

# **Male Daft Bodies: Camping on YouTube**

---

Pavlos Kountouriotis

# Male Daft Bodies: Camping on YouTube

---

Pavlos Kountouriotis

Youtube, the most famous video-sharing website nowadays, has often been assimilated to a “Vaudevillian” stage, because of the variety and the short length of the pieces. Another characteristic that Youtube shares with Vaudeville is that both are a place where issues disturbing identity, gender and sexuality emerge (Young, 2007). Yet it has not received enough attention by the academia.

In this essay I would like to approach two videos posted on Youtube by user King Julien. In my analysis of these two videos, I will employ a Camp theory perspective. I do not imply that these videos are necessarily Camp in the strict sense of the term (*if* such a strict sense really exists), but I believe that such an analysis could help us to discover things that we wouldn't otherwise be able to see.

## 1. Introduction

Therefore, I consider imperative to define how I read the notion of “Camp” before going any further or differently said what are the aspects and characteristics of a Camp object ? Traditionally, Camp is associated to effeminate homosexual men. But in Literature, “Camp” has most of the times been employed to mean something else than “a swishy little boy with peroxidized hair, dressed in a picture hat and a feather boa, pretending to be Marlene Dietrich” (Isherwood, 1954, 51). As Isherwood (1954) mentions, but never went into detail, Camp is

“something much more fundamental”(51). Susan Sontag (1964) explains that

While it is not true that Camp taste is homosexual taste, there is no doubt a peculiar affinity and overlap. But all liberals are Jews but Jews have shown a peculiar affinity for liberal and reformist causes. [...] Nevertheless, even though homosexuals have been its vanguard, Camp taste is much more than homosexual taste. One feels that if homosexuals hadn't more or less invented Camp, someone else would. (64)

Sontag has been attacked for her stance when arguing against the gayness of Camp. Gere (2001) considers that “she is not only dishonoring, but disempowering gay men” (361) and Meyer (1994) argued that her version of Camp:

with its homosexual connotations downplayed, sanitized, and made safe for public consumption,[...] removed, or at least minimized, the connotations of homosexuality. Sontag killed off the binding referent of Camp- the Homosexual- and the discourse began to unravel as Camp became confused and conflated with rhetorical and performative strategies such as irony, satire, burlesque, and travesty: and with cultural movements as Pop. (7)

However, a big amount of literature has disembarked from the idea that Camp is a strictly homosexual sensibility. Booth (1983) clarifies that “while it may be true that many homosexuals are Camp, only a small proportion of people who exhibit symptoms of Camp behavior are homosexuals” (70) . And Core (1984) goes further stating:

I do not posit homosexuality as requisite for Camp: quite the contrary. Camp is most obvious to me in a homosexual context, but I perceive it in heterosexuals as well, and in the sexless professionalism of many careers.” (81)

This list of literature distancing or freeing Camp from male homosexuality could go on for quite a long time. From my research, however, on Camp literature, I have noted that the common denominator of all these theorists, even those believing that Camp is a homosexual sensibility, is that nearly all of them speak from a queer studies<sup>1</sup> or a feminist perspective. In other words, Camp has always been studied as an issue of gender and sexuality. What I suggest here is to pacify, at least for the purpose of this article, the opposing views on Camp

---

<sup>1</sup> And queer studies does not necessarily mean homosexual studies.

by perceiving camp as a Queer sensibility, not strictly homosexual though.

What are then the characteristics of Camp as perceived above? Or differently put, what is it that makes something Campy?

First of all, Camp is “the love of the exaggerated, the ‘off’, of things-being-what-they-are-not”; “the hallmark of Camp is the spirit of extravagance” (Sontag, 1964, 56). Furthermore, Campy behavior or performance draws from a character and continuously repeat these characteristics probably in an exaggerated manner. Sontag (1964) mentions that “Camp is the glorification of ‘character’” (60).

