

Evan Meacham

Comp 250

Moore

19-4-13

*Title?*

*"The United States is unusual among the industrial democracies in the rigidity of the system of ideological control - "indoctrination," we might say - exercised through the mass media." -Noam Chomsky*

The history of our great country, as Noam Chomsky so eloquently asserts, is one stained with propaganda; ~~as~~ it is an uncontestable fact that the mass media has been harnessed, time and time again, as a vehicle of exploitation and indoctrination, stooping the masses to push an ideological agenda rooted in extorting individual civil liberties as a means of achieving greater wealth and power for the elite, ruling class. This relationship has long been utilized to push an agenda which often times asserts the will of the elite at the expense of the collective whole, as the government spins the dominant class' perception of select individuals in a dehumanizing manner as a means of maintaining these peoples as subordinate and marginalized in order to extort and exploit valuable resources and labor deemed unworthy of higher socioeconomic classes and ethnicities. Whatever the cause may be, the United States media has all too frequently taken on the role of a puppeteer, manipulating citizens against the very civil liberties and equality our nation was founded upon.

However, the role of the mass media as a governmental pawn, I maintain, is merely one side of the coin, so to speak. The media of the United States, given our Constitutional freedom of speech, can and often times has superseded the throws of the elite puppeteers as a means of

achieving greater civil liberties and equality for the very peoples it often oppresses. This dual nature of the media within the United States provides a unique opportunity for the populace of our nation to efficiently expose the exploitive nature of those in control as a means of harnessing collective opposition to overthrow and exchange discriminatory societal norms.

Within the past century, the civil rights of our nation's citizens have experienced radical transformation, to the extent that the very definition of love as a strictly heterosexual enterprise has forever been altered, incorporating instead an acceptance of all forms of love, be it homo or heterosexual, as legitimate and socially permissible. This paradigm shift within the realm of love can largely be attributed to the incorporation of the mainstream media, utilizing national television, as a tool for combating negative perceptions about homosexuality, reversing negative stereotypes in favor of positive ones while simultaneously publicizing and humanizing their plight for the entire nation to witness firsthand. Through incorporating television, once again, in an activist agenda, the civil liberties of love are forever changing, both culturally and legally, within America, ultimately enhancing the civil liberties of our country as a whole, pushing what little true equality we possess to new, unforeseen heights.

Throughout the past century, numerous academic works attribute various definitions, theories, and causal relationships regarding the controversial topic of societal change within America, and on a more broad global scale as well. As conceptualized by author Roy Eidelson, no catalyst has so profoundly shaped the nature and direction of social change as the presence of inequality within a given society. "Inequality is associated with diminishing levels of physical and mental health, child well-being, educational achievement, social mobility, trust, and community life... most members of society... experience these adverse consequences either directly or indirectly"(Eidelson 4). As the current research suggests, social change would be

superfluous at best without the hierarchical partitioning of society, from resources to civil rights, inequality is the sole factor fueling the flame of change.

Traditionally, inequality within American society has been based upon race, however the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. “expanded the scope of his Civil Rights activism by redefining the problem of social inequality to include all those in the United States who were poor, regardless of their race or ethnicity”(Bretz 19). Casting aside racial and ethnic prejudices, King harnessed all those marginalized by the exploitive nature of our society as a means of questioning the very basis of our societal norms. Like King, social change at its most base nature is concerned with exposing the inequalities present, and socially normative, within a society, as a means of inspiring change and usurping the present status quo. However, social change often takes an issue-attention cycle format, as exposed by scholar and author Anthony Downs, as a means for people to decide what social issues are currently important and worthy of nation wide attention (Downs 38). This cycle largely dictates which issues are addressed at any given point in time and can potentially account for King’s inclusion of all walks of life in his civil rights campaign (Bretz 20). When analyzed holistically, it becomes evident that this model, although useful in raising awareness, often fails to realize substantial change due to the cyclical nature of the public’s attention cycle, as our society jumps from problem to problem without ever committing sufficient time to solve the first before whimsically immersing ourselves in the next ‘big’ social injustice (Downs 40-42). Additionally, some topics are so pervasive within society, such as the African American civil rights movement, that they supersede this model to achieve decisive victories in the name of social justice.

Many agents of change are at the direct disposal of the very populations exposed to social injustices. From a psychological vantage point, Eidelson alludes to the fact that one of the most

powerful agents of change can be collective outrage, a pro-social emotion spawning directly from oppression. "Collective moral outrage can spur the concerted action required to alter the systems, policies, and attitudes that foster inequality"(Eidelson 4). Moral outrage unifies people and communities who may have preconceived boundaries of separation from each other while simultaneously functioning as a political force driving for concrete results and a solid plan of action. In addition to internal agents of change, more self-evident avenues are available as external agents of change, such as education. To social evolutionist Patrick Geddes, education "...had the potential to develop active citizens whose interdisciplinary learning would enable them to identify and promote progressive social trends"(Sutherland 349). Likewise, professor Frank Lentricchia of Duke University alludes that "The professor's task now becomes helping students 'spot, confront, and work against the political horrors of one's time'"(Martin 55). Through the gradual accumulation of knowledge, the student is virtually empowered by information--information exposing the inequalities and injustices of society. Higher education works against Down's issue-attention cycle theory, as students are thoroughly informed on a wealth of subjects with the intention of long term investments toward change as opposed to exposure to highly phenomenalized, fad-like problem solving cycles perpetuated by the media as a form of cheap entertainment (Downs 42). Through the internal and the external, marginalized peoples have at their disposal a wide array of agents of change, all revolving around the themes of collective cooperation, awareness, and education.

Perhaps the most efficient outlet for social change within the past century has fallen into the hands of the media, as it has come to reflect and re-define social norms and project globally the injustices incurred by various marginalized peoples. One of the most effective and influential utilizations of the media to attain civil rights occurred throughout the 1960's civil rights

campaign where figures such as Martin Luther King Jr. championed innovative, non-violent forms of protest as a means of capturing the attention of the media, gaining national coverage for the movement. "At the same time civil rights activists tried to expose the ugliness of racism, they themselves strove to be viewed in a positive light"(Festle 14). Festle goes on to point out that the key to the success of the civil rights movement relied heavily on their consistent media coverage and clever construction of an image contradicting common social conceptions. Within today's society the media is continuously utilized as an agent of change for humanitarian rights, however it is important to understand that the same institutions which usurp the status quo, can all too easily be utilized to maintain and enforce the very establishment or ideology it may have previously combatted against. This is evident within the regional variation of media coverage of the civil right's movement, as southern newspapers and television programs relentlessly worked to spin a negative bias whenever possible (Festle 14). Despite the potential for negativity, it is through the media that oppressed groups are given access to national coverage, providing the opportunity for an image contrasting those viewed as normative to be cultivated and broadcasted on a national scale, raising awareness and forcing people to confront issues otherwise easily avoidable.

Within today's society the media, through the mechanism of television, is once again being utilized as an agent of social change altering the socially acceptable definition of love, from one strictly dominated by heterosexuality to one promoting a normative conception of homosexuality as a legitimate form and expression of love deserving of equality. In turn, the involvement of television in this matter has effectively pushed the issue of homosexual civil rights to the forefront of the public eye and will undoubtedly function as a pivotal causal factor in eradicating social and federal discrimination and prejudices on a nation wide scale.

The presence and portrayal of homosexuality within the United States media, namely television, has proven quite transformative, as the visibility and connotations associated with homosexual characters and plots have gradually evolved from a point of virtual non-existence to a place of positive pervasiveness. With the advent of television the dynamic of media within America was forever altered, as television provided a means for a nation-wide outlet of information and cultural values to be rapidly distributed and absorbed by millions of citizens on a daily, even hourly basis. Thus, as mentioned earlier, how and when a minority group is portrayed through this medium can be directly linked to the national perception of these groups. As far as homosexuality is concerned, television has been slow in exposure, and even slower in portraying in a positive light.

