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Thesis abstract

When Arnold Schwarzenegger muscled his way into the competition for the governance of California in October 2003 many thought it was a joke, or worse, a sign of the devolution of American politics into the lowest form of populism (Louw, 2005; Baudrillard, 2005; Indiana, 2005). Yet, Schwarzenegger’s victory in the recall election is indicative of a history of celebrities in American politics as well as a more widespread ‘culture of celebrity’ that has burgeoned beyond entertainment and into all forms of public life (Andrews and Jackson, 2001; Holmes and Redmond, 2006). While much has been made of celebrity in aiding Schwarzenegger’s successful governance campaign (Hoberman, 2005; Indiana, 2005; Mathews, 2006) remarkably little has been said about the role of his hypermuscular body in facilitating his move into politics.

Drawing on theoretical approaches to celebrity, the body and masculinity, I go well beyond the recall election to make connections among Schwarzenegger’s media representations as an exemplar of muscular masculinity and his accruement of immense cultural, political, and economic capital. By analyzing his celebrity images across his career (i.e. bodybuilding, film and politics) I show how he has been depicted as a ‘body of governance’ in various media such as bodybuilding magazines, autobiography, film and the popular press. This longitudinal approach enables me to show how Schwarzenegger’s celebrity images have shifted over time as well as how they have shaped and been shaped by the particular promotional contexts in which they have been created. Moreover, I examine these depictions in relation to discourses about bodies such as race and gender that organise hegemonic concepts of masculinity and shape notions about citizenship and leadership in American culture.

By providing insight into the complex discourses that enabled a modern day strong man to barter his body for power, this study enriches understandings of how idealised body images in popular culture disseminate much more than measurements for beauty and success. They shape and are shaped by gendered, racialised, classed and sexualised discourse about what it means to
be powerful and carry deeply embedded historical and cultural notions about who is perceived as most fit for American citizenship and best built for governance.
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Chapter 1

Introduction
Celebrity body/politics

The establishing scene for this study opens on the Californian recall election (October, 2003) in which Arnold Schwarzenegger, former bodybuilding champion and mega film star transitioned into his current celebrity incarnation, the Governor of California or “the Governator” as he was affectionately and/or derisively known. When Schwarzenegger muscled his way into the gubernatorial race, many thought it was a joke or worse, a sign of the devolution of American politics into the lowest form of populism (Louw, 2005; Baudrillard, 2005; Indiana, 2005).

However, the merging of celebrity with politics is by no means a new phenomenon. Actors and entertainers have long played activist, representative as well as supportive roles in government since at least the 1940s when Broadway actress Helen Gahagan Douglas was elected to the U.S House of Representatives (Dannheisser, 2007). Since then, actors have held some of the highest forms of political office, including Ronald Reagan who was a B-grade film and TV star before serving as Governor of California and becoming President of the United States in 1981 (Marks & Fischer, 2002).

The lineage of celebrity politics goes back even further in California where, in many respects, government and Hollywood grew up together. Indeed, the recall amendment that opened the door for Schwarzenegger to run for governor was introduced nearly a century ago by the state’s first celebrity governor, a theatrical lawyer by the name of Hiram Johnson (Mathews, 2006). Backed by two Republicans, a doctor and a newspaper publisher, Johnson gained public attention by promoting the notion of direct democracy and by selling himself as a “people’s governor” fighting a tyrannical political machine (Mathews, 2006). That Johnson and the notion of direct democracy helped pave the way for someone like Schwarzenegger to gain power in California is clear in the context and the styling of his 2003 campaign. Invoking Johnson and calling himself the ‘people’s governor’, Schwarzenegger pitted his famous images as a self-made man and action hero against an image of a political machine led by Governor Gray Davis and the
so-called ‘special interests’ whom he had charged with bleeding the state dry. Like Johnson a century before him, Schwarzenegger bypassed the news press and dodged political debate by going directly to the popular media. He promoted himself like one of his films, appearing on late night television, radio and talk shows, even holding rallies outside film theatres (Mathews, 2006). Also like Johnson, and what helped Schwarzenegger’s celebrity campaign, was the political malaise against which the recall election was set. Intense skepticism towards politicians was expressed on both sides. There were those who felt betrayed and let down by the current governor, Gray Davis who they being blamed for California’s energy and economic crises and whose political persona was perceived as being as dull as the connotation of his Christian name (Cooke, 2005). On the other side, there were those who felt that Republicans were undermining democracy and stealing power in California by paying people to sign a recall petition against Davis. In an early article discussing Schwarzenegger’s political aspirations, the author points out that in such moments of political malaise “…Americans want a terminator if not a barbarian, in their elected offices” (Latham, 1991, p.117).

Clearly, celebrity was at the heart of the 2003 recall election, and its relationship to Californian politics and Schwarzenegger has been well documented (Mathews, 2006; Indiana, 2005; Cooke, 2005). Indeed, considering the size of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity it should be unsurprising that he emerged the victor from a pool of candidates that consisted of ‘boring’ politicians, unknown members of the public and a handful of B-grade film stars. Yet, as much as the recall election was about celebrity it was also about bodies. This aspect of the recall election has been less discussed. The importance of the body as a promotional tool for politics was clear in the styling of each celebrity candidate whose meanings clearly revolved around their bodies. Schwarzenegger drew heavily on his action hero film imagery, quoting himself from the Terminator films and posing as California’s future “Governator”. He also drew on the imagery of his championship body by likening the task of repairing the state to his challenges as a
bodybuilder. Adult film star, Mary Carey used her famously sexualized body as the centerpiece for her campaign, frequently flashing her breasts in advertisement for her promise to abolish the car tax and place a tax on breast implants instead. Similarly, star of the 1970s comedy *Different Strokes*, Gary Coleman, also cultivated recognition of his celebrity body/image to garner support for his campaign. Thus, in what was clearly a competition of bodies and celebrity it should come as no surprise that “the world’s reigning action hero” (Hoberman, 2005), was perceived (though not by all) as most ‘fit’ for governance.

No ordinary body, Schwarzenegger’s body is a white, muscular, and profoundly mediated body that is loaded with symbolic meanings about masculine identity, power and success. These meanings are both cultural and historical and come by way of a long history in the West of depicting power in the shape of muscles and of deploying muscular men as exemplars of masculine beauty, individualism and industry (Kuriyama, 1999; Dutton 1995; Kasson, 2001). While Schwarzenegger has certainly been mocked for his foreign accent and perceived as ‘muscle-bound’, especially during his early transition from bodybuilding to film, he has since been overwhelmingly depicted as a ‘body of governance’; a man capable of taking action and leading the less motivated to self-determination and success. The mythology that surrounds Schwarzenegger as a self made man who built himself up through building up his body has been bred by his depictions in bodybuilding magazines, his roles in Hollywood films, his own self-descriptions in autobiography and magazine interviews as well as in his many biographies. This plethora of popular texts underscores both the extent to which Schwarzenegger’s body is the bedrock of his celebrity and our cultural fascination with his body. This is further evidenced by the fact that during the recall election, his ability to govern was largely predicated on his film roles, for which he was dubbed “Conan the Candidate”, “Running Man” and “the Governator”. Indeed *Terminator 3*, the final installment of his immensely successful Terminator franchise was released just one month prior to his announcement that he would run for governor. Prime
advertising for his campaign, his role in this film is similar to his previous roles as a cyborg-saviour of the human race (read: American) from destruction by alien forces. The media coverage for this film revolved around the imagery of his hypermuscular body. Indeed, one film reviewer marveled how, at 54, his body appeared unchanged from the championship physique that first garnered him attention as a bodybuilding celebrity (McGough, *Flex*, 2003).

Certainly, Schwarzenegger’s body was not the only reason for his success in the recall election, many of which have already been discussed. What has been overlooked, however, and is worthy of close attention is how his hypermuscular body afforded him an immensely powerful symbolic platform from which to sell himself to audiences/voters as a strong and capable leader.

**Research questions and method**

As one of the most photographed bodies in American and indeed global popular culture, Arnold Schwarzenegger’s celebrity imagery provides an opportunity to study the contemporary cultural meanings of one of the most powerful body ideals in the history of Western and especially America culture- muscular masculinity. Furthermore, given how Schwarzenegger has been able to use his muscular body to accrue social, cultural, economic and political capital, his media imagery is ripe for a study of the relationship between the cultural meanings of muscle and the embodiment of power. Chris Holmlund (1997) best articulates the importance of studying the body in relation to questions of power: “The question for media analysts is to define…what kinds of bodies are needed and/or tolerated by current societies, and to describe how the apparatus of body and power functions in popular culture today” (1997, p.146).

Moreover, where Schwarzenegger’s imagery straddles physical culture, popular culture and politics, his images can provide insight into the symbolic power of muscle in these arenas that continue to be male dominated and in which muscular male bodies dominate as signifiers of personal and political power. The research questions that guide my research are as follows: What is the role of Arnold Schwarzenegger’s body in shaping his celebrity meanings? How has he
been depicted across the promotional contexts of bodybuilding, film and politics? What are the
continuities and contradictions among these shifting media depictions? What can this tell us
about the contemporary meanings of muscle and the embodiment of power in American culture?

Given the sheer volume of Schwarzenegger’s media images it is impossible to analyze
them all. However, I provide a comprehensive coverage of their diversity and multiplicity by
organizing them into three separate, yet related studies, each focusing on one of his celebrity
incarnations (i.e. as a bodybuilder, a film star and a politician). I examine the discourses through
which Schwarzenegger has been constructed as a bodybuilding champion, a film star and a
politician by analysing his portrayals in corresponding media such as bodybuilding magazines,
autobiography, film, popular magazines, and news press. I have selected these texts based on
their discourses about muscular masculinity that have shaped Schwarzenegger’s celebrity
meanings and how they connect to broader discourses about bodies such as whiteness, class and
heterosexuality that enable power to pool around certain kinds of embodiments. The chapters are
organized chronologically to provide the reader with a sense of the growth and expansion of
Schwarzenegger’s celebrity over time. In addition to providing a sense of this progression, I
demonstrate how each promotional context, along with their traditions of representing muscular
masculinity contribute to the meanings that are associated with images of Schwarzenegger’s
muscular masculinity and by extension his ability to accumulate material forms of power.

Description of the study

I begin my study by locating it within two and interrelated bodies of literature: celebrity
and muscular masculinity. My purpose here is to introduce the reader to relevant research and
debates about the cultural function of celebrities as well as the role of the body in shaping the
value and meanings of their media images. Following a brief history of the emergence of
celebrities and the historical and cultural conditions from which they emerged, I highlight a
discursive approach to celebrity as most useful for my study. Specifically, I take the view that
celebrity images embody discourse about what it means to be an individual in contemporary society (Marshall, 1997; Dyer, 1986). Drawing on accounts of film stars and other nineteenth century entertainers such as strong men, I show how their bodies, rather than simply their images functioned as sites where notions about subjectivity are articulated, struggled over and negotiated (Holmes & Redmond, 2006; Andrews & Jackson, 2001). Moreover I show how whiteness has intersected with muscular masculinity in the historical production of muscular men as symbols of male power. However, neither muscles nor celebrity are the preserve of white men. I turn to studies of non-white sport stars to show how multiple and intersecting identity categories complicate the meanings associated with celebrity bodies. In order to account for the differential distribution of power among celebrity images, I use the concept of hegemonic masculinity that perceives masculinity as a powerful organizing discourse among men, and of Western cultures (Connell, 2004, 2005; Messner, 1992, 2007). Thus, I am able to show that the meanings of muscular masculinity, like celebrity are multiple, negotiable and inherently unstable. In support of this view I draw on literature on bodybuilding that exposes the contradictions of muscular masculinity, between its homoerotic and hetero-masculine connotations. I conclude that despite these contradictions, power is unequal and the concept of hegemonic masculinity remains relevant because it helps to explain certain continuities in the pooling of power around the images of white, muscular men.

My theoretical approach to the study of muscular masculinity is followed by a discussion of the underlying methodological perspectives that underpin my chosen method of textual analysis. Underpinning my approach to textual analysis are post-structural perspectives that approach texts not as unified or transparent in their meanings but as constituted by discourses that link up to how power circulates in society. While discourse analysis is not a unified method or theory it provides a set of insights into how meanings about the social world are produced and how these meanings connect to broader structures of power. Discourse analysis thus places
power at the center of analysis. Discourses, according to Dyer (1986) are “not philosophically coherent systems of thought but rather clusters of ideas, notions, feelings, images attitudes and assumptions that, taken together, make up distinctive ways of thinking and feeling about things, of making particular sense of the world” (p.17). Based on this methodological standpoint, in the latter part of this chapter I detail the types of texts that I selected for my studies as well as the reasoning behind these choices.

Chapter 4 is designed to provide the reader with an overview of Schwarzenegger’s biography and celebrity career. Drawing on a number of his published biographies, my purpose in this chapter is to provide the reader with a sense of the rich and varied history of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity career as he travelled through bodybuilding into film and into politics. Moreover, this description is meant to highlight the diversity of his images and show how his body has served as currency for climbing his way up the social ladder from “King of the bodybuilders” to a member of the American elite. Though this chapter is more descriptive than analytical, I highlight the mythologies that have grown up around his celebrity such as his images as a self-made man and an immigrant success story that I move to deconstruct in following chapters.

In Chapter 5 I examine the construction of Schwarzenegger as a celebrity bodybuilder. Specifically, I address the puzzle of how it was that he was able to cross the divide between bodybuilding subculture and a mainstream culture in the 1970s that viewed bodybuilding as, at best, a pseudo sport and, at worst, a cult of homosexuality. I argue that he was successful because he moulded himself to the ‘twin discourses’ of masculinity and individualism that underpin power in celebrity culture and more broadly, American culture. Using a textual analysis of his autobiography, *Arnold: The Education of a Bodybuilder* (1977) I analyse his ability to promote bodybuilding and himself to a mainstream audience along two salient themes, heterosexuality and individualism. It is revealed that he developed a hyper-heterosexual persona
to combat the perceived homoerotic connotations of bodybuilders and sold himself in the image of a self-made man at a time when citizenship was being articulated through neo-liberal narratives about self-responsibility. In my discussion, I also show how his ability to market himself to a mainstream audience was enabled by his whiteness, a privileged racial category that underpinned notions of masculine physical perfection (within bodybuilding and mainstream culture) as well as broader cultural notions about who was fit for American citizenship.

In Chapter 6 I explore the role of Hollywood film in expanding and branding Arnold Schwarzenegger’s celebrity into a more complex and nuanced mixture of paternal and muscular masculinity. Following scholars of celebrity, I borrow the post-structural concept of intertextuality to show how Schwarzenegger’s celebrity is made up of a combination of his on-screen and off-screen imagery. I trace intertextual processes using what I call a ‘critical filmography,’ a chronological examination of his film roles in which I identify several images and two major transitions in his celebrity persona. The first is a transition from being type cast as a one-dimensional bodybuilder in the 1970s to becoming an icon of muscular masculinity in 1980s through his roles in action films. The second transition is evident in his shifting depictions from a violent action hero to more nuanced image of muscular manhood in the 1990s when he began to make comedy and family-themed films. While I highlight Schwarzenegger’s role in shaping these transitions as well as the role of the popular media, I explain his metamorphosis in terms of discourses circulating about muscular masculinity, citizenship and celebrity during these decades. These discourses include the hypermasculine governmentality of Reagan during the 1980s, white male backlash politics in the 1990s and a continuing xenophobia that policed who does and does not belong to the category of an American citizen. Among my findings is that Hollywood film has been one of Schwarzenegger’s greatest promotional tools and that it was through Hollywood films that he developed the increasingly complex persona that helped him to market himself in the more serious role of a community and state leader. Also, and continuous
with the previous chapter, I show how discourses of whiteness and heterosexuality contributed to his ability to play the hero, both in action and in comedy, and sustained the currency of his celebrity sign.

Chapter 7 examines Schwarzenegger’s most current celebrity incarnation as a celebrity politician. Using Schwarzenegger’s own and news press and public constructions of him as a governor during the 2003 recall election, I explore debates about the political potential of celebrity politics and show that it is not so apolitical as some critics suggest. I do this through an examination of three images of Schwarzenegger as a candidate during his campaign: “the Governator”, which was an image of himself as a strong and benevolent leader; “the Gropenator” that emerged following an expose by the LA Times of allegations of sexual assault by Schwarzenegger against several women between the 1970s and 1990s; and “die Gropenfuhrer” that arose from a cartoon by Doonesbury artist, Garry Trudeau who depicted Schwarzenegger as a giant hand ‘groping’ for power. Each image relates to one another, revealing the intertextual processes at work in the production and ‘deciphering’ of celebrity signs. Furthermore, all three images reveal the complex intersections at work in ideological constructions of muscular masculinity such as sexuality, nationality and whiteness. My analysis of the ways in which Schwarzenegger’s celebrity imagery was attacked suggests that celebrity politics can invoke meaningful engagement about political issues despite the emphasis on images. While the criticisms of Schwarzenegger, were not entirely progressive, they are valuable in so far as they highlight constant struggles over power that is embedded in notions about who is fit for American citizenship and who is built for governance.

Chapter 8 provides a consolidation of the major contributions of this research to understandings of the relationship between images of muscular male bodies and the accumulation of material power in contemporary American culture. Based on my findings about embodiment and how it matters in popular culture and in politics, I suggest two areas for future
research. These include research into the current contours of male bodies and muscularity in film and the role of the body in constructing images of leadership. My discussion of embodiment and leadership encourages a shift in thought towards the global as well as the local dimensions of masculinities, bodies and politics.

**Contributions**

The first of my contributions is to lead us to a thicker description of the complex discourses that enabled a modern day strong man to achieve global fame and political power in a world saturated by media images. While, as audience research shows, textual analysis can produce various readings depending on the social locations and positioning of spectators, my study provides a unique, in-depth analysis of the longitudinal development of a celebrity and in particular, the discursive processes that shaped and made Schwarzenegger’s celebrity meaningful and immensely powerful. Moreover, as a study of the male body and its relationship to power, my research speaks to issues of masculine embodiment and contributes to a larger project across the humanities of documenting the historical construction and continuing tenacity of the white male body as most fit for American citizenship and ‘best built’ for governance, against which “other” bodies are measured.
Chapter 2

Review of literature
Introduction

In recent decades, the study of celebrity has become increasingly pertinent and legitimized given how fame and notoriety have achieved greater levels of value in all levels of public life. No longer confined to the realms of entertainment, celebrities are common in and often central to the cultures and economic structures of sports, education, religion and politics (Andrews and Jackson, 2001). This phenomenon has been largely driven by the mass mediation of culture and the adoption of the image as the main unit of communication (Whannel, 2002). Critical perspectives on celebrity have emerged from within the realms of cultural and media studies and celebrity has been variously viewed as embodying power relations between audiences and media producers and between citizens and the state. Following from these views, debates about celebrity have centered on their progressive or negative contributions to intellectual and political life.

For this study, I mostly adhere to the notion that celebrities embody discourse about “what it means to be a human being in contemporary society” (Dyer, 1986, p.7). More specifically, as Marshall (1997) states, “celebrity status resonates with conceptions of individuality that are the ideological ground of Western culture” (1997, p. x). Andrews and Jackson (2001) nicely articulate this view in relation to sport stars. Drawing on Dyer (1986) and Marshall (1997), they describe celebrities as “significant public entities responsible for structuring meaning, crystallizing ideologies, and offering contextually grounded maps for private individuals as they negotiate contemporary conditions of existence” (p. 2). Thus, celebrities represent sites of power relations where discursively produced meanings about what it means to be an individual in capitalist society are struggled over and negotiated.

In this chapter I provide a review of the critical literature on celebrity in which I highlight discursive approaches as the framework for my study. I provide an overview of debates about celebrity beginning with a description of the historical emergence of celebrity to which these
debates are tied. I argue that while an historical perspective can tell us about the social, cultural, political and economic shifts that gave birth to celebrity, they tell us less about how individual celebrities become meaningful and how these meanings shift over time and according to context. Here I turn towards a discursive approach, which looks at the role of discourse; how culturally produced clusters of knowledge, beliefs, thoughts and attitudes about the social world shape particular investments in celebrities as well as their commodity value. Furthermore, discursive approaches to film and sport stars highlight the powerful role of the body in discourse about celebrity. In order to account for the role of the muscular body in shaping Schwarzenegger’s celebrity images, I enfold a sub-literature that describes the historical and cultural construction of muscular masculinity as powerful. Finally, I draw on the concept of hegemonic masculinity to explain the dominance of white male bodies as powerful in the media.

**Historical perspectives on celebrity**

While celebrity is often discussed as a contemporary concept, Kings, Pharaohs, God-Kings and heroes all represent early forms of public notoriety and fame. Monuments, paintings and literature were composed in their honour and helped to mark them as distinctive from the rest of the population (Andrews & Jackson, 2001; Marks & Fischer, 2002). Yet, as Boorstin points out, a focus on the image separates contemporary celebrity from its earlier forms.

…the celebrity is a person who is known for his well-knownness…The hero was distinguished by his achievement; the celebrity by his image or trademark. The hero created himself; the celebrity is created by the media. The hero is a big man; the celebrity is a big name (1962, pp.52-61).

Boorstin’s point about an emphasis on image in celebrity culture is crucial. In many ways, the history of the emergence of the contemporary celebrity is simultaneously a history of
the rise of mass media. Prior to the nineteenth century when mass communications technologies were developed, changes in notions of government paved the pathway for the rise of the contemporary celebrity through the ascendance of individualism as a dominant form of social subjectivity. According to Rojek (2001) contemporary celebrity culture emerged in conjunction with three historical processes: the democratization of society, the decline of organized religion, and the commodification of everyday life. Rojek identifies the American Revolution as a crucial historical context because of the changes it brought in ideology and governmentality. The overthrow of monarchical rule and consequent democratization of government meant that power and government could be transferred from the monarchical ruler to the individual whose freedom and patriotic responsibility it became to rule himself. This underscores Foucault’s thesis about the rise of modern apparatuses of power in which subjectivity became cast in terms of individualism, and where the individual’s body became the target of social control. Foucault called this ‘governmentality’. Governmentality is evidently at work in this period of revolution described by Rojeck, in which the myth of the self made man was commonly promoted and who advertised the notions of self-government through his role modeling of self-determination and rugged individualism (Rojek, 2001; see also Dyer, 1986; Marshall, 1997).

Along with the ascendance of individualism as a dominant form of social subjectivity in the eighteenth century, celebrity has been associated with the rise of the image as the main form of communication in the nineteenth century with the development of consumer capitalism and communications technologies (Rojek, 2001; Turner, 2004; Holmes and Redmond, 2006). Before the development of visual technologies, fame was mostly attributed to men who were known for doing something of perceived importance such as athletes, leaders, inventors and businessmen (Whannel, 2002; Monaco, 1978). Stories about such men were circulated by printed press such as in newspapers and books. The notoriety of athletes in particular was linked to spectator sport and was supported by the development of sport-related magazines and guides. As Whannel
points out, “as long as spectator sport has existed, stars have played a major role in the process of audience building and much sports writing focused upon charismatic performers” (2002, p.31).

According to Boorstin (1962), the period of the 1870s to the 1880s constituted a “graphic revolution” when technological innovations were made in the production and dissemination of images such as dry-plate photography and print film.

The invention of photography helped to shift the focus on public individuals away from their skills and towards their images as photographs began to accompany the narratives of newspaper articles. Monaco (1978) notes how a corresponding shift in news reportage from information to entertainment began to occur with the introduction of public relations management. This shift in representation from print to images also coincided with a shift in who could be represented. This was seen in the circulation of images of actors, actresses and vaudeville entertainers such as the famous strong man, Eugen Sandow on cards that were included in packages of cigarettes (Whannel, 2002, Budd, 1997).

The birth of the cinema caused the acceleration of celebrity culture through its ability to transmit instant images to mass audiences. In its early stages, film mostly promoted the images of men such as leaders and sports heroes because news reportage was the main function of early cinema (Whannel, 2002). Taylor (1997) and Bernardi (1996) further contend that the history of the cinema is simultaneously a history of white men whose bodies have dominated and been idealized in cinema imagery since its invention. Indeed, while the 1980s appears to be the beginning of such idealized images on screen, Eugen Sandow, the nineteenth century strong man and father of bodybuilding, was one of the first images to be captured on Edison’s camera in 1901 (Budd, 1997).

Shickel (1985) explains that celebrity culture really exploded in the early twentieth century with the development of cinema into an entertainment-focused form. The introduction of sound, the proliferation of film houses throughout the United States and the increasing
dominance of the cinema by feature length films, made it a hugely popular form of entertainment and subsequently actors and actresses began to dominate in celebrity culture (Whannel, 2002; deCordova, 1990). Indeed, the focus on their images has led many scholars to refer to film stars as the first of the contemporary celebrities. According to deCordova (1990) the film star was an economic strategy in the rapid expansion of the film industry in the first half of the twentieth century. He shows that, as film production grew and became more competitive, the actor was made a figure of interest in order to differentiate films without actors from films with actors and to attract audiences to their exhibition. Yet film stars also grew from and fed a deeper cultural hunger for more romantic pop heroes than the local businessmen and inventors advertised in the newspapers (Shickel, 1985). According to Shickel, the new consumer culture and worship of film stars caused a change in mass sensibility towards information and entertainment: “the public ceased to demand that the hero actually do something of real consequence and it became possible to achieve fame in “the realms of play” (1985; p.6).

Celebrity culture was augmented once again in the 1950s with the spread of television, which made popular culture more private and accessible than film because it was installed in the home. In this way, it was similar to the radio in that it created an “illusion of intimacy” (Schickel, 1985) between audiences and celebrities. Television quickly displaced the cinema, radio and even the newspaper as the main source of information and entertainment (Andrews and Jackson, 2001). Focusing on entertainment, news and sports, the television helped to entrench existing forms of celebrity while also giving rise to new ones. TV personalities, newsreaders, politicians, and even serial killers became celebrities through the publicization of their crimes and personal lives in the daily news (Turner, 2004). This proliferation of celebrity was further aided by the rise of tabloids, lifestyle magazines and advertising who traded in celebrity images and that would become a major media industry by the 1970s and 1980s (Whannel, 2002).
Globalizing forces have further shaped celebrity culture into a major and global business as media industries have converged, integrated and extended into international markets (Whannel, 2002). These conditions saw the emergence of sport as its own media industry, into a ‘global media complex’ and the rise of the global sports star. Indeed the growth of mass media into global media has demanded a greater flexibility of celebrity images of all kinds that can appeal to both global and local markets (Giardina, 2001; Oats and Palumbaum, 2004). Flexibility has thus become a desirable characteristic of today’s celebrities for advertisers who seek to create single images that can relate to audiences throughout the world.

The historical shift towards the image and entertainment throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, led by developments in communications technologies, has been perceived as causing a ‘democratization’ of celebrity. In doing so it has increased the value placed on fame as a goal pursuable by the general public and a marker of esteem (Homes and Redmond, 2006). This has certainly been made possible by the development of the Internet where people can now create their own profiles and style their personas in public ways and have their “15 seconds of fame” as Andy Warhol is famous for predicting (Whannel, 2002; Turner, 2004).

**Debates about celebrity culture**

The emphasis on images that historical accounts of celebrity reveal to be at the centre of celebrity culture has come to define debates about the effect of celebrity on contemporary life. Similar to debates about the value of mass media and its impact on society, celebrity has been viewed as either devaluing culture with its emphasis on image over substance, surface over depth or as providing new forms of social expression and subjectivity. The use of celebrities as commodities for culture industries has led some theorists to describe celebrity as a form of social control much like the Frankfurt School thesis about how audiences passively consume mass media (Marshall, 1997; Rojek, 2001; Turner, 2004; Holmes and Redmond, 2006; Marks & Fischer, 2002). Marshall (1997) argues that the celebritization of culture is directly related to its
convergence with capitalist discourse and expansion of the mass media that has transformed celebrities into commodities and audiences into consumers. Following this argument, many have worried that celebrities promote inauthentic and surface forms of subjectivity and values. Such views have crystallized in discussions about celebrity politics where the mediation of politics by the mass media and use of celebrities as promotional vehicles is perceived as decaying democratic political process and turning voters/audiences away from important social issues (Marks & Fischer, 2002; Weiskel, 2005). Drawing on Baudrillard’s notion of the simulacrum, Marks and Fischer (2002) go so far as to argue that celebrity politicians participate in the simulation of culture and in the manufacture of social control by drawing audiences into the democratic fold by the allure of their popular images.

These perspectives, however, place too much emphasis on the power of the media and capitalist economics in directing the currency and success of celebrity images. Indeed, a study by Gamson (1994) of the Hollywood culture industry showed how celebrity production is at once highly rationalized and disorganized. His final picture of the Hollywood culture industry is one of tensions between control and lack of control over celebrity images:

…creators, the authors of the celebrity text, are far from constituting a monolithic elite manufacturing standard celebrity products. Interests diverge, and the workers battle each other throughout the production process; the texts created are filled with the conflicts from which they are born (p.107).

Furthermore, the view that celebrities themselves are “passive objects of the media” who are entirely controlled by so-called ‘celebrity producers’ (Monaco, 1978) has also been troubled by research that shows how the industrialization of celebrity has actually given stars a new form of control over their images as well as immense financial gains. Turner (2004) points out that
sports stars can earn as much as two-thirds of their salary from corporate sponsorship while film stars can command exorbitant salaries for their films as well as earn money from modeling and advertising contracts. These large revenues have enabled some, like Arnold Schwarzenegger to create their own production companies, as well as to purchase the rights to their films, giving them significant control over the depiction and distribution of their images.

On the perception of audiences as passive consumers of celebrity images, Corner and Pels (2003) argue that such arguments make judgments about the kinds of investments people should make in culture as well as ignore the multiple and counter-hegemonic ways in which celebrity is consumed. This is a popular argument of those who see value in celebrity culture as a social relation and as a stabilizing force that provides meaning to people’s lives (Rojek, 2001; Turner, 2004). A pair of anonymous authors comment:

Our culture relies on certain prominent figures to define and understand itself. Marilyn Monroe, JFK, Elvis Presley, Princess Di- each suggests an aspect of the collective desires, weaknesses, dreams and fears that we constantly turn over in our minds, gossip about, or use for comparisons. We talk through these figures to express ideas about hate, love, sex, drugs, death, religion, morality, power, money and other things that are difficult to consider directly. In them we recognize ourselves writ large as well as our fellow citizens in their best and worst lights (Arnold Schwarzenegger, Write us, 2004, p. 2).

Holmes and Redmond (2006) thus recast the notion of the celebrity-commodity as “not just a desired object but also an intimate doorway for connecting people” (p. 3). This perspective, on the role of audiences in shaping celebrity meanings, has led some scholars to reposition celebrity not as a fixed thing or one-way power relation between media producers and audiences
but as a complex, discursive formation of cultural meanings that facilitates and reflects social relationships (Turner, 2004; Andrews and Jackson, 2001). As Andrews and Jackson (2001) point out, despite the efforts of culture industries to produce successful or popular images, there are no guarantees that a celebrity will be consumed in the ways in which they are intended. “Audiences are far from homogeneous entities, and consumers habitually display contrasting expressions of celebrity appropriation according to the cultural, political, and economic contingencies of their social location” (p. 5).

Taken together, the perspectives that I have described above suggest that the power and meanings of celebrity images are determined both by the media producers who make and circulate them as well as by audiences who, in recent years, have been given greater recognition for their role in assigning meanings to celebrities that determine their failure or success. While some of these views can be determinist in either direction of the audience or the media, they begin to account for the shifting, slipping, and multiple meanings that cluster around celebrity images.

What is missing from these accounts, however, is an explanation of how discourse, those knowledges, beliefs and attitudes about the social world and our role in it, drive commercial and audience investments in celebrity. This is where I turn to the work of post-structural informed writers who emphasize the role of discourse in shaping celebrity meanings and thus determining their power, longevity and success. This is to say that the celebrity is perceived as a cultural sign whose meanings are shaped by idealized forms of social subjectivity in particular historical and cultural contexts (Holmes and Redmond, 2006).

**Celebrity as constituted through discourse**

déCordova’s (1990) work on the emergence of the film star in the early part of the twentieth century (1900-1920s) demonstrates the primary role of discourse in driving the development of the film star and in shaping their cultural meanings and economic value. He
argues that while the star is made up of both economic and discursive practices, the commodity value and cultural currency of star images are given by their construction in discourse. He writes: “The star became the point of an economic exchange only by virtue of its identity as constructed in discourse” (p. 11).

In his study, he highlights the particular discursive strategies of representing film stars by differentiating them from earlier forms of actors. Unlike earlier film actors and “picture personalities” whose identities were either anonymous, secondary to the film form itself, or restricted to the roles they played in films, the star emerged as an individual beyond the film and the production house for which it was a promotional tool. deCordova explains that the commodity value of stars developed in a climate of increasing competition among production houses who were looking to differentiate and attract audiences to their films. Yet, beyond the film star’s use as a promotional tool, it emerged from an expansion of discourse about actors that was largely driven by the popular press.

…as an actor is individualized the name supports an expansion of the actors identity through writing that reveals what he or she is ‘really’ like behind the screen. The actor is assigned a personality, a love life, and perhaps a political persuasion. As one moves back from the text to its ostensible source, one confronts a figure that is given a rather detailed, and typically ‘realistic’ human identity (p.21).

He shows how the identities of film stars followed the fictionalized plots of films, which were often didactic tales about middle-class morality, serving to secure both cultural ideals about sexual morality and family as well as promoting consumerism through discourse about their glamorous possessions and hobbies. Importantly, deCordova shows that this expanded discourse on stars was not only driven by economics but by the discourse of film journalism that provided
an endless stream of information about the private lives of film personalities in fan magazines and the trade press. He further identifies how the process of developing film stars was different from earlier forms of individuating actors because it was a thoroughly intertextual process. This is to say that multiple sources and discourses such as the popular press, film journalism and public relations converged in the production of the personalities of film stars. deCordova’s study thus offers three compelling points for the discursive study of celebrity: 1) the film star is a product of economic strategy and of discursive practices, 2) the star only becomes commercially valuable because of its identity as constructed in discourse, 3) the star’s identity is not inherent within the individual star nor is it confined to a particular text (i.e. film) but rather emerges from the intertextual relationships among the discursive practices of a variety of sources i.e. fan magazines, the trade press and news media.

All of these points are demonstrated by Dyer’s seminal work on film stars, Heavenly Bodies (1986) in which he puts discourse analysis to work in understanding the particular purchase of three film stars: Marilyn Monroe, Paul Robeson and Judy Garland. Dyer’s work provides a nice historical extension of de Cordova’s, as well as in-depth case studies of the discursive practices that direct the purchase of star personas. His case studies are instructive because he pays close attention to the particular contexts- cultural and historical- in which stars are made and makes sense of their prominent or signature elements (that distinguish them from other celebrities) through discourse. Beginning with Monroe, he identifies her sexuality as key to her symbolic and commercial value, which he understands in relation to the explosion of discourse about female sexuality in the 1950s. Regarding Robeson, a rare black stage and film star during the 1920s-1940s, he focuses on discourses about blackness and ethnicity to explain how he could become a star in a mostly white dominated industry. In his final case study of Garland, he makes sense of her popularity among gay males through the notion that discourse is
multiple and can produce alternative meanings depending on the identifications and social location of the audience.

In combination with deCordova, Dyer’s work is instructive for my research on Arnold Schwarzenegger for three reasons. First, he emphasizes that the particular purchase of a star cannot be understood outside of the particular cultural and historical contexts in which they are made and circulated. This helps us to account for change in individual celebrity images, which evolve, expand and sometimes diminish over a time period. Second, like deCordova, Dyer perceives the star as composed of not a single coherent image but rather as a collection of images and intertextual processes among various and inter-related forms of media (i.e. tabloids, fan magazines, newspapers). Moreover he points to how social categories are intertextual and intersect in his study of Monroe in which he shows how her whiteness contributed to her construction as a sexual object in the 1950s. Most importantly, however, Dyer’s work emphasizes the role of the body in shaping celebrity meanings and value. Indeed, while the image has been well noted as being central to celebrity, the body has been overlooked in the work described so far as key to celebrity images and the meanings that we associate with them. Holmes and Redmond (2006) note how “fame is understood to be centered on the body and there is an emphasis on how corporeality drives the production and consumption of stars and celebrities” (p. 6). The idea that the body is central to celebrity extends upon the previously discussed understandings of the significance and power of celebrity as residing in their personification of what it means to be human; to be an individual in contemporary capitalist society. This is clear in Dyer’s studies of Monroe and Robeson in which he identifies that the main discourses that constituted them, sexuality and ethnicity- are rooted in the body.

