

This file is to be used only for a purpose specified by Palgrave Macmillan, such as checking proofs, preparing an index, reviewing, endorsing or planning coursework/other institutional needs. You may store and print the file and share it with others helping you with the specified purpose, but under no circumstances may the file be distributed or otherwise made accessible to any other third parties without the express prior permission of Palgrave Macmillan.
Please contact rights@palgrave.com if you have any queries regarding use of the file.

PROOF

Part II

Collective Identities and Emotions

PROOF

5

Women, Television and Feelings: Theorising Emotional Difference of Gender in *SouthLand* and *Mad Men*

Elke Weissmann

Contemporary American television drama – particularly of the ‘quality’ genre – has been celebrated for their female characters which appear significantly stronger than previous iterations of women on American television (Paul Harris). These are women who have jobs and, more importantly, drive the narrative forward. In many ways, these dramas seem to suggest that at least some demands of the second feminist movement have been taken into account. Indeed, Jane Arthurs, in her well-considered analysis of *Sex and the City* (HBO, 1998–2004), indicates that this is certainly true for this particular drama, despite some obvious shortcomings. However, as Arthurs does, we might need to temper our celebratory language somewhat. First of all, such celebrations often seem to be quite forgetful of earlier dramas that centred on strong women, including *Cagney & Lacey* (CBS, 1981–88). Secondly, such celebrations usually focus on the visibility of women within the narrative, rather than consider their narrative function and other issues of representation. Finally, such celebrations often do not take into consideration other aspects of gender connected to these dramas, including access to powerful roles in production, the gendering of genres and dramas, the implied gendered address of dramas, and the responses of audiences that contribute to an understanding of these dramas in relation to gender.

In the following, I aim to conduct a comparative analysis of two recent American dramas – *Mad Men* (AMC, 2007–15) and *SouthLand* (NBC, 2009, TNT, 2010–13). The analysis will be informed by feminist scholarship that emerged from the second feminist movement, and these dramas will be examined in the light of some key feminist demands that

resulted from it. This scholarship first of all reacted to charges of the vulnerability of audiences (particularly women and children, see Schiller or Bandura et al.). They indicated how television as a domestic medium followed the rhythms of domestic life with offerings targeted at particular groups at particular times (Modleski, 'The Rhythms of Reception'). Further, feminist scholarship highlighted that television was an important cultural form even if it was undervalued because it was connected to the domestic space and hence to a sphere normally gendered feminine (Spigel). Most of these writers, coming together as a 'Woman and Film' group, had a particular interest in soap opera, the least valued dramatic form on television, even if it was one of the most popular (C. Geraghty, 'The BFI Women'). Moreover, they had a particular interest in the female characters in these soaps and in the particular dramatic form of soap opera which, according to some commentators, had the space to subvert traditional ideologies because of the continuous and fragmented nature of these dramas (see Geraghty, 'The Continuous Serial; Feuer, 'Melodrama, Serial Form'). Finally, these scholars had a particular interest in women viewers (Modleski; Brunson; Ang; Hobson) who – until then – had all too often only been thought of as 'easily duped' and were usually considered as secondary to male and even teenage viewers (see Weissmann).

Out of this scholarship came several key feminist demands: feminists wanted women to have greater access to powerful roles in broadcasting and production. As many scholars (Holland; Hyem) highlighted, there were too few opportunities for women to progress into senior management, or even senior creative roles. Indeed, out of this demand came – in the UK at least – the Women in Film and Television group which continues to operate to the present day, indicating that perhaps not quite as much has changed as is sometimes reported. Another demand related to the variety of representation. Several content analyses, including the ones undertaken regularly by the National Organization for Women, drew attention to the limited representation of women in the media. For example, they highlighted that most women in film and television tended to be white, below the age of 50 and slender. They were also cast primarily in the role of mothers, lovers or caregivers and are portrayed as passive within the narrative. Women were also often believed to be housewives, mothers or consumers when they were addressed as viewers by the media, and again feminists demanded greater variety. Many believed that Channel 4 in the UK, when it was established in 1982, might offer an opportunity to bring about such a change, but they soon found themselves rather disappointed (Baer and Spindler-Brown). While these demands at first seemed rather distinct and separate, in what

follows I will show that they were actually interconnected: the demand for more women in senior roles goes along with a belief that this will eventually offer greater variety of representation which will cater to the variety of women's needs beyond their roles as wives, mothers and consumers.

