduct is as much a matter of their being at places where fun matters in its regulation but also of their being attracted to such places through the household. (Over the following TV seasons, as Dave and Rick age and as episodes increasingly concern them and their experiences outside the home, episodes regularly end with a public musical performance by Rick rather than at home.)

This particular episode is remarkable in part because it demonstrates how household governance relies (albeit in an emerging and tenuous fashion) on the fair and responsible distribution of domestic technologies -- in an era when middle-class households generally had only one television set, one phone, and one phonograph. Just as ownership of records, portable phonographs, and portable radios were giving way to a new household economy/distribution (e.g., teens' privacy as a component in the liberal management of households), television programming for "the entire family" (as coherent national taste culture) was increasingly about demonstrating how to distribute, coordinate, and mobilize domestic technologies for effective household management. In this episode's commercial break and concluding advertisement for Hotpoint appliances, the household telephone is touted as an expedient mechanism for ordering an array of time- and labor-saving kitchen appliances, which Harriet demonstrates as necessary for effective household management: "Everyday's a holiday with Hotpoint." And Harriet's demonstration of domestic appliances is integral to the episode's more general demonstration of managing households with teenagers. Significantly, the episode is less about the place of TV in the lives of the sons, whose investment in music is part of their mobility outside the home, than in the effective (liberal) household-management skills of their parents -- the sons' relative immaturity being overcome through the rational, progressive home, and demonstrated outside the home. The circulation

of television broadcasts into the household (as a way of representing the relation of musical, telephonic, and kitchen technologies in household management) not only contributed to a new regime of mobility and privacy but also represented television as an indispensable instrument for rationalizing how to live and govern at a distance. The "open-ness" and "broad-minded-ness" of the Nelson home relies upon techniques for effective management of the household and their son's mobility as free but disciplined individuals. That the episode concludes with Ozzie and Harriet about to watch a TV program opens the Nelson home literally to adjacent TV episodes (other domestic settings) and to the watching of television in real-life households. The episode's final representation of television-watching, by linking the situation with the family phonograph to the family television set, underscores the precariousness of "family TV" as a mechanism for the liberal governance of households, even as it affirms television/genre's role as part of effective household governance . Consequently, even television-watching is itself a matter of the kind of mature, responsible conduct necessary for households that are both effectively run and effectively "open" (among other things, to television).

The Nelson household becomes an integral component of the formation of a community comprised of open, safe, reasonably managed households. Even though Ozzie has to go next door to maintain his progressive reasoning about household management, he still can assume that his next door neighbor, who also owns a television, will understand his personal investment in particular kinds of television, and that going there to watch TV will not irreparably damage his marriage/family or his own role as household manager. Ozzie's is a household, after all, that relies upon and builds trust through the effective mediation of household spaces and external social spaces through television.

The domestic sphere is a useful site for thinking about the intersection of cinema and youth precisely because of television's rapidly emerging value in the effective management of the mobility of youth. The emergence of the tele-film and particularly the domestic comedy -- series-production honed as a domestic appliance and as part of the moral economy of middle-class households -- certainly is not an example of the "teen film" that has been the object of film/genre criticism. Considering, however, the attachments of youth and cinema to/through particular governmental rationalities (where youth are governed in their mobility to and from different sites) involves recognizing the relation between the classroom, the domestic sphere, and the sites where youth moved. The objectives of household management -- and television's relation to those objectives -- relied upon the objectives of other institutions, their ways of instituting movie-watching, and the effective management of youth's mobility beyond these spheres. Home, as a meaningful place, has always been about access and mobility (men's vs. women's, adults' vs. children's) and about securing paths to an outside from an inside, while making the inside secure against an outside. Understanding how spheres of privacy during the 1950s (and the rapid proliferation of the suburban home in the U.S.) were shaped through and made instrumental for a new regime of mobility requires attention to the technologies of home and the mobility of its inhabitants. Although the leisure and recreational sites of youth were not regulated in the same way as were the classroom and home, the mobility of youth to leisure sites was governed nonetheless through the classroom and household (and in part through the application of screen technologies at those sites). As I point out in the next section, the theater was a leisure site where the conduct of youth -- in their mobility -- was organized through a particular set of techniques related to movie-watching.

