(RE)SHAPING THE POLITICAL NARRATIVE OF THE WAR ON DRUGS:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CULTURAL IMAGINARY OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE WAR ON DRUGS IN *OZ* (1997-2003) AND *ORANGE IS THE NEW BLACK* (2013-2019)

Master's Thesis

North American Studies

University of Leiden

Rianne der Weduwe

S1899457

June 15, 2019

Supervisor: Dr. S.A. Polak

Second reader: Dr. J.C. Kardux

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Over the last five decades, the United States has developed a penal system that knows no parallel in modern history or in the present. Whereas the incarceration rate of the United States was largely stable and comparable to that of other Western countries throughout much of the twentieth century, the number of convicted felons started to rise from the 1970s onwards (Gottschalk, *The Prison and the Gallows* 3-4). Since the late 1990s, scholars from various field of study such as sociology, (social) history, and cultural studies have studied this momentous turn in U.S. penal history. Despite different approaches, most scholars agree that the last three decades of the twentieth century are marked by significant changes in social and penal spheres legitimated by a rising public fear of (violent) crime and drug criminality.

According to historian Heather Ann Thompson, the increase of the U.S. prison population fits in a much larger historical framework of urban decline and criminalization of minority groups. In the wake of suburbanization and white flight, inner-city neighborhoods increasingly became centers of poverty and (alleged) criminality (Thompson 705). Thompson illustrates that the criminalization of these urban spaces predominantly followed after the implementation of harsher legislation on drug criminality from the mid-1970s till the turn of the 21st century (708). The disproportionate policing of inner-city neighborhoods resulted in social and racial disparities among the growing prison population (Thompson 708-710). From the late 1970s onwards, African Americans, Hispanics, and poor whites were disproportionately impacted by what David Garland later defined as the practice of ‘mass incarceration’. Within these socio-economically disadvantaged communities, imprisonment rates were (and still are) significantly higher than in more privileged white, middle class communities (Tucker, Western).

The rising incarceration rate also followed after a significant shift in public policy and social marginality governance (Beckett and Western 43-45). Sociologists Katherine Beckett and Bruce Western argue that before 1980, socially marginal groups were governed through welfare support and rehabilitative approaches to poverty. After the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan, however, the approach to regulating socially marginal groups took a punitive turn. Lowered access to welfare support and tougher sentencing policies increasingly placed poor communities under the control of penal institutions rather than social support programs (Beckett and Western 55).

As the social and racial disparities among the prison population increased, scholars paid more and more attention to social and penal reform. Predominantly legal scholars have suggested ways to put a halt to discriminatory mass incarceration practices. Anne Traum, for instance, has called upon judges to take the narrative of mass incarceration into consideration at sentencing. Although she does acknowledge that the solution to the mass incarceration problem lies in more systemic reform, her work illustrates that by exercising more judicial discretion at sentencing, the harms of (mass) incarceration can already be limited on a case-by-case level (Traum 467-468). Whereas Traum's work is aimed at starting reform from within the criminal justice system itself, Michelle Alexander addresses a broader audience in her call for reform. She has called upon advocates of social justice and the general public alike to open their eyes to institutionalized racism and dismantle the myth of a colorblind contemporary U.S. society and criminal justice system (11-12). To make significant changes to the contemporary discriminatory system of crime control, Alexander argues, social justice advocates must start "a conversation that fosters a critical consciousness" (15) in the general public. Alexander provides a strong critique on the racial disparities among the prison population and disproportionate socio-cultural impact of mass incarceration practices on the African American community. Throughout her work, she draws the analogy between contemporary mass incarceration and the institutionalized form of racial discrimination at the time of the Jim Crow laws. Alexander defines mass incarceration as the New Jim Crow, a contemporary racially defined system of control. She argues that the stigma of criminality in the age of mass incarceration has become a racial stigma (Alexander 198). The social experience of a whole generation of African Americans is shaped by the intersecting disadvantages of their race, class, gender and age (Alexander 197-200). To end mass incarceration, the fundamental relation to race and class in U.S. society must be revisited, both on a social and a political level (Alexander 11-16).

Cultural studies scholars have illustrated that in opening the general public's eyes to the inequalities of the criminal justice system, media can play a crucial role. Mediated images of prison far outweigh the visibility of real-life prisons and prisoners (Hunt 69). Although the lives of many Americans have been shaped by mass incarceration, the great majority still lacks firsthand experiences with, or direct conversational knowledge of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners (Novek, Surette, Wilson and O'Sullivan). According to Walter Lippmann's theory on pseudo realities and pseudo environments, personal and firsthand experiences usually provide

valuable information to construct rational categories and related frames of references (n. pag.). When these experiences – or 'environments' – are missing, people have a tendency to create irrational categories to understand the world around them and place it within a social and cultural context, in which "even a kernel of truth may be lacking, for they can be composed wholly of hearsay evidence, emotional projections, and fantasy" (Allport 31). The irrational categories are influenced by mediated images and strongly rely on (stereotypical) representations. Given that firsthand experiences of mass incarceration are disproportionately present in groups that remain at the margins of society, it can be assumed that public opinion is largely based on mental images and cultural imaginations – called pseudo realities by Lippmann – of crime and punishment (Yousman, Novek).

Cultural images such as representations of prison in television drama series can provide imaginative metaphors that help the general public to accept or reject certain policy choices in crime control (Wilson and O'Sullivan 88). The constructed realities in televisual representations of prison can influence the general public's understanding of actual prisons and prisoners. As such, prison drama series can offer a pseudo reality to audience members that lack firsthand experiences of the penal system.

1.1 Aim and Thesis Statement

In this thesis, I aim to show how television prison drama can (re)shape public opinion on punitive crime control policies and mass incarceration practices. I will analyze three narratives of secondary information that each can influence the general public's understanding of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners. I will look at the political narrative of the War on Drugs as well as analyze the cultural imaginary of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs. The first narrative that will be deconstructed is the political War on Drugs discourse that is prevalent in presidential speeches and debates delivered between 1968 and 2004. Mass incarceration is generally accepted as an institutional consequence of the political War on Drugs. A close reading of these speeches and debates will provide insight into the images of villainy and victimhood and the stereotypical identity of a (drug) criminal as constructed by the U.S. government in the War on Drugs campaigns.

Subsequently, I will analyze two critically acclaimed televisual representations of incarceration. The prison drama series *Oz* (1997 – 2003) and *Orange Is The New Black* (2013 –

2019) (henceforth referred to as *OITNB*) offer cultural representations of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners in the wake of the War on Drugs. A critical analysis of the constructed narratives on criminality in the first season of both these prison drama series will offer insight to the way that popular culture can reinforce or criticize and reshape stereotypical identities communicated in political narrative. Despite the fact that both *Oz* and *OITNB* invite their audience to reflect on the carceral state, the two constructed lead narratives foster distinctly different pseudo realities. This thesis will therefore argue that by placing stark emphasis on racial tensions and prison violence, *Oz* reinforces the stereotypical image peddled for years in the political War on Drugs discourse, whereas *OITNB* criticizes the racial stigma of (drug) criminality.

The lead narratives represented in *Oz* and *OITNB* will be deconstructed using an intersectional approach. In 1989, Kimberlé Crenshaw introduced intersectionality as an analytical tool to gain greater insight into the different axes of power and domination at work in the construction of social identity and the hierarchical patterns that shape everyday social spaces. The key elements that run throughout this theoretical framework are power and social control. An intersectional perspective opens up the possibility to discuss the functioning of power relations between social groups in cultural texts. This theory originates from feminism but has over the past decades shifted to other fields within the social sciences and humanities as well. After a brief overview of the theory itself, it will be explained in more detail how this theory will be applied in the upcoming analyses of *Oz* and *OITNB*.

In her introduction to intersectionality theory, Crenshaw identified a problem with the existing frameworks and studies on race and gender. According to Crenshaw, existing scholarly efforts in the fields of feminism and identity politics so far were too narrowly focused on intergroup differences and did not sufficiently take into account intragroup diversity (1242). As a result, these studies did not reflect real life experiences. To illustrate this claim, Crenshaw discussed how the experience of sexual violence by black women cannot be explained by only focusing on racism, nor by solely looking at oppressive social structures that result from sexism (Crenshaw 1242-1244). Their unique experiences are shaped by the social structures that are generally linked to their intersectional identity as women of color. In the social space, race and gender politics readily intersect to determine one's place in society (Crenshaw 1243-1244).

Intersectionality theory thus invites scholars to look beyond single dimensions as race, gender or class. Whereas Crenshaw specifically focused on the intersection of race, class, and gender, more recent studies have also pointed to sexuality and able-bodiedness as determining dimensions in the construction of social and cultural power relations (Taylor, Hines and Casey). Over the past decade, scholars such as Momin Rahman, and Amber Johnson and Robin M. Boylorn have illustrated that sexuality may have been a largely overlooked feature in the experience of already marginalized groups such as religious or racial minorities. Fostered by dual oppression, such groups remain largely invisible to the larger public. Including members of multiple marginalized groups such as gay Muslims or transgender people of color in popular cultural texts such as television series opens up the possibility for the public to revisit stereotypical identities and challenge structures of social oppression.

I will use an intersectional perspective to analyze the representation of prisoners in the U.S. prison system in the first season of *Oz* and *OITNB* respectively. More specifically, I will discuss how social power structures shape the U.S. prison system and how this is represented in these two prison drama series. I also consider how the relation between prisoners, drugs and violent crime is constructed. The intersectional analyses will highlight the role that various identity categories such as ethnicity, class, sexuality, gender, able-bodiedness and religion play in social power dynamics. Within these categories, emphasis will be placed on "the particular values attached to them and the way those values foster and create social hierarchies" (Crenshaw 1297). In sum, I will discuss how identity categories function as oppressive mechanisms, how they are used to draw a line between 'good' and 'bad', 'normal' and 'deviant', and 'victim' and 'criminal'.

After a brief contextual and theoretical framework, a close reading of the 34 selected presidential speeches and debates will be provided. Subsequently, *Oz* and *OITNB* will be analyzed in individual chapters. The final chapter will emphasize the most important findings of this research project. Moreover, these concluding remarks will indicate the limitations of this work.

2. Contextual Framework

In a discussion of cultural representations of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs, it is important to delve deeper into the political and social context of this particular 'war' itself. As Mona Lynch has argued, "an examination of the varied ways that drug crime control policy has been deployed can help contextualize our understanding of contemporary (gendered) racism within criminal justice institutions" (178). Although most drug crime control policies that are commonly linked to the War on Drugs were passed during the 1980s and early 1990s, the political rhetoric supporting these federal drug laws shows a longer history. During the 1960s and 1970s, predominantly Republican politicians used distinct anti-crime rhetoric in their campaigns to draw the attention of working-class whites (Simon, Thompson, Western). By placing emphasis on the danger that drugs could pose to the social position of this group in the unstable American society of that day – caused by "a volatile mixture of rising crime, social protest, and the erosion of white privilege" (Western 53) – these politicians imposed a fear of (violent) crime in the minds of a large share of the American population. In 1971, President Richard Nixon declared illicit drugs and its users "public enemy number one" (Weimer 263), signaling the start of the federal War on Drugs. Halfway through the 1970s, the first federal drug laws were passed in response to rising crime rates, in which mandatory minimum sentences for drug-related crimes were introduced (Thompson 709-710). Over the next decade, the anti-crime rhetoric used by politicians increasingly targeted poor, inner-city neighborhoods. From roughly 1985 onwards, "Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives alike called repeatedly for an 'all-out war on drugs'" (Reinarman and Levine 21). This broad political crusade against drugs was popularized by the Reagan administration during the 1980s and later continued by the Bush administration into the 1990s. For these conservative politicians, the drug problem formed a gateway into the repositioning of Republican morals and values disguised by a narrative of social concern (Reinarman and Levine 38).

As a result of harsher federal and state sentencing policies, imprisonment in the United States ceased to be a measure to control individual violators of the law and increasingly turned into a mechanism of social control that shaped the life experience and socio-economic chances of particularly minority groups in U.S. society (Alexander, Garland). Between 1984 and 1990, federal sentencing guidelines became stricter by the year. In the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 and the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988, the possibility for early supervised

release was ruled out, mandatory minimums for drugs crimes were introduced and money laundering became a felony. Consequently, more offenders were sent to prison, where they on average also served longer time than before. Following these policy changes, the federal and state expenditure on crime control quickly increased (Schulhofer 208-209).

Not only federal laws, but also state-imposed mandatory minimums for drug crimes changed the correctional landscape in the United States during the War on Drugs. In 1978, for instance, the state of Michigan adopted the '650 Lifer Law'. This law required courts to sentence anyone who was caught selling at least 650 grams of heroin or cocaine, to life in prison (Mauer 6). A highly controversial aspect of the 650 Lifer Law was the fact that it also applied to first time offenders. Also in other states, sentencing policies became increasingly punitive. During the 1990s, many states adopted what came to be known as the controversial 'three strikes and you're out' laws (White 705-706). These ruled that offenders with previous convictions had to be punished more severely with increasingly lengthy prison sentences. Ultimately, after the third arrest, habitual offenders faced a lifetime in prison, regardless of the severity of the crime that was committed (White 705-706).