It is in order to give further currency to the urgency of having more women in senior roles in the television industries that I conduct a comparative analysis here. Both *Mad Men* and *SouthLand* have been praised for the number of strong female characters who are shown to have narrative agency. However, how they are represented and what this narrative agency implies need to be unpacked further. The dramas are particularly useful for such a comparative analysis as one of them has been created and is showrun by a man (Matthew Weiner, *Mad Men*), while the other has been created and is showrun by a woman (Ann Biderman, *SouthLand*). Of course, television authorship is more complex, particularly in America, where there are often teams of writers working together. However, overall creative control is held by the head writers and showrunners, and it is these individuals who decide on the key framework through which narrative and character can be developed. This means that how narrative themes and characters are conceptualized within the universe of a drama is usually decided by them, particularly during the early stages of the series. While the analysis will focus on *Mad Men* and *SouthLand*, there is nevertheless an indication that their representation can be understood to be paradigmatic for how 'quality TV' created by men and women usually represents women.¹ As I will argue below, much of the difference in representation relies on a subtly, but importantly different conceptualization of women in relation to feelings: while *Mad Men* develops female characters by drawing on relatively stereotypical views of women as emotional (even if it tries to subvert some of the associated assumptions to this stereotype), *SouthLand* emphasizes the role of female instinct and affect to develop the female characters as competent. Such a distinction requires a better understanding of the conceptualizations of feelings, a matter which I will turn to first. I will then analyse the two dramas in the context of their production history and the representation of their female characters, drawing on some of the methodologies, including content analysis, but also close textual analysis, from earlier feminist work on television.

Emotions, feelings, affect

As several scholars note (for example, González, 'Introduction'; Gorton), emotions have become central to scholarship in a wide range of fields.

González (1–2) highlights that much of this is to do with the modernization of western cultures, which includes a shift in the responsibility of emotional labour from institutionalized, social rituals to the individual. As a result, she argues, we see an interconnected increase in emotional culture and therapeutic culture: culture places greater emphasis on emotions, rather than the objects and realities to which they relate, and the management of these emotions is conducted in therapeutic experiences by focusing on reflection and self-evaluation. Consequently, González argues that emotions are closely connected to self-knowledge and meta-emotions. This is also supported by Roberts, who argues against the idea that emotions are separate and opposed to processes of understanding. Rather, he writes emotions ‘are affective “cognitions” or cognitive “affects”’ (23). Gorton closely mirrors these ideas, particularly as far as the relationship of emotions to knowledge is concerned. Gorton highlights that emotions help us to define our place in the world as they determine our experience and contact with the world (56–7).

Despite the clear similarity in argument about the role of emotions for our (self-)knowledge, these descriptions also illustrate that there is a terminological uncertainty involved in how emotions are theorized. Thus, Roberts and González suggest that there is a difference between feelings and emotions – with feelings appearing as more basic gut reactions than the higher order, psychological emotions. Gorton, on the other hand, places emotions also at the contact with the world, and thus seems to suggest that the bodily reactions, described by Roberts, are part of an emotional repertoire that spans a number of experiences. Gorton places the main theoretical distinction in the difference between emotion and affect. However, at closer inspection, it becomes clear that this distinction is precisely about the same issue. Quoting Probyn, Gorton highlights that the distinction in the literature is often drawn between emotions as ‘cultural and social expression, whereas affects are of a biological and physiological nature’ (56). Thus, affect describes the bodily reactions – just as feelings appear in González and Roberts’s works. While for Roberts, gut feelings are not always emotions, Gorton suggests that affect and emotions are closely intertwined. As a result, she places ‘importance on the way in which feeling is negotiated in the public sphere and experienced through the body’ (56).