What Camp taste responds to is ‘instant character’ [...] and conversely what is not stirred by is the sense of the development of character. Character is understood as a state of continual incandescence- a person being one, very intense thing. This attitude toward character is a key element of the theatricalization of experience embodied in the Camp sensibility. [...] Wherever there is development of character, Camp is reduced. (61)

And this stylization, this insistence to character means that the person who is campy is serious about this personification, he or she really believes in it and is passionate about his/her character . Susan Sontag(1964) expounds:

In naïve, or pure, Camp, the essential element is seriousness, a seriousness that fails. Of course, not all seriousness that fails can be redeemed as Camp. Only that which has the proper mixture of the exaggerated, the fantastic, the passionate, and the naïve. (59)

In fact, this seriousness is so much, indeed *too* much, that it fails to be taken seriously altogether. This failure takes place in the moment where the real identity emerges within and because of the passionate devotion to the character. As Core (1984) argues, “Camp is a lie that tells the truth” (81). And I believe that it is this enlightening potential that we are seeking to see when in a theatron. Camp has, thus an innocent sincere quality that is both refreshing and witty. According to Sontag (1964):

Camp taste is kind of love, love for human nature. It relishes, rather than judges, the little triumphs and awkward intensities of ‘character’ ... Camp taste identifies with what is enjoying. People who share this sensibility are not laughing at the thing they label as ‘Camp’, they are enjoying it. Camp is a tender feeling. (65)

## **2. Background**

Having defined in general terms the sensibility of Camp and before going into describing and analyzing the *Male Daft Bodies* videos by King Julien, I think we should have a look at the history behind. *Hands: Harder, Better, Faster, Stronger* is a videodance made by user

“FreckleStudios”, a white young American male who joined Youtube on November 2006 and added this video eight months later on June 6<sup>th</sup> 2007. The title of the video comes from the song that is featuring in the video and that is called “Harder, Better, Faster, Stronger” by Daft Punk. When the video begins, we watch two clenched fists palms facing the camera. After a long opening watching the fists wriggle and jig, words or fragments of words written on the surface of the exterior, interior and side of the palms and the fingers are revealed. The words appear in perfect sync with the lyrics revealing some very smart and complex choreographic combinations for hands. These combinations are dictated by a concept similar to “lip-syncing”, the only difference being that the fingers and parts of the hands are now the skilled performers instead of the lips. In 2006 Anderson writes : “Fortunately, amateur lip-syncing has—like other secret arts of the bedroom—been liberated by the Web. YouTube is a clearinghouse of virtual nonsinging.”

This video soon became a featured video and in one or two months it had received more than 2 million views. Today, it has been watched 21,480,163<sup>2</sup> times in its original link. If we add up to this number visits to other websites hosting this video the number exceeds by far the tickets the best and most popular dance company has ever been able to sell for one performance. From then on more than a thousand videos<sup>3</sup> have been posted online, trying to imitate different aspects of the original or imitate the imitations.

The *Daft Hands* explosion can perhaps be more clearly understood by exploring its relation to theory of memes. Richard Dawkins, the zoologist and evolutionary scientist, introduced the “meme” concept in his 1976 book, *The Selfish Gene*, to signify a “unit of cultural information transferable from one mind to another.” A meme is thought to operate similarly to



genes (thus the derivation of the word) by propagating itself as a unit through cultural evolution and diffusion. The term “Internet meme” has been formulated to explain memes that are spread through the Internet, and once Internet memes have gained enough popularity to be recognized beyond the Internet community, they become “Internet phenomenon” (Wikipedia, Internet meme). According to this terminology, the *Daft Hands*

---

<sup>2</sup> Visited on July 3<sup>rd</sup> 2008.