Overall, the War on Drugs and its related federal and state-imposed policies "vastly expanded crime prosecutions and made prison sentences for drug offenses routine" (Traum 429). Whereas these legal policies were officially race-neutral, it soon became clear that the likelihood of ending up in prison for a drug-related crime was significantly higher among communities of color (Wacquant, Alexander, Lynch). Over time, the War on Drugs resulted in unprecedented incarceration rates that have transformed the United States into "the world's warden" (Gottschalk, "The Past, Present, and Future of Mass Incarceration in the United States" 483) in a timespan of only half a century.

Within the scholarly debate, the explosive boom of incarceration in the United States has become known as 'mass incarceration'. In 2001, Garland introduced the term to refer to societies that deal with "a rate of imprisonment that is markedly above the historical and comparative norm for societies of this type" (1). Although the term suggests that the masses are affected by it, Loïc Wacquant points out that it hides a meaningful contradiction that directly deals with the core of the social problem: "'Mass' incarceration is socially tolerable and therefore workable as public policy only so long as it does not reach the masses: it is a figure of speech, which hides the multiple filters that operate to point the penal dagger" (78).

The social group that in particular has been disproportionately touched by the punitive turn of the War on Drugs are young, disadvantaged African American men from urban areas. Among them, especially those who are less educated and are working age without a job have a chance to be incarcerated that is 50 times higher than the national average (Western 18). Up until the turn of the 21st century, U.S. incarceration rates increased sevenfold. The likelihood for Latinos to end up in the U.S. criminal justice system approximately tripled during the last three decades of the twentieth century, whereas the chances for African Americans to be incarcerated increased by eight times (Gomberg-Muñoz 340, 344-345). In 2006, Bruce Western published a study that indicated that "three out of every two hundred young white men were incarcerated in 2000, compared to one in nine young black men" (16). As a result of this, Heather Ann Thompson has argued, "America's urban centers were increasingly trapped in a vicious cycle of imprisonment and want, one that both undergirded and ensured civic distress: mass incarceration increased poverty, increased urban poverty led to even more urban incarceration, and so on" (709-710).

To end this vicious cycle, it is important to break with the stigma that links urban communities of color to drugs and crime, and which frames them to pose a threat to the larger American society (Cole, Forman). As Marie Gottschalk has pointed out, "the factors that created the carceral state are not identical to the ones that sustain it today" ("The Past, Present, and Future of Mass Incarceration in the United States" 487). To break down the political and legal framework which holds mass incarceration in place today, the problem must be readdressed. Instead of pragmatic arguments, the disproportionate social impact of mass incarceration must be stressed and moral appeal to social injustice must be incited in the general public. By holding up a mirror to the general public on (politically constructed) stereotypical identities of criminality, cultural texts such as prison drama series can start a conversation on the inequalities and injustices of mass incarceration. The following chapter will elaborate on theories of (stereotypical) representation and marginalization to explain how cultural texts like televisual representations can break the empathy gap between the incarcerated population and the general public.

3. Theoretical Framework

> "How we are seen determines in part how we are treated; how we treat others is based on how we see them; such seeing comes from representation" (Dyer 1).

As Richard Dyer points out in the opening quote, representations can reach far beyond their initial meaning. They are part of a complex meaning-knowledge-power relation that structures everyday interaction between people and social hierarchies. Through cultural representations, people interpellate their own identities and their place in society (Pramaggiore and Wallis 318). In this chapter, I address how (cultural) representations can strengthen existing power structures or challenge the status quo. The close link between meaning, knowledge and power will be explained using Michel Foucault's discourse theory and Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony. Furthermore, I discuss how stereotypical representations can negatively influence social hierarchies, resulting in forms of oppression such as marginalization.

In any representation, language fulfills a crucial role. Language, in this context, not only refers to words and sentences, but equally to sounds and visual images which can carry meaning (Hall, "Introduction" 2-4). Similar to for instance an expression, the meaning of a certain representation is determined by the cultural framework in which it is created and interpreted. During the encoding process, a representation is always influenced by previous texts and the social position of the producer. It is never an objective or stand-alone observation of reality (Dyer 2-3). Nonetheless, this does not mean that representations exclude reality at all (Dyer 3). Through representations, audiences are offered a selective, sometimes incomplete or partial vision of reality. Such represented versions of reality fit within larger conceptual maps of the world. How people interpret a represented image of reality depends on their discursive frames of knowledge. Through discourse, people define 'truth' and regulate the world around them.

Foucault has argued that instead of a single truth, there are many competing worldview and regimes of knowledges at work in society that "exist side by side or struggle for the right to define truth" (Jørgensen and Philips 13). The dominant discourses – e.g. on a social, cultural or political level – that emerge within a certain society or historical period are the result of this power struggle.

In this thesis, a close reading of the presidential speeches and debates will provide insight into the constructed image of the drug problem in the political War on Drugs discourse. It provides insight into the way that presidents framed the drug problem as a crisis that legitimated a disproportionate increase of the federal budget on crime control and provided an explanation for the stark rise of the prison population. I will pay close attention to the way that the presidential narrative tries to generate consent for the punitive turn in crime control. To maintain their hegemonic position, it is crucial for political administrations to frame their policies as the most efficient and appropriate solution. A hegemonic position brings power and knowledge together, and as Hall has argued, "knowledge linked to power not only assumes the authority of 'the truth', but has the power to *make itself true*" ("The Work of Representation" 49). When hegemony is achieved, it means that the dominant frame of knowledge is perceived by the general public as a natural, objective reality rather than a subjective, cultural construct.

Two types of hegemony can be achieved within society through which dominant groups can exert control: hegemony over the social domain and political governance. A hegemonic position can be acquired in two ways: through coercive control and consensual control. Whereas coercive control is created by "direct force or the threat of force" (Ransome 198-199), consensual control is acquired in a more subtle way. Combined with an illusion of choice, the hegemonic view is presented as the most sincere and righteous option. As Nicholas Carah and Eric Louw argue, "for hegemonic groups, the more naturalized and obfuscated [their] discourses and practices are, the better" (64). This naturalized position strengthens the dominance over competing discourses.

The hegemonic group often relies on stereotypical prejudices and related forms of discrimination to strengthen their own position in the social hierarchy. Stereotyping can be defined as a problematic representation of a social group. One of the most problematic aspects of stereotyping is that it frequently paints a negative and homogenous picture of a minority group. It fails to account for individual expression and diversity within such a social group. Moreover, stereotyping is always embedded in an oppressive power structure. Since the stereotyped group itself has no control over the way that they are represented, the constructed image is often oversimplified and altered so that it fits naturally within the dominant discourse.

In most cases, people who belong to the dominant social groups in the center are hardly aware of the impact that stereotyping can have on others at the margins of society (Dyer 9).

Stereotyping often creates a social hierarchy. It defines who is in power and who is not. The use of negative labels in representations places people at the margins of society, denies them agency over their own socio-economic chances and fixes identity as a collective entity. In the upcoming analyses, I will discuss how the dynamic between different social groups can be recognized. As marginalization often occurs through binary oppositions, I will assess how the three texts draw a line between what is good and bad, what is understood as normal and deviant or which groups are clearly included and excluded. Drawing upon Jacques Derrida's linguistic model, Hall explains that binary oppositions always exist within a culturally constructed relation of power ("The Spectacle of the 'Other'" 235). There is no "peaceful coexistence" (Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other'" 258) between the two, one term will always dominate the other. At large, studying the use of binary oppositions provides insight into the way that culturally constructed meanings can be reinforced or challenged through language and images.

4. The Political Discourse of the War on Drugs

Through persuasive communication, political parties try to set in motion a process of social and political identification within the electorate. Political messages usually fit within a larger party ideology and reinforce the shared (cultural) beliefs of the party members. In any political discourse, specific values, perspectives and positions are expressed vis-à-vis a problem, event or point of discussion (Van Dijk 22-23). Discourse as such, always functions as carrier of (implicit) ideology and assumptions.

The American political system is largely divided by two competing worldviews – represented by the Republicans on the one hand and the Democrats on the other hand. The Republican discourse invokes the idea of a strict father figure who disciplines and punishes in the best interest of his child. In this ideology, strict rules should keep the child on the right track. Republican rhetoric typically emphasizes individual responsibility and the benefits of limited influence by the federal government for domestic threats (Iyengar 1). The opposing view – held mostly by Democrats and progressive politicians – can be compared to a nurturing and protective parent who tries to guide a child in its development. In political terms, this view calls for strong social security policies and a large responsibility for the federal government in the successful development of its citizens (Iyengar 1). Drawing on these ideologies, politicians will determine how certain social problems are dealt with and how federal funds are allocated.

The President, as the Head of State and the Head of Government, holds one of the most powerful positions for determining which social problems will become major political issues. As William N. Elwood has argued, presidential speeches play a crucial part in this process of presidential definition (94-95). The use of specific phrases, distinct combinations of words or figures of speech can shape the public perception of the problem. Through clear and clever rhetoric, a President as such can set the agenda for political and social debate (Johnson, Wanta and Boudreau 181).

Throughout this chapter, a corpus of 34 presidential speeches will be discussed to map the most prevalent narratives on drug use and drug criminality in the period between 1968 and 2004. All speeches were retrieved from the online database of the Miller Center facilitated by the University of Virginia. The number of analyzed speeches in this analysis is the direct result of a specific search for recorded speeches that included the term ‘drugs’ and/or ‘narcotics’. After this initial search, all speeches that discussed drugs and narcotics within the context of prescription

drugs and legalized use for health care purposes were filtered out. The speeches were delivered by seven different Presidents of the United States (mentioned in chronological order, followed by the number of speeches concerning 'drugs' and/or 'narcotics' delivered in between brackets): Lyndon B. Johnson (1), Richard Nixon (1), Gerald Ford (2), Ronald Reagan (5), George H.W. Bush (9), Bill Clinton (13) and George W. Bush (3). As can be quickly noticed, the broad majority of the 34 speeches within this analysis were delivered between 1986 and 2004, with a peak during the Reagan presidency, the George H.W. Bush (for the sake of clarity henceforth referred to as Bush Sr.) presidency and the Clinton presidency.

Out of all speeches in the corpus, eighteen were a so-called 'State of the Union Address'. In State of the Union Addresses, Presidents offer a reflection on legislative successes and introduce new policy priorities. These annual speeches provide Presidents with a unique podium to capture the attention of Congress as well as the general public and the media, all at once (Shogan and Neale 1). The high number of references in State of the Union Addresses confirms that the discussion of illegal drugs and related domestic policymaking was prioritized by various Presidents on their respective political agendas. Whereas Presidents Johnson, Nixon and Ford all only referred to drugs in one of their State of the Union Addresses, the topic was included in nearly every State of the Union Address since 1986. Particularly between 1986 and 1996, Presidents Reagan, Bush Sr. and Clinton – in his first term – dedicated lengthy passages to this problem. After 1996, the weight placed on this issue slowly faded. Presidents Bill Clinton – in his second term – and George W. Bush did not extensively discuss the drug problem anymore, but instead briefly reminded the Congress and the American people that a "deadly cycle of drugs and crime" (Clinton, 1999 "State of the Union Address") still had to be broken. Colleen J. Shogan and Thomas H. Neale, however, have concluded that even such brief, yet substantive arguments lead to an increase of public attention to the issue (10).

By placing emphasis on the recurrent themes of legislation and responsibility in all 34 speeches, this chapter will argue that the overarching political discourse of the War on Drugs is built upon a clear dichotomy of victimhood and villainy rooted in race and class disparities. The sections below will discuss how individual presidents have dealt with these themes in their speeches and debates on drug abuse and drug criminality. The aim of this chapter is to lay out the key developments in presidential rhetoric that shaped the political War on Drugs discourse throughout the decades. To clarify the arguments provided, the most salient examples from

specific speeches and debates will be discussed in more detail. During the analysis, the emphasis has been placed on the use of metaphorical references to waging a war on drugs and crime that runs through all speeches as a common thread. At the end of the chapter, a brief overview will be provided that connects the central themes in this discourse analysis and highlights the key elements of the political discourse of the War on Drugs between 1968 and 2004.

4.1 Legislation

In the analyzed speeches and debates, there is a strong emphasis on the importance of getting tough and strict legislation passed through Congress. Many Presidents have applied a straightforward approach by directly linking drugs and crime, and presenting it as a threat to the American ideal and the well-being of the nation. In the late 1960s – when domestic policies were still much more focused on lowering crime rates rather than illegal drug practices – Lyndon B. Johnson paved the way for his successors by advocating for the passage of the Drug Control Act in his 1968 "State of the Union Address". According to Johnson, this piece of legislation was needed to "protect the individual rights of every citizen" (1968 "State of the Union Address"). In the years that followed, the protection of fundamental civil rights became a popular way of justifying new crime and drug policies. Strict law enforcement and tough crime bills were framed as "key to building a better America" (Bush Sr., "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the End of the Gulf War"). In particular, during the late 1980s and the 1990s, Presidents Reagan, Bush Sr., and Clinton advocated in favor of tough sentencing laws for people who were involved in drug trafficking and drug abuse. Throughout their campaigns, they constructed a narrative built upon the shared premise that "drug abuse is a repudiation of everything America is" (Reagan, "Speech to the Nation on the National Campaign against Drug Abuse") and that drugs "shake the foundations of all that we know and all that we believe in" (Reagan, "Speech to the Nation on the National Campaign against Drug Abuse"). In 1996, President Clinton emphasized that to remain "the strongest force for peace and freedom on Earth", tough crime bills had to be supported and the "three strikes and you're out" needed to become a nationwide standard ("Remarks at the Democratic National Convention").

