Introduction to *The Modeling Life: Fashioning Our Attention from Gibson Girls to Glamazons*

Elizabeth Wissinger

The air outside the tents at Lincoln Center during New York City's Fashion Week crackles with energy. The paparazzi, fashion students, film crews, fashion reporters, and a curious tourist or two press in close, craning their necks to see the impeccably dressed fashion movers and shakers saunter up the steps, pause for a photo op, and disappear into the Shangri-La inside, the sanctified zone where editors, photographers, buyers, celebrities and models make this thing that is known as "fashion." Round the back, in the staging area to the tents, fashionistas and their acolytes in sky-high heels totter by. Models, still in their wild hair and makeup from the shows that just finished, tumble out and pose obligingly amidst calls of "Over here!" and, "just one more!" as flashing cameras try to capture them before they slip into waiting black cars. The excitement is palpable. I am on a research mission, milling around in the crowds at New York's Fashion week, drinking up the energy.

What is this energy about? It is the energy that fashion generates, and has become a multi-billion dollar industry, reportedly estimated to be valued at close to $1,781.7 billion within the last year.[1] Energy is what fashion channels and markets, and fashion models are its most reliable purveyors. When a fashion model strides to the end of the catwalk, strikes a pose and gives attitude to the cameras, if she hits her mark, she adds countless value to her own image, the designer's image, and ultimately to the image of fashion in general. Unpacking what it is that models do to rev up this energy, and why it is so valuable, is at the heart of this book.

Energy is infectious. It is contagious. It sweeps through crowds, and ebbs and flows in individuals. The ripple of excitement infecting the room was palpable when the first model appeared on the catwalk of the DKNY show in the West Village. She arrived in a blinding flash of cameras, her spindly legs spiking the runway in definitive strokes, keeping time to the deep thrum of a blaring soundtrack. As she rounded the corner, the electricity sparking off of her was almost visible. Krista, a model who'd stomped many a runway in her day, described what it's like:

> There are 30-40 cameras going off; there's a tension in the room. They are all looking at you, and it has an impact, you have an interaction. With the music and the moods blending, there's a kind of fervor that creates a certain subtle tempest of energy, and the models feed off of that. They get into it.

Creating this fervor is the name of the game in fashion, and part of a model's job is to get the energy vibrating at just the right pitch. If she gets it right, she may become the darling of the runways, or catapult to the status of "it" girl, every model's dream.

Yet, that brass ring is incredibly elusive. As everyone in the industry knows, it's anyone's guess which "look" will become the next one that's "hot." Dawn, a model who'd come to New York to find her fortune, told me she was frustrated by this dream's capricious nature:

> You never know what's good, I mean you can ride the wave, or it could be that it's already been done, so it's a has been, it's over, you never know, but part of that, I mean, that's the whole confusion. I know that you need the one person, the right person, the right people to say 'yes' to your look, and you're in. That's really all it is.

Attitudes can change overnight in the fashion world. Fashion is what I would call an "affective industry" that traffics in the moods, feelings, and predispositions that can sweep everyone into

their wake, and then, just as suddenly, be gone. As such, it is as mercurial and unpredictable as the weather. Sitting at her highly polished desk, Julie, a model booker at one of the largest agencies in New York intoned in her Jamaican lilt, "You never know which way the breeze will be blowin' each day."

Of course there are regularities, otherwise no one could do business, but in the face of ever more volatile markets, the fashion cognoscenti struggle to navigate the social conditions that produce the elusive quality that makes a good photograph great, cause a dress to sell out in one day, or make a model agent's phone ring off the hook for one particular face on her roster. The forces behind the waves of interest and desire for this or that product bubble up from a form of social energy that belongs to no one and everyone at once. It is a collective phenomenon that exists only in transit, registered as a reaction that is usually hard to articulate.

As sociologist Herbert Blumer discovered in his landmark study of fashion, the collective nature of "incipient taste" is hard to explain, leaving fashion buyers to give the uninformative answer that they chose one nearly identical dress over another because it is "stunning." Blumer himself claims that the relation between, on the one hand, the forces of modernity to which fashion experts try to respond, and, on the other hand, the "incipient and inarticulate tastes of the fashion consuming public" is a relationship that is "obscure."[2] While he did not undertake analysis of it in his paper, Blumer claimed this relationship constituted one of the "most significant mechanisms in the shaping of our modern world."[3]

What Blumer intuited, but did not want to tackle, was the impact of "affective" energy, energy that can set actions in motion before we decide to perform them, a kind of energy that is particularly susceptible to manipulation by the media.[4] Notably, he made this observation in 1969, around the same time television was becoming a full-blown social force reshaping modern

life as we knew it. Our attraction to and engagement with television, and ultimately to the proliferation of screens that now make up the fabric of most American lives, paved the way toward what social theorist Nigel Thrift has referred to as a "series of highways of imitation-suggestion" through which affective energies flow. [5]

Affect resides in the dynamism at the heart of all of us, in the felt sense of vitality, the feeling of being alive.[6] When one is tuned into affective flow, one goes with gut reaction, the viscerally felt impulses that guide actions whose causes, upon reflection, we are hard pressed to explain. Not exactly instinct, prior to emotion, affective energy is part of the atmosphere in the room, the mood or attitude in a crowd, or the intake of breath at the sight of a beautiful or striking image that impacts the individual and changes their inner state. Sometimes affective energy moves so quickly, we aren't sure what has happened to us, we just know something has changed. Sweaty palms make us realize we are nervous, a pulsing temple betrays our anger. As Brian Massumi, a communications scholar who popularized of the notion that affective energy is most effectively whipped up and dampened by the media, has quipped, "the skin is faster than the word."[7] Current media systems are reaching unforeseen levels of complexity. Fashion models have been key players in the drama that has entangled us with the emotive/affective technology of the screen, an entanglement that makes the modulation of affective flows not only possible, but profitable. Studying fashion models raises some interesting questions as to how we can account for the ways in which emotion and personal feeling have become increasingly prominent in contemporary life, where the notion of privacy is growing quainter by the day, and people regularly engage in the practice of sending something called "emo-tweets."[1]

---

[1] I use the phrase as per this blog, http://horiwood.com/2009/08/01/katy-perry-tells-miley-cyrus-no-more-emo-tweets/ accessed 2/25/11.

Tracing the arc of modeling's history and practices against the backdrop of evolving

screen technologies, from cinema, to television, to the internet, in tandem with developments

within various productive regimes, from the heavy engines of industry to the lightning fast globe

spanning exchanges that govern production today, this book seeks to uncover changes in the

history of control as it has played out in relations between technology and the body. The fashion

model's body is shaped in the nexus between productive and visual technologies. As such, it is

an excellent site to read the changing locus of control within the constant technological

innovations that characterize capitalist production. From Taylorism, to the Company Man, to

Total Quality Management, models have been managed much like workers in other sectors of the

economy. What's interesting about models, however, is that it is their job to create the idealized

bodies that help attract us to ways of being in the world that facilitate productivity. While most

discussions of models and control focus on men's dominance and how the model's body is cut to

the measure of male desire, oppressing women by making a ludicrously unrealistic body type the

feminine ideal, this book argues for taking another look at the problem. This alternate approach

not only seeks to complicate the role of patriarchy in this process, it also takes aim at anti-

consumerist critiques that claim models and advertising push us to consume more than we need,

engaging in a wasteful lifestyle. It is true that the needs of consumerism and patriarchal power

shape models' bodies, as conventional understandings would have it. This book argues, however,

that current levels of development in productive and imaging technologies also shape bodily

ideals. That is to day, our means of representing ourselves to ourselves shape what gets

represented, and our means of survival shape who we think we are. Seen from this angle, the

model's body not only reinforces sexual ideologies while prompting us to buy things, it idealizes

a way of being in the world that engages us with images and technology in rhythms that are productive for capital.

Why Models?