The Theater

Hollywood feature-films about youth, such as *Rebel Without a Cause*, may have assumed their youth audience's familiarity with the narrative situations and logics of classroom films and tele-films. The feature-film *Unwed Mother* (1958) dwells on the shame and pathos of undisciplined female sexuality as does the classroom film *Girls Beware* (1960). Unlike *Rebel*, the production values of many Hollywood feature-films marketed for teen audiences resulted in a visual, narrative, and performance style not unlike classroom films and tele-films. However, feature-films about youth, and particularly the ones marketed for youth, were adapted for a particular kind of engagement with particular sites away from home and school. In that sense, these films assumed that cinema played a role in the mobility of youth differently than did classroom films or television. *Rebel*'s representation of Jim's dad asleep in front of the television speaks particularly to the site of feature-length films in the mobility of youth; it is not a representation typical of classroom films or television's domestic comedy.

While film/genre criticism has developed a fairly sophisticated account of cinema as an ideological apparatus, that account has generalized the site of cinema, ignoring its relation to a field of exteriority generally and to specific, historical arrangements of social space. It has assumed not only that cinema is a distinctive set of formal practices and that engaging with cinema is primarily a cognitive, psychic and interiorized process of making meaning and ideology, but that the site of movie watching occurs in a distinctive (dark) place -- a place disconnected and unsupported by connections to other sites. Indeed film/genre criticism, focused on the filmic construction of screen space and on the mythologization of places through generic convention, has been particularly ill-equipped to explain how particular sites become cinematic, how movie-watching gets articulated to/through particular social spaces and arrangements. The movie theater took a particular shape precisely in its relation to other sites and always as a matter of movie-goers' relative access and mobility to those sites. In this essay, I consider the theater after having discussed the classroom and the domestic sphere precisely in order to make the relation of film/genre and youth a matter of decentering the movie theater and of considering its place and mattering in relation to conditions of access. Several dimensions of the movie theater's relation to youth's mobility and access warrant consideration.

First, while movie theaters have been been sites of leisure and recreation where youth could venture "on their own," without the supervision of parents, a theater's openness to "unsupervised" youth depended upon its regulation internally and from various institutions. In the 1950s, the mobility of youth particularly in urban and suburban environments rapidly became a central subject of feature-films that represented youth. Unlike the films screened at school and unlike films and tele-films screened at home, however, films screened at theaters were about attracting youth outside the home and about the pleasures and meaningfulness of time spent away from home, of attachments formed among youth and to particular sites away from home and school -- even as they demonstrated the precariousness of undisciplined mobility and the consequences of irresponsible behavior. Titles of many of these feature-films dwelt upon the exigencies of youth's mobility, though in different ways for young men than for young women. An advertisement for *The Careless Years* (1957) highlights responsibility incumbent on independence through mobility: "Girls from the right kind of home… stumbling into the 'wrong' kind of love!" And an ad for *Young and Wild* (1958) reads: "The scorching, reckless joy rides of wild girls on the road!" Numerous other feature-films from the 1950s represent independence as a practice requiring self-regulation, self-care, and self-security, and simultaneously as the basis for youth's potential volatility/excesses/immaturity at unsupervised places or at places supervised by adults. *Girls on the Loose*, *Running Wild*, *Runaway Daughters*, *Runaway*, *Hot Car Girl*, *The Wayward*

Girl, *Speed Crazy* -- and certainly *Rebel Without a Cause* -- all define the agency of youth through their mobility and congregation away from home and school. In this sense, films at theaters reinforced the value of places outside the home as part of an economy dependent upon youth's mobility and access, to places outside the home where it was possible to congregate in large numbers, and outside the school where congregating in large numbers always had the potential for displaying youth's empowerment.