To exercise power over the debate on drug abuse, many Presidents constructed distinct images of 'good' and 'bad' citizenship. In numerous speeches and debates, they have told (brief) stories of "hopelessness" (Bush, 2003 "State of the Union Address") experienced by drug addicts

and their families and friends. Involvement with drugs has also been frequently linked to more abstract ideas such as limitations of personal freedom and national progress. The abstract nature of these terms is important to take into consideration because such vague definitions provided space for personal interpretation within the confines of the provided presidential definition. By juxtaposing drugs and violent crime with positive terms "like love and hope and trust and confidence" (Reagan, "Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse"), the terms of 'good' and 'bad' lives have been defined.

Presidents have also explicitly made use of binary oppositions to frame drugs as a bad influence to the American people. President Clinton, for instance, linked "violence and drug and gangs" with a "loss of values" in his 1994 "State of the Union Address". He defined the particular values that he deemed lost, making the argument that drug abuse goes hand in hand with the "disappearance of work" (Clinton, 1994 "State of the Union Address") and the "breakdown of our families and our communities" (Clinton, 1994 "State of the Union Address"). Binary oppositions were also used to define why drugs were 'bad' for the nation at large. Within this context, violent crime and drug abuse were often defined as the opposite of "domestic tranquility" (Ford, 1976 "State of the Union Address") and as a threat to "national peace" (Clinton, 1994 "State of the Union Address"). These examples illustrate how several Presidents have contributed to the inherent link between drugs and 'bad' citizenship.

4.1.1 War and Illness Metaphors

To ensure a hegemonic position in the political domain, it is crucial for Presidents to present their narrative as the most reasonable and fair solution. Combined with cleverly constructed images of 'bad' and 'good', metaphorical words and phrases can play a crucial role in this process of legitimatization. Metaphors are powerful tools for speakers to connect with listeners on an emotional level as well as provide them with crucial information and offer a certain perspective on the issue at stake (Elwood 95). The political War on Drugs discourse is particularly defined by the use of war and illness metaphors. Looking at the way that these two metaphors have been used throughout the decades offers an interesting perspective on constructed images of villainy and victimhood in the War on Drugs discourse.

During the twentieth century, American presidents frequently used the war metaphor to frame social issues. In his 1970 "State of the Union Address", President Richard Nixon argued

that “the word ‘war’ has perhaps too often been used – the war on poverty, the war on misery, the war on disease, the war on hunger” and as such had lost its power when new domestic problems needed to be solved. Merely two decades later, however, the war metaphor again became a popular term in the political domain. In the so-called War on Drugs, politicians appointed an evil enemy – illicit drugs and narcotics – that needed to be defeated (Elwood 96). Although the term War on Drugs implicates that drugs posed a growing threat to the American nation, drug-related crime was in fact declining when this term was introduced in the political discourse (Alexander 6-7). As Alexander has convincingly argued, drug crime merely served as the initial pretense to increase policing in poor inner-city neighborhoods (4-7). Although the term War on Drugs suggests otherwise, this illustrates that the primary targets of this metaphorical war were the American people who lived at the margins of society. Whereas the political promise of the War on Drugs was thus to provide a forceful answer to a rise in drug crime, the ‘solution’ and political attention to this social crisis in fact preceded the problem itself.

To defend legislative decisions, the war metaphor has proved particularly valuable to several Presidents. In his 1988 “State of the Union Address”, President Reagan for instance, referred to the War on Drugs as a “battle, a crusade with many heroes”. The term ‘crusade’ cleverly combined the idea of waging a war with the religious footprint in American heritage. In 1989, President Bush Sr. argued that only “a new attack on organized crime” (“Address before a Joint Session of Congress”) would suffice. In his 1991 “State of the Union Address”, President Bush Sr. directly linked the war metaphor to policymaking as he proudly declared that his administration had implemented a “national strategy for combating drug abuse”. By using terms that originally are linked to warfare, a sense of urgency is established as a threat to the nation and the American people that must be defeated. Constructing and attacking a common ‘enemy’ through such presidential rhetoric unites rather than divides the electorate and as such it will generate consent for legislative measures.

Besides presenting legislation as the key to winning the fight against this evil other called ‘drugs’, another key narrative can be distinguished that shapes the political discourse. Looking at the way that crime bills and sentencing policies are discussed in the speeches and debates, there is also a strong call to interpret legislation as the cure to “the scourge of drugs” (Reagan, “Farewell Address at the Republican National Convention”). The use of this metaphorical reference to illness did not only provide Congress and the American people with a frame to

interpret the danger of drugs itself in. By labelling drugs as “a deadly bacteria” (Bush Sr., “Inaugural Address”), a “scourge” (Reagan, 1987 “State of the Union Address”) and “an uncontrolled fire” (Reagan, “Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse”), Presidents Bush Sr. and Reagan linked their rhetoric to abstract images of drugs as a contagious substance and threat as well. Although they did not link these terms directly to the users, symbolic and abstract terms like these can add to a stigmatized view on drug users as villains and threats to law abiding citizens. Such connotations exclude the possibility of victimhood for drug users.

4.2 Responsibility

In order to properly deconstruct the War on Drugs discourse prevalent in the presidential speeches and debates in this analysis, it is important to also look beyond the theme of legislation. As will be illustrated in this section, the question of responsibility forms another key theme in these texts that provides valuable insights into the role that stereotyping and marginalization play in this complex political debate. Generally speaking, it is the Republican ethos of strong personal responsibility that prevails in the presidential narratives constructed around taking responsibility for domestic social issues such as the drug problem. The primary responsibility for solving drug abuse is as such commonly placed with local and state governments, supported by the moral decision making of the American people. In principle, the role of the federal government is limited in “crimes that affect individuals” (Nixon, “State of the Union Address”). According to President Nixon, the drug problem however proves a special case: “[…] in the field of organized crime, narcotics, pornography, the federal government has a special responsibility it should fulfill” (“State of the Union Address”). In his statement, President Nixon explicitly linked drugs with other examples of what he considers to be immoral things in life, such as pornography. In 1986, President Reagan reinforced Nixon’s statement and called upon “a combination of government and private efforts which complement one another” (“Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse”). Perhaps most significant is the continuation of this call for personal responsibility by Democratic President Clinton. In his 1996 “State of the Union Address”, President Clinton – despite of being a Democrat – stressed that it is in the hands of the public to remove the bad seeds from their communities, while federal institutions take on the

challenge of dealing with the suppliers. These calls for shared efforts, however, proved to be mostly symbolic measures.

Throughout the decades, the federal government placed the primary responsibility for solving the problematic relationship with drugs and crime in the hands of the people. Parents should be more attentive to their children, teenagers should resist the temptations of alcohol and drugs, and the American people, in general, should look after each other more closely. The presence of drugs in the lives of many Americans is predominantly framed as an individual problem, with a solution that lies in honoring moral values and a change in personal attitudes. Perhaps the most memorable speech in this regard was delivered in 1986 by President Reagan and First Lady Nancy Reagan. In a joint address to the nation, they argued in favor of a "great, new national crusade" (Reagan, "Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drugs") on drugs. President Reagan and the First Lady delivered an emotional appeal to stand up against drugs. Nancy Reagan emphasized in her contribution to the speech that "there's no moral middle ground" ("Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drugs") in the fight against drug abuse. Only by saying no to drugs, she concluded, it is possible to "say yes to your life" ("Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drugs").

In the opening remarks of this speech, President Reagan highlighted that this joint address was not a typical Presidential speech, but rather an important message from one family to another: "[…] we speak to you not simply as fellow citizens but as fellow parents and grandparents and as concerned neighbors" ("Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drugs"). Throughout the speech, Nancy Reagan repeatedly voiced her motherly concerns about the damage that drugs do to the nation and specifically to children: "[…] there's a drug and alcohol abuse epidemic in this country, and no one is safe from it – not you, not me, and certainly not our children, because this epidemic has their names written on it" ("Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse"). Her emotional appeal was complemented by several stories of (young) people that had overcome drug addiction to illustrate the importance of taking one's responsibility towards solving the problem. After Nancy's contribution, President Reagan announced a series of tougher laws and new initiatives that were meant to support the American people in their personal crusades against drugs. It can be argued that the particular approach of this "Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse" fits neatly within the larger Republican political discourse. Nancy Reagan provided a strong narrative that urged

every American to "set forth solid standards and stick to them" ("Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse"). President Reagan – as the father of the nation – in turn, stepped up by calling for stricter laws to protect the American people from this "form of tyranny" ("Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse") called drugs.

Whereas every American must express "an outspoken intolerance for drug use" (Reagan, "Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse"), Presidents tend to (disproportionately) frame specific social and racial groups as scapegoats in the political War on Drugs discourse. After a close reading of the speeches and debates, it can be concluded that particularly teenagers and young adults are blamed for the high demand for drugs and the persistence of violent crime. Although President Reagan, for instance, opens his "Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse" by saying that "drug and alcohol abuse cuts across all generations", it is just moments later that he identifies the age group 18 to 25 – "most likely just entering the workforce" – as regular drug users who are involved in "a new epidemic: smokable cocaine, otherwise known as crack". Similarly, in his 1994 "State of the Union Address", Clinton linked drug and crime problems to young people living in the "toughest neighborhoods, on [the] meanest streets, in [the] poorest rural areas". Another direct targeting strategy can be found in President Clinton's 1995 "Address on Race Relations". Where most of his predecessors addressed the inclusive American family and refrained from calling on a specific social or racial group, Clinton directly addressed the African American community:

> Thirty years ago, the marchers were demanding the dignity and opportunity they were due because in the face of terrible discrimination, they had worked hard, raised their children, paid their taxes, obeyed the laws, and fought our wars. Well, today's march is also about pride and dignity and respect. But after a generation of deepening social problems that disproportionately impact black Americans, it is also about black men taking responsibility for themselves, their families, and their communities. It's about saying no to crime and drugs and violence. It's about standing up for atonement and reconciliation. It's about insisting that others do the same and offering to help them.
>
> – "Address on Race Relations"

In his speech, Clinton acknowledged the marginalization of African Americans in earlier decades

and expressed his appreciation for “black men taking responsibility for themselves, their families, and their communities” (“Address on Race Relations”). Although this excerpt on its own would suggest that President Clinton recognized a disproportionate impact of social problems in the daily lives of black Americans, he continued his speech with a provocative and stigmatizing statement:

> On the other hand, blacks must understand and acknowledge the roots of white fear in America. There is a legitimate fear of the violence that is too prevalent in our urban areas. And often, by experience or at least what people see on the news at night, violence for those white people too often has a black face.
>
> – “Address on Race Relations”

These two contradictory statements shape a disparate narrative on responsibility for the crime and drug problem within the African American community. The black community as a whole is burdened with the actions of their ‘bad seeds’. In addition, the fear experienced by white people is presented as a collective experience, victimizing white urbanites. The stereotypical image – portrayed by news outlets – that “violence […] too often has a black face” (Clinton, “Address on Race Relations”) – is reinforced by Clinton’s remark on legitimate fear.

As has been illustrated throughout this chapter, many different elements of a political speech taken together can dictate how social issues are discussed. The collectively constructed image of villainy in the 34 case studies outlines the social environment in which drug crimes presumably most frequently take place. Whereas Presidents Johnson and Ford in the late 1960s and mid-1970s still largely framed the drug problem as something that needed to be faced by the users themselves, Presidents Reagan, Bush Sr. and Clinton took a different turn during the 1980s and 1990s. In the second half of the 1980s, Reagan predominantly discussed drugs as a threat to the well-being of children and youngsters. In a shared crusade with his wife Nancy, he campaigned for individual responsibility to prevent more victims of drug addiction. Whereas Reagan still framed users of drug as victims, Bush Sr. moved away from this perspective in the late 1980s and the early 1990s. In his speeches and debates, drugs were always inherently linked to criminality. President Bush Sr.’s punitive rhetoric was furthered by his successor. From 1993 till 2000, Clinton defined drugs as a cumulative problem. He consistently linked drugs with

violent crime, street gangs and poverty. After Clinton's presidency, this rhetoric largely ebbed away.

Overall, predominantly Presidents Reagan and Clinton have defined the social identity of drug users as poor, young Americans who are most likely living on welfare support. This oversimplified framing of the black community as drug abusers creates a marginalized position in society for African Americans who are not involved in drug abuse and drug criminality. By juxtaposing drug abuse and drug criminality with American culture, morals and values, a hegemonic position for this political view is solicited. It is presented as the most appropriate, just and natural solution to the domestic crisis. Overall, the constructed War on Drugs discourse outlines which citizens should be supported by society and which citizens must be relocated to the margins of society by 'tough' legislation.