Why study models? Why not look at the creative directors, artists, photographers, and advertising executives whose job it is to mastermind those images that pull us into engaging with media on a daily basis? If, as theorist of the body Barry Glassner once asserted, the model's job is merely to "take paint well," and therefore is about "as important as a canvas is in understanding a painting," why talk to the canvas when you can interview the artist?[8] The kind of issues regarding bodies, identities, and images models stir up speaks to key developments in feminist thought since the 1990s. As some feminists have pointed out, objects and bodies are not so passive as we have assumed, their materiality has an agency of its own, and as such must be taken into account when trying to understand any creative or productive process.[9]

Changing perspectives on the role of women's work, and material agency, have inspired a growing scholarly interest in modeling. These "model" studies have made a valuable contribution to understanding the role of masculinity and the aesthetic economy of modeling;[10] modeling and aesthetic labor;[11] the history of the fashion show;[12] the modeling industry in Australia;[13] modeling and emotional labor;[14] race in modeling;[15] modeling as entrepreneurial labor;[16] and narratives of the model 'life.'[17] None of these studies, however, has focused on how the fashion model's ability to transmit affective energy plays into corporate practices of branding and market research, and so is highly significant to understanding the role of emotion in contemporary life.

Periodizing productive and imaging regimes, while examining the ideal body within each one, this volume seeks to uncover subtle dynamics of power exercised via the images models seek to create and embody. The move from the 1920s idealization of the body as machine in the industrial age, to the fluidly dynamic and changeable body of the 1960s and beyond, indicates how changing representations of the body reflect shifting configurations of power and control. Viewing modeling in this way demands looking not only at the representations models create, but the productive systems that created these images. With each new age of productive technology, a new ideal worker was born. The "mechanical regularity demanded of the assembly line worker," for instance, produced a conformity and stability that were once revered.[18] Anthropologist Emily Martin finds that today, however, "emotional lability," that is, the rapid movement on the "scale of feelings,"[19] to produce the "vital energies" necessary for entrepreneurialism, is increasingly prized as a resource for "stimulating markets."[20] In this newest incarnation, the "manic" worker, one governed by the "unrestrained heat," and "vital energies" of extreme entrepreneurialism, must be ready to "shapeshift," and push "the limits of everything" in unforeseen and unprecedented ways.[21] I argue these "vital energies," seen here in the form of an increasingly valued mania, correspond to the growing practice of tapping into affective flows for use as raw material to stimulate markets.

A *productive* or *imaging* regime, like any political regime, involves power and control over how, when, and why certain events take place. Each productive regime dictates how commodities are produced, disseminated and received. Similarly, each image regime brings with it "laws of transmission" that dictate how images are produced, disseminated, and received.[22] Different modes of production or imaging involve a different timing, different pressures, and bring different results. The transformation from manufacturing in industrially based production

to the de-industrialized, information and service based forms of production more dominant today have changed conceptions of what a product is; manufacturing widgets via physical labor, for instance, gave way to manufacturing an image or a smile via symbolic or emotional labor.[23] Similarly, the transitions from paint, to photographic emulsion, to electrons sweeping a screen changed commonly accepted ways of seeing images, styles or norms of image presentation.[24] In his classic book *Ways of Seeing*, John Berger points out that accepted "ways of seeing" changed when imaging technology changed: "the invention of the camera changed the way men saw. The visible came to mean something different to them." He contended that this change was

> immediately reflected in painting. For the Impressionists the visible no longer presented itself to man in order to be seen. On the contrary, the visible, in continual flux, became fugitive. [25]

Within this fugitive visibility, photography's ability to automatically form an image, to 'see' and register an image with a nonhuman eye profoundly affected how painters 'saw,' how paintings were used and understood, irrevocably changing their overall role in social life.

There are no clear demarcations between regimes, however; even though one form of imaging eventually comes to dominate all others, each bleeds into the next, in a process scholar of the media Marshall Mcluhan deemed "remediation" to describe how each new form of media contains elements of the old, such as the shutter click sound made by most digital cameras.[26] After the invention of photography, for instance, painting and illustration did not disappear, but they changed in form and style; after the outbreak of television, cinema redefined itself; and television is currently morphing in response to the computer. [27] Each new imaging surface disrupted old assumptions, breaking old social ties and forging new, requiring new mappings of how images were produced, received and understood. Similarly, different productive regimes,

from craft based to industrial production, to the de-industrialized information age now characterizing most Western, developed economies, changed notions of how the body in society was seen and represented.

From Corsets to Diet Pills: The shift from discipline to control within changing imaging regimes

Organizing the periods of modeling's history in terms of both productive and imaging regimes builds on post structuralist feminist Patricia Clough's notion that the dominant mode of imaging and the dominant forms of power are connected within a specific "regime of representation" that enforces particular social and cultural practices.[28] She discusses how, in the late nineteenth century, during the birth of industrial capitalism, the body was represented as a closed system, one that could be organized so as to be trained to accumulate resources and expend them at work.[29] This notion of the body, conceived as a self-contained organism, was trained to become the "docile body" Michel Foucault has described, governed by disciplinary regimes such as the school, the factory, or the family, which fit bodies into normatively raced and gendered categories.[30]

This notion of the trainable body, one that can be disciplined and shaped to conform to a specific image, governed the early history of modeling, during what I shall refer to as the regime of the *gaze*.[31] In the regime of the gaze, photography and cinema dominated imaging forms, and these disciplinary techniques held full sway. In the 1860s, models literally molded by corsets, worked under strict supervision in fashion houses. By the 1920s, the corsets were gone, but the cinematic age inaugurated a new focus on the standardization and control of both images, and the models' bodies used to create those images. Consequently, practices in modeling moved toward making the body fit industrial-age notions of mechanical power, using scientific management to

achieve the ideal of the body as machine. In the early 1900s, as cinema industrialized images for

mass consumption, the serialized synchronicity of models' movements on the first catwalks

echoed the synchronous movement of human bodies producing Model T's on the assembly line.

In 1923, the first modeling agency was incorporated in the United States and model managers

took up the practice of engineering models' bodies and images in keeping with newly visible

cinematic techniques of editing and suturing. They used this technique to control and shape

models' bodies and their image, closely vetting press coverage of their models, measuring and

limiting models' body shape, size, and behavior, thereby reducing the wide variety of previously

acceptable behaviors and body types, to create a predictable, identical, model 'look.'

This ideal of the standardized model image, produced through discipline and training,

developed and became more refined during the heyday of the cinematic regime of the gaze,

between the 1920s and 1950s. In this era, the delirium of the fashion world did not spin at such a

frenetic pace. Images created by models such as the ever-so-haughty Dorian Leigh, her hips

canted at just the right angle, exuded unattainable elegance from the purse of a lip, or the curve

of one slightly raised, highly manicured brow. The mid-century American consumer got *Life* or

Vogue magazine once a month, or at most weekly. Fashion news took months to arrive from

Paris, the center of the fashion world at the time. There was no 24/7 news coverage allowing

access to fashion weeks from around the globe. In fact "fashion week" was a phenomenon that

only happened in the big three of the fashion nexus, Paris, London, and New York. It wasn't

until 1953 that jet travel made the first "International Fashion Issue of Vogue" magazine

possible. A fashion editor giddily exclaimed,

> We couldn't have done such an issue before. Fashion only got its internationalization papers a short time ago, and for the first time in one issue we can report on couture collections in five countries.[32]

The slow pace of fashion reporting matched that of advertising, in which it was assumed a consumer would take the time to actually read the text of an advertisement, and brand loyalty could be built up over the course of a lifetime.

After the 1960s and 1970s, however, modeling work changed its course radically. The 1950s idea of the trainable body, created through a long process of carefully managing models' looks, behaviors, and careers, while not abandoned, was eventually accompanied by a different notion of control. In this era, blending the body with technology took on a new allure. The 1960s futuristic shapes of Paco Rabanne's robot like models were precursors to the 1980s supermodels' half-human, half-machine cyborg look. Both glamorized robotization, replacing the human with the artificial as the way of the future, as more and more of us stayed home from the Cineplex to tune into the cybernetic feedback loops of our television sets.[33] This change emerged from several sources, not the least of which was industrial capitalism's trend toward a globalized, flexible, finance driven mode, and television's new domination of all forms of imaging.