Second, youth's attachment to the theater during the 1950s involved the transformations of movie theaters as spaces of leisure and sociability. More drive-in movie theaters than indoor theaters were erected during the 1950s, and in U.S. cities which were expanding the most rapidly, drive-ins outnumbered indoor theaters. Although the number of drive-ins had grown slowly before World War Two, they became particularly suited after the war to rapid suburban development. Drive-ins' low-cost construction, coupled with their easy demolition within flexible real estate patterns, the dependence upon automobile use in suburban tracts, and the newness of the suburban settlement (before they had become established enough to support outlying shopping malls), all contributed to the drive-in's rapid and widespread proliferation during the '50s. That the mobility of youth (particularly in the outer-urban and suburban residential areas) was so reliant upon the car made the drive-in an important recreational site for youth away from home and parental supervision. Given that many of the theatrical films concerned precisely the auto-mobility of youth -- simultaneously the self-gratification and self-responsibility of moving about without strict adult supervision -- makes significant their connection to the movie theater generally, and the drive-in theater specifically. Like the classroom film and the tele-film, a particular kind of theatrical film (low-budget films that easily could be themed for double-billing and identified as "teen films") developed through the various practices that made the drive-in a common site where youth congregated. While the classroom film provided demonstrations of sexual responsibility, health, and safety (particularly in films for girls), the theatrical film more often articulated the self-responsibility of sexual agency through accounts that at least acknowledged the attraction and potential thrills of temporarily escaping home and school. In that sense, the drive-in and its films were important mechanisms for accompanying and, in that way, directing and governing the (sexual) freedom of youth whose independence relied upon cars and sites such as the drive-in. The drive-in, for adults and teens, offered a regulated space for sexual encounter. Like the motel, which became just as instrumental as a site of sexual encounter within the new regime of mobility and privacy, the drive-in was structured as a semi-public heterotopia -- a space accepted as a proper site for sexual encounter outside the home and outside public spaces.

Amidst the rapid emergence and the widespread use of drive-in theaters, the objectives and exhibition practices of indoor theaters increasingly accommodated youth audiences. Films representing rock music, for instance, developed as part of a spatial and semantic redefinition of the indoor-theater as a recreational site for youth. Representing rock music through theatrical films was in part a way of placing/instituting the convergence of musical and (tele-)filmic genres outside the home. One implication of this was economic. Theatrical films representing rock music pertained to an economy that relied upon youths' listening to music at home as well as outside the home. The theatrical film representing rock music also pertained, however, to a moral economy for governing the conduct of youth, in their leisure time and from locations where the conventions of music and film converged. As much as *American Bandstand* on television, theatrical films became a potent means of representing and commodifying a youth lifestyle shaped through rock music. Attending films outside the home, however, involved a somewhat different set of responsibilities in that lifestyle than did

dancing and listening to music at home on the radio, the phonograph, or the television. In that sense, rock music relied upon theatrical and televisual representation to secure a trust by both adults and youth about the meanings and proper places of rock music, with the theatrical films and television helping to make rock music, its performers, and fans part of a sphere of sociality outside the direct oversight by parents but more or less acceptable to progressive forms of adult supervision. Shaping the progressive adult and the sites of musical performance were objectives of theatrical films representing rock as much as was defining the responsibilities of youth in their mobility to and from the home. More than the drive-in, the indoor-theater and auditorium was a common site for both films and musical performances attended by youth during the 1950s -- an occurrence that particularly illustrates how film genres became mechanisms reorganizing indoor theaters for youth. To the extent that the narratives of films on rock (e.g., *Rock All Night*, *Rock Baby*, *Rock It*, *Rock*, *Pretty Baby*, *Carnival Rock*, *Jailhouse Rock*) were about finding and shaping the proper place for rock performance, the theater-auditorium (either in these films or as the material site and *raison d'être* of these films) became a technology for staging the well-behaved rock concert. (Whereas the Hollywood musical has long been about "putting on the show," the problem of where to stage a musical performance and of distinguishing between proper and improper stages was central to theatrical films representing rock.) Indeed demonstrating the viability of this technology was a central objective of films representing rock at time when newspapers were highlighting the unruliness of youth attending rock musical performances and films at indoor theaters (e.g., the account of a riot that occurred in conjunction with a screening of *Rock Around the Clock* in a mid-west city in 1956, "New 'Rock' Explosion of Hot Youth; Branch Mgr. Discounts Morals TNT," *Variety*, May 2, 1956, p. 1).