5. Intersectional Analysis of *Oz*

In 1997, cable provider HBO released a prison drama series that became widely known for its uncompromising use of explicit language and depiction of graphic content. *Oz* was the first original drama series that was commissioned by cable provider HBO. According to the writer of *Oz*, Tom Fontana, the aim of this prison drama series was to give a face and a voice to a share of the U.S. population that "deserves more recognition and attention than it gets by most of us on the outside" (Nelson 35).

By combining provocative visuals – for instance of prisoner rape – with narrative depth, *Oz* played a large role in setting new standards for television programming aimed at niche audiences who were willing to pay for non-regulated and challenging content. When the first episode of *Oz* aired in 1997, the gross majority of television programming in America was still produced by the Big Three television networks ABC, CBS and NBC. These networks followed the principle of the least objectionable programming. Due to FCC (Federal Communications Commission) regulations and advertisement revenues, provocative content was avoided at all costs. As a cable provider – where audiences pay to get access to the programming – HBO did not have to abide to the rules set by the FCC. Therefore, HBO could move away from the conservative approach to television making and create a unique prison drama series.

The intersectional analysis provided in this chapter is limited to the first season of *Oz*. The central focus of the analysis is the show's representation of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners. Throughout this chapter, I will argue that the overall representation of drug criminality and drug criminals in *Oz* reinforces the constructed images of villainy and victimhood in the political discourse as discussed in the previous chapter. The explicit and implicit links between the African American prison population, drugs and violence show that *Oz* largely reproduces and solidifies the hegemonic political narrative. Although the extradiegetic narration by inmate Augustus Hill at times challenges political policies and social practices that shape the U.S prison system and the War on Drugs, it does not outweigh the stereotypical representation in the diegetic story. To provide context to this chapter's discussion, I will first provide some general information and clarifying remarks on the plot and setting of the show.

5.1 Plot and Setting

Throughout the six seasons of *Oz*, a group of prisoners and staff members inside the walls of the

fictional Oswald Maximum Security Penitentiary (henceforth shortened to 'Oz') is followed in their daily routines. In 'Oz', Tim McManus (Terry Kinney) runs an experimental unit based on the liberal idea that rehabilitation is a more productive answer to criminality than harsh punishment and public retribution. As becomes clear in the opening scene of the show, each time that a new group of inmates arrives, McManus gets to choose which prisoners will participate in his experiment and who of them will be serving their time in 'Gen-Pop' (general population). The prisoners in 'Emerald City' – as the experimental unit is called – are convicted for crimes that range from assault and vehicular manslaughter to drug crimes and (conspiracy for) murder. McManus's aim is to rehabilitate these convicted criminals during their time in prison so that most of them can become productive members of society again if they are released. Although this rehabilitative idea seems to contradict the punitive logic of the War on Drugs sentencing policies, there is in fact a strong connection to the political War on Drugs discourse. Regardless of the crime they committed and the socio-economic circumstances that drove them to get involved in criminal activity, the prisoners are framed as troublemakers who need to be pushed back in line by the authorities. Inside 'Emerald City', prisoners are given relatively much freedom and control, under the conditions that they follow a given set of rules and that they actively work on improving their self-discipline. McManus's experiment as such indirectly implies that the inmates have ended up in prison due to behavioral problems rather than as a result of the structural disadvantages many of them face outside of prison. The inmates in 'Emerald City' serve as examples of citizens who were unable to say no to drugs and criminal activity. The focus on rehabilitation suggests that 'Emerald City' functions as a constructive learning environment where the lack of self-discipline and responsibility of the inmates can be fixed. In this controlled environment, inmates are supposed to learn how to become responsible members of society after having served their time in prison.

In the show's first season, the audience follows the experiences of the newly arrived inmate Tobias Beecher (Lee Tergesen). During his time in 'Emerald City', Beecher is confronted with the harsh reality of life inside the U.S. prison system. As soon becomes clear, Beecher's experiences are shaped by a complex power struggle between the different social groups in 'Emerald City'. Throughout the first season, the rights and privileges of the inmates are increasingly limited because of new state and federal policies. During the season finale, in episode eight, a riot unfolds. This unfolding of the plot suggests that the inmates are incapable of

changing their problematic behavior. They are represented as beastlike criminals who seize the first real opportunity they get to return to their violent, criminal ways. This turn of events supports and legitimizes a retributive U.S. prison system and reinforces the images constructed in the political War on Drugs of (drug) criminals as a threat to the nation.

Although there is no mention of the exact state in which 'Oz' is located, there is clarity about the time in which the story takes place. Through the metacommentary provided by inmate Augustus Hill (Harold Perrineau), it becomes clear that *Oz*'s diegetic story is set during the same time as it was aired. The majority of inmates are convicted during the mid- and late 1990s. Hill himself for instance, was convicted to life in prison – up for parole in twenty years – on November 6, 1995 for the possession of illegal substances and murder in the second degree. Jefferson Keane (Leon), in turn, was convicted on May 14, 1997 to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole for two counts murder in the first degree. Nino Schibetta (Tony Musante) was sent to prison for 120 years – up for parole in 70 years – based on two counts conspiracy to commit murder. It can be argued that the long sentences that these men have to serve are partly the result of their racial and social identities. Hill and Keane are both from the African American community. Schibetta, in turn, is an older Italian American. Given the long sentences these men have to serve – or the time they have left until they are eligible for parole – it is striking that young, white inmate Ryan O'Reily (Dean Winters) faces life imprisonment with the possibility of parole in 'only' twelve years. Compared to the crimes the other inmates are convicted of, O'Reily's list of criminal activity is far more extensive. He is convicted for two counts vehicular manslaughter, five counts reckless endangerment, possession of controlled substances, criminal possession of a weapon and parole violations on July 12, 1997. It must be noted that O'Reily also is a repeat offender, illustrating that he has not changed his bad ways after his prior sentence. In the political War on Drugs discourse, there was a strong call for tougher legislation to keep violent criminals and repeat offenders off the streets. Whereas O'Reily clearly poses a threat to society with his reckless and criminal behavior, he is not punished as severely as his fellow inmates from minority groups. In *Oz*, there is little to no critical inquiry about the discrepancy between the constructed political narrative and the apparent institutional consequences of the War on Drugs and related sentencing policies. In his metacommentary, Hill merely presents the criminal records as dry facts.

Because of the significance of power structures and inequalities to this analysis, it is also relevant to reflect on the unique setting in which this narrative story unfolds. Contrary to the other units, the cells in 'Emerald City' are made up of glass walls (still 1). There is no privacy for the inmates. They are always in full sight of the officers and of each other. During the daytime, the prisoners work together in one of the prison factories and spend their time in the common 'living room', which is little more than a large open space with some tables, chairs and a TV corner. In the middle of 'Emerald City' – on an elevated level – there is a hexagonal control unit in which officers observe the prisoners 24 hours a day (still 2). This setting resembles Jeremy Bentham's design of the Panopticon. Similar to the Panopticon, 'Emerald City' can be defined as "a kind of laboratory of power" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 204). When applied to a penal institution, the Panopticon must be understood as a functional model that is aimed at "[inducing] in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 201). Connecting this theory to McManus's liberal vision of the prison system, it can be argued that the panoptical setting in 'Emerald City' is used to maintain the power inequality between the officers and the inmates, while the around-the-clock surveillance simultaneously stimulates the prisoners' self-discipline (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 205-207). The following section will further elaborate on the complex structures of power that shape the prisoners' experiences in 'Emerald City'.

Still 1: All cell blocks have glass walls that take away any form of privacy the prisoners have in 'Emerald City' (*Oz*, S01E01).

Still 2: The setting of 'Emerald City' resembles Bentham's design of the Panopticon. From the control unit, prisoners can always be observed, whenever they are in the common area or in their glass cells (*Oz*, S01E06).

5.2 Prisoner Hierarchy and Social Control

In *Oz*, there are multiple divisions of power. Among the prisoners, the hierarchical structure can

be defined as simple and complex at the same time. In ‘Emerald City’, several social groups are formed based on race, religion, sexuality or other forms of like-mindedness. Each of these groups has a certain degree of power over the others, whether they run the kitchen or control the drug trade. Throughout the first season, it becomes clear that control over the drug trade inside ‘Emerald City’ is understood among the prisoners as the most powerful position. The group that runs the smuggling and distribution of the so-called ‘tits’ has overall control. Simply put, they possess something that all other gangs want. Whether it is putting an end to drug use such as the Muslims and the Aryan Brotherhood strive for, or whether a group is dependent on drugs to come in due to large-scale addiction such as is the case with the Homeboys (African Americans), the Latinos and the Gangbangers (homosexuals and transvestites). During the majority of season one, the Italians led by Nino Schibetta, run the drug trade. Their main clients are the Homeboys, whose leader Adebisi (Adewale Akinnuoye-Agbaje) continuously tries to take over the control so that his gang is no longer dependent on the Italians for their drug supply. At the beginning of episode five, McManus confronts Nino Schibetta with the diminishing power of the Italians:

> The last couple of weeks have been tough on you, Nino. Your wife dying, Dino murdered, Joey D’Angelo out of commission. Overall, your troops, they’re thinning. They’re getting older, they’re more anaemic. Now, the blacks and Latinos are taking over, on the street and in here. So we gotta face it, the days of the Mafia are over. – *Oz*, S01E05

During this conversation, McManus offers the leader of the Italian gang a chance to make a deal with a DEA officer. McManus hopes this will put a halt to drug-related violence and murders in ‘Emerald City’. Because Schibetta does not give in to the offered deal, McManus transfers all Italians but Schibetta out of ‘Emerald City’. By doing so, McManus hopes that Schibetta can no longer run his drug operation and that consequently, the drug problem will disappear. Instead, two other gang leaders, Adebisi and O’Reily, join forces and successfully take over from Schibetta. Adebisi becomes the new leader in charge of the drug trade. During the riot in the season finale, Adebisi and his gang members eventually go crazy because they have no more supply of heroin. At this point, their own strength has become their weakness. The unfolding of this power struggle in favor of the Homeboys, combined with McManus’s remark that “the

blacks and Latinos are taking over, on the street and in here" (*Oz*, S01E05) reinforces the political narrative that the core of the drug problem lies in the hands of the black community. Although the Homeboys are far from the only regular drug users inside 'Emerald City', they are the only ones who visibly go through withdrawal when the supply of heroin dries up during the riot. These diegetic, narrative events identify African Americans both as fanatic users and as distributors.

Besides their position vis-à-vis each other, there is also a clear hierarchy within the groups themselves. Each gang has a leader, who is respected by the others in the group and decides what the members can and cannot do. The leaders are all very masculine characters. They are strong and resolute and show little emotion or remorse for their actions. Kareem Said (Eamonn Walker) is the leader of the Muslims, Nino Schibetta runs the group of Italians (also known as the Wiseguys), Miguel Alvarez (Kirk Acevedo) leads the Latinos, Ryan O'Reily speaks for the Irish and Verne Schillinger (J.K. Simmons) is in control of the Aryan Brotherhood. The African American gang – The Homeboys – are initially led by Jefferson Keane but after his death in episode six, Simon Adebisi takes over his position. Not only do the prison gang leaders control their fellow inmates, they also serve as a link between McManus and the prisoners. McManus is very aware that these men hold powerful positions in 'Emerald City'. Because the continuation of McManus' experiment partially relies on keeping violence numbers low, he shows the leaders a certain level of respect. In return, the leaders keep their gangs in line.

Several inmates such as Tobias Beecher, Bob Rebadow and Augustus Hill are not included in one of the abovementioned groups. For all sorts of reasons, they are not accepted into one of the existing gangs in 'Emerald City'. As a result, they end up on the bottom of the prison hierarchy. Augustus Hill for instance, is not included as a member of the African American Homeboys. Because the Homeboys are all about being tough and intimidating, Hill is excluded. Because Hill is bound to a wheelchair, fellow inmates often see him as weak. Other groups don't allow Hill in, because of the color of his skin. Hill's intersectional identity frames him as an outlier to the rest of the prison population. Comparable to Hill, Tobias Beecher is also discriminated by fellow inmates. Especially in the opening scenes of the show, it is stressed that others in prison do not approve of Beecher due to his social status outside of prison and his privileged class background. When four new prisoners arrive in the Oswald Maximum Security Penitentiary, Beecher's appearance already creates a gap between him and the rest of the prison

population. With a business suit, a clean-shaven face and big glasses, Beecher looks anything but streetwise. Throughout the first episode, several scenes indicate that Beecher has good manners and until recently lived a quiet middle class life. Upon introduction to his sponsor – a fellow inmate who is supposed to guide Beecher through the first days in 'Emerald City' – Beecher reaches out for a handshake, but Dino Ortolani (Jon Seda) is not impressed and continues smoking his cigarette. After a brief glance at Beecher, he makes a judgment call: "Beecher, huh? […] What're you in for? Shaving strokes off your golf score?" (*Oz*, S01E01). Beecher's appearance clearly does not match with Ortolani's image of a fellow criminal. Throughout the first season, also some staff members stress that Beecher does not match their profile of a criminal. In the second episode, for instance, Officer Diane Whittlesey (Edie Falco) comes to check up on Beecher because he hasn't left his cell for 2 days after his cellmate Schillinger branded a swastika on his behind. Talking to Beecher, she says that "prison is a rough environment for anyone, but a man like you […]" (*Oz*, S01E02). Whittlesey's suggestive remark confirms that even staff members do not identify Beecher as the stereotypical criminal. This framing matches the positioning of the white middle class at the opposite end of criminality in the political War on Drugs discourse.