Under the laws of transmission in this regime, instantaneous impact came to be more highly valued than telling a story. Modeling work moved away from the scripted performance in which models were molded into a specific image through specific costuming, rules of etiquette and behavior, and careful training. Gone were the disciplinary practices of wearing white gloves, and a proper hat, when traveling to go-sees and shoots. The 'live' quality of television imaging inspired a different kind of image production. Television's instantaneous and automatic quality, and its sense of simultaneous recording and presentation demanded a new openness and

vulnerability on the model's part which left little room for artifice or the process of becoming an image that had been common in modeling up until this point. By the 1960s, the tightly controlled, carefully scripted performance typical of modeling gave way to a far more intense exchange, which one model likened to "having your soul sucked out through your eye sockets.'"[34]

Television's "soul sucking" tendencies were all about immediacy, and this type of imaging occasioned a new metaphor for the body. Born in the age of cybernetics, television's systematization of human reactions operating via feedback loops of ratings and advertising opened up the body to technology. New forms of electronic and computational products that were coming to characterize post-industrial production facilitated a shift in thinking of the body as an open system rather than a machine, as this feedback technology made the body's chaos, malleability, and unpredictability into valuable forces. Television blurred the space between image and world, attracting our glance rather than our gaze, hooking into what geographer and social theorist Nigel Thrift has called our "ante-conscious" attention, which is prior to consciousness.[35] With this ante-conscious, absent minded glance, rather than the focused gaze, Thrift argues, television became one of the "affective technologies through which masses of people become primed to act," organized into specific time zones and proclivities by the media with which they interacted.[36] Borrowing from media scholar John Ellis's contrast of the cinematic gaze with the "televisual glance," I will refer to the television era of imaging as the regime of the *glance*.

Television's seismic shifts deeply affected image-making techniques, extending its influence beyond the small screen to print and photographic media. In the studio, the model was called on to shed the theatrical and studied poses that had been the badge of her profession between the 1920s and 1950s, and open her self and body to the camera in unprecedented ways.

The highly crafted, controlled aesthetic of the pre-television era shifted toward an immediate, changeable and open ideal, in which images that looked good close up, or in motion, became the norm, a state of affairs characteristic of the imaging regime that succeeded that of the glance, brought on by the dawn of the digital age.

In the regime of the ***blink***, the rise of the internet and other digital computer technologies have been transforming every aspect of modern life, from the sheer volume of images coming at us every day, to the miniaturization that is transforming everything from the way we travel and communicate, to the way we make toast in the morning. Dubbing this "pictorial order" the regime of the blink was inspired by Malcolm Gladwell's exploration of the subject in his book of the same title.[37] In *Blink* he argues that decisions are often made during the split second before we are conscious of what we are doing, that we figure out the game before we realize we have "figured the game out" making necessary adjustments long before we are consciously aware of what adjustments we are supposed to be making.[38] While Gladwell was not interested in interrogating the new technologies that made these discoveries possible, nor did he feel the need to rehearse the arguments of Gilles Deleuze, Baruch Spinoza, and Henri Bergson, philosophers whose ideas have helped social theorists understand these developments, he touches on ideas that stir up questions on both fronts. Gladwell is interested in the "missing half second" that communications scholar Brian Massumi discusses with regard to the gap between the "beginning of a bodily event and its completion in an outwardly directed, active expression," a gap which we do not feel or notice, detectable only through reactions below consciousness, such as heartbeat and breathing, that make themselves known after the fact of speeding up or slowing down.[39] What makes it into consciousness is subtracted from a much deeper bodily reaction, the bodily

reaction taking place in the "half second delay" in the time of Gladwell's blink, or, as I argue, in the domain of affect.

If, with psychologist Teresa Brennan, we take the body as a "receiver and interpreter of feelings, affects, attentive energy," then what goes on in that half second delay is actually a processing of responses to the transmission of affect between bodies.[40] Since images, Brennan argues, are a "concrete mechanism" of this transmission, then flooding the bodily receivers through affective transmission could easily jam up the networks, causing action without thinking, response without reflection, a reaction to a mood or feeling, rather than reasoned judgment, in making everyday choices.[41] In the influx of images that typify our modern world, our jumpiness has become extreme.

While the televisual glance contains some intention, at least in terms of directing the attention in a particular way, the digitized blink is caught off guard, before conscious realization of what is happening. The regime of the blink is characterized both by speed and a veritable explosion in the availability of information, moving faster than the human ability to process it. Part of this speed comes from the fact that digitization transforms everything into a common language, creating an "enormous gain in speed and flexibility over earlier forms of electronic communication," as media scholar Vincent Mosio had pointed out.[42] The unifying language of ones and zeroes brings everything that can be translated into it onto the same plane, smoothing out barriers that formerly slowed information's trajectory. This speed up compressed meaning into "units of information" where "the news story is reduced to the sound byte."[43] The move from the analog to the digital is a break in which, as social theorist Scott Lash observes, life begins to move "too fast for reflection and too fast for linearity…in speed up, culture becomes increasingly ephemeral."[44] This speed up of culture engenders a new interest in engineering the

half-second delay, characterizing a moment when affectivity has become a target of corporate interest. As Maurya Wickstrom has argued, the "somatic" reach of the corporation now penetrates into the fiber of our beings, as we learn to perform, through mimesis and identification, the story and feelings of a brand.[45] She takes "mimesis" in the sense used by philosopher Walter Benjamin, as a "compulsion" to "become and behave like something else," such as a brand identity, as in "Are you Mac or PC?"[46] As she puts it, "the corporations have turned us into affective, embodied, theatrical laborers on their own behalf," so much so that it is "hard to remember, or imagine, alternative ways of being." [47]

All this is to say that we are not wholly the authors of our actions, and in the regime of the blink, our semi-conscious intentionality becomes the target of conscious manipulation by marketers, politicians, and the like.[48] Because the internet can track reactions to events in real time, as well as trace geographical preferences in movie rentals, youtube videos, and hits on political websites, it is now easier to see the waves of affect that ripple through populations, leaving moods, feelings, and shifts in things as nebulous as, say, the consumer confidence index in their wake. Not only have they made these flows easier to see, these technologies have quickened the pace of change. In the fully mediatized society, the pathways of what Thrift refers to as "imitation/suggestion" proliferate, as more data and images provide more distractions, links to click, or ideas to find out about, creating a "poverty of attention" in which the suggestible crowd's attention shifts as quickly, and utterly, as the sylvan flashes of a school of fish.[49]

In this regime, creating an image that cuts through the noise has become a high stakes game, especially when capitalist modernity keeps generating what historian of perception Jonathan Crary has called "a constant re-creation of the means of perception" resulting in the emergence of a "social, urban, psychic, and industrial field increasingly saturated with sensory

15

input."[50] We are now inundated not only with fashion images, but images of all kinds, imploring us for our attention. Lucas Conley, author of a humorous treatment of what he diagnoses as 'OBD', or "obsessive branding disorder" observed, "from advertisements on billboards to newspaper ads, television commercials, online banners, and spam, the average American encounters between three thousand and five thousand ad messages each day, a number that has nearly tripled in the last generation."[51] This uptick in the onslaught of branded images has ridden a rising torrent of money. Conley reported that as recently as five years ago, "U.S. advertisers spent nearly $300 billion – about $10,000 a second – trying to reach us… Advertisers have spent more in the last decade than they did in the four previous decades *combined*."[52]

This is not chump change. Capturing our attention amidst these changes has become a valuable enterprise. The new velocity and volume of images smattering our everyday lives in recent decades can be summed up as what geographer and social theorist Nigel Thrift calls the "mediatization" of everyday life:

> We now live in societies which are enveloped in and saturated by the media: most importantly, it is difficult to escape the influence of the *screen* which now stares at us from so many mundane locations – from almost every room in the house to doctors' waiting rooms, from airport lounges to shops and shopping malls, from bars to many workplaces… from the insides of elevators to whole buildings.[53]

This tendency for imaging run wild is due in part to the accelerated development of technologies that alter what Thrift, no doubt playing on Marxist Raymond Williams' idea of the "structure of feeling," calls the "structures of attention." These structures are shaped by the way different technologies, which alter our perception of the world and affect the speed of perception, create different modes of visibility, ranging from the Google Earth level of satellite images down to the

minutiae of mega-magnification; from the magnificent sweep of images across the wide screen of the Cineplex, to the staccato attack of the 15 second commercial spot.