An Afterthought about Fun: Placing Cinema and Youth within New Regimes of Mobility

In *Back to the Future* (1984), the path to engineering the accomplished, self-confident, and fully realized family occurs through time-travel, in a modified Delorean, back to the 1950s and literally to the threshold of mass suburbanization. If "home" is a place that can only be realized by going somewhere else, then cinema became an important site in the 1980s for fashioning a relationship between baby-boomers and their children, for *re*-embodying youth; and being so hyper-mobile (notwithstanding the technical glitches that the film ascribes to time-space compression) requires new portable accouterments, such as the protagonist's Walkman and camcorder, as well as new lessons about youth at the steering wheel of retrofitted cultural technologies, e.g., the car, school, home, prom, and rock music. As an ethnographic narrative, *Back to the Future*'s young protagonist is considerably more mature, sober, and responsible than the 1950s youth that he encounters (or than the adults, introduced at the film's beginning, which the 50s seems to have produced). (*Back to the Future* is one of several films, including *Forrest Gump* and *Pleasantville*, wherein passages back through the 1950s frame narratives about the enlightenment of youth from the 1980s and 90s.) The pre-suburban California town to which the film's young protagonist returns -- a model of life around a town-square that in 1984 was just a gleam in the eyes of the architects of Disney's Celebration -- is constructed of chronotopes less from *Blackboard Jungle* than from 1950s TV and the classroom film. Quite literally, the passage between the past and the present is through the strip mall parking lot and the movie theater, whose place in a post-suburban arrangement is marked by the passage from a pristine marquee advertising a 1950's Reagan film to a dilapidated marquee advertising a contemporary porn film -- the ultimate degradation of the downtown movie theater in an era of the Meese Commission report and other neo-conservative panics about youth's access to "adult" material from the home. In this

respect, the film is a gesture toward securing a future, post-suburban environment wherein social authority derives more from embodiments of youth as a category of advanced temporal-spatial mobility than from the disciplinary enclosures such as the school, the theater, or the house. Furthermore, the mobility requires and produces active, entrepreneurial (self-actualizing and self-governing) youth, embodied both by the protagonist (Michael J. Fox, who for years had played the hyper-earnest, neo-conservative on TV's *Family Ties*) and by the "youthful" parents cum entrepreneurs that his time-travel produces. If self-realization is a key to and an effect of self-discipline for advanced (or neo-) liberal governance, then societies committed to governing that way require technologies (in this case fashioned out of cinema) that represent the relation of youth to its own advanced/mature freedoms -- beyond home, school, and earlier sites of self-realization.

This essay has attempted to underscore that genre and youth are neither entirely fixed nor entirely free social bodies and categories, but rather that, as bodies/categories, they have become attached to particular places through regimes of mobility -- that their freedom and governance occurs through, indeed depends upon, their attachments to these places and through a society's ways of regulating mobility. I have discussed cinema and youth (and their intersection) in this way so as to counter the notion, particularly common in film criticism, that they are merely or primarily ideological constructions. Films and youth circulate individually and as aggregations, but the freedom of their circulation (their mobility) has been governed through their relation to places that have been deemed and made acceptable, receptive, and useful for their separate objectives. The domestic sphere, the school, and the theater/mall all have been sites that have been made appropriate for youth and cinema as spaces where the potential unruliness of youth could be managed. Yet the potential desires and unruliness of youth, as individuals and social aggregations, also has been a matter of youth's mobility among these places and its claim upon these places. The question that I have attempted to address, therefore, is less, "Where have youth gone to escape adult supervision?", than "How are the pleasures and desires of youth a matter of their relative mobility across social spaces and of their relative access/attachments to particular places, and second, how are their access and attachment to particular places a matter of their freedom *and* governance?" Governing the pleasures of youth at school or at home is different than at the theater or the mall, or in the car, but only in that these latter sites involve different mechanisms for governing youth through their freedom. I thus would agree with Grossberg that youth have constructed their own places in the space of transition between institutions of domesticity, schooling, and consumption -- in the space that "the dominant society assumed to be no place at all -- merely a transition" (Grossberg, 1990: 178-179). I would add, however, that this space of mobility and the locations of congregating and of fun, such as the theater/mall, have been places where youth are always subject to being governed in their freedom, in their mobility.