<sup>3</sup> Approximate number after a research on the videos with the specific terms “Daft Hands” and “Daft Bodies” in quotation marks.

began as a posting on YouTube, which then transformed into an Internet meme when most members of that site became familiar with this video and especially when the *Daft Bodies*, an adapted to the whole body imitation by two young ladies, was posted. *Daft Bodies* began being copied in the virtual but also in the non-virtual world in events such as talent, dance or lip-syncing competitions, parties etc, it metamorphosed into a veritable Internet phenomenon. Memes are viral and propagate around sometimes being subject to mutation, crossover and adaptation (Daily Meme), precisely the manner in which the Daft Bodies has spread. Memes can either be parodies or pastiche. Jameson in his seminal article *Postmodernism and Consumer Society* (1983) distinguishes between the two:

Parody [...] produce[s] an imitation, which mocks the original. I won't say that the satiric impulse is conscious in all forms of parody: in any case, a good or great parodist has to have some secret sympathy for the original, just as a great mimic has to have the capacity to put himself/herself in the place of the person imitated. Still, the general effect of parody is - whether in sympathy or with malice - to cast ridicule on the private nature of these stylistic mannerisms and their excessiveness and eccentricity with respect to the way people normally speak or write. [...] Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar or unique style, the wearing of a stylistic mask, speech in a dead language: but it is a neutral practice of such mimicry, without parody's ulterior motive, without the satirical impulse, without laughter, without that still latent feeling that there exists something *normal* compared with which what is being imitated is rather comic. Pastiche is blank parody, parody that has lost its sense of humor.”(114)

Accordingly, *Daft Bodies*, added 5 months after *Daft Hands*, is a pastiche of the original because it refuses to comment or parodize the original version. *Daft Bodies* is not just a copy of the original version but it is the full body version of the *Daft Hands*, it is the very first pastiche of our research, or as its creator says “*Daft Hands* with a twist”<sup>4</sup>. The analogies of the videos are based on the binary hands-bodies and are very apparent:

- The *two* fists are substituted by the bodies of the *two* girls. From Hands syncing to Body syncing.
- The combination of the two fists to form some words now becomes a combination of the two bodies of the girls.
- The nudity of the skin of the fists to allow space for words to be inscribed on the surface remains in the *Daft Bodies* version with the girls wearing black underwear.
- The minimalist aspect of the original piece, which extrudes any expression of feelings

---

<sup>4</sup> As written on the video description on YouTube

and emotions in order to convey the concept, is kept in the second version by using foil papered boxes covered on their heads. And these boxes might also refer to the characteristic robotic voice of the song and also to the usual appearance of the Daft Punk singing duet as two aliens playing music for the humans.

- and many more.

With this version, however, the body and its performative social and cultural significance become prevalent. Latika Young notices that:

Internet users are no longer merely confined to confronting issues of identity online with words (either written or verbal), they can now investigate and craft their own embodied moving (video) explorations precisely in the realm where these questions are most tangible—the body itself. (1) [...] What this suggests, then, is that the Internet *really is* creating a space where blended identities—where notions of gender, sexuality, class, age and ethnicity all intersect with dance as situated in the body--can exist (12)

For this reason, I would like to proceed further in the chain of imitations and analyze two specific pastiches of the *Daft Bodies*, called *Daft Punk Harder Bodies (Male version)* and *Daft Punk Harder Bodies Single Male Version*. My analysis of these two copies of a copy, will embark on the notion of Camp as perceived above. Through my description, I will try to see if aspects of the Camp sensibility, such as gender performance, exaggeration, failure, pathos, naivety etc- can be read in the videos. As I have already mentioned, I do not consider these videos to necessarily be Campy. But reading them through Camp theory, I believe we can discover different aspects of the videos.

### 3. Male Daft Bodies

*Daft Punk Harder Bodies (Male Version) Harder Better Faster* was added on February 2008. From the title already we read that the bodies are going to “harder” and that this is a male version. Just before the dance begins, the video starts with some introduction titles.

“First of all, we would like to congratulate the two cute girls of the original version, HARD WORK GIRLS, it was easier for us, although it was tough, it was just to make a ‘male version’, BIG KISS”.

Thereafter 4 more titles appear with the names of the dancers and director: “K. Square”, “Jay 2” read as “Jay Jay” and “King Julien”.