The focus on affect in relation to our emotional and cognitive experience of the world was influenced by Merleau-Ponty’s work which moved phenomenological thinking towards a greater emphasis on lived experience and on the experience of the body within the world. This is picked

up, amongst others, by Sara Ahmed, in order to emphasize the role of the body to our knowledge of the world, particularly from the point of view of an 'other' who experiences the world as disorienting. In relation to media, Laura Marks offers an insight into how our experiences with primarily visual media, such as film, are deeply embodied. This is also theorized by Sobchack who emphasizes that such affective experiences – even when they are pre-conscious – are nevertheless cognitive. As she puts it, '*my fingers knew what I was looking at* – and this *before* the objective reverse shot' (63; italics in original). Although Sobchack and Marks's analyses are concentrated on film, they are nevertheless able to highlight how vision more generally can generate a range of embodied experiences which are both emotional and cognitive.

This complex relationship between affect and emotion has been picked up by several feminist writers (see Lury; Weissmann and Boyle; Gorton; Kavka), in order to theorize the viewer's embodied relationship to television. Kavka and Gorton place a special emphasis on shame in order to grapple with the viewer's experiences in relation to the 'bad object' television, whilst Lury and Weissmann and Boyle are particularly interested in the haptic visuality (Marks) produced by specific texts. All of them indicate the role of the text, be that the specific textual construction, or the display of intimacy and emotionality on the screen in relation to the viewer's engagement. Nevertheless, the viewing experience – the moment of being a member of the audience – is clearly at the centre of their investigations.

The following tries to unpack how different television texts conceptualize emotion in relation to women. Thus, rather than emphasising the viewing experience, the analysis is focused on the production of meaning in the text. As I will argue, the difference is precisely dependent on how the dramas conceptualize women in relation to emotion. Whilst *Mad Men* imagines women as emotional who express their emotions via the body, *SouthLand* sees women as experiencing their world affectively – and, by being aware of these affects, becoming emotionally and professionally competent.

***Mad Men*: women and emotion**

Before delving deeper into the conceptualization of women as emotional, it is useful to consider the production context. *Mad Men* is a crucial series for AMC that has helped define the channel as a home of quality American TV drama. Originally focused on showing American movie classics (as indicated by its name), its branding was deeply

entrenched in ideas of 'classic' Hollywood cinema (Jaramillo), which brought it close to the original brand of HBO. As Kuhn highlights, the classics of cinema are largely gendered male. The establishment of a cinematic canon is connected to the embracing of cultural values which place traditional feminine genres and pleasures (such as melodrama, soap opera and talk) at the lower end of the cultural hierarchy. While such gendering connected to cultural values could easily be changed with a rebranding exercise, Jaramillo argues convincingly that the current trend towards original programming actually entails a return to its original brand – including the return to the cinematic which *Mad Men* is precisely an example of. By emphasising the cinematic and addressing an audience of cinephiles, AMC creates associations with a cinematic experience which, Caughie indicates, is in itself deeply gendered masculine.