To link the governance of youth, as social bodies, to their relative social mobility (i.e., their mobility across social spaces) and to their attachment to particular places, also entails recognizing that these sites relied upon one another and that their interdependence was not fixed. During the 1950s, the theater mattered to youth as a site for fun precisely in youth, film, and the theater's relation to home and school. The theater also was made available as a site for fun as part of a socio-spatial *arrangement* -- a social distribution and contract about places for fun. The theater, as a place where cinema and youth intersected, was subject to an established set of expectations about theaters and an emerging set of uses that involved the mobility of youth. As such, its relevance to youth and to cinema became part of a broad socio-spatial re-arrangement and a new regime of mobility that were shaping the circulation

of youth and cinema. I emphasize this point in part to counter the tendency in genre criticism to explain social change through the conventions, negotiations, and counter-conventions of film narrative as "cultural logics". I do so also to emphasize (after Henri Lefebvre) that societies are organized spatially, that "the production of social space" refers to instantiations that are both representational and material, and that social space, in these terms, is a condition for social transformation, for making history. While I thus would agree with genre criticism, that genres are regulatory mechanisms (that they have a capacity to regulate in their regularity), I am decidedly more interested in their capacity to regulate the access and mobility of cinema and youth to places and to regulate (through) the production of social space. In this sense, the suburban mall and multiplex cinema developed out of a social arrangement that instrumentalized the school, home, and indoor/outdoor theater in their relation to one another. The cinematic, whose value within this arrangement was predicated upon its dispersal across these sites during the 1950s, was thus semantically and spatially redefined in the 1980s through these sites and through their changing relation to one another. Although this essay's account of this development is partial and selective (emphasizing the trends in white, middle-class enclaves), a more elaborated and micrological analysis would consider particular zones where emerging and residual formations of the movie theater were redefining the spatial distribution/paths of classes of youth, e.g., the showing of Blaxpoitation and marital arts films at downtown movie theaters in Austin, Texas that drew together -- briefly during the 1970s -- African-American youth from the city's east side and White students from the nearby university (based on the author's experience at that theater; also see Streible, 1993).

The changing place of cinema is not merely an ontological issue -- what is cinema any longer in the age of DVD and video streaming? -- but a matter of regulating the conduct of social bodies (e.g., youth) at particular places and *in* their relative mobility. In this respect, the question of how youth is embodied and mobilized is deeply a question of where youth is located through technologies of embodiment and mobilization such as movie theaters, the household, or the school. In that respect, the relation of youth to particular sites that has occurred since the 1950's panics and responses to films such as *Blackboard Jungle* (see Appendix Three) needs to be seen as inter-dependent with changing modalities of progressive education and liberal governance in a nation so committed to articulating freedom and youth and to governing youth through their "immaturity," through the paths made available for becoming fully responsible citizens, social bodies, and revelers.

[Note: This essay was conceived as an introduction and conclusion to an essay that I co-authored with Stephen Bailey ("Cinema and the Premises of Youth" for Contemporary Hollywood Genres, ed. Steve Neale, London: BFI, forthcoming). Readers are encouraged to assemble their own version out of these separate publications.]