The role of these titles apart from giving a reference to the original and introducing the names of the performers is also a performance of gender and sexuality. From the very

beginning we might guess that they are two heterosexual men attracted to girls because they consider them “cute”. Their names are not their real ones, but they use nicknames. As Vivianne de Klerk and Barbara Bosch (1996) have pointed out in their quantitative research “conventions regarding nickname coinage and usage are intimately connected to the gender of bearers and users, and the following trends emerged.” (288) Nicknames, accordingly, are employed in order for the person to be identified within a certain desired sex role stereotype. Before trying to guess and unpick what their nicknames might refer to or how they are perceived and interpreted by the spectator, we need to take a closer look at the used font. The font of the nicknames looks like a graffiti with strong references to the graffiti sub cultural practice. Nancy Mc Donald (2005), in her book *The Graffiti Subculture: Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London*, forges a link between subcultural practice and identity construction, explaining that young men use graffiti to construct masculinity and claim power. In that sense graffiti style font is a means for performing masculinity, heterosexuality and power. Indeed, the one of the two men, King Julien, announces himself as having some sort of supremacy and power, decisively fitting in the heterosexual standard stereotype. But the nickname of the other performer, Jay Jay, is not so easily identifiable. For me, a young white homosexual, the name Jay Jay could either be Jay Jay Johanson, the singer most welcome by gay audiences who features also in the *Queer as Folk* soundtrack, or Jay Jay the Jet Plane, a colorful cartoon adventure of a jet plane and his friends planes addressed to younger kids. In any case, whether my associations are correct or not, we can agree that there is certain playfulness inherently in the name either because of the repetition of this bisyllabic name, either because of the written mode as “Jay 2”. This playfulness is atypical, odd, almost queer of the masculine stereotype. Moreover Wierzbicka (1992) explains that bisyllabic name are typical for enhancing femininity in women (with the “diminutive” ending, such as Debbie or Lindy, instead of Deb or Lin)” whereas “masculinity appears to inhere in the short CVC [consonant- vowel- consonant] structure of many (male) nicknames such as Bob or Bill, and many female names are typically bisyllabic (228). Therefore, we could say that the name Jay Jay is already a disturbance and a failure of the hyper- masculinity of the graffiti font.

After the frame opens in the internal of a small room with white walls, probably a bedroom, one after the other, the two male dancers enter the space with a smile on their lips that predisposes the spectator that something exciting is soon going to happen. The right one is wearing his boxers, the left one an athletic, lycra type, shorts by adidas with three stripes on the side. The walk is slow, lazy-looking. Once they are both inside the frame, they both take off their t-shirts whilst their nude well-shaped, smooth and muscular bodies prick the eye and titillate the spectator. The right dancer is dancing with his pelvis projected to the front as an



erotic invitation. Their gaze remains fixated to the camera, as if they are looking at each individual audience member, make us feel that this striptease is a personal pleasure. Their way



to take off their pants- in order for them not to lose their balance, they diminish the range of their movement and appear more concentrated and serious - shows the awkwardness and dorkiness of their dance, giving an element of failure in this well rehearsed strip tease game. But they will soon perk up with the throwing of the clothes out of frame, maybe to the

space where the audience is sitting and watching. The last boundary of space has been broken. They now approach the camera, we feel their proximity, we wonder what they will do to us. Can we touch them? They soon pick up their glasses to remind to us that they did not come closer for us. They play with our desires. They wear the glasses, but in comparison to the girls' foil covered boxes, the glasses do not hide the face. They enhance even more the image of a sexual act. An overt image of "cool". They turn their backs to us in order to show some text written. But it is not 'DAFT' and 'PUNK', as in the case of the two girls. In their case it is their nicknames written on their back. This is the most overt effort to make us identify them with a specific identity: the one that the nicknames impose.