This exponential uptick in the availability of information and images created a corresponding distraction of attention, due to the "mental shelf space" constraints described by economists Robert Frank and Philip Cook.[54] With information moving so fast, we have begun to suffer from what New York magazine journalist Sam Anderson quipped is a "poverty of attention." Quoting prescient statements by1970s economist Herbert A. Simon, he explains:

> What information consumes is rather obvious: It consumes the attention of its recipients. Hence a wealth of information creates a poverty of attention, and a need to allocate that attention efficiently among the overabundance of information sources that might consume it.

Anderson elaborated, "As beneficiaries of the greatest information boom in the history of the world, we are suffering, by Simon's logic, a correspondingly serious poverty of attention."[55]

This "poverty of attention" results from the regime of the blink in part because digitization has allowed information and data to move faster than ever. Going digital generated new "techniques of attention" as the media disseminated themselves "more widely and finely through the social field, assisted by miniaturization and digitization" resulting in what communications scholar Brian Massumi has called a "networked jumpiness" that facilitated various forms of "affective attunement."[56] In the full flowering of the digital regime from the late 1990s onward, the televisual glance gave way to the new regime of the blink. In our "networked jumpiness," we flit from one image to the next with little time for conscious reflection, and at times, without registering what we actually see. Paradoxically, this new regime also fostered an

interactive engagement with images, which pulled us into a far closer "attunement" with imaging processes than ever before.

The markets in sensory saturation inspired marketing guru Thomas H. Davenport, during the information technology boom of the 1990s, to observe, "Telecommunication bandwidth is not a problem; human bandwidth is."[57] Human beings' capacity for attention is limited while the resources being thrown at capturing it seem limitless. Since we can only absorb a small fraction of the current offerings on the hundreds of information channels available to us on the many screens that populate our lives, it makes sense to think of attention as a scarce resource, in which image purveyors compete for finite quantities of attention. In the speed up of the world of images moving faster than conscious perception, channeling or directing what psychologist Teresa Brennan termed the "life drive" of attention is becoming ever more valuable.[58] The affective propensities of media play a crucial role in channeling attention.[59] In this world of more media more of the time, the methods for this channeling and control have grown increasingly subtle and refined. Don't blink, or you'll miss it.

Transmitting affective energy in the form of moods or feelings plays into corporate practices of branding and market research, for instance, a lesson the supermodels of the 1980s learned quite well. The ability to transmit affective energy has particularly shaped corporate practices in several ways since the age of the first supermodels. From the abstract measurement of feeling in the psycho-demographics of the consumer confidence index, or the digitized view of customers provided by "site clusterings by zip code," to what urban sociologist David Grazian has described as the "reality marketers" who sell their "fun" personalities and the presence of their culturally and economically attractive friends at nightlife events, tapping into the value of social effervescence is good business.[60]

Modeling has come to typify this form of production and makes it attractive to the general public. Living "the life" of modeling has become a job requirement for many models, in which models work to create the appearance of being 'in the know' about the latest styles, present themselves in line with the current bodily ideal, and make it look fun in the process. Glamorizing the fashionable lifestyle, models not only benefit the fashion and cosmetic industries for which they work, they also help interest audiences in engaging with fashion more generally, selling fashion as a way of life. The result? Modeling work draws publics toward being regulated by fashion, engaging with its rhythms, aligning with its needs. I argue that this kind of regulation feeds a kind of biopolitics of beauty, organizing individuals not only as consumers with desires, but also as populations ready for transformation, always already in need of that makeover.[61] The deindustrialized, information saturated production of the 1990s onward also turned toward the biomedical as raw material, converging, not coincidentally, with rise of the internet, the pharmaceutical industries, and traumatized looking bodies of the waif models of "heroin chic" fame. Engaged in this manner, publics interact with visual, surveillance, medical, and productive technologies in ways that create value during both leisure and work time. As we turn to the screen to find the information we need to achieve our new look, email, blog, or twitter about what we want to buy, to be, or to achieve, we intimately engage with screen technologies that organize bodies in time and space in a manner that is beneficial to capital.

In the regime of the **blink**, from model agents' split second judgments of a model's potential, based on intuitions they find difficult to articulate, to the demand for models to reshape themselves and their 'look' to fit the times, modeling work is shaped by an ideal of the changeable body, malleable in accordance with shifts in attitude and meaning, receptive to technological manipulation, and governed by unpredictable forces of affect and emotion. Digital

technologies that gave rise to the regime of the blink facilitated the desire to manipulate appearances, since digitization enables an infinite malleability of appearance down to the tiniest pixel. The latter half of this book explores how, in recent decades, models have sought to embody the ideal of a malleable body, always ready for transformation, and in the process, glamorize this practice for the general public. This ideal of a malleable body arguably emerged from what French philosopher Gilles Deleuze identified as the shift from disciplinary societies to societies of control, in which the exercise of power aimed less at molding individual identities over time and moved toward a continuous modulation in a field of constantly changing codes.[62] Building on Deleuze's ideas, Marxist scholar Nicholas Thoburn explains that in a disciplinary society, individuals are molded in "mass formations (family member, student, worker, national citizen)" and, I would add, consumer. In the shift to "modulation," control operates through arrangements of "forces, genetic codes, affects, capacities, and desires that are configured, known, and modeled as samples, data, propensities, populations, and markets."[63] Thoburn calls this configuration a "cybernetic model of social production," and in the latter half of this book, I unpack how modeling work provides a prime example of this kind of production in action.

The information revolution that enabled the "mediatization" of everyday life fostered the development of a new aspect of the economy, in which symbolic production or immaterial labor, where the product is not an object, but rather an experience, a meaning, or an association, gained currency.[64] In this organization of production and imaging, bubbling energy of social relations produce value in networks in which images, attention, experiences, and attitudes are exchanged. This effervescent value resides in producing something as fleeting as an experience, a mood, or a feeling. Stimulating and measuring the movement of these affective energies generated by experiences, moods, and feelings became profitable.[65] In the transitions from the regimes of the

gaze, to the glance, to the blink, fashion and modeling became prime vehicles for transmitting and manipulating affective energy, and were instrumental in building the pathways of affective production. As such, tracing how modeling work has changed and developed in the speedup of image bombardment, and rapid fire attempts to grab our attention, uncovers how these changes are rooted in the dynamics of power played out in relations between technology and the body, dynamics which this book seeks to elucidate and examine.

Nice Work if you Can Get It: Defining Affective Labor

Building on work by social theorists such as Michael Hardt[66], Antonio Negri,[67] Brian Massumi,[68] and Patricia Clough,[69] I situate the modeling industry within what these scholars conceptualize as the "affect economy" in which the circulation of bodily, inter-personal, emotional or affective energies is being calibrated for profit. As social philosophers Hardt and Negri have argued, affects express a "certain state of the body along with a certain mode of thinking," and affective labor "produces or manipulates affects such as a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement or passion."[70]

Hardt and Negri's definition of affective labor has come under attack as being insufficiently nuanced to capture the qualitative differences between the experience of being a computer programmer whose work creates games that produce excitement, versus that of being a care-giver, whose work produces feelings of ease. Cultural studies scholars Rosalind Gill and Andy Pratt find the "bluntness and generality of its definition"[71] problematic, while media Studies professor David Hesmondhalgh and cultural sociologist Sarah Baker reject it entirely, finding Arlie Hochschild's formulation of "emotional labor" to be "more compelling and useful."[72]

These critiques are not unfounded. As I have argued elsewhere,[73] Hardt and Negri's approach to affect tends to elide it with emotional labor, an important distinction. Their definition of affective labor as "the production and manipulation of affect and requires (virtual or actual) human contact, labor in the bodily mode,"[74] and also as "labor that produces or manipulates affects such as a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement, or passion,"[75] which they then periodically link to the idea of women's work, service work, or care work as a kind of stand-in for all affective labor, presents two problems. First, it represents an imprecise use of the term "affect;" the examples Hardt and Negri give, of "legal assistants, flight attendants, and fast food workers (service with a smile)"[76] invite a tendency to elide their definition of affective labor with emotional labor, especially in light of the well known study of flight attendants' emotional labor[77] and others including legal assistants[78] and the service industries.[79] Second, differentiating affect from emotion is an important theoretical tool for understanding the non-subjective aspects of affective labor. Focusing on the subjective qualities of affective labor minimizes an important dimension of the concept because it does not adequately explore affective labor's additional tendency to call on changes in energy that take place below the level of consciousness. This quality of affect allows it to be tapped by media technologies such as television and the internet that function to form an attachment to the viewing subject. This attachment to images is contstructed in part by the kind of affective labor represented by fashion modeling.

