

Does Media Violence Make Daily Violence Invisible?

Reformulations of the Perennial Topic of "Television and Violence"

The contradicting results of media impact research give rise to justified doubts about media violence invariably producing violent behaviour. Television is more complicated: the conveyed messages are equivocal. TV is part of identity formation. What we see has very much to do with our experiences in daily life. Also, violence is a complex phenomenon working at different levels. Not every kind of violence is visible, and it may well be that forms of hidden violence are more dangerous than the violent images actually shown.

Media impact research, which centres on the effects of media violence on viewers' behaviour, has not produced really satisfying results despite the major efforts and funds that went into it: *"Overall, we are far from any, even any approximate, answers to the questions raised"* claims media expert Winfried Schulz (1992, p.5). There is hardly any area where parents' and educators' fears of doing something wrong and their desire for clarity and media educational recipes are as great, and where we have such a multitude of contradicting findings, as in media impact research (cf. Rathmayr 1996).

*Television is not simply passive consumption.
Rather, television has to do with me.*

First of all, I would like to show that the reasons for such blocks may be rooted in wrong questions and theoretisations, and in research's own blind spots. This assumption has already been made by Michael Kunczik (1994, p. 222): we conduct research as long as funds are coming in *"without ever asking ourselves whether we have put forward the right question"*. Secondly, this is why I have reformulated a number of issues, adopted different perspectives and asked other questions. They lead, thirdly, to a number of suggestions for media education (at school).

I. Wrong questions and blind spots

As I see it, the reasons for shortcomings in TV impact research are to be found at three different levels. Level one: impact research very often regards TV consumers as mere passive objects. Level two: this coincides with the view that TV, as a medium, is a dangerous and tempting generator of stimuli, especially so for children and juveniles. Level three: finally, impact research appears to have little difficulty with the notion of violence in terms of its very own topic – and this turns out to be problematic. Let me describe these three aspects in greater detail:

1. Helplessly exposed to a flood of stimuli?

Impact research is always based on the assumption that media products showing violence will cause violent behaviour in the consumers of such broadcasts. Violence in television programmes will generate violence in daily life. Although nowadays we no longer tend to speak of *the* cause and *one specific* effect, impact research is based on a stimulus-response-model which considers the individual an – admittedly intelligent – apparatus that will respond with violence in the presence of other factors (such as difficulties within the family, problems at school, sexual trouble). Such an approach turns television audiences into compliant objects

of the media: objects of seduction, passive recipients of messages. According to this view, media education has the function of sheltering and protecting the object from media power.

I maintain that the consumer is not simply an object in front of the TV screen but is, first and foremost, made into an object by those theoretical approaches, an object that has to be educated, protected and compressed into a system of rules, regulations, requirements and educational measures. As illustrated by the media theorist Bernhard Rathmayr (1996, p. 141), it is precisely this policy that turns children and juveniles into "alibi victims of media society".

2. Flood of images: the equivocal world of pictures

Television consumers cannot be reduced to more or less seducible response apparatuses that are entirely in the hands of the medium and receive only passively what is being offered. By the same token, we cannot rely on television airing unequivocal messages.

I maintain that the media convey messages at different levels which may take on different meanings depending on the knowledge and experience of viewers. Also, the reports and pictures broadcast before or afterwards and the things not shown or said will change the meaning of messages.

3. All that is violence ...

Especially when we talk of violence, we are seduced by images that speak for themselves. Violence is seen! Therefore, it is not surprising that media impact research is painting a curiously colourless face of violence. Apparently, there is hardly any substantial agreement on what media violence actually is. Moral indignation about violence in the media rarely results in a distinction between the various forms, levels and functions of violence for consumers.

I maintain that this approach leads to a situation in which we no longer recognise hidden forms of violence and in which our notion of violence is determined by media-conveyed images of violence that are gradually covering up our daily experiences with violence. This might result in people accepting something as violent only when it conforms with media violence.

II. Reformulations

My argument against this stance is to consider viewers **active television subjects** that negotiate and form their own identity while watching television. As I shall also show, television is not so much a stimulus generator airing dangerous pictures but rather a space that initiates, generates, modifies, articulates etc. myriad identity routines. And finally, I will try to uncover the dangers of assuming that the notion of violence is something evident and does not require any further definition, as such an assumption obscures more than it clarifies.