During his stay in 'Emerald City', Beecher experiences an enormous personality change. Upon arrival in 'Emerald City', Beecher is visibly overwhelmed by all the impressions and confusion. Through clever use of camera work, the audience can relate to the emotional rollercoaster that Beecher goes through. The first scene in 'Emerald City' starts with a medium close up of an obviously scared Beecher holding tight to his belongings in front of the entrance gate (still 3). The fast tracking shot backward that follows makes Beecher appear smaller and smaller until he isn't visible anymore. This shot literally reduces Beecher to nothing inside 'Emerald City', something which later on also

Still 3: Beecher holds on tight to his belongings before entering 'Emerald City' (*Oz*, S01E01).

Still 4: Beecher is overwhelmed by his first impression of 'Emerald City' (*Oz*, S01E01).

figuratively speaking happens to Beecher on a social level. After a close up of Beecher's shocked face (still 4), lots of swift camera movements create confusion on where to look. The blurry impressions, caused by the use of swish pan shots, emphasize Beecher's feeling of alienation to this place. The scene ends with a close up of Beecher's face, showing that he – literally – has to swallow to take everything in. Beecher soon learns that his social status as a middle class lawyer does little favor to him inside 'Oz'. His profession and formerly privileged social position (outside of prison) both work against him. In prison, a different worldview defines the norm. Throughout the first season, Beecher as such continuously needs to negotiate his prison identity in order to survive. From a seemingly innocent, timid, middle class lawyer he develops into a reckless and violent drug addict with queer traits. His initial identity as a middle class lawyer made him very vulnerable in the first half of the season. During his time in prison, Beecher starts to behave more and more like an aggressive and irrational beast. It is this changed version of Beecher who earns the respect of influential groups such as the Homeboys.

It can be concluded that by spending time in prison among violent, predatory criminals, Beecher becomes a version of himself that he never has been before. Instead of changing his behavior for the better and overcome his alcohol addiction, he turns to drugs and becomes increasingly violent. In 'Emerald City', he is time and again tempted by the omnipresence of drugs, to which he eventually can no longer say no. Beecher's transformation reinforces the political message that drugs are a threat to anyone, regardless of your social position or class status in society. It is also striking that it is in particular this violent, addicted version of Beecher – who has lost his good morals and values and who has failed to take his responsibility to turn away from drugs – who earns the respect of the Homeboys. Whereas the African American inmates initially did not want anything to do with Beecher, they more and more accept him as he gets violent and starts to rely on drugs. Beecher's development as such indirectly links drug abuse and violent behavior back to young, African American men. It suggests that the African American inmates understand this criminalized and dangerous behavior as more desirable than the timid and shy version of Beecher.

5.3 Extradiegetic Criticism

In the sections above it has been discussed how several key developments in the plot and character representations position *Oz* as a cultural text which reinforces the dominant political

discourse on drugs criminality and drug criminals. In one of those sections, it has already been briefly mentioned that inmate Augustus Hill does not belong to one of the main gangs in 'Emerald City'. Although Hill does not actively partake in the diegetic story, he fulfills a crucial role in the greater storyline of *Oz*. The extradiegetic metacommentary delivered by Hill provides valuable insight into *Oz*'s representation of the U.S. prison system.

One of the most significant elements of Hill's meta-commentary is the use of direct address. During his extradiegetic features, Hill directly looks into the camera with eyes almost piercing through the screen (still 5). This documentary-like style of narration is very unconventional for a popular drama series. The use of direct address goes against the cinematic convention of ignoring the presence of the camera. Breaking the so-called fourth wall can be done to create a sense of intimacy with the audience of an audiovisual text. This intimacy can be experienced either as intimidating or as increasing sympathy among the audience (Brown 13). In *Oz*, breaking the fourth wall arguably invites the audience to actively think about the political and social environment that the diegetic story is set in. Given the topics addressed, it can be assumed that any critical commentary and philosophical reflections voiced by Hill are directed at the politics and society of the 1980s and 1990s. At times, the provided metacommentary is very sharp and to the point, directly questioning the righteousness of political policies:

Still 5: During his metacommentary, Hill breaks the fourth wall and directly addresses the camera/audience (*Oz*, S10E05).

> Over 3,000 men and women are sitting on death row right now. Congress has denied state inmates access to federal courts. Congress has also eliminated financing to law officers for death row appeals. The states themselves are shortening the appeals process. In this country, there's now one execution every single week. There were more executions this year than any time since the '50s. And we all know how righteous the '50s were.
>
> – Augustus Hill (*Oz*, S01E04)

In statements such as the above, the metacommentary holds up a mirror to the audience. By confronting the audience with the consequences of Congressional and state legislation on the death penalty and the cruelty of the U.S. prison system, Hill fulfills the aim of the show's writer Fontana. He gives a voice to the men and women on death row, who can't speak for themselves. In episode six, the metacommentator also focuses on the long-term effects of the tough-on-crime policies that result in more life imprisonments (without the possibility of parole) and longer sentences overall:

> Six percent of the total prison population is 55 and older. That's double 10 years ago. And we say 55 is old, because criminal life adds around ten years' worth of wrinkles. Still, in *Oz*, you get decent food, exercise, regular checkups. And if you don't get whacked, you'll live longer than you would in your own hood. Yeah, the prison system. It can keep you alive, but it can't take care of you. – Augustus Hill (*Oz*, S01E06)

By including statistical comparisons such as the one above on elderly inmates, Hill again invites the audience to rethink whether the current practices in the U.S. prison system are the most effective in the long term. During each episode, the metacommentary position functions as a key link between the fictional events and experiences in 'Emerald City' and the everyday realities of the U.S. prison system. A critical note must however be placed on Hill's position as narrator in this show. It is striking that the most critical perspective of the series is told by a character who is placed at the very bottom of the prison hierarchy. The psychedelic music and surreal settings (still 6, still 7) in which Hill delivers

Still 6: Extradiegetic narrator Hill is placed in a surreal setting, devaluating the serious criticism he delivers to the audience (*Oz*, S01E05).

Still 7: During many of the addresses, Hill sits in a turning glass cage that hangs above the common area in 'Emerald City' (*Oz*, S01E03).

his addresses largely overshadow the serious tone and the weight of the message to the audience.

It can as such be concluded that whereas *Oz* made some inroads to criticize the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs, the show has not radically challenged the images of villainy and victimhood constructed in the political War on Drugs discourse. The white middle class lead character Tobias Beecher is, regardless of the fact that he himself turned to drugs, represented as a victim of the situation. Beecher's turn to violence is largely overshadowed by the respect that he earn with this move among his fellow prisoners, in particular the African American inmates. As such, the diegetic storyline has reinforced the political narrative that drugs and crime can pose a threat to anyone. Moreover, the show has disproportionately framed the drug problem as a racial problem. Although McManus's rehabilitative experiment offered various possibilities to critically inquire the punitive turn in the U.S. criminal justice system, the only transcending commentary was delivered by an inmate without real authority and credibility. Overall, *Oz* has reinforced the political narrative that links drugs and violent crime to communities of color.

6. Intersectional Analysis of *Orange Is The New Black*

Similar to *Oz*, *Orange Is The New Black* (*OITNB*) is a prison drama series that offers its audience a glance of life inside a U.S. prison facility. Whereas the HBO production *Oz* solely focused on male inmates, this Netflix Original has represented life in a women's correctional facility. The show has received much critical acclaim since its release in July 2013. For the first season alone, the show received a total of twelve nominations for the 66th Primetime Emmy Awards, of which three were eventually won. *OITNB* was also listed as one of the top ten 'AFI Television Programs of the Year' by the American Film Institute in 2013. The narrative of the show is based on the memoirs of co-writer Piper Kerman. In *Orange Is The New Black: My Year in a Women's Prison* (2010), Kerman shared her own experiences at the minimum security prison FCI Danbury.

In the fictitious minimum security federal correctional facility Litchfield Penitentiary, the show's main character Piper Chapman (Taylor Schilling) largely follows the same path as *OITNB*'s co-writer Kerman. She has to complete a fifteen month sentence for her involvement in an international drug smuggling operation. Honoring the advice of her lawyer, Piper pleaded out to avoid a longer sentence when going to trial for felonious money laundering. In the first season of *OITNB*, the audience follows Piper as she is confronted with the harsh realities of life inside a U.S. prison facility.

What makes *OITNB* specifically interesting to this thesis's discussion, is its comprehensive representation of the (institutional) consequences of the War on Drugs. In the first episode ("I Wasn't Ready"), counselor Healy (Michael Harney) mentions to Piper that Litchfield Penitentiary "isn't *Oz*". Placing himself in the role of protective patriarch, Healy reassures her that "gossip and rumors" (*OITNB*, S01E01) are the only weapons that incarcerated women 'fight' with. With this intertextual reference to *Oz*, Healy assumes that Piper's view of prison life is – given her social background – most likely based on violent media representations of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners. As will be discussed throughout this chapter, *OITNB* represents how the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs have evolved since the late 1990s. Whereas *Oz* focused on the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs for men from social minorities, *OITNB* represents how mass incarceration in its current form also functions as a mechanism of social control in a wider context. This prison drama series highlights how various social inequalities, including those that reach beyond racial oppression, contribute to the

disproportionate incarceration of marginalized groups in society. In particular, *OITNB* represents how mass incarceration policies take a toll on marginalized women. It is important to take into account that whereas the majority of prisoners in the United States are male, the number of incarcerated women has significantly increased since the turn of the 21st century (Zaitow and Thomas vii). In the aftermath of the War on Drugs, a staggering 60 percent of the female prison population is convicted of a federal drug offense. The number of women that got charged for a violent crime steadily decreased during the same period (Chesney-Lind 84-86).

The tremendous increase in women's crime numbers, feminist criminologist Meda Chesney-Lind has argued, was spurred by the "worsening economic situation facing women on the economic margins" (86). Their disadvantaged social location – and corresponding poverty – not only triggered participation in illegal practices but these women also typically faced "a considerable disadvantage […] in plea negotiations" (Chesney-Lind 90). Because they typically hold lower ranks in the hierarchy of criminal organizations and thus have less valuable information to provide to the authorities after their arrest, women are less likely to successfully negotiate lower sentences (Chesney-Lind 90). Consequently, they serve longer sentences in prison compared to their male counterparts. In addition, as more and more women are incarcerated for longer periods of time, their sentence also affects those who remain outside of prison. This intergenerational effect predominantly affects children whose custodial parents are sent to prison (Western and Pettit 8). If no suitable relative is able or willing to care for these minors, they are placed in foster care. In some states, the children will eventually be placed for adoption and the incarcerated mothers will lose their parental rights (Mauer and Chesney-Lind 4). These examples illustrate that the experience of women with the U.S. criminal justice system is not easily comparable to that of male criminals (Bush-Baskette, Chesney-Lind, Golden, Lenox).

Over the past five years, scholars have used a range of different perspectives, such as (post-)feminism, (post-)racism, queer theory, social justice theory, and cultural criminology to discuss *OITNB*'s representation of incarcerated women and the U.S. criminal justice system. In particular, the show's representation of diversity has been widely discussed. According to Christina Belcher, *OITNB*'s representation of race and class diversity merely functions as a cover for the "endorsement of neoliberal individualism and an emphasis on personal responsibility" (494). Throughout the first three seasons, Belcher argues, the show "flattens and universalizes

the prison experience" (494). It fails to acknowledge how structural racism and inequalities are (still) embedded in today's neoliberal multicultural society and the prison system. Similar to Belcher's critique, Shannon O'Sullivan's intersectional analysis of criminality in *OITNB* concludes that the show places undue weight on individualized choices and lacks a productive critique of neoliberal logic (411). Furthermore, O'Sullivan argues, stereotypical understandings of race, class, gender, and sexuality are not sufficiently challenged due to the "legitimating lens of white, upper middle-class" (411) identity.

According to Suzanne M. Enck and Megan E. Morrissey, this perspective serves as an invitation to white middle class viewers to identify with the show's protagonist Piper. In their reading of *OITNB,* the overt display of whiteness and stereotyping takes place within a comic frame, which "encourages a level of engagement with post-racial critiques that might not otherwise occur" (Enck and Morrissey 314). Nonetheless, Enck and Morrissey also point out that this frame limits the show's potential for social critique. According to these two scholars, the show "is limited in its more microscopic focus on how individuals are hurt through incarceration" (Enck and Morrissey 313). As such, larger systems of inequality which "make mass incarceration function so efficiently within U.S. public culture" (Enck and Morrissey 313) remain underexplored in *OITNB.*

In this chapter, I will depart from these existing critiques of *OITNB.* Throughout the intersectional analysis, I will argue that this prison drama series in fact does invite its audience to revisit naturalized discriminatory social constructs and mass incarceration practices in contemporary U.S. society. Throughout this chapter, it will be discussed how this Netflix Original represents the experiences of women in prison with a clear focus on the impact of marginalization. The show offers a critical perspective on how the U.S. prison system is "racialized, gendered, classed and otherwise differentiated and experienced along well-known axes of social inequality (Jenness n. pag.). An intersectional analysis of the show's narrative and some of the most salient characters will illustrate how *OITNB* represents the presence of structural inequalities in the U.S. prison system. I will argue that the show provides a critical counternarrative to the hegemonic view constructed in the political War on Drugs discourse. In its first season, *OITNB* has challenged the dominant political narrative that points to drug criminality and drug abuse as the cause of social and cultural deterioration. The prison drama series as well criticizes the constructed reality in which drugs are linked to a specific ethnic or

social group.

6.1 Race and Class Identity

In her book *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*, Michelle Alexander argues that "while the size of the system alone might suggest that it would touch the lives of most Americans, the primary targets of its control can be defined largely race" (8). Alexander emphasizes that the male prison population is clearly divided along racial lines. The male prison population is made up of 32.3% whites and 67.7% non-whites (Tucker 137). Among the female prison population, this division is less extreme. In an article on the color of mass incarceration, Ronnie B. Tucker mentions that a total of 106,232 women were incarcerated in state and federal prisons at the end of 2014. Nearly half of this group were white women (49.9%). The other half of the female prison population was made up of African American inmates (21.3%), Hispanics/Latinas (16.8%) and women belonging to another racial group (12%). Although these numbers might suggest that whites and communities of color have been equally impacted by the War on Drugs, *OITNB* offers its audience a more comprehensive look into the lives of incarcerated women in a U.S. prison facility. By telling the story behind the numbers, *OITNB* depicts how the War on Drugs and its related policies structurally discriminate against those living at the margins of society. The show highlights that the great majority of the women incarcerated in the U.S. prison system face (permanent) social exclusion based on structural race and class discrimination.

In the first season of *OITNB*, race and class are important and recurrent themes. Many of the women incarcerated in Litchfield Penitentiary belong to marginalized social and racial groups. Their stories are a crucial component of the show's critique of the political War on Drugs discourse and mass incarceration of marginalized groups in society. The show emphasizes that although drug crimes are committed within every social sphere, turning away from drugs is not the same for everyone. The show highlights that the drug problem is held in place by social inequalities and systemic oppression. To follow Nancy Reagan's advice to 'just say no' to drugs and criminality – as upper middle class Piper eventually did when things got too scary for her – there has to be a safe environment to return to. For the majority of people who are involved with drugs, such a place simply does not exist. The backstories of the marginalized women incarcerated in Litchfield Penitentiary are meant to encourage the show's audience to think about

the stories behind the criminal activity these women got involved in. It conveys the message that – although presented as such in the political War on Drugs discourse - that drugs, most of the time, are not an isolated problem.

The personal narratives of Aleida (Elizabeth Rodriguez) and Dayanara (Dascha Polanco) Diaz, and Taystee Jefferson (Danielle Brooks) are clear examples of this critical inquiry of the political War on Drugs discourse. Their backstories make the audience aware of the fact that these women lack the agency to turn away from drugs. Their inability to say no to criminality and drugs is placed in a wider context to illustrate that for those at the periphery of society, taking personal responsibility is far more complicated than for those at the center. These backstories as such critically inquire the emphasis placed on personal responsibility in the political War on Drugs discourse.

In episode five ("The Chickening"), for instance, the story of Latina inmate Aleida Diaz and her daughter Dayanara Diaz is presented in a flashback. The Diaz family lives in a crowded, dilapidated apartment. Given this setting and their Hispanic roots, it can be assumed that this family belongs to the poor lower class. After Dayanara's father had left the family, Aleida got in a relationship with a man called Cesar (Berto Colon). As the flashback shows, Cesar is involved in criminal activities. He frequently uses the Diaz kitchen to prepare drugs. Aleida complies with the illegal business because she and her children are financially dependent on him. Also, Aleida is afraid to speak up to him. When Aleida asks Cesar how much longer he is planning to use the Diaz kitchen for his drug business, Cesar is clearly insulted. He replies to Aleida: "What, you don't like me anymore?" (*OITNB,* S01E05) and (sexually) intimidates her. Aleida's body language and facial expression reveal that she is scared by Cesar's response. Eventually, when Cesar's drug dealing business is discovered by the police, Aleida takes the fall and ends up in prison. After Aleida's incarceration, Dayanara becomes the primary caretaker of her siblings. A short time after her mother, she too ends up being arrested on drug charges. Both Aleida and Dayanara were sent to prison because they did not refuse Cesar's illegal practices in their house. The money earned from Cesar's drug business provided essential things such as protection, food, toys, and clothes to the Diaz family. The backstory of Aleida and Dayanara Diaz illustrates that drug criminality is held in place by a larger problem of social inequality and systems of oppression. In the case of the Diaz family, their disadvantaged socio-economic position –

originating from the intersection of gender, race and class inequalities – made them particularly vulnerable for men like Cesar.

Another compelling backstory that is introduced in the first season is that of inmate Tasha 'Taystee' Jefferson. In episode nine ("F*cksgiving"), Taystee gets an early release and confesses to her fellow inmate and good friend Poussey Washington (Samira Wiley) that she is afraid for life outside of prison:

Taystee:	"I'm scared."
Poussey:	"Nothing out there gonna be scarier than this shit."
Taystee:	"Shit, I been in institutions my whole life. I was a ward of the state till I was 16. Then juvie. I got no skills."
Miss Claudette:	"Well, no you're just lying. You've worked in that law library for two years. You know more than my public defender."
Taystee:	"Yeah, but out there, you need real school for that stuff. No one's gonna take me serious."

Although there are no flashbacks to Taystee's life outside prison shown in the first season, this conversation between Taystee, Poussey and Miss Claudette (Michelle Hurst) clearly illustrates that Taystee has been a victim of the so-called school to prison pipeline. The school to prison pipeline refers to a "growing pattern of tracking students out of educational institutions, primarily via 'zero tolerance' policies, and tracking them directly and/or indirectly into the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems" (Heitzeg 1). Especially among the youth of color, this problem is growing. Outside of prison, Taystee has always faced structural barriers to upward mobility. As a result of her intersectional identity, she never really got a chance to live a successful life and develop her full potential. From early childhood onwards, she has been governed by the welfare system.

Taystee's backstory provides a compelling critique of the U.S. prison system as it functions in the wake of the War on Drugs. Throughout the first season, Taystee is represented as an intelligent and capable young woman, who has a lot to offer to the outside world. Although Taystee has gained valuable work experience in the prison's law library, she will always be held back by the lack of a formal (high school) education when applying for a 'real' job. At Litchfield

Penitentiary, Taystee never got a chance to catch up on her education. Due to budgetary cuts, the GED program was 'temporarily' put on hold during her stay there. Taystee's story illustrates the problematic aspect of the tough sentencing laws introduced during the War on Drugs. Taystee's sentence did not make her a more productive member of society, but rather fueled the problems she already faced.

It furthermore shows to the general public that the stigma of the prison label will not easily wear off. Once you've been inside the prison system, it is very hard to get your life back on the right track. After her release in episode nine, Taystee already returns to Litchfield Penitentiary in episode twelve ("Fool Me Once") for a violation of her parole. In an argument with Poussey, Taystee brings up some of the challenges ex-felons with an underprivileged background face. For Taystee, the gap between prison and re-entry was insurmountable. With a part-time job at Pizza Hut – where she got paid minimum wage – she had to pay $900 each month to pay off her prison debt. Moreover, she recalls not having a safe place to stay, because everyone she knew was either "poor, in jail, or gone" (*OITNB,* S01E12). Ultimately, she got trapped in what Wacquant defined as the "closed circuit of perpetual marginality" (qtd. in Alexander 95). To Taystee – who never got prepared for living life on her own – prison offered the safety and stability of a home: "I know how to play it here. Where to be… and what rules to follow. I got a bed" (*OITNB,* S01E12).

OITNB also places emphasis on the social construction of the War on Drugs. In several scenes, the show depicts how the practice of mass incarceration is held in place by a social system in which stereotyping and discrimination are crucial elements. Throughout the first season, overt representations of minority discrimination invite the audience to revisit stereotypical assumptions that aid to the contemporary carceral state. Discrimination based on stereotypical images is predominantly represented in conversations among inmates from the same socio-cultural group. In Litchfield Penitentiary, inmates are assigned to a bunk in a block that corresponds with their ethnicity. As such, the Latinas live in 'Spanish Harlem', the African Americans sleep in 'The Ghetto' and whites are assigned to 'The Suburbs'. This segregation creates a strong coherence among inmates with similar racial identities. The women share the same bathroom, they sit together in the cafeteria, they gather during the outdoor time and they look out for their 'own'. Especially among the white inmates, there are many instances where discriminatory remarks are made in passing. In episode five ("The Chickening"), for instance,

Red (Kate Mulgrew) clearly judges her fellow inmates based on discriminatory stereotypical images of African Americans and Hispanics. After Piper has seen a chicken walking around on prison grounds, many of the inmates go looking for it. It is quickly revealed that a rumor was spread that the chicken might be stuffed with drugs or money. Because Red wanted the chicken for herself to make Chicken Kiev, she is angry at Piper, assuming that it was her who told everyone such stories about the chicken:

Red: "[…] Black girls hear about a chicken, of course this will happen."
Piper: "Why, because all black people love chicken?"
Red: "Don't be racist. Because they're all on heroin and somebody's been telling them there's heroin in the chicken."
[…]
Red: "If she hasn't been scared off, the Spanish or the blacks have her. Those Spanish probably won't even eat her… just cut her throat and drink her blood, or something else superstitious. All I wanted was to eat the chicken that is smarter than other chickens and to absorb its power. And make a nice Kiev. But, oh, well." – *OITNB*, S01E07

Although she reprimands Piper for her explicit discriminatory remark, Red is blind to her own clouded judgment. Red obviously draws upon stereotypical images that inherently link drugs to communities of color. A similar form of unconscious discrimination can be recognized in episode six ("WAC Pack") when some white inmates discuss Lorna's (Yael Stone) candidacy for the Women's Advisory Council (WAC). After several disagreements between women from different groups in the prison, counselor Sam Healy (Michael Harney) has called an election to appoint five representatives who discuss pressing matters with him. During dinner, the inmates discuss the WAC election in the cafeteria:

Piper: "So who are you running against besides Taystee?"
Lorna: "She don't count. Black ladies just run against the other black ladies. My competition is Pennsatucky. But it don't matter, because Red's gonna make all the white girls vote for me."

Piper: "So, you're… you only run against white people?"

Lorna: "Hmm."

Nicky: "You can only vote within your race or your group. Look, just pretend it's the 1950s. It makes it easier to understand."

Lorna: "See, everyone elects a representative from their own tribe. White, black, Hispanic, golden girls, others. And those five gals, they meet with Healy, they tell him what we want, then he speaks to the higher-ups. It's like student council."

Piper: "But how is that an effective system? Not every Hispanic person wants the same thing."

Lorna: "Oh, sure they do. They all want to come to America."

– *OITNB*, S01E06

Similar to Red in the previous excerpt, Lorna here ignores any form of individuality among her fellow inmates from communities of color. In the excerpts above, both Red – "don't be racist" (*OITNB*, S01E07) – and Lorna – "everyone elects a representative from their own *tribe*" (*OITNB*, S01E06; emphasis added) – demonstrate that they want to distance themselves from overt racism. Despite their superficial awareness, these women reproduce hegemonic stereotypical images. Their judgments are clearly based on racial tropes. A significant aspect that must not be overlooked, is the fact that the overt discrimination is voiced by a member of the lower or working class white community. Both Red and Lorna also have an immigrant background. Outside of prison, Red ran a convenience store and diner for the Russian American community. Lorna, in turn, has an Italian American background. Prior to their incarceration, the women lived in poverty at the margins of society. Given their socio-economic status, Red and Lorna benefit from the racial framing of drug criminality and drug abuse. The emphasis on racial identity in the War on Drugs is the only thing that grants them privilege over poor communities of color.

6.2 Gender, Sexuality and Able-Bodiedness

In addition to the emphasis placed on the racial and classist aspects of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs, *OITNB* also depicts how the U.S. prison system functions as

a system of social control for those who do not conform to the (neoliberal) heteronormative ideal. By including narratives of queer identity and mental illness, *OITNB* illustrates how the U.S. prison system is constructed around and holds in place hegemonic norms of gender, sexuality, and able-bodiedness. The show represents how mass incarceration practices not only affect lower class communities of color but also have a disproportionate impact on gender nonconforming, sexually deviant and physically or mentally impaired members of society. In the first season of *OITNB,* numerous inmates do not identify with the (neoliberal) heteronormative ideal. This section will single out two of the most prominent characters to illustrate how social stigmas degrade individuality and aid to the mass incarceration of marginalized groups in society. I will argue that the personal stories of these two characters – Sophia Burset (Laverne Cox) and Suzanne 'Crazy Eyes' Warren (Uzo Aduba) – invite the audience to think about the stereotypical frames that define social privilege and discrimination.