**Celebrity bodies as sites of power**

The notion of the body as a site of power stems from Foucault’s writings about the modernization of power in which he famously re-conceptualizes power as productive rather than
repressive. In his essay entitled “Governmentality” Foucault describes the development of a complex relationship among the body, knowledge and power that occurred with the shift from a Feudal society to a society of control. In *Discipline and Punish* (1977), Foucault illustrates this shift by describing how power was previously concentrated in the body and corporeal hands of kings, in so far as it was his body that was protected from harm and whose power it was to take or spare the lives of his subjects. With the passing of the feudal state, he argues, power was dispersed from this single concentration to the citizenry. This does not mean to say that citizens became equally powerful nor more powerful than their leaders, but that the concern for the health and wealth of the state became bound up with a concern for the health and wealth of its citizens. The body in this regime is to be understood within the context of the development of capitalism that draws on the resources of the corporeal body for productivity and growth. According to Foucault, capitalism would not have been possible without the “controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomenon of population to economic processes” (1978; 141). Hence, it was in the interests of industrializing societies to maximize economic growth by fostering human life rather than threatening it. Yet more than fostering life, power in modernity was directed at bodies in a way that taught self-discipline and that asserted control through the establishment of systems of measuring normalcy against which bodies could be judged.

Foucault used the term ‘biopower’ to describe the particular corporeal nature of power within a regime of governmentality. ‘Biopower,’ Foucault explains is located in the disciplinary techniques and regulatory methods that came to focus on bodies. Unlike the repressive powers of sovereignty, biopower was productive and regulative: it extended the body’s abilities and the populations capacities by harnessing their energies towards its own goals (i.e. capitalist accumulation). Furthermore, and crucial to Foucault’s notion of modern power was that it did not function repressively, which is to say that power was not forced upon bodies but that it operated
through discourse about normalcy and regimes of self-discipline. In *Birth of the Clinic* (1975) and *Discipline and Punish* (1977), Foucault explains that power relations work on and through bodies according to ‘disciplinary regimes’ and techniques that are largely disseminated by scientific institutions (i.e. schools, prisons, psychiatry hospitals etc) with the aim of regulating and managing populations. Citizens learned, through the disciplinary regimes of the military, school, and medicine to self-regulate. Primary among these ‘technologies’ were the disciplinary gaze and processes of normalization, which, Foucault explains, contributed to the production of ‘docile bodies’ (i.e. self-governing citizens who internalize power in the form of moral and proper proscriptions for personal and public conduct (Foucault, 1977, p. 174).

Following Foucault, Marks and Fischer (2002) assert that the body is central to the power that we invest in celebrities as well as the particular meanings that we associate with their images. “The investiture of authority in celebrities represents a continuation of the trend by which social bodies operate as the site where relations of power are played out” (p.371). This statement is central to their attempt to understand the prominent role of celebrities in politics and their argument that celebrity politicians draw an apathetic public back into the democratic fold. In particular, Marks and Fischer draw on Foucault’s writings in *Discipline and Punish* and summarise: “The passage of the fascination with the king’s body to a greater awareness of the body politic constitutes in part the emergence of modern notions of citizenship. Thus just as the body politics must be kept healthy, it can also be mobilised for the purpose of legitimating the unity of the people and the power relations that constitute it” (p. 382). Towards an understanding of the reification of celebrities within a so-called democratic regime that disperses power among citizens, they note how power still lodges (though fleetingly) in the bodies of select few. According to Marks and Fischer, “It is celebrities whose bodies serve as sites in which power relations are invested” (p.384). They are able to explain how the public is attracted to celebrities in politics because they overshadow or are disassociated from the negative connotations of
uneared power and despotic control associated with politicians. Celebrities bring a different set of meanings to politics that are more closely associated with the dreams and aspirations of the body politic, of personal empowerment, of individualism and success.

The role of the body in shaping the power of celebrities and their meanings is nicely illustrated in Wills’ (1997) account of the production of John Wayne’s star persona. Wayne, he says, “had an aura of slumberous power” that was linked to “the easy control of his large body” (p. 18). Indeed, Wills explains Wayne’s suitability for the Western genre of film in terms of how his body was an expression of his rugged masculinity. His body took up space on screen and exerted power over others (i.e. women and racialised others) in an embodiment of the notion of the frontier myth that sat both at the heart of the Western genre and American nation building. “Wayne’s body spoke a highly specific language of manliness, of self-reliant authority. It was a body impervious to outside force, expressing a mind narrow but focused in the task, impatient with complexity” (p.22). While Wills’ account of Wayne does not offer an explicit critique of masculinity as a source of Wayne’s power as a film actor and celebrity, it is useful for drawing attention to gender as a powerful organizing discourse of celebrity. Masculinity is clearly a dominant discourse in shaping the meanings and power of celebrity images, especially where an image of the muscular male body remains a potent symbol of male beauty and power. Where the ideal body for women is exemplified by the thin and toned bodies of female celebrities, the ideal body for males has historically been a “muscular and toned, flawless fiction” (Magill, 2006). While body types for males have certainly varied and co-existed in popular culture at any given time, the ‘cult of the muscular body’ (Oats and Durham, 2004) has predominated in images of male celebrities. As the following section shows, not only do these celebrity bodies set standards for male beauty and empowerment, they also contribute to the shaping of broader notions about who is fit for citizenship (Montez de Oca, 2005; Dutton, 1995; Kruger, 1999).
White men’s muscles, celebrity and power

According to Dyer (2002), muscles are the sign of male power. Connell (2005) explains that muscles are associated with men’s ability to physically overcome challenges and that part of learning to be male is learning to cultivate a body that speaks of power, competence and domination (Connell, 2005). White and Gillett (1994) add that muscles have become viewed as the most fundamental biological difference between men and women and are therefore invested with binary meanings that eschew passivity, softness, weakness and homosexuality. During (2004) takes the symbolism of muscularity to the global context with his assertion that muscles are a universal signifier of masculinity because they connote men’s most basic resource of power. The notion of individualism that is at the heart of celebrity culture is shown to be embedded in the promotion of muscular masculinity as attractive, healthy and powerful and as an aspirational body image for men (Frew and McGillivray, 2002).

Of course, the articulation of muscles with masculinity is a historical and cultural process that embodies power relations of race, sexuality and nation. As early as the ancient Greeks, muscles were perceived as connoting masculine beauty, male strength and power (Dutton, 1995; Oats and Durham, 2004). According to Kuriyama (1999), connotations of national and racial superiority were grafted onto Greek bodies through their self-depictions as muscular in literature and art. This was compared with Greek depictions of barbarians as having ‘slack’ bodies, which was meant to reflect their perceived lack of cultural articulation. Showing how Chinese medicine has been more preoccupied with the outside of bodies, Kuriyama highlights how the gaze of Western medicine turned its eyes inward and focused upon the muscles as a salient structure of the human bodies. Kuriyama further denaturalises the inward gaze of Western science by showing how doctors and philosophers differentiated among peoples by grafting moral and ideological beliefs onto their bodies.
Poggie (1997) explains that in the 1800s across Europe and later in the U.S, a preoccupation with muscular masculinity grew out of changes in social structures, as a remnant of the turmoil of industrialisation and modernization. The muscular body, she argues, provided men with a visual, embodied sense of fortification against the perceived ‘penetrating’ forces of femininity, homosexuality and racial ‘others’ onto whom anxieties about social chaos were often projected. “Only a hard, visibly bounded body can resist being submerged into the horrors of femininity and non-whiteness,” writes Dyer (2002, p.265). In a detailed discourse analysis of representations of whiteness in early twentieth century Hollywood cinema, Taylor (1996) suggests that the depiction of white men’s bodies in the cinema as spectacles of power were consistent with the white supremacist nation-building myths of the fin-de-siecle. Stratton (2005) extends the ideological connection among bodies and the cinema to the processes of capitalist economy that produced muscular men’s bodies as commodities beginning as early as the late nineteenth century. “As media spectacles, white muscular men’s bodies entered a semiotic system where they served to mediate between consumption and fantasies about self-fulfillment and enhanced social status” (Stratton, 1999).

In his study of fin de siecle American ‘manliness’, Kasson (2001) describes the development of muscular masculinity as a hegemonic type through the careers of three celebrity performers: Eugen Sandow, the father of modern bodybuilding, Harry Houdini, the famous magician and escape artist, and Tarzan, the fictional king of the jungle as depicted by William S. Burroughs. While the unclad male body was certainly problematic for white male superiority and heteronormativity in this period (as they continue to be today), Kasson reveals that the physical performances of these men offered a powerful image of masculinity at a time of intense social upheaval that placed ideas about white male supremacy under stress. Disturbances in turn-of-the-century social order were caused by industrialization, feminist movement and new waves of immigration from Europe to the United States. Kasson writes: “In the guise of entertaining, they
reassured the primacy of the white male body against a host of challenges that might weaken, confine or tame it” (p.8). Kasson further notes that while images for women in this period shifted between subordination and transgression, images of men emphasized and advertised metamorphosis. Thus, towards further explaining the appeal of Sandow, Houdini and Tarzan in this period and drawing similarities among them, he shows how each embodied the possibility of masculine transformation into an empowered individual. From a skinny man to muscle man, from a chained man to escapee, from an orphan to king of the jungle, each of these muscular celebrities dramatized escape from the “confinement of modern life to the recovery of freedom” (p.8).

Magill (2006) links ‘the cult of the muscular body’ to the rise of the celebrity industry more specifically, arguing that the widespread desire for muscular masculinity as an ideal body image is coterminous with the rise of celebrity culture and with modernism as a cultural movement. Magill exercises this thesis in the context of the 1920s Jazz Age, which is particularly significant for the rise of the movie star and as many contend, the rise of the contemporary culture of celebrity. The 1920s are also significant in the history of modernity because it was a period marked by significant social upheaval and change. Beliefs about male superiority were literally blown apart by war and the images of which were clearly and daily displayed in the news press. As an industry that is dependant upon “idealised corporeal images” celebrity culture flourished in the wake of this destruction because it delivered idealised images of white men’s bodies within a broader cultural movement to reinstall the white male as superior. Focusing on the images of three celebrity figures: physical culturist, Bernarr MacFadden and actors Ralph Valentino and Lon Chaney, Magill shows how their bodies were central to their celebrity. He argues that while each performed a different persona and in different contexts (MacFadden was a poster boy for bodybuilding and exercise for health while Valentino and Chaney performed hegemonic masculinities in film) they were popular precisely because they
promoted a powerful “a panacea for postwar disillusion” (p.1). Magill argues that the most important function of these celebrities for male audiences was to counteract widespread feelings of masculine corporeal frailty.

Montez de Oca (2005) explores a further cycle of anxiety over American men’s bodies through ‘muscle-gap’ discourse popular in the 1950s-60s America. The muscle gap, like the missile gap, Montez de Oca explains, described anxieties over a significant gap in the fitness of American youth as compared with European boys and girls. This revelation occurred during cold war conflict when the United States was attempting to assume a leadership role in international politics. Differences in the fitness of American youth compared with Europeans caused a moral panic about men’s bodies and the subsequent discourse around re-building them was concerned with male bodies as a resource of the nation and as a measure of its power. The response to the muscle-gap, Montez de Oca shows, consisted of a two-pronged approach. First, anxiety about the conditioning of men’s bodies was disseminated through cold-war discourse that pitted America as a leader of the ‘free world’ against the ‘slave world’ of the Soviet Union. Examining articles in newspapers and magazines throughout this period, Montez de Oca reveals how this binary construction of the U.S relied upon the construction of a heteronormative male subject. He finds evidence of this in homophobic discourse about the so-called ‘softening’ of men and their bodies by modern consumer culture and fears about their openness to ‘penetration’ by communists. Gay men were particularly stigmatized as being vulnerable to communist penetration based on stereotypes about their effeminacy. Within this hypermasculine and homophobic response to the muscle gap evident in discourse about hard and soft masculinities, physical education was heavily promoted. Eisenhower formed the President’s Council on Youth Fitness in 1952, which Kennedy later expanded to target all citizens in under the new rubric of the President’s Council of Physical Fitness. In addition to the popular media as a major channel for spreading muscle-gap discourse, it was also disseminated through educational and scientific channels during the
cold war period. The convergence of government, media, education and science was seen in the creation and implementation of national standards of physical fitness designed to “measure, hierarchize, and place youth within a national matrix of bodies…so that weak ones could be identified and made subject to bodily regimes of transformation” (p.154).

The preoccupation with hard white bodies that has clearly preoccupied discourse about bodies and nation in twentieth century America evolved into its most aggressive incarnation in the 1980s. This was the period in which Reagan became president and when Hollywood became dominated by hypermuscular action heroes. In her detailed textual analysis of selected films from this period such as Rambo (1981) and Terminator (1984) Jeffords (1994) demonstrates a connection between the representation of hypermuscular men conquering in colonial settings and the hypermasculine imagery and rhetoric of Reaganism. Jeffords explains how Reagan’s presidency was characterised by efforts to “remasculinize” America and its men after significant losses in international politics including the Vietnam War, for which he openly blamed on the ‘soft’, ‘liberal’ leadership of his predecessor Jimmy Carter. Jeffords points out how Reagan himself contributed to the melding of the individual identities of men with a national identity based on strength, toughness and a willingness to use force where ever necessary through his own image as a ‘manly’ man, an outdoorsman who had himself photographed chopping wood and riding horseback (Jeffords. 1994). Against this political context, Jeffords reads the images of hypermuscular men wreaking vengeance on “others” perceived as a danger to the United States, as reflecting gendered notions about nationhood that preoccupied and were articulated by the discourse of the Reagan presidency. Jeffords analysis is also valuable because it shows how images of hegemonic masculinity shifted between the 1980s and 1990s with changes in popular discourse about gender and politics. She explains that during Bush’s presidency, political concerns shifted inward to issues of domestic order and that these concerns were registered in filmic depictions of men returning to the home. Jeffords notes that while popular films of this era
(i.e. Kindergarten Cop (1990), City Slickers (1991), and Terminator 2 (1991)) hailed the arrival of the “New Age Man”, a more sensitive and caring prototype of the 1980s action hero, they continued to encode patriarchal politics through depictions of men assuming leadership roles and putting mothers and Others in their place. Jefford’s analysis of film in relation to nation building discourse is thus compelling for highlighting the link between representation and politics as well as the role of images of muscular men in an ongoing process of masculinising American men.

While the meanings associated with muscles have shifted across the twentieth century, a common theme of a ‘crisis’ of masculinity drives surges in the appearance of images of muscular males and the particular shape of their contours. The accounts of images of white male bodies in cinema and popular culture summarised above extend on the understanding of celebrity identities as sites where corporeal tensions are played out. While white men have overwhelmingly been depicted and celebrated in popular culture as exemplars of muscular masculinity, neither muscles nor individualism are exclusively the preserve of white males. “The hard body” as Tasker (1997) writes, “is underwritten by intertwining discourse of gender, race, nationality and power” (p. 334). This point is perhaps best made by examining discussions of sport celebrities where studies of non-white and especially African American men provide insight into the multiple categories of race, gender, sexuality and nationality that shape celebrity meanings in both local and global contexts.

**Intersections of race and gender in the celebrity body: The sport media star**

While studies of sport celebrity have illuminated the contours of a range of sport stars, research has tended to focus on racialised images for the ways in which sport media and advertising uphold racist, nationalist and gendered beliefs about bodies, identities and American citizenship (Andrews, 1996; Andrews and McDonald, 2001; Wilson, 2005). While I am aware of the dangers of focusing on black and non-white athletes exclusively, I wish to focus on a few of these studies as a foil to the previous discussion of celebrity images of white males. My intention
is to highlight how intersecting discourses about race, sexuality, class and gender shape media images of celebrities and how these varying representations contribute to the maintenance of unequal relationships of power.

Much of the interest in sport stars has focused on the media images of basketball legend, Michael Jordan. A former face of the NBA, Nike and now his own brand of basketball merchandise, Jordan was at one time positioned as the face of American masculinity. In his detailed study, Andrews (1996) shows how race intersected with masculinity in producing Michael Jordan as an icon of the NBA and of American citizenship more generally. Emerging in the early 90s, Andrews suggests that Jordan’s image of clean-cut, hard working manhood was marketed as a positive foil to the anti-authoritarian, anti-social and perceived anti-American images of black male athletes who were perceived as dominating the NBA and alienating white audiences. Applying a critical race analysis to media representations of Jordon, Andrews (1996) examines how his image was manufactured to capture white American audiences who had previously been turned off the NBA by the game’s overtly ‘black’ demeanour. Analysing Jordan’s images in various sport media and advertising, Andrews (1996) draws on Hall’s notion of “race as a floating signifier” to demonstrate how his image was both identified and dis-identified from stereotypical images of black masculinity. He was identified with blackness in terms of beliefs about his natural athleticism, captured in the Nike commercial, “Born to dunk” in which he performs superhuman physical feats. Yet, in other commercials such as “Be like Mike” he was elevated above the negative connotations of primitivism through his depiction as a humble, hard working, model of sportsmanship which contributed to the perception of anti-authoritarian of NBA players as spoiled, lazy and self-involved brats. Andrews also suggests that Jordan’s image was adaptable to a model of white middle class masculinity because he did not publicly identify with ‘blackness’ in a civil rights sense like other black athletes who have been vilified in the white press for their outspokenness. Ultimately, Andrews shows that while
Jordan’s image of clean cut, hard working masculinity was powerful as a ‘non-stereotypical’ image of black masculinity, it relied upon and reinforced a deeply racialised binary of ‘good blacks’ versus ‘bad blacks’ (Wilson, 2005) which in a post-Reagan, ant-affirmative action world, promotes a myth of social mobility as well as sustains a model of American citizenship based on a model of middle class whiteness and self-responsibility.

In a similar study of the media representation of Chinese NBA sensation, Yao Ming, Oats and Palumbaum (2004) found similar racial stereotyping of Ming as well as of black men as they were complicated through the body of this Chinese player. Analysing Ming’s images in American news press, NBA and sponsor advertising, they show how his image was loaded with meanings about hegemonic masculinity in both Chinese and Western contexts. For China, Ming’s towering size and humble demeanour were seen as a symbolic opportunity to show its strength and superiority to the US, and provide an opportunity for symbolic resistance to the feminisation of the “Oriental” male in Western culture. Towards understanding the polysemy of Yao’s image, Oats and Palumbaum look to the demands of a global sport media market, that seeks athletes with the potential to speak to a range of audiences/markets across local and global contexts (Oats and Palumbaum, 2004). Furthermore, in understanding the choice of Ming, the first Chinese player to be selected as a representative for the NBA, they argue that Ming’s nationality and racial difference were ripe for political use at a time of stilted political negotiations between China and the U.S. For the NBA, then, and advertisers such as Nike, Ming’s intellectual and humble style of masculinity was marketed to white audiences as a contrast to the anti-authoritarian image of black players as well as to Chinese-American audiences who could identify with Ming’s muscular image of Chinese masculinity. Furthermore, and for both audiences, his recruitment and star treatment was used to bolster an image of the NBA and of America as welcoming to foreigners (Oats and Palumbaum, 2004). The tensions between Chinese and American investments in Ming, however, actually reproduced racist
understandings of the black athlete in both contexts where Ming was held up as exemplary against the demonised image of black players. This binary was crystallized in the media, Oats and Palumbaum show, through the production of a rivalry between Ming and notorious ‘bad boy’, Shaquille O’Neal. Where Ming was characterized as a gentle, humble and skilled athlete, this was juxtaposed to the aggressive, arrogant and physically powerful image of O’Neil, thus reinforcing racist understandings of black males as primitive, uncivilized and ‘all-body”.

Cole and Andrews (2001) make a similar argument about the media representation of golfer, Tiger Woods who, through his own and corporate construction, has been hailed as “America’s son” because of his multi-racial identity. They argue that the emphasis on his multi-racial identity in advertising was strategic for shifting the image of golf and Nike from being perceived as racially exclusive and elitist to being perceived as progressive and ‘colour blind’. Moreover, they assert that the touting of Woods as ‘America’s son’ mapped the rhetoric of ‘colour-blindness’ onto the nation where his elevation to celebrity status could be held up as evidence of a post-race America that has fully adapted to its place in the ‘global community.’ Yet the entrenchment of race as a powerful discourse in determining ideal images is easily visible in the racialised depictions of other African American celebrity athletes such as Mike Tyson, Muhammad Ali and Dennis Rodman, all of whom have been perceived through racial stereotypes as deviant for their refusals to conform to normative codes of (white) appearance and behaviour (see also Wynn, 2003; LaFrance and Rail, 2001; Sloop, 1997).

As the above studies emphasize, images of sport stars are guided by the interests of the corporations who represent them and are further linked to nationalist and racialized discourse about what it means to be an American citizen. This leads us to an important insight about non-white and racialized celebrity images. While their images may appear to be progressive in their emphasis on celebrating racial difference they more often promote an ideal of individuality based on a model of white middle-class masculinity that keeps a hierarchy of bodies in place.
**Hegemonic masculinity as a lens for studying celebrity**

The combination of studies that I have explored in this section on celebrity bodies helps to underscore a crucial point about Foucault’s understanding of power. This is the notion that power is both enabling and disabling for bodies as the discourses on race in sport media clearly shows. For white men, discourse about muscular bodies can make them powerful while racialised discourse about black and other racialised males often operates in ways that reduces them to their bodies and to commodities for consumption by advertisers and audiences alike. Yet power is not as black and white as my discussion also shows. Black male athletes such as Yao Ming, Michael Jordan and Tiger Woods can be empowered with the mantle of representing major sports and media corporations and making massive salaries while white male athletes can be viciously stigmatized and disempowered through homophobic discourse about homosexuality. In a discussion of media representations of two athletes with HIV, Magic Johnson and Greg Louganis, Dworkin and Wachs (2000) show how intersecting discourses of homophobia, heterosexuality and misogyny displaced the blame for Johnson’s disease onto the women who were charged with giving him the disease, as well as onto homosexuality more generally. By comparison, the media coverage of HIV positive diver, Greg Louganis, that focused on his homosexuality, he was stigmatized and marginalised as a danger not only to other athletes but also to society.

To understand these complex relationships among male celebrity identities that I have illuminated throughout this review, I draw on Connell’s notion of hegemonic masculinity (1987) that has been widely influential on the study of masculinity as a central organising discourse of sports and society more generally. This concept is useful for understanding the relationship between celebrity, bodies and masculinity because it offers a theoretical understanding of how masculinity operates as a power relation among men as well as helps to explain how certain
subjectivities such as the heterosexual, middle-class, white male continues to be elevated and linked to conventional notions of manhood and citizenship.

“Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (2005, p.77). Connell’s notion of hegemonic masculinity has been popularized as a way of understanding how dominant notions of masculinity arise and become powerful in the organization of institutions and the socialization of boys and men that maintains unequal hierarchies among the genders, in both local and global contexts (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). Importantly, as Connell qualifies, the notion of hegemonic masculinity does not imply a top-down system of domination of all men over all women. Rather it aims to capture and explain how power and privilege are experienced differently by men and how power and privilege have historically and culturally weighed in favour of white, heterosexual, middle-class males.

Furthermore, where Connell stresses how masculinity is relational to femininity, he stresses that masculine subject positions and power are also shaped by their intersection with other social categories (i.e. race, class, age, sexuality and so on). As per Gramsci’s conception of hegemony, power is not simply assumed in such a system but is negotiated and consented to and while most men do not and cannot measure up to the exemplars of masculinity that embody hegemonic norms, they gain a “dividend” from its operation such as how heterosexual men gain privileges through the subordination of women and homosexuals as inferior and deviant. Moreover, women as well as homosexual males can gain from consenting to a male hegemony.

While Connell’s deployment of hegemony does not suggest that power resides only and always in the hands and bodies of white middle class males, theorists of masculinity regularly cite celebrity the images of muscle men such as Arnold Schwarzenegger as symbolic exemplars of hegemonic masculinity. This is because, as I discussed earlier, muscles have been historically
perceived as the most basic resource of men’s power and the attribute that sets men apart from women, who by comparison are depicted as weak, irrational and unsuited for leadership. Thus, while few men actually embody hegemonic masculinity, they can look to exemplars who role-model what it means to be a ‘real man’, thus shoring up instabilities in ordinary men’s psychological relationship to masculinity. According to Messner (2007), symbolic exemplars legitimize, “the global subordination of women and ensures men’s access to privilege” (p.463).

Importantly, hegemonic masculinity does not assume that masculine norms are unchanging or stable as McDowell’s points out: “masculinity is incoherent, unstable and in a constant state of utter convulsion” (1997, p.369). This point is best made in the context of bodybuilding where dominant meanings of muscle have historically wrestled with its homoerotic and homosexual connotations.

On the one hand, Saltman (2003) shows how the martial discourse of bodybuilding language and magazines eschews passivity and homosexuality through constructing the muscular male body as “a body of war”. White and Gillett (1994) concur with Saltman in their analysis of the symbolic representation of muscular masculinity in a bodybuilding magazine where muscularity is associated with aggressive masculinity such that it becomes a spectacle of masculine power. Pronger (1992) and Dutton (1995) view extreme muscularity as not merely symbolic of the phallus but as the phallus embodied. White and Gillett (1994) point out that hypermasculine images of muscle men belie deep-seated insecurities about power and that aggressive masculinity symbolizes men’s attempts to restore feelings of self-control & self-worth. This is confirmed in Klein’s (1993) ethnography of a group of Southern Californian bodybuilders who admitted to being drawn to the sport because it provided them with a sense of power that they did not feel in their everyday lives (Klein, 1993).

While the aggressive image of the male bodybuilder has been read as the embodiment of hegemonic masculinity (White and Gillett, 1994), it remains a site of contested cultural meanings
about sexuality and gender. Boscagli (1996) explains that while images of hard bodies can be positioned in ways that distance them from the feminine and by extension the homosexual, their objectification renders them passive in the same ways that women are objectified by the male gaze. ‘Gender trouble’ in bodybuilding can also be attributed to the adoption of muscular masculinity as an image of hegemonic masculinity in gay magazines and media as well as the development of gay bodybuilding subcultures (Pronger, 1992). The historical tensions between investments of images of muscular masculinity with heteronormativity, homoeroticism and even explicitly homosexual meanings highlights that muscles are at once a powerful and ongoing symbol of masculine dominance as well as a contested site of power.

The hegemonic view of masculinity has allowed scholars to move beyond the corseting effects of sex-role theory and static vision of male domination over women, encouraged by the notion of patriarchy (Messner, 1992, 2007). To be sure, hegemony theory has enabled theorists to account for power differentials not simply between men and women but among men and to explain how some men are able to dominate over other men and gain privileges. This has been shown in work on the normalization of heteromasculinity in sports (Messner, et al, 2000, Wellard, 2002), the privileging of white male bodies over black male bodies in images of ideal bodies and dispositions (Andrews, 1996; Rowe et. al, 2000) as well as how race, class and sexuality combine to shape men’s access to and acceptance within sporting cultures (Booth & Loy, 1999).

The embrace of hegemonic masculinity as a departure point for analysis however, has also been strongly critiqued for being too deterministic in its vision of power and where it resides. Pringle (2005) has argued that the notion of hegemonic masculinity has caused an overly negative perception of sport and masculinity as wholly oppressive of men, their relationships with women and other men as well as damaging to their bodies and psychologies (Gardiner, 2002, Pringle, 2005). This concern is somewhat reflected by McKay et al. (2000) in their
acknowledgement that for much of the 1980s and 1990s scholars “focused on negative outcomes such as pain and injury, homophobia, and violence against women by men. In some ways, sport was portrayed as a hostile cultural space for boys to grow up in and to develop relationships with one another and with women” (p. 6). Research on masculinities has since turned towards capturing the greater nuances in men’s experiences of self and one another through participation in sports. This was partly enabled by the influence of Foucauldian type analyses, led of feminist theorists and the integration of post-structuralism into the study of sport, which has helped somewhat in solving the problem of perceiving men as simply compliant with or resistant to hegemonic codes of masculinity that govern sport. These perspectives have also allowed for a more complex understanding of identities as fragmented and for men’s experiences of identity and power as complex, inconsistent and contradictory (Andrews and Jackson, 2001; Pringle, 2005). Resistance, contradiction and negotiation have thus joined discourses on hegemonic masculinity resulting in more nuanced portrayals of men’s experiences of masculinity and of male sporting cultures.

Nonetheless, the powerful and negative effects of a hegemonic notion of masculinity that glorifies violence, toughness, sexism and homophobia is not to be underestimated nor can the idealized images of muscular male bodies that support narrow standards of masculine power and beauty. As I pointed out earlier, it is through media images of muscular men such as Schwarzenegger and sporting heroes that hegemonic masculinities are embodied and celebrated (Connell, 2005; Messner, 2007). In a textual analysis of televised sports most watched by boys and their accompanying advertising, Messner et al. (2000) found that the sport media overwhelmingly expose boys to a one-dimensional image of masculinity that they call the “Televised Sports Manhood Formula”. While they are careful to point out some of the contradictions of their study such as the rare presence of white female reporters and black men (though in entertainment rather than intellectual roles) as well as the existence of alternatives to
hegemonic images of men in commercials, they argue that “the Televised Sports Media Formula provides a remarkably stable and concrete view of masculinity as grounded in bravery, risk taking, violence, bodily strength, and heterosexuality.” (p. 392). In accordance with the notion of hegemonic masculinity, Messner et al qualify that this image of masculinity is constructed in relation to women “as sexual support objects or invisible” and in relation to other men “who don’t measure up” (p.392). Messner et al’s insights are particularly important because their study draws on and adds to Jhally’s notion of the sport/media complex, which points to the interrelation and alignment of sport with the media in circulating and selling ideology. Considering the promotion of a hegemonic masculinity based on violence, racism, misogyny and homophobia identified in the “Televised Sports Manhood Formula”, the commercialization of sport as a major form of media and its positioning as central among other forms of media is revealing of how sport plays an immensely powerful role in the stabilization and promotion of dominant forms of masculinity in culture more broadly.

In a review of key studies of sport media, Wilson (2007) concurs that sport media construct and legitimize a gender-based power structure in sports and culture more generally through the glorification of male domination and aggression and images that pacify and sexualize women. He further asserts that this is not simply an effect of ideology but reflects a male dominance over the production of sport spectacles where men are overrepresented at all levels from camera operators to advertisers, promoters and team and media owners. While, as Wilson points out, it is incorrect to assume that audiences passively absorb media messages, they undoubtedly have a powerful effect on shaping and perpetuating dominant ideology. Indeed, the effects of images of ideal muscular male bodies and hypermasculine gender performances in sport media and the media more generally, has been shown in recent research on boy’s and men’s destructive attitudes towards their bodies. This includes playing through injury and pain (White and Young, 1999) as well as increasing reports of ‘megarexia’, and body dysmorphia
among boys and men (Clarke, 2004). Empirical research on the effects of images of ideal male bodies on television, especially in advertising suggests a powerful correlation between men’s exposure to idealised body images and their pursuit of ‘better’ bodies in order to feel more powerful and worthy of acceptance and love (Agliata and Tantleff-Dunn, 2004; Weber, 2006; Pope et al, 2000). Again, this is not to depict boys and men as passive consumers of media as has been a strong critique of earlier studies of media audiences (Wilson, 2007). However, it appears undeniable that dominant masculine subjectivities and their embodiment in images of muscular men hold a profound, if often unstable and fleeting, power over Western cultures. The notion of hegemonic masculinity is thus crucial to my study of Arnold Schwarzenegger because it helps to link the symbolic production of white, muscular, male bodies to more material forms of power in a world where hypermasculinity structures American cultural institutions from sport to politics.
Chapter 3

Methodology & Method
Introduction

My approach to studying the connections between Arnold Schwarzenegger’s media images and his immense accrual of power as a celebrity and political leader is to conduct a textual analysis of the various media texts in which he has been represented. My rationale is largely based on the findings of scholars that contemporary celebrity is produced through the media such as images in advertising, in sports broadcasting, film and television, in the pages of sports and news columns as well as in popular magazines. Arnold Schwarzenegger is a media creature, meaning that we can only know him through his images in the popular media. Certainly, there are many types and applications of textual analysis. In this chapter I will explain how my particular approach to studying media texts is shaped by post-structural insights into how texts produce meaning and link up to power in society. In particular, my application of these insights follows from literature discussed in the previous chapter where scholars of film and sport study the discourses through which celebrities are constructed to explain the cultural value and meanings invested in their media imagery. Importantly, I am applying discourse analysis not a unified method or theory but rather as a set of insights shaped by the work of post-structural scholars into the processes through which meaning is produced and how these meanings connect to broader structures of power and knowledge that structure our social worlds. Further, while there are varying traditions in the application of discourse analysis such as deployed by Laclau and Mouffe and ‘critical discourses analysis’ as described and deployed by Norman Fairclough (1992), my usage is much less formal. Rather than apply discourse analysis as a specific method, I more borrow from the insights of particular scholars whose ideas I describe below, to help me produce a fully historical, intertextual and multiple reading of various media texts.

The first half of this chapter is dedicated to explaining the discursive approach to textual analysis. I begin by outlining the structuralist origins of the text as a unit of analysis before moving to outline the post-structural augmentations of textual analysis. I highlight three main
insights of post-structuralism that I apply to my analysis of Arnold Schwarzenegger’s media imagery. These are: 1) the notion that textual meanings are discursive and connected to power; 2) that textual meanings are multiple, contextual and change over time; 3) that textual meanings are produced through intertextual processes. I also draw on a fourth category of analysis that has been stressed in the work on sport stars by sports sociologists. This is the notion of political economy, which is useful for the study of celebrity because it can account for the role of political and economic relationships in shaping images of celebrities. Political economy can help to account for aspects of celebrity that cannot be accounted for using a discursive perspective alone.

After elaborating on what I view as the strengths of a post-structural approach to textual analysis I turn to outline how I went about doing my own textual analysis of Arnold Schwarzenegger’s celebrity imagery.

Textual analysis as a tool for critically ‘reading’ celebrity

In explaining the rise of a celebrity culture throughout the twentieth century, scholars have perceived celebrities less as individual people and more as cultural signs whose meanings speak to broader notions about “what it means to be a human being in contemporary society” (Dyer, 1986, p.7). In order to access the particular meanings of celebrity-signs, researchers have turned to textual analysis to study the ways in which celebrities are represented in popular culture. These representations are conceived of as texts and include visual images and printed media that position individual celebrities in particular ways. The conception of celebrities as signs and the use of media texts to investigate their cultural meanings comes by way of the ‘linguistic turn’ in cultural studies; the adaptation of structuralist insights about language and its meaning to the study of popular forms and media (Bertrand & Hughes, 2005).

Structuralist origins: Deciphering the text

Structuralism is associated with the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure who argued that language is not simply a naming device but rather a symbolic system through which we
construct knowledge about the world (McGowan, 2006). In this paradigm, a text is made up of individual signs (i.e. words) whose meanings are not pre-determined but are formed through ‘systems of signification.’ The meanings of a text are thus perceived as based on the arrangement of its signs within specific structures of language. The aim of semiotics then was to uncover the meanings of a text (i.e. sentences) based on the notion that they had a structure that could be scientifically studied. While the application of semiotics to non-literary texts such as films, advertising and celebrity by cultural studies’ scholars has been helpful for legitimizing the study of popular culture, many of the structuralist assumptions about the ways in which texts produce meanings have proven to be limiting. These assumptions include a linear view of the communication process from text to viewer, an over-determined view of the role of the author in controlling textual meanings and a limited view of textual meanings as relatively fixed, knowable and confined to the text (Bertrand & Hughes, 2005).

Post-structuralism: The text as discourse and power

In complicating the notion of a text and how it produces meaning, cultural studies’ scholars have drawn on the insights of post-structuralism. The term post-structuralism is associated with the work of Julia Kristeva, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault and others whose work grew out of critiques of structuralist approaches to textual analysis (Manning and Cullum-Swan, 1994). Discourse and power are key terms for post-structuralist thinkers whose innovations in approaches to textual analysis can be characterized by their shift away from uncovering the embedded meanings of a text to exploring the systems of knowledge through which the meanings of a text are structured and how these connect to broader arrangements of power (Chandler, 2002). The discursive approach, according to Stuart Hall (1997) is,

…concerned with the effect and consequences of representation- its “politics”. It examines not only how language and representation produce meaning, but how the knowledge that a
discourse produces connects with power, regulates conduct, makes up or constructs identities and subjectivities, and defines the way certain things are represented, thought about, practiced and studied (quoted in Chandler, 2002, p. 6).

This revised view of the text and the ways in which texts produces meaning is shaped by a specific ontology, one that is related to postmodernism’s radical revision of modernist notions of subjectivity, “Reality” and “Truth” (McDonald and Birrell, 1999). Briefly, post-structuralists work from the understanding that objectivity is impossible; that there is no unified “Truth” about the world. This is because the world is only knowable through our constructions of it; how it works and our place in it. The way that we develop and perpetuate these perspectives is through language and other forms of representation such as the image that we use to make the social world intelligible (Bertrand and Hughes, 2005).

Discourse is the term that is used to describe these culturally constructed codes and views that we use to make sense of the social world and which embed power relations. Dyer (1986) nicely articulates the notion of discourse as “not philosophically coherent systems of thought but rather clusters of ideas, notions, feelings, images attitudes and assumptions that, taken together, make up distinctive ways of thinking and feeling about things, of making particular sense of the world” (p.17). Michel Foucault contributed much to post-structural approaches to textual analysis because he saw discourse as the link between knowledge and power: “It is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together” (Foucault, 1984, p.100). Foucault has demonstrated this notion in his many accounts of the historical construction of the body through medical, criminal, psychiatric discourse, and has provided powerful demonstrations of the relationships between the historical production of knowledge about the body and the exercise of power over bodies. In History of Sexuality Vol. 1 (1976) for example, Foucault shows how developments in medicine, psychiatry and criminal psychology shifted knowledge about
homosexuality from a natural or accepted practice to a disease engaged in by abnormal identities whose personality and desires required rehabilitation. His work has been among the most influential on contemporary social theory and has refocused attention throughout the sub-disciplines of cultural studies towards the body as a central locus of power and towards subjectivity as constituted through discourse.

As I highlighted earlier, discourse analysis is neither a unified theory nor method for conducting textual analysis. However, there are varying traditions in which the study of discourse has and can be applied and it is worth highlighting some of them here so as to clarify my own use of discourse analysis for this study. As Phillips and Jorgensen (2002) identify them, discourse analysis has been applied to the study of language and power in three main ways (certainly, there are more) that are shaped by the particular ontological positionings of their authors: Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory, critical discourse analysis as set out by Fairclough (1992) and discursive psychology. While all three traditions work from a social constructionist perspective, they differ in their theoretical underpinnings and methods of analysis. For example there are differences between how discourse theory and critical discourse analysis perceive the role of discourse in shaping power relations. Moreover, where discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis are more focused on the broader operations of discourse, discursive psychology is more focused on the ways in which people use language in everyday interactions. While I share their social constructionist ontology, my use of discourse analysis is much more flexible than applied by any of the above traditions. Rather, I apply the theoretical insights offered by certain post-structuralists such as Foucault and Barthes to shape my view of the text as a thoroughly discursive contextual, historical and intertextual construct. To further clarify this position, I now move to describe a similar approach to the study of celebrity and media texts called “Reading sport critically” as described by sports sociologists McDonald and Birrell (1999).
Reading sport critically: Post-structural approaches to studying sport celebrity

The notion of discourse has been particularly powerful for advancing the analysis of celebrity because it emphasizes context and connects the cultural meanings of celebrities to broader arrangements of power in which they are embedded and to which their images contribute. These insights have led to a refocusing of textual analysis on the interrogation of power in images of sport celebrities. McDonald & Birrell (1999) refer to this perspective as “reading sport critically”. In arguing for the legitimacy of this perspective they contend that it “focuses analytical attention on specific sporting incidents and uses them to reveal a nexus of power that helps to produce their meanings” (p. 284). This perspective clearly shapes much of the recent research on sport celebrity that moves beyond the modernist approach of viewing celebrities as knowable unified subjects. Instead, researchers look outside their texts to examine the discourses that constitute them as meaningful, to particular audiences in specific historical, political, and cultural contexts. They can then explore how these meanings connect to broader cultural beliefs about what is normal and desirable for bodies and identities.

Andrews (1996) explains his conceptualization of Michael Jordan in post-structural terms: “Michael Jordan’s popular signification reveals a complex narrative incorporating many of the historically grounded racial codes that continue to structure the racial formations in the United States (1996, p. 125). Andrews takes an historical approach to Jordan and identifies four major constructions of him throughout his career in the NBA, among them his depictions as a natural athlete, as an unraced ‘all-American male and as a ‘black’ man following the revelation of his gambling debts and his father’s murder. He supports these constructions with data from news media, sports commentary and advertising that contributed to the various and shifting portrayals of Jordan and he explains these portrayals in terms of the racialised and gendered discourses about race, athleticism and what it means to be an American in post-Reaganite America. Andrews is successful at excavating the cultural meanings of Jordan because he
situates his representation as a ‘black athlete’ and a star within the particular historical, cultural
and political contexts in which his images circulated.

**Textual meanings are multiple and contextual**

Studies of sport celebrities highlight another crucial insight for textual analysis. This
insight relates to the observation that textual meanings are neither fixed nor singular but are
rather fluid across time and context and are multiple. This view came by way of the critique of
the structuralist notion that textual meanings are determined by the particular structure of a text
and the intention of its author. Barthes made this point with his pronouncement about the “death
of the author” (1968) and birth of the reader in which he argued that the meaning of a text is not
determined by its origin but rather by its destination (Chandler, 2002). Thus post-structuralists
argued that audiences are not passive observers of media representations but are actively
engaged in the process of meaning production (Belsey, 2006).

The multiple and contextual meanings of celebrity representations are nicely
demonstrated in Giardina’s (2001) study of Martina Hingis. Giardina studies the multiple
perspectives in Hingis by reading her representations in three different cultural contexts:
Switzerland, across Europe, and in America. Drawing on advertisements, sports commentary and
news media stories about Hingis in each of these contexts, he identifies specific and different
discourses that make her meaningful within each of these contexts. In Europe, he shows how
advertising highlighted Hingis’s flexible identity and her ability to speak various languages and
attributed these sophisticated attributes to a notion of ‘Pan-European flair’. Giardina further
explains how the portrayal of Hingis as mature, worldly, and sophisticated lends these same
qualities to the products that she was asked to advertise. In America, Giardina shows how Hingis
was understood through a discourse of ‘girl power’ that positioned her as a role model for young
women, and through heteronormative notions of femininity. Giardina further explains these
different depictions of Hingis as an effect of the notion of flexible citizenship and beneath it, the effects of globalization and globalization of the media on notions of identity and belonging.

Importantly, the post-structural insight that texts can have multiple meanings does not mean that a text can mean anything at all. Rather, the strength of post-structural informed textual analysis is that the meanings they produce are dependant upon the particular perspectives from which they are interpreted and the specific historical, cultural, personal and political contexts in which they are read (Manning and Cullum-Swan, 1994; McGowan, 2006). This is the meaning of polysemy, which Hall (1980) qualifies is not the same as pluralism. Where pluralism suggests the equal ranking of different viewpoints, polysemy indicates how multiple meanings are expressed according to their placement in broader and hierarchical arrangements of power.

**Textual meanings are intertextual**

In addition to the relationships between audiences and texts, post-structuralism emphasizes the relationship among texts in determining their meanings. According to Barthes “a text is…a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations” (1977, quoted in Chandler, 2002). Barthes is describing the notion of intertextuality, which Julia Kristeva, his student, is credited with contributing to post-structural understandings of textual analysis. According to Kristeva, texts derived their meanings not from their author or internal structure but from prior texts and contexts. This is to say that the boundaries of texts are permeable and that in order to understand them, we must view them through the surrounding texts and contexts to which they are related. Dyer (1986) and deCordova (1990) deploy the notion of intertextuality in their studies of film stars. Both perceive stars as composed not of a single coherent image but rather as a collection of the various images that emerge about them in popular culture (in tabloids, fan magazines, newspapers, Internet). The star’s identity, writes deCordova “is an intertextual field of associations… it [actor’s identity] does not exist within the individual star but rather in the connections among a
wide variety of texts” (1990, p. 20). Dyer studies the construction of Marilyn Monroe through intertextual discourses about sexuality in the 1950s. He does this by examining the nuances and continuities across her depictions in films, stage plays, Playboy magazine and in popular magazines. In his study he demonstrates how the notion of discourse itself is intertextual: “A discourse runs across different media and practices, across different cultural levels- from the self conscious Playboy ‘philosophy’ to the habitual forms of pin-up, from psychoanalytic theory through psycho therapeutic practices to the imagery of popular magazines and best selling novels” (1986, p. 17).

The convergence of discourse with political economy

In adopting a discursive approach, sports sociologists have also extended the application of textual analysis to consider the role of political economy in shaping the meanings of celebrity texts. Political economy refers to the study of how political and economic interests of the state, big business and the media for example shape the kinds of images we see and how they are depicted. The role of political economy is well illustrated in a study of the celebrity meanings of Yao Ming (Oats and Palumbaum, 2004). In their study of the ways in which Ming is depicted in NBA and affiliated advertising in the U.S and overseas, Oats and Palumbaum notice how he is positioned differently. They show how Ming is positioned in China as a role model for Chinese men and as an ambassador for China to the world through his characteristics of humility, sportsmanship and lack of arrogance that is perceived by the Chinese as a characteristic of the West. In America, Oats and Palumbaum notice how Ming is positioned in advertising as the new face of the NBA whose characteristics of humility and poise are used to dispel the negative associations developed through the linking of the NBA’s image with African American athletes whose anti-authoritarian styles of clothing and address have been perceived as ruining the image of the sport. In addition to explaining these different and strategic depictions of Ming in China and the U.S. through specific cultural discourses about race, nationality, masculinity and
athleticism, Oats and Palumbaum also consider how the particular interests of the NBA and its sponsors (i.e. Nike and Mac) converge with these discourses in shaping images of Ming. This is further embedded in a broader understanding of globalization as a political economic process that contributes to the flexible and multiple meanings of sport stars.

The consideration of political economic forces in shaping the images of sports icons is important because it helps to avoid the reduction of celebrities to discourse alone. Rather, the consideration of political economic forces in shaping celebrity meanings reveals that there is a complex interplay between material and ideological practices (i.e. between ideology and practices of consumption and production) that shape celebrity meanings.

**Strengths of the discursive approach**

Certainly, post-structural methodology has been criticized for its failure to offer a standardized, ‘scientific’ model for conducting research as well as its refusal to locate any singular ‘truth’ about the social world. It is true that post-structuralism is not a unified theory or methodology but is rather a set of theoretical ideas “which have at their core a self-reflexive discourse which is aware of the tentativeness, the slipperiness, the ambiguity and the complex interactions of texts and meanings” (Lye, 1997). However, the acknowledgement that there is no singular, universal ‘Truth’ embedded in a text awaiting discovery by the right scientific method, does not necessarily translate to a weakness or limitation of post-structural influenced research. Rather, the view that culture and therefore meaning is multiple and contradictory is perhaps the greatest strength of the post-structuralist viewpoint. It can lead to more complex and accurate accounts of culture and the power relations that shape it because of the attention it encourages to the specific socio-cultural, political and historical contexts in which texts are produced, circulated and consumed (Locke, 2004).

McDonald and Birrell (1999) highlight three main advantages of the discursive approach in relation to the study of sport celebrity: 1) it makes sport count as a serious topic of
investigation following its turn towards non-literary and popular forms of culture such as film and advertising; 2) it connects sport sociologists to the aims and research projects of other cultural critics; and 3) it enables sport sociologists to relate sporting incidents specific to the sporting world to the larger social context. Indeed, these points are not only applicable to the study of sport stars. Due to the overall conceptualisation of celebrity as a discursive terrain of meanings, McDonald and Birrell’s points can be applied to all forms of celebrity, which is helpful for my study of Schwarzenegger and figures like him whose celebrity imagery spans multiple promotional contexts such as sport, film, and politics.

**Method: ‘Reading’ Schwarzenegger critically**

Following from the insights of post-structural theory identified in this review as well as from the applications of post-structuralism to sport celebrity (McDonald and Birell, 1999; Andrews 1996) my method is to conduct a discursive textual analysis of Schwarzenegger’s media imagery. To clarify, this means that I do not apply discourse analysis as a strict method but rather draw on crucial insights of post-structuralism that underpin discourse analysis so as to produce a thoroughly contextual, historical, intertextual and multiple readings of the various media texts that I have selected for my analysis. Specifically, post-structuralism shapes my particular approach to studying Schwarzenegger’s images chronologically and across the promotional contexts in which he has been represented (i.e. bodybuilding, film and politics). I do this for several reasons: 1) to chart the changes in his imagery across time, 2) to explore how his celebrity has been shaped by each of the promotional contexts in which he has been represented and 3) to highlight connections, contradictions and consistencies among his depictions in each of these contexts in terms of how discourses about muscular masculinity circulate.

In Chapter 4 I begin by setting up my analysis by providing a brief biographical description of Arnold Schwarzenegger. I assemble this description from a wide variety of sources including Schwarzenegger’s autobiography (*Arnold: The education of a bodybuilder*),
the five biographies that have been written about him, biographical information on DVD’s, Schwarzenegger’s own personal and governor’s website (Schwarzenegger.com, Governor.com), related bodybuilding books, popular magazines and news articles. My aim is to focus attention on the chronological time-line of his career, the details of his achievements within bodybuilding, film and politics and his movements between them. In presenting these biographical ‘facts’ I heed warnings that biographies are composed of a mixture of factual and fictional details about a star that are embellished in ways to support their particular mythologies and the deeply held cultural mythologies that underpin our fascination with them (Marshall, 1997; Rojek, 2001; Andrews and Jackson, 2005). Mythology, as explained by Roland Barthes (1957) is an ideological system of representation that naturalizes certain versions of reality. More specifically, mythology operates by evacuating or obscuring historical and cultural context from an image such that a situation or series of events can appear normal, natural or common sense (Barthes, 1957). To say that Schwarzenegger’s biography is mythological is to point out that although certain facts may be true such that he was born in Austria and became an international film star, the story of how he achieved his goals obscures the privileges (of whiteness, heterosexuality, gender and his membership in the Kennedy family) that helped him to get there. Rather, his successes are naturalized as the result of his own hard work and steely discipline through deeply historical and cultural myths about meritocracy, masculinity and citizenship. While my intent is not to fully analyse mythology in my presentation of Schwarzenegger’s biography, (this is the task of the following chapters), I highlight its operation by pointing out the contradictions and inconsistencies in and among his different depictions.

In Chapter 5 I examine Schwarzenegger’s depiction as a celebrity bodybuilder. While Schwarzenegger’s ability to market himself to mainstream audiences has been attributed to his relationships with bodybuilding promoters and gatekeepers, little is understood about how the kinds of discourses circulating about muscular manhood in the 1970s helped him in his self-
promotion. I have selected Schwarzenegger’s own autobiography, Arnold: The Education of a Bodybuilder (1977) as the principal text through which to conduct this investigation. Part autobiographical and part motivational fitness manual, Education tells the story of Schwarzenegger’s bodybuilding career from his initial encounter with bodybuilding as a young boy in Austria to his immigration to America where he came to dominate in international bodybuilding circles after having won seven consecutive Mr. Olympia titles. Following this narrative is a series of photographs of his world champion physique and a fifty-page weight-training manual in which Schwarzenegger offers the reader advice on how to begin on the weight-training regime that he used to build his body. Education is a crucial cog in Schwarzenegger’s marketing machine because it appeared at a time when he had retired from professional bodybuilding and was experiencing difficulty breaking into Hollywood film (Baker, 1999). While the book was not immediately successful, a glowing review in the New York Times helped it to achieve a spot on the ‘best sellers’ list. The popularity of the book has since grown, evidenced by its numerous reprints and translation into various languages.

While there are a number of biographical texts about Schwarzenegger, I have chosen to examine Education because it offers some insight into how he constructs his own image as an icon of muscular masculinity. This is not meant to suggest that his narrative is in any way a ‘pure’ account of himself or his bodybuilding career. The post-modern turn in cultural studies has defeated beliefs in objectivity (Evans, 1999) and feminist research on autobiography reveals how individuals embellish, reconstruct and interpret their life stories depending on the contexts in which they are told and for whom they tell them (Evans, 1999; Bell & Yalom, 1986). As Rosen (1998) points out, the value of autobiography lies in what is “lurking beneath its modest surface, the great themes of memory, identity, the making of meaning and the social construction of reality” (1998, p.2). Rather, and based on my interest in explaining how Schwarzenegger was able to sell himself to the mainstream in a way that no other bodybuilder has been able to do, I
analyse Education for the kinds of discourses circulating about muscular manhood in the 1970s that might have helped to develop his popularity. I identify and analyse two interrelated themes: heteronormativity and individualism, which I discuss in relation to bodybuilding subculture and in the particular context of discourse about masculinity and whiteness. I further support my analysis by drawing on bodybuilding magazines, popular articles, interviews and photographic imagery that contributed to Schwarzenegger’s depiction as a heterosexual ambassador for bodybuilding and an exemplar of self-determined manhood.

In Chapter 6 I move to examine the expansion of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity from a famous bodybuilder to a more mainstream icon of muscular masculinity through his roles in Hollywood films. While there are plenty of film reviews and scholarly articles that analyse his films individually, no study currently exists that charts the development of his celebrity persona throughout his entire film career. I undertake this task using a ‘critical filmography’, a chronological examination of Schwarzenegger’s film roles between 1970 when he starred in his first feature film, Hercules in New York, up until 2003 when he starred in his last film, Terminator 3. My intention is to chart the shifts in his celebrity persona and to explore how these changes are shaped by his film roles and his depictions in popular media. Thus, in addition to studying film and making my own interpretations, I create a portrait of his evolving celebrity by drawing on interviews, film reviews, scholarly film articles and articles in popular magazines. I have selected these texts based on the information they contain about the filming, directing and audience reception of Schwarzenegger’s films as well as his own role in providing the financial and symbolic muscle for his film projects. The role of these texts in contributing to the development and meanings of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity persona is also illustrative of the arguments made by celebrity scholars that various parties including directors, agents, public relations and most prominently the popular press are involved in the creation and manipulation of celebrity identities (Gamson, 1994; Turner, 2004).
In Chapter 7, I continue my chronological view of the development of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity imagery by moving to examine his construction as a celebrity politician. Certainly, much has been written about the recall election, the role of the media and the political climate that enabled Schwarzenegger to succeed (Indiana, 2005; Mathews, 2006; Messner, 2007). However, less has been focused on detailed analysis of the kinds of images that circulated about him in this political role. I attempt to address this gap through a discourse analysis of three related and contradictory images: “the Governator”, “the Gropenator” and “the Gropenfuhrer”. These three images stood out among the many film inspired monikers applied to Schwarzenegger during his campaign for several reasons. First, they provide insight into the multiple and conflicting meanings that are attached to the image of Schwarzenegger’s hard white body and the hypermasculinity that he projects. Second, through intertextual discourse about muscular masculinity, each moniker provides an opportunity to examine the intersections among masculinity, sexuality and nationality in shaping notions of who is fit for citizenship and who is built for governance. Third, the deployment and circulation of these images by Schwarzenegger and his supporters, the media and members of the public highlight how ‘celebrity politics’ can provoke meaningful debate. In my analysis, I draw on a range of texts that include news footage of the recall election, news articles, popular magazine articles, cartoons and other images produced by independent media and members of the public audiences.

My main focus in analyzing the above-described sets of data and what guides my data selection is how they reveal discourses about muscular masculinity that shape Schwarzenegger’s celebrity meanings. Moreover, and following from the studies described above such as Andrews study of Jordan and Giardina’s (2001) work on Hingis, I embed and explain each of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity constructions in the cultural, historical and political contexts in which these images were created and circulated. Thus, like Andrews (1996) and Giardina (2001), I can connect particular constructions of Schwarzenegger such as his image as an icon of
American muscular masculinity created through his roles in 1980s action cinema to broader discourses and structures of power. These include racialised, sexualized and gendered categories of identity that shape cultural notions about normal and ideal bodies and belonging. These categories are particularly powerful and pertinent because they underpin notions of who is ‘fit’ for American citizenship and who is ‘built’ for governance. I use these phrases throughout the thesis to indicate how Schwarzenegger’s construction within privileged or stigmatized social categories of race, class, nationality and sexuality shape his proximity to American ideals and norms for masculinity, citizenship and political leadership.

My method thus follows from four key points offered by post-structural theorizing that I outlined in the first section of this chapter. First, Schwarzenegger’s celebrity meanings are discursively produced. This is to say that his meanings derive from knowledge and speech about muscular masculinity, whiteness, heterosexuality and power that make him popular, important, and relevant. Dyer puts it most simply: “Stars matter because they act out aspects of life that matter to us” (1986, p. 17). Schwarzenegger matters, for example, because muscles matter to us. By viewing Schwarzenegger’s images as discursive texts, I can make connections between his depictions in popular culture as a powerful leader and exemplar of American masculinity and his accruement of immense social, economic and political capital. Thus, I am able to relate my study of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity both to the larger cultural phenomenon of celebrity and to other cultural institutions of sport and politics where images of muscular masculinity have powerful purchase.

Second, I show that Schwarzenegger’s celebrity meanings, like his imagery are multiple, contextual and mutable over time. While he is often depicted as an ideal body through historical narratives about muscular masculinity, he has also been depicted as unintelligent and a dangerous foreigner based on associations between his Austrian-ness and fascism. I show how these depictions have changed according to the promotional contexts in which he has been
represented but also according to historical shifts in cultural discourse about muscular masculinity and the identity categories with which gender intersects. This provides an historical view of the discourses and power relationships that have produced and sustained Schwarzenegger’s celebrity meanings throughout his three-decade career. Third, I show that intertextual processes are involved in the construction of Schwarzenegger’s shifting celebrity personas. This is revealing of the intertextual processes that support the production of contemporary celebrities as well as highlighting relationships among sport, film and politics as mutually promotional of one another and of muscular masculinity. Also, by exploring Schwarzenegger’s own role in constructing his celebrity imagery, such as through his autobiography, his involvement in film production and his performances as a governor, I show how intentionality can converge with discourse in the creation and elevation of celebrity images.
Chapter 4

Who is Arnold Schwarzenegger?
The boy from Thal goes to Mr. Universe

Arnold Alois Schwarzenegger was born in 1947 in Thal, Austria one year after the birth of his older brother, Meinhart. He was born into a strict Roman Catholic family headed by his father, Gustav and his mother Aurelia (Andrews, 2003). Gustav looms large in all of his biographies and is variously depicted as a handsome, talented athlete/musician whom Arnold wished to emulate (Sexton, 2005), or as a violent drunk, strict-disciplinarian and Nazi party member who victimized his wife, bullied his sons and pitted them against each other in constant competition (Leigh, 1990; Leamer, 2005). While less is written about his mother, Aurelia, she is also depicted in multiple ways. She is a downtrodden housewife (Leigh, 1990) who disapproved of Schwarzenegger’s bodybuilding along with his father (Smolarcik, 1992) or a brave mother who defended her sons against her husband’s tyranny and whom Schwarzenegger credits with being his greatest supporter (Andrews, 2003). “With parents like this”, asks one biographer, “are we surprised that Arnold grew up devoid of wimpishness?” (Andrews, 2003, p.14).

It is documented that Schwarzenegger grew up in relative poverty due to the economic depression that hit Austria after the collapse of Germany at the end of the Second World War (Sexton, 2005; Schwarzenegger, 1977). Schwarzenegger himself claims that he grew up without a refrigerator, a telephone, a television or a flushing toilet. Yet, despite Schwarzenegger’s claims of impoverishment he also claims to have enjoyed regular family outings to the cinema, galleries and museums. His contact with sports came from his parents whom he claims stressed a healthy lifestyle and enrolled him in a range of physical activities that included swimming, bicycling, running, curling and playing soccer (Andrews, 2003; Schwarzenegger, 1977). Soccer became his favourite activity at which he was quite skilled. There are several versions of how he became interested in bodybuilding. In her Unauthorized Biography of Arnold, Leigh (1990) contends that Schwarzenegger’s penchant for bodybuilding grew out of a need to defend himself against his overbearing father. Yet Schwarzenegger tells two other versions of how he fell in love with
weight training at age 13: when he observed older boys at the local lake doing push ups and lifting weights that made their bodies more muscular and when his soccer coach took his team to a gym for strength training (Hollywood hero, 1999; Andrews, 2003; Leamer, 2005; www.schwarzenegger.com). Of this experience Schwarzenegger is quoted as saying, “And there it was before me, my life, the answer I’d been seeking” (Sexton, 200, p. 23).

Schwarzenegger names two men who inspired him to devote himself to bodybuilding full time: Johnny Weissmueller, a former swimming champion and Tarzan who Arnold saw as a 6 year old when his father took him to see him open a new swimming pool in Graz (Leigh, 1990; Baker, 1999) and Reg Park, a British bodybuilding champion and peplum film star whom Arnold has reported to have discovered through bodybuilding magazines and from watching Hercules films (Hollywood Hero, 1999; Sexton, 2005; Schwarzenegger, 1985). Inspired by their bodies and celebrity, at14, Schwarzenegger began lifting weights six-nights a week under the tutelage of former Mr. Austria, Kurt Marnul. Though little information is available about his schooling, it is reported that he went to the local primary and high schools where he was an average student (Andrews, 2003). Reporting on this period of his life, Schwarzenegger stresses that most of his time was spent formulating his famous ‘Master plan’, a plan that he claims he made for his future at an early age that included becoming the greatest bodybuilder in the world, moving to America, becoming a famous actor and making his first million dollars by age 30.

In 1965, at age 18 Schwarzenegger began a one-year mandatory military service in the Austrian army. Still set on a bodybuilding career, he risked punishment from his superiors by going AWOL to compete in and win his first bodybuilding competition, the Junior Mr. America (Schwarzenegger, 1977). While most soldiers would be punished for such a stunt, Schwarzenegger claims that when he showed the officers his trophy they lionised him to the other soldiers and held him up as an example of strength and courage. Rather than punishment, Schwarzenegger claims that he was ordered to train his body full time. In addition to his apparent
special treatment, he claims that he enjoyed his army experience because of the time it gave him to train, to eat meat and to drive tanks, a job that his father’s influence has helped him to obtain (Schwarzenegger, 1977).

Following the completion of his one-year military service, Schwarzenegger flew to London to compete in the amateur Mr. Universe competition. Despite his losing, he caught the attention of a German magazine and gym owner who paid him to move to Munich to manage his gym. Schwarzenegger lived in Munich for the following year where he worked at the gym as a personal trainer and met his long time friend and training partner, Franco Columbu. Under Columbu’s influence, Schwarzenegger briefly deviated from bodybuilding to compete in his first power lifting competition, where he won a heavy weight title (Schwarzenegger, 1977).

Meanwhile, his work at the gym had paid off and by 1967 he had earned enough money to purchase the gym for himself. This marked his first business enterprise that also included a mail-order business selling T-shirts, photographs, posing trunks and training manuals under the name of Arnold Strong (www.schwarzenegger.com). Also, through competing in bodybuilding shows throughout Europe, Schwarzenegger had begun to attract the attention of bodybuilding gatekeepers who supposedly recognized him for his remarkable physique. A British bodybuilder and judge named Wag Bennett invited him to London where he housed him, taught him how to pose and took him on a tour of Britain in a bodybuilding expo. He also toured Belgium and the Netherlands in exhibitions where he gained his famous nicknames, “the Giant of Austria” and “The Austrian Oak” (Schwarzenegger, 1977).

In 1967 Schwarzenegger returned to London for a second attempt at winning the Mr. Universe title that he had lost the year before. This time he succeeded in capturing the prestigious title along with the attention of bodybuilding’s major American business mogul, Joe Weider. Weider is known as the founder and gatekeeper of International bodybuilding and is credited with helping Schwarzenegger to move to America to develop his body and his career.
According to Adler et al (2003) “Weider saw in Arnold the makings of his long sought ‘hero’ who could bring his sport from a fringe past-time (sic) into the lucrative American mainstream” (p.3). In a slightly different version of events, Weider claims that it was Schwarzenegger who approached him for the opportunity to live and train under his tutelage (Weider, 1991). Either way, in 1968, Weider sponsored Schwarzenegger to move to California’s mecca of bodybuilding, Santa Monica, with a salary for one year, a car and an apartment. In return, Schwarzenegger was to help Weider promote his bodybuilding enterprise by supplying his magazine, Muscle Builder (now known as Muscle and Fitness) with pictures and details about his training regime, as well as competing in his federation, the International Federation of Bodybuilding that was vying for dominance over international competitive bodybuilding at the time.

Over the next decade, Schwarzenegger won every significant bodybuilding title available, including the coveted Mr. Olympia event, seven times over. A renowned champion, a self-proclaimed “King of the bodybuilders”, his status as ‘the best body of all time’ (Muscle and Fitness, 2003) was written in his ideal measurements. The discrepancies in the reporting of these measurements, however, highlights how mythology is at work in his celebrity construction. His biceps (a.k.a. “the Austrian Alps”), which were at one time reportedly the largest the sport had ever seen, are said to have measured between 20 3/4 inches to 22 inches while his height has been given at anywhere between 6 ft 3 and “remarkably short” (During, 2004). Despite these discrepancies, his impression as a man of mythological muscular proportions remained intact.

Pumping up to make his move: stepping into film and fitness promotion

In 1969, Schwarzenegger made his first attempt at translating his ideal body into film. He was cast in a B-grade peplum called Hercules in New York (a.k.a. Hercules Goes Bananas) in which he played the principle role. This opportunity was facilitated by Weider, whom the producers of the film had contacted in their search for a bodybuilder to play the lead. As a
newcomer and a foreigner, his name was changed to Arnold Strong and his voice was dubbed into American English. While Schwarzenegger was paid $12,000 for 12 weeks of filming (Baker, 1999), the film was a flop. To make ends meet, Schwarzenegger began a bricklaying business with his friend Franco Columbu. The two men advertised themselves as European craftsmen and attempted to trade on their bodies by calling the business “Pumping Bricks” (Baker, 1999; Smolarcik, 1992). While only marginally successful, Pumping Bricks provided Schwarzenegger with the funds to invest in a much more lucrative business venture, real estate (Baker, 1999). He began by purchasing and leasing a small apartment building in Santa Monica which he later sold for a profit and bought more properties along the Santa Monica and Venice Beach area at a time of increasing gentrification. Schwarzenegger has since become a major real estate mogul and has built a real estate empire that stretches from the Los Angeles basin to Denver and Columbus, Ohio, valued at tens of millions of dollars (Adler, 2003). By 1975, after winning his sixth consecutive Mr. Olympia title and having become a 28-year-old millionaire, (Smolarcik, 1992) Schwarzenegger had achieved the first two steps of his so-called “Master plan”.

The same year, he retired from bodybuilding in order to pursue a career in acting. He played a bodybuilder in The Long Goodbye (1973), Stay Hungry (1976) The Villain (1979) Scavenger Hunt (1979) and The Jane Mansfield story (1980). Though he won a Golden Globe for his role in Stay Hungry he struggled to break the type cast of playing a bodybuilder (Hollywood Hero, 1999). Rather than break it, he turned to embrace this image as a promotional vehicle by accepting a role as ‘himself’ in Gaines and Butler’s now cult hit, Pumping Iron (1977). While the film is ostensibly about competitive bodybuilding, the film focuses on Schwarzenegger as its star and documents his rivalry with other bodybuilders. His presence in Pumping Iron introduced him to a mainstream audiences and he has been credited with inspiring the entire nation to pick up weights as part of a national fitness boom that was occurring.
throughout the 1970s (Baker, 1999). While the renewed fitness enthusiasm among Americans developed from more complex factors than the image of Schwarzenegger in Pumping Iron alone, he used his new fame to promote himself as a fitness guru.

He began to use bodybuilding as a promotional vehicle for his celebrity in the guise of fitness promotion. 1977 also saw the release of his autobiography/DIY bodybuilding manual, Arnold: The Education of a Bodybuilder. Documenting his rise to the peak of bodybuilding competition, by his own hand, the book helped to stimulate the popular perception of him among mainstream audiences as a self-made man. While initially dismissed, the book’s eventual popularity was proven when it reached number ten on the New York Times best sellers list. His fitness promotion took on a higher profile after meeting his wife-to-be, Maria Shriver in 1978. Through his relationship with Shriver, Schwarzenegger became involved with her mother’s charity, the Special Olympics, a sporting event that provides athletic competition for children with intellectual disabilities. He was appointed to ‘international weight training coach’ of the special Olympics in 1979. As part of his fitness promotion enterprise he also co-wrote bodybuilding-training manuals for men, women and children. Among these are The Encyclopedia of Modern Bodybuilding (1985), Bodybuilding for Men (1981) and a series on fitness for children Arnold’s Fitness for Kids: Ages Birth to Five (1993), Ages Six to Ten (1993) and Ages Eleven to Thirteen (1993). He also continued to promote bodybuilding by writing editorials and giving interviews for articles in Joe Weider’s newly established Flex and his original Muscle and Fitness magazine. Whether a publicity stunt (Hollywood Hero, 1999) or genuine hankering to return to competition (Schwarzenegger, 1985), Schwarzenegger came out of retirement in 1980 to compete in and win his seventh Mr. Olympia title. The drama was documented in the little known documentary, The Comeback (1980). He also entered the business of bodybuilding promotion with former promoter Jim Lorimer, by launching his own bodybuilding and fitness exposition, The Arnold Classic. Begun in 1989, the event has since
expanded into a huge bodybuilding and fitness exhibition, it was renamed the Arnold Fitness Expo in 1993 (www.schwarzenegger.com).

Breakthrough: Becoming a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame

In 1983 Schwarzenegger became a naturalized U.S citizen (Sexton, 2005). Yet, perhaps the more powerful demonstration of his assimilation in to American culture was his transition from a bodybuilding legend into a Hollywood action hero. His role as Conan in Conan the Barbarian (1982) began his movement from the type cast of a bodybuilder to box office beefcake, indicated by the one million dollars that the film grossed at the box office (Smolarcik, 1992). He followed this with a sequel, Conan the Destroyer in 1984 and in the same year was cast in the now cult science fiction thriller, Terminator. While the release of this film did not make him an instant star he began to build his reputation as a muscle bound hero in other epic action adventures such as Red Sonja (1985) and in martial dramas such as Commando (1985). His filmography throughout the rest of this decade is prolific. He starred in an average of two films per year: Raw Deal (1986), Predator (1987), Running Man (1987), Red Heat (1988) and Twins (1988). His status as a popular film star was registered when he was simultaneously named the most violent actor of the year by The National Coalition on Television Violence and received a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame (Baker, 1999).

His next two films, Red Heat (1987) and Twins (1988), marked his efforts to expand his characters beyond muscular masculinity and into comedies and family themed films. This was enabled by his teaming up with comedian, Jim Belushi in Red Heat (1988) and with director Ivan Reitman (Twins) whom he initially approached to write him a part in a comedy. As Reitman tells it, he wrote Twins especially for Schwarzenegger and his co-star Danny De Veto whose oppositional physiques he believed would make a good film (Baker, 1999). While Twins received mixed reviews upon release, by 1990 it had grossed over 120 million making him one of Hollywood’s most bankable stars, commanding as much as 15 million dollars per film.
(Smolarick, 1992). His rise to global popular status was recognized when the international film exhibitor’s trade show named him “International Star of the Decade” (During, 2004).

The following year Schwarzenegger starred in Total Recall (1990) and Kindergarten Cop (1990) showing that he could straddle the action and family entertainment genres with a self-reflexive humour that has become one of his most famous character traits. Total Recall and Terminator 2, one of the biggest grossing films of all time, firmly announced his status as an international star and icon. True Lies (1994) and Junior (1994) improved opinions about his lack of acting ability by proving his comedic skills.

As well as expanding his range as an actor, these films also mark Schwarzenegger’s increasingly control over his image and film making. He began his own company, Oak Productions to manage his image and is reported as having closely collaborated with directors such as James Cameron on Terminator 2 as well as exercising the power to choose the actors and directors with whom he worked as was the case with his selection of James Cameron for True Lies (Baker, 1999) and Jonathan Mostow for Terminator 3 (Epstein, 2005). While firmly established as an international film star and icon of muscular masculinity, his films throughout the late 1990s and early 2000 began to wane at the box office. Last Action Hero (1993), Jingle all the way (1996) and Batman and Robin (1997) all bombed at the box office. His last feature film to date, Terminator 3: Rise of the Machines, was a moderate success but nowhere near the popularity of his early films. Despite the seeming anti-climax of his film career at the end of the 1990s, his career in film had established him as more than a Hollywood celebrity, as a popular cultural icon, for which he has been celebrated with numerous awards. He was named International Film star in every country in which his films were exhibited by The Hollywood Reporter in 1991, International box-office star of the decade in 1993 by NATO star west, and received an American Cinematheque award in 1998.
Becoming a community leader and a member of the American elite

At the same time that Schwarzenegger was developing his celebrity persona through film, he was also shaping up for politics by involving himself in community leadership. This was largely facilitated by his marriage into the Kennedy family in 1986 when he wed Maria Shriver, daughter of Eunice and Sergeant Kennedy in a highly publicized ceremony. As mentioned above, it was through Shriver that he became involved with her mother’s charity, the Special Olympics. He has since become its Global ambassador, promoting the organisation world wide and helping to establish international events. He furthered his philanthropy in 1989 by becoming a benefactor to the Simon Wiesenthal Foundation, an international organization that commemorates the memories of holocaust victims. The extension of his philanthropy to holocaust victims, however, corresponded with the revelation of his father’s membership in the Nazi party, causing some to view it as more of an act of damage control than sincerity (Leigh, 1990).

Schwarzenegger’s image as a community leader was also helped by his involvement in Republican politics. As a reward for his support in campaigning for George Bush in the 1988 presidential election, he was appointed to Chairman of the Presidents Council on Physical Fitness (Lipsyte, 1995). In this role Schwarzenegger made it his mission to visit each of the 50 states, at his own expense, and promote physical education and fitness for children (Smolarkic, 1992). In the same year he was appointed the Chairman of the Inner City Games, a project designed to provide physical activity and competition for inner city children across the U.S. In 1991 he further became affiliated with the After School All Stars, a mostly Hollywood funded organization that provides after school and summer programs for children (www.governorcalifornia.ca). In 1994 Governor Pete Wilson appointed him to the Chairman of the California Governor’s Council on Physical Fitness (Booth, 2005). Already a father of four by
1997, Schwarzenegger’s image as a community and state leader had been thoroughly characterised by children, fitness and family.

Schwarzenegger has received several humanitarian awards for his philanthropy. His benefaction has been rewarded with two National Leadership awards in 1991 and 1997. In 2000 he received the Father Flanagan Award given to individuals who have lived a life of example to children. In 2002 he was awarded the Muhammad Ali Humanitarian Award by Ali himself (www.firstlady.ca, 2006). His philanthropy in America has also been recognized in his home country of Austria. In 1997 the soccer stadium where he supposedly played as a boy was named after him and in 1999 he was presented with a Ring of Honour from the city of Graz. In 2002, the city of Graz proposed the building of a 77ft statue of the terminator at a cost of five million dollars to commemorate the filming of his third terminator film (Holler, 2003). According to a letter that Schwarzenegger wrote to Graz, he urged that the money would be better spent on social programs for children and the poor and the project was subsequently abandoned (Holler, 2003).

**Total Recall: Becoming a politician**

On August 6th, 2003, fresh from promoting *Terminator 3*, Schwarzenegger made his third and current celebrity transformation into the Governor of California. This was preceded by a highly publicized media campaign during the recall of former Governor Gray Davis in which he competed with 135 members of the public and B-grade celebrities among a handful of politicians (Indiana, 2005, Cooke, 2005).

From the perspectives of his supporters he has been a good governor. According to Maria Shriver’s website, he has “brought California back from the brink of bankruptcy” (www.firstlady.ca.gov), raised the minimum wage, lowered unemployment, invested in the infrastructure and the environment. Yet he has been less successful from the point of view of his critics. Nicknamed “the Governator” his celebrity shine was somewhat tarnished during his first
term in office as he came under heavy attack for calling his democratic opponents “Girlie men”, for vetoing a bill on same-sex marriages and for making comments about protecting the borders from illegal immigrants. He was called a homophobe, a sexist, and a racist as well as was accused of promoting steroids to teenagers by refusing to sign a bill that would outlaw the sale of performance enhancing substances in California. In response to these criticisms he gave up an eight million dollar contract with the former Weider-owned Flex and Muscle and Fitness magazines for which he had been an executive editor and contributor since the 1970s (Indiana, 2005). Schwarzenegger’s consultancy on the magazines was also perceived as a major ‘conflict of interest’ with his governorship (Nicholas and Salladay, 2005). He was further attacked by firemen and nurses for attempting to curb public spending by targeting public employee’s unions and mandating a lower nurse to patient ratio (Messner, 2007). While he held firm to his promise of not raising taxes in his first term, he proposed $2.2 billion in cuts to welfare, health, education and retirement programs. His waning popularity was reflected in polling numbers that showed his support dip from 56 percent to 33 by the end of 2005 (Booth, 2005). Following the publicity of his denial of clemency to a high-profile death row prisoner, Stanley Tookie Williams, his lack of popularity was registered as far as Austria where, having previously promoted him as their ‘son’, its leaders threatened to remove his name from the former “Arnold Schwarzenegger” soccer stadium (www.cnn.com, 2005). Schwarzenegger was strategic in removing his name and returning his “son of Graz’ ring before either were demanded (Holler, 2003).

True to his flexible celebrity, Schwarzenegger recovered his popularity in 2006, wining 56 percent of the vote against the democratic incumbent, Phil Angelides (Messner, 2007). He achieved this by moving to a more centrist position on social issues, expressing liberal views on stem cell research, animal rights, abortion and gun control (McCarthy, 2004). He elected several Democrat advisers to his legislature and began to distance himself from Bush and his war mongering in Iraq. Mostly, he recovered his support through his emphasis on issues of the
environment for which he has earned international praise and the new moniker, “the Green Giant”. Among his environmental plans have been the “Solar Roofs Plan” and an idea to cut green house gases by developing a “Hydrogen Highway” that would run from California into Canada.

At the time of the writing of this project, Schwarzenegger is currently still serving as governor, promoting universal health care and California tourism and trade. Yet, after five years in office, his detractors believe that he has done more damage to the state than the recalled Governor, Gray Davis. Some have even begun to suggest that Schwarzenegger should himself be recalled before he turns “the Golden state” into stone (Kurtzman, 2007; Shaw, 2008). When his final term ends in 2010 it has been rumoured that he will return to film or run for congress. Neither have been confirmed.

By no means does this description pretend to be a complete or definitive account of Schwarzenegger’s biography and career. However, it serves to highlight the immense complexity that lies beneath his celebrity veneer. As a pre-text to my analysis it shows how his multiple and intertextual imagery as a champion bodybuilder, business man, fitness guru, film star, philanthropist, community leader, member of the American elite and politician all coalesce in the creation of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity images. Moreover, and as I move to demonstrate in following chapters, the straight line that biography draws between his achievements and each increase in his economic and political power, helps to nourish his personal mythology as a self made man and the American nation building myths upon which his imagery relies.
Chapter 5

Marketing muscular masculinity in *Arnold: The Education of a Bodybuilder*
Introduction

Arnold Schwarzenegger is an exemplar of celebrity culture. He has marketed himself as a model of masculine physical perfection and of individualism to American society. Both of these narratives are encapsulated in his autobiography, *Arnold: The Education of a bodybuilder* (1977) in which he writes, “I taught myself discipline, the strictest kind of discipline. How to be totally in control of my body, how to control each individual muscle. I could apply that discipline to everyday life” (1977, p.109). While the self made man is a common theme of the star’s autobiography, Schwarzenegger’s self-depiction has been particularly celebrated because of his use of his body as the clay out of which he carved his exemplary self. “He was a symbol for those who wanted to gain authority and control over their bodies and their politics,” gushes one writer, “In a time when the U.S. and individual Americans seemed to be losing their way, Arnold was a man with a plan” (Lipsyte, 1994; 61).

Yet, what really sets Schwarzenegger apart from other celebrities is that he began his climb from immigrant status and anonymity to fame through the obscure subculture of competitive bodybuilding. “An oddball sport” by Schwarzenegger’s own admission, bodybuilding has at best been deemed a pseudo-sport by mainstream society based on its extreme aesthetic practices and at worst, shunned for its homoerotic imagery (Klein, 1990; Kruger, 1999; Richardson, 2004; Obel, 2002). Most compelling about Schwarzenegger perhaps is that no other bodybuilder has achieved the same level of fame in mainstream culture. While Schwarzenegger’s nineteenth century forefathers, Eugen Sandow and Bernarr Macfadden achieved significant celebrity through their self-promotion as models of muscular masculinity and of physical culture more generally, both men remained viewed as performers, and by some as ‘crack-pots’ with suspicious sexual proclivities (Ernst, 1991; Budd, 1997; Kasson, 2001). Similarly, in the contemporary context, many bodybuilders have surpassed Schwarzenegger’s records and ideal measurements but none have so successfully crossed the divide between the
body and the mind that they could be seen as an icon of American masculinity or a legitimate political leader.

The puzzle that presents itself, then, is how Schwarzenegger managed to promote himself in ways that no other bodybuilder has done either before or after him. Some answers lie in Schwarzenegger’s relationships with bodybuilding judges and promoters as well as his own ability to market himself. “I began looking at myself as a product, treating myself as a product to be marketed in a business-like way” (quoted by McDaniel, 1979, p. 116). He explained to one reporter, “From bodybuilding, I learned the power of the press, how they were the most potent vehicle to promote your image and marketability, and I never forgot it. The media became integral to everything I did. I used it to promote Pumping Iron and to build a movie career (Flex 2000 p. 129). As his greatest promoter, international bodybuilding mogul, Joe Weider suggests that it was Schwarzenegger’s personality combined with his muscular masculinity that was inspired the fitness boom of the 1980s. In an ironic choice of words, Weider claims, “Arnold was so articulate and humorous on talk shows that bodybuilding finally came out of the closet and experienced a renaissance that is still going on today” (1991, p. 28). He continues: “When the public saw that a bodybuilder could be a normal, well-rounded person rather than a muscle bound freak, they began to flock to the gym in droves” (p.30). What has been less discussed in relation to Schwarzenegger’s success, however, is how discourses circulating about muscular manhood and physical activity in the 1970s, when he was making his move from bodybuilding champion to mainstream celebrity, were stimulated by and contributed to his ability to market himself.

Through an analysis of Schwarzenegger’s best-selling autobiography Arnold: The Education of a Bodybuilder, I show that Schwarzenegger was particularly astute at recognising and moulding himself to two, interrelated discourses about masculinity and physical fitness circulating in the 1970s. First, I show how Schwarzenegger marketed himself as a model of
hetero-normative manhood within a context of ongoing anxiety about national strength based on the perceived atrophy of white men’s bodies. Such fear was stimulated in particular by the disappointment of the American performance in the Vietnam War and by the destabilisation of the white, heteronormative male as the naturalised subject of American citizenship by civil rights, LGBT liberation and second wave feminist movements. Certainly, such anxiety over the stability of heteronormative masculine identities as they are linked to nationhood were not new and has been a recurring theme throughout American history (Kasson 2001; Montez de Oca, 2005; Magill, 2006). Contributing to anxieties about American masculinity in the 1970s were Cold War discourses from the 1950s and 60s about the perceived inferior fitness of youths and men’s bodies compared with those in Europe, which caused moral panic about the strength of the nation at a time when it was pursuing leadership of the ‘free world’ (Montez de Oca, 2005; Howell, 2005). The so-called ‘muscle-gap’ between America and its European rivals spawned a revival of hegemonic hypermasculinity that relied upon homophobic and nationalist discourse about ‘soft’ white men vulnerable to communist “penetration”. Added to this was concern about the effects of the encroaching culture of consumerism on men that not only encouraged consumption of male bodies as objects (Montez de Oca, 2005; Howell, 2005). These fears coalesced in the production of a hypermasculine image of America as a protector of the ‘free,’ against an image of the Soviet Union and any “other” who could be seen as a threat to the ‘freedom’, ‘democracy’ and normative manhood of the Unites Sates) (Montez de Oca, 2005).

In addition to reviving concerns about the fitness of American men, the period between the 1950s and 60s saw the reform of physical education in schools and cultural policy designed to increase the fitness of its citizens. This was the vein in which President Eisenhower initiated the President’s Council on Youth fitness in 1952 that President Kennedy later expanded to include the entire population under the rubric of President’s Council of Physical Fitness. Looking through a Foucauldian lens of governmentality, Montez de Oca (2005) emphasises how cultural
policy that encouraged the weighing and measuring of children by physical educators and citizens to take responsibility for their own health helped to (con)fuse fitness with fitness for citizenship. While the government, education and scientific institutions played a key role in disseminating self-responsibility discourse, Montez de Oca further notes that “non-governmental actors, such as fitness experts, helped direct and structure the field of physical education and the habitus that citizens developed in fitness regimes” (2005, p.150).

Following from the revival of physical culture between the 1950s and 60s, the 1970s saw the emergence of the celebrity fitness guru, among whom Jane Fonda was one of the most famous, and like Schwarzenegger has been accredited with bringing fitness to the masses (Howell, 2005). The promotion of aerobics and indeed Schwarzenegger’s opportunity to promote bodybuilding as a legitimate regime of fitness was partly enabled by a shift in discourse around ‘healthy exercise.’ This was based in increasing concern about cardiovascular disease, which by the late 1960s had begun to replace infectious diseases as the number one health threat to Americans (A&E Marvels of Modern Fitness, 1998). Schwarzenegger leaped on the bandwagon of fitness promotion with bodybuilding. He did this in a context not only of fitness culture but also of the merging of fitness with consumer culture through the development of fitness into an industry (Howell, 2005). Driven by the logic of consumer culture, identity was being reshaped in terms of consumption and display, “that increasingly persuaded individuals to not only purchase the objects of production, but to also recognise themselves and their bodies as commodity signs in which they materially, ideologically, and affectively invest” (Howell, 2005, p. 231). Similar to Cold-War discourse, concern regarding the commodification of male bodies and encouragement of men along with women to cultivate their outer image, remained (Stratton, 1999).

It was in this context of the promotion of physical fitness and the promotion of consumer culture that Schwarzenegger was successful. He arrived at a time of burgeoning interest in physical culture and took up the charge of masculinizing body work for men in the face of the
potentially feminizing effects of consumer culture (Stratton, 1999). As I show in my analysis of 
*Education*, he deployed a discourse of hyperheterosexuality to submerge, if only momentarily, 
the homoerotic connotations of muscle. Second, I show that his depiction of himself as a self 
made man resonated with neoliberal discourses about self-determination that increasingly 
promoted exercise in terms of exercising good citizenship (King, 2003). Scholars of the body and 
fitness culture have long identified self-responsibility and the equation of good health with moral 
constitution as the defining features of discourses on health and fitness. They have also shown 
how these discourses align with and grow from a broader governmental discourse known as 
neoliberalism that promote self-governance as a model of good governance in the context of a 
receding welfare state (Cruikshank, 1999; King, 2002). Especially pertinent to the promotion of 
exercise in terms of exercising good citizenship are the sexualised, racialised and gendered 
expectations for ‘good bodies’ that neoliberalism promotes. This is to say that while discourses 
about self responsibility for health, wealth and happiness are oriented towards all citizens with 
the aim of causing them to become self-sufficient, they promote and privilege a model of 
citizenship that is coded as white, heterosexual, able-bodied and middle-class. It was precisely 
these privileged categories that Schwarzenegger embodied and that supported his construction of 
himself as an exemplar of self-determination and of heterosexual masculinity. In my exploration 
of this theme I further explore how Schwarzenegger’s overall image as a model of American 
manhood and self-determination was also underpinned by whiteness. I show that the privileging 
of whiteness was encoded in neo-liberal discourse and in the very conventions used for 
measuring muscular masculine physical perfection that bodybuilding promotes.

**Queer eye for the muscular guy: Homophobia and heteromasculinity in the marketing of 
muscle to the mainstream**

*Education*, like bodybuilding, is all about the body. Hence, its driving discourse revolves 
around the definition of what constitutes muscular masculine physical perfection. Yet, this
central theme is also its central problem because of a persistent homophobia towards muscle
building that has dogged the attempts of bodybuilding entrepreneurs to market the sport since the
late nineteenth century. Certainly, suspicions about the homosexuality of bodybuilders have been
confirmed by the growth of gay male subcultures around the sport as well as through the
iconization of the hypermuscular body in gay pornography. Yet, despite the actual existence of
gay men in sport, homophobia always already arises out of what Pronger calls a “homoerotic
paradox” in male sports. Pronger (1990) developed the notion of the “homoerotic paradox” to
describe the contradictions that arise from the fetishization of the male body and intimacy among
men that develop from the close relationships encouraged by all-male sporting cultures. These
contradictions form a paradox because masculine sporting cultures have been historically built
upon the repression of homosexuality and the exclusion of women from men’s games (Messner,
1992). As scholars of bodybuilding point out, the homoerotic paradox is particularly pronounced
in bodybuilding where the focus of the sport is on producing and displaying the muscular male
body (Richardson, 2004; Obel, 2002; Kruger, 1999; Klein, 1990; Budd, 1997).

The creation of bodybuilding was certainly not the first time that male bodies were put on
public display. Klein (1993) shows how the prehistory of bodybuilding can be found in religious
art that depicted muscular male bodies in symbolic connection with religious purity and strength.
When modern bodybuilding emerged in the late nineteenth century, in an increasingly secular
and consumer oriented culture, this religious element was removed and the focus shifted to the
display of the muscular body (Stratton, 1999). Thus, as Stratton explains, the emphasis on the
male body as a product for consumption necessarily complicated the perceived sexual identity of
bodybuilders who had become a commodity fetish, a position that had traditionally been
relegated to women. Richardson (2004) concurs that bodybuilding, “destabilizes the
performative gender binary, cherished by patriarchal culture, which equates femininity with
passivity and objectification of the body while masculinity is synonymous with activity and the
body as a vehicle for the display of power” (2004, p.50).

Homoeroticism has been identified in the depictions of hypermuscular men in
bodybuilding magazines and photography (Richardson, 2004; White and Gillett, 1994), in gay
pornography (Pronger, 1990) and in the close relationships among men who compete and train
together (Pronger, 1990; Klein, 1993; Richardson, 2004). Homophobia has simultaneously been
identified as a common response to and by bodybuilders and bodybuilding promoters to prevent
slippages in the erotic connotations of muscle (White and Gillett, 1994; Richardson, 2004). In a
study of depictions of male bodybuilders in Flex magazine, White and Gillett (1994) found that
men were depicted in overwhelmingly aggressive and militaristic ways in order to deflect the
potentially emasculating effects of being looked at. In the following discussion I examine how a
homoerotic paradox is at work in Education and explore the strategies that Schwarzenegger
deploys in attempting to resolve this paradox. I show how his assertion of a heteronormative
gender identity, while never entirely complete, contributes to his acceptance by mainstream
culture as an exemplar of hegemonic masculinity at a time when bodybuilding was becoming
popularized as a legitimate body practice for heterosexual men.

The homoerotic paradox in Education

The various sexual meanings of muscle building can be read into Schwarzenegger’s
opening descriptions of his attraction to bodybuilding, which in essence was an attraction to the
bodies of other men. Recounting his first visit to a bodybuilding gym he writes: “Those guys
were huge and brutal. I found myself walking around them, staring at muscles I’d never seen
before. The weight lifters shone with sweat; they were powerful looking, Herculean” (p.14). Of
his first bodybuilding mentors, three middle-aged Austrian men with whom he began his training
in Graz, he says: “I was in awe of them, of their size, of the control they had over their bodies”
(1977, p.15). He admits to being ‘transfixed’ by one man in particular, a British bodybuilder-
cum-muscle-film star, Reg Park, whom he came to admire through watching films in which he played the role of Hercules and through reading muscle magazines. “In one of those magazines I saw my first photograph of Reg Park. He was on a page facing Jack Dellinger. I responded immediately to Reg Park’s rough massive look” (1977, p.17). Schwarzenegger’s comments about the pleasure that he derived from his brutal work-outs with other men is also suggestive of an element of homoeroticsm in bodybuilding. “It was a fantastic feeling to gain size from pain. All of a sudden I was looking forward to it as something pleasurable… We bragged to each other about how much it hurt” (1977, p.85).

While these statements need not necessarily be read as homoerotic, the paradox is highlighted by Schwarzenegger’s repeated eschewals of ‘elegance’: “I knew in my mind that I was not geared for elegance. I wanted to be massive. It was the difference between cologne and sweat” (p.18); likewise in his fear of being perceived as ‘delicate’, “I wanted to be a big guy. I didn’t want to be delicate” (p. 17). These statements, repeated throughout Education, suggest his own discomfort with looking at and admiring other men’s bodies. Yet, these attempted assertions of heteronormativity are complicated by the fetishization of his body by other men, which Schwarzenegger captures in his responses to his own burgeoning musculature. He describes the fascination of one judge with his arms: “Although it’s not customary to do any measuring during a competition, one of the judges took out a tape and measured my arm, which was over 20 inches. That was it for him, that was all he was concerned about” (p.57). He also claims that bodybuilding “judges almost fainted” at the sight of his body and that when he flexed his biceps, “entire audiences swooned at their size” (p.45). Indeed, Schwarzenegger became legendary for his biceps, which became his most photographed body part and an inexhaustible topic of conversation in bodybuilding magazines. Somewhat similar to female objects of desire, his measurements often preceded him in the press and his biceps along with other muscular body parts were ogled like breasts. One reporter wrote, “Medusa’s snakes couldn’t writhe with the
rawhide power and whipcord muscularity of Arnold Schwarzenegger’s boa biceps” (Tyler, 1970, p.14). Schwarzenegger also participates in his fetishization throughout Education with his regular claims to be “turned on” every time that he saw new growth in his muscles (p.12, p.64).

The emphasis on his muscle size, which is a recurring trope in Education, mostly as evidence for his ascension to the title of the best built man alive, presents a remarkable parallel with the themes of gay pornography. Pronger (1990) underscores these parallels with the titles of some gay films and magazines: Inches, Huge and Never Big Enough (1990, p. 161). The phallic connotations of muscle are echoed in the following statement: “If someone could get a 21 inch arm, I would blow mine up to 22 inches” (p.84). Indeed, bodybuilding scholars have commonly read the hard, bulging muscular body of the professional bodybuilder as a giant phallus (see Dyer, 2002; Pronger, 1990). This reading is further supported by Schwarzenegger’s repeated descriptions of the feelings he gained from posing for other men at bodybuilding competitions: “My body was pumped and tight, blood surging out to every capillary” (1977, p.74). “This was my pump up. Blood was rushing to every single area of my body” (p.75). “I hit my first pose and people screamed. There it was again, that warm rush through my body” (p.51).

Due to the double meanings of muscular masculinity, its currency in both homosexual and heterosexual economies of desire, the meanings of Schwarzenegger’s muscles can never be controlled or pinned down to articulate only with heterosexuality. Indeed, it has long been rumored that Schwarzenegger’s body has been the subject of gay films (Leigh, 1990; Outland-Baker, 2006) and accusations of his participation in gay pornography have been used to slander his public image. Gay men have also made Schwarzenegger the object of their desire, which sits within a tradition of images of muscle men being sold for personal pleasures. In the nineteenth century photographs of Eugen Sandow were sold on the black market to gay men while today images are widely sold in a range of mainstream, bodybuilding and specifically gay magazines (Budd, 1997). While Schwarzenegger worked very hard to project a “normal” image of
bodybuilding in order to make the sport and himself popular, this does not mean gay audiences ignored him or that he did not benefit from the spectatorship of gay men who bought or magazines bearing his image. However, the point I wish to make is that the homoerotic connotations of muscle building were submerged by its couching in heterosexism and homophobic discourse. This is evident in Schwarzenegger’s own statement to a reporter that he had “no hang-ups with the fag business” when asked about his appeal with gay men (quoted by CNN.com, 2003).

**Strategies of disavowing homoeroticism: homophobia**

Homophobia and homophobic discourse have been identified as common strategies in the denial of the ‘queer’ elements of muscle building. Sam Fussell, in his famous bodybuilding odyssey, *Muscle* (1991) deploys homophobia as a strategy for disavowing the queer connotations of his own body and his participation in muscle building. This is clear in his descriptions of certain protagonists whom he identifies as having feminine or homosexual characteristics. He describes one bodybuilding promoter as “a fat gym owner sporting a prodigious belly and a mincing step” (1991, p. 228) and another bodybuilder in homophobic terms:

> I decided to trust no one, and do the job myself, when number 61 breathlessly sidled up
to me. “Do your back?” he whispered, sounding like a child molester skirting the edge of
a playground. He stared up into my eyes, and I coughed in reaction to the dose of

While Schwarzenegger’s repeated eschewal of ‘delicacy and ‘elegance’ in his muscle building discourse are nowhere near as rabidly homophobic as Fussel’s, he deploys a similar strategy of stereotyping homosexuality as a deviant foil to his own normative heteromasculine identity. While he acknowledges that “there were a few gay men who hung around
bodybuilding”, he assures the reader that, “These were not the bodybuilders themselves, not the serious ones. Two or three rich guys in Munich hung out in gyms and tried to pick up young bodybuilders by promising them the world” (1977, p.43). He admits to his own courtship by one such ‘predator’, a bodybuilding judge and magazine owner he calls “Schneck”. Significantly, Schneck is characterized as a non-muscular and manipulative opportunist who chooses what Schwarzenegger sees as the “easy” pathway to wealth and success, through exploiting the labour of others. This is juxtaposed to Schwarzenegger’s own perceived hypermasculine method of achieving success through self-determination and an almost masochistic dedication to physical labour.

**Martial discourse in the construction of heteromasculine muscle building**

This image of the bodybuilt body as a labouring body is complicated by the goal of the sport, which is to display muscles rather than to demonstrate their utility. Strong (2003) comments on this problem: “Bodybuilders are aware that what they do may be understood as a rather passive affair where, despite their bodies’ prodigious muscularity, they exist only to be looked at” (p.165). The feminization of muscle by way of its display is clearly a concern for Schwarzenegger who frequently asserts the utility of his body. This is distilled in the following comment about why he chose to compete in Olympic weightlifting:

> The image of myself with a loaded barbell pressed up and my arms locked took a long time to get out of my system. Olympic weightlifting wasn’t what I wanted to do. I’d done it primarily to prove a point- that a bodybuilder not only looked strong, he was strong, and that well developed muscles were not merely ornamentation (1977, p.39).

Certainly, Schwarzenegger’s performances in Hollywood action films can be seen as an extension of this compulsion to reiterate a heteronormative gender identity through the
performance of a physically aggressive muscular masculinity. Boscagli (1996) contends that while spectacular hard bodies can be positioned in ways that distance them from femininity, their commodification as objects to be looked at and consumed for the diverse pleasures of mass audiences renders them passive in the same way that women are objectified by the male gaze. Lingis (1994) goes so far as to refer to the modern bodybuilder as a “carnal orchid”, a “strangely incompetent and gratuitous” creature whose strength and muscular armour have been made redundant by the computerization of industry and war (1994, p.ix).

Significantly, war is a trope in Education, where Schwarzenegger’s draws on a martial discourse to masculinize his own image of muscular masculinity. This is distilled in one particular story that has since became quite famous, about his going AWOL from the army during his compulsory one year service in order to compete in his first major bodybuilding competition, the Mr. Europe Junior. Schwarzenegger explains that when he returned to the barracks with his trophy, he expected to be punished but instead found himself lionized by his officers who saw him as a role model for other soldiers. “I became a hero because of what I’d gone through to win. When we were out in the field the drill instructors mentioned it. ‘You have to fight for your fatherland’ they said. ‘You have to have courage. Look at what Schwarzenegger did just to win this title’” (1977, p.39). Other examples of martial discourse can be found throughout the text in his references to himself and other bodybuilders as ‘gladiators’, his comparison of bodybuilding competition to ‘battle’ and his army training and in the following advice to readers on the necessity of aggression as a training method: “You have to communicate with the bar: “You son of a bitch, I’m going to rip you off my chest, I’m going to throw you over my head, I don’t care how much you weigh. I’m the man who’s going to take you out. I’m going to be the master of you” (p.90).

According to bodybuilding scholars, martial imagery is a common strategy in bodybuilding discourse for masculinizing muscle building and legitimizing it as a sport. Strong
(2003) writes, ‘images of violent activity may help to assert bodybuilding’s relationship to these (sports) more obviously male arenas” (p. 165). Strong (2003) further explains that martial discourse “structures a permission (one normally denied) to look at the male body” (p.173) in a way that differentiates it from “the sexually objectifying male gaze at the passive female form” (p. 163). Saltman (2000) finds evidence for this in the depiction of male bodies as weapons in bodybuilding imagery as well as in the depiction of certain body parts such as biceps, as guns, and notes how the will to discipline and sacrifice the body in bodybuilding is akin to soldiering. Strong and Saltman both understand this aggressive posturing as a method of self-protection against vulnerability of the body and more specifically, against emasculation by the gaze of male onlookers. The extent to which martial discourse has been effective for Schwarzenegger’s self-depiction as a heteronormative icon of muscular masculinity is suggested by another famous bodybuilder’s perception of him as a “human fortress”, and a “billboard of invulnerability.” Fussell claims that he was inspired to take up bodybuilding because of Schwarzenegger’s image in Education which he describes in the following way: “A glimpse of the cover told me all I needed to know, There he stood on a mountain top of California, every muscle bulging to the world as he smiled and posed. Just the expression on his face indicated that nothing could disturb this man, A victim? Not bloody likely” (1991, p. 24).

**Proof of sex with women**

Another strategy for disavowing homoeroticism in Education can be found in Schwarzenegger’s frequent assertions about sexual relations with women and his claims that bodybuilding was responsible for affording him these opportunities. Early on in the narrative he explains that part of his motivation for bodybuilding was to “impress the girls who liked it” (p.26) and that bodybuilding was responsible for introducing him to sex. “I’d been introduced to sex with almost no hang-ups. The older bodybuilders at the gym started to include me in their parties. It was easy for me. These guys always saw to it that I had a girl. ‘Here, Arnold, this
one’s for you’” (1977, p.26). This theme continues throughout the narrative to the extent that bodybuilding is depicted as a culture of sex, where sex with women is fundamental to bodybuilding training.

It was a great time. We cooked shish kebabs, sat around the fire and made love…we swam naked out in nature, had all this food, wine and women; we ate like animals and acted like animals. We got off on it so much that it became a weekly routine—eating fresh meat and drinking wine and exercising (1977, p. 85).

Certainly Schwarzenegger was not the first to link muscles with heterosexuality as nineteenth century bodybuilders had attempted to do with their claims that muscle building increased male virility (Kasson, 2001; Toon & Golden, 2002). Kasson explains the linking of muscle building with heterosexuality in the late nineteenth century through taboos around representing the human body. To represent the body in ways that were not couched in religious devotion, allegory or scientific exploration “was to risk falling from the lofty plane of the nude to the shameful one of the merely naked” (Kasson, 2000, p.21). Thus, in an era of photography where images of muscle men could and were circulated among audiences for admiration of their physical attributes, Eugen Sandow, the father of modern bodybuilding, worked very hard to disassociate his body from the shameful and homoerotic connotations of “the merely naked” through his strong man performances. Thus, while audiences could and did gaze up on his near naked body, such admiration was couched in his performances of unbelievable strength and his embodiment of the possibility for masculine physical transformation that he represented. Thus, he was able to bill himself as “The Perfect Man” through his simultaneous positioning as the “World’s Strongest man”, that he had publicly proven in competitions with other men and that he continued to iterate throughout his career through his strong man acts (Kasson, 2001).
While Schwarzenegger’s performance of heterosexuality surpasses in performances what was possible in the nineteenth century, his linking of heterosexuality with muscle building certainly follows in this tradition. While his image of heterosexual manhood was introduced to mainstream audiences by Education, it was created decades earlier through his depictions in bodybuilding magazines at a time when bodybuilding promoters were trying to capture mainstream audiences. From the late 1960’s onwards his image dominated in Muscle Builder, Mr. America: The Magazine for Today’s Virile Man, Muscle and Fitness and Flex, magazines in which muscle building was overlaid with a heterosexual discourse through the regular promotion of exercises, diets and potions to increase masculine virility. Schwarzenegger’s image as an exemplar of this culture was created and supported through a slew of articles detailing his sexual appetites and bearing his photographs. One such article was headed, “How to attract girls the muscle man way” (Neary, 1970) and depicted a swim-trunk clad Arnold with several bikini-clad women in various poses of adoration (Fig.1).

While only readers of bodybuilding magazines may have been exposed to these images, mainstream audiences were introduced to Schwarzenegger by Pumping Iron (1977), the now cult classic documentary about the 1975 Mr. Olympia in which Schwarzenegger ostensibly plays “himself”- a hypersexed and overly self-assured bodybuilder who dominates his competition using intimidation tactics. Because of his performance in this film, for which he is best remembered for his claim that lifting weights is akin to ‘coming’, to ‘having sex with a woman’, he was not just recognized as a bodybuilder but as a hyperheterosexual showman who made bodybuilding heterosexy. Stratton (1999) argues that the success of Pumping Iron must be understood within the context of a new visibility of the male body in 1970s consumer culture where men were being increasingly identified and targeted as consumers and their bodies

---

1 Significantly, all of these magazines were owned by Schwarzenegger’s mentor, Joe Weider and for all of which Schwarzenegger served as the executive editor. He was forced to step down from this post in 2005 when it was perceived as a conflict of interest with his role as Governor of California.
unveiled and used in advertising. However, this encouragement to look at the male body presents obvious problems for heteronormative masculinity that Holmlund (1997) highlights in her reading of *Pumping Iron*. She acknowledges how the excessive musculature of the male bodybuilder’s bodies pushes them beyond the normative boundaries of manhood and towards a liminal space that “threaten[s] the tenuous equation established between masculinity, muscularity, and men” (p. 154). This is why, in Holmlund’s evaluation, the film avoids direct fetishization of the men’s bodies in contrast to the typical ‘tits and ass’ depiction of female bodybuilders (who represent another dangerous sex/gender liminality) and centers Schwarzenegger who “is constantly surrounded by women, glorying in his supermasculinity” (p.153).

Stratton (1999) further explains how, in order to circumvent the feminization of commodity male bodies in consumer culture, muscle building was articulated to traditional notions of masculinity through its positioning as a form of labour. Yet, within this context of consumer culture where identity was being more closely articulated to ‘lifestyle’ and image (Howell, 2005) bodybuilding as a form of labour was cast in the language of labour on the self-as a productive activity towards the creation of self-responsible citizens. Saltman (2002) elaborates:

> Bodybuilding as a form of labour has a productive function of mobilizing consumption within the capitalist economy. Symbolically, the bodybuilder functions to expand a capitalist morality of hard work, meritocracy, discipline, competition and progress defined through quantifiable and empirically confirmable results (p.49).
In the following section I show that in addition to making muscles heterosexy Schwarzenegger promoted himself by linking muscle building with self-determination in the image of himself as a self-made man.

**Marketing muscle building through narratives of self-determination**

Bodybuilding has been widely promoted, as have sports in general, as a method of male self-improvement. This is evidenced in the claims that nineteenth century bodybuilding entrepreneurs made about the benefits of muscle building for men’s health and self-esteem which spoke to more widespread cultural beliefs about the intimate relationship between the body and character distilled in the popular dictum of the time: “a sound mind in a sound body” (Budd, 1996; Ernst, 1991; Kasson, 2001; Toon & Golden, 2002, Vertinsky, 1999). Eugen Sandow, Bernarr Mac Fadden as well as their twentieth century prodigy, Charles Atlas all sold stories about how their own self-improvement was facilitated by their miraculous physical transformations through bodybuilding. The most famous of these was the “Mac” advertisement for Atlas’ ‘Dynamic Tension System’ in which “Cyril the 7-stone weakling” builds up his body and clobbers the bully who once kicked sand in his face (Toon & Golden, 2002). This legacy is apparent in Schwarzenegger’s muscle building discourse in *Education*: “Strength and confidence, plus a first hand knowledge of the rewards of hard work and persistence, can help you attain a new and better life” (1977, p.256). In the tradition of his bodybuilding forefathers he offers frequent vignettes about his own inadequacies as a child- of sickness and lack of self-esteem, which he claims to have remedied by bodybuilding. He uses his image as a specimen of physical perfection to support further claims about the benefits of muscle building. “You’ll have better stamina, agility, coordination and resilience” and claims that bodybuilders have “fewer heart attacks, improved flexibility, resistance to disease and injury” compared with untrained bodies” (1977, p.146).
In his discourse of self-improvement, Schwarzenegger places particular emphasis on the development of the mind through muscle building. “The process of bodybuilding does not, in my estimation, stop with the body” (1977, p.256). He offers his achievements in and beyond bodybuilding as an example of the power of self-determination. He claims to have “developed such absolute control over my body that I can decide what weight I want for any particular time and take myself up or down to meet it” (p.30). In constructing this mind-body link, Douglas Hall explained that Schwarzenegger deliberately borrowed from a discourse of psychocybernetics, a branch of popular psychology that was influencing athletes and their approach to their bodies and training in the 1960s and 70s. Pioneered by plastic surgeon, Dr. Maxwell Maltz in his best selling book, Psychocybernetics: The Science of Self-Improvement (1960)\(^2\), psychocybernetics is a philosophy for self-improvement based on the notion that the body can be transformed through the power of positive thinking. According to Maltz, “The difference between a successful man and a failure is not one’s better abilities or ideas, but the courage one has to bet on his ideas, to take a calculated risk and to act” (1960, p.71). The masculine logic of psychocybernetics is reflected in Schwarzenegger’s self-image as one who fulfilled his dreams by taking a risk on an “oddball sport” and by betting his future on his body. His success at selling himself in this role is reflected in his depiction as “the most extreme example of aggressive individualism” (Lindqvist, 2003).

On one level, Schwarzenegger’s emphasis on self control over the body and the body as a tool towards a man’s self improvement reflects a protective masculinist discourse that Stratton (1999) and Saltman (2002) argue is key to the legitimacy of bodybuilding for heterosexual men in commodity culture. According to Hall, psychocybernetics was chosen with the aim of legitimizing bodybuilding as a sport by linking it to other masculine sports. Furthermore,

\(^2\) Psychocybernetics remains immensely popular and testament to this is the republication of Maltz’s book in an updated (and best selling) edition: *The new psycho-cybernetics: The original science of self-improvement and success that changed the lives of 30 million people* (Prentice Hall, 2002). There are numerous web sites devoted to teaching psycho cybernetics and the book is constantly checked out of the library.
Schwarzenegger’s emphasis on the mind in his discourse about how muscle building breeds self-determination can be understood as part of his strategy of self promotion. His emphasis on the mind was a way of depicting himself as having a ‘brain behind the brawn’ so that he could break free of the type cast of a dumb bodybuilder and gain more complex roles in films. There is a third context in which the success of Schwarzenegger’s marketing strategy can be understood. This is the discourse of neoliberalism, an emergent governmental discourse in the 1970s and 80s that rescripted citizenship by linking good citizenship with self responsibility and self-determination.

**Exercising good citizenship: Neoliberal discourse in Education**

Foucault has astutely written about how the self-disciplining of the body as a form of social control is a product of the modernization of power. He calls this strategy of governance in which self-subjection is emphasized, governmentality. Neoliberalism is the term that has been applied to this contemporary form of governmentality. King (2003) explains that this style of self-governance emerged as a way of circumventing and governing anxiety about a receding welfare state, which was heavily reformed in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s. The will to self-governance is linked with self-empowerment and individualism in such a way that those who were dependant on the state such as the sick, immigrants and the poor were stigmatized as lazy, immoral and burdensome individuals who endangered the state and other citizens by their inability to self-govern. According to King, in this environment of cutting back the welfare state, “the body became an emblem of personal power and worth as well as purchasing ability. But facilitated not simply by the marketing and consumption of fitness products mediated by large corporations…but was a strategy of neo-liberal governmentality” (2003, p.209). In relation to the operation of neoliberalism in and through fitness culture, the “good” body and by extension, the “good” citizen is measured by the ability to self-regulate through exercise. By taking up the will
to exercise, to become ‘healthy’ and self-sufficient according to institutionally proscribed methods, citizens effectively render themselves governable (King, 2003).

At the same time that individuals were being motivated to take responsibility for themselves, they were being bombarded with images of hard, white male bodies in Hollywood films, of which Schwarzenegger would later become one of the most recognizable (Jeffords, 1994). Thus Schwarzenegger’s promotion of a muscular body for men sat well with the notion of the ‘good’ body, one that was being increasingly defined in terms of muscular tone for both men and women. Furthermore, given that the rhetoric of neoliberalism demonized the sick, the poor, and non-white, the good body was very much about reproducing a model of citizenship that privileged middle-class, masculinity and whiteness.

Indeed, Schwarzenegger has built his image as a fitness guru to Americans through promoting neoliberal discourses on health that link fitness with self-responsibility and citizenship. Since retiring from bodybuilding competition, he has ventured beyond the promotion of bodybuilding to fitness more generally through his involvement in community sport such as the Special Olympics and through his role as Chairman of the President’s Council on Physical Fitness. In these roles he has toured the country promising to ‘pump up Americans’ and preached to them the necessity and value of leading a ‘healthy’ lifestyle. He has deployed the discourse of self-responsibility in his series of books on weight-training and fitness books for men, women and children. His series on ‘fitness for kids’ provides a good example of how he has moulded his promotion of fitness to the notions of ‘risk’, prevention and self responsibility for health that dominate in neoliberal discourse. In these books that are directed at developing the fitness of children from birth to age fourteen he declares: “To my mind, the single most serious and challenging fitness problem facing America today is the steady decline in the physical fitness of children” (1993a, p.1). He positions kids as being at risk of heart disease, obesity and poor self esteem and calls upon parents to “turn around the fitness crisis” (1993b, p.1). The theme of self-
responsibility is strongest in the third instalment where Schwarzenegger urges teenagers to take up the regulation of their bodies and fitness for themselves, “because kids 11 to 14 years old should begin taking responsibility for their own well-being” (1993c, p.4).

**Whiteness in the marketing of muscular masculinity**

Embedded in Schwarzenegger’s construction of himself as a model of responsible citizenship and heteronormative muscular manhood in *Education* is an equally powerful, though less obvious, discourse about whiteness. Whiteness, as a key theme in *Education*, can be detected in Schwarzenegger’s notion of muscular masculine physical perfection. “The best is not the biggest but the most perfectly developed,” he declares following the description of his first defeat at the 1966 Mr. America contest in New York (1977, p.96). One man by the name of Chet Yorton stands out in the narrative as emblematic of this articulate muscular masculinity. Schwarzenegger describes his “winning look”: “He was golden brown; he was cut up and defined; each muscle thoroughly wrapped in veins” (p. 49). Schwarzenegger’s emphasis on Yorton’s tanned skin, blonde hair, and perfectly symmetrical physique is revealing of a persistent ethnocentric bias in bodybuilding aesthetics. Moreover, this ethnocentrism as it centred on American bodies is suggested by Schwarzenegger’s claims that his American counterparts made him feel “painfully aware” of his shortcomings. “Compared to most of us in Europe,” he claims, “the Americans were like special creatures of science. Their bodies seemed totally ready-finished, polished. Mine was far from finished. I had just come from London with a big, muscular body…I had to get the separation, the finish, the tan” (1977, p.49).

Scholars and historians have shown how bodybuilding embeds a Eurocentric bias though its measuring of men’s bodies against classical aesthetics borrowed from Greek and Roman sculpture (Budd, 1996; Dutton, 1995). Perfect symmetry was a central tenet of the classical ideal, which according to Todd (1998) was bred into bodybuilding by early enthusiasts who actually measured the dimensions of Greek sculpture and used these numbers to judge the bodies of real
men (Todd, 1998). Strong (2003) notes how, “In this respect bodybuilding language and attitudes are the inheritors of classical formulations and understandings of beauty” (p.168). No doubt this classical influence lent an artistic legitimacy and air of bourgeois sophistication to the sport and its practitioners at a time when it was considered by some to be ridiculous and by others, bordering on the pornographic (Budd, 1997, Stratton, 1999; Kasson, 2001). Sandow went so far as to claim an ancient lineage to the Greeks as part of his promotion of himself as “the perfect man” (Kasson, 2001).

That modern bodybuilding, established in the late 40s, adopted classicism for its own aesthetic is evident in the description of Mr. Universe who was a national title holder: “Mr. Universe is built on a total heroic scale and every muscle group blends harmoniously with all the others in this most Herculean physique” (Tyler, 1970, p.23). A classical informed aesthetic of muscular masculinity can also be seen in the mimicry of classical tropes in the posing of athlete’s bodies for competition and in promotional photography. These images typically featured men in poses that mirrored classical sculpture and whose beauty and power are suggested by upraised arms and a heaven ward gaze. Dyer (2002) draws out the ideological connotations of whiteness in these images: “Whiteness is an aspirational structure, requiring ideals of human development. All the rhetoric of bodybuilding is founded on this and most vividly seen in the aspirational motifs of the posing vocabulary, bodies forever striving upwards” (2002, p. 265). Hercules, a recurring trope in Education, was also the theme of a genre of 1950s films known as peplums, in which white bodybuilders played the roles of classical heroes such as Hercules (Dyer, 2002). It was through these films that Schwarzenegger explains he became transfixed with his first bodybuilding idols, Reg Park and Chet Yorton, both of whom played Hercules. Casting himself in their mould, he would eventually play this role in his first film, Hercules in New York (1973). Dyer argues that the casting of white men in these roles contributed to the naturalization of their bodies as best bodies within bodybuilding subculture as well as the white male body as a
superior body more broadly. Dyer’s insight resonates with many of the pictures displayed throughout Education where Schwarzenegger is posed in the tradition of Greek sculpture against the backdrop of nature (Fig.2), and with three black children kneeling at his feet and looking up at him in adoration (Fig.3). “Photographic images are pieces of evidence in an ongoing biography or history” writes Sontag (1980, p.358). This is underscored by a series of black and white images of Schwarzenegger that complete his autobiographical story and act as evidence of his claim to be a specimen of masculine physical perfection (Fig.4).

Work on the racial politics of competitive bodybuilding has also been helpful for exposing Eurocentric bias in the standards that have been used to measure championship bodies. Kuriyama (1999) explains that muscular articulation in the West has a history of being tied to intellectualism, civilization and progress. Tracing this thinking back to the Greeks, he shows how this notion of the superiority of the articulate muscular body embedded a racialised discourse about the superiority of the Greek state and culture by comparison with Barbarians. Boyle (2006) has also shown how the notion of ‘perfect’ symmetry was used against black male competitors throughout the history of the Mr. America competition where black men’s losses to white men were consistently explained in terms of their supposed lack of calf development. This purported ‘racial defect’ helped to disqualify black men from competition because it prevented them from being perceived as having ‘perfect symmetry’ that was required of a bodybuilding champion. This supposed ‘defect’ of black men’s bodies was perceived through a neo-classical lens, the legacy of which is evident in Schwarzenegger own description of the perfect calf muscle as “full and pronounced all the way down to the ankle…like in classical images of Warriors and athletes” (1985, p.481). The racialised contours of muscular masculinity are further evident in Education through Schwarzenegger’s depiction of a Cuban bodybuilder, Serge Oliva. Oliva is an important figure in bodybuilding because he is known as Schwarzenegger’s greatest rival and some believe that if it were not for racism, Oliva would be known as the greatest bodybuilder of
all time. Schwarzenegger’s racialisation of Oliva is obvious in his perception of him as a superhuman threat to be overcome, compared with his idealization of white men whom he wished to emulate. Schwarzenegger refers to Oliva as “the myth,” a term that while revering, also carries stereotypical connotations of primitivism when it is linked with black identities (hooks, 1991). “I understood why they called him ‘the myth’. It was as jarring as if I’d walked into a wall” (1977, p.97). While this description may have been written in the spirit of admiration, it is simultaneously problematic because it dehumanizes Oliva by comparing him with a myth or a wall. Elsewhere, Schwarzenegger deploys another devise of racist language by perceiving Oliva through animal tropes. In his Encyclopaedia of Modern Bodybuilding (1985), he writes:

His shirt would come off, and there would be that incredible mass. He would transfix you with a look, exhale with a kind of animal grunt, and suddenly the lats would begin to flare and just when you thought they were the most unbelievable lats you ever saw, boom- out they would come, more and more and more, until you began to doubt that this was a human being you were looking at (1985, p. 46).

While I am not suggesting that Schwarzenegger is or was being deliberately racist, I am arguing that his self-perception as ‘king of the bodybuilders’ operates through and is secured by a racialised discourse about muscular masculinity in which whiteness is privileged. Certainly, the 1960s and 1970s, the period surrounding Schwarzenegger’s climb to bodybuilding fame and mainstream notoriety was a period of intense struggle around issues of race and belonging in America as marked by the civil rights movement. The role that whiteness played in elevating Schwarzenegger, an immigrant, to celebrity status can be better understood through depictions of African American athletes at this time.
Where sports have historically provided arenas for the exercise and display of gendered and identities and nationalist sentiments, race has clearly played a role in struggles over power. Indeed, contests between black and white opponents have provided embodied struggles over power but where black athletes have been stereotyped through racialised binaries that relegate them to the role of the dangerous other while white men have been invested with idealised notions about American citizenship. These dynamics are clear in the depictions of African American boxer Jack Johnson who defeated America’s ‘great white hope,’ Jim Jeffries in 1910. Register (2003) notes that while Johnson’s victory represented a new form of empowerment for black men, it was cast in threatening terms by the white media that exacerbated white fear of blacks. The cinema in particular helped to sustain and exacerbate stereotyping of black athletes as aggressive, violent and destructive as it captured the contest between Johnson and Jeffries and turned his physical prowess into a spectacle. Clearly, depictions of African American athletes throughout the twentieth century reveal how a racist legacy of representing masculinity, athleticism and citizenship remains. Writing about the depiction of Muhammad Ali in the 1960s and 70s Wynn (2003) shows how Ali was constructed through racist stereotypes about black males as primitive and hypersexual in a way that worked to invoke fear among white audiences. Sloop (1997) shows similar finding in his investigation of the media depictions of Mike Tyson as a “killing machine” and a dangerous animal following the rape of Desiree Washington. Certainly, stereotypes of African American athletes as threatening to the cultural fabric were enhanced by their vociferous political resistance to racism for which Ali received the degrading nicknames of the ‘Louisville lip’ and ‘Blabbermouth’ (Wynn, 2003). Similarly, gold and bronze medalist, 200 metre sprinters, Tommie Smith and John Carlos generated vicious critique for being ‘un-American’ at the 1968 Olympics when, during their medals ceremony, each raised a black gloved fist in a salute to civil rights. As a result, Smith and Carlos were suspended from the national team and banned from the Olympic village. The racialisation of athletes as ‘black’
coupled with their vocal support of the civil rights movement complicated their ability to represent idealised notions of masculinity and citizenship that have historically been based on a model of white, middle-class masculinity. By comparison, it can be seen how Schwarzenegger, as both white and a vocal supporter of the American Dream, was a much more viable candidate to embody American-ness than his racialised counterparts.

Indeed, the extent to which racial bias in sport and in bodybuilding remains, is evidenced by the fact that despite the current domination of bodybuilding by black men, Schwarzenegger remains bodybuilding’s most recognizable icon. Dyer (2002) points out how, despite the increasing success of black men in sports and society more generally, images of white men continue to dominate in representation, helping to normalize whiteness to notions of masculine beauty and power. This is supported by the canonization of Schwarzenegger in a 2004 special edition of *Muscle and Fitness*, as possessing the “the best physique of all time.” Unsurprisingly, Schwarzenegger was crowned ahead of his bodybuilding idols and of his famous Cuban rival, Oliva and other African American champions. The discourse used to describe Schwarzenegger’s prize-winning body recycles and reinforces the mythology that began and has sustained his career in which his muscular masculinity is linked with self-determination. He is described as “a one in a million combination of structure, size, shape and smarts […]. Others might eclipse his number of wins or his level of muscularity, but in the hearts of bodybuilding fans, one thing remains clear: Arnold will always be no.1” (*Muscle & Fitness*, 2005, p.161).

Despite Schwarzenegger’s seeming appearance as an unlikely celebrity given his origins as a bodybuilder, I have shown that there is more logic to his rise to popular fame than first appears. Clearly, Schwarzenegger’s success at selling muscle building to mainstream culture was largely dependant on an image of himself as a heteromasculine exemplar of muscular manhood and self-determination. The former image worked by submerging a pervasive homophobia towards muscle building for men and by promoting strands of neo-liberal discourse of self-
responsibility for health that undergirded 1970s fitness culture. Moreover, his self-image as an exemplar of American masculinity simultaneously smuggles as well as underscores whiteness as privileged in neo-liberal notions of good bodies that shape broader notions of American citizenship. Without the presence of heterosexuality and whiteness, Schwarzenegger would likely not have been so successful at crossing the wide divide between bodybuilding and mainstream culture. I continue to explore these themes in the following chapter where I trace the expansion of his celebrity through film into a popular brand. In particular I highlight a process of intertextuality among his on-screen and supposed ‘real-life’ images and show how these interchanges enabled him to develop his celebrity beyond that of a foreign bodybuilder and to be taken more seriously as an icon of American ness capable of leadership.
Chapter 6

The Intertextual terminator:

The role of film in branding 'Arnold Schwarzenegger'
From the earliest days of motion pictures, it was clear that an extraordinary body could lead to bigger things (Mathews, 2006, p.6)

Arnold Schwarzenegger’s greatest role has always been Arnold Schwarzenegger (Anon, 2000, p. 174).

**Introduction**

Film has been one of Arnold Schwarzenegger’s greatest promotional tools. The documentary, *Pumping Iron* (1977) first introduced Schwarzenegger to mainstream audiences as an Austrian bodybuilding champion. Yet it was through Hollywood film that he became a major celebrity and an icon of American popular culture known simply as Arnold, Arnie, even Schwarzy (During, 2004). Moreover, by projecting his image into the global market place, Hollywood film helped Schwarzenegger to develop into his own brand. A complex melange of masculinities, this brand has become as recognizable as the McDonald’s arches or the Nike Swoosh. “Not a day goes by without the possibility of encountering that grinning, chiselled face and that pumped up body as it permeates the very fabric of American existence” (*The Economist*, 2004, p. 2). Schwarzenegger’s evolution through film from a foreign bodybuilder to “a walking talking embodiment of the American Dream” (Hirshberg, 1990) is a complex tale of muscular masculinity, metamorphosis and marketing strategy. The story as I tell it here reveals that Schwarzenegger’s image went through several transitions, challenging the popular belief that his climb from bodybuilding to film stardom was somewhat natural and inevitable.

The first transition that I describe occurred between the beginning of his film career in the 1970s and the mid-1980s when he went from being typecast and stereotyped as a “dumb” bodybuilder because of his foreign name and accent, to being assimilated to the image of an American. This assimilation process began in the mid 1980s when Schwarzenegger shifted roles
from playing a foreign ‘other’ to playing an American in the ultra-patriotic and ultra-macho genre of Hollywood action films. I explain his transition to playing American characters through intersections among discourses of whiteness and muscular masculinity within the context of Reaganism (Jeffords, 1994; Andrews, 1996). I further highlight Schwarzenegger’s own role in his assimilation process through the promotion of himself as an immigrant success story who embodied the American Dream. I show how his self-promotion relied upon an ideological linkage between whiteness and American-ness that, in addition to his muscles, further supported his ability to embody a dominant image of American manhood.

The second transition in his film imagery occurred around the turn of the 1990s and can be seen in his shift away from the pure machismo of the 1980s towards a ‘gentler, softer’ portrayal of muscular masculinity. This shift can be seen in his movement towards comedy and family themed films. I relate this second transformation to shifts in gendered discourse during the 1980s and 1990s that produced a new prototype for hegemonic masculinity known as the “New Age Man”. A seemingly reformed prototype of hegemonic masculinity, the “New Age Man” phenomenon was a result of anti-war protest and feminist movement in particular that provided significant critique of hypermasculinity and called for more nuanced and complex portrait of masculinity in the media. While a seemingly pro-feminist figure, this new prototype smuggled backlash politics about white men’s victimization and sought, through various discourses, to reinstall a paternalistic notion of masculinity. In my exploration of Schwarzenegger’s depictions in comedy and family themed films during this decade I show how his performance of a so-called ‘softer’ masculinity were successful precisely because he maintained a hypermasculine front. That is, he was able to avoid the feminising effects of going ‘soft’ on the inside because he remained hard on the outside.

The third transition that I describe is perhaps less of a transformation and more of a solidification of the Schwarzenegger brand. I show how this occurred through his intermixing of
action and comedy during the last decade of his film career (the late 1990s and early 2000s). I argue that while these films were less successful than those of his earlier ouvre, they helped to solidify his image in films as complex mixture of paternal, yet action oriented man with leadership qualities. Far from signalling the death of his celebrity star, then, his imagery in these later decades prepared him for his role as a Republican politician by constructing him as a leader. That role that film has played in constructing Schwarzenegger as a ‘real’ life leader is nicely articulated here by two fans:

Through him we know how to be influential and powerful, how to meld machines and bodies, how to entertain the global village, how to whip a country into shape, how to fulfill the traditional American Dream, and perhaps even how to heroically kill and be killed (anon, 2004, p. 2).

In addition to exploring the role of Schwarzenegger’s film imagery in developing him into a brand and constructing him as a leader, I also show how a relationship between the popular press and film took part in this process. As my analysis makes clear, the Schwarzenegger brand has developed from much more than his film images alone. His brand has developed out of complex relationships among his media imagery as a foreign bodybuilder, a father, a philanthropist and member of America’s elite, produced and recorded in popular magazines, television, Internet and news press. This intermixing of Schwarzenegger’s off-screen and on-screen personas suggests the operation of intertextuality that scholars have shown is essential to the creation of contemporary celebrities. According to deCordova (1990), unlike modern theatrical and film actors whose identities were less important to audiences than the characters they performed, film stars grew into celebrities through the production and circulation of knowledge about their private lives. While audience interests in what stars are ‘really like’ fuelled this process,
competition among film studios to differentiate their product from one another and the discourse of the popular press have been implicated in the production of film stars (deCordova, 1990; Dyer, 1995, Turner, 2004). Intertextuality thus describes the process through which film stars developed into celebrities through the interrelation of a star’s so-called ‘real’ imagery with their screen images. The star’s identity, writes deCordova “is an intertextual field of associations… it [actor’s identity] does not exist within the individual star but rather in the connections among a wide variety of texts” (1990, p. 20). The actor’s name, deCordova further explains, contains these “intertextual associations” and thus supports the expansion of their celebrity beyond film.

These insights about celebrity can be usefully applied to “Arnold Schwarzenegger” whom I show, cannot be understood apart from the collections of interwoven images that make up his brand (deCordova, 1990; Dyer, 1986). This is suggested by the biographical tone of my description of his development through film. Indeed, throughout my discussion of his film roles and how he was depicted in popular magazines, I show how his film imagery as a heroic leader of men, women and children shaped as well as were shaped by his so-called ‘real’ imagery as a self made man, father and community leader. Furthermore, I highlight how Schwarzenegger participated in this process through deploying a self-parodying humour and a self-referential style that helped to enfold his ‘real’ life images as a bodybuilder, a father, a husband and a paternal leader into his on-screen characters. As one reporter put it, “Arnold Schwarzenegger seems to understand what Elizabeth Taylor has always understood: his greatest movie is his own life” (Latham, 1991, p. 117). Thus, in addition to confirming how intertextual processes are at work in the production of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity, this study is revealing of how Schwarzenegger himself and the multiple discourses circulating about muscular masculinity more generally, all coalesce in the production of his media images.
Hercules goes to Hollywood:

Eracing the “Other” in images of Arnold Schwarzenegger

As the world’s reigning action star Schwarzenegger specialized in enacting the masculine (Hoberman, 2005, p.33).

While the current size of Arnold Schwarzenegger’s celebrity gives the impression that his was a natural and steady climb to stardom, this was not in fact the case. His initial attempts to begin a film career were hampered by the very features that would eventually make him famous. His hypermuscular body, his thick Austrian accent and his lack of acting ability all contributed to his dismissal by film reviewers for his first performance in Hercules in New York (1969). In this film he assumed the mantle of Hercules from his bodybuilding forefathers, ‘all American’ men who were typically cast in this role (Dyer, 2002). While his white muscles fit the contours of the Hercules mould, his name and accent made him stand out. Attempts at erasing his otherness are apparent in the dubbing of his voice and his billing under the pseudonym, “Arnold Strong”.

While these efforts somewhat assimilated him to the images of his American predecessors, they also created the impression that he was an inarticulate foreigner, which was bolstered by stereotypes about bodybuilders as being all brawn and no brain. Schwarzenegger was clearly aware of these negative perceptions and made efforts to steer his image towards refinement and intelligence. Evidence of this is found in a 1970 article in Joe Wieder’s Muscle Magazine, the major bodybuilding publication of the time, for which Schwarzenegger was a major promoter.

As Arnold’s muscles have atrophied from a reduced weight-training regimen, so has his bodybuilding persona given way to a more rarefied eclecticism. Where protein powder and supersets were once the parlance of the day for the six-time Mr. Olympia, now chat about Chagall serigraphs and international politics holds an echo in the space about the Bavarian (Neary, 1979, p. 53).
However, given that bodybuilding magazines were yet to secure a mainstream readership, Schwarzenegger’s body continued to precede him in film as it did in bodybuilding. With his image still firmly tied to bodybuilding, he continued to be limited in his roles throughout the 1970s. He was cast as a one-dimensional bodybuilder in supporting roles to more recognizable actors in *The Long Good Bye* (1973) *Stay Hungry* (1976), *Scavenger Hunt* (1979), *The Villain* (1979) and *The Jayne Mansfield Story* (1980). In 1974, frustrated with his typecast, he accepted a role in the now cult hit, *Pumping Iron* (1977) a documentary based on the book by George Gaines and Charles Butler that revealed the curious sport of bodybuilding to mainstream audiences who were becoming increasingly interested in sculpted bodies and working out (Frew & McGillivray, 2005). As the star of the film, Schwarzenegger took on the role of ‘himself’ with great enthusiasm, portraying himself as a hypersexed, self-assured, and self-determined ‘King of the bodybuilders’. While the film itself was “a slow-burning hit” (Hotten, 2004; p. 140), the reason for its success was Arnold Schwarzenegger who, following the premier of the film, became a topic of intense interest in popular magazines and among the American elite. One film reviewer wrote after the New York premier:

This week, all New York really cares about is Arnold Schwarzenegger. He’s everywhere, in all the papers and magazines and gossip columns. No dinner is complete without a new, mouth watering detail about Arnold. In fact, if Robert Redford were to walk into the same room as Schwarzenegger, he would probably be in analysis for years, recovering from the shock to his ego (Andrews quoted in Hotten, 2004, p.140)

Following the relative success of *Pumping Iron* Schwarzenegger received his first positive review as an actor. It was in the form of a Golden Globe for ‘best newcomer’ for his role in *Stay Hungry* (Weider, 1991). This acclaim was, in many ways, an opportunity for
Schwarzenegger to break away from his stereotyping as a bodybuilder, a process which began when he was cast in the 1982 “skulls and bearskins epic,” *Conan the Barbarian* (1982). Playing Conan put Schwarzenegger on the map, not for his acting ability but for his captivating spectacle of muscular masculinity (Fig.5). Indeed, his remarkably muscular body was what caused director John Milius to cast him in the film, suggesting a turn in attitudes towards muscular male bodies. While the film’s producer, Dino de Laurentis had resisted casting Schwarzenegger out of a belief that his accent would deter audiences from seeing the film, Milius managed to convince de Laurentis of his unique physical preparedness for the role. Milius recounted this story to an interviewer, emphasizing that if they did not have Schwarzenegger to play the part of Conan “we would have had to build him” (Smolarcik, 1992, p. 7). Yet, his casting as the barbarian also spoke to the continuing tenacity of associations among muscles and primitivism at this time. This attitude is distilled in a comment made by Milius: “There’s something wonderfully primeval about him, harking back to the real basic foundational stuff: Steel and Strength and will” (quoted in Smolarcik, 1992, p. 8). Indeed, the image of the barbarian has been a central motif in representations of bodybuilders (Dyer, 2002). The strong men of the nineteenth century, the forefathers of bodybuilding, posed for photographs in roman sandals and leopard print loin cloths, accoutrements that were supposed to assuage the homoerotic connotations of muscle by creating an image of rugged masculinity (Kasson, 2001). The motif of the barbarian was also strong in the 1950s peplum films in which bodybuilders, among them Schwarzenegger, played the role of the mythical hero. As Dyer (2002) points out, while the image of the barbarian carries with it connotations of primitivism, this is more often linked to a non-white image. The white barbarian by contrast, is most often depicted as a saviour of civilization; he is a hero. Yet, white men’s muscles carry different connotations depending on their intersection with historically specific and nationalist discourses. Dyer notes that white muscles “very often mobilize(s) a sub-Nietzschean rhetoric of the Übermensch that, however
inaccurately, is strongly associated with Hitlerism and crypto-fascism” (2002, p.265). In addition to his stereotyping as a muscle bound brute, Schwarzenegger’s early images were also interpreted through intertextual associations among his Austrian nationality, his body and fascism, exemplified in his next role as the killer cyborg in Terminator (1984).

Arnold as the alien other in the Terminator

The Terminator has become one of Schwarzenegger’s most popular screen images, largely due to the success of its sequel, Terminator 2: Judgment Day (1991). Yet in this first film he plays an inarticulate killing machine. Speaking a total of eight words (not lines!) throughout the entire film, Schwarzenegger is literally a body on screen (Fig.6). His role is to evoke terror in his human victims and by extension, the audience. Initial reviews of his performance echo perceptions of him in his earlier films where he was perceived through stereotypes about bodybuilders. The Washington Post wrote derogatively, “As a Robot, Arnold Schwarzenegger has finally found a role appropriate to his talents” (quoted in Smolarcik, 1992, p. 8).

Schwarzenegger’s casting as the killer cyborg in the Terminator (James Cameron, 1984) exemplifies a tension between the growing admiration in America for his muscles and anxiety over their fascist connotations. While lingering camera angles invite the audience to admire his uniquely muscular and sculpted physique he is undoubtedly positioned as a spectre of fear whose lack of humanity threatens to destroy (American) civilization. “Cyborgs and men are mutually compatible images which mutually support cultural associations among masculinity, rationality, technology and science” (Balsamo, 2000, p. 150). Gonzalez (2000), who examines the first depictions of male cyborgs in nineteenth century Europe, explains that the coupling of human bodies with machines was a product of intense cultural anxieties about the changing shape of male power in a rapidly industrializing environment. “Bodies built out of the same material as their environment are better suited to bear the load of modernity” (de la Pena, 2003, p. 45). According to Poggie (1997) images of men merged with machines assuaged the racial panic that
merged with fears about male supremacy because it provided a visual, embodied sense of the impenetrability of patriarchy and white supremacy against the perceived ‘penetrating’ forces of women, homosexuals, and racial ‘others’. Dyer (2002) concurs, “only a hard, visibly bounded body can resist being submerged into the horrors of femininity and non-whiteness” (2002, p. 265).

Balsamo (2000) notes how, given the extreme technological rationality of the 1980s, the choice of Schwarzenegger to play the terminator was a natural one. Given that Schwarzenegger is a real life cyborg whose body has been manipulated by various weightlifting, dietary and medical technologies, his assimilation to a machine in the Terminator appears logical. This is confirmed by the film’s director, James Cameron who claims that upon seeing Schwarzenegger he exclaimed, “you’re a machine” and immediately cast him in the role of the terminator. In a retrospective on his portrayal of himself in Pumping Iron, Schwarzenegger capitalizes on this perception of him as a machine.

I came across as this typically Germanic guy, with no emotions being sent into war to just destroy everything and then come back and have no remorse, no feelings, no nothing… I was playing out the role that I would later play in the terminator (Muscle & Fitness, 2003, p. 172).

Compared with images of male cyborgs, female versions have typically borne the burden of representing the dystopic possibilities of human life as mediated by technology (Balsamo, 2000; Gonzalez, 2000). Schwarzenegger’s depiction as the alien other in the Terminator would thus seem to contradict the gendered associations of cyborgs. However, as a ‘foreign body’ in American cinema his depiction as the alien cyborg confirms Tasker’s observation that the “hard
body is underwritten by intertwining discourse of gender, race, nationality and power” (1997, p. 334).

Of course, Schwarzenegger’s depiction in the Terminator as an inarticulate killing machine can be understood in terms of his inchoate celebrity at this time. While he had attained his American citizenship the year before the release of the film he was still relatively unknown as an actor. When recognized at all, he was known for his role in Conan the Barbarian and for his reputation as a bodybuilder, established by the documentary Pumping Iron. In both of these films, he is marked as an immigrant by his thick Austrian accent and his foreign name that was thought to difficult to pronounce. On a deeper level, then, Schwarzenegger’s depiction as the killer cyborg must be understood in terms of a long and lasting history of xenophobia in the United States.

Arnold (1998) provides some evidenced for this interpretation with his reading of the Terminator alongside the 1980s crisis in the American automobile industry. He makes a literal translation of the terminator into fears about the termination of men’s jobs through the adoption of a Japanese model of car manufacturing which threatened to replace human bodies with machines. Rather than implicate the US government and car manufacturers, the responsibility for these fears was displaced onto the foreign companies from whose business models the Americans borrowed and to whom they outsourced manufacturing. Similarly, Larson (1997) reads the depiction of Schwarzenegger in the Terminator in terms of fears about outsiders inspired by a mixture of late cold war politics and 1980s nationalism. He describes this climate in the following terms: “the body politics requires a non-human other which it can eviscerate in order to confirm its own political and spiritual legitimacy” (Larson, 1997, p. 57). Larson supports his observations by drawing attention to the fascist connotations of Schwarzenegger’s muscular body as it is fused with a machine. He describes these connotations as represented by the “hyperrational directedness” and mechanical movements of the cyborg compared with the
fluidity and vulnerability to injury of the human hero. Larson further emphasizes the heart, or lack of heart in the terminator’s case, as a potent marker of difference where the terminator’s lack helps support his depiction as a monstrous “other”. Instead, a human protagonist is the hero of the film whose body represents the reified political body of the 1980s. In the mould of Rambo, the hero, Kyle Reece is depicted as a man scarred by a foreign war who must go it alone and depend upon the powers of his own body to save his civilization from obliteration or rule by an alien army of “others”. Schwarzenegger’s role in *Terminator* can be reduced to this representation of “otherness”. As Larson (1997) astutely notes, rather than a generic representation of the “other”, Schwarzenegger’s hypermuscular body and Austrian accent create connotations of fascism, a particular kind of national and political otherness in the American cultural imagination.

The extent to which Schwarzenegger was aware of these damaging connotations of his body at the time of the *Terminator* is unknown. Certainly, he promoted the image of his body as a machine, both in bodybuilding discourse and in interviews, as the above quote demonstrates, and he continued to play in violent action films that emphasised his body as a weapon. He also went on to brand the terminator image by playing in two further instalments of the films. Despite the fascist connotations of his nickname “The Austrian Oak” (the oak was a symbol of Nazi paramilitary training at the 1936 Berlin Olympics) it has continued to be invoked when referring to his reputation as a champion bodybuilder and he named his own production company Oak productions. What is known, however, is that he developed a keen awareness of the dangerous associations between his nationality and Nazism after the discovery of his father’s alleged membership in the Nazi party in the late 1980s (Leigh, 1990; Andrews, 2003) and disquiet about his own alleged admiration of Hitler (that was supposedly expressed in and edited out of *Pumping Iron*). His friendship with former Austrian president, Kurt Waldheim further inflamed critique. In 1989 Schwarzenegger became a benefactor to a high profile Jewish organisation for
the commemoration of the holocaust, the Simon Wiesenthal Centre. Many have perceived this move as strategic in distancing him from damaging accusations (Leigh, 1990; Latham, 1991). At the level of the symbolic, Schwarzenegger’s movement away from playing a foreigner to playing an ‘American’ in the next period of his film career, can also be seen as a discursive strategy in his distancing from the dangerous connotations of his perceptions as a foreign body.

**Becoming an American: The ascendance of muscular masculinity and the role of whiteness in assimilating Arnold Schwarzenegger to an American**

Schwarzenegger’s depiction as the bad guy was brief. In the same year as *Terminator* he returned to his role as Conan in *Conan the Destroyer* (1984) and took his place among the pantheon of 1980s muscle gods with starring roles in *Commando* (1985), *Raw Deal* (1986), *Predator* (1987) and *Running Man* (1987). In each of these films he plays a law enforcer such as a Colonel, a major or a vigilante citizen who takes it upon himself to fight corruption. The most compelling aspect of these roles, however, is less his reincarnation as a good guy and more his transformation into an American (Fig.7). This occurred despite the persistence of his Austrian accent. Schwarzenegger’s ability to play an American in these mid-1980s’s films marks a second major transition in his celebrity persona as it is has been constructed in film. This transition from being constructed as an Other, to being accepted as “the same” (i.e. American) can be understood through the intersection of whiteness with a particularly aggressive form of muscular masculinity that became hegemonic in this decade. This hypermasculinity can be identified in the genre of Hollywood action films in this era as well as the hypermasculine governmentality of Reagan.

Muscles have long existed as a leitmotif of national and racial supremacy in the cultural imagination of the United States (Vertinsky, 1999; Kasson, 2001, Montez de Oca, 2005). Historically, cultural representations of muscle have appeared at times of perceived or real crises
in the political, social and economic power of white men. At the turn of the century, celebrity strong man and father of modern bodybuilding, Eugen Sandow and his twentieth century successors Bernarr McFadden and Charles Atlas created their celebrities from the promotion of muscle building as restorative of the powers of white men (Vertinsky, 1999; Kasson, 2001). Likewise, cinematic portrayals of Tarzan in the 1920s by former athletes and the muscular heroes of the 1950s peplum films, all plucked from the stage of competitive bodybuilding, further fortified beliefs about white male supremacy in the aftermath of war when the vulnerability of men’s bodies was dramatically underscored by photographs of carnage in the news press (Dyer, 2002; Magill, 2006). The period between the 1970s-1980s, however, gave birth to a particularly aggressive expression of muscular masculinity that Kusz characterizes as “testosterone-dripping displays of male masochism coupled with rage directed at others” (2004, p.201).

Embodied by the hypermuscular action heroes of the 1980s cinema such as Schwarzenegger and Stallone (Rambo), this renewed celebration of white men’s muscles grew out of a post 1960s context of anxiety over real and perceived national decline. This was brought on by a constellation of forces such as the shame of the loss of the Vietnam War, a new wave of feminist movement and the civil and LGBT rights movements (Kusz, 2004). In response to these intense criticisms of the state and the white masculine supremacy upon which its power rested, several “recovery rhetorics” emerged that claimed the victimization of white men and called for the restoration of their power. Reaganism was among the most powerful of such discourses that called for a widespread ‘remasculinization’ of America and its men (Jeffords, 1994; Kusz, 2004). According to Andrews (1996), Reagan blamed the perceived ‘softening’ of America on the former president Jimmy Carter, whose liberal leadership he blamed as the cause of the nation’s economic and moral decline (Andrews, 1996; Dickenson, 2003). Reaganism was framed by and promoted a binary system of embodied identities that reified white masculinity and demonized
those who did not fit into this social norm (Andrews, 1996). Women, the poor, disabled, non-whites and homosexuals were thus commonly constructed as ‘soft bodies’ whose perceived weaknesses were threatening to the health and prosperity of the nation. This occurred despite the fact that these populations were disadvantaged through policies that cut social securities and drastically diminished the welfare state.

While the principle of equality for all plays an especially prominent role in the nationalist sentiments of the United States, Americans also look to the image of one particular national type who can represent the amalgamation of the wide diversity of groups that make up the American citizenry (Taylor, p.130).

In this “era of bodies” (Jeffords, 1994, p. 25) it can be seen how the images of white muscular men on cinema screens articulated a notion of Americanness through their hard bodies and their playing at protecting the nation from decline, a threat that in film is always brought on by “others” (i.e. women, homosexuals and terrorists). Yet, as Abele (2002) points out, the hard-body action hero was not the only depiction of manhood available to audiences in the 1980s. Glam rock stars strutted their emaciated bodies upon stages and in music videos in full leather outfits and make-up. However, hypermasculine heroism certainly monopolized images and discourse on manhood. Abele (2002) notes how the muscular male “epitomize(d) the qualities of the “successful” American male- a man with his eye firmly on his goal, his ‘duty’, committed to toughing out whatever gets in his way” (p. 447). Jeffords (1994) makes explicit the link between the colonial themes and performances of hypermasculinity in 1980s Hollywood action films and what she calls Reagan’s “remasculinization of America”. She argues this based on what she reads as the “Vietnam war revisionist” plots of films such as in the Rambo series and Terminator as well as the depiction of men’s bodies as weapons. The body-as weapon, Jeffords argues was
the locus of masculine regeneration through violence committed against others. Dyer (2002) adds to this reading a more explicit reading of whiteness as key to the cultural reification of white men’s muscles. Unlike the muscular heroes of former decades such as Tarzan who was played by former swimmers and football players, Dyer points out that the men who played in 1980s action films were all bodybuilders. Stallone, Schwarzenegger, Lungren and VanDamn all built their bodies either exclusively through bodybuilding or through a combination of weight lifting and martial arts. “Many of the formal properties of the built body carry connotations of whiteness: it is ideal, hard, achieved, wealthy, hairless and tanned” (Dyer, 2002, p. 265). Dyer further asserts how these images of white male supremacy were supported by the colonial settings and themes of action films. In most cases, he points out, that the hero is pitted against a foreign enemy who is depicted as a devious, inhuman and often effeminate type. Moreover, and reflective of the paternalistic role in which Western nations like to cast themselves, the hero ends up not only defeating the enemy and saving his own people but also remedies the problems of the enemy nation. Often betrayed by government bureaucrats who are depicted as too ‘soft’ to take on the enemy, these men make it their personal vendetta against the feminizing forces of foreigners, women and their own government to restore themselves and their nation to power (Jeffords, 1994). As Kusz points out, these narratives collectively encourage a return to frontierism, an historical restorative and nationalist rhetoric that normalizes whiteness to American citizenship. Moreover, the myth of frontierism privileges masculinity by imagining the white male body as foundational to the nation and a man’s willingness to use it as evidence of his allegiance.

Messner observes, “During this historical moment of cultural remasculinization, Schwarzenegger was the right body at the right time” (2007, p. 464). Certainly, while Stallone among others also portrayed popular images of muscular masculinity, their bodies did not measure up to the always already champion physique of Schwarzenegger. As Dyer
(2002) points out, Schwarzenegger was a known champion whose championship qualities were proven by his seven Mr. Olympia titles: “Stallone’s body is not so certified, his narratives involve him proving himself physically. Schwarzenegger’s body is simply massive, his characteristic facial expression genial, his persona one of teutonic confidence” (2002, p.266).

It was in this racial and masculinist climate that Schwarzenegger began his transformation through film from “Other” to the ‘Same’. His assimilation is reflected not only in his acceptance as an American on film despite his thick accent but is completed through his construction vis-à-vis ‘other’ characters such as women and non-white peoples. As Hall (2001) has pointed out categories of human difference operate through binaries in which one side is always privileged. In the representation of white and non-white bodies, then, there is always an unequal relation of power that supports long held historical beliefs about the inferiority of non-whiteness and the superiority of whiteness. This relation of power has been observed in Schwarzenegger’s films. Hoberman (2005) notes how Schwarzenegger’s heroization in film is partly achieved through the depiction of black and non-white characters as primitives and untrustworthy villains. This is certainly true of the Conan films in which he is accompanied by two racialised sidekicks, a ‘nutty’ Chinese ‘witch doctor’ and a black female warrior who growls and spits at her enemies. In Predator, Schwarzenegger plays opposite a native American man and an African American man, the former who is stereotyped as a ‘closer-to nature’ tracker and both of whom are brutally killed by the alien, a 10-foot creature with a black carapace and a Medusa’s wig of hair that bares a striking resemblance to dreadlocks. Predictably, Schwarzenegger survives to destroy the seemingly indestructible alien creature whose technological enhancements far exceed his flimsy by comparison, man-made weapons. Predator is one example of how whiteness operates in all of his films, where Schwarzenegger’s white muscular body outperforms the
bodies of all other racialised men (and women), to save the day and by extension the human (read: American) race.

Schwarzenegger’s ability to transform his nationality, despite his lingering accent, highlights how whiteness confers flexibility upon the white man’s body in relation to the racialised subject whose body is confined by racial categories. While whiteness is visible in so far as it connotes superiority upon a body, it is also invisible when the white hero can defy the limitations of his nationality and perform other ethnicities. The racialised body by comparison is a body of visibility and limitations. Tasker (1997), drawing on Fanon, explains that race acts as a limitation on the body for those marked as non-white. This racialising process is nicely demonstrated by the story of Bruce Lee, the only non-white male action star to ever rival the popular stature of Schwarzenegger. Like Schwarzenegger, Lee moved from his home country of China to America in search of a film career. However, according to Chan (2000), Lee’s initial attempts to break into Hollywood were thwarted by perceptions of him as being “too Chinese” by American producers and filmmakers to be cast in western roles. This rejection was the driving force behind his return to Hong Kong where, somewhat ironically, he made the films that would later make him famous in America. While Lee’s muscular body certainly defied traditional feminizing stereotypes of Chinese men (Chan, 2000), he remained largely appreciated for playing the part of another racial stereotype, the mysterious Chinese martial artist.

In light of this discussion about belonging, it is worth noting that Schwarzenegger’s ability to assimilate to a model of Americanness and his membership within this category remains conditional. We are reminded of this every time that his accent or his muscular body are mocked, or when intertextual associations are made between his muscles and nationality with fascism. Nonetheless, his assimilation to Americanness in this period suggests the permeability of the ideological category of ‘American’ where the definition of
who is a citizen and who is an immigrant is determined by one’s belonging to the category of whiteness.

**Conan the Republican**

Importantly, the relationship between images of muscular men and the political climate of the 1980s was not simply representational. This is suggested by Schwarzenegger’s ability to muscle in on politics through his support of Republican presidential campaigns. Yet his ability to do so was not simply because of the resurgence of muscular masculinity as iconic in this decade. Schwarzenegger’s ability to support political causes was also enabled by a history of celebrities in politics and a particular shift in their political roles in this decade. Marks and Fischer (2002) trace the relationship between politics and Hollywood to show how the roles of entertainers have shifted across the decades. They show that in the 1960s, entertainers and actors played largely ceremonial roles in the support of grassroots activism and politics such as singers who wrote protest songs and actors who lent their support to anti-Vietnam war activism. By the 1970s, however, they explain the lack of grass roots activism and a generalized political apathy in terms of a growing mistrust of politicians who only ever seemed to lie or be embroiled in some sort of scandal. “The late 1970s witnessed the emergence of a celebrity culture that took advantage of the public’s desire to return to an age of glamour after the disappointments and failed promises of the 1960s and the disgrace of Watergate” (2002, p.376). Marks and Fischer argue that the election of Ronald Reagan, a former television and film actor, as President in 1980, marked a shift in the political roles of celebrities from decorative to representational. They draw a parallel shift in political culture from one of substance to one of image, and describe the bodies of celebrities as the fundamental link between the two. Drawing on Foucault’s notion of the body as the target and site of power they write, “The investiture of authority in celebrities represents a continuation of the trend by which social bodies operate as the site where relations of power are played out” (p. 372).
Schwarzenegger was unique among celebrities for the kind of body image that he lent to politics, an image that can be seen as celebrating two and intertwined themes of the 1980s, celebrity and muscle. Moreover, where muscle underpinned the governmentality of Reaganism and “the great American tradition of using masculinity as political currency” (Kimmell, 1996) more generally, it was in Republican politics that Schwarzenegger’s muscle found its greatest currency. In 1984 Schwarzenegger campaigned extensively for Reagan’s re-election and again for George Bush’s presidential campaign in 1988. Dubbed “Conan the Republican” for his role in these campaigns, Reagan and Bush clearly capitalized on audience recognition of the film star as well as the masculine authority that his muscles lent to their own leadership personas. Bush in particular has been accused of using Schwarzenegger’s muscles to attenuate his own so-called “wimp image” (Latham, 1991, p.115). The use of Schwarzenegger’s image for political purposes certainly worked to his own advantage as well. One reporter suggested that his subsequent appointment to Chairman of the President’s Council for Physical fitness by Bush helped to “erase his politically unhealthy steroid image” (Latham, 1991, p.115). Certainly, in addition to providing him another promotional vehicle for promoting his films, the use of his image to promote American politics further supported his transformation from a foreigner to “the same” by associating him with traditional Republican notions of citizenship and manhood. Indeed, Latham goes on to point out how the image of Bush and Schwarzenegger together on the same political podium was well calculated in that it produced a quintessentially American image of “the aristocrat whose family has been here forever and the boy that just got off the boat” (1991, p.115). By proving himself in politics he was able to change public perceptions of himself as a dumb “jock” bodybuilder and give weight to the ideological linkages between muscles, masculinity and leadership. The powerful and tenacious reach of these linkages is evidenced by Schwarzenegger’s ability to use his muscular masculinity to promote himself as a leader. This was made clear during his campaign for Governor of California in 2003 when he drew heavily
on his images and stories from film and bodybuilding to support a depiction of himself as a strong, self-motivated and determined leader (see Ch 7 for a detailed discussion of muscular masculinity in Schwarzenegger’s representation as a Governor).

**Building the immigrant success story**

While discourses of muscular masculinity and their intersection with whiteness certainly contributed to this significant shift in Schwarzenegger’s popular perception from a foreign bodybuilder to a model of American masculinity, he was by no means passive in this process. It is widely recognized that Schwarzenegger is more of a talented businessman than he is a talented actor who has used his biography as part of his self-promotional strategy. A rags to riches story about a poor boy from Austria who achieved fame and fortune in America by building up his body and believing in the American Dream, moulds his image to the myth of the immigrant success story among others that support American nationalism.

Schwarzenegger first forged this image of himself as a self made man and immigrant success story in bodybuilding magazines such as *Muscle Builder*, *Muscle and Fitness* and *Flex* magazines. As a frequent commentator in these publications, Schwarzenegger iterated and reiterated his biography in advice columns and interviews that were ostensibly meant to promote bodybuilding. In a 1979 interview in *Joe Weider’s Muscle Builder* he weaves his biography into the conversation about his bodybuilding career: “When I came to live in this country in 1968 I could not speak the language well at all. I couldn’t listen to the news, I couldn’t read the papers. I came with no money at all” (Daniel, 1979, p. 118). The interview begins with a quote from his 1977 autobiography, *Arnold: Education of a Bodybuilder* in which he heavily promotes his image as a self made man: “I taught myself discipline, the strictest kind of discipline. How to be totally in control of my body, how to control each individual muscle. I could apply that discipline to everyday life” (1977, p.109). A 1991 article in *Muscle Inc* quotes him as saying: “I believe in the philosophy of staying hungry. If you have a dream and it becomes a reality, don’t stay
satisfied with it too long. Make up a new dream and hunt after that one and turn it into a reality” (1991, p. 144). Likewise, his biography proved to be a powerful promotional tool for promoting an image of himself as a politician. In a 2003 article in Flex magazine, designed to promote his campaign for Governor in the California recall election, he weaves his biography into the conversation in ways that celebrate the myth of the American Dream and mould his image to that of an immigrant success story. “I believe this (America) is the place where anyone can make it, but there are no hand outs, you have to work hard…I wouldn’t have been able to do any of the things I have done in my life if it wasn’t for America” (McCough, 2003, p. 95).

Schwarzenegger’s biography perpetuates the classic ‘immigrant success story,’ a nationalist mythology that supports the ideological linkages among whiteness, masculinity and American citizenship. These links are further secured by the myth of the self made man whose body is positioned as the primary tool for the making of his fortune. Moreover, his willingness to use his body is positioned as the measure of his manhood. The myth of the immigrant success story is also dependant on classed and racialised norms as they intersect with the notion of Americanness. In the American Dream, America is imagined as a classless society where the successes of an individual are attributed to their own personal motivation to climb the social ladder. Also known as meritocracy, this perception of social status obfuscates actual and deep seated economic inequalities in the U.S which hold current hierarchies in place. That Schwarzenegger can claim to be an immigrant success story is interesting given his supposed status in Austria as the son of a police chief, which would have conferred some status upon his family. While he claims that he came to the U.S with no money in his pockets, he had the luxury of choosing to spend the entirety of his time working out and competing in bodybuilding competitions with the financial support of various generous benefactors. Dyer speaks to this class dimension of bodybuilding:
The built body is a wealthy body. It is well fed and enormous amounts of leisure time have been devoted to it. The huge, firm muscles of Gordon Scott, Steve Reeves and Arnold Schwarzenegger make the simplest contrast with the thin or slack bodies of the native peoples in their films. Such muscles are a product and sign of affluence (2002, p. 266).

The ease with which journalists, interviewers and fans have come to reproduce Schwarzenegger’s mythology on their own suggests a willingness to believe in the American Dream. “All his life, whenever he has conquered one world, he has always moved on to another” (Latham, 1991, p.117). Another praises him as one “who took control of his life by taking control of his body” (Lipsyte, 1993, p.54). Schwarzenegger’s success at selling himself through his biography is also indicative of the tenacity of these grand narratives despite constant challenges to their racialised, classed and masculinised dimensions.

**The Intertextual terminator: The “New Age Man” and the emergence of Schwarzenegger’s brand**

Schwarzenegger’s film imagery took a significant turn in the late 1980s, away from the pure macho and ultra violence of action films and towards more nuanced portrayals of masculinity. This is evident in his film roles from 1988 onwards when he began to play a family guy who develops nurturing relationships with women and children. He plays a hardened cop-cum-kindergarten teacher in *Kindergarten Cop* (1990), a cyborg with a paternal side in *Terminator 2* (1991) and the world’s first pregnant man in *Junior* (1994), in which he learns to embrace his ‘feminine side’ (Fig, 8.). What is remarkable about these roles, compared with Schwarzenegger’s previous performances, is their level of self-reflexivity. Unlike the more subtle process of intertextuality that I discussed in the previous analysis such as among his muscles and fascism, his film images in this decade are characterized by overt forms of
intertextuality such as self-parody and allusion (Fig. 9). This development points to the emergence of Schwarzenegger as a celebrity, which is to say that he progressed from being identified through his film roles to becoming a person “well known for his/her well-knownness” as Boorstin (1962), an early theorist of celebrity, first put it.

The first hint of this shift in Schwarzenegger’s performances of masculinity can be seen in *Twins* (1988). This was his first comedic role in which he plays a gentle giant, the unlikely twin brother to comedian/actor Danny De Vito. His depiction in *Twins* marks a significant break from the ‘hired muscle’ that made him famous in the earlier part of the decade because he is depicted as much more than a body. His character, Julius, is an intellectual, a scholar of literature and languages and is depicted as the superior of the two twins. He is described as “a highly educated but sheltered giant with a big heart,” compared with De Vito’s character, who is described as “a pint sized hustler with an insatiable lust for women and money” (DVD).

As an indication of his growing celebrity at this time, director Ivan Reitman (*Ghostbusters* (1984), *Junior* (1994)) wrote *Twins* explicitly for Schwarzenegger and De Vito because he believed that the combination of their screen personas (and no doubt their bodies) would make a successful comedy. Reitman’s prediction was proven correct by the following year when the film had made $216,000,000 worldwide (imdb.com). The success of *Twins*, however, did not simply derive from the coupling of Schwarzenegger and De Vito nor from a sudden reversal in opinions about Schwarzenegger’s acting talent. What appealed to audiences about this film was Schwarzenegger’s ability to poke fun at himself, to parody those attributes that had initially caused his dismissal by audiences and reviewers.

**Parody and the biographical imperative**

At its most basic, parody describes a “referential allusion” to something or someone with comic intent (Dentith, 2000). Hutchenson writes, “Parody is imitation with a critical difference, not always at the expense of the parodied text” (1985, p. 7). Hutchenson further asserts that
parody is a form of intertextuality because it draws its meanings from allusions to other texts. In *Twins*, parody derives from Schwarzenegger’s depiction in outdated, ill fitting clothing, and awkwardness with American customs, an obvious allusion to stereotypes of immigrants. Yet his playfulness with mocking these aspects of himself enabled the audience to participate without being implicated in the xenophobia that underlies such mockery of difference.

Schwarzenegger’s parody of the immigrant in *Twins* is essentially a parody of himself, which highlights a second form of intertextual process at work in his images throughout this decade. This is the enfolding of his biography into his films, the effect of which is to cause a conflation of Schwarzenegger’s ‘real’ and fictional personas that Byers (1995) refers to as the “biographical imperative”. The extent to which this occurs in Schwarzenegger’s films led Grady (2003) to refer to them as “cannibalizations of the stars’ box-office biography” (p.7).

**Balancing the masculine and the feminine in *Kindergarten Cop***

The operation of the biographical imperative is clearly visible in Schwarzenegger’s next film, *Kindergarten Cop* (1990). Also a Reitman vehicle, Schwarzenegger plays a hardened detective who becomes softened by his experiences posing as a kindergarten teacher (Fig.10). The intertextual associations among this character with his ‘real’ life character are highlighted in this appraisal of his performance by a film reviewer: “What makes *Kindergarten Cop* all the more fun is knowing that Arnold Schwarzenegger and kids around the globe are on the best of terms that the Sultan of Sinew works hard to keep it that way” (Stoddard, 1991). Stoddard’s appraisal serves to illuminate the pleasure that audiences derive from intertextuality in Schwarzenegger’s films; it allows them to exercise their knowledge of celebrity and their dexterity with recognizing intertextual references (Chandler, 2002).

Schwarzenegger’s *Kindergarten Cop* character was clearly shaped by his ‘off-screen’ image at this time as a paternal protector of the health of American children. He had begun to cultivate this image in the mid 1980s, when, through his marriage to Maria Shriver he became
heavily involved in the Special Olympics, a charity for involving disabled children in organized sport. His concern for the health and fitness of American children was further promoted through his role as Chairman of the President’s Council on Physical Fitness. In this role, Schwarzenegger pledged to visit each of the fifty states to spread the word of fitness to American children. By delivering on this pledge and continuing to play the “good guy” in cinema, Schwarzenegger was developing an image of active, wholesome, Republican masculinity that was expected of a leader. The success of this image of himself as a man of action but with a soft spot is reflected in a comment by one reporter, “Even as he brandishes the props of an alpha male- thick cigars, hypermusculature, hoarded capital- he disarms his critics with innate sangfroid and eye-twinkling self deprecations” (The Economist, 2004, p. 174).

Also, by 1990, Schwarzenegger was not just assuming the fictional role of a father, he had become one with the birth of his first child. Popular magazines contributed to this advertisement of his new image as an action hero-cum-father figure by focusing on his private life and by privileging themes of paternity in articles that were ostensibly meant to promote his films. A 1989 article in The Saturday Evening Post, promoting the “First Annual Great American Workout” staged by George Bush, focuses almost entirely on Schwarzenegger, emphasizing his fatherhood in pictures with his wife and child as well as with crowds of smiling children. A 1990 Vanity Fair article similarly depicts him leaning over a baby carriage in seeming rapture with his newborn child. “Marriage and fatherhood seem to agree with Schwarzenegger,” writes the author of the article, “He is not one of those gooney born again fathers who tell romantic stories about the miracle of natural childbirth and the joys of diapering, but he’s clearly entranced with the kid” (Hirschberg, 1990, p. 182). This author clearly expresses some anxiety about Schwarzenegger’s ‘softened’ manhood in her compulsion to confirm that his masculinity remains intact.
While Schwarzenegger’s depiction in *Kindergarten Cop* as a romantic hero who reads stories to children about bears who go shopping may have set him up for ridicule, reviewers loved it. “Faced with a fearless, unstoppable adversary of a kindergarten class, the destroyer, the terminator, the predator, the ex-FBI agent becomes a pitiful hulk screaming for mercy” (Stoddard, 1991). The secret to the success of this comedy and others clearly derives from intertextual associations among his hypermasculine imagery that is the core of the Schwarzenegger brand. “Kindergarten Commando” as Messner (2007) recently dubbed him, is a father figure who is willing and still able to use his muscles to defeat the bad guys and maintain the social order. This nuanced image is partly achieved through the referencing of Schwarzenegger’s past action films. In *Kindergarten Cop*, allusions to his macho film roles abound. An early scene in the film references the *Terminator* when Schwarzenegger/Kimball is depicted pursuing the villain through a shopping mall. He takes long mechanical strides and wears the same hard expression, dark sunglasses and oversized shotgun that defined his image in *Terminator*. Parody in this sense derives from the fact that the action hero has been reduced to a kindergarten teacher. However, this image creates pleasure rather than panic in the audience because, while it mocks the hyperbole of his trademark masculinity, it simultaneously confirms that his muscular masculinity remains intact.

Schwarzenegger’s ability to play a ‘softened’ version of the muscular masculinity that made him famous in the 1980s was not due to the sheer force of his charm alone. It corresponded with a shift in notions about masculinity between the 1980s and 1990s, most visibly rendered on film. Abele (2002) notes a trend towards more vulnerable depictions of masculinity in the late 1980s and early 1990’s Hollywood cinema, exemplified by what she terms “masculinity deconstructing films”. She includes *Die Hard* (1987), *Ghost* (1990) and *Total Recall* (1990) in this category and argues that their male protagonists, while hard on the outside, are forced to come to terms with their own vulnerability and learn to form nurturing relationships with women.
and children. While Abele overstates the progressive nature of this so-called ‘deconstructed masculinity’ her point is instructive for understanding Schwarzenegger’s so-called softened image of masculinity in the 1990s. His metamorphosis into a gentle giant corresponds with the emergence of a ‘new’ masculine prototype known as the “New Age Man”.

Also known as the “sensitive new age guy” (or SNAG), the “New Age Man” emerged as the figure head for a renewed ‘crisis of white masculinity’ in the 1990s in response to new waves of feminist and civil rights movements such as LGBT liberation that attacked the hegemony of male supremacy and made whiteness visible as a racial category (Kusz, 2004; Kimmel, 2006; Connell, 2005). The “New Age Man” was also the product of capitalist forces, such as deindustrialization and globalization that caused a restructuring of the economy and a subsequent decline in the incomes of middle-class white men (Kusz, 2004). While these changes did not correspond with a rise in the standard of living or privileges of women, African-Americans or gays, a reactionary ‘victim rhetoric’ in favour of white men displaced onto ‘Others’ the blame for shifts in the social and economic fabric of American culture. “This populist rhetoric often portrays multi-culturalist and feminist forces as threats to American families, traditional values and the nation, all of which are coded as white” (Kusz, 2004). This attitude found various expressions in the popular culture and was the basis for a rash of sit-coms figuring images of disadvantaged men such as Married with Children, King of Queens and Roseanne. Fears about the real or imagined losses of white male privileges were also manifest in the rise of various masculinity recovery movements such as the Promise Keepers, Robert Bly’s ‘Iron John’ tribal retreats for men, as well as the slew of popular psychology supporting biological essentialism. Kusz (2004) identifies the extreme sport movement as exemplary of this backlash rhetoric. Identified with the slacker generation of so-called misguided teens at its emergence, Xtreme sport became rearticulated to a revival of traditional American values in the 1990s when it became the pursuit of white middle-class men. Xtreme sport was conducive to the practice and
articulation of rugged individualism, conquering new frontiers and achieving individual progress because it gave white men an avenue to prove their potency through the exercise of their bodies that had been somewhat emasculated by their commodification within capitalist culture.

One of the most popular films of this decade, *Fight Club* is exemplary of the feelings of crisis at the heart of the “New Age Man” persona. The protagonist (Ed Norton), emasculated by his Ikea lifestyle develops a hypermasculine ego (played by Brad Pit) to restore his masculinity and his self-pride. He starts a “Fight Club” where middle-class white men in similar situations go to reclaim their masculinity by competing in fistfights with other white men. The popularity of the film and lack of critique of its overt homophobia and misogyny is one suggestion of the widespread embrace of the “New Age Man” image and the insidiousness of its backlash politics.

While on the surface, the “New Age Man” can and has been interpreted as a pro-feminist figure for his ability to be vulnerable and emotional, feminist scholars have convincingly argued that the new man actually smuggles old sexisms through its maintenance of traditional masculinity that relies upon homophobia, racism and misogyny (Faludi, 1991). Indeed, as Connell (2005) points out, the colloquial usage of the notion of ‘crisis in masculinity’ does not reflect the theoretical use of the term “crisis”, which suggests a destruction and restoration of a given system. As Kimmel points out, while the “New Age Man” represented a shift in popular images of masculinity, it did not entirely transform nor eclipse the previous hypermasculine prototype. Rather, “New Age Man” incorporated a ‘softer’ side into a remaining patriarchal view of men (Kimmel, 2006). Only by leading with the muscle, then (Messner, 2007), could a man show compassion and vulnerability in the 1990s. This clearly became the modus operandi for Schwarzenegger’s ‘revised’ masculinity in the 1990s, helping to adapt his image to the demands of the new decade and aiding in the sustenance of his celebrity.
Total Recalling muscular masculinity?

Schwarzenegger’s desire to play more nuanced and intelligent characters attracted him to the sci-fi action adventure *Total Recall* (1990). Screen-writer Gary Goldman commented: “If Arnold’s body is the perfect vehicle for his soul, this movie is the perfect vehicle for Arnold Schwarzenegger” (interviewed on DVD, 1999). As in the film, where the viewer has difficulty discerning the difference between what is real and what is ‘a dream’, it is equally difficult to discern where Schwarzenegger begins and where his character, Quaid, ends. This seeming collapse between Schwarzenegger and his film character is indicative of the biographical imperative in his films. Described by co-screen writer, Ron Shuset, as ‘a thinking man’s action movie”, Schwarzenegger’s character in *Total Recall* exemplifies the “New Age Man”. He plays Quaid, a seemingly ordinary man who, through various convoluted twists of the plot becomes a leader of a mutant colony on Mars and leads them to freedom against a totalitarian despot. In doing to, he relies equally on his intelligence and his body, reflecting Schwarzenegger’s ambition to be perceived as an intellectual as well as an exemplary body. Originally scripted to be a “timid, accountant type guy”, Quaid was reincarnated through Schwarzenegger as an action hero, but one with a sensitive side.

*Total Recall* is of further significance in Schwarzenegger’s filmography because it marks the beginning of his increasing control over the production side of film. The story of the film’s making and re-making, a 10-year saga, is a fascinating example of how the interests of producers, directors, investors and choice of actors help to shape a film text. While Schwarzenegger had been pushing for the lead since before production, the film’s producer, Dino de Laurentis (who has also produced *Conan*) was favouring Patrick Swayze for the role of Quid. Not long after filming began in Australia, the director ran out of money and bankrupted the project. It was Schwarzenegger who, like his film characters, saved the day by convincing producer Mario Kassar to buy the script, found investors to finance the project, chose Paul
Verhoeven to direct, and cast himself as the central protagonist. Schwarzenegger also convinced the film’s financers to provide extra money to advertise the film on a wider scale helping Total Recall to secure the number five grossing film of 1990 with the biggest opening weekend of any film that year (25 million) (Grady, 2003). As Schwarzenegger himself pointed out, the financial success of Total Recall projected him to official global stardom (interview on DVD, 1990). This was not simply because of his starring role in the film. Total Recall married Schwarzenegger’s image with breakthroughs in special effects technologies for which the film won an academy award. As a star of the blockbuster science fiction genre, Schwarzenegger’s imagery was enhanced by its glamour and trailblazing reputation, thus contributing to his own biographical portrait as a trailblazer himself (in film, business, politics). Total Recall highlights how the genre of science fiction film both contributed to Schwarzenegger’s celebrity status as a Hollywood icon as well as created opportunities for him to become involved in the production side of film that allowed him to gain greater control over his image.

A kinder, gentler Terminator: making Schwarzenegger ‘the same’ in Terminator 2

The multiple images that Schwarzenegger accrued throughout the 1990s, as an action hero, comedian, fitness guru, community leader, business mogul and father-figure, all coalesced in the production of his image for Terminator 2 (1990), arguable his most famous film role. T2 also marks a pinnacle in his capital as a film star, both in terms of his global popularity and in terms of film production costs and revenue. Schwarzenegger was paid thirty million dollars for his role in this film which itself cost over one hundred million dollars to make (the most expensive film at the time). T2 grossed over 200 million dollars in its first year (imbd.com) and has since made more money than any of Schwarzenegger’s other films to date, rivalled only by its sequel, Terminator 3 (2003) (which cost twice as much to make) (imdb.com).

As in Total Recall, Schwarzenegger played a key role in providing the muscle for T2, both financially and physically as its star. Yet the most compelling aspect of T2 is the complete
reversal in the depiction of his cyborg character from a ruthless ‘alien’ killer in T1 to a ‘kinder, more gentle’ terminator as Schwarzenegger describes him. While the transformation in the T-100 cyborg is explained within the film as a result of it being reprogrammed to act as a protector for the teenage protagonist against a newer, more lethal terminator, a more compelling explanation lies in Schwarzenegger’s establishment as a celebrity and his successful assimilation into a model of traditional American manhood. This is underscored by one biographer who contends that the T2 cyborg, “resonated with Arnold’s own personal characteristics, his relentless, unyielding pursuit of whatever he wanted” (2005, p.171). Referring to his character in T2 as “the Schwarzenator,” Byers (1995) further underscores this conflation or rather confusion between Schwarzenegger and the cyborg as a branding mechanism.

Not only is his character in T2 now ‘good’, he is depicted as more human than machine (as opposed to more machine as he was depicted in the first film) with the ability to learn from his human companions (Fig.11). This intelligent aspect is somewhat indicative of the shift in Schwarzenegger’s celebrity persona from all brawn to having a brain. This shift in perceptions of his intelligence also corresponds with the covering up of his body, which in earlier decades was always exposed when he was identified only with his body. Indeed, the T-100 is more human than human as is indicated by the heroine of the film who suggests that the cyborg would make the ideal father for her son. This seemingly outrageous suggestion is undoubtedly made plausible by the fact that Schwarzenegger, whose celebrity images have become dominated by themes of paternalism, was cast in this role.

Reforming Schwarzenegger from Other to saviour in Terminator 2

Schwarzenegger’s re-positioning as a paternal protector, a father figure who is also a military weapon corresponds in part to his successful assimilation into a model of reformed 1990s masculinity, which Messner best describes as combining “the kick-ass muscular heroic
male body with situational expressive moments of empathy, grounded in care for kids, and a capacity to make us feel safe” (2007, p. 469).

Schwarzenegger’s paternal relationship to his teenage charge, John Conner, is a central theme in T2 that corresponds with traditional Christian values of patriarchal family relations promoted by both Reagan and Bush that blamed single mothers for the so-called demise of the family and the emasculation of American men (Jeffords, 1994, p.28). This backlash rhetoric is clear in the hierarchical relationships among the cyborg and his young charge, John, and with Conner’s mother. Throughout the film John confides in the terminator about his unhappy childhood due to his ‘incomplete’ family situation, which consists only of a militaristic and non-nurturing mother. Sarah Conner is portrayed as an unnatural mother who repeatedly expresses a general mistrust of men and deflects John’s appeals for a father with statements like “we’re better off on our own.” Played by a stunningly muscular Linda Hamilton, Sarah Conner can be read as a feminist figure yet only in so far as she is able to physically protect herself and her son. A physically strong and intelligent presence in the male dominated psychiatric hospital where she has been imprisoned for most of John’s life, she loses her authority over her son early on in the film after she is rescued by the terminator. The subordination of Sarah is most poignant in a scene where John prevents his mother from destroying the terminator that she fundamentally distrusts based on her experiences of being its target in the first film. Conner asserts his dominance over his mother, in light of his fated role as the future leader of the human race. Subdued by his command, Sarah eventually comes to view the terminator as the best option for a father because, as she says, “It would never get drunk and hit him. It would die to protect him. In an insane world it was the sanest choice.” Read within the backlash climate of the film’s making, this logic reproduces the patriarchal standpoint that a cyborg father is a better option than a single-mother parented family.
Schwarzenegger vs. the Alien: Racial politics in Terminator 2

The radical rescripting of Schwarzenegger’s character can be further understood in terms of the racial politics underpinning new age masculinity as well as a broad cultural shift in attitudes towards technological mediation of human life (Larson, 1997). This is suggested by the fact that Schwarzenegger is no longer the alien and that (an)Other has been created to take his place. The T1000 (or liquid metal man) is a newer and more sophisticated prototype of terminator. Made from liquid metal it can change its shape and recover quickly from injury. While both terminators are coded as ‘white’ and ‘male’, they are constructed through a binary of ‘same’ and ‘other’ that is nevertheless underwritten by racial categories. Larson (1997) reads a cultural shift around attitudes to technology and consumer capitalism into the binary depiction of the human-like machine played by Schwarzenegger and the morphological alien body of the liquid metal man. He interprets the acceptance of the T-100 as an indication of a more widespread comfort with the mediation of human bodies by machines, against the imagery of his liquefied opponent who represents new moral and political anxieties about the ‘disorganization’ of the state due to invisible flows of information and capital (Fig.12).

Byers (1995) further argues that the shape-shifting, screaming T1000 that oozes through spaces and penetrates its victims with pointy objects represents ‘pomophobia”, fears about economic instability in a post-modern world where anxieties are displaced onto the bodies of minorities such as women, immigrants, non-whites and homosexuals. Thus this new spectre of terror provides a foil for confirming Schwarzenegger’s status as “the same” which is underpinned by his hard white muscles. Schwarzenegger gets to prove his insider status and his allegiance to the nation by destroying the T1000. This occurs in the denouement scene when the T100 hurls the T1000 into a vat of molten steel- a symbolic expulsion of the ‘alien’ from the nation and the securing of its borders by the hard, white, male body who, despite his melting heart, remains intact.
Certainly, Schwarzenegger’s hard, white muscles represent permanence, control and stability compared with the horrifying spectre of anarchy that is the T1000. Easthope (1990) writes that ‘the most important meanings that can attach to the idea of the masculine body are unity and permanence…Very clear in outline and firm in definition, the masculine image of the body appears to give a stronger sense of identity” (p. 53). Indeed, the audience’s faith in the terminator is secured through the image of Schwarzenegger’s body in this role that in the film and in ‘real life’ appears to be immutable. Indeed, this impression is given by the remarkable continuity among his physiques between the terminator films and across his films in general. This seeming permanence of his body contributes to the popularity of his cyborg imagery. Seemingly immutable, his body provides a sense of security amidst the seeming chaos of social change. As the nation changes shape, Schwarzenegger’s body stays the same. This notion of his permanence, an ideological statement about the supremacy of white masculinity, is nicely captured in the final scene of Terminator 2 when, after terminating the T1000, Schwarzenegger lowers himself into the same vat of molten steel- a sacrificial gesture to secure the lives of his human charges. As his body submerges into the smouldering vat of steel, it sinks without melting. Read within the intertextual field of his imagery, his disappearance into the vat of molten steel with a large thumbs-up, indicates a reassuring gesture to audiences that “Arnold” will “be back”, if not in the guise of a terminator, then in some other form (i.e. the “Governator” as it turned out). At the core of this dénouement and indeed the Schwarzenegger brand more generally, is that his hard body and his hypermasculinity will always remain intact.

The extent to which his image in T2 represents his successful shift from an alien other to a model of American masculinity is evidenced by the reversal in usages of the machine metaphor. Where the machine metaphor had previously been used as mockery, such as likening his acting ability to that of a robot, by the 1990s machine metaphors had been rearticulated to celebrate his masculinity. One reporter described Schwarzenegger as “a biomechanical stud in
whom you couldn’t tell the muscle building limbs from the bristling armory (sic) of portable weapons” (Andrews, 2003, p.5) while another fetishized his body as “a hot wired combination of sinew and circuitry (fulfilling Nietzsche’s vision that “the higher man is inhuman and superhuman”) (Wolcott, 1997, p.126). This acceptance of his image as iconic of white American masculinity and nationhood signals how, by this point in his film career, Arnold Schwarzenegger had become not only an icon of muscular masculinity, but an established brand.

Dénouement: Exercising the Schwarzenegger brand

The immense success of Terminator 2 was followed by a significant failure. Last Action Hero (1993) was reviled for its attempt to playfully expose the intertextual processes that support Schwarzenegger’s celebrity images. In Sight and Sound, one of the major journals for film criticism, one reviewer judged its self-reflexivity “an act of hubris” while another claimed the film signalled the death of the action genre and of Schwarzenegger as an action hero (Romney, 1993, Sheehan, 1993). This was prophetic of the reception for many of his following films, which barely recovered more than a third of their production costs. Schwarzenegger enjoyed moderate success with his return to playing a less-reflexive action hero in True Lies (1994) as he did with his return to comedy in Junior (1994). While the latter comedy was not as successful as his earlier ones, audiences still delighted in seeing “the Superman physique turn pear-shaped”, (Johnson, 1995) and he earned some positive appraisals of his acting skills: “If there are any people left who don't realize that Arnold Schwarzenegger is a superb actor, they ought to see Junior” (Forbes, 1995). Yet, despite this relative success, the popularity of his films continued to wane at the box office. Batman and Robin (1997) received poor reviews as did Fraser (1996), End of Days (1999) and Collateral Damage (2000), whose plot bizarrely resembled the events of September 11th, and which stalled the release of the film until the following year by which time it was considered to be in bad taste. Yet the waning of his image as a hero on film didn’t seem to matter. Interest in Schwarzenegger had already shifted to constructing him as a politician.
As early as 1991, speculations about his political ambitions began to dominate articles and interviews. One reporter wrote, “Every now and then Americans want a Terminator if not a barbarian in their elected offices” (Sneider quoted in Latham, 1991, p. 117). Indeed, the release of *Terminator 3* (2003) corresponded with Schwarzenegger’s announcement that he would run for Governor of California that same year. *Terminator 3* (2003) had moderate success at the box office, proving the confirmed success of the *Terminator* formula, yet simultaneously suggesting the demise of the film franchise (the film only took $44 million at the box office, out of the $200 million that the film cost to make). Yet *Terminator 3* only suggested the demise of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity on film. By this time he was already making his highly publicised transition into politics through the recall election, for which *Terminator 3* acted as a promotional tool. This is evidenced by reviews of the film in which his performance of leadership and heroism are conflated with projections about his abilities to be a ‘real’ leader. Reviews of Schwarzenegger as a candidate are some of his most glowing reviews to date. Thus, by no means did the waning of Schwarzenegger’s film career by the end of the 1990s and into the 2000s signal the waning of his celebrity career. Rather, it indicated a metamorphosis into another celebrity incarnation, “the Governator”. My exploration of this image, among others, in the following chapter, provides further insight into the role of film in branding “Arnold Schwarzenegger” and in developing his image as a leader. In particular, I show how his imagery as a celebrity politician was dependant on his images in film and that these images resonated with hypermasculine portrayals of Republican masculinity more broadly. Further, I show how his political imagery and its interpretation by audiences provides insight into the relationships among muscular masculinity, nationality, citizenship, and power and how these discourses helped a modern day strong man to muscle his way into American politics.
Chapter 7

Reading 'the Governator’s' body:

The politics of muscle in celebrity politics
Arnold Schwarzenegger is the same kind of actor that Ronald Reagan was, which is not really an actor at all... In movie after movie Arnold and Ronnie essentially play themselves. They are in a tradition that includes John Wayne, and Robert Redford, who is always “Robert Redford”. Such actors always project the same image, which may well be an advantage for a movie star and is certainly an advantage for a politician (Latham, 1991, p. 116).

**Introduction**

In October 2003, Arnold Schwarzenegger spectacularly transitioned into his third major celebrity incarnation, the Governor of California or the “Governator” as he was affectionately and/or derisively known. The stage for this transformation was set by the now famous recall election. Led by a Republican congressman, the election was sparked by the circulation of a state-wide petition calling for the recall of the present governor, Gray Davis, for his alleged failings of the state. Cooke (2005) reports that the election quickly became a circus when 135 B-grade celebrities and colourful members of the public threw their hats into the ring. When Arnold Schwarzenegger entered the race, however, the election was identified as an example of celebrity politics.

Many have expressed extreme concern over celebrity politics and its perceived threat to American democratic political process. Marshall (1997), without stating that audience/citizens are dupes of popular culture, argues that the use of the popular media by celebrity politics works to discipline the masses by organising them into more manageable and non-threatening forms. Taking this Frankfurt school type argument to the extreme, Weiskel (2005) describes celebrity politics as a ‘politics of distraction’ that is leading American people up the proverbial garden path and away from important political and social issues such as the environment. “National politics have become a side show where clowns and buffoons strut and bellow across a movable
stage to divert the public’s attention from what is really shaping their lives and determining the future fate of the planet” (Weiskel, 2005, p.394). Weiskel blames the broad acceptance of politics as entertainment, the “Hollywoodization” of news media and the use of new media technologies such as blogging, and web streaming that he believes is causing the homogenization and narrowing of information compared with former methods of broadcasting. Marks and Fischer (2002), drawing on Baudrillard’s notion of the simulacrum, worry that the mediatisation of political process means that democracy has been replaced by a simulated form. Further, and drawing on Foucault, they argue that celebrity bodies, with their emphasis on surface and style participate in this simulation of consent by capturing the attention of the citizenry who are easily seduced by celebrity. Indiana (2005) writes scornfully of the Schwarzenegger campaign:

The Schwarzenegger bandwagon was a flying carpet, floating elusively between the haemorrhoid-crimson Mars of Total Recall and the carnage strewn freeways of Terminator 2 films in which the candidate rescued humanity from slavery and annihilation… Voting for Arnold Schwarzenegger “sent a message” of brand loyalty to a consumer product, a public image, an icon of power (pp. 20-21).

Certainly, there are elements of Schwarzenegger’s gubernatorial campaign that raise the warning flags waved by scholars and journalists about the decay of democratic political process into ‘celebrity politics’. These include Schwarzenegger’s carefully choreographed and rehearsed performances that helped him to avoid serious discussion of political issues. Dubbed the “Governator”, “Running Man” and “Conan the Republican”, he encouraged audiences/voters to identify with him as a leader through his celebrity personas, promising to ‘terminate’ Gray Davis and say, “hasta la vista” to California’s social and fiscal problems at every opportunity. Furthermore, Schwarzenegger used his contacts and experience with the popular medium of
television to promote himself, exemplified by his use of the *Tonight Show*, hosted by his friend, Jay Leno, where he made his initial announcement that he would run for governor.

However, panic over the emphasis on media and style is but one view of the political possibilities enabled by celebrity politics. Corner and Pels (2003) note the elitist tone of perceptions that the media is transforming a ‘higher’ form of politics into a ‘lower’ mass cultural form as well as highlight the moral judgments embedded in these accusations about the kinds of investments people should make in politics. They suggest that celebrity politics has the ability to adapt to the demands of a thoroughly mediated world and to citizens on their own turf who have become more interested in judging politics from individual leaders and their styles than the more distant and anonymous representations of government. “In generating new structures of proximity and distance, television democracy offers new risks but also new opportunities for democratic representation and accountability” (Corner & Pels, 2003 p.7). Simons (2003) elaborates on this position, pointing to two ways in which ‘television democracy’ should not be viewed with such suspicion and disdain. First, he argues that the media is enabling for democracy because it facilitates the spread and speed of information to a mass audience. Second, he asserts that audiences are not passive consumers of mass produced information but are skilled in reading media and capable of forming critical interpretations. Drawing on Hall’s ‘encoding/decoding’ model of media to audience communication, Simons argues that audiences are capable of making interpretations that go against those intended by those who produce media. There is a wealth of empirical data to support Simon’s point such as studies of how women read romance novels (Radway, 1987), how audiences interpret soap operas (Ang, 1985) and how young Canadian men interpret images of African American males in NBA and affiliated advertising (Wilson, 2005). In relation to how audiences read political figures, Marshall (1997) concedes, “in a kind of binarism, the effort to control the image betrays its opposite: that the image in its play with affect could produce uncontrollable consequences in the mass public”
Looking back at the recall election from these more nuanced perspectives there are opportunities to ‘see’ public resistance to celebrity politics in criticisms of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity ‘style’. Examples include criticisms of Schwarzenegger’s fitness to govern based on his lack of experience in politics and his profession as an actor, his status as an immigrant, and more explosive accusations that surfaced from his past such as beliefs about him being a Nazi sympathiser, a womanizer and a misogynist.

In this chapter I explore the possibilities for critical engagements with celebrity politics by analysing three specific and related images from Schwarzenegger’s 2003 campaign: “the Governor”, “the Gropenator”, and “die Gropenfuhrer”. “The Governor” was a leading image of Schwarzenegger’s campaign that positioned him as a strong and powerful yet benevolent leader based on intertextual references to his images as a terminator in the blockbuster films bearing the same name. “The Gropenator” emerged as a sardonic twist on “the Governor” following the revelation of sexual assault allegations against Schwarzenegger by the Los Angeles Times in the final weeks of the election. “Die Gropenfuhrer” emerged around the same time as “the Gropenator” and was coined by Doonesbury artist, Gary Trudeau, in a cartoon in which he depicted Schwarzenegger as a giant hand- ‘groping’ for power. A parody of the German word for leader, gruppenfuhrer, “the Gropenfuhrer” moniker attacked Schwarzenegger based on his nationality and long-standing allegations against him of being a Nazi sympathizer because of the revelation of his father’s membership in the Nazi party, his friendship with former Austrian president Kurt Waldheim and his own alleged comments about admiring Hitler. More than showing how the discourses around these images were critical and both supported and challenged Schwarzenegger’s construction as a leader, my analysis highlights how masculinity was central in their formation.

I begin by addressing Schwarzenegger’s construction of himself as a “Governator”. I show how, through its allusions to the terminator films, this image projects a hegemonic
masculinity that draws on Schwarzenegger’s muscular body for its symbolic power and an image of paternal yet forceful masculinity that he projects in his action films. I further situate his performance of hegemonic masculinity within a tradition of representing Republican leaders as hypermasculine. I show how Schwarzenegger puts on the mantle of Republican hypermasculinity in his interactions with other male and female Democrats. I then move to explore how “the Gropenator” moniker produced a critique of his hypermasculine persona based on accusations about Schwarzenegger as a serial groper and a misogynist. In my examination of the public uses of this nickname I show how it highlights the intersection of (hetero)sexuality with muscular masculinity and how the power of celebrity, combined with the eroticization of heterosexual masculinity helped Schwarzenegger to recover his image from damage. In the final section of this chapter I read “the Gropenfuhrer” imagery for its ‘race’ based allegation of Schwarzenegger’s unfitness for citizenship because of his foreign nationality and point out how xenophobia continues to shape notions about belonging in America.

Where the images of Schwarzenegger that I have chosen to analyze are collectively and intertextually produced by various factions of the ‘media’ and the ‘public’ (i.e. ‘spin doctors’, independent journalists, major news press, internet based activist groups and individual artists) I read these images for their critique of Schwarzenegger’s celebrity persona in an attempt to show that celebrity politics is not apolitical as many cultural critics suggest. Moreover, while I illuminate some of the broad dynamics of celebrity politics, between the production/recovery of hegemonic gender scripts of political leadership and public critique of this posturing, I am able to show how masculinity operated as a central organising discourse of Schwarzenegger’s governance campaign.
“The Governator”:
Performing hegemonic masculinity in American politics

From the very beginning of his campaign, Schwarzenegger was promoted as a man of action. His ability to govern was perceived as being written on his hyper muscular body and already demonstrated through his film roles. The recall election was referred to as a “Total Recall”, and “T4: Rise of the Candidate” while Schwarzenegger himself conflated his image as a leader with his film roles. Dubbed “the Running Man”, “the Collectinator” and “Conan the candidate,” Schwarzenegger played the part of the action hero by promising to “pump up” Sacramento and “terminate” Gray Davis along with California’s massive fiscal deficit. Among his many film-inspired monikers, “the Governator” stands out for capturing the kind of masculinity at the heart of his political persona.

Imagine the governator. Imagine the muscles, the macho style of action star Arnold Schwarzenegger as California’s swaggering chief executive. Imagine the lead of those terminator films literally arm wrestling reluctant legislators, carrying a mostly centrist Republican agenda on shoulders as wide as the Golden Gate Bridge (Honig, 2003. p.9).

Crucially, and distinct from his ‘baddie’ role that he played in the first Terminator (1984) film, the “Governator” image draws from his most famous film character as a cyborg in Terminator 2 (1991) and Terminator 3 (2003). Reformed from the vicious killer he depicted in T1, his characters in T2 and T3 meld his hard-body action hero images from the 1980s with his more nuanced portrayals of masculinity that he developed in the 1990s through his roles in comedies and family-themed films. Messner (2007) refers to Schwarzenegger’s strategic mixing of muscle with care of women and children in his leadership persona as “Kindergarten Commando”, which also indicates the role of intertextuality and film in producing this image.
Indeed, the theme of paternalism that runs through Terminator 2 already overflows into Schwarzenegger’s construction as a politician through his background in community leadership. He has acted as a coach and ambassador for the Special Olympics since the early 1980s and his involvement in forming social policy for after school activities has centered on the care of children. The fit between his character in T2 and his political persona thus appears to be a natural one. Like his character in T2 whose duty was to protect a young boy and by extension the human race, Schwarzenegger positioned himself as rescuing the people of California from the “bad guys” accused of wreaking havoc in the state. This is how he presented himself on the Tonight Show when he described his decision to run for office as a ‘sacrifice’. “I felt it was my duty to jump into the race and bring hope to the people” (quoted in Mathews, 2006). In a later interview with Flex, (2003) he said that while he had desired to channel his energies into directing and producing, “I feel very strongly that we can turn the state around. And I didn’t want to stand around any longer watching the politicians up there neglecting the people” (McGough, 2003, p. 96).

The saturation of Schwarzenegger’s campaign with references to the terminator and other films suggests his awareness of its currency for building a leadership persona as well as the power of celebrity for politics. In his speeches, Schwarzenegger used his signature sound bites of “hasta la vista, baby” and “I’ll be back”, depicting the recall race in terms of the plots of the terminator films. Fans and supporters joined in sporting T-shirts and waving placards depicting his bust as the cool, ray ban-clad cyborg with the caption “Terminator for Governor” and “Governator for president”. Yet, despite his paternal posturing, an attitude of dominance cuts through his campaign, confirming Messner’s point that, “the new hybrid masculinity always leads with the muscle” (2007, p.475). “This is a war,” Schwarzenegger boomed to supporters at a rally, “We are in the trenches. We have to fight. To my twin terminators, ‘Hasta la vista, baby.” Coupled with his frequent promises to ‘terminate’ Gray Davis along with the states’ immense
deficit, all of these performances draw upon a discourse of hegemonic masculinity whereby force is glorified as the preferred method of problem solving (Hoberman, 2005).

**The body as evidence of leadership**

In politics as on film, Schwarzenegger’s body was at the heart of his campaign imagery. Indeed, T3, the final instalment of the terminator series, released only a month before his announcement to run for governor, can be seen as advertising for his campaign (Indiana, 2005). Reviews of T3 were focused almost entirely on his body as it appeared in the film. McCough marvels at how Schwarzenegger, at 54 years of age, was able to rebuild his body for the film and appear heavier and more muscular than ten years ago when he starred in T2 (Flex, 2003, April). Schwarzenegger clearly encouraged the perception of his body-as-evidence of his leadership by comparing the task of fixing the state to his challenges as a competitive bodybuilder, drawing attention to the ideological connections between physical strength and mental toughness, the idealized qualities of a leader (Marshall, 1997). Dodging questions from reporters about his practical intentions on political issues, Schwarzenegger instead appealed to audiences with his background in bodybuilding and film as evidence of his abilities to govern. Furthermore, where the muscular male body stands at the heart of American nation building myths, he invoked the “American Dream” and his own ‘immigrant success story’ to promote his campaign. He appealed to bodybuilding fans, “I believe this is the place where anyone can make it, but there are no handouts, you have to work hard” (quoted in McGough, 2003, August, p.95). “Nowhere else but in America could my story have happened. Not just because opportunities present themselves here but this country in general, encourages you to go beyond your limit” (quoted in McGough, 2003, p. 97). These myths helped to situate Schwarzenegger as ‘one of us’, supporting his self-promotion as a governor “for the people” not of the people as he proclaimed (Mathews, 2006).
Beyond creating a captive audience, the saturation of Schwarzenegger’s campaign with imagery of his muscles can be interpreted as a way of combating the potentially feminizing effects of celebrity culture. Marshall (1997) points out that celebrity poses a danger to virile masculinity because it places the subject in a relatively ornamental and passive role. This is compared with other kinds of celebrated public individuals such as the hero who is made famous for having performed some feat of daring or significance (Marshall, 1997). It could be argued that Schwarzenegger is a hero, not only because he has played the hero in film but because he is depicted as a ‘real life’ saviour of the health and well being of children through his work as Chairman of the President’s Council on Physical Fitness and as a global ambassador for the Special Olympics. However, as an actor his heroism is largely fictional and as a bodybuilder his muscles are largely ornamental.

Furthermore, Schwarzenegger’s body has fallen away somewhat from the buffed and bronzed specimen of masculine perfection that had originally made him famous. Once pictured in magazines and films in little more than a pair of posing trunks (the evidence of his virile masculinity on clear display) his ageing body is now mostly hidden when it is shown, which can be read symbolically as a shield against revealing the fragility of the ageing male body and of constructions of muscular masculinity more generally. This shield does not, however, protect him from ridicule or critique. An online site, www.strangeland.com circulated two comparative images of Schwarzenegger, one of him in elite competitive shape accompanied by the caption “I’ll be back” and the other depicting him in swim trunks with the caption “Oh my back!” (Fig.13). This image underscores McDowell’s (1997) assertion that “masculinity is incoherent, unstable and in a constant state of utter convulsion” (p. 369). While gender can be etched into the body in spectacular relief, gender is never stable and must be constantly reproduced in order to be legitimate.
Not simply a matter of gender, however, his muscular body evokes connotations of class that can be read into the positioning of his body vis-à-vis his images as a muscular spectacle in bodybuilding magazines and in film. While his images as a bodybuilder and action hero were able to lend support to his self-image as a strong leader, his reduction to the body alone causes problems for his ability to be seen as a legitimate leader. In the late nineteenth century, strongman, Eugen Sandow faced a similar problem. Kasson (2001) explains that Sandow cultivated an air of bourgeois sensibility through fine clothes and affiliation with high society such as actresses, businessmen and politicians. Thus, while he appeared nearly naked in his strong man shows, his ‘double’ or perceived ‘real’ identity as a gentlemen and member of the bourgeoisie served to protect him from the stigma of vulgarity that at that time was associated with nudity and the labouring body. Indeed, like the early criticisms of Schwarzenegger in film, skepticism was expressed about his ability to lead based on the fact that his experience lay in acting, not in politics, which can be seen in impersonations of his accent (i.e. “Ah-nold” and “Kah-li-fornia”). Schwarzenegger easily absorbed such attacks, however, through his deployment of self-parody, a trademark that effectively endeared him to audiences through film (see Chapter 6). Moreover, his cultivation of elitism through his bold display of wealth helped to offset perceived ‘low class’ connotations of his body and his status as an immigrant. While Schwarzenegger is well known and indeed worshipped for the immense social, economic and political capital that he has amassed throughout his career, he further cultivated this image during the recall through sartorial display (expensive suits and jewelry), lavish luncheons and donations to organizations, references to his Hummers and private jet as well as the $22 million dollars that he sunk into his campaign (Cooke, 2005). Among these conspicuous displays of wealth, the presence of his wife, Maria Shriver, provided the most powerful embodiment of bourgeois support for his leadership. Standing by his side at many of his public events and campaigning for her husband on her own, Shriver represented Schwarzenegger’s membership in the Kennedy
family and his membership more broadly among America’s political and economic elite. Messner (2007) further underscores how class and nation intersect with gender in Schwarzenegger’s construction of himself as a sympathetic leader because of his experiences as an immigrant. He argues that despite Schwarzenegger’s ability to construct himself as one who is sympathetic to immigrant experiences, as a white ethnic he is removed from the daily experiences of poverty, institutionalized racism and xenophobia experienced by America’s vast majority of non-white immigrants. This contradiction between Schwarzenegger’s claim to identify with immigrants and the reality of his status as a member of America’s elite, is further underscored by Mitchell (1996) in his discussion of the class politics of California’s geography and economy that are built on the backs of seasonal immigrant labourers. Mitchell points out how the myth of the Californian Dream, like the American Dream erases their effort, poverty and pain in narratives that mythologize the beauty and prosperity of the so-called “Golden State”.

Cast in the light of class politics then, Schwarzenegger’s self promotion as a body built to lift the state out of its debts and place it back on its romanticized path to prosperity, both obfuscates and lays bear the real bodies that do the building of California’s economy and who are exploited for its gain.

**Comparative masculinities in politics: Schwarzenegger vs. a very ‘Gray’ Davis**

The Democratic party is the natural home of the effete thesbian and quiche eating intellectuals not to mention feminists. The republican party is the natural home of macho men- erstwhile wrestlers such as Dennis Hastert, Donald Rumsfeld, football stars like Jack Kemp and J.C Watts and of course Arnold Schwarzenegger (Honig, 2003, p.10)

The “Great American tradition of using manhood as political currency” (Kimmel, 2006, p. 26) was clearly alive in the recall election in the positioning of Schwarzenegger in relation to his opponents. Schwarzenegger’s image as California’s terminator was supported by
comparisons with the less than charismatic, thin and ageing image of the challenged governor, Gray Davis. The media contributed to these comparisons. In two different news sources Davis was described as “a colorless and highly unpopular policy wonk” (Werner, 2003) and a “largely distant, uninspiring leader” (Honig, 2003). Moreover, and compared with Schwarzenegger, Davis appeared to represent an outdated image of governance based on policy rather than personality. Lacking in celebrity charm and hypermasculine persona, he was perceived as distant, ‘boring’ and untrustworthy compared to Schwarzenegger who was depicted as “colorful”, “bold” and “charming” in his unabashed machismo. Both in body and political style, Davis appeared impotent compared with Schwarzenegger’s image of fit, masculinity and seeming eternal youth, thus helping to mobilize mistrust and anger against Davis.

Many aspects of Schwarzenegger’s “Governator” persona are consistent with a pattern of hypermasculine gender performance common to Republican leaders. His performance calls upon the symbolism of past and current Republican leaders who also used their bodies and hypermasculine posturing to create their political personas. Theodore Roosevelt, twenty-sixth president of the United States is well known for his “cowboy” persona and for promoting himself as a model of rugged masculinity through photography as well as through his writing (Kasson, 2001). Like Schwarzenegger, Roosevelt claims in his autobiography (1913) that he overcame a sickly childhood by building himself up into a 200-pound specimen of manhood (Kasson, 2001). His narrative is accompanied by images of himself in authoritative positions such as assistant secretary to the navy, Governor of New York and President of the United States. As part of his self-promotion for the 1904 presidential campaign, the essence of his rugged manhood was captured in a photographed of himself jumping a fence on horseback. He further cultivated this image throughout his career in politics by publishing several books on hunting (Kasson, 2001).

After Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan is perhaps the best known Republican for his macho performances of leadership. Named ‘Man of the Year’ by *Time* magazine in 1980, Reagan
depicted himself as a hero who could repair what he saw as the damage done to the nation’s economy and morality by his perceived ‘liberal’ predecessor, Jimmy Carter. In Reagan’s analysis and indeed that of his supporters, the 1970s represented a ‘softening’ of America and its men which was linked directly to Carter and his preferred methods of negotiation over force in international political affairs (Montez de Oca, 2005; Jeffords, 1994; Douglas and Michaels, 1994). Reagan’s performance of hypermasculinity, referred to by Jeffords (1994) as a ‘retributive masculinity’ was formed in direct response to this ‘feminisation’ of America, worsened by the blows to the country’s ego and economy by the loss of the Vietnam war and the period of social revolution between the 60s and 70s that saw hegemonic masculinity and colonialism heavily criticized by feminist, civil rights and gay and lesbian activism (Andrews, 1996; Jeffords, 1994). Duguid identifies Reagan’s masculinity with a 1950s type domestic order where “masculinity and femininity are functions of whether one takes an active or passive role in sex or business alike” (Duguid, 2006, p. 25). In his media imagery, Duguid explains, Reagan came across as a black and white decision maker, a real man, in comparison with Carter who was supposedly ‘wishy-washy’ in his decision-making and was disdainfully referred to as ‘the first female president’ for seeking political council from his wife (Jeffords, 1994). Douglas and Michaels (1994) capture the sentiment of Reagan’s attack on Carter and liberalism: “American men had let their muscles atrophy, their weapons rust and the contents of their boxer shorts shrivel” (p.527).

If Carter and ‘liberalism’ were responsible for the so-called emasculation of American men, Reagan offered hard-bodied masculinity as the answer to the re-masculinisation of men and the nation that was to be fortified by such bodies. Regan achieved this masculinisation, according to Jeffords (1994) by drawing heavily upon his screen characterizations of manhood, depicting himself in the cowboy mould and liberally quoting from the narratives and lines of films to shape this depiction. Jokingly referred to as “Ronbow” by his opponents, Reagan played into this image of hard bodies masculinity when he commented at a press conference about the release of
hostages in Lebanon, “Boy, I saw Rambo last night. Now I know what to do the next time this happens” (quoted in Jeffords, 1994, p. 28). In addition to being photographed in manly postures such as chopping wood or riding horses, Reagan devised narratives about U.S strength along the plots of films into which he wrote himself in as the hero. By promoting himself as a hard-bodied saviour of the nation from the so-called ‘soft’ leadership of former ‘liberal’ leadership, Reagan fused his image of masculinity with a masculinising image of the nation.

The hypermasculine posturing of Republican leaders can be seen in a gendered binary that played out between Republicans and Democrats during the 2004 presidential race where John Kerry and George. W. Bush competed to be “the best commander in chief for a country at war” (McCarthy, 2004, p.1). The Bush persona, Quindlen (2003) contends was “the reformed party animal, the laconic rancher, the anti-intellectual e-student” which works to masculinize him through a binary opposition with intellectualism and centrist that are often associated with effeminacy and weakness. Kerry, who promoted gun control and a liberal position on same-sex unions, attempted to avoid the usual associations between liberalism and effeminacy by going hunting and donning military fatigues in pictures where he posed with his war veteran friends. In the last days of the presidential campaign, both Kerry and Bush called upon popular icons to further imprint and masculinize their images in the minds of American audiences. Kerry called upon Bruce Springsteen, or “the Boss” as he is known, to lend his image as a working class hero. Springsteen sang ‘No surrender” and urged his audience “to work for change in the country” (McCarthy, 2004, p.1) while Bush called upon Schwarzenegger who lent his hypermuscular action hero imagery to Bush’s gung-ho discourses about “wining the war on terror” and restoring Christian values to America. These choices of popular masculine figures are indicative of the kinds of masculinities that Democrats and Republicans have historically used to construct their styles of governance.
Shepherd (2006) further highlights how traditional gender narratives have characterized George W. Bush’s presidency through an analysis of his public addresses and pamphlets dropped over Iraq during the so-called “war on terrorism”. She identifies the operation of hegemonic masculinity in the construction and deployment of two predominant images of men since the 9/11 incident: the “ordinary decent citizen” who, through media images of rescue workers, police and firemen, was constructed as a heterosexual white male, and the “authority figure” who represented traditional paternal masculinity. Adopting this latter image, Shepherd shows how Bush constructed himself as a saviour of America and for oppressed peoples all over the world. Moreover, the image of Bush as an authority figure, Shepherd shows, was completed by his wife, Laura, who proclaimed the purpose of the war to ‘rescue’ Afghani women and children from the barbarism of Muslim culture and Muslim men. These two images together, of the ordinary local hero and the authority figure, Shepherd concludes, represent America and international politics as the preserve of white men who are naturalized to the public sphere, keeping women bound to the domestic. Hypermasculinity as a feature of Republican leadership is evident in the most recent presidential election where the slogans adopted by Democrats and Republicans are easily recognized. Where Clinton, Obama and Edwards based their images respectively on “women’s advocacy”, “hope and change”, and advocacy for the poor, Republicans such as Giuliani, McCain and Romney advertised themselves respectively as a “maverick”, a war hero, and offered “bold, new leadership focused on business success and public achievement” (Marinucci, 2007).

**The woman problem in politics: Arianna Huffington**

The inherent sexism that undergirds performances of hegemonic masculinity in Republican/Democrat encounters was clear in Schwarzenegger’s interactions with a female opponent, Arianna Huffington. Schwarzenegger sparred aggressively with Huffington during the only public debate in which he agreed to participate, turning her questions into jokes and
insisting on speaking over her. His hypermasculine posturing was supported by the show’s male host who laughed at Schwarzenegger’s jokes and thwarted her opportunities for rebuttal. When Huffington attempted to criticize Schwarzenegger’s platform on taxes he replied, “You have the biggest loophole in taxes, I could drive my Hummer through it”! The audience broke into applause and laughter as did the show’s host. Frustrated, Huffington quipped, “I know this is how you treat women but not right now”! Again, Schwarzenegger replied, “I have realized that I have a perfect part for you in T4” (quoted in Mathews, 2006). The comment elicited more guffaws and applause from the audience.

Following the debate, Huffington seized the opportunity to depict Schwarzenegger as a misogynist by interpreting his T4 comment as an allusion to the treatment of the female terminator in Terminator 3, where Schwarzenegger shoves the female robot’s head into a toilet, assaults her with a urinal and finally destroys her with a big, black jack-boot to the face. Schwarzenegger defended himself by claiming that his remark was meant as a compliment to Huffington based on his belief that women in the Terminator films are heroines. Regardless of Schwarzenegger’s intentions in making the remark, his interaction with Huffington drew praise from male colleagues and fans, suggesting the tenacity of sexism in politics, particularly in relation to notions of leadership. This is further evidenced by the response of a reporter who characterised Schwarzenegger’s T4 comment as a “superb retort” and the results of a poll conducted immediately after the debate, which revealed an increase in Schwarzenegger’s popularity (Werner, 2003; Mathews, 2006).

The Gropenator:

Intersections of (hetero) sexuality with hegemonic masculinity in Schwarzenegger’s gender performance

While Schwarzenegger’s hypermasculine gender performance was celebrated, mostly by Republicans, his macho posturing was also harshly criticized. Much of the critique was about his
suitability as a leader based on his past performances as a bodybuilder and a film star. His imagery as a bodybuilder was highlighted in particular based on his promotion of himself as a womaniser. Magazine interviews from the 1970s were reused as evidence of these charges. The Smoking Gun, an on-line journal cobbled together his various quotes from the film Pumping Iron and magazine interviews in which he supposedly espoused admiration for dictators and spoke candidly about sex, drugs and the size of his penis (www.thesmokinggun.com, 2003). In anticipation of the use of this material for slander, Schwarzenegger bought the rights and re-released Pumping Iron in 2003 as a 25th anniversary edition of the film. Among the ‘special features’ that were added to the film was a lengthy interview with Schwarzenegger in which he repositions his flamboyant persona and statements about sex and power as mere fantasy, meant only to sell bodybuilding as ‘fun’ to audiences. Schwarzenegger took a similar approach to questions about his attitudes to women. While somewhat embarrassing, these questions were easily deflected by “the Governator” who claimed that he never lived his life to be a politician and that he was a different person now. However, a more powerful set of accusations were yet to come.

Days before voting began, the Los Angeles Times published a story describing six separate allegations of sexual assault against Schwarzenegger between 1970 and 1990 when he was working on the set of Terminator 2. By the end of the scandal, sixteen women had come forward with similar claims. A journalist twisted Schwarzenegger’s “Governator” moniker into “the Gropenator”, effectively re-signifying the intended meanings of his action hero imagery into a misogynist and predator. The “Gropenator” label clearly highlights the homophobia and sexism that undergirds hegemonic masculinity. Kimmel (2006) writes “Homophobia, the fear of being perceived as gay, as not a real man, keeps men exaggerating all the traditional rules of masculinity, including sexual predation with women” (p.279). Various members of the public joined in his ridicule with satirical cartoons and videos including a YouTube video that matched
footage of Schwarzenegger from the recall with quotes about his womanizing, and that satirized his accent. A group of California feminists known as Code Pink were particularly active in protesting Schwarzenegger, heckling him at rallies with signs that read, “Predator” and “Gropenator” (Flemming, 2003).