1. TV spaces

First: nothing is self-evident. A few examples: **Why do I see what I see? Why do I notice a small detail in a film which others don't even see? Why am I moved to tears by an episode that causes others to laugh or to show no reaction at all? Why do I like a film that bores others? Why am I enraged by a scene in which others find nothing special? So, why do I perceive things differently from others?** – The answer is simple: watching TV is no mere passive consumption but rather it has to do with me. There is a constant exchange between the images seen and the experiences made by me. I suffer, desire and condemn, I am angry and get carried away. All this I am because I am involved in television with all my personal experiences and emotions.

When watching TV, we are in a kind of space of our own, in a "TV space". The French historian Michel de Certeau (cf. 1988, p. 215 ff.) distinguishes between places and spaces. *"Overall, space is a place with which we are doing something."* (p. 218). If this place were a word or a picture, space would be a word that is spoken or a picture that is negotiated. By TV space, I mean a place where we as TV viewers are active, where we "live with" the pictures shown, as people tend to say.

TV space is an identity space, i.e. as in many other spaces, it is the space where things happen that define what we are, what makes us, what gives us our unique identity. To understand this, we have to know what identity is.

2. Who I am and what I do

Modern identity concepts no longer presume that what makes me is an unalterable trait of my essential being, something inside me that remains unchanged across time and requires me to live up to it somehow. Identity is no essence, no being, and it is never fixed nor fixable. So what is identity then? What is it that makes me? And how can I say that television is part of what I am? My assumption is that we define, generate, change, stabilise our identity, what we are in daily routines. What I call identity is an unstable construct, the backdrop against which we gain the capacity to act. The better we know who we are, what we want, what we desire, the better is our capacity to act (in whatever direction). By taking action, we show others who we are.

The better we know who we are, what we want, what we desire, the better is our capacity to act (in whatever direction).

3. TV action

As any other action, watching TV is among our daily (identity) routines. TV space is neither a particularly exceptional nor a particularly threatening place. **What is essential is whether we are able to turn this place into a space where we act as subjects, i.e. a space that does not make us mute or incapable of action but enables us to gather new experiences. Hence, TV space is an active interchange.** No matter how we design this interchange, it is of great importance for our constant identity negotiations and representations.

4. Curious bystanders, space of desire

TV space, however, is also a fantastic space, an imaginary space where identity is generated by imagination, identification, projection, etc. As such, this space is no different from other spaces.

5. Television: Being there? Seeing what is important?

Television is "wonderful". We are there, everywhere – live! And if not live, then at least close to the scene: reality TV makes it happen. But we are also there because, through television, we are in vogue. And we are there because we are "in the picture". We are up-to-date, abreast of the latest developments and news. But television does not only convey important information. It also tells us what we are to deem important. At the same time, this medium produces and (re)presents a kind of public. Public in this context also means that television both produces and presents role models and ideal designs of society. Christina von Braun (1994, p. 25) calls such changing designs, which are generated by different epochs and, in turn, shape the face of an epoch, the *"collective imaginary"*. Television invariably becomes the producer, translator, representative and carrier of the collective imaginary. The routine of watching TV is a form of – weak – participation in the public and consumption of the public.

6. A news item in Austria's daily news or: does media violence hide violence?

Do we see on TV what is important? Or, maybe, do we consider things important that are shown on TV? Do things become unimportant that are not shown by the media? Do they become invisible when not seen? Or, will they even become untrue when not appearing on screen? Television always works with images. They seduce because they make everything else invisible – but not ineffective. To illustrate this point, there is no better example than TV's depiction of violence. This is why those media researchers get into trouble who dissolve the notion of violence in denotative terms: they say that violence – what violence is – can be read in the image directly. The difficulties start with the material this is related to. "Rambo", of course, is violent, so are "Terminator" and "Platoon". Do those forms of media violence hide violence?

Let me try another approach and illustrate the difficulties encountered in defining the notion of violence by the example of a brief news item broadcast on Austria's daily news after Christmas. We saw some beautiful pictures of the snow-adorned Alps while being told that the winter sport resorts on the Arlberg were still suffering from lack of labour despite the number of job-seekers in other parts of Austria. The hotel owners, it was said, called upon the public employment service to tighten its suitability criteria for the unemployed. In their opinion, the jobless would have to be forced to work in a province other than their own for one season if they were to remain eligible for unemployment benefits. Apparently, that was such an important piece of information that it deserved inclusion in prime-time news. But in what respect could such news be important? Perhaps, because a report on labour scarcity sounds anachronistic in our times of rampant unemployment? Perhaps, this should even have been the positive news item of the day? No, nothing of all this. To put it bluntly, the issue simply was: here is work, and there are jobless people who could do the job, but apparently they don't do it (if we are to believe the report). Naturally, the immediate question that comes to our minds is: how is this possible – nowadays? The answer issues from what was said: due to "lax" regulations we cannot force the unemployed to take up such jobs. It is as simple as that. There is no need to decipher the image, because it is self-evident: the unemployed don't want to work, they are a lazy bunch and abuse all those generous regulations and social benefits. That is why jobless people must be forced to work by tightening suitability criteria. Nothing of this was ever said in the report. There is no need for such explicitness: for years the media have driven home the message; we have seen innumerable debates on unemployment, on the parasites of our welfare state, on the need to slash benefits, on all the biased perceptions of the "lazy" jobless. Such a brief report will immediately revive those messages about unemployment and the unemployed. The report confirms the saying "whoever wants work will find work". This shows a first invisible impact: it remains invisible that this news item is embedded in a long discussion on unemployment. It links up with numerous prior reports, experiences, fantasies. At the same time, this report will pre-structure many later news, experiences and fantasies on the issue. This is how a long chain of news will gradually form certainties, and we are no longer able to discern the particulars that have converged to form a certainty. Certainties (and that is why they are called that) tend to shut themselves off from experiences. Frequently, they even structure new experiences, i.e. we try to lead a new experience back to things known, to certainties. Isn't that a form of violence to which we have always been exposed?

Let me take you a step further. Is the above short report important news? One would have to assume so. A preliminary glance shows this to be right: firstly, there is the information on a problem. Secondly, there is the information on problem solution: the proposal made by hotel owners. But, as presented, the information hides a number of deficits: there is no information on the pay level in this industry, no information on the working conditions in the catering

business of the area, no information on the situation of the affected job-seekers and their families or financial situation, etc. And, of course, there is no information on the reasons for structural unemployment. Finally, there is no information why precisely this news item has been included in prime-time news.

Shouldn't we better ask about the actual information content of such news? What is it the viewers are supposed to be informed of? In fact, what kind of impact is this message, this information – or should we rather say misinformation – supposed to have? Since we do not know much more after having seen this news items than before, couldn't it well be that such information is not intended to provide further knowledge? Is this message primarily targeted on the emotional level because, as shown above, it may be meant to encourage, generate and stabilise stereotypes and prejudices?

Presented briefly and without commentary, does this message not (re)produce a form of structural violence? Required to report in objective terms, journalists have to refrain from commentaries. They are supposed to report, nothing else. However, is uncommented reporting not in blatant violation of the much-cited objectivity? The latter still seems to be based on the idea that we can "only" report on naked facts, and in so doing, achieve objectivity. But: objective reporting primarily means "balanced" reporting. In our example this would signify that the above report is followed by a second one in which the public employment service either rejects or welcomes or examines the hotel owners' request. However, such an opposite stance does not invalidate the images people have of the unemployed. This kind of objectivity is an illusion: it is the illusion of the "naked event" within the report which can only be and always has been assigned a meaning within a powerful discourse.

Summary: media violence is much, much more than a series of violent images. It may well be that those violent images are still the most harmless because they can at least be recognised as such, whereas we are continuously flooded with messages that contain violence because they produce stereotypes, prejudices, negative images, etc. **I maintain that any fixation on violent images is the very means of diverting our attention from those other forms of hidden violence.** In fact, it is those types of violence – Galtung calls them structural and cultural violence – that form the basis for the kind of violence we face every day. We should ask ourselves whether visible violence is not a reaction to those myriad traces of hidden violence.

7. The violence triangle of Johan Galtung

To determine the different forms of violence, we could start with the famous violence triangle created by the peace researcher Johan Galtung. Galtung distinguishes between three different levels of violence: direct or interpersonal violence in its different facets. Direct violence always involves an actor who – by design or not, in manifest or latent form – exerts physical or psychological violence. We are familiar with this form of violence, which can be experienced and studied empirically. Structural or indirect violence is quite different; there are no actors: *"nobody appears on the scene to harm somebody else directly; structural violence is inherent in the system and expresses itself in unequal power conditions and thus unequal chances in life."* (Galtung 1980, p. 9 ff.). Finally, there is also the concept of "cultural violence". By cultural violence, Galtung means any attributes of society that may be used to legitimise direct or structural violence. That form of violence neither kills nor cripples people, but it helps justify such acts (cf. Galtung 1990).

Our gender order exemplifies how Galtung's triangle of violence could be understood since this gender order is based on triple male dominance:

- (a) Direct or interpersonal violence would be equivalent to what the Australian feminist Elizabeth Grosz calls sexism: "Sexism resides in a series of individual or collective acts

of discrimination against women. There are a vast number of sexist behaviours ranging from pejorative, negative comments and assumptions about women, to their active exclusion from certain social spheres or activities, to conscious intimidation, harassment, and overt violence, including rape. Sexism is an empirical phenomenon. It is visible, designatable, material, a set of actions (including language) which treats women in unequal ways to men. It is thus the *unwarranted* differential treatment of the two sexes, to the benefit of one and at the expense of the other. (Grosz 149)

(b) Above and beyond any particular and concrete sexist acts, there is a structure which Grosz calls "*patriarchal*" and which is comparable to Galtung's idea of structural violence. This structure is characterised by the fact that it "systematically evaluates masculinity in positive and femininity in negative terms. Patriarchy is thus a structural mode of organization placing men and women in different positions in social, economic and interpersonal relations. It does not consist in empirical acts; it is a latent structure which makes possible and organizes these individual acts into systematic form, providing the context and the meaning(s) for sexist inequalities. It is for this reason that, even if all examples of sexism were removed, women's oppressed position would remain unchanged. This is made up of not only different, unequal treatment of the two sexes, but also of the different meanings and values accorded to the two sexes, even in cases where they behave in the same ways. What is considered forceful in men may be considered aggressive in women, even if they behave identically. Patriarchal structures are not immutable, but are historically variable, operating in specific ways in socio-geographically specific cultures; yet it always retains the primary commitment to upholding and maintaining male supremacy." (Grosz 149f.)

(c) And finally, Grosz's model also includes a form of cultural violence: "If sexism operates empirically and observably, and if patriarchy operates structurally, a third level of social misogyny can be discerned that is of major significance for those interested in the operation of theory, representations, and discursive systems. The proliferation of oppressive images and representations of women and the feminine is not entirely distinct from sexist or patriarchal power relations; each requires representational systems. This mode of oppression could be described as 'phallogentric'." (Grosz, 150)

What both Galtung and Grosz can tell us is the fact that the area of violence that can be studied and confirmed in empirical terms is only one portion of the phenomenon of violence. Television will always operate on the above three levels of violence. However, this does not mean that television presents these three levels in similar proportions. Rather, television is structured like a good detective story which, if it were to succeed, has to follow golden rules: Rule no. 19 says: "*All crimes in detective stories must be committed for personal motives. International conspiracies and war politics belong to another category of literature. [...] But a fine murder story must remain 'cosy'*" (Van Dine 1971, p. 147) In brief: individuality is the key. It is the bad guys that murder the good guys. Van Dine observes correctly that such murder stories remain „cosy“: there is a clear distinction between good and bad, villain and victim. There are no blurred borderlines, and the motives are absolutely clear. Everything is visible, i.e. on the surface. And every crime can be solved through meticulous following of

clues – and with the viewers' active involvement, as we have learned thanks to *Aktenzeichen XY ungelöst*.^{*} In fact, *Aktenzeichen XY ungelöst* is an example and model of this type of television. The programme's famous former anchor usually introduced his broadcast in the following way: "I would love to tell you something positive, but we live in a mean world where crime techniques are becoming increasingly violent." The films of the show all follow the same pattern: a world without crime, a family/individuals in harmony with themselves and their environment (the experienced viewers know: those are the victims). Crime befalls this peaceful world like a fateful blow and throws the victim(s) off their course.

8. Media violence and daily violence

Galtung's triangle of violence has the advantage that it highlights different forms of violence and does not limit violence to physical damage. The problem here is that, with his triangle of violence, Galtung interprets the notion of violence so excessively that everything tends to become violence. At the same time, violence is rated as something "*negative and abnormal*", something "*that must and can be avoided, prevented, abolished*" (Wimmer/Wulf/Dieckmann 1996, p.7). To talk about violence has thus always meant to take a stance. But we have to consider that to be against violence does not necessarily mean to espouse law and justice since law and justice themselves still resort to violence to be enforced. Moreover, being against violence does this mean being against any form of violence? Drawing borderlines often is more important than defining a concept in "positive" terms. Hence it is important to remember that there is no essential, natural definition of violence. Any violent behaviour is based on symbolic processes, assignment of meaning and assessment. This includes self-interpretations made by humans about themselves (cf. Wimmer/Wulf/Dieckmann 1996, p. 17).

If there is no violence per se, but if violence is interpreted as such through the meaning assigned to it, and if we deem such symbolic processing an active process of the individual through which the individual relates social interpretative patterns to own experiences, then the problem will not be media violence but rather the daily experiences of violence expressed through media depictions of violence. **TV images are only full of meaning through their articulation in the context of other violent images and violent experiences.**

If we talk of – young – people's identity and capacity to act, we have to ask ourselves whether the media and media violence will damage this identity. **I maintain that media violence, which is merged with experiences of daily violence, will limit people's options to act and fix their identities.** Damages are restrictions and fixations of one's own identity that will lead to (self)destructive acts.

9. The non-recognition of the other

When working on violence and experiences with violence, it seems to be appropriate to proceed in dialectic terms: using the concept of violence includes, first and foremost, a utopian moment and an ethical requirement which form the core of Emmanuel Lévinas's writings: the non-recognition of the other as an other is the beginning of any violence. As soon as we are talking of violence, we evoke the idea of undamaged life, of a right to happiness. It is in this sense that the notion of violence not only describes a certain reality but also intervenes in this reality. Secondly: "*Violence, in concrete terms, can only be qualified, assessed and evaluated as violence in the historical context of a socio-political situation.*" (Wimmer/Wulf/Dieckmann 1996, p. 37). Happiness or undamaged life, what they actually are, need concrete definitions. Otherwise, we only describe our longing for never-ending happiness and get around the requirement of changing concrete conditions in life.

* A crime investigation TV show on Austrian, German and Swiss TV

III. Proposals for media education

Even at the risk of nourishing the illusion of having concrete, immediately applicable recipes for media education, I would like to draw a number of conclusions from the above reformulations. True, they have to stand the test of practical application and be adjusted to practice. I consider this practice to be work that is evolving continuously, and I also and primarily consider it to be work on oneself which is indispensable for any form of teaching.

1. Why an analysis of the notion of violence is indispensable

A precondition for any media education is an accurate analysis of the notion of violence. Otherwise we would run the danger of duplicating those images of violence that are aired by television without asking what kind of violence this actually is, whether this form of violence is of importance to television consumers, how different forms of violence operate, what target their use has, etc. "Seduction" by images of violence is so great that we tend to take the visible for the whole.

In my opinion, analysing the concept of violence is in itself part of media education. If we ask about what violence is for me or you, which kind of violence is seen, what this has to do with my life (at school, at home), we confront images with our own experiences and get to the core of any media education.

2. Widen the capacity to act

Critical media education should not be of any moralising or prohibitive nature. It is by no means a "*prohibition-led education*" (Röll 1997, p. 163). Rather, it should initially focus on the identity routines of consumers with the objective of widening people's capacity to act. Television affects identity routines because, for the viewer, it opens up a space of myriad meanings, levels of might, forms of desire and fantasies. In this space, which could also be called an "in between" site, there is the place for identity formation, a place for projections, identifications, etc. (cf. Angerer 1995, p. 30 ff.). TV space is full of power and meaning for the process of identity formation since it is part of a discourse which identifies certain routines with certain meanings, bans or prescribes certain routines and highlights the individual acting within this space as a specific subject. In other words: consumers' experiences, which are always structured by different discourses, are essential for the impact TV images may have, what meaning they may get. A restricted capacity to act in this context primarily means fixing the meaning assigned; fixing on the visible, on the denotative function of the world of images; fixing of imagination; fixing of identification.