While it seems that much modeling work could easily be understood as emotional labor, the term describes only part of what it is models do in their work. Emotional labor, for example, deals with feeling management. Specifically, emotional labor is the "effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions,"[80] or in

Arlie Hochschild's well known formulation, the effort to "induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain an outward appearance that produces the proper state of mind in others."[81] Models do perform emotional labor, especially when they are asked to convey a particular emotion in the course of posing for the camera. This is particularly true of catalogue or commercial[82] models, for instance, who are most often asked to look "happy" or "content" while they show the clothes, in a mode one model referred to as "smiley."

Higher up the fashion hierarchy, however, models who produce images for haute couture and other luxury goods may receive less direction. If a body's affect is its ability to act, engage, or connect, then affective *labor* refers to activities that influence the possibility of engagement or connection between bodies, and/or the powering up of a body's potential. Affective labor in this regard, then, is not as targeted as emotional labor. It demands, rather, a sensitivity to "pre-personal" and "pre signifying" energies, that take the form of moods, atmospheres, or predispositions, which result in "bodily activation."[83] When a model at an editorial shoot for *Vogue* or *W* magazine, for instance, tries to get the 'feel' for the energy in the room, to pick up on the atmosphere and channel it to produce a facial expression that might be appropriate to the tone of the encounter, she or he is performing affective labor. This form of affective work involves the effort to tune in on the level of affect, insofar at it is "an experience of intensity…that changes the state of a body, that has concrete effects on individual and social practice."[84]

In my analysis, I use affect in this expanded register; I am careful to understand affect as a condition of emergence of emotion, and emotion as the capture, closure, and naming of affect. Modeling work is affective labor on several levels. First, there is the actual labor of producing an image. When a model is in front of the camera, the goal is to channel energy in a way that will

capture attention via the image produced. To create a truly affective image, the model must be sensitive to the surrounding 'vibe' or ambience that the client wants, as well as bringing something unexpected to the proceedings, an element of surprise that reportedly is most important in the highly affective and unconventional images that characterize high fashion modeling.

Second, the model must work to network. Modeling work is certainly social. This book focuses on how models work with this kind of social energy, helping to create the effervescent value that bubbles up between a model and a photographer during an especially good photo shoot, playing on the social energy that happens at fashion shows, or parties, or in the street. The "structures of attention" that emerged from shifts in imaging production from the 1980s onward created myriad new ways for models to profit from the ability tap into these flows to attract 'buzz.' If they were savvy, models turned a profit from it, both for themselves and for their clients, adding value to a brand, or some gloss to a product, and, in the process, get people interested in a certain way of life.

A third aspect of affective labor is to model work on the body in such a way that it glamorizes the malleable body, stimulating markets in techniques for modulating bodily vitality and affective potential. While retouching has been around almost as long as photography, the kinds of eye widening, skin polishing, and neck lengthening techniques that are made available through digital photo editing in programs like Photoshop have been around only since the 1990s.[85] With digital technology, the power to manipulate images extends to bodies themselves, in the form of genetic engineering, laser surgery, or prosthetic devices of both a medical and cosmetic nature. Art historian and fashion scholar Karen de Perthius has seen in these practices a trend toward a "synthetic" ideal. She claims that, "as the 'real' body approaches the ideal of

airbrushed humanity," an approach made possible by non-invasive procedures such as Botox, or chemical peels, fashion representation is given the "impetus to extend the limits of artifice in order to maintain an unattainable level of perfection."[86]The result? The ubiquity of highly edited images combined with the increased pressure to embody them in person, despite the fact that these images can only be achieved through technological manipulation, has contributed to a more intense management and stricter supervision of the model's body*,* and, arguably, bodies in general.

As I outline in the latter chapters of this book, this intense scrutiny has lead to the trend toward the ever-shrinking model's body. Fashion is always about difference, and body ideals do come and go, but on the whole, the fashionable body has been a slender body, and in recent years, the "model" body has grown increasingly thin. In this environment, the drive to expose the body in more places at more times, coupled with the notion of the physically perfectible body attained through technical manipulation, whatever form that perfection might take, have pushed the model aesthetic to further and further extremes just to be the *most* fashionable, in order to grab the most attention, as the trend toward size "0" models seems to indicate.

In this last respect, affective work calls on the body's receptivity and its power to be affected, its openness to manipulation, to act and be acted upon. This form makes the body's affect, its "power to act," to use Spinoza's definition, productive by opening the body's vital capacities to technological manipulation. These vital capacities can include the potential for engagement, focus, or attention that influence action, forces most commonly played upon by advertising. The ability to manipulate the communicative power of a body's exterior shape and surface stimulates markets in all manner of appearance enhancing products, from diet pills to cosmetic surgery. It is a form of labor that connects the body to technologies that measure and

attempt to direct the body's energy, its 'life force,' so to speak. Whether that life force is being projected via the body's appearance, or exists as a potential, residing in the body's DNA, the body's affectivity is a force or energy that by means of affective labor is opened up or connected to technology that can measure, direct, or use it for profit.

In other words, making affect productive can take the form of putting the body directly in engagement with biomedical technologies that make its malleability into a market resource; or it takes the form of exposing us to images, through devices that measure attention or engagement, such television or the internet. This is a mode of affective manipulation, in which, as anthropologist Anna Gibbs points out, "the media function as amplifiers and modulators of affect, which is transmitted by the human face and voice, and also by music and other forms of sound, and also by the image."[87] It is a form of manipulation that is particularly important to consider in the kinds of "information- and image-based capitalist cultures," where Nicholas Thorburn has argued, "affect is a key dimension of experience,"[88] as it is here in the United States. The media stimulate indeterminate responses in the body that generate flows which escape from the bodies that precipitated them.

In this light, affective labor is the work to open the body's vital capacities to technological manipulation or measurement, either through allowing technological intervention into the body, or by exposing the body to devices that transform affective responses into information, gathered in terms of indexes of consumer confidence, poll results about political fears, or the psychographic data, regarding attitudes, affinities, and propensities collected by marketers to get a feel for how to place their products. Thus, affective labor involves the effort to open up to connectivity in social settings, to technological manipulation of the body's surfaces (and inner forces), as well as to bodily exposure to imaging devices that can direct and channel

26

affective energy. In other words, images impact bodies directly by means of what English and humanities scholar Jamie Skye Bianco has deemed a "modular, interfaced, technosociality."[89]

Thinking of production from this angle demands thinking about how energies formerly considered as natural and individual are being abstracted out by scientific and entertainment technologies, and made to circulate in ways only remotely related to the bodies that generated them. Investigating modeling work within what sociologist of media Eric Klinenberg has called the "media ecology" in which we now live, can tell us much about power relations, especially in terms of how the body is being shaped and molded in an affective register.[90] When models try to project vulnerability and openness to the camera in the studio, for instance, or when they appear on runways, at social gatherings or on the street, they are trying to tap into the power of affective energy to make images that catch attention, produce a reaction, and perhaps resonate in ways that make them stand out from the pack. They learn to employ "socio training" techniques that promote self identity and self esteem, and produce bodily capacities such as a particular walk, or 'look,' to get the job done.[91] Those who succeed learn to strike just the right affective chord, one that resonates in the intended audience at the perfect pitch, making them someone who cannot help but be noticed. In the process, they model the body "open" to technology, making it seem attractive to be this way. They also learn to make these techniques seem desirable practices, making self-commodification, and exposure to imaging technologies something everyone should want to do.

