Brinn Rhodes

Capstone Analysis

Through an analytical engagement with the text *The Substance,* my main argument is that this movie reveals the vast control that the patriarchy maintains over society, and that if we use a critical lens to examine this movie by looking at the demonstrated incongruities, as viewers, we can gain a new perspective and shift out of our current way of knowing and thinking. The film is a societal critique, showing our worst flaws. Furthermore, it can be seen as a critique of the way women are treated, looked at, and judged. The film shows a slightly exaggerated experience of an aging woman to convey the very harsh reality of nearly every woman today. The movie is filled with metaphors and juxtaposing ideas that are, in actuality, tools to help us wake up and self-correct. I believe that the metaphors in this movie are strategic, as metaphors can help viewers to better understand something that is fact by substituting it with a metaphor, as opposed to "using the ordinary intellectual method of substituting abstractions reached by analysis" (Burke "Permanence and Change" 95) Following a Burkean format, I argue that the film is laid out in such a way that first, highlights our pieties (a main theme that I will touch on a lot throughout this analysis) and how we choose to blindly accept our norms, uses body horror and other incongruent images and ideas to reveal the absurdity, then leaves the audience with choice to adopt a new perspective.

Patriarchy and metaphorical extension

I first want to highlight the role that patriarchy plays in the film and the metaphor within that. Patriarchy can be broadly defined as a system in which men disproportionately hold the power and are considered to be dominant. Patriarchy is what our country and most of Western

society are built on. This means that patriarchy, for years, has defined women's beauty standards, their general roles in society, their value, etc. Throughout *The Substance*, we see a consistent theme of patriarchal standards being enforced. Similar to the film industry, Olumide Joshua Oki describes the phenomenon of patriarchy in the fashion industry, explaining this as women having to receive an "endorsement" from "male figures who dictate the terms of desirability and worth" (173), and this is especially apparent in the dynamic between Harvey and Elisabeth/Sue/ While not necessarily upheld by men only, it was a system created by men and now kept in place by both men and women, as it has become the norm. This is what Burke would describe as a piety. We are taught not to question this system and continue to live in a patriarchal society, despite the fact that it ultimately hurts men and women alike. There are various examples of how the patriarchy manifests itself throughout the film.

I argue that the patriarchy is metaphorically represented through one character, Harvey, and various other male characters throughout the film. As stated before, patriarchy is something that sustains itself in our society because it is upheld by men and women, but in different ways. Women maintain the patriarchy–oftentimes unknowingly–because they feel as if it is their only choice, and by choosing to align themselves with the patriarchy, perhaps they will receive its benefits. We see this quite frequently with Elisabeth's character. She chooses to align herself and conform to societal expectations in hope that she will be rewarded. Before examining Elisabeth's actions, though, we first need to foreground our understanding of why she chooses to do these things. From an uninformed perspective, one might assume that Elisabeth's actions are "stupid" or lacking "common sense," because who would willingly inject a radioactive-like neon green liquid into their body, right? However, through taking a closer look at what drove her to this point, it doesn't appear to be so crazy.

Harvey's character is an amalgam of patriarchy, sexism, ageism, and misogyny. Although not necessarily a "main character," he always appears in ways that directly antagonize women. In fact, it is not just Harvey who does so, but consistently we see men in positions of power, or in a position of judgment/overseer of women. One of the movie's opening scenes is Harvey on the phone with who we can assume to be another executive or producer. The camera shows a wide angle that centers on Harvey's face as he uses the urinal. In this scene, he is simultaneously urinating while on the phone, calling Elisabeth an "old bitch," (*The Substance* 00:06:42-00:06:43), while we are, ironically, in close direct eye contact with his aged and wrinkled face. Meanwhile, Elisabeth overhears the whole conversation, and this is the beginning of what we know to be Elisabeth's determination to stay young. Harvey says, "I'll make it simple. We need her young. We need her hot" (*The Substance* 00:06:29-00:06:39). Harvey's character can be viewed as the one who assigns value and worth in Elisabeth's eyes since he is an executive, meaning that in Elisabeth's case, she has been trained to seek his stamp of approval without even consciously knowing.

Immediately following this scene is Harvey firing Elisabeth. This scene can be described as gross, to say the least. As Harvey is explaining to Elisabeth that she is being let go, he is grotesquely eating shrimp. The scene opens showing Harvey ripping off a shrimp's head, then immediately we see a close-up of him chewing his food while talking. We continue to watch him rip apart these shrimp, put them into his mouth, and spit out the shell. Although this scene is hard to watch because of Harvey's impolite and disgusting eating habits, it reveals a nasty, