Introduction

On the morning of August 12, 1999, Jose Bové and a band of fellow French sheep farmers descended on a McDonald's restaurant under construction outside the village of Millau. Angry that the 851st McDonald's in France was being constructed in their backyard, Bové, his accomplices, and a group of several hundred supporters parked their tractors, forklifts, and Citroens on the restaurant lot. With chainsaws, chisels, hammers, and screwdrivers, the group literally dismantled the half-built structure and carried it away piece by piece. In a media-driven, globalized world, the group's actions were perfect for television coverage.

The images that appeared on news programs around the world included the tractors and forklifts carrying pieces of the restaurant to the lawn of the regional magistrate's office in Millau, farmwives passing out Roquefort cheese to villagers to protest against McDonald's power to undermine local food production, and Bové himself toting a huge McDonald's sign. "Good visuals," as the media people say. Those arrested for their actions came to be known as the "McDonald's Ten" and quickly gained popularity throughout France and all over the world (Williams, 2001); Bové himself received such acclaim in Europe that some observers employed the term "Bovémania" to describe the phenomenon ("Think Global," 2000).

Bové elicited this response by using McDonald's sign value, its symbolic capital, to connect the profound European concern with food to the expanding worldwide fear of

the excessive power of transnational corporations. The paragon of a transnational company with huge assets and political-economic power, McDonald's saw its kinetic energy appropriated by Bové and redeployed in the construction of his own media image. Very sophisticated in his awareness of signifiers, symbols, and "the sign of the burger," Bové understood that McDonald's conveys diverse meanings to different individuals. In an interview in June 2001, he observed that people around the world see McDonald's very differently than many Americans do. In many places outside the United States it is viewed as a symbol of affluence and wealth—inside the United States it is not (Jeffress, 2001).

Taking the stand at his trial, Bové continued his analysis of the meanings of the McDonald's signifier: "McDonald's is the symbol of standardization of food," he said, adding an American simile: "What we did was like the Boston Tea Party" (Williams, 2001). Continuing this semiotic theme, the symbolic dimension of McDonald's vis-à-vis Bové—and McDonald's in general—attracts scores of interpreters. Journalist Tom Wheeler (2001), describing Bové as a "farmer for our time," asserts that his attack on McDonald's makes him the most compelling symbol of "the worldwide counterattack of peasants and family farmers against corporate agriculture . . . and global trading blocs organized by the big capitalist powers." Other observers identify McDonald's as the most important signifier around the world for free market capitalism and Bové as a leading symbol of opposition to it (Jeffress, 2001; Williams, 2001). And still other analysts refer to Bové as an enemy of modernist scientific progress (Watson, 1997b). These competing signs of the burger constitute a central dimension of this book.

McDonald's elicits responses like this in the United States and around the world. Americans are frequently baffled by

the negative feelings many people outside the United States hold about their country. After the tragic attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, news programs portrayed shocked Americans asking why would anyone want to harm the United States. As one woman put it, speaking on CNN in the aftermath of the attacks:

> America has done nothing but help the world, often at great sacrifice to our own people. When people around the world have needed help, we have given it to them. Many have sacrificed their lives for people around the world. We have never done anything to hurt them. Why do they not understand that?

In this context Jose Bové's actions against McDonald's help us understand aspects of this anti-American sentiment. He disassembled the Millau McDonald's to protest against U.S. imperialism, trade policies, and the promotion of *malbouffe*, bad food (Williams, 2001). To many Europeans, Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans, McDonald's stands as a primary symbol for the Americanization of the planet, with all the environmental, political, moral, cultural, and economic dimensions of that process. When it comes to McDonald's and its relationship to America, we recall the Five Man Electric Band in the late 1960s exclaiming: "Signs, signs, everywhere a sign." McDonald's and America are signs for much of what is wrong with the contemporary world, Bové says:

> First, McDonald's represents globalization, multinationals, and the power of the market. Then it stands for industrially produced food bad for traditional farmers and bad for your health. And lastly, it's a symbol for America. It comes from the place where they not only promote globalization and industrially produced food but also unfairly penalize our peasants. ("Think Global," 2000)

McDonald's executives understand the widespread perception of their corporation as a signifier of America. One executive told me under the promise of anonymity (September 12, 2001) that after the terrorist-controlled airplanes crashed into the World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon, all McDonald's regional offices were closed and evacuated. A memo emailed to each office stated that the perpetrators were obviously attacking America directly, and since McDonald's represented America, company offices were highly vulnerable. In this case the executives thought the sign of the burger was powerful enough to get them and their staff members killed.

Thus, the symbolic meaning of McDonald's has taken on an emotional power similar to that of a flag or a ring. Bové's attack on McDonald's allowed him to appropriate some of the negative underside of this highly charged semiotic power, so that he:

- was hailed as a national hero in France.
- was compared to Robin Hood (Williams, 2001).
- was described as the new Vercingetorix—the revered warrior who led the Gauls against the Romans in 52 B.C. (Wheeler, 2001).
- was supported at his trial by 45,000 anti-McDonald's and anti-American demonstrators (Noble, 2000).
- received the adulation of thousands at an antiglobalization forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil ("Expelled French Activist," 2001).
- was cheered by residents of the West Bank town of el-Khader (Khalili, 2001).
- marched into Mexico City alongside Subcommandante Marcos and the Zapatistas (Williams, 2001).
- spoke in front of a McDonald's during the demonstrations against the World Trade Organization in Seattle as

protestors broke the restaurant's windows. (Seidman, 1999)

For another aspect of the signifying power of the Golden Arches, consider McDonald's role in the changes that have taken place in American education and the expansion of corporate power in everyday life over the past few years. In this market-driven neo-liberal era, many schools in the United States have accepted corporate intrusions into the classroom, and it is not uncommon to see corporate advertising and programming in American schools (Hoffman, 2001). Taking advantage of this new ideological climate, McDonald's has produced advertisement-laden curricula for almost every academic subject, including language courses in Russian, Spanish, French, and German (McDonald's Customer Relations Center, 1994).

Channel One (a for-profit company that offers free televisions to schools if they agree to broadcast its loosely defined "news programming" and, most important, numerous commercials) opened the gates, permitting McDonald's and thousands of other companies to occupy schools in the early 1990s. Students are required to view corporate television programming and live presentations (Boyles, 1998). The lesson corporations are attempting to teach students involves a form of scholarly passivity and acceptance of the data provided about political-economic matters (Boyles, 1998; Hoffman, 2001; Kincheloe, 1999).

Exemplifying this new corporate order, McDonald's was invited on May 22, 2001, to Stonington High School in Connecticut to provide career guidance during a required assembly. Among the students who walked into the school auditorium not knowing that McDonald's was involved was Tristan Kading, a 15-year-old sophomore. His story illustrates both the dramatic changes that have occurred in American

schooling and the political atmosphere of the twenty-first-century corporatized cosmos. After a presentation on the advantages of working at McDonald's, the company's representative called for volunteers to participate in a mock interview. The first student selected made a masturbatory reference and was asked to return to his seat. At this point new volunteers were called for, and Kading was chosen. Ignoring the promptings of the McDonald's representative, Tristan used the forum to denounce McDonald's corporate policies—including practices leading to environmental destruction, lies about the use of beef tallow in preparing its French fries, and harmful farming methods (Raptorial Hall of Fame, 2001). Admonishing Kading that his comments would not get him a job at McDonald's, the representative ordered him to give back the microphone (Green, 2001).

School administrators immediately removed Kading from the assembly, describing him to the group as an "embarrassment to the school" (Green, 2001). The principal then demanded that the young man apologize to McDonald's in writing and read a second apology to students and teachers over the school intercom (Raptorial, 2001). In the broadcast apology, Kading described himself as a "bad student" whom no teacher would want to have in class (Green, 2001). In an interview with me after the fall 2001 term had begun, Kading confided that he should never have apologized for his comments. "Don't do anything," he said, "until you know your rights" (interview, September 20, 2001).

The message that the administrators and McDonald's sent to students is clear, Kading said: It is not acceptable to express your political opinions in school (Green, 2001). By early June Kading decided to leave Stonington High and the system that had consistently supported the administration's actions against him. After looking for another school, however, he

decided to return to Stonington in September because he could not find one that was any better. Now, Kading reports, administrators avoid him and "try not to look at [him]" when he walks by. Unrepentant for his actions, Kading told me that he wants Americans to know that

> if this world is to have any extended future, McDonald's needs to be cut out. When you eat a hamburger, you're also eating a section of the South American rainforest and the air it purified. McDonald's is currently in a cozy situation as it seems our country is being run by a plutocrat, but hopefully we will see the problems McDonald's is creating even without the government shadowing our view before we have to start worrying about the world running out of oxygen. (Interview, September 20, 2001)

Kading's and Bové's relationships to the sign of the burger and its culture of power serve as fitting introductions to this book. Readers can sense in these episodes that powerful concepts and symbols are circulating around the Golden Arches—concepts and symbols that none of us (myself included) sensed in our first contacts with the corporation. In this circulation lie the conceptual origins of *The Sign of the Burger: McDonald's and the Culture of Power*. In this context the generative question emerges: Why is McDonald's a lightning rod for debate and discussion, an object of fascination, evoking strong feelings and emotions in the United States and around the world? Such a query leads us to the larger question: Why study McDonald's?

McDonald's serves as a widely recognized example that concretizes a plethora of larger social, cultural, economic, political, and educational concepts. The popularity of George Ritzer's *The McDonaldization of Society* (1993, rev. ed. 1996) has encouraged further analysis on these levels. The McLibel Trial in Great Britain, which pitted McDonald's battery of

lawyers against two unemployed Greenpeace activists in the late 1990s, also raised public consciousness of the company's social, cultural, political, economic, and environmental role (Vidal, 1997). And, of course, McDonald's saturation advertising and founder Ray Kroc's Horatio Alger story of the "little company that made good" have contributed to its high public profile.

Analysis of such a well-known corporation allows adherents of different political and cultural perspectives to make ideological points about an institution with which people are intimately familiar. McDonald's "sign value" signifies far more than hamburgers. Indeed, the nature of the signification differs dramatically depending on whom one asks, illustrating the deep divisions both inside and outside the United States in readings of contemporary civilization. As I interviewed McDonald's employees and consumers from around the world, these dramatic differences revealed themselves in many different languages and accents. Such ubiquity and conflicting perceptions make McDonald's a symbol for an age.

The power of McDonald's to elicit dreams and fantasies from people around the world illustrates its compelling impact on the collective psyche. Numerous children I interviewed talked about wishing for an infinite supply of McDonald's hamburgers. Some wished they could someday own a McDonald's restaurant; many others wanted to raise hamburger trees on a fantasy farm they would someday run. One creative fanzine writer illustrates the importance of McDonald's in his consciousness and its power to infiltrate our fantasies:

> If Hollywood were to make a movie about a rogue McDonald's manager charged with turning a cadre of slip-shod but loveable ne'er-do-wells into a crack outfit of burger servin' prodigies in what Rex Reed would hail as "The Film of the Decade!"

> then such a movie would be set here at this B-List McDonald's. Of course, this presupposes that Hollywood would make such a movie, which, after Hamburger: The Movie, they most decidedly will not. I mean, I wouldn't go to any feel-good movie about fast food restaurants and the callow employees there who learn an important life's lesson. Unless, of course, there was nudity. ("Philip," 1996)

Thus, McDonald's has captured the public imagination, playing many roles in the contemporary globalized society: all-American success story, creator of Happy Meal fandom, symbol of Western economic development, concrete representation of modernity, corporate bully, postmodern sign value, object of disdain, patron or cultural dislocator of McWorkers. I focus on the some of the more compelling roles in Chapter 1 and continue this effort in the following chapters, analyzing the nature of McDonald's sociocultural, political, and economic power. I concentrate particularly on the ways this culture of power has influenced—or, as I phrase it throughout the book, educated—America and the world. McDonald's educative or "cultural pedagogical" aspect involves its capacity to produce and transmit knowledge, shape values, influence identity, and construct consciousness.

The analysis of the Golden Arches' power dynamic, the power and domination McDonald's has constructed in the cultural realm, and the complex, never totally successful, ways it operates are the core concerns of this book. Vandana Shiva (1997) contends that McDonald's power has much in common with the pre-perestroika Soviet Union. The biggest difference, she argues, involves the ways the world has reacted to the two power wielders. Whereas the whole world was outraged by the concentrated, centralized control of the communist regime, most people are untroubled by

the authoritarianism of transnational corporations that have no accountability to anyone.

Indeed, McDonald's the power wielder stands ready to do battle with anyone who messes with its power, with the positive valences of its sign value. The company understands the hegemonic worth of its signifiers as mechanisms of social regulation. George Ritzer sees McDonald's production process as an old-fashioned, modernist form of rationalization—an accurate understanding, for the most part—but the company's relationship to sign values is a good example of how the hegemonic process works in a postmodern context. Thus, the discourse about McDonald's generated by Ritzer and his supporters and critics, as well as this book (I hope), has an important relationship to some of the key debates of the early twenty-first century.

In this context we can see that McDonald's represents a new kind of business power—not a manufacturer or some other traditional form of industry, but an entertainment-based, fun-producing firm that extends to every last corner of the globe. Along with Coke and Disney, McDonald's produces power via pleasure. Significantly, this power-related (political) process takes place in the realm of culture—the sphere of society traditionally viewed as separate from the political. In the new electronic social order, the cultural realm becomes the most important venue of political socialization. This is a key theme of this book.

Another facet of "Why study McDonald's?" leads us to examine the website "McSpotlight" as a prototype for grassroots global democratic action in the twenty-first century. The unanticipated sociopolitical aspects of the McSpotlight debate room discussed in Chapter 1 do not diminish the important achievement of the website's founders. In the first three years of its existence, McSpotlight was visited 65

million times, making it one of the most important monitors of corporate behavior on the planet. Friends of democracy have much to learn from its organizers.

In this globalized context McDonald's operates in a landscape shaped by diverse logics and organizing motifs. This context suggests yet another response to "Why study McDonald's?" The Golden Arches exist in and respond to various sociocultural, political, and economic formations simultaneously and with little sense of the contradictions involved. For example, McDonald's operates on both a Fordist and a post-Fordist economic plane in the context of premodernist, modernist, and postmodernist cultural logics; it functions as a highly rationalized and as a transrational/affective organization, depending on the goal.

Given such multidimensional complexity, Doug Kellner (1998) asserts that a multiperspective analysis is needed. Taking his cue, *The Sign of the Burger* employs a mutually informative, synergistic bricolage of research methods, including ethnography, content analysis, historiography, cultural studies analysis, rhetorical analysis, semiotics, and critical hermeneutics. McDonald's is such a complex phenomenon that, as Kellner puts it: "The more perspectives one can bring to its analysis and critique, the better grasp of the phenomenon one will have and the better one will be at developing alternative readings and oppositional practices" (1998, p. xii). It is my hope that this book will not only help readers understand the Golden Arches in new ways but extend our thinking about research and interpretive processes as well.

A few brief definitions may be in order at this point to help readers unfamiliar with some of the contemporary jargon of cultural analysis and sociology. The terms "modernism" and "modernist" are used here to denote ways of

thinking and modes of social organization that emerged as part of the scientific revolution beginning in Western Europe in the mid-seventeenth century. Understanding the failure of medieval ways of seeing the world, modernist thinkers sought new methods to understand and control the outside environment. Cartesian-Newtonian science became a foundation for this new impulse as it set out to make sense of complex phenomena by reducing them to their constituent parts for detailed analysis. Connected to modernism's scientific dimension is a socioeconomic one: capitalism, with its unyielding faith in the benefits of science and its handmaiden, technology, its doctrine of progress, its cult of reason and rationalism, and its logic of economic organization, which would culminate in the early twentieth century in Fordism.

The term "postmodernism" is used in complex and often confusing ways to designate both a philosophical position and a social era. Philosophically, postmodernism has something to do with the questioning of previously delineated modernist tenets. More specifically, postmodernist observers subject to analysis those social assumptions previously shielded by the modernist ethos. They admit previously inadmissible evidence, derived from new questions asked by once excluded voices, challenge hierarchical structures of knowledge and power that promote "experts" above "the masses," and seek new ways of knowing that transcend scientifically verified facts and "reasonable" linear arguments deployed in a quest for certainty.

"Postmodernist" is often used as well to describe the social condition of the globalizing electronic contemporary world. In postmodernity the grand narratives, the stories we tell to make sense of the world, are no longer believable; they fail to understand their own construction by social and

historical forces. Reason is undermined because of its cooptation by those in power, who speak with the authority of a science not subjected to self-analysis. There is no way to simplify this definition of the postmodern condition. It is not a discrete, homogeneous historical period. All cultural expression in the contemporary era is not postmodern. In the economic domain, for example, post-Fordist flexible accumulation and emphasis on niche markets coexist with mass production of standardized products.

The postmodern condition is marked by a social vertigo that emerges from what has been referred to as "hyperreality" (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1991; Gergen, 1991; Smart, 1992). In this hyperreality individuals tend to lose touch with traditional notions of time, community, self, and history. New structures of cultural space and time, generated by electronic images bombarding us from local, national, and international sites, shake our personal sense of place. Electronic transmissions move us in and out of different geographical and cultural locales instantaneously, juxtaposing nonlinear signifiers and images of the world with downhome, folksy, and comfortable personalities who reassure us in the midst of the chaos. In this context many people are rendered vulnerable to the sign. Relinquishing the desire for self-direction in the thick semiotic jungle of hyperreality, they have difficulty making sense of the world and their role in it. Contact with such social and cultural dynamics makes it harder to generate commitment to anything (Kincheloe, 1995).

The Sign of the Burger is part of an ongoing conversation about McDonald's that includes the work of George Ritzer (1993, rev. ed. 1996) and John Watson (1997). Ritzer's *McDonaldization of Society* focuses on the ways in which the modernist hyperrationality of McDonald's organizational strategies elevates efficiency and standardization over

questions of human needs and quality. The organizational plan forged by its founder, Ray Kroc, and the company's subsequent development fit well with the hyperrational historical trajectory of modernism. Ritzer's portrait of McDonald's is less important than his concern with the process of McDonaldization. We can learn much about hyperrationality, commodification, and dehumanization from Ritzer's analysis, but his reluctance to view McDonald's from diverse social locations—vantage points that provide us with a deeper sense of the McDonald's phenomenon and the complex ways it interfaces with and shapes the lives of people around the world—undermines the cogency of the analysis.

Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia, edited by John Watson, attempts to address the shortcomings of Ritzer's approach by studying the role of McDonald's in five East Asian countries. Anthropologist Watson and his contributors explore the different ways in which these countries engage the Golden Arches, as evidenced by the specificities of consumer practices and the meanings individuals ascribe to their consumption. In this process the researchers are always concerned with testing the validity of Ritzer's McDonaldization thesis, especially as it concerns issues of standardization and cultural homogenization. Unless they are aware of this backdrop, many readers will not understand the authors' need to prove McDonald's lack of impact on local eating habits and cultural practices. Hence the central message of Watson's book: The corporation has blended so well into local East Asian cultures that it is no longer an American cultural icon or a wielder of power.

In these authors' analysis of East Asian consumption, McDonald's has little to do with larger sociopolitical and economic concerns. Indeed, Watson and his contributors,

according to reviewer Samuel Collins (1998), do little more than affirm consumer behavior studies published in the *Journal of Consumer Research* and the *Journal of Marketing*. They consistently fail to grasp that contemporary advertisers intend for consumers to make their own meanings of products—it is an effective marketing ploy. This is why McDonald's customizes its foods for particular locations while concurrently clinging to the signifier of modern, advanced Americana—a semiotic tightrope. Thus, Watson et al. dismiss the power dynamics that I find so central to the story of the Golden Arches, arguing that the uniqueness of individual consumption erases concerns with the negative effects of globalization, transnational capital, and political-economic domination.

Such an analysis would dismiss Tristan Kading's concerns with environmental destruction and health, or McSpotlight's interest in the exploitation of children and low pay for workers, as not germane to the McStory. Consideration of problems like these would require researchers to move beyond asking narrow questions about specific meanings of consumption and raise social, cultural, political, and economic issues with interviewees. Observing the complex dynamics that emerge when the micro-social intersects with macro-concerns could have awakened the authors to another cosmos of meaning. In researching cultural-political artifacts, it is important not only to study consumption and production processes, but also to analyze how, say, hamburgers become implicated in diverse dimensions of culture.

This, of course, is what I am attempting to do in *The Sign of the Burger*. I begin in Chapter 1 by detailing the role of McDonald's in my own early life in the mountains of East Tennessee. In this context I document its role as a signifier of modernity and as such an escape route from my rural sta-

tus. I tell my own story to help answer the questions "Why McDonald's?" and "Why study McDonald's?" Throughout the rest of the book I explore the ways in which individuals around the world have made use of the signifier of modernity, as I did. I provide examples of how much McDonald's matters to people in contemporary society, how much energy they are willing to expend—both positive and negative—in reference to its meanings. In Chapter 2 I analyze these meanings in an ideological context. Ideology is the process of protecting unequal power relations, and in this framework I study the many ways in which McDonald's produces ideology, as well as the ways in which different people receive it.

In Chapter 3 I focus on the postmodern aspects of McDonald's and the cultural dynamics that operate to extend its culture of power. Using the electronic power of communications media, a company can deploy signifiers under the radar of consciousness to shape attitudes and colonize desire in ways beneficial to its political-economic interests. In a society such as the United States where political literacy is in decline, such signifiers can exert a powerful subliminal effect. In Chapter 4 I extend my analysis of the company's political impact through the notion of McDonald's as public educator. McDonald's has played a significant role in the corporate reeducation of the American public to adopt a political-economic perspective that is more market-friendly, more accepting of unfettered free enterprise. I explore the ways in which this effort has been received by particular individuals, documenting examples of those who accept the reeducation project and those who reject it.

Chapter 5 probes the complexity of this educational role, analyzing the hegemonic aspect of the corporation. Hegemony is the process of maintaining domination in contem-

porary democratic societies by winning the consent of individuals to dominant forces of power. McDonald's wins this consent by attaching its signifiers to prevailing belief structures such as family values, patriotism, and nostalgia for a culturally homogeneous small-town America. In other countries around the world, McDonald's uses profoundly different if not conflicting signs to produce hegemonic power. With these understandings in mind, I explore McDonald's struggles to protect the sanctity of its signifying practices—the sign of the burger.

In Chapter 6 I detail McDonald's contemporary struggle to control the sign of the burger in the face of a variety of challenges. Since sign values in hyperreality are fickle, the corporation must keep up with day-to-day changes in the reception of particular signifying practices in an information-saturated world. Having endured a string of end-of-century marketing failures—the Arch Deluxe in 1996, Campaign 55 in 1997, and Beanie Babies in 1998—McDonald's in the first decade of the twenty-first century faces a historical watershed. When one adds the public relations disaster of the McLibel Trial, observers begin to understand the trouble in the Hamburger Patch. Confused by the mixed reception of its signifiers, the corporation is struggling to formulate new ways of representing itself in a rapidly changing world.

It is important in this context to describe my research methods. I began my research in the late 1980s and continued to collect data until September 2001. I approach interview-based research as a form of improvisational ethnography. In my experience, predesigned questions and formal questionnaires often assume a knowledge of where the interview is supposed to go and tend to shape the information obtained. With this in mind, I sought out individuals in naturalistic settings who

often initiated conversations about McDonald's on their own volition. Sometimes, of course, I opened the conversation; at other times I encouraged interviewees to elaborate on their initial comments. As much as possible I engaged the informant in a conversational tone and avoided the question-and-answer format of a formal interview. Because many of the conversations were spontaneous, I rarely used a tape recorder. I took notes on interactions that occurred:

- in McDonald's lines (queues) of customers waiting to place their orders
- with parents reflecting on their children's attitudes toward McDonald's
- with children describing their McDonald's experiences
- with audience members after my speeches on McDonalds
- with teachers and students in school settings
- with individuals in foreign countries speaking with me—the American visitor.

Many potential interviewees became uncomfortable when I followed up their comments with politically inscribed questions, and they declined to offer further information. As I describe in the chapters that follow, some became angry with me when I asked or induced them in some way to react to political aspects of the McDonald's phenomenon. I consistently use pseudonyms to protect interviewees, though sometimes, when the information is relevant, I refer to their race, gender, and nationality. The notes on the interviews are handwritten and stored in my personal files. In addition, I use information obtained from Internet websites and chatrooms. One problem that confronts researchers in the twenty-first century is that websites can quickly go from universally accessible to completely inaccessible, making it impossible to validate or challenge particular sources. As

this book goes to the typesetter, all websites cited in the bibliography are available on-line. For those interested in pursuing some of the themes discussed in this book, the McSpotlight website offers an ever-changing and ever-expanding body of information.

In conclusion I would like to thank Stanley Aronowitz and Doug Kellner for their assistance in the publication of this book.