In part, *Mad Men* aims to undermine this, and Matthew Weiner's own background contributes to this. Weiner sees himself as a feminist (Cox) and his previous work indicates his wish to subvert traditional assumptions about gender. Before creating *Mad Men*, Weiner had been part of the writing team and eventually the team of executive producers of *The Sopranos* (HBO, 1999–2007), a series which mixes the traditional (hyper-)masculine gangster genre with a very feminine one (soap opera). By showing Tony Soprano as being in need of therapy – in other words needing to talk – the drama suggests a subtle dominance of the feminine genre – and hence feminine values. In comparison, *Mad Men* appears even more feminine: as a period drama, it foregrounds the pleasures of costume. Indeed, *Mad Men's* designer Janie Bryant became an international star in her own right as a result of her work for the series. However, here, the genre is masculinized by its focus on the world of work and business and placing a greater emphasis on male perspectives (particularly those of Don Draper) rather than female ones, even though they are featured and provide a useful counterbalance. The feminine perspectives – particularly those offered by Betty Draper, Joan Harris and Peggy Olson – offer insights into feminist critiques of that period and more generally traditional gender roles. However, the 1960s setting also allows audiences to feel superior to that time as it offers audiences the chance to 'see how far we've come'. Inevitably, that means that, in part, the feminist critique is undermined as it is transferred onto an imaginary past. In other words, rather than reminding audiences of the continued problems that women face, the period costume as well as other aspects of the narrative emphasize that what we see is in the past and we now know better. These other narrative aspects include a scene when we see

Sally as a young girl running around with a plastic bag over her head (1.2), or when the Drapers are getting up from a picnic and leave the rubbish strewn on a perfectly mown lawn (2.7). As *The Guardian* points out, such images are dwelt upon in order to highlight the laissez-faire attitude of that generation towards environmental issues, suggesting a critique from a morally superior standpoint. Nevertheless, it is this standpoint that enables us to misunderstand the feminist critique as it allows us to assume that in regard to the treatment of women, we have also progressed.

Mad Men's problematic feminism is perhaps further emphasized when we approach the series drawing on the methodology of content analysis, with a focus on the women. Of the regular ten characters that we see throughout the series (from seasons one to seven), four are women (if we include Don's daughter Sally). At first, this suggests a relatively equal distribution of roles and perspectives within the context of the representation of a sexist time. However, all of the women are white, middle class (or at least from an urban background) and under the age of 40. Moreover, all of them are relatively slender, even if Joan Harris is sometimes described as curvy. This compares relatively unfavourably to the main male characters. Although all of them are white too, and can now be classed as middle class, Don is from a rural, working-class background and their age range is much wider. Indeed, as Edgerton argues, *Mad Men* is precisely interested in investigating the relationship between the different generations (xxiii), though this seems largely confined to the relationship of men to each other. When considering the recurring cast, the image hardly becomes any better. Although the gender balance seems slightly more equal (44.8 per cent of all other characters recurring in at least five episodes are female and 46.1 per cent of all character in at least two episodes are female), the representation of different races or ages remains relatively limited. Of the 87 women who appear in at least two episodes, only five are black, and only 21 are over the age of 45. Of course, such a representation is in line with the sexism and the segregation of races of the period in which the series is set; at the same time, such limited representation does nothing to tackle this image. Thus, rather than, say, providing us with representations of the everyday experiences of the few black women (for example, Dawn), we have to infer what their experiences are like by reading their faces in close-ups in moments of obvious racism.

A close textual analysis, focused on the representation of women in relation to emotion, highlights that although the drama uses female perspectives in order to undermine the dominant discourses of masculinity

PROOF

94 *Women, Television, Feelings: SouthLAnd and Mad Men*

and masculine values, it does this by creating stereotypical images of women. In *Mad Men*, women are presented as emotional. This is particularly true in comparison to the male characters, though this changes slightly over the seasons as the 1960s bring a greater degree of liberation from traditional gender norms. Nonetheless, throughout the seasons, women are presented as being in touch with their emotions, even when they suppress them. However, their emotionality is portrayed as positive: it offers scathing critiques, and thereby gives audiences insights into the failings of the otherwise compelling Don Draper. Such moments are particularly evident when Don is confronted by his rejected lovers, including Rachel Menken and Allison who both, in their different ways, make visible Don's moral depravity in scenes that highlight their own emotionality. As such, the women can be seen to represent a moral compass for the men.