Plan Of The Book

In order to trace the development of imaging regimes and the changing notions of productivity that developed in tandem with these regimes, Part I of the book develops three themes: the first is the story of how modeling work grew more intense, more highly valued, more

tightly supervised and more focused on submitting to bodily manipulation. It tells the story of how each new imaging regime brought not only an intensified demand for work on and in the body, in terms of heightened control and management of the body and presence of the model. This section delineates how these shifts also fostered a gradual pull for models to be more and more open or receptive to intense scrutiny by the camera, even while making an effort to produce an apparently effortless look.

The second theme traces how shifts in the dominant form of imaging technology provoked significant changes in the production of models and modeling. When illustration gave way to photography in the 1800s to 1900s, modeling fees increased and regularized; with the rise of cinema in the 1920s, came the incorporation of first modeling agency; from television's impact in the 1960s, to cable television and the internet's role in the globalization and fragmentation of images in the 1990s, models became household names, giving rise to the supermodel brands of the 1980s and modeling's subsequent leap to global prominence in the 1990s.

The third theme treats how an expanding environment of control, in which power is increasingly exercised by modulating population wide trends at different levels of aggregation, from genetics, to moods, to markets, facilitated a profound shift in understandings of what types of human energy can be managed for productive ends. From this perspective, changes in modeling work are shown to be representative of changing loci of control resulting from capitalism's shift from an industrial base toward the globalized, computerized, finance driven forms of capitalism we know today. This environment of changing understandings of the nature of audiences also instigated new goals for fashion imaging. It moved from molding specific consumer desires toward creating a more diffuse attachment to, or feeling about, a brand; and, as

a result, modeling work went from being highly scripted to being more open to a model's vulnerability and ability to project a feeling or mood. Arguably, this changed goal in advertising, from producing loyal customers to promoting a brand, represents an attempt to harness previously unexploited forms of human energy for productive ends. Tracing these relationships lays the groundwork for seeing how modeling work and industry structure have shifted and molded themselves toward channeling affective energy for profit.

Part II of the book deals with the work of modeling today, considering how models engage in affective production, and what it means to say that. It explores the work models do when branding a product and how that functions to sell us the model lifestyle. This section also considers the role of race in the affective markets of modeling, seeking to understand how the uncertainties of the market can contribute to the knee-jerk reliance on cultural stereotypes, demanding more work for models of color, for less money, in the competition for a very circumscribed number of jobs. This part of the book then considers the role of affect in the scouting system, tracing the impact of the internet on this age old practice for recruiting models and illustrates how the new pathways of affective production brought new demands for affective faces. It then considers the question of why models are so thin, by tying models' slenderness to the volatile markets that the affective economy creates. Finally the book concludes by exploring how it is models 'model' a lifestyle that makes the body productive for capital and we all get pulled into the matrix.

Methods, or How did I get started on this topic, anyway?

How does one navigate working in the epicenter of the sensory overload typical of today's media experience? How best to cut into the process, to investigate how images are made, why they are worth so much, to whom, and why? How do these images draw us into a new level

of engagement with technology? To get at some of these questions, I hit on the idea of studying

the history and practices of image production, and zeroed in on those images that seemed a

powerful influence in contemporary life, that is, fashion images. My interest in bodies and

control led me to think about the most iconic bodies in the process of image making: fashion

models.

The choice made sense for a number of reasons. First, I had access. I live in New York

City, and as anyone who lives or works in Manhattan can attest, it's hard to avoid contact with

the fashion industry. Whether it's stumbling upon the lights and scurrying assistants of a fashion

shoot as one turns down a side street, or finding that your usual lunchtime spot has been

temporarily transformed by the tents that mushroom overnight in Bryant Park, like any New

Yorker, I couldn't help but be familiar with fashion.

Second, I spent my first few years in New York living with a fashion photographer, and

so was exposed to the modeling world through fly-on-the-wall access to photo shoots and

industry events such as "model parties," where modeling agencies throw a party to promote their

models to photographers and other potential clients. I was even "scouted" to be a model, that is,

asked if I wanted to come to an agency and talk about possibly signing with them. These casual

offers never lead to any real employment. Since I fit the part, however, and was living in that

world, I did occasionally model. I posed in return for clothes, or to do a friend a favor, but I

never quit my day job. Once I decided to make modeling the topic of my research, I used my

connections to the modeling world to start building a snowball sample, asking each person I

interviewed to recommend one or two more. I was surprised at how easy it was to meet models,

once I started asking. Contrary to conventional wisdom that models are self centered, stuck up,

stupid, and snobbish, few of the models I interviewed fit the stereotypes; they were warm, friendly, and unusually forthcoming.

I did have assumptions about the modeling world, as most of us do. Like many women, images of fashion models shaped my adolescent development, and, not surprisingly, as a teenager I developed body image issues. I thought I was too fat when I compared myself to the menagerie of bone thin models whose images I'd plucked from various magazines and taped up around my mirror. I both loved and hated those images. They seemed to taunt me with their inaccessibility combined with their promise that I too, with a little work, could become like them. Fashion modeling seemed a glamorous world, a one-way ticket to womanhood for an awkward 14 teen year old, like stepping out of a constrictive skin into a world of freedom, excitement, and adventure.

This personal connection to models and modeling also resonated with the mood of the times when I entered graduate school in the mid 1990s. Models were everywhere. The reign of the supermodels was in full swing, and the public interest in models had reached a fever pitch. Journalist Michael Gross had come out with a sensational pop history of modeling, provocatively titled "Model: the Ugly Business of Beautiful Women." The world seemed to be on a first name basis with Linda, Christy, Naomi, and Cindy. Transvestite singer RuPaul rose to fame admonishing the supermodels to "work it, girl." They could be seen cavorting in George Michael's "Freedom" music video, telling us about fashion on MTV's series, House of Style, or on the arms of rock stars, prize fighters, and movie stars who were only too willing to be their escorts.

Models and modeling are a rich research topic for examining gender and power relations as well as issues of representation. Wanting to avoid repeating work that had already been done,

and to accommodate the kinds of questions modeling raised for me, I turned to post structuralist questions about the nature of subjectivity and identity that challenged given ideas of bodily integrity. I found the possibilities opened up by scientific developments that questioned the notion of the body as a self contained organism hard to ignore, and was fascinated by theories of bodily affect, that accounted for what happens when bodies and images interact far better than the received notions of the identity formation that develops in response to available representations. But, as I noted earlier, affective energy belongs to everyone and no one at once, which presented me with a dilemma. How could I examine the workings of affect, when it is a social energy that can only be detected in its effects? I knew that images could transmit affective energy, but I wanted to examine how affective energy got into the image in the first place. To explore this theory in the real world, I talked to models about the nature of their image making work. I asked what they considered their job, what it was like to be in front of the camera or on the runway, how they experienced the industry as a whole, how they got into modeling in the first place, and let those questions lead to further discussion. I was trying to get a sense of the lived experience of modeling, what it's like to live in the camera's eye, to get at how and why interpersonal energies are circulated by imaging technologies, and how that circulation is turning a profit in the circuits of value in which images, feelings, attitudes, and other forms of bodily energy are now being made productive.

Models are not the only ones I talked to. Since modeling is an "art world," as sociologist Howard Becker describes, made up of not only the front stage players, but also many supporting roles, I also talked to photographers; stylists; casting directors; the occasional creative director, and model agents, or "bookers" as they are sometimes called.[92] Employing the ethnographic

technique called "participant observation," when I wasn't interviewing, I went on photo shoots, attended industry events, pretended to be a model to get into castings, hung out at modeling agencies, and went to fashion shows.

I hit a goldmine when a friend sympathetic to my research offered me an occasional day job as a casting assistant at the photo production company where she worked. This break is why my ethnographic work is another New York or at least urban story, since firms like my friend's production company tend to be clustered in fashion centers like New York (or Paris or London). As a casting assistant, I worked with models who were seeking jobs, and took notes under the table, in between my regular duties. It was my job to manage the flow of traffic coming in, get the models ready to be photographed for their 'try out,' and make sure they left as soon as they had finished.