When they start showing the words one by one, their movements are clear, sharp, strong. The sharpness of the movement and rhythm and the bigger letters might, by and large, interpret the choreographic concept cleaner than the 'girls'. But the exaggeration of their masculinity alters the minimalist character of the piece. The societal imposed gender stereotypes and their performance become more prevalent than the mere illustration of words written on the skin surface. The left dancer uses even more muscles than needed and the visual result is a compact, stiff and overtly muscular body. When he performs the word "stronger", he shows the word written on the external part of his arm, flexing his biceps. This flexion of muscle and its pose does not serve so much to illustrate the word but more importantly the meaning of the word. The choreography is now starting to work on a more

literal level. Their gaze remains fixated to the camera. They are not allowed to look at each other<sup>5</sup>.

Ramsey Burt (2007), speaking about the prejudicial association between male dancers and homosexuality, explains that this excess of muscular strength can easily be explained by the fact that “hyper-masculine display [...] sometimes naturalizes aggression and violence as dancers try to show that they are not effeminate, where ‘effeminate’ is a code word for homosexual” (11). This macho show off as an “effeminophobic” attitude (367-368) is doomed to fail, however, not because of their inability in balancing and coordinating but because as one YouTube user, WhoDoVooDo (2008), illuminates “two dudes cannot dance together without looking gay anymore.”. The mere existence of two semi naked young men in a private room troubles the heterosexual and homosocial norms. In order for them to manage to be together in the same space, they have invented a device of performing ignorance of the other. They never look at each other. No eye contact is allowed; no intimate relationship can be shown on this video. And this homophobic action of disregarding the other on the one hand exaggerates even more their desire to be identified as macho heterosexual men, and on the other hand reveals more and more the failure to be identified as such because of the weakness and insecurity they feel in front of the potentials of a nude male body. consider for a second their clothing. Even that disturbs this show of hyper masculinity. The right one is wearing his boxers, the left one an athletic, lycra type, shorts by adidas with three stripes on the side probably because he feels uncomfortable being with his underwear next to his friend and in front of a camera. Prudent his action might be, it is even more bothering to wonder: where does he usually wear such a short shorts? In the gym when lifting weight or performing hundreds of abdominals? Such an outfit clearly disturbs the stereotypical dress-code of the heterosexual guy. I think that Core’s (1984) description of what Camp might be is really appropriate here: “Camp is a lie that tells the truth” (81). They are a lying when they are saying they are macho, strong fearless men. But they are telling the truth with their awkwardness, exaggeration, pathos, naivety and seriousness. Susan Sontag (1964), on her *Camp Notes*, states that “there is seriousness in Camp (seriousness in the degree of the artist’s involvement) and, often, pathos” (62). And goes on to explain why naivety is important in Camp.

Pure Camp is always naïve. Camp (‘camping’) which knows itself to be camp is less satisfying [...] Probably intending to be campy is harmful. (58)

---

<sup>5</sup> In fact just when they make the first movement to take off their t-shirts they look at each other, but this look is more of an encouragement and because they are still dressed. When semi-naked, their relationship changes.

In the faster tempo, the right dancer enters the rhythm and illustrates more dancery the temporarily tattooed words. We almost forget the existence of words and the choreography becomes a clear disco dance of a repetitive character. The left one seems to find it harder to accept this freedom to dance. This rigidity on keeping the danciness to the minimum makes it more difficult for him to keep his balance. There is an excess of muscular power and a subsequent lack in balance and coordination. They never look at each other on the video. In all that however there is an inner look for concentration, a passion and a devotion. “Without passion, one gets pseudo-Camp- what is merely decorative, safe, in a word, chic.” (Sontag, 1964, 59)

In the end they only give each other a high five and a strong handgrip. They have a tough look of success but no sentimental elevation for their accomplishment. They still continue performing their overmasculine characters trying to give us the impressions that this gender performance will continue also behind the camera.

Two months later, King Julien decides to make a video on his own. The new video is called *Daft Punk Harder Bodies Single Male Version*. It begins in the same way with introduction titles, same fonts and same music. After that, we see the same space, same light, same angle.

In this one however, King Julien persistently doesn't look to the camera. He might sometimes look at the screen to see his reflection. If the whole video seems less sexy this time it is because the choreography has now become a narcissistic action. He no longer tries to tease us but to show off. We are not allowed to be involved in this moment. But when he approaches the camera to take his glasses, a smile pervades his face that breaks the performance of the macho stereotype.