This emotionality also hinders the women in their career prospects. Because this is a world of masculine values, we are presented repeatedly with women who have learnt to control and suppress their emotions, but who we nevertheless know have them. For example, one of the first scenes that gives us an insight into the formidable Faye Miller shows her emotionally charged and upset as she breaks up with her current boyfriend over the phone. Peggy, too, is shown to only step into management as she learns to control her emotions. This is communicated in a particularly telling scene: we see her walk into the bathroom in order to get a break from the complex emotional demands that are placed on her in the male-dominated world of the advertising agency. As she positions herself in front of a mirror, we can see her observe other women as they cry and let their emotions flow. On a purely narrative level, what this scene reveals is Peggy's resolve *not* to be like the other women. In this case, that means primarily not being emotional – or at least not showing her feelings. In other words, Peggy's strength is predicated precisely on her ability to suppress what women are shown to be in *Mad Men*: emotions. Her control over her emotions propels her along a career path. For example, when she confesses to Pete Campbell, she tells him she could have shamed him into marrying her, she could have decided to live out her feelings for him, but she decided to opt for a career instead (2.13). As Jeffers-McDonald points out, the shift up to her own office comes along with assumptions of becoming a 'harder task mistress than an executive who had not risen from secretary status... [and] Peggy showed that she could be ruthless' (132). This suggests that not only does Peggy suppress her own feelings, but she also takes less and less note of those of other women. Because we see this world through

her eyes rather than those of the other women, women's emotionality becomes devalued. That, however, also means that women in their traditional gender roles appear to bring little to the table that is valuable in terms of their career. In addition, the suppression of emotion is presented as a matter of choice, and thus cloaks this particular moment in the language of neoliberal ideology and postfeminism. This is also evident in the later series, when Peggy pitches the Burger Chef advert, her most successful moment (7.7). Here we see Peggy draw on her emotions, some of which are clearly authentic, while others are not, in order to create a great sell. She manipulates her emotions and those of others, ensuring they are controlled, in order to further her career. All of this means that women are presented as having the potential to move up in their careers even during this pre-feminist, sexist time, as long as they choose to behave like men.

Another interesting aspect about the scene in which Peggy chooses not to be like the other women (and the Burger Chef pitch scene) is the manner in which it is presented. The scene is clearly marked as a subjective point of view shot: the camera is consistently positioned with Peggy. In other words, the woman's point of view needs to be marked as subjective – as belonging to one particular woman. Such a shot (along with the use of similar ones across the seasons) illustrates how much of a masculine worldview is provided by the rest of the programme. In other words, while we receive the occasional insight into what this world is like for women, generally we are aligned with a masculine point of view. As a result, this particular perspective becomes normalized, common place. Hence, despite moments of feminist critique, we are still offered a world as perceived by men.

This is most evident in how the series imagines women, their emotions and their bodies, and in an attempt to examine this further I want now to focus on Betty Draper. In the words of Davidson, 'Betty Draper's character could have been created from Betty Friedan's [*The Feminine Mystique*'s] opening passage – name and all' (137). Davidson, of course, refers to the 'problem with no name'; the sense of boredom and desperation experienced by many women in 1950s and early 1960s America. Betty is typical for the suburban housewife: apparently she has it all – the big house, the husband, the children, even a servant –, but she is also lonely and bored. While in her old life as a model, she was universally at the centre of attention, she has been moved into the margins, where it is easy to forget about her. This 'problem with no name' expresses itself in her hands going numb, which leads to Betty crashing her car while the children sit in the back. Davidson indicates that 'this is an important

plot development, as it leads her to see a psychiatrist' (139). There, she ends up talking about the boring, mundane nature of her life. Jones plays these scenes by emphasising the sense of boredom that she herself experiences, indicating the emptiness of the psychoanalytical process in relation to her experience. But the crash and, more importantly, her numb hands are more than a plot development. White describes her disorder as 'hysteria', thereby also aligning her with the general pathologization of middle-class women in the nineteenth century. Women at that time were conceptualized by (male) doctors as purely emotional – as lacking the rational skills of men and hence descending into hysterical fits. That this is expressed through Betty's numb hands is no coincidence: it places the emotionality into women's bodies, and emphasizes that women's primary means of expression is precisely through their bodies. At the same time, it pathologizes Betty and her emotionality as her body bears the medical signs of her unstable/unhappy mental state.

For Betty, the bodily expression of her emotions continues when she gains weight as the result of a cancerous growth in season five. Again, Betty seems trapped in her domestic setting, even if this is with a different husband, and she appears similarly unhappy and resentful, though much of her anger still seems directed at Don. Her means of regaining control is again through the body: she joins a Weight Watchers class and monitors her bodily functions obsessively. However, Betty is not the only one whose body becomes (and remains) the site of expression of her feelings: Peggy's pregnancy internalizes her sexual feelings for Pete Campbell; and even when she has learnt to suppress her feelings, her body nevertheless is the prime site that still expresses these emotions. Thus, in 'The Other Woman' (5.11), when Peggy tells Don that she will be leaving the company to join a rival firm, he bends down to kiss her hand, while her own hand has to wipe away a tear that she is shedding. This 'bodily registering' of emotion, to paraphrase Nunn and Biressi, is typical of the representation of women in *Mad Men* and highlights how the series imagines women and their bodies: they remain emotional and their emotions are presented as complex psychological states. At the same time, their bodies become the site on which these psychological states manifest. Thus, although offering a feminist critique, *Mad Men* is unable to escape the traditional gendered perception of women as emotional and as bodies. By remaining within these bounds, the series also returns to a dichotomy of women, emotion and body on the one side, and men, thoughts and mind on the other, a dichotomy that seems to exclude any potential for cognitive affect or affective cognition (Roberts). More importantly, bodies in *Mad Men* are

solely conceptualized as a site of expression, rather than as the surface and space from which we can experience life and the world. This is in sharp contrast to *SouthLand*.

***SouthLand*: women and affective cognition**

SouthLand was originally developed for NBC, the network with a long tradition of quality TV drama (Lotz, 'Must See TV'; Feuer et al., *MTM 'Quality Television'*). As a main network, however, its place next to quality cable channels such as HBO or AMC is less assured, particularly since the latter have branded themselves in such a way that places their quality in their difference from network television, altering the language used to evaluate television drama. As a result, the drama's quality brand is less obvious than *Mad Men*. Nevertheless, the series' stylistic closeness to other quality crime drama, including *Hill Street Blues* (NBC, 1981–87), *Homicide: Life on the Street* (NBC, 1993–99), *NYPD Blue* (ABC, 1993–2005) and, more recently, *The Wire* and *The Shield* (FX, 2002–08), as well as its particular approach to the investigation of crime suggest a generic closeness to the quality genre.

Series creator and showrunner Ann Biderman's own background contributes to the placing of the series in the quality genre. Biderman was a writer on *NYPD Blue* before turning to Hollywood, where she scripted some of the 1990s most renowned crime films, including *Copycat* (1995), *Primal Fear* (1996) and *Smilla's Feeling for Snow* (1996). Such a background brings with it both the pedigree of a quality series as well as the (still relatively) higher cultural status of cinema. Interestingly, Biderman stayed on for only two seasons as showrunner, before turning her attentions to *Ray Donovan* (Showtime, 2013–). However, she has recently stepped down as showrunner for this drama, apparently due to the series' consistent budgetary problems (Andreeva). Biderman's early departure from the two shows that she created hints at potential problems that women still face in the industry which, according to both Biderman and Michelle Ashford (creator of *Masters of Sex* [Showtime, 2013–]), remains deeply discriminatory towards women (Birnbaum). However, as a result of her departure, I want to exclusively focus on the first two seasons of the series. These were not just overseen by Biderman, but also largely written by her, as well as a number of other female writers.

In terms of gender representation, *SouthLand* seems less balanced than *Mad Men*: of its eight regular cast, only two are women; however, one is black and one white (though they are both younger than 45).