The intersection of gender, race, class, and sexuality is in particular depicted in the personal story of transsexual inmate Sophia Burset. Before her transition, Sophia identified as Marcus, a middle class African American man working at the New York Fire Department. In episode three ("Lesbian Request Denied"), Sophia's backstory is provided through brief flashbacks. In the opening scenes of this episode, it is indicated that prior to her coming out, Sophia confined to the norm of heterosexual middle class life. Marcus was employed in a masculine line of work, provided for his wife Crystal and their son Michael and enjoyed the respect of colleagues and his family. Once Marcus decides to give in to his transgender identity and starts hormone therapy to transition to Sophia, he faces social exclusion and disapproval of his former colleagues and his own son. Eventually, Sophia is arrested for the credit card fraud that she committed to pay for the transition procedure. It turns out that her son Michael, as the ultimate rejection of his father's transgender identity, reported her to the police. Sophia's backstory highlights the thin line that defines who is privileged in society and who is discriminated against. It shows how stereotypical judgments and social labels push people to the socio-economic margins and beyond.

During her incarceration, Sophia is represented as a hyperfeminine character with, in the words of inmate Sister Jane Ingalls (Beth Fowler), a "Playboy body" (*OITNB,* S01E05). She always wears make-up, takes pride in her body and runs the prison's beauty salon. Sophia oftentimes is depicted while looking in the mirror or doing her beauty routine. Despite her

gendered appearance and prison occupation, she frequently is confronted with transphobic attitudes and discrimination. In episode five ("The Chickening"), for instance, inmate Tiffany 'Pennsatucky' Doggett (Taryn Manning) refers to Sophia as "it" and "an abomination". Also several members of the prison staff make disrespectful comments. In episode three ("Lesbian Request Denied"), Officer Mendez (Pablo Schreiber) defines Sophia as "a whole different species" and as having a "cyborg pussy". In a similar fashion, counselor Healy complains to the assistant warden Natalie Figueroa (Alysia Reiner) that he has "got a *tranny* camped out in [his] hallway yelling about her hormones" (*OITNB*, S01E03; emphasis added). In response to Healy's complaint, Figueroa repeatedly misgenders Sophia: "He can suck it up. She. Jesus. […] If he wanted to keep his girlish figure, he should've stayed out of jail" (*OITNB*, S01E03). These remarks emphasize time and again to the audience that Sophia – as a transsexual – does not belong. As Judith Butler has argued, gender functions as a regulatory norm to hold in place social constructs of normalcy and deviance (51-54). In Sophia's case, the range of phrases used by her fellow inmates and staff members suggest that their transphobic mentality will forever define her as the 'other' and as deviant from the social norm. Despite her efforts, the social system is not designed to accept her for who she is, thus excluding her by definition.

As briefly mentioned above, Sophia also is denied her legal rights by the U.S. prison system. In episode three ("Lesbian Request Denied"), her hormone dosage is cut in half due to a prison-wide switch to generic medical drugs. When she reports the issue to counselor Healy, Sophia is told that "the prison can no longer provide high-end hormones" (*OITNB*, S01E03). When she demands a medical review by the prison doctor, Healy denies Sophia her right to necessary medical care:

Healy:	"You can't go to the clinic unless it's an emergency."		
Sophia:	"This is an emergency."		
Healy:	"Yeah, well, we don't see it that way."	–	*OITNB*, S01E03

Whereas Sophia is denied the appropriate hormonal dosage due to alleged budget cuts, it is illustrated that the prison does provide hormones for inmates that are going through menopause, such as Sister Ingalls. Given that "U.S. Bureau of Prisons policy is to provide hormones [to transgender prisoners] at the level that was maintained prior to incarceration" (Reisner, Bailey

and Sevelius 753), it can be argued that Sophia's discontinuity of medical care is more likely to be the result of institutional discrimination rather than the outcome of the facility's switch to generic medication. With this narrative, *OITNB* touches upon the institutional discrimination experienced by transgender women – in particular, those of color – such as medical mistreatment. Sari L. Reisner, Zinzi Bailey, and Jae Sevelius have argued that "the intersecting forces of racism and transphobia produce multiple layers of marginalization among transgender women of color, which may ultimately result in a disproportionate burden of social, mental, and physical health disparities" (763). By representing Sophia's struggle, *OITNB* raises awareness of the pervasiveness of discriminatory social constructs in contemporary U.S. society. It highlights how even within the federal prison system, individuals and social groups are targeted for oppression and are victimized based on their intersectional identities.

The second example of a character whose prison experience is strongly shaped by her intersectional identity is Suzanne 'Crazy Eyes' Warren. Suzanne is an African American inmate with a mental disability. Although she frequently loses her emotional self-control and inflicts self-harm by hitting herself on the head, Suzanne is rarely isolated in SHU or sent to Psych. Although there is no backstory provided of Suzanne's life prior to her incarceration, it is evident that she was adopted by a wealthy white couple who frequently visit her in prison. Suzanne's story provides the audience with a starting point to think about the U.S. prison system's inadequate handling of inmates with special needs. In a conversation with Piper in episode eleven ("Tall Men with Feeling"), Suzanne explains how the mentally ill in prison are mistreated:

Suzanne: "When I get angry … sometimes I can't control myself. That's why I go to Looney Jail sometimes. Psych. But not like 'psych!' I gotta work on self-control. I can come back up here when I'm in control 'cause Mommy and Daddy and the lawyer have an agreement with the warden. Yeah. I like it up here."

[…]

Piper: "Is Psych worse than the SHU?"

Suzanne: "Way worse. Scary. It's bold. Cold. Old. It's real bad. I wouldn't wish it on the worst gremlin."

Piper: "But they give you a therapist …"

Suzanne: "[scoffing] No. Nope. I mean … they give me medication and make me calm, but that just makes me sleepy. Sometimes when I'm real upset, they tie me down, like a balloon, so I don't fly away."

Piper: "That sounds horrible."

Suzanne: "Yeah. Nobody comes back from Psych. Except me. Once you go to Psych … you get lost in Psych."

During the conversation, Suzanne points out to Piper what Psych is really like. Piper's ignorant belief that being sent to the psychiatric ward results in medical care and treatment, functions to hold up a mirror to the audience. It places emphasis on the malfunctioning of the U.S. prison system for prisoners that face mental problems. When Suzanne opens Piper's eyes, she also addresses the fact that usually, a transfer to Psych ward is a one-way trip. Notably, she herself is an exception to the rule. Despite the fact that Suzanne appears to be extra vulnerable in the U.S. prison system given the intersection of her racial identity and her mental disability, she eventually turns out to be rather privileged. Whereas other mentally unstable inmates, such as Blanca Flores and Tiffany 'Pennsatucky' Doggett, are sent to Psych for first time outbursts, Suzanne stays in general population throughout the complete season. As her own comment suggests, this is predominantly the result of the special agreement arranged by her privileged parents and her lawyer.

This analysis of *OITNB* has focused on the cultural representation of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs. It has been discussed how the intersecting axes of domination shape the experiences of women incarcerated in the U.S. prison system. The discussed scenes illustrate how privilege and discrimination run throughout contemporary U.S. society and leave their mark on the criminalization of marginalized groups. *OITNB* must be credited for its critical inquiry of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs. In many instances, the show has included overt examples of discriminatory practices that illustrate how the political discourse of the War on Drug has disproportionately targeted minority groups and pushed them further away to the margins of society. The final chapter of this thesis will discuss the most significant findings of this research project. In addition, there will be a brief reflection on the shortcomings of the analyses and suggestions will be made for further research.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

The central aim of this thesis has been to provide a comprehensive understanding of the cultural imaginary of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs. I have looked into three different narratives that each offer a unique representation of drug criminality and drug abuse. In chapter four, I have discussed how seven different U.S. Presidents have adopted a view on the drug problem in recorded speeches and debates. After a brief overview of the most salient findings of this analysis, I will restate how *Oz* and *OITNB* have reinforced or reshaped the political War on Drugs discourse.

In the period between 1968 and 2004, predominantly State of the Union Addresses have served as stages on which Presidents advocated for tougher and more punitive crime control. In the early years of this period, public policy was aimed at preserving the morals and values of the whole American family by helping the individuals that walked on the wrong path of illicit drugs. As the years passed, the narrative however became more hostile towards drug users. An imaginary line was drawn between the 'good' citizens and those that were involved with drugs in any way. Presidents Reagan and Bush Sr. sought to legitimize their public policy through the use of metaphorical references to war and illness. These created strong appeals to the public's mind and authorized the use of disproportionate measures as they were meant to put a halt to a threatening social illness. In the presidential War on Drugs discourse, the question of responsibility for the drug problem and the increase in crime was initially answered with a call for more individual responsibility among all the American people. Although the narrative of personal responsibility never completely disappeared, it was Reagan who halfway through the 1980s began to define social and racial groups that disproportionately had to bear the burden of the stigma of criminalization. Between 1986 and 1995, Reagan and Clinton narrowed down their criminal target group to roughly 18 to 25 year old, poor/welfare supported, African Americans living in inner-city neighborhoods.

The analyzed prison drama series *Oz* and *OITNB* showed great overlap in their narrative approach. Lead characters Tobias Beecher and Piper Chapman both suddenly found themselves caught up in the harsh realities of prison life. Initially, they felt obviously displaced in their new prison surrounding. Both white middle class characters transitioned from timid and shy to outspoken and violent in the course of the first season. Given the fact that HBO and Netflix are

paid on demand platforms, it can be assumed that both shows sought to create a narrative vantage point that would work well for a middle class audience. From this point forward, both shows used the character development to position themselves in the cultural imagination of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs.

Despite their shared vantage point, the two prison drama series show strong differences in their representation of characters from minority groups in the U.S. prison system. In the first season of *Oz*, the stereotypical image of drug criminality as constructed in the discussed presidential speeches and debates can clearly be recognized. Most notably, the power struggle among the inmates for control over the drug trade did little to reshape the negative political framing of African American young men as violent and involved with drugs. In *Oz*, moreover, characters with complex intersecting identities are relocated to the bottom of the prison hierarchy and excluded from the leading social groups in prison. Only after Tobias Beecher changed into a violent and irrational version of himself and became addicted to drugs, he was accepted by those at the top of the prison hierarchy.

A distinctly different image of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners has been represented in the first season of *OITNB*. This show included many complex backstories to help stimulate the audience to think about the sentences that these women serve. The show continuously challenged the political framing of the drugs problem as a criminal problem. By addressing racist and oppressive structures in Litchfield Penitentiary and in the U.S. society at large, *OITNB* has emphasized that mass incarceration is as much a social problem as it is a criminal problem. The political War on Drugs discourse has also been reshaped by the fact that a large share of the women in Litchfield Penitentiary who serve time for drug crimes are white rather than members of the African American community. Whereas the political narrative predominantly pointed to communities of color as the villains in this social crisis, *OITNB* has offered an alternative narrative to this constructed reality. With compelling stories such as Tasha 'Taystee' Jefferson's experience with the school to prison pipeline, the prison drama series has invited its audience to think about feasibility of upward mobility for those at the margins of U.S. society in the wake of the War on Drugs.

Overall, *Oz* and *OITNB* have represented the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs in distinctly different ways. The emphasis on 'bad' behavior and violence, and the

frequent links between the African American inmates and drugs suggest that *Oz* largely fosters to the same pseudo environment as the political War on Drugs discourse. *OITNB*, in turn, has been far more critical of the stereotypical representation of drug criminality and drug criminals as have been constructed in the political War on Drugs discourse. This prison drama series has most notably offered an alternative to the racial stigma of the drug problem.

It must be acknowledged that this research project has been only modest and limited in scope. First, the analyzed political discourse has been narrowed down to presidential speeches and debates that were recorded and archived in the database of the Miller Center. To complement the findings of this research project, it would be highly recommended to expand the political discourse to broader political campaigns and speeches by other leading political figures. This would result in a more comprehensive view of the presented narratives throughout the War on Drugs. Second, it is crucial to keep in mind that the intersectional approach in the analyses of *Oz* and *OITNB* is by definition influenced by my own identity and any prior knowledge of the U.S. prison system and its prisoners. Furthermore, the findings of this thesis offer only a partial understanding of the cultural imaginary of the institutional consequences of the War on Drugs. I would therefore suggest further research that deals with all available seasons of *Oz* and *OITNB*. As multiple seasons cover a longer span of the (aftermath of the) War on Drugs, this will not only offer a more complete impression of the way that these two shows represent the U.S. prison system over time, but also how they relate to each other.

Works Cited

Alexander, Michelle. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press, 2010.

Allport, Gordon W. "The Nature of Prejudice." *Stereotypes and Prejudice: Essential Readings*. Ed. Charles Stangor. Philadelphia: Psychology Press, 2000. 20-29.

Beckett, Katherine and Bruce Western. "Governing Social Marginality: Welfare, Incarceration, and the Transformation of State Policy." *Punishment & Society* 3.1 (2001): 43-59.

Belcher, Christina. "There is No Such Thing as a Post-Racial Prison: Neoliberal Mulitculturalism and the White Savior Complex on *Orange Is The New Black*." *Television & New Media* 17.6 (2016): 491-503.

Brown, Tom. *Breaking the Fourth Wall: Direct Address in the Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Bush, George H.W. "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the End of the Gulf War." 1991 Joint Session of Congress. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 6 March 1991. Address.

Bush, George H.W. "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress." 1989 Joint Session of Congress. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 9 February 1989. Address.

Bush, George H.W. "Debate with Bill Clinton and Ross Perot." 1992 Presidential Debate. Washington University. St. Louis, Missouri. 11 October 1992.

Bush, George H.W. "Debate with Michael Dukakis." 1988 Presidential Debate. Wake Forest University. Winston-Salem, North Carolina. 25 September 1988.

Bush, George H.W. "Inaugural Address." 1989 Presidential Inauguration. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 20 January 1989. Address.

Bush, George H.W. "Republican National Convention." 1992 Republican National Convention. Astrodome. Houston, Texas. 20 August 1992. Address.

Bush, George H.W. “State of the Union Address.” 1990 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 31 January 1990. Address.

Bush, George H.W. “State of the Union Address.” 1991 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 29 January 1991. Address.

Bush, George H.W. “State of the Union Address.” 1992 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 28 January 1992. Address.

Bush, George W. “State of the Union Address.” 2002 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 19 January 2002. Address.

Bush, George W. “State of the Union Address.” 2003 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 28 January 2003. Address.

Bush, George W. “State of the Union Address.” 2004 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 20 January 2004. Address.

Bush-Baskette, Stephanie. “The War on Drugs and the Incarceration of Mothers.” *Journal of Drug Issues* 30.4 (2000): 919-928.

Butler, Judith. *Undoing Gender*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004.

Carah, Nicholas and Eric Louw. *Media & Society: Production, Content & Participation.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore: SAGE Publications, 2015.

Chesney-Lind, Meda. “Imprisoning Women: The Unintended Victims of Mass Imprisonment.” *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*. Eds. Marc Mauer and Meda Chesney-Lind. New York: The New Press, 2002. 79-94.

Clinton, Bill. “Address on Affirmative Action.” 1995 Speech in Defense of Affirmative Action Programs. National Archives & Records Administration. Washington, D.C. 19 July 1995.

Clinton, Bill. “Address on Race Relations.” 1995 Speech on Ending Racial Discrimination. University of Texas. Austin, Texas. 16 October 1995.

Clinton, Bill. “Presidential Debate with Senator Bob Dole.” 1996 Presidential Debate. University of San Diego. San Diego, California. 6 October 1996.

Clinton, Bill. “Remarks at the Democratic National Convention.” 1996 Democratic National Convention. United Center. Chicago, Illinois. 29 August 1996. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “Remarks to the Congregation of St. Paul’s AME Church.” 1996 Presidential Campaign. St. Paul AME Church. Detroit, Michigan. 3 November 1996.

Clinton, Bill. “Remarks to the Convocation of the Church of God in Christ in Memphis.” 1993 Presidential Campaign. Mason Temple Church of God in Christ. Memphis, Tennessee. 13 November 1993.

Clinton, Bill. “Second Inaugural.” 1997 Presidential Inauguration. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 20 January 1997. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “State of the Union Address.” 1994 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 25 January 1994. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “State of the Union Address.” 1996 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 23 January 1996. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “State of the Union Address.” 1997 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 4 February 1997. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “State of the Union Address.” 1998 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 27 January 1998. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “State of the Union Address.” 1999 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 19 January 1999. Address.

Clinton, Bill. “State of the Union Address.” 2000 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 27 January 2000. Address.

Cole, David. “Turning the Corner on Mass Incarceration.” *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 9.1 (2011): 27-51.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43 (1991): 1241-1299.

Dyer, Richard. *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Elwood, William N. *Rhetoric in the War on Drugs: The Triumphs and Tragedies of Public Relations*. Westport and London: Praeger, 1994.

Enck, Suzanne M. and Megan E. Morrissey. "If Orange is the New Black, I Must Be Color Blind: Comic Framings of Post-Racism in the Prison-Industrial Complex." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 32.5 (2015): 303-317.

Ford, Gerald. "Republican National Convention." 1976 Republican National Convention. Kemper Arena. Kansas City, Missouri. 19 August 1976.

Ford, Gerald. "State of the Union Address." 1976 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 19 January 1976.

Forman, James Jr. "Racial Critiques of Mass Incarceration: Beyond the New Jim Crow." *New York University Law Review* 87.21 (2012): 21-69.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Random House, 1977.

Garland, David. "The Meaning of Mass Incarceration." *Mass Imprisonment: Social Causes and Consequences*. Ed. David Garland. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001. 1-3.

Golden, Renny. *War on the Family: Mothers in Prison and the Families They Leave Behind*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth. "Inequality in a 'Postracial' Era: Race, Immigration, and Criminalization of Low-Wage Labor." 339-353.

Gottschalk, Marie. "The Past, Present, and Future of Mass Incarceration in the United States." *Criminology & Public Policy* 10.3 (2011): 483-504.

Gottschalk, Marie. *The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Hall, Stuart. "Introduction." *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997. 1-12.

Hall, Stuart. “The Spectacle of the ‘Other’.” *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997. 223-290.

Hall, Stuart. “The Work of Representation.” *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997. 13-74.

Heitzeg, Nancy A. “Education or Incarceration: Zero Tolerance Policies and The School to Prison Pipeline.” *Forum on Public Policy Online* 2 (2009): 1-21.

Hunt, Ashley. “The Disappearing/Reappearing Prison.” *Art Journal* 66.3 (2007): 68-73.

Iyengar, Shanto. “Speaking of Values: The Framing of American Politics.” *The Forum* 3.3 (2005): 1-8.

Jenness, Valerie. “Foreword.” *Caged Women: Incarceration, Representation & Media.* Eds. Shirley A. Jackson and Laurie L. Gordy. New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2018. n. pag.

Johnson, Amber and Robin M. Boylorn. “Digital Media and the Politics of Intersectional Queer Hyper/In/Visibility in *Between Women*.” *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 11.1 (2015): 1-26.

Johnson, Lyndon B. “State of the Union Address.” 1968 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 17 January 1968.

Johnson, Thomas J., Wayne Wanta and Timothy Boudreau. “Drug Peddlers: How Four Presidents Attempted to Influence Media and Public Concern on the Drug Issue.” *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 12.4 (2004): 177-199.

Jørgensen, Marianne and Louise Philips. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2002.

Kerman, Piper. *Orange Is The New Black: My Year in a Women’s Prison*. New York: Random House, 2010.

Lenox, Marne L. “Neutralizing the Gendered Collateral Consequences of the War on Drugs.” *New York University Law Review* 86 (2011): 280-315.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922.

Lynch, Mona. “Theorizing the Role of the ‘War on Drugs’ in US Punishment.” *Theoretical Criminology* 16.2 (2012): 175-199.

Mauer, Marc and Meda Chesney-Lind. “Introduction.” *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*. Eds. Marc Mauer and Meda Chesney-Lind. New York: The New Press, 2002. 1-12.

Mauer, Marc. “The Causes and Consequences of Prison Growth in the United States.” *Mass Imprisonment: Social Causes and Consequences*. Ed. David Garland. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001. 4-14.

Miller Center. “Presidential Speeches.” *Miller Center.org*. The University of Virginia, 2018. Web. 29 May 2019.

Nelson, Robin. “HBO Premium: Channelling distinction through TVIII.” *New Review of Film and Television Studies* 5.1 (2007): 25-40.

Nixon, Richard. “State of the Union Address.” 1970 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 22 January 1970.

Novek, Eleanor. “Mass Culture and the American Taste for Prisons.” *Peace Review* 21.3 (2009): 376-384.

O’Sullivan, Shannon. “Who is Always Already Criminalized? An Intersectional Analysis of Criminality on *Orange Is The New Black*.” *The Journal of American Culture* 39.4 (2016): 401-412.

Pramaggiore, Maria and Tom Wallis. *Film: A Critical Introduction.* London: Laurence King Publishing, 2011.

Rahman, Momin. “Queer as Intersectionality: Theorizing Gay Muslim Identities.” *Sociology* 44.5 (2010): 944-961.

Ransome, Paul. *Social Theory for Beginners.* Bristol and Portland: The Policy Press, 2010.

Reagan, Ronald. “Farewell Address at the Republican National Convention.” 1988 Presidential Farewell Address. Louisiana Superdome. New Orleans, Louisiana. August 15, 1988.

Reagan, Ronald. “Speech to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse.” 1986 Campaign Against Drug Abuse. West Hall of the White House. Washington, D.C. 14 September 1986.

Reagan, Ronald. “State of the Union Address.” 1986 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 4 February 1986.

Reagan, Ronald. “State of the Union Address.” 1987 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 27 January 1987.

Reagan, Ronald. “State of the Union Address.” 1988 State of the Union. The United States Capitol. Washington, D.C. 25 January 1988.

Reinarman, Craig and Harry G. Levine. “The Crack Attack: Politics and Media in the Crack Scare.” *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice*. Eds. Craig Reinarman and Harry G. Levine. Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1997. 18-51.

Reisner, Sari L., Zinzi Bailey and Jae Sevelius. “Racial/Ethnic Disparities in History of Incarceration, Experiences of Victimization, and Associated Health Indicators among Transgender Women in the U.S.” *Women & Health* 54.8 (2014): 750-767.

Schulhofer, Stephen J. “Rethinking Mandatory Minimums.” *Wake Forest Law Review* 28.2 (1993): 199-222.

Shogan, Colleen J. and Thomas H. Neale. *The President’s State of The Union Address: Tradition, Function, and Policy Implications*. Philadelphia: DIANE Publishing, 2011.

Simon, Jonathan. “Mass Incarceration: From Social Policy to Social Problem.” *The Oxford Handbook of Sentencing and Corrections*. Eds. Joan Petersilia and Kevin R. Reitz. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. 23-52.

Surette, Ray. *Media, Crime, and Criminal Justice: Images, Realities, and Policies*. Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2015.

Taylor, Yvette, Sally Hines and Mark Casey. “Introduction.” *Theorizing Intersectionality and Sexuality*. Eds. Yvette Taylor, Sally Hines and Mark Casey. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 1-14.

Thompson, Heather Ann. “Why Mass Incarceration Matters: Rethinking Crisis, Decline, and Transformation in Postwar American History.” *The Journal of American History* 97.3 (2010): 703-734.

Traum, Anne R. “Mass Incarceration at Sentencing.” *Hastings Law Review* 64 (2012): 423-468.

Tucker, Ronnie B. “The Color of Mass Incarceration.” *Ethnic Studies Review* 37.1 (2017): 135-149.

Van Dijk, Teun. “Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis.” *Language & Peace*. Eds. Christina Schäffne and Anita L. Wenden. London: Routledge, 2005. 17-33.

Wacquant, Loïc. “Class, Race & Hyperincarceration in Revanchist America.” *Daedalus* 10.3 (2010): 74-90.

Weimer, Daniel. “Drugs-as-a-disease: Heroin, Metaphors, and Identity in Nixon’s Drug War.” *Janus Head* 6.2 (2003): 260-281.

Western, Bruce and Becky Pettit. “Incarceration & Social Inequality.” *Daedalus* 139.3 (2010): 8-20.

Western, Bruce. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006.

White, Ahmed A. “The Juridicial Structure of Habitual Offender Laws and the Jurisprudence of Authoritarian Social Control.” *University of Toledo Law Review* 37 (2006): 705-745.

Wilson, David and Sean O’Sullivan. *Images of Incarceration: Representations of Prison in Film and Television Drama.* Winchester: Waterside Press, 2004.

Yousman, Bill. *Prime Time Prisons on U.S. TV: Representation of Incarceration*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2009.

Zaitow, Barbara H. and Jim Thomas. “Preface.” *Women in Prison: Gender and Social Control*. Eds. Barbara H. Zaitow and Jim Thomas. Boulder and London: Lynne Riener Publications, 2003. vii-ix.

Media list

Orange Is The New Black. Dir. Andrew McCarthy, Phil Abraham, Michael Trim and Constantine Makris. Perf. Taylor Schilling, Kate Mulgrew, Uzo Aduba, Danielle Brooks, Dascha Polanco, Selenis Leyva, Nick Sandow, Yael Stone, Taryn Manning, Adrienne C. Moore, Jackie Cruz, Laura Prepon, Natasha Lyonne, Jessica Pimentel, Michael Harney, Elizabeth Rodriquez, Lea DeLaria and Laura Gómez. Netflix, 2013 – 2019.

Oz. Dir. Adam Bernstein, Alex Zakrzewski, Nick Gomez, Jean de Segonzac, Darnell Martin, Keith Samples and J. Miller Tobin. Perf. Ernie Hudson, J.K. Simmons, Lee Tergesen, Dean Winters, George Morfogen, Terry Kinney, Rita Moreno, Harold Perrineau, Eamonn Walker, Luna Lauren Velez, Granville Adams, Tom Mardirosian and Kirk Acevedo. Home Box Office (HBO), 1997 – 2003.