He wears his glasses. His movement is heavier, it seems as if he does not want to move, he is afraid of the excessive dance. We witness his awkwardness on the moment. Sometimes he smiles, he can't stop it. Doyle talking about Vanessa Beercroft's *U.S. NAVY* installation in San Diego Museum of Contemporary Art, writes: “By all accounts the most interesting part of this event was the visibility of the difficulty the men had maintaining a straight face” (86). It is exactly this difficulty that provokes stage fright and makes the performance more and more interesting, because these are the moments when we can see a more real identity of the performer, it is a less violent representation (Ridout, 2007). The smile could be either because he knows what his approach can cause to the spectator or because of embarrassment for dancing all alone in front of a device, or for many other reasons. In any case, his smile comes as a weakness of theatrical presence performing the stereotypical masculinity.



The quality of movement has changed. To paraphrase Gere (2001) talking about 29 *Effeminate Gestures* by Goode, “In [King Julien’s] case, however, the intention is obvious: the [masculine] gesture is purposefully overlarge, a garish maneuver extended to an amplitude of 200 percent when a mere 20 would suffice [...] The gestures are effulgent, rich, creamy, *excessive*.” (355-356) The poses have gotten an additional layer of muscularity. The focus does not remain on the surface of the skin where the blue ink is, but on the whole of the body as a notion carrying an identity. The poses refer this time even more to bodybuilding shows because he now goes more often to fourth position, side view, knees bent, posing his arm biceps and triceps. The movement in between does not simply serve as a transition, but its quality has acquired a dynamic and strong layer that can refer to fighting, kicking, punching, boxing. The poses do not serve anymore to point up the words but the muscles and the masculinity they breathe. In this second video, which is a copy of the copy, of a copy of the original, King Julien has removed the pause when showing the words that are on his thighs. As a result, the concept is blurred by the execution of movement with the emergence of the body and its sexuality. Another example is when he lifts his left arm in order to show his ribs, he has changed his movement to remind a salutation of strength. In the end of each strophe little wrist circles refer to the movement of hip-hop singers when they sing “yo yo” and show off their “busterness”.

After some time that he is dancing in the fast tempo, slowly he releases the excessive energy, realizing that he doesn’t need to play it so tough, especially now that there is no other naked male on the frame that could threaten his gender performance. Often he looks on the floor probably because of his insecurity to stare at the audience. He is obviously less strong now alone. In the end he waves and makes a bow. No high five this time. A small pause from the abundant masculinity. Later on he recollects his character and turns off the camera.

#### **4. Conclusion**

As explained above, these two videos are not necessarily Camp although they can be read as such. Maybe, one could even argue that camp can produce a queering of gender regardless of the sexuality of the performer.

What is more important however, I believe, is that by trying to identify the Campy aspects on these two videos -such as exaggeration, naivety, pathos, seriousness, failure etc-, we managed to a small understanding how Internet is creating a space of blended identities—where notions of gender, sexuality, class, age and ethnicity all intersect with dance as situated in the body. Moreover, I agree with Young (2007) when he observes:

Internet dorky dance participants are challenging notions of who can dance, for whom, in what manner and by what medium. As they engage in an instantaneous process of production, reception, and reaction they are re-claiming masculine identities as they display to millions their right to dance, whether awkwardly or not. And, if they are sometimes ridiculed, more often they are given a collective high-five by the larger Internet community. (13-14)

