“By exploring screen representations of boys, this ambitious collection addresses a little-researched area in gender studies. Given cinema’s occlusion with boyhood, what does the coming-of-age narrative reveal about the process of becoming a man? The anthology approaches this question in an admirably multifaceted way, analyzing films from different historical eras and nations with attention to the issues of race, ethnicity, and sexuality that make portraits of boyhood so complex and so important to studies of masculinity.”

—Barbara Klinger, Indiana University

“This sprawling collection of essays does well to focus our attention on the range of tough guys, teeen-boys, and chronic masturbators that populate the contemporary teen film. What makes Where the Boys Are so worthwhile is the picture it gives us of the global male teenager—boys from the South Bronx to Scotland meandering in all their heartless, heartbreaking glory.”

—Jon Lewis, Oregon State University, author of The Road to Romance and Ruin: Teen Films and Youth Culture

“As the originality, richness, and diversity of the films treated and the perspectives elaborated testify, Where the Boys Are makes an important contribution, applying recent advances in cultural studies and feminist methodology to a corpus that has not received systematic scrutiny.”

—Thomas Waugh, Concordia University, Montreal, author of The Romance of Transgression in Canada: Sexualities, Moving Images, Nations
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I get bored sometimes
when people tell me to act my age.
Sometimes I act a lot older than I am—
I really do—
but people never notice it.

J. D. SALINGER, The Catcher in The Rye
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Looking away from Joseph, to preserve his integrity, for a longer look, Potiphar's wife sees Joseph's pious nature. Her look, coupled with a possible realization of her own guilt, provides the perspective of the story of Abraham and Isaac. Astonishingly, the song states that Isaac might have some degree of consciousness as his father is about to sacrifice him.

You who still believe in death to sacrifice these children.

As time goes by, it makes a difference.

When we look at the beliefs of those in primitive times, the ideas of every tribe look back from Isaac before he is about to slit his own throat, an avenged glance that saves the boy's life.

God spoke to him from heaven and said, "Abraham!"

Abraham?" he exclaimed. "It is I who have made you rich. For your sake I will do this, that my covenant will be assured between me and you and your descendants after you, and that your descendants will possess the land of Canaan, the land that I gave Abraham our ancestor."

(Deuteronomy 29:10-14)

This verse provides a powerful voice within the film industry. Media executives, who have witnessed the success of 

L.L.E. and Harry Reems's The Reckless Lives of the (1974), a film that explores the sexuality of their Jewish boy protagonist, for a number of years. "I believe that the sexuality of our Jewish boy protagonist, for a number of years, has been a great deal of controversy."

The moment is a key instance in which one does not look away from this boy, but looks at him. For even I know that he is the son of God. You have killed a child caught in sin from Him, and God will see what you have done. God will see what you have done."

(Deuteronomy 21:5)

He knows that he has killed a child caught in sin from Him, and God will see what he has done. God will see what he has done.

God will see what he has done.

And he runs from her gaze.
behavior. While I, Lee, depicts a relationship between a pedophile and a ten-year-old boy, it hardly depicts this relationship in the same way. "Love" focuses on the present and the future, whereas "I, Lee" focuses on the past and the present. The former is a more direct, literal representation of the tale of a boy and his relationships, while the latter is more abstract and symbolic. The former is more realistic, while the latter is more fantastical. The former uses a more straightforward narrative, while the latter uses more complex and layered storytelling. The former is more focused on the characters' experiences, while the latter is more focused on the themes and ideas. In summary, while both films use similar elements, they use them in different ways to achieve different effects and to tell different stories.
According to young Danny, God does not ask Abraham to sacrifice Isaac on Mount Moriah as a test of faith, but as a show of God’s power. "God says, 'Do you know how powerful I am?" Danny concludes. After the sacrifice, "his father simply comes back."

Appearing thirty minutes into the film, this flashback sequence is presented later in the film. That is, the film briefly presents Danny’s father as important, but then the film’s focus shifts to other characters. The film’s narrative is centered on the tragic loss of Danny’s father, and his subsequent adoption by a Canadian couple. Danny’s relationship with his father is a central theme of the film, and his father’s death is a pivotal moment in the story. The film ends with Danny’s adoption by his new family, and his subsequent happy life in Canada.

In the film, Danny’s relationship with his father is portrayed as a loving and supportive one. Danny admires his father and often seeks his advice and guidance. The film also highlights the importance of family and the impact of a supportive family on a child’s life. Danny’s relationship with his father is a central theme of the film, and his father’s death is a pivotal moment in the story. The film ends with Danny’s adoption by his new family, and his subsequent happy life in Canada.

The film’s narrative is centered on the tragic loss of Danny’s father, and his subsequent adoption by a Canadian couple. The film’s focus shifts to other characters, and its narrative is driven by the personal struggles and emotional turmoil of its characters. The film’s themes include family, love, loss, and the challenges of growing up.

In conclusion, the film is a powerful and moving exploration of the human experience. It is a story about the importance of family, the impact of loss, and the struggles of growing up. The film is a testament to the power of storytelling and the ability of cinema to capture the human experience in a powerful and moving way.
and the viewer’s consciousness. To understand how both of these "themes of the Jew" have been handled in the context of this story, one should first locate Dancy Daniel’s script and cinematic vision amid the broader tapestry of American assimilation and Jewish immigration culture. Thus, the challenge is to explore the tensions and at times hostile exchange between American assimilation and Jewish immigration culture. This is achieved through the dramatic production of Elmer Hill’s "Jewish Boy," a teleplay first presented on radio in 1941. Its reception was significant because it was one of the first Jewish-themed plays to achieve widespread radio broadcast and to exploit the drama of assimilation and immigration. "Jewish Boy" explores the complexities of Jewish identity and teaches assimilation at the same time. It must be seen in the context of the simultaneous popularization of the Haggadah (a paper on the Purim holiday) and the unprecedented success of the "Jewish" film industry. While "Jewish Boy" is not overtly religious in its exploration of the semi-biography of Alexander, it is part of the larger tension between assimilation and Jewish culture. As the characters move through the process of assimilation, they are forced to decide how to balance their Jewish identity with the demands of American culture.

The narrative of "Jewish Boy" is complex and nuanced, exploring the internal conflicts and external pressures faced by the characters. It is a story of struggle, identity, and choice. The characters must decide whether to remain true to their Jewish heritage or to assimilate into American culture. This tension is further highlighted by the character of Alexander, who is forced to choose between his Jewish identity and his American identity. The story is a reflection of the broader cultural and historical context of the time, and it continues to resonate with audiences today.

In "Jewish Boy," the characters must confront the pressures of assimilation, both from within and without. They must decide whether to embrace American culture or to hold onto their Jewish heritage. The story is a powerful exploration of the challenges faced by Jews in America, and it continues to be relevant today. It is a story of resilience, identity, and the struggle to find a place in a world that is often hostile to Jews. Ultimately, "Jewish Boy" is a story of hope and redemption, a tale of courage and determination. It is a story that reminds us of the importance of maintaining our cultural heritage while also embracing the values of the主流社会.
The interplay of glances in L.I.E. counting money, from Gary’s point of view.

Gary eroticized in a reverse shot before L.I.E. establishes Howie’s point of view.

a dream state and grainy, overexposed fantasies of Gary. The Believer establishes Danny as a hapless voyeur who discovers his lover Carla Moebius (Summer Phoenix) making love to her mother’s boyfriend (Billy Zane). In both films, however, the depiction of these erotic bodies ultimately “clawes back” the boy’s sexuality, reenacting extremely traditional themes of patriarchy and heterosexism. In Eros and the Jews, David Biale (1997) locates a long-standing tension dating back to biblical times that wrestles between the polarities of sexual pleasure and procreation. L.I.E. and The Believer operate very much between these poles, acknowledge-

ing that the Jewish boy has both sexual potency and sexual appeal. Yet the films domesticate this desire—the boy’s and the audience’s—ultimately asserting normative depictions of heterosexual and familial roles. Howie’s sexual advances are ultimately channeled into a “proper” father-son relationship. Danny’s hypersexual rage ultimately transforms him into a “Jewish father.”

L.I.E. explicitly establishes Howie’s sexual desire through a set of subjective, shot/reaction shot sequences. The first of these occurs when Howie and the boys rob a suburban home. Part of a longer, rapidly edited sequence, a close-up from Gary’s point of view shows him counting twenty-dollar bills. The next medium shot shows a shirtless Gary wearing a pearl necklace. The sequence cuts back to the close-up of the twenty-dollar bills, but this time the camera tilts up and rack focuses on the confused Howie as he literally stumbles into, and assumes, the subject position from which he and the audience have been gazing upon the stimulating Gary.

This moment in the film proves critical, for it establishes both Howie’s sexual desire and the ambiguity of this desire. Without providing an initially identifiable subject position from which to gaze upon Gary, the sequence both justifies and obscures its eroticism. Once Howie enters, the point of view shifts from Gary’s perspective to Howie’s perspective. The film thus partly anchors the erotic image of pubeitous Gary to Howie’s desire. Having eroticized Gary before Howie enters, however, the film destabilizes the possibility that the palpal desire for Gary belongs centrally to Howie; it is a desire clearly present for us yet not originating with any identifiable character—until Howie is suddenly identified.

Even once the sequence does establish the subjectivity of Howie’s eroticized gaze at Gary, the film still obscures Howie’s desire through a series of shots in which Gary looks directly at the camera, but Howie glances offscreen. After the film establishes Howie’s subject position, the film cuts back to the medium shot of a shirtless Gary, this time with him looking up and into the camera. A subsequent cut to an extreme close-up of Gary shows him putting his finger up to his lips and again looking directly into the camera, a gesture that implies not just secrecy but highly charged sexuality. The stark lighting contrast with minimal fill light on one side of Gary’s face creates deep shadows, which reinforce the ambiguity of the shot. After the next cut, a medium close-up of
Howie watches Gary after literally stumbling into the shot. Note the slightly off-screen glance.

Howie looks away before he returns to looking at Gary, and then with his eyes cast slightly off camera.

Gary catches Howie, and us, with a direct glance.

A jumpcut to a close-up eroticizes Gary, but from whose point of view?

Howie shows him looking toward Gary, but not directly into the camera. Howie briefly looks screen left, then returns to his off-screen glance. In a subsequent close-up, Gary once again looks directly at the camera and smiles. While L.I.E. leaves open the possibility for both Howie and the audience to desire Gary, the film does not allow for an expression of Howie's desire through an explicit definition of the gaze upon Gary as being Howie's gaze. It does not, then, fully permit Howie to express his own desire. One can look upon Gary looking directly at the camera because he is the object of desire, but while the film does not deny the possibility of that desire as coming from Howie, neither does the film depict this desire as explicitly belonging to him.

Of course, the homoerotic desire for Gary occurs within a range of sexualities depicted in L.I.E. The voiceover director's audio commentary on the DVD of the film reinforces the preferred ambiguity of a gaze that eroticizes Gary as an object of desire, while simultaneously obscuring the origins of that desire. After robbing the house, the still shirtless Gary wears a stolen fur as the four boys walk together. "It's not about homo- or homosexuality," Michael Cuesta explains, regarding the presence of the fur coat. "It's about sensuality." For Cuesta, the coat has to do with the general sensuality of pop culture and Jim Morrison's appearance on an album cover, and not specifically with any gay sensibility. However, the scene has everything to do with heterosexuality, since it eroticizes not just Gary, but a way of looking—and not looking—at Gary. This looking and not looking persists throughout the film. The audience...
an exploration regarding other Danny's sexuality or his religious identity. Yet the two seem mutually exclusive. Danny believes that all Jews are essentially female, then he believes Jews are usually sexually attracted to other Jews. He also believes the Holocaust survivors who were repeatedly raped and killed by the Germans had a male body, and their bodies were never exposed. The film suggests that the Jew's body does not own an authentic presence or identity, but is instead a construct imposed upon the Jew by the Nazis. The film's portrayal of the Jew's body as a sexual object is consistent throughout its narrative, and this is a significant factor in its portrayal of Jewish identity. 

Danny's identity as a Jew is shaped by his encounters with the Holocaust survivors. He is a survivor of the Holocaust, and his experiences with other survivors shape his understanding of identity and sexuality. His interactions with other survivors suggest a link between hidden Jewish identity and hidden identity of other survivors. However, the film does not explore the extent to which Danny's identity as a survivor is shaped by these interactions. Instead, the film focuses on Danny's personal struggles and his efforts to come to terms with his identity as a survivor. 

The film's portrayal of Jewish identity is significant in that it challenges traditional notions of identity and sexuality. It suggests that identity is not fixed, but is constantly evolving and changing. It also suggests that identity is not defined by one's biological sex, but by one's experiences and interactions with others. Danny's experiences with other survivors suggest that identity is not singular, but is instead a construction of multiple narratives and experiences. 

The film's portrayal of Jewish identity is also significant in that it challenges traditional notions of identity and sexuality. It suggests that identity is not fixed, but is constantly evolving and changing. It also suggests that identity is not defined by one's biological sex, but by one's experiences and interactions with others. Danny's experiences with other survivors suggest that identity is not singular, but is instead a construction of multiple narratives and experiences.
homoeroticism and potential critiques of heterosexuality and identity politics. Yet both films also recall a much older, unresolved tension. Rather than directly address the possibility of young Jewish male desire, the films leave this desire inscrutable and unknown. Like the story of Abraham and Isaac, the potential for rape and for threats is stayed and, however temporarily, the law of the father restored. The sexual ambiguities and potential for violence that L.I.E. and The Believer recover for modern-day audiences make both of these films unique, if not comparatively radical in their insistence upon ambiguity. Yet neither film can emerge from the "clawback" of the emphasis upon the father, whose presence remains as persistent as his own transvestism. And the sexuality of the Jewish boy, remaining unseen, unexamined, and unconfronted, can only, in the end, be imagined, dreamed, or invented—in a fantasy that grows ever more exploitative and unreal.
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THE FEMINIZATION AND VICTIMIZATION OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN ATHLETE IN BOYZ N THE HOOD, COOLEY HIGH, AND CORNBREAD, EARL AND ME

Charlene Regester

Cinematic representations of black male camaraderie have occupied the center of discourse on black life over a period of nearly twenty years, in part because of mass appeal, in part because of the ability of these representations to generate crossover audiences, and in part because of their level of authenticity in revealing the fragility of black life. Three films that have most effectively presented the struggles of young black males are Cooley High, Cornbread, Earl and Me (both 1975) and Boyz N the Hood (1991). As representations of youthful black male camaraderie, these films collectively foreground the black male athlete and his tragic circumstances, exploring inner city life and its influences on the fate of the black male and displacing onto a young black male victim the larger sociopolitical dilemma of crime, poverty, and disenfranchisement.

In these three films, young black athletes systemically die, rendered passive victims somewhat in the manner of the femme fatale. This essay examines how these films feminize the black athletic boy and set his victimization at a moment just prior to his arriving at maturity. Death is used narratively as a signifier of the transcendence adolescent boys must achieve in their struggle to reach adulthood. Despite dissimilarities within the plots of these films, the same story is ultimately reconstructed in all three of them. Over a twenty-year time span, in three separate films, black male adolescents are shown as unavoidably unable to escape their tragic plight as they are targeted for victimization.
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