Again, both adhere to the traditional representation of slenderness, but it is noticeable that the make-up for Officer Chickie Brown emphasizes, rather than underplays, her age and tiredness. Thus, although at first sight the programme conforms to traditional representations, *SouthLAnd* also undermines them. In terms of recurring cast (which is significantly smaller in *SouthLAnd* than in *Mad Men*), 42.6 per cent are women. In line with the main cast, they are significantly more ethnically diverse with nearly half of them being from black or Latin American backgrounds. We also see a wider representation of ages: 34.8 per cent of the cast are older than 45. Moreover, we see them in a range of roles: women are mothers, carers and *at the same time* police officers and other workers, while in *Mad Men* they tend to be either one or the other. Of course, in part such a representation is down to the specific genres and time periods in which the two dramas are set, highlighting some of the fallacies of content analyses as a whole (Gunter 55–92).

The key difference between the two dramas, however, is the portrayal of gender in relation to emotion. In order to analyse this, the larger textual construction needs to be considered. Crime drama has traditionally been considered gendered male, with a focus on masculine knowledge and perspectives (Munt). However, from the 1980s onwards, this has gradually been challenged, particularly by dramas such as *Cagney & Lacey*, *Prime Suspect* (Granada, 1991–2006) and *Silent Witness* (BBC, 1996–). Thus, Deborah Jermyn highlights how particularly the latter and other forensic-science focused series ‘pivot on female investigators and forensic detail – and indeed the exchange between the two’ (49). This is given further support by Hallam, who argues that the investigative, detailed gaze belongs to the realm of feminine investigation, while masculine detection is based on intuition. This focus on intuition and instinct was also recognized by Chandler (qtd in Sparks 354) who argued that masculine instinct is central to the construction of heroism in crime drama and, through it, also of masculinity. In contrast, crime drama focused on female investigators undermining ideas of heroism by constantly framing the female investigator with the body of victims, and thereby, as Thornham proposes, also subverting the traditional division of a masculine disembodied gaze and a feminine embodied object. As Thornham argues in relation to *Prime Suspect* and *Silent Witness*, these women ‘must at the same time speak from the position of *the body*’ (79, italics in original) in order to offer insights. *SouthLAnd* complicates this further. Rather than reminding us constantly of the body of the investigator in relation to her object, it suggests that the gaze itself is always embodied. It proposes this, by

constantly returning us to the concept of a cop's instinct throughout its first two seasons.

The theme of the detective's or police officer's instinct is made explicit in a scene in the first episode ('Unknown Trouble', 1.1) when Officer John Cooper, after having observed his new rookie partner, Ben Sherman, kill a man, gives him a talking to that emphasizes that he believes Ben is a real police officer. The speech focuses on what it means to be a police officer. Cooper describes it as a 'front row seat to the greatest show on earth' and concludes: 'You're a cop because you don't know how not to be one. If you feel that way, you are a cop. If you don't, you're not.' Thus, being a cop is not connected to years of training – training that Sherman had just gone through and followed to the letter. Rather, in Cooper's eyes, training is clearly not as important as an officer's innate intuition and instinct. Furthermore, in season two, Cooper tells Brown that he believes it will be an off-duty cop, following their instinct, who will arrest the notorious serial rapist they are chasing. Thus, Cooper, as the traditional, male cop, is constantly articulating the recurring stereotype of a cop's instinct to other officers who appear as less typical police officers.

While this suggests an adherence to concepts of male-dominated instinct, it is the women who are shown to be the ones who act on them, rather than the men. The reasons for that lie in the preoccupation of the male cops with other things, including sex, drugs and alcohol. Thus, Cooper, who is at first presented as a key figurehead and role model, soon turns out to be addicted to pain medication, while Brown's partner, Dewey Dudek, is shot as a result of alcohol-induced bravado. In contrast, the women appear to be constantly aware of what is going on around them. This is perhaps most apparent when, in a car full of people, including two other police officers, Brown is the one who calls out to stop the car as she has noticed a baby crawling on the street. Similarly, Lydia Adams is constantly praised for her detective work because she follows her instinct.