According to recently updated statistics, Asia accounts for more Internet users than North America and Europe--56%, in comparison to North America's 5.1% and Europe's 12%-- but in North America and Europe, 73% and 27% of the total population participates in the Internet, whereas only 14% of the total Asian population does. Further, the last eight years has seen a 1176% increase in the number of Middle Eastern Internet users, whereas, in the same period, the increase in North America was only 127% (Internet World Stats, 2008). With these global shifts in Internet usage, the future will likely bring enhanced cultural crossovers with more memes originating in other countries, resulting in spin-offs that blend identities, different ideas and humor with startlingly piquant results. An interesting offshoot of this research would be to identify how "awkward," especially in relation to movement and dance, is constructed differently in other cultures. Youtube dance and its aesthetics of failure and "meming" is also impacting the world of performance and video art. Currently, for example, "International Festival" (a project initiated by Marten Spångberg and Tor Lindstrand) is in the process of making *Sweat the movie* incorporating the aesthetics of failure, exaggeration, "meming", gender trouble, pathos etc on a film that they believe will be the future of dance movies. As Colson Whithead mentioned "It is failure that guides evolution; perfection offers no incentive for improvement." (Whitehead, 1999)

## 5. Bibliography

- Anderson, S. (2006). YouTube and the Neglected Art of Lip Syncing. Music box Magazine. Retrieved June 24<sup>th</sup> 2008.
- Berger, J. (1972). *Ways of seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation & Penguin Books Ltd.
- Bersani, L. (1995). *Homos*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Booth, M. (1983). Campe- Toi ! On the origins and definitions of Camp. In F. Cleto (ed., 1999), *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject* (pp. 66-79), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bristow, J. (1988). How men are. *New Formations*, 6, 119-131.
- Burt, R. (2007). *The Male Dancer: Bodies, Spectacle, Sexualities*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London & New York: Routledge.
- Core, P. (1984). Camp: The lie that tells the truth. In F. Cleto (ed., 1999), *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject* (pp. 80-86), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doyle, J. (2005). The trouble with Men, or, Sex, Boredom, and the Work of Vaginal Davis. In G. Butt (ed.), *After Criticism: New Responses to Art and Performance* (pp. 81-100), Malden, Oxford & Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gere, D. (2001). 29 Effeminate Gestures: Choreographer Joe Goode and the Heroism of Effeminacy. In J. Desmond (ed.), *Dancing Desires: Choreographing Sexualities on and off the stage* (pp. 349- 381), Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Isherwood, C. (1954). The World in the Evening. In F. Cleto (ed., 1999), *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject* (pp. 49-52), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1983). Postmodernism and Consumer Society. In H. Foster (ed.), *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (pp. 111-125). Port Townsend, Washington: Bay Press.
- de Klerk, V. & Bosch, B. (1990). Nickname and sex role stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 23(5-6), 281-289.
- Meyer, M. (1994). *The Politics and Poetic of Camp*. London: Routledge.
- Phillips, A. (1993). *On kissing, Tickling, and Being Bored: Psychoanalytic Essays on the Unexamined Life*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Sontag, S. (1964). Notes on 'Camp'. In F. Cleto (ed., 1999), *Camp: Queer Aesthetics and the Performing Subject* (pp. 53-65), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Young, L. (2007). *Dorky Dance.com: Dorky Dancing, Vlogging and the Rise of Self-Produced Dance on the Internet*. Unpublished Master's thesis, The Florida State University, College of visual Arts, Theater and Dance.

Whitehead, C. (1999). *The Intuitionist*. New York: Anchor Books.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, culture and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

"Internet Meme," Wikipedia, available from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet\\_meme](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet_meme); Internet, as accessed on 3 July 2008.

"What Is a Meme?" *The Daily Meme*, available from <http://thedailymeme.com/what-is-a-meme/>; Internet; as accessed on 3 July 2008.

"Daft Punk Harder Bodies (Male Version) Harder Better Faster"  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6EUupnF02vo> ; Internet; as accessed on 3 July 2008.

"Daft-Punk-Harder-Bodies-Single-Male-Version-By-KSquare"  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-D2AVaJM87I> ; Internet; as accessed on 3 July 2008.

"Daft Hands - Harder, Better, Faster, Stronger"  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K2cYWfq--Nw> ; Internet; as accessed on 3 July 2008.

"Daft Bodies - Harder, Better, Faster, Stronger"  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ILYD -A X5E> ; Internet; as accessed on 3 July 2008.