Sometimes we saw hundreds of models in a day, and I made use of this direct contact to make arrangements with anyone who was willing to meet me for research interviews. Sympathetic to my project, even when I wasn't in the office, my friend sent models my way, and the collaboration proved to be quite fruitful for research. It should be noted that this casting agency dealt only with commercial, not high fashion, clients. I was not at castings for high-fashion magazines or other luxury goods manufacturers such as Chanel or Dior. Journalistic accounts of these types of castings describe situations similar to the ones I observed, however: a room full of models waiting to be seen, the client's desultory glance at the head shot or book, the quick dismissal with no indication of whether or not those few moments made a positive or a negative impression.[93]

The casting agency was a great resource, but skewed my sample toward older models and, surprisingly, men, who, despite their minority status in the modeling industry, seemed to be

easy to find. These men, or "boys" as they are referred to in the business, seemed to have no qualms about making arrangements to meet me in a coffee shop, or at their agency, wherever.

The ease with which I secured interviews with males models makes sense, given the gendered structure of power we live in. I was a relatively unthreatening prospect for them, indicated by their willingness to meet with me, and their willingness to give me the names of other models. Perhaps the male models had less to lose as well – their schedules did not seem to fill up at quickly as those of the female models, and, since they make less money than the women, perhaps less was at stake in taking time out of their day for an interview with a sociologist.

Getting access to the young female models who tend to do high fashion, however, was another story. The few I did get access to, at industry parties for instance, or from other respondents, would say 'no' outright when I called them, or say 'yes' and then cancel. It was clear the girl models demanded more drastic measures.

I decided I needed to go to where the models are – the castings. When I finally managed to secure an interview with a female model who had walked runways, and worked for fashionable clients such as Abercrombie and Fitch, I took a risk, and asked her to share her agenda with me. Typically, when they are looking for work, models get a list of castings each morning, and the day's work consists of trying to make it to each one of them, taking the subway or cabbing it all over town. I figured that I would go to these castings, and pose as a model if need be, in order to make the necessary contacts.

The first on the list was on lower Broadway, just north of Soho, in a relatively fashionable part of the city. I walked into the building with two other girls, both quite tall; one was very slender with long blond hair and the other was more voluptuous with big eyes. They

were unmistakably models and seemed to be looking for which floor to go to, so I asked "Are you going to the casting? I think it's in suite 903." They seemed grateful, and while waiting for the elevator, I made my move: "I'm a sociologist and I'm studying the modeling industry." I explained a bit of what I was doing, and they seemed receptive, so I followed them down the hall to a very big, open and well-appointed office with sculpture on broad shelves, very large computer screens on desks perched at multiple levels, and a wall of windows looking out over lower Broadway.

We were asked to sign in, and the voluptuous one muttered under her breath, "You can be my friend." I didn't sign in; using my new identity, I went to sit and wait with them. The slender one was just starting out, and had only been in New York for 2 weeks, up from Texas. My 'friend,' who seemed a bit older, had been at it for 7 months. The first girl seemed nervous. She said she was trying out modeling on school break. I thought maybe she was on break from college, but later my new confidant said she was sure it was high school.

Eventually they called us into another room. We entered to see three people seated at a table. We lined up in front of them; perhaps I appeared to be there for the job; one of the people behind the table give me a quick once over. It made me flinch to be looked at in such an appraising way – and gave me a momentary insight into what these workers go through every day, as part of their job. An woman who seemed in charge, dressed in all-black with funky vintage shoes and glasses, dismissed us, and as we walked out, I invited my informant for coffee so we could talk more about working as a model. She accepted. It was a very productive day!

Once I found how remarkably easy going to casting could be, emboldened, I decided to try for more. One sweltering July afternoon found me out on the street in the blistering sun,

staking out the entrance to a casting, accosting models as they came in or out. After receiving the brush off from more than one model, I finally got lucky: a girl leaving the casting not only agreed to talk to me, but invited me to meet her and her roommates at her "model apartment." As some of you probably know, agencies rent or own apartments and use them to put up girls who are trying out the industry, or are only in town for a few weeks, and need accommodation. Usually these are regular apartments that have been fitted out like dorm rooms, with bunk beds and a chaperone, to look after the more often than not teenaged inhabitants. This particular apartment was in Tribeca, and housed six models in what should have been a two bedroom apartment. There was one bathroom for the six of them, and a 23 year old chaperone. We did a group interview in their living room; miraculously, all six were home, and my tape recorder worked, and I came away with new insights into how models get work (many of these girls were found at model search contests or scouted in the street) and how modeling can become a whole way of life; as one girl put it, "it's like a lifestyle, it takes over you life. It's not like when you go work at the Gap and then come home and be normal."

By the time I did that interview, I was knee deep in doing the research, and getting bolder all the time. My sample was getting pretty well rounded, but I felt it needed more representation by top management. Calls to top agencies in New York had produced a few hits, but for the most part I'd been shunted to lower level staff, and I wanted to talk to the head honchos. I decided to play the international card, and cold call modeling agencies in Paris, saying I was a researcher from New York, and would they take the time to meet with me? I secured five interviews with agencies in Paris this way, conducted in a whirlwind trip to Paris that included the coup of getting an appointment with the owner of the top modeling agency in the world at the time, who

discussed the modeling world with me in her beautifully appointed office overlooking a grand Parisian boulevard.

These interviews led to others, until eventually, I had spoken in depth to fifty four industry professionals and models, some speaking for almost two hours. As I staked out the lobbies of modeling agencies, went to castings, and continued working at the casting agency, I was always amazed at what people were willing to share. It didn't hurt that I seemed to be part of their world, but I think it was also an advantage that I wasn't. Having that distance made me a safe stranger, what the sociologist Georg Simmel described as a person whose "distance and nearness, indifference and involvement" makes it possible to elicit sometimes the "most surprising openness – confidences which sometimes have the character of a confessional and which would be carefully withheld from a more closely related person."[94]

Working with these confidences, I hope to give the reader some insight into the kind of world in which we reside. Putting these moments of sharing into context, I seek to shed light on recent changes in technology that are tending toward engaging in a commerce in affect. By analyzing how changes in imaging technology have made capitalizing on this energy possible, I will show how this kind of arrangement is indicative of changes in power over bodies that results in a form of entrainment, in which bodies, actions, and impulses are brought into alignment by the media technologies with which we so willingly engage, in part because models have made them so attractive. The value of directing affective energy, in the form of affection for a brand, or interest in looking at branded images, or participating in branded experiences, has skyrocketed in part because the rewards can be so great for hitting the right note with the buying public. Habituating that public to needing the new 'it' bag each season, to 'throwaway' fashion, has

become a huge part of fashion marketing in which models play a pivotal role. This entrainment is

a tool for power which brings bodies into alignment with each other, moving to the same

rhythms, modulated to the same tone. Although we participate gladly, we need to be more savvy

about the process by which our pleasures and energies are bent toward corporate ends, and by

showing these relationships here, I hope to open our eyes precisely to these machinations.

---

[1] The global apparel industry's total revenue in 2006 was US $ 1, 252.8 billion.
According to an estimate, the global apparel industry will have reached a value of US $ 1,781.7
billion by the end of 2010, with not further updates available as of early 2011.
From http://www.fashionproducts.com/fashion-apparel-overview.html#global
[2] Blumer 1969 p. 280
[3] Blumer, ibid.
[4] Thrift p. 65, and also, regarding media susceptibility, also Anna Gibbs.
[5] ibid. Thrift 2008 p. 23 and p. 240
[6] inspired by Massumi.
[7] Brian Massumi *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation,* Duke University Press, Durham &
London, 2002, "The Autonomy of Affect" 23-45. NEED TO REFORMAT THIS CITATION.
[8] Glassner (1988:40) get ref from Humanities file
[9] (Clough 2008; Haraway 1993, 1997; Butler 1990; Grosz 1995, 2005; see also Latour and
Woolgar, 1986; Knorr-Cetina 1999; and Brennan, 2004). get ref from Humanities file
[10] (Entwistle, 2002, 2004, 2009 get ref from Humanities file
[11] (Entwistle and Wissinger, 2006); ditto
[12] (Evans 2001);ditto
[13] (Maynard, 1999) ditto
[14] (Mears and Finlay 2005; Mears, 2008) ditto
[15] (Sadre-Orafai, 2008); ditto
[16] (Neff, et al., 2005); ditto
[17] (Parmentier and Fischer, 2007). ditto
[18] Martin *Bipolar* p. 42.
[19] Martin *Bipolar* p. 43.
[20] Ibid. Martin p. 53
[21] Martin, *Bipolar*, pp. "heat" 39, "energies" 53, "shapshift" and "limits" 42.
[22] Dienst 1995:146
[23] Cite to Zukin for 'symbolic labor' and Hochschild for 'emotional labor.'
[24] Gilbert-Rolfe 1999:179.
[25] John Berger. 1972 . *Ways of Seeing* Middlesex, England: Penguin Books and New York: The
Viking Press.
[26] Marshal Mcluhan *Understanding Media* get date and page number.
[27] See Gilbert-Rolfe 1999 for more in depth discussion of this phenomenon; or, for example, as
Deleuze (1989) notes, cinema had to distinguish itself from the new medium of television by

playing up its unique qualities with immersive technologies such as the widescreen viewing made possible by cinemascope and panavision. Similarly, television has become more interactive and shaped by viewers (in the form of viewer driven contests and reality shows such as *American Idol* and viewer opinion polls collected via pushing buttons on cable remotes) in reaction to computers' interactivity. See also Macluhan on 'remediation,' in which new forms of media technology contain elements of the old forms.

[28] Patricia Clough and Jean Halley, eds. *The Affective Turn.* P. 16

[29] with reference to Terranova and Parisi as stated in *The Affective Turn* [page ref?].

[30] cite to Foucault, Docile Bodies

[31] Inpired by Laura Mulvey's piece, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema, " ADD CITATION INFO HERE. Although she did not invent the concept of the cinematic gaze, she did much to make it famous in her analysis of the "male gaze" in cinema and its effects on shaping women's bodies.

[32] *Vogue* magazine, March 15, 1953, as quoted in Marshall Mcluhan, *Understanding Media* p. 195.

[33] *Social theorist Scott Lash clarifies: "Organic systems work on a physiological model. Technological systems work on a cybernetic model. Cybernetic, self-regulating systems work through functions of intelligence, command, control and communication."* "Technological Forms of Life" *Theory, Culture, and Society* 2001 vol. 18 (1):105-120 London:Sage p. 107

[34] Keenan, 1977, 133.

[35] [Is this source for the following cites from Thrift?
Non-representational theory : space, politics, affect
Authors: Thrift,N.J.
Source: 2008, 325, Routledge, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY
Non representational Theory p. 23

[36] Thrift 2008 p. 26

[37] The reigning "pictorial order" is comprised of commonly accepted modes of perception, and styles or norms of image presentation and imaging techniques. Gilbert Rolfe 1999:179. FULL CITATION TO *Blink* goes here also.

[38] Gladwell, Malcolm. *Blink*. 2005. New York: Little, Brown, and Co. p. 10

[39] Massumi *The Autonomy of Affect* p. 29,

[40] Brennan p. 87

[41] Brennan p. 68

[42] Vincent Mosio *The Digital Sublime* Cambridge: MIT Press 2004. (quoting Longstaff 2002)" p. 155

[43] Lash p. 110

[44] Lash p. 110 he goes on to point out: The novel may last "for a generation," a scholarly book "a decade," but a newspaper article has "value for just a day."

[45] Wickstrom p. 2 re "somatic reach."

[46] Walter Benjamin 1978, p. 33 as quoted in Wickstrom page…? It's marked in your Xerox Betz. "Are you Mac or PC?" comes from the 2000s ad campaign that staged an ongoing exchange between a groovy, hip looking 'Mac' guy and the PC, a boring corporate suit.

[47] Wickstrom, p. 4.

[48] In this vein, thinking about affect demands challenging traditional notions of personhood, and Thrift goes so far as to argue that looking at how affect continually transfers "autonomic

hormonal and muscular reactions" between people challenges the idea that "the body is a fixed component of humanity." Of NON Rep book P. 236

[49] Imitation/suggestion from Thrift p. 243.

[50] get cite to Crary ? geez! and Gladwell, Malcolm. *Blink*. 2005. New York: Little, Brown, and Co.

[51] Lucas Conley, 2008, *Obsessive Branding Disorder* 98 don't the publisher's names have to be in there too?

[52] Ibid. 99

[53] Thrift 'Intensities' p. 63

[54] Winner take All Frank and Cook p. 38.

[55] Get the magazine and cite this quotation.

[56] Brian Massumi, Fear (Spectrum Said) "techniques" on p. 44 and jumpiness, etc. on p. 32 respectively.

[57] get a cite from the book for this.

[58] Brennan *The Transmission of Affect* p. 36

[59] cite to Anna Gibbs and quote her here if you can.

[60] David Grazian, *On the Make* get page number

[61] The phrase 'biopolitics of beauty' was inspired by J. Zylinska's article. *Of Swans and Ugly Ducklings: Bioethics between Humans, Animals, and Machines;* see also M. Jones, 2008, *Skintight: an Anatomy of Cosmetic Surgery.* London: Berg.

[62] Gilles Deleuze *Postscript on the Societies of Control* get rest of cite from Thrift.

[63] Thoburn Patterns of Production p. 83

[64] "Mediatization" is Thrift's term, 'Intensities' p. 63, symbolic production has been written about by Sharon Zukin, *The Cultures of Cities,* among others, and immaterial labor was brought to the academy's attention most prominently by XX Lazzarato Lazarrato.

[65] Jo Entwistle has referred to the aesthetic markets of modeling as "effervescent markets" in which the speed at which fashions come and go affects the value of commodities within fashion markets (Joanne Entwistle, "The Aesthetic Economy," *Journal of Consumer Culture* 2002 Vol 2 (3):317-339.)

[66] Hardt (1999, 2000, 2004)

[67] Negri (1999, 2000, 2004)

[68] Massumi (1993, 2002),

[69] Clough (2000, 2003, 2007),

[70] (Hardt and Negri, 2004:108)

[71] **In the Social Factory?: Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work**
Rosalind Gill and Andy Pratt
Theory Culture Society 2008; 25; 1
Theory, Culture & Society 2008 (SAGE, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, and Singapore), Vol. 25(7–8): 1–30
p. 15

[72] Creative Work and Emotional Labour in the Television Industry
David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker
Theory, Culture & Society 2008 (SAGE, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, and Singapore), Vol. 25(7–8): 97–118
PAGE 114.

[73] Wissinger Modeling as Affective Labour *ephemera* Feb 2007

---

[74] Hardt and Negri (2000:293)

[75] Hardt and Negri (2004:108, see also 2000:293).

[76] (2004: 108)

[77] (Hochschild, 1983)

[78] (Pierce, 1995)

[79] (Godwyn, 2006; Steinberg and Figart, 1999) [these are in refs in ephemera paper.]

[80] (Morris and Feldman, 1996:98) [refs from ephermera]

[81] (Hochschild, 1983: 7).

[82] These are models on the lower rungs of fashion production, who are not well known, and work for lower level clothing catalogues such as Sears, JC Penney, or La Redoute.

[83] Thoburn 84 Ibid.

[84] Thoburn 84

[85] For an example of these techniques in action, see http://cbeau.ca, a website that shows the extensive changes made in fashion photographs before and after they have been re-touched.

[86] De Perthius, Karen, "Beyond Perfection," in *Fashion as Photograph,* Eugenie Shinkle, ed. London: IB Taurus, p. 171.

[87] Gibbs (2002), 338.

[88] Nicholas Thoburn, "Patterns of Production: Cultural Studies after Hegemony," *Theory, Culture, and Society,* (Vol 24 Issue 3, pp. 79-94):84.

[89] Jamie Skye Bianco, "Techno-Cinema," *The Affective Turn), 53.*

[90] get cite for Klinenberg's book on the Heat Wave. [I have biblio info for this]

[91] Adkins p. 119 and p. 125

[92] Howard Becker *Art Worlds* page no missing

[93] TK quote from a journalistic account of what it is like to be at a model casting. THE MALE MODEL CASTINGS TREATED IN THE NYTIMES

[94] P. 404 Simmel 1950.
 is this correct source?
Book Title: The sociology of Georg Simmel
Authors: Simmel,Georg; Wolff,Kurt H.
Source: 1950, 445, Free Press, Glencoe,Ill.