3. Media education as a narrative action

As Michel Certeau says, we create a transition from place to space through narrative action. Narrative action means to position oneself by recounting, talking about the film, confronting what happened in the film with own experiences; to ask: Who am I? What do I want? etc. Recounting, talking and questioning has a liberating function: when expressed, fixed stances become equivocal and uncertain: things could be different. This requires us to position ourselves. Positioning, taking a stance, thus means that we no longer occupy any position of power where we could talk from with certainty. Taking a stance is difficult, we become vulnerable, exposed. At the same time, this move means that we change from a – certain – place to an – ambiguous – space, that the boundary between strange and familiar ground is altered in dual terms. Firstly, this boundary will shift and may result in previously strange ground becoming familiar and previously familiar ground becoming strange. Secondly, the nature of the boundary itself will change: it will become unstable, porous, permeable, it will lose its border-type character. TV space is always also an identity space. However, it is now

no longer the space of an individual. Rather, subjectivity issues from the permanent exchange on routines which link up with each other and thus take on their meaning.

What is media education? It turns a TV place into a TV space – in dual terms:

- (a) It gives viewers a direction, a movement. I.e., viewing becomes an active act of questioning, of wanting to see otherwise and other things. "... and this precisely means seeing!" – "Do you know what you want?" For Friedrich Nietzsche (in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*, 1998, vol. 3, p. 307 f.) seeing is a matter of will: "*Haven't you ever had the fear of being incapable of recognising what is true? The fear of your senses being too blunt, and even your fine sense of seeing being much too coarse? If you would only realise what will is at work behind your seeing! For example, how you wanted to see more yesterday than another, how you want to see it otherwise today than the other, or how you long from the beginning to find agreement or the contrary of what has been believed to be found to date! Oh, those shameful desires! How often are you watching for the strong-looking, for the reassuring – because you are just tired!*"
- (b) Media education intensifies the curiosity of bystanders. Intensification is no quantitative multiplication but rather a qualitative growth. It works through articulation with other (non-TV) experiences. Intensification of a desire that unfolds in TV space means ramification of this desire into other spaces of experience.

4. Reality is what offends us

"The matter at issue is the confidence to consider reality on the basis of one's own assumptions." (Rathmayr 1996, p. 157). Reality is what offends us, Vilém Flusser once said. Media realities are so dangerous because we can no longer be put off by them, because they are the facts themselves which we subject ourselves to. This is how we should understand Rathmayr's invitation: "*What we need is a dramatic increase in the discussable [...]*" However, no more is being discussed because there is nothing offensive any more. It is what it is. This may result in a hardly enunciative aggressiveness which is not the consequence of the world of media images but of television as such. Likewise, such aggressiveness may be the repeatedly felt inability to get offended. The aggressiveness of "it is what it is" refers to the inescapableness of daily life. This is where we experience impotent violence. Films from the late 1960s and early 1970s convey some of the freedom of "nothing needs to be as it is", of the feeling that "everything is negotiable".

Media education will increase the discussable. How? By showing that television is fixed on the visible and thus creates a gigantic area of the invisible. Invisible are: questions we are no longer able to ask; correlations we miss but which hold the images together. **In media education we always have to be aware that what is being shown must not be taken for what it appears to be.** The insistent question in (media) education is: couldn't it be otherwise? Couldn't it be shown otherwise? Why this picture with that text? Why is crime always introduced by music in *Aktenzeichen XY*? What is the function of music and editing? And so on.

5. Does violence make sense?

To prevent violence from being repeated is the task of media education. This means: *To give violence no reason, no sense whatsoever.*" (Wimmer/Wulf/Dieckmann 1996, p. 60). We should try and understand Rambo, too, a student said about the action hero. Should we? Doesn't such an attempt illustrate our incapacity for analysis? An incapacity that keeps us from going beyond the given. This would trap us within the kind of impotence Rambo experienced (in fiction, though) and from which he could only liberate himself by an act of violence that seemed to give him back his sovereignty ...

6. Making violence visible

In conclusion, let me cite Siegfried Kaltenecker (1996, p. 8): the uncovering of hidden violence, the "*policy of visibility*", is the foremost task of media education. However, visibility is not achieved without effort. It is hard work – the work of deconstruction. This is, as Jacques Derrida is not weary of maintaining, a political strategy.

References:

Gunew, Sneja (ed.): Feminist knowledge. Routledge: London&New York 1990, 147-174.