However, with ABC series *Hot 1 Baltimore* in 1975, directed by Norman Lear, the very first gay couple was featured on a comedic television series, a milestone moment in television history which marked the beginning of a lengthy and arduous journey of homosexuality through national television. Prior to 1975 homosexuality was virtually a non-issue within prime time television aside from the 1971 episode of *All in The Family* where character Archie Bunker is confronted by a drinking buddy's coming out, however the homosexuality mentioned prior to 1975 is considerably insignificant as it was carefully orchestrated as minor subplot and limited to supporting characters (Bozell 1). According to scholars Alexander Doty and Ben Gove "...since the 1970's lesbians, gays, and queers have become active subjects in popular culture addressing increasingly larger audiences" (qtd. in Prono X). The initial style of queer representation within television, post 1970's, took the formulaic approach of depicting heterosexual characters confronted by homosexuality, and frequently portrayed main characters as becoming enlightened about homosexuality at the hands of a gay guest star. This is evident within an episode of *Dear*

*John* where John is experiencing a gay male coming on to him and ultimately concedes that “We are what we are, and we should be accepted as such”(qtd. in Bozell 2). Such messages of acceptance played a crucial role in spawning the beginnings of a long media campaign promoting the societal acceptance of homosexuality as just another equal, yet alternative, expression of love. Additional popular series from the 80’s featuring reoccurring homosexual characters included *Hooperman*, *Roseanne*, *Doctor Doctor*, and *Brothers*. Two years later in another episode of *Dear John*, John’s ex wife becomes a lesbian and John overcomes his initial anger to conclude, “People have the right to live their lives any way they want to. This is the 90’s right?”(qtd. in Bozell 2). Thus the television series of the 1980’s and early 90’s escalated the status of homosexual visibility from a mere comedic ploy, to that of a viable alternative to heterosexuality warranting the societal respect of its counter-part. By the mid 90’s television experienced an affluence of homosexuality, as series such as *The Pursuit of Happiness*, *High Society*, and *The Crew* featured homosexual characters playing major, regular roles.

Additionally, two men were shown getting married on *Roseanne* while two women were married, defiantly, on the popular 8pm family time slot within an episode of *Friends*. According to the 1996 reporting of the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation twenty-nine regular or reoccurring characters were homosexual, whereas twenty-two of those characters were featured on prime time television (Bozell 2). Within the span of two decades the visibility of homosexuality within the media escalated substantially, setting the stage for the widespread visibility found within the popular television shows of today.

However, no singular event within the history of television shook the discriminatory throws of society as much as the popular late 90’s series *Ellen*. Comedian Ellen DeGeneres played a character loosely based off herself within this series appropriately named Ellen. Unlike

any television event prior, DeGeneres chose to publicly coordinate her coming out both as a person and as a character within her show, thus making her "...the first openly gay person to play an openly gay character on TV" (Prono 87). The significance of this event, known as "The Puppy Episode", was twofold in that DeGeneres became both the first homosexual leading character featured on national television and a prominent icon for the gay and lesbian rights movement. The impact of her public coming out is evident within the immense popularity of that episode which enjoyed some 40 million viewers and "...rated as the number-one show of the week by Nielsen Media Research"(Levina et. al. 738). According to author Jim Elledge, "Ellen functions as a strategic political subtext such that the producers, and DeGeneres herself, used the medium of comedy and television to speak past the script to not only the topic of homosexuality, but to the issues of sexism, censorship, and artistic freedom" (2). However, some scholarly critics of the coming out episode of *Ellen* claim that the absence of Ellen's sex life within the episode falls into aspects of heteronormativity, as issues such as monogamy, to many, are strictly heterosexual. Yet this lack of sexual activity between Ellen and Susan can conversely be perceived as a means of combatting negative stereotypes revolving around the promiscuity of homosexuality while furthermore providing a basis of emotional appeal, likening homosexual love to that of heterosexual. Rather than play into hetero-dominant stereotypes, DeGeneres trudged through the muck of conservative critics, discriminatory network agents, and biased corporate sponsors to provide a realistic, yet humorous, depiction of the day-to-day trials of an average lesbian as a means of humanizing homosexuality. Utilizing humorous and creative writing, the audience is taken aboard the life of a homosexual, ultimately revealing just how similar and intrinsically human lesbian relationships are to those of heterosexuals (Elledge 14). The relentlessness of DeGeneres and her writers, adamantly promoting the political agenda of