Yet what is compelling about the Gropenator scandal is how it actually supported Schwarzenegger’s campaign. While Schwarzenegger eventually admitted to having “behaved badly sometimes” (quoted in Booth, 2005) and apologized for upsetting anyone, (though he qualified that this had not been his intention) many used his sexuality in his defense. Republicans launched a vitriolic attack against the Times and its reporters as well as the female complainants who were depicted as money-grubbing liars trying to tarnish the reputation of a powerful man. Schwarzenegger and his aids called the accusations “puke politics” and suggested that Davis and Democrats were behind the “smear campaign” (Mathews, 2006). That the Times story caused a swell of conservative support for Schwarzenegger was registered in how supporters in the news media, radio and Internet. Despite that fact that Schwarzenegger admitted to having “behaved badly sometimes” and his offer of an apology, his supporters accused the Times of having a ‘liberal’ agenda and trying to sabotage Schwarzenegger’s campaign. What is perhaps most striking among his support, however, is how his image as a womaniser was actually used to deflect the groping charges. A biographer defended him against a charge of groping a woman’s breast by attesting that Schwarzenegger was “more of a “bum-man” (Leamer, 2005); a conservative New Orleans radio host argued that Schwarzenegger should not be held to “today’s standards” (quoted in Dees, 2006); while a friend claimed that he merely possessed a, “ribald sense of humor twenty years out of date” (quoted in Adler et al. 2003). Female journalists also came to his defense. One diminished his alleged groping as ‘playful’ and harmless compared with Clinton’s perceived sexual criminality during the Lewinski scandal. A female audience
member at a rally in Santa Monica gained publicity for sporting a T-shirt that read, “He can grope me” while another wore the slogan “Gray Davis groped my wallet” (Mathews, 2006).

Thus, in many respects, “the Gropenator” scandal provided Schwarzenegger with an opportunity to confirm his image as a leader by providing him the opportunity to affirm his heteromasculinity. Garlick (2003) explains why heterosexuality is so powerful, because it is the authenticating link between sex and gender for defining a ‘real’ man. He writes, “it is not so much that hegemonic masculinities are heterosexual but rather that heterosexuality produces a hegemonic notion of masculinity” (2003, p.163). This observation is particularly relevant in relation to a discussion of Schwarzenegger whose masculinity has historically been authenticated by his performance of hyper-heterosexuality to combat homophobic stereotypes about bodybuilders as homosexuals.

“He can grope me”: The political economy of Schwarzenegger’s sexuality

Indeed, many of the accusations surrounding “the Gropenator” scandal are hardly new. Schwarzenegger is well known for his claims about his sexual exploits and much of his celebrity imagery, as a bodybuilder and a film star, has been based on his performance of hyper (hetero)sexuality. His nascent celebrity as a bodybuilding icon was based on his presentation of a hyper-heterosexual persona that was forged, in part, for his role as an ambassador for bodybuilding to a mainstream audience. He heartily promoted his promiscuity in magazine interviews, autobiography, in his exercise manuals and to his biographers. The common theme in all of these discourses was his claim that he had a lot of sex and that muscle building was the key to his virility and ability to seduce women.

Whether the discourses surrounding Schwarzenegger’s sexuality have been discrediting or congratulatory, they highlight a more general public appetite for confessions about sexuality. It is staggering how many reporters, male and female have enquired about the size of Schwarzenegger’s penis (how it measures up to his muscles) and the number of times that
Schwarzenegger has referred to its size in his interviews. In an interview to promote *Conan the Barbarian*, Schwarzenegger responded to a question about whether his desire for muscles was driven by inadequacy: “Well, I got into bodybuilding for a few reasons. I was always interested in proportion and perfection. When I was fifteen, I took off my clothes and looked in the mirror. When I stared at myself naked, I realized that to be perfectly proportioned I needed 20 inch arms to match the… rest of me” (quoted in www.thesmokinggun.com, 2003).

Foucault’s work on the history of sexuality is useful for understanding the public’s seemingly insatiable appetite for discourse about Schwarzenegger’s sexuality. Foucault challenged the perception that modernity was characterized by the repression of sex and instead argued that in fact it is marked by the explosion of discourse about sex and sexuality. Indeed, he suggests that society became entirely preoccupied with it: priests wanted to hear about it in confession, the sexuality of children caused moral panic and homosexuality was proscribed and treated with the necessary panaceas and punishments. The Gropenator scandal is a legacy of this modern obsession with sexuality and is further highlighted by the recent release of a ‘tell all’ book by Schwarzenegger’s former girlfriend, Barbara Outland-Baker (2006). Entitled *Arnold and Me: In the shadow of the Austrian Oak*, Outland-Baker details her relationship with the governor including his alleged philandering. Schwarzenegger’s awareness of his sexuality as a promotional tool in politics, as it was in bodybuilding and film, is suggested by his participation in Outland’s book. He was interviewed for the book and wrote its introduction.

“The Gropenator” scandal highlights how heterosexuality is central to the construction of normative masculinities and is key to developing an image of legitimate and strong leadership in politics. The erotic currency of heterosexuality in politics is underscored by McNair in his book, *Striptease Culture* (2002), where he argues that the production of political sex scandals became a useful political tactic for slandering and popularizing politicians in both the U.S and Britain in the 1990s. He shows how public interest in the sex-lives of politicians corresponded with a more
general fascination with sex and sex work practices evidenced by the rash of films in the 1990s such as *Show Girls* (1996) *Striptease* (1996) and *Boogie Nights* (1997). Messner (2007) further highlights the gender dynamics of political sex scandals and their currency for constructing male politicians. Using the example of the infamous sex scandal involving Bill Clinton and White House intern, Monica Lewinski, he points out how the publicization of the affair counteracted Clinton’s former emasculated image as a Democrat who had no record of military service and was supportive of gay rights and women. Following the scandal in 1998, his popularity surged to its highest point and he was named “most admired man in the world” (Messner, 1997, p. 472). In relation to Schwarzenegger, Brians’ (2003) study of media bias in the recall election is revealing of how a discourse about his sexuality helped support his image as a favourable candidate.

Brians studied a monologue of Jay Leno on the *Tonight Show* leading up to the election. Focusing on the jokes that were made about the front running candidates, Davis, Huffington and Schwarzenegger, Brians’ found that Leno’s jokes uniformly cast Davis in a negative light and all of the jokes denigrated the other candidates except for Schwarzenegger. He also found that many of the jokes aimed at Schwarzenegger were deflective of criticism and were sexual in nature.

**The role of Maria Shriver in masculinizing “the Governator”**

Maria Shriver played a key role in the damage control of her husband’s image during the “Gropenator” scandal. Shriver was a strong presence at all of his rallies and stood by his side when he denied the charges and apologized for his “mistakes”. She defended him to the press as courageous for facing the controversy and extolled his virtues as a father, husband and community leader at her own events. At a gathering of women for her California Women’s Leadership Association, she declared her husband an “A-plus human being” and depicted him as “intelligent”, “compassionate” and “bold” by recalling his rags to riches biography.

Shriver’s construction of Schwarzenegger as a ‘good’ father, husband and leader is complemented by her own celebrity image as a thin, white, well-spoken and appropriately
feminine woman who espouses family values. Furthermore, as a member of the Kennedy family, she carries their celebrity miasma as elites and benefactors to the poor and disabled. Eunice Shriver lent her own image as a Kennedy and as an inexhaustible philanthropist to her son-in-law, defending his character through appeals to his work as an ambassador for the Special Olympics. In a statement to the media, she exalted Schwarzenegger’s love of children and community service.

While the image of Shriver as a loving and supportive wife somewhat sanitized Schwarzenegger’s image as a family man, her status as his sexual partner also complicated these images in a way that supported his hypersexual imagery. Indeed, the media’s interest in her was largely related to her relationship with her husband, specifically their sexual relationship. When asked about her initial attraction to the young bodybuilder at a press conference she responded, “Hello, have you seen his body?” (quoted in Cooke, 2005). During a candid interview with Oprah she told the audience that she and her husband were “still hot for each other” and spoke to Vanity Fair (2003) about the secrets to their ‘happy marriage’. It appears that Shriver played a dual role in the construction of Schwarzenegger’s masculinity for his leadership persona that is highlighted by the “Gropenator” scandal. Her media images as both a loyal wife and an active sexual partner supported a complex image of Schwarzenegger’s masculinity that is akin to his images in film- a hybrid mixture of a virile action hero, a Terminator and a Kindergarten Cop, whose love of women and children keeps him fighting the “bad guys”.

“Die Gropenfuhrer”: Othering the (white) immigrant

While the emphasis on Schwarzenegger’s heterosexuality in the discourse surrounding the “Gropenator” scandal helped to fortify his image as a leader by normalizing him to hegemonic manhood, his leadership was simultaneously challenged around his authenticity as an American citizen. These challenges were levelled at him through images in which he was depicted as a fascist dictator. Like accusations of groping, rumours about his Nazi sympathies are
long standing from his bodybuilding days when he purportedly expressed admiration for Hitler and performed a Nazi salute in out-takes of *Pumping Iron*. Since then, perceptions of him as a racist and a fascist have been fed by testimonies by bodybuilders who have charged him with racial slurs, as well as the revelation of his father’s alleged membership in the Nazi party and his own friendship with indicted Nazi war criminal, Kurt Waldheim.

The fascist connotations of Schwarzenegger’s muscular image were powerfully underscored in the image of Schwarzenegger as the “Gropenfuhrer”, the third intertextual moniker that I explore in this chapter. The “Gropenfuhrer” nickname was coined from the German word for group leader, “gruppenfuhrer” and emerged through a cartoon by Doonesbury artist, Garry Trudeau (Fig. 14). In his cartoon, Trudeau depicts Schwarzenegger as a giant hand and has him respond to two questions from reporters. Referring to him as Herr Gropenfuhrer, the first reporter raises concern about the “amend for Arnold campaign”, a grassroots campaign led by Arnold supporters to change the constitution so that naturalized immigrants can run for president. “Yes this would be fantastic for America”, replies the giant hand. The second question raises concern about his fitness for leadership given what the reporter calls a “decades-long history of sexual harassment”. Herr Gropenfuhrer responds, “There is no problem, this sex thing. We should have another fantastic amendment legalizing it!”

Trudeau’s depiction of Schwarzenegger as a dangerous foreign dictator ‘groping’ for power reveals a lasting xenophobia towards immigrants in the U.S., particularly non-white immigrants who have been historically depicted as hypersexual threats to white women and to the health of American democracy. African Americans have been consistently imagined as the racialised other to the white norm as have other non-white immigrants such as those from Hispanic, South Asian and Chinese backgrounds, all of whom have been depicted as threats to white communities through the association of their bodies with hypersexuality and violence (Andrews, 1996). Compared with ‘non-white’ individuals, whiteness has historically been
perceived as unraced and is thus often rendered invisible through the ideological mechanisms that articulate it to normalcy. In the previous chapter I showed how Schwarzenegger’s whiteness has contributed to his perception as an American citizen in his films despite the thick Austrian accent. This is because, as Tasker (1997) points out, the white man’s body is imagined as unbounded, as able to transform beyond its limits, including ethnicity. I have also discussed how whiteness enabled Schwarzenegger to draw upon and cast himself in the mould of the “immigrant success story”. Yet, while whiteness is certainly a privileged cultural symbol in relation to non-whiteness it can be strategically articulated and disarticulated to notions of nationhood depending on the discourse within which it is absorbed and deployed. Warren and Twine (1997) demonstrate this in their discussion of the shifting racial identity of the Irish, who they explain were once stigmatized by the British in America as racial others along with African Americans (see also Gilman, 1999 and Vertinsky, 1995). As immigration shifted across the twentieth century from majority Europeans to Asians and Mexicans by the 1980s, the category of whiteness expanded to include all Europeans who could be perceived as white while these new immigrants took their place as racialised ‘Others’. That the Irish could become ‘white,’ highlights the arbitrariness and political deployment of racial categories.

**Achtung baby! The fascist connotations of the white man’s muscles**

Trudeau’s Gropenfuhrer cartoon spawned, as well as joined a number of other images that depicted Schwarzenegger as a fascist dictator. Like the “Gropenator”, images of him as a fascist dictator, in the forms of posters, bumper stickers, and T-shirts, competed with and drew from the intended positive meanings of his “Governator” persona. The terminator imagery that had been used to support a positive image of his leadership was repositioned to depict him as a threat to American democracy and citizenry. One such counter-image appeared on the cover of a local magazine, *Metro Santa Cruz*, in which an image of the 1984 leather clad, gun toting cyborg killer is accompanied by the title, “50 reasons not to vote for Arnold.” Artist Don Hakman,
depicted Schwarzenegger as a red eyed metal skeleton beneath the heading, “The term eliminator, dawn of hate. It’s not about the majority anymore” (Fig.15). The flexibility of the terminator imagery is partly enabled by the shift in Schwarzenegger’s terminator image between the first and second films. As I explained in the previous chapter, his image in the original film was of an indiscriminate killing machine that shifted considerably to a paternal protector for the human race by the second film. The above posters draw on his image from the first film, emphasizing his killer cyborg persona, which is more robot than human and has been read as a fascist cultural symbol (Larson, 1997).

While the muscular male body has served as an icon of hegemonic manhood and national security across cultures, under Nazism it took on a particular aggressiveness as a symbol of masculine strength and racial purity (Mangan, 1999; Kruger, 1999). According to Sontag, this was represented in fascist art in which “the taste is for the monumental hero and mass obedience to the hero” (Sontag, 1980, p. 316). Klaus Theweleit (1987) wrote about the most extreme embodiment of Nazi masculinity in his description of the paramilitary group known as the German Friekorps. The Friekorps are perhaps the most easily identifiable image of the fascist hero because they emphasized extreme discipline in their training and hardness of the body. McDonald (2007) points out how in this hypermasculine mentality, the fusion of a hard body with aggressive masculinity represents a “flight from the feminine”, belying a deep misogyny and racism (p. 57). While it is a stretch to conflate Schwarzenegger with this radically aggressive masculinity of the Friekorps, a more subtle linkage between Schwarzenegger’s muscular masculinity and fascism emerges from the relationship that fascist leaders forged between fascism and sport (Vertinsky, 2007). McDonald (2007) explains, “while the sporting body is not inherently pro-or anti-fascist, it is nevertheless an ideological form that in particular contexts can either serve or undermine the political culture of fascism” (p.53). Fascist physical culture promoted sport as a way to discipline the body, to make it ready for war as well as to
demonstrate the superiority of the Aryan race and Germany, the fatherland (Mangan, 1999; McDonald, 2006). Fascist connotations are thus necessarily embedded in the celebratory images of Schwarzenegger’s white hypermuscular body that he built through extreme physical training and within a male dominated order of the culture of bodybuilding. Moreover, they are embedded in his former nickname, “the Austrian Oak” that carries connotations of the German oak, chosen to symbolise paramilitary training as the official symbol of the 1936 Berlin Olympics. Yet, as Saltman (2003) points out, the love of physical discipline and drive towards sameness promoted by fascist physical culture, are also common features of American bodybuilding. Saltman explains that while the identity project of the male bodybuilder may be articulated differently in America through capitalist discourses of production and consumption and a dominant discourse about individualism, American bodybuilding promotes the elimination of difference by encouraging deference to cultural norms. Indeed, this observation can be extended to the promotion of the ‘body beautiful’ in American culture more generally where fit, toned and muscular bodies are equated with health, wealth and success. The conjuring of fascist connotations in images of Schwarzenegger’s body shows how muscular masculinity can be disarticulated from “American” in the image of the immigrant, whose difference is fed by moral panic about immigrants as a threat to the health, wealth and stability of the nation.

Robbie Conal, a local Californian produced a particularly striking image of Schwarzenegger as a fascist dictator. It is a sketch of his bust with a threatening grin and glowing red eyes with the words “Achtung baby” in burning red letters emblazoned across his forehead (Fig.16). The reference to fascism is completed by a quote from Schwarzenegger that appears along the bottom of the poster “I was always dreaming of very powerful people, dictators and things like that”. The quote was given in the context of the bodybuilding documentary Pumping Iron. Conal also produced bumper stickers to accompany his posters. One of these is a brief monologue expanding on the ‘Achtung baby’ theme and the other depicts ‘Gropenfuhrer’ in red
with ‘Schwarzenegger’ written beneath it, in an attempt to make the names and meanings synonymous. Conal, a self-proclaimed ‘guerrilla artist’, spread the posters and stickers all over San Francisco in an act of what he calls “counter-infotainment”. He proclaims the purpose of his posters was “to tickle the general public into thinking along with us about issues we think are important to the health of American Democracy, the Constitution, our First Amendment rights, and the future of Rock ‘n’ Roll” (www.robbieconal.com). Conal’s self-righteous claims about protecting the ‘health of American democracy’ coupled with his monstrous depiction of Schwarzenegger reveals lingering anxieties about immigrants as dangerous to the health of the nation. The extent of this xenophobia is suggested by the existence of other groups such as “Americans against Arnold” who emerged as a counter campaign to “Arnold for president” begun by some of Schwarzenegger’s supporters following his success in the recall election.

“Americans against Arnold” position themselves as concerned patriots and justify their existence by claiming that the campaign to change the constitution ‘soft peddles Arnold’s Nazi, Drug use and sexual harassment”. On their web site, “Arnold exposed: save the constitution”, “Americans Against Arnold” further justify their attack on Schwarzenegger: “because we love America and believe that the founding fathers were right: only someone born in America should be able to be president” (www.arnoldexposed.com). The group also disseminated so-called ‘counter-information’ about Schwarzenegger such as quotes and images that they perceived to belie his Fascist proclivities and his plan to install himself as a dictator over American society. One such article of propaganda was a T-shirt with an image of Schwarzenegger’s face and the word “Obey” on one side and “No Arnold for President” on the back. “This T-shirt is made in the U.S.A, but Arnold wasn’t” (www.arnoldexposed.com) states their advertising for the shirt.

Indeed, the uproar sparked by movements to change the constitution so that Schwarzenegger and other foreign-born citizens could run for president serves as poignant evidence of the shifting conditions that determine all immigrants belonging in the ideological category of “American”.
One reporter highlighted these contradictions: “An immigrant boy can still come to America and build himself up into almost anything. Mr. Universe, Mr. Terminator, Governor of California. Anything but president. You still have to be born an American citizen for that” (Latham, 1991, p. 117).

The “Gropenfuhrer” label, as it was applied to Schwarzenegger, thus highlights the lasting xenophobia towards immigrants in the U.S. The problematisation of Schwarzenegger’s fitness for leadership based on the perception of him as a dangerous immigrant further shows how identity and belonging is based on multiple intersections among race, nationality and masculinity in shaping notions of American citizenship. However, despite the powerful criticisms against him, Schwarzenegger mounted an effective defence. Major Jewish leaders and friends came out in his support including the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, a high profile organisation for the commemoration of the holocaust, for which Schwarzenegger has earned honours as a major benefactor. Schwarzenegger’s bodybuilding mentor, Joe Weider (who is also Jewish) testified that Schwarzenegger had in fact only ever ridiculed Hitler while his ‘old’ Austrian friends purportedly told journalists that as a teenager he had chased neo-Nazis down the street. Schwarzenegger himself stated in one of his final campaigns, following another apology to women, “I always despised everything Hitler stood for. I hate the regime, the Third Reich, and all of those whole Nazi philosophy. I have always fought against that” (quoted in Mathews, 2006, p. 187). The power of Schwarzenegger’s ability to protect his image was perhaps most profoundly demonstrated when George Butler retracted the part of his book proposal for Pumping Iron, in which the alleged statements about Schwarzenegger’s admiration for Hitler appeared. Butler stated that he had in fact misquoted Schwarzenegger (Mathews, 2006).

Like “the Gropenator”, the “Gropenfuhrer” controversy failed to significantly damage Schwarzenegger’s campaign. Polling results following the combined scandals revealed that his ratings had only dropped by one percent from 59 to 58 (Mathews, 2006). While support among
those who did not like him to rise by ten percent, Schwarzenegger remained safe because his supporters had largely stayed with him. To be sure, the fact that the recall vote also remained strong and unaffected at 55 percent gave him an advantage as the front running candidate to replace the outgoing governor. That “democracy in California had gone Blockbuster” (Mathews, 2006. p. 189) is supported by my study of the way in which celebrity and muscular masculinity combined to make the recall election a Schwarzenegger headlined production.
Chapter 8

Conclusion
Summary of findings

The aim of this study has been to illuminate connections among Arnold Schwarzenegger’s media images and his accumulation of immense social, economic and political capitals. While others have stressed his celebrity in helping him to climb the social ladder from bodybuilding to the summit of America’s social and political elite, this study draws attention to the role of his hypermuscular body in helping to construct him as a powerful individual and leader. Through a longitudinal approach that examines his representations as a bodybuilder, a film star and a politician, this research illuminates the powerful culturally and historically constructed contours of the muscular male body that have carried Schwarzenegger from the realm of popular culture into politics.

Despite the seeming impossibility of a bodybuilder being able to cross the divide between body and mind such that he could eventually be perceived as a leader, my examination of Schwarzenegger’s depiction as a celebrity bodybuilder during the 1970s shows that there is more logic to his rise to fame than first appears. Through an examination of his self-depiction in Arnold: The Education of a Bodybuilder (1977) as well as his depictions in bodybuilding magazines, I have shown how Schwarzenegger’s success at selling himself to a mainstream American audience was largely dependant on his image as an exemplar of heteromasculinity and self-determination. The former image worked by submerging a pervasive homophobia towards muscle building through talk about sex with women, the male body as a machine, and bodybuilding competition as a war among men. The latter image worked through both historical mythologies about American nationhood as fortified by the strength of self-determined men and through neo-liberal discourses about self-responsibility for health and wealth that undergirded 1970s physical culture. One of the most significant findings however, is how whiteness helped Schwarzenegger to overcome the stigma of his immigrant status. Whiteness is shown to
determine not only who can belong to the category of American citizenship but also to be embedded in the body through Eurocentric conventions of bodybuilding competition. Thus, my investigation of Schwarzenegger’s images as a bodybuilder demonstrates how his image as a model body in bodybuilding linked up with notions of ideal bodies within constructions of American-ness more broadly. Schwarzenegger’s image as an exemplar of American masculinity, constructed through his autobiography and bodybuilding media, smuggled as well as underscores how whiteness is privileged by neo-liberal discourses about “good” bodies that shape broader notions of American citizenship.

The powerful connotations of muscular masculinity that helped Schwarzenegger to establish himself as a celebrity bodybuilder also helped him to forge a successful career in film. While the rise of blockbuster films and their hypermuscular protagonists provided him with an opportunity to capitalize on his body in the 1980s, his ability to become an icon of this genre and muscular masculinity more broadly was supported by shifts in cultural discourses about gender and nationhood. Moreover, his subsequent transitions and development into a mixture of muscular and paternal masculinity in films throughout the 1990s and 2000s, leading up to his political career, are also explained through the shifting contours of American culture. His initial difficulty with breaking into film and out of the typecast of an inarticulate bodybuilder, were due to xenophobic attitudes towards foreigners that manifested in Schwarzenegger’s depiction as an alien other in films such as the Terminator. However, his brief stint as the bad guy and his ascendance to a star of the action hero genre by the mid 1980s was facilitated by the development of muscular masculinity into a hegemonic form during this decade. Furthermore, the machismo that Schwarzenegger and indeed other muscular men in Hollywood films projected, shared an axis of continuity with the hypermasculine rhetoric of the Reagan presidency that separated ‘hard bodies’ from perceived ‘soft’ ones. Schwarzenegger’s survival as a film star during the following two decades was shown to be linked to his ability to mould
himself to changes in representations of masculinity. For example, his images in the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s reflected a new prototype of sensitive masculinity known as the “New Age Man”. This was evident in the shift in his imagery from action films to comedies and family-oriented films in which he developed the self-parodying persona that has become his trademark. His maintenance of an authoritative role in these ‘softer’ films and his acceptance by audiences, however, can be explained by that fact muscular masculinity continued to define dominant notions about ‘real’ men. My study of Schwarzenegger’s images in films is also revealing of how the medium of film itself, in collusion with the popular press, has contributed to the construction of Schwarzenegger as powerful, self-determined and capable of leadership. By examining processes of intertextuality among Schwarzenegger’s on-screen and off-screen images in film and in the popular press, I have shown how they mutually supported one another in depicting him as a male role model on screen as well as off. As a global realm of communication in a culture saturated by media images, film has been Schwarzenegger’s greatest promotional tool.

The role of film in shaping and promoting an impression of Schwarzenegger as a leader is further demonstrated in my analysis of his imagery as a politician. By exploring three prominent constructions of him as a governor, “the Governor”, “the Gropenator” and “the Gropenfuhrer”, I show the complexity of the importation of his celebrity images into the realm of politics. My analysis of the “Governator” nickname reveals how his image as a governor drew its significance and impact from his popular images in films, specifically from the later Terminator films in which he plays a cyborg warrior-cum-saviour of the human (read: American) race. In addition to his performance of hypermasculinity that relied upon his images in films and bodybuilding, Schwarzenegger’s self construction as a future governor also tapped into a tradition of hypermasculine gender performance common to Republican leadership. Through a complex display of wealth, machismo and muscles, Schwarzenegger assumed power by putting
on the mantle of Republicanism. While his machismo made him popular with some, it drew critique from others and my exploration of alternative depictions of him as a governor, reveals the intricacies of the multiple meanings of Schwarzenegger’s muscles as they have intersected with his nationality and sexuality. Indeed, as alternative discourses about governance the images of the “Gropenator” and a “Gropenfuhrer” registered deep-seated anxiety about his otherness, both in terms of his perceived hypersexuality and his foreign origins. These also serve to highlight deeper cultural anxieties about belonging and bodily ‘excess’ in America, that is registered in an entire continuum of phobias including fat phobia, xenophobia, homophobia, misogyny and racism.

Overall, what I have shown in my detailed analysis of Schwarzenegger’s shifting media imagery throughout his career is that his rise through the ranks of American popular and political culture has been supported by discourses about muscular masculinity, whiteness, wealth and heterosexuality that link his muscular embodiment with idealized forms of public subjectivity (i.e. celebrity, individualism, leadership). Certainly, this study does not foreclose nor claim to capture all of the myriad readings that audiences make from texts, which research has shown to depend upon the social locations, educations and political perspectives of readers. Indeed, I myself am a spectator on Schwarzenegger. However, through developing links between celebrity, the muscular body, and power, this study makes unique and important contributions to research on celebrity, masculinity and power. It illuminates how the significance of celebrity images in American culture are heavily dependent on the body and that masculinity is a guiding discourse in this process. Yet, masculinity here is revealed to subscribe to Connell’s original and modified use of the term as a shifting, complex and powerful construct that has local, regional as well as global dimensions. Certainly, all of these complexities are revealed to be at work in the media imagery of Schwarzenegger, specifically the various interpretations of these images that I have discussed throughout this study. For example, my analysis of the intersections among
muscular masculinity, whiteness and citizenship in Schwarzenegger’s metamorphosis from a foreign body to an embodiment of the American Dream, highlights the complexity of the role of discourses about masculinity in the construction of the immigrant body in relation to the “American” body. This underscores the reality that not all immigrants are created equal and that whiteness in combination with hegemonic forms of masculinity (i.e. heterosexuality, a desire for upwardly mobility) determine one’s chance of belonging as an ‘American’ or being relegated to an Other. Certainly, while Schwarzenegger’s media imagery has been troubled by audiences, his survival as a popular icon of muscular masculinity throughout the decades and his continued ability to capitalize on his muscular body, especially in aiding his transition to politics, suggests the tenacity of the ‘white man’s muscles’ as a potent signifier of masculine beauty, power and success against which all “Others” are judged. Finally, by emphasizing the role that popular culture plays in disseminating notions about bodies and subjectivity I have made an important contribution to post-structural theorizing. This has been to show how power is not merely symbolic and amorphous but is embedded in and exercised through bodies according to their categorization within gendered, sexualized and racialised discourses.

Recommendations for future study:

Male bodies in film

The role of popular culture in disseminating images of male bodies as powerful, ideal and fit for leadership presents numerous directions for future research. Film, as this study has shown, is a powerful medium for the creation and branding of hegemonic male images such as the hard body action hero that dominated in the 1980s. It would be fruitful to examine new trends in film since the passing of Schwarzenegger from the silver screen into politics. Where the top ten grossing films of the 1980s and 1990s were dominated by blockbuster films in which hard bodies took matters into their own hands, in the twenty first century we are witnessing a shift in genre towards animation, comic books and fantasy as well as changes in the shape of male bodies that
appear in lead roles. Among Spider Man (2002, 2004), Pirates of the Caribbean (2006), Harry Potter (2001, 2005, 2007), Chronicles of Narnia (2005), Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers (2002), Return of the King (2003) and The Matrix (1999, 2003) most feature male leads who are either teenage boys or young men who look like teenagers such as Toby McGuire (Spider Man), Elija Wood (Lord of the Rings) and Orlando Bloom (Pirates of the Caribbean). While Keanu Reeves and Johnny Depp belong to an earlier era of the 1990s when the hard body was still a significant presence, unlike Schwarzenegger and Stallone they represent more sexualized and perhaps feminized images of men through being constructed as pin ups, appreciated as much for their looks as for their acting abilities. What kinds of masculinities do these men portray? How might they reproduce or present alternatives to hegemonic forms? At the same time that popular images of masculinity appear to be atrophying, images of hypermusculature continue to circulate. This is exemplified by two recent releases, The Hulk (2008) and Iron Man (2008), both remakes of comic book characters. While played by slighter built actors, Edward Norton and Robert Downey Junior, their digitally enhanced, beefier than beefy alter egos suggest a continuing desire for muscular masculinity in twenty first century struggles over male power and identity.

Perhaps a more visible suggestion of a resurgence of muscular masculinity in the cinema is apparent in the spate of sequels to 1980s action films that instead of starring new actors feature the hard body heroes from decades past. “History never repeats itself, but it is an avid recycler” (2001, p. 223) writes Kasson in observing how the muscular men of the 1970s and 1980s assumed the mantle of embodying hegemonic masculinity from their turn-of-the-century forefathers. To what extent do Terminator 3: Rise of the Machines (2003), Rocky Balboa (2006), Live Free or Die Hard (2007) Rambo IV (2008) and Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull (2008) represent continuous and/or new concerns about (white) male power in twenty first century America? Certainly, the revival of Schwarzenegger, Stallone, Willis and Ford also suggests a shift in celebrity culture that requires further study. One reviewer of Rambo
IV explains the resurgence of former action heroes through the failure of Hollywood to produce newer ones (The Guardian, February 16, 2008). He suggests that the failure of actors such as Vin Diesel or The Rock to carry on the mantle of muscular masculinity from Schwarzenegger and Stallone has to do with their lack of personality and charm, attributes that set men like Steve McQueen, Sean Connery, Stallone and Schwarzenegger apart. Certainly, while this reviewer points to a shift in celebrity culture where perhaps the mass production of stars has produced a glut such that none appear unique, his nostalgia for McQueen, Connery and Schwarzenegger is perhaps suggestive of a more widespread longing for perceived more authentic or ‘real’ men. It is clear then that recent Hollywood films, both individually and collectively cry out for careful analysis and present opportunities to extend upon the work that I have done here. Though I have discussed in some detail how narratives of hegemonic masculinity have shifted across the decades of Schwarzenegger’s career from the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s into the 2000s, more work needs to be done on the present period in which muscular masculinity clearly continues to carry connotations of crisis in myths about both nationhood and masculinity, as well as visions for their empowerment. As I have understood Schwarzenegger’s media imagery against the cultural and political contexts between the 1970s and the early 2000s, when his images were circulated and popularized, images of men in current film must be understood within the particular political regimes and gendered discourses that characterize twenty-first century America. The Bush presidency, the war on terrorism, the discourses of third wave feminism and the moral panic over obesity are all relevant and pressing contexts in which current trends in film and images of men’s bodies could be analysed.

The body and leadership

These intriguing questions about depictions of men, race and nationhood in film could also be understood in a moment when, for the first time in history, the nation is being faced with the choices of a black male or a white female for president. More accurately, perhaps, American
audiences are being faced with the images of a ‘white female’ and a ‘black male’ that, concurrent with the permeation of politics by celebrity culture, are carefully constructed, poised and judged according to their proximity to appropriately gendered, racialised, classed and sexualized selves. This is to suggest that while these are breakthrough images for a country that has been exclusively led by white male presidents, Hillary Clinton’s performance of femininity for voters and Barack Obama’s construction of himself as a model of middle-class black masculinity that avoids negative stereotyping, resonate with the emphasis of my research on the importance of the body in politics. Certainly, our judgment of leaders, based on their images, has been shaped by the merging of political process with celebrity through the mediation of politics by television and other media that privilege the image as the unit of communication. The powerful role that masculinity and whiteness play in celebrity politics (and of course politics more generally) is underscored by the popular argument that Clinton and Obama are playing the ‘gender’ card and the ‘race’ card in promoting themselves as politicians. Indeed, it has been suggested that the election would be a level playing field if all of the candidates were white males like McCain. As the election draws closer, however, the masculine contours of the nation become more visible as Clinton’s chance of becoming the first female president is lost. I do not mean to reduce politics to a gender binary nor the preference for Obama to pure sexism. However, based on my study of the links between masculinity and politics that supported Schwarzenegger’s bid for governance, it appears that the nation cannot yet reconcile the image of a woman with its hypermasculine contours. As is clear from this example, issues related to the embodiment of leadership also present pressing directions for future research. How have the presidential candidates for 2008 been depicted in the media and in relation to one another? What role do racialised, classed, gendered and other discourses play in their depictions? How do their images support and or challenge traditions of imagining leadership and power in America, especially in this age that has been touted as post-feminist and post-racial era?
Other immediate examples of the relationship between embodiment and power in politics can be seen in other national contexts such as in Canada where the body weight of Prime Minister, Steven Harper, has recently drawn intense public concern. An open discussion of Harper’s weight in the Canadian media began in 2006 after the publication of a photograph of Harper shaking hands with George W. Bush while on a tour of the Mayan ruins with Mexican President Vicente Fox (Fig. 17). The portly impression of Harper compared with the slimness of the other leaders provoked discussion about his ability to lead. While Harper’s supporters retaliated with the chastise that it was not very nice to make light of someone’s weight, journalists and bloggers carried the conversation to its deeper conclusions. Described as “fat” “obese” and “unhealthy”, concern about Harper’s body provides a clear example of how bodies are mapped onto the nation and how certain bodies are privileged while others cause moral panic. “The prime minister’s weight struggles are the personification of the country’s struggles” (The Hive, 2006 March 26) assessed one journalist who suggested that Harper set a better example for the country by losing weight. This same reporter also used the issue as an opportunity to police fat bodies by suggesting Canada institute smaller portion sizes in cafeterias and vending machines.

In this example of the issue with Harper’s weight, the body is also invariably bound up in discourses of gender. Posing as an avid hockey fan and being frequently photographed in an army-green flak jacket, Harper appears to be aware of this fact as he clearly works at cultivating a masculine persona worthy of a Canadian leader. A particularly salient moment in the process of Harper’s masculinization involved Arnold Schwarzenegger when the two were photographed together in 2007 during Schwarzenegger’s promotion of his ‘hydrogen highways’ to Canada. In this picture the two leaders are depicted holding up a Hockey jersey emblazoned with the other man’s last name (Fig.18). While the image of Schwarzenegger holding the jersey imprinted with “Harper” does nothing more than provide him with a promotional opportunity to sell himself, the
jersey held up by Harper suggests a moment of symbolic transference of masculinity from the action star-cum-Governator to the Canadian who has been somewhat feminized by criticisms about his weight. Thus, within this final example about connections among bodies and leadership is an opportunity to see and examine the global dimensions of masculinity and how they shape local constructions. Connell, augmenting her original theory of hegemonic masculinities, has lead the call for gender to be understood beyond the local contexts in which they have traditionally been studied: “Masculinities, as socially constructed configurations of gender practice, are also created through a historical process with a global dimension” (2005b, p.1805). With Messerschmidt (2005), Connell argues for research that can account for the ways in which local and regional masculinities are forged in environments of globalised media and transnational business as well as how global masculinities are shaped by constructions of masculinity at local and regional levels. Given that Turner (2006) has recently dubbed global issues of power “the Schwarzenegger factor”, the study of hypermasculinity in both its local and global dimensions in arenas of popular culture, sport, business and politics all remain necessary and compelling areas for future research.
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