Just how these instincts manifest is already made explicit in the first episode. Here, Adams investigates the case of a missing child. Adams is shown to be compassionate, expressing her feelings in her tone of voice and face. She instantly steps into the breach when her partner struggles to hold back the mother who arrives at the scene, accusing her estranged partner of neglect. However, Adams is also competent – her words calm the mother down and, although compassionate, she also clearly displays her authority. Her competence is illustrated further when she speaks to a group of onlookers who stand on the other side of the road. Amongst

them, she recognizes potential suspects, but uses the moment to suggest she is looking for witness statements and asks them all to write down their addresses. This leads to the search of the house of one of the onlookers who turns out to be in possession of child pornography. As they leave the house, Adams is still answering questions and giving orders while everyone rushes off; shortly afterward, Adams briefly stops short because she has noticed a trail of ants. Her body reacts instantaneously, and she stops to look more closely. She reacts with similar embodied immediacy to a trail of ants in her own house. This scene is shot in a few simple close-ups. The first one is from below the kitchen counter, with the ants in the foreground while Adams stands in the background, drinking a bottle of water. As the focal point is on the ants, her image is blurred. The ants remain in focus, even when we see her body react to them: although it is clear this is meaningful, she does not yet seem to understand on a conscious level in what way. However, her body already seems to know. We are given another close-up of the ants, then the same close-up of Adams as she finally understands. At this point, the focus is pulled onto her face to indicate the shift from a purely embodied to a conscious level: her bodily reactions and instinct become affective knowledge. Thus, we see Adams experience embodied knowledge *before* her mind knows (Sobchack): in her contact with the world, her body is central to directing her gaze, which is, similar to other female detectives (Hallam), detailed and thorough, and in which lie the roots of her affective knowledge.

Conclusions

Unlike male instinct, female instinct in *SouthLAnd* is deeply embodied and, as an affective experience, is also closely connected to both feeling and knowledge. Thus, *SouthLAnd* conceptualizes emotion not only as psychological emotion – though this exists too – but primarily as an affective experience of the world which, if experienced fully aware, can lead to deep insight. Women, then, are emotional – but this emotion is part of their natural contact with the world. Such a depiction is close to how contemporary phenomenology describes emotion and affect – as a gradation that recognizes the role of affect and emotion to knowledge. This contrasts sharply with *Mad Men*, where women's emotions are primarily conceptualized as psychological and where these feelings are expressed on the women's bodies which can lead to the women's pathologization. As a result, women can only become competent if they suppress, or at least control, their emotions. Thus, emotions are placed

PROOF

Elke Weissmann 101

in opposition to rational thoughts. *Mad Men*, then, returns to traditional dichotomies and, by doing so, also relatively traditional ideas of gender in their depiction of emotion.

What this analysis makes visible, then, is that these two dramas present two very different understandings of women and their emotionality. In *Mad Men* emotions can be valuable when they make evident what is morally right or wrong, or when they are deliberately evoked for a particular purpose, such as career progression; however, emotions are largely superfluous and hinder those who give them too free expression. Thus, women must choose to suppress them in order to become strong. In *SouthLand*, the suppression of emotions through alcohol, drugs or sex has the opposite effect. This is largely because emotions are not perceived as complex psychological states, but are instead regarded as everyday experiences that determine the nature of our contact with the world. This difference can be neatly summarized as contrasting a Freudian understanding of emotion with a phenomenological understanding of emotion. The first suggests that emotionality requires therapy and hence 'fixing', while the latter accepts emotions as part of our meaning making about the world.

Such differences in conceptualization are paradigmatic for other dramas written by either sex. As a result, the call for more women in powerful and creative roles still needs to be heeded. We need a greater diversity of representation, particularly when it seems that the only way that women can appear strong in male-created and dominated drama is given by the 'choice' to be less like other women, and hence to devalue their own sex.