homosexuality and feminism, ultimately led to the cancellation of *Ellen* following its fifth season; however, the impact of the series manifested itself throughout American media, as the role of homosexuals within television was forever altered, and the perceptions of homosexuality as a viable alternative lifestyle to heterosexuality began to grab a concrete foothold within American culture.

As the grip of acceptance continued to gain momentum, homosexuality became increasingly visible through the immensely popular television series *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* that debuted in July of 2003. In part, the uniqueness of this series revolves around the fact that its premier episode launched just nineteen days after the monumental Supreme Court ruling regarding the case of *Lawrence v Texas*, which effectively overruled anti-sodomy laws which many believed to be explicitly aimed toward criminalizing, and in turn, further marginalizing homosexuality as an expression of love (Steele 1). Additionally, the Fab 5's debut came just weeks after president Bush publicly drew a direct link between homosexuality and sin. Thus, the political environment surrounding the show was one of national controversy as the nation was actively vacillating acceptance and rejection of homosexuality, providing a unique opportunity for the series to take on the role of combatant for gay rights, whimsically fighting Bush's 'war on morality' (Steele 1). Utilizing ingenious timing and humorous writing, the visibility of homosexuals within television was escalated to unforeseen heights, as the popularity of the series received national accommodation in the form of an Emmy (Prono 217). As the national agenda was centered on homosexuality, rather gravely, *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* essentially ran with the momentum of publicity, offering a humorous counter-attack on the heterosexual domination of American society. Through the guise of comedy, once again, the visibility of homosexuality within national television was elevated to new heights as the series featured not

one, but five real life gay men engaging with and even critically scrutinizing their hetero male counter-parts in the name of adequately adapting them to be better heterosexual lovers (Steele 1). Through the reality television format, five homosexual men were given direct, unscripted interaction with the very men who all too frequently provide the backbone of the societal discrimination of homosexuality. However, the Fab 5 are relatively easy on their hetero brethren, merely functioning to improve their overall physical appearance, a fact that speaks volumes for the ethical character of homosexuality, particularly in juxtaposition to the discomfort evident within the mannerisms and musings of their subjects. Some critics of the series claim that it merely plays into negative stereotypes of gay men, yet scholar Jap Kooijman asserts that, “Ironically, if the show can be accused of negative stereotyping at all, it is the stereotyping of straight men as badly dressed, culturally illiterate, unhygienic slobs”(106). It is only through the hands of the Fab 5 that these poor heterosexual men are able to positively adapt their love lives and increase their romantic and sexual appeal to the opposite sex (Kooijman 106-107). Although the fact that the Fab 5 play in to commonplace stereotypes of gay men is undeniable, the ways in which they go about these stereotypes provides a means for viewers to formulate new conceptions about the extent of the negativity surrounding these generalizations. “By playing into gay stereotypes, the Fab 5, paradoxically, lay them to rest” as “...the clichés they embody are magically reconstructed as richly human, without the tiniest swatch of shame”(Steele 2). This reconstruction of gay stereotypes can predominately be contributed to the blatant, unabashed humanity and personality exhibited through the Fab 5’s demeanor and actions. Furthermore, *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* effectively shot down popular hetero conceptions of gay men as sexual deviants, relentlessly preying on straight men by engaging in overt, excessive flirtation. Through jokingly flirting with straight men on national television it becomes evident that

“Flirting is just good fun, not a sexual assault”, thus, “...the Fab 5 are both aggressively sexual and nonthreatening”(Steele 2). Through casual flirtation, the public is given an alternative, realistic model to the common conception of homosexuals as sexual predators. Instead, gay men are portrayed in an equal light to that of hetero men in that they both engage in a similar manner of casual flirtation on a regular basis, ultimately revealing the sexual drive of males in general is not as variable as homophobic males tend to believe. Ultimately the immense popularity of *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* ushered in widespread visibility, favorably depicting homosexual men as very much human and deserving of equal cultural acceptance while simultaneously laying to rest age-old negative stereotypes through the mechanism of humor.