Appendix One

This essay was conceived as a theoretical justification for a project that considers how youth and cinema have been attached and regulated through particular sites in the U.S., from the 1950s to the present. In this respect, the project involves rethinking the objectives of film genre analysis and the concomitant canons and categories that have organized histories of film in the U.S. It seems fitting, therefore, to interject here that while the "newness" of New Hollywood cinema does have something to do with the transformations of Hollywood cinema as an industry and a set of narrative conventions (the usual ways that New Hollywood has been discussed), accounts of New Hollywood that follow those paths tend to ignore how

these changes have occurred through an emerging socio-spatial arrangement, new spheres of sociality, and new distributions of cultural resources (a new cultural economy) wherein cinema and youth have come to matter in new ways, in their mobility and in their articulation to particular sites. Bailey's and my project is less interested than most accounts of New Hollywood, therefore, in explaining how New Hollywood has developed out of a "classical" cinema (or out of cinema per se), and we reject the notion that "convergence" -- technological, industrial, or otherwise -- is a recent trend marking the "newness" of Hollywood cinema). Instead we are asking what the new-ness of Hollywood cinema has to do with the changing paths, mobility, and spatial attachments of youth.

Appendix Two

For more on Hay's discussion of cultural technology after Williams' discussion of television as "technology and cultural form," see "Unaided Virtues: The (Neo-)Liberalization of the Domestic Sphere," *Television and New Media* 1:1, 2000, parts of which are reprinted in "Unaided Virtues: The (Neo-) Liberalization of the Domestic Sphere and the New Architecture of Community," *Governing the Present: Foucault and Cultural Studies*, SUNY Press (forthcoming). For related discussion of the school and museum as "cultural technology," see Ian Hunter, *Culture and Government*, op cit., and Tony Bennett, *Culture: A Reformer's Science*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.

Appendix Three

See "Motion Pictures and Juvenile Delinquency: Report of the Committee on the Judiciary," prepared by the U.S. Congressional Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, May 25, 1956. This report, in tandem with a contemporaneous Congressional report, "Television and Juvenile Delinquency, attempted to form a governmental response to the "growing trend" of depictions of sex and violence in motion pictures, and the effects of these depictions on the behavior of teen audiences. The committee viewed and analyzed several films, with the newly released *Blackboard Jungle* receiving the most attention in the report. Opposing direct forms of government censorship (and repeatedly affirming the importance of liberty in American society), the committee proposed greater responsibility on behalf of the motion picture industry, and greater reliance upon "professionals" and other "responsible people" (p. 69) to advise the industry on making films that presumably would not depict ungovernable youth ("violence run rampant," p. 70). The report also proposes greater synergy between the motion picture industry and institutions such as libraries, schools, churches, and civic organizations. While this was certainly not the first report about the effects of motion pictures on youth in the U.S., its intersection with the social arrangement described in this essay offers one way to consider the contradictions about the governmentalization of the relation between cinema and youth.

References

Rick Altman (1999) *Film/Genre*. London: BFI.

Tony Bennett (1990) *Outside Literature*. New York/London: Routledge.

Thomas Doherty (1988) *Teenagers and Teenpics: The Juvenilization of American Movies in the 1950s*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Michel Foucault (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon.

Christine Gledhill (2000) Rethinking Genre, *Reinventing Film Studies*, ed. Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams. London: Arnold, pp. 221-243.

Lawrence Grossberg (1990) *We Gotta Get Out of this Place*. New York/London: Routledge.

Lawrence Grossberg (1998) The Victory of Culture, *Angelaki*, 3:3, pp. 3-29.

James Hay (1997) Piecing Together What remains of the Cinematic City, *The Cinematic City*, ed. Dave Clarke. London/New York: Routledge, pp. 53-74.

James Hay (August, 2001) Locating the Televisual, *Television and New Media*, 2:3, pp. 205-234.

Ian Hunter (1988) *Culture and Government*. London: Macmillan Press.

Jon Lewis (1992) *The Road to Romance and Ruin: Teen Films and Youth Culture*. New York/London: Routledge.

Christian Metz (1974) *Language and Cinema*. The Hague: Mouton.

Steve Neale (1990) *Questions of Genre*, Screen 31:1, pp. 45-66.

Dan Streible (1993) The Harlem Theater: Black Film Exhibition in Austin, Texas, 1920-1973, *Black American Cinema: Aesthetics and Spectatorship*, ed. Manthia Diawara. AFI Film Reader. New York: Routledge, pp. 221-236.

Raymond Williams (1974/1992) *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. Hanover/London: Wesleyan UP.