As the visibility of homosexuals, both single and within a relationship, has escalated to encapsulate holistic public attention, the impact upon the series' audience is manifesting rather positively, as evident through today's popular television shows *Modern Family* and *Glee*. According to a poll carried out by <sup>(THR)</sup> The Hollywood Reporter, series featuring homosexual stars are currently advancing popular support behind homosexual civil liberties issues such as gay marriage, as “Views on gay marriage have exponentially gone in its favor since 2002”, made evident through the fact that roughly three times as many voters participating in THR polling are in favor of gay marriage today (Appelo 1). Although there remains those conservative minded individuals who increasingly oppose gay rights proportionate to the amount of homosexuality exposed to them through television, overall the polling discovered that “...the shows made almost as many Romney voters more in favor of gay marriage: 13 percent got more pro-gay marriage, 12 percent got more anti”(Appelo 1). These statistics expose a radical transformation of cultural acceptance clearly coordinating with the vast increase of pro-gay visibility within television. The Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation's annual television visibility

analysis affirms the monumental leaps toward cultural acceptance, as it found that "...a record 4.4 percent of actors appearing regularly on prime-time network drama during the 2012-2013 season will portray lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender... characters", a marked increase from 2011-12's 2.9 percent (Wong 1). Despite the lack of academic research analyzing these modern positive portrayals of homosexual individuals, it is clear that their transformative success revolves around careful orchestration of re-humanizing gays and illustrations drawing parallels between the lives of homosexuals to those of heterosexuals. According to *Washington Post* critic Tom Shales, this is evident through the way *Modern Family* "depicts a gay-male marriage in which both partners are refreshingly dimensional, believable human beings...they're not flawed in the silly, stereotypical ways that once dominated such portrayals"(qtd.in Rosenberg 1). Through such realistic displays of healthy, homosexual relationships, the national perception regarding the validity of gay relationships, and even marriage itself has been positively and permanently altered. Within the realm of television, appearance clearly shapes public perception.

Spanning the history of homosexual involvement in the immensely popular media outlet of national television several key themes emerge which have proven fundamental to the evolution of the widespread culture acceptance of homosexuality as an equal expression of love. First and foremost, the increased national visibility provided through television functioned to bridge the cultural gap between appearance and actuality, so that gay characters were placed in a position where a clear picture of realistic homosexual life could be projected to mass amounts of the populace at a rather rapid pace. Thus the gradual acceptance of their life choices began to take root in the subconscious minds of their viewers. "It is the way in which gay characters are allowed to appear in the mainstream media that will have a great effect not only on strategies of both opponents and supporters of these actions, but also on the attitudes of the general

public”(Levina et. al. 756). Once visibility became acceptable, the gears of media activism shifted to focus on crafting positive images of gay characters as a means of combating hetero-dominant cultural prejudices once and for all. From humanizing negative stereotypes to exposing the similarities between homo and hetero love, tailoring refined, healthy images of gay characters provided the basis for the milestone cultural acceptance of homosexuality within today's social atmosphere. Furthermore, these television series reach beyond the grasps of America's cultural realm to provide influential weight in swaying political favor towards never before seen gay civil rights advancements such as the Supreme Court's Lawrence v Texas ruling, the repeal of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell', as well as the monumental rehearing on the Defense of Marriage Act by the Supreme Court within the upcoming months. Moreover, the recurrent method of comedy as an agent of social change has contributed vastly to the newfound successes of the gay rights movement. The employment of comedy, generally in the format of the sitcom, has enabled a reimagining of hetero-dominant cultural generalizations, as it virtually eradicates the levity behind these erroneous misconceptions. From comedic scenarios depicting straight men being confronted by their close friends coming-outs to humorous dramatizations of common gay stereotypes, shows like *Ellen*, *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*, and *Dear John* efficiently act to remove the power backing popular stereotypes, as comedy provides a means for lightening prejudices and subtly exposing the logical absurdities backing them. Lastly, the majority of successful homosexual oriented television series tend to draw on instilling a deep sense of ethos within their viewers. Illuminating the grave day-to-day realities of being homosexual within a hetero-dominant society, from discriminatory legislations to hateful slurs and blatant intolerance to physical violence, the viewer is essentially drawn in to their homosexual character's everyday plight for social and political acceptance. As writers and actors appeal to the emotional side of

their viewers, a true grasp of the intrinsic experience of the inequality of love within American culture is made evident and viewers are thrust into the shoes of their gay character's everyday struggles, thus compelling a stronger emotional bond between heterosexual viewers and actual homosexual individuals. Through this bond, the struggle for equality supersedes the confines of sexuality, rallying the very people whom have historically imposed their dominant values upon society into the ranks of those fighting against these values. As mentioned previously, it is only through collective opposition, the merging of the marginalized and those outside the discriminatory scope of society, that true societal change can take place, which is very much the case evolving within the social and political realms of our society today. Although this bond is not holistic, as many conservatives maintain their prejudices to this very day, it is a social evolutionary step in the direction of achieving, at long last, an equal right of love for all of America.

Despite overwhelming evidence supporting the role of television as an instrument of gay civil rights, it is crucial to discuss the discrepancies and limitations encountered while exploring this topic. There exists within the world of academic television criticism a number of scholars who believe that the television portrayal of homosexual characters merely plays into the heterosexual conception of gays, thus acting to further embed heterosexual culture dominance within our society. The fact that many series portray gay characters as blatant representations of their stereotypes, some believe, merely functions to "...provide a very important connection between the psychological heterosexism of an individual and societal prejudice against gay, lesbian, and bisexual people"(Levina et. al. 743). Whereas others feel that shows like *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* play off gay stereotypes as a means of further advancing their capitalistic agenda, as the series often features overt product placement, and functions to shift the perception

of homosexuality to that of a fashion commodity (Kooijman 107). Yet others assert that the majority of these television series are not doing enough in regards to fulfilling the role of civil rights activist. Such opinions stem from the fact that these series are not bold enough, continuously concealing any form of sexual embrace between homosexual characters. Due to the fact that the sexuality of *Ellen* is strictly separate from her public and political realm, critic Susan Hubert emphasizes that, "Ellen's supposedly controversial attempt to push the limits of acceptability actually reinscribes conventional sexual politics"(qtd. in Eledge 6). Despite the truths adherent within these criticisms of homosexual television, the fact remains the same that public opinion, as a direct result of enhanced gay visibility, has shifted dramatically over the past four decades in a largely positive manner. It is true that many corporations utilize homosexual characters as a means of furthering their material gains through shameless product placement and advertising. Although this is not entirely negative as straight Americans are made to emulate heterosexual culture, which in turn acts to further normalize it within society. Similarly, it is true that many homosexual characters represent the very stereotypes the gay rights movement fights to eliminate. However, the rhetorical methods through which these characters exhibit common negative generalizations typically serve to detract from the very negativity of the stereotypes they display. Whether it is humor or ethos, the writers and actors promoting homosexual rights tend to humanize homosexuals and thus eliminate the validity of such stereotyping. Additionally, the claims that gay television is not adequately politically engaged clearly ignore the monumental changes to society the increasing incorporation of homosexual visibility within the realm of national television has produced. Overall criticisms of the effectiveness of gay visibility within television fail to consider the larger picture of shifting national acceptance toward the homosexual civil rights movement.

The limitations encountered within this present study predominately revolve around a lack of information regarding current criticisms of television shows advocating for homosexual rights. Aside from the statistical data supporting the increasing acceptance of gay rights resulting from today's popular television series like *Glee* and *Modern Family*, virtually no scholarly reviews exist for these shows. The lack of coverage regarding these series provides a slight hole within the current research, as no detailed evaluations exist to illustrate the mean by which these shows act to support gay civil liberties. Once further research is conducted regarding the means through which current television series inspire cultural and political change within America, a holistic understanding of the role of television within this battle can be fully assessed. Through these assessments an adaptive strategy could potentially be formulated combining the strengths of the entire television movement to ultimately further the cause to an even wider social and political acceptance. Despite the lack of research regarding this matter, the current study holds its ground in that it shows the adaptive strategies and repercussions of gay rights television activists up to this juncture in our history.

Ultimately, the role of television within the United States has yet again taken on the format of activism, as the relentless push for homosexual visibility within national media has ushered in a new era of civil rights within our country. Through clever construction of appearance and persistence in the face of widespread opposition, gay rights activists have successfully altered the very definition of socially acceptable love within dominant society, so that homosexuality is popularly perceived as a viable alternative to that of their heterosexual counterparts. Through the utilization of television as a mechanism for societal change the social and political equality of homosexuals within America has been pushed to unforeseen heights, and is in no way losing momentum, as equality within the institution of marriage, as many assert,



is merely months away. Thus the face of love within our traditionally hetero-dominant culture has experienced a paradigm shift within the last four decades, such that the definition of love can no longer cater to the prejudice and homophobia of our country's traditionally intolerant culture.

Works Cited

- Appelo, Tim. "THR Poll: 'Glee' and 'Modern Family' Drive Voters to Favor Gay Marriage -- Even Many Romney Voters." *The Hollywood Reporter*. The Hollywood Reporter, 3 Nov. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2013.
- Bozell III, L. Brent. "Gays' Long March Through Prime Time Continues." *Human Events* 53.17 (1997): 20. Web. 18 Apr. 2013
- Bretz, Brenda. "The Poor People's Campaign: An Evolution Of The Civil Rights Movement." *Sociological Viewpoints* (2010): 19-25. Web. 27 Mar. 2013.
- Downs, Anthony. "Up and Down with Ecology—the 'issue-attention cycle.'" *The Public Interest* 28 (1972): 38-50. Web. 27 Mar. 2013.
- Eidelson, Roy J. "Inequality, Shared Outrage, And Social Change." *Peace Review* 23.1 (2011): 4-11. Web. 27 Mar. 2013.
- Elledge, Jim. *Queers In American Popular Culture*. n.p.: Praeger, 2010. Web. 18 Apr. 2013
- Festle, Mary Jo. "Listening To The Civil Rights Movement." *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide* 12.6 (2005): 10-15. Web. 27 Mar. 2013.

Kooijman, Jaap. "They're Here, They're Queer, and Straight America Loves It." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 11.1 (2005): 106-109. Web. 18 Mar. 2013.

Levina, Marina, Craig R. Waldo, and Louise F. Fitzgerald. "We're Here, We're Queer, We're On TV: The Effects Of Visual Media On Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Gay Men And Lesbians." *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology* 30.4 (2000): 738-758. Web. 18 Mar. 2013.

Martin, Jerry L. "The University As Agent Of Social Transformation: The Postmodern Argument Considered." *Academic Questions* 6.3 (1993): 55-70. Web. 27 Mar. 2013

Prono, Luca. *Encyclopedia Of Gay And Lesbian Popular Culture*. n.p.: Greenwood Press, 2008. Web. 13 Apr. 2013.

Rosenberg, Alyssa. "'Modern Family' and Gay Marriage: It's Complicated." *The Atlantic*. N.p., 13 Oct. 2010. Web. 10 Apr. 2013.

Steele, Bruce C. "The Gay Rights Makeover." *Advocate* 897 (2003): 42. Web. 18 Apr. 2013

Sutherland, Douglas. "Education As An Agent Of Social Evolution: The Educational Projects Of Patrick Geddes In Late-Victorian Scotland." *History Of Education* 38.3 (2009): 349-365. Web. 27 Mar. 2013.

Wong, Curtis M. "'Glee,' 'Modern Family' And Other LGBT-Themed TV Shows Drive Gay

Marriage Support: Poll." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 05 Nov. 2012.

Web. 18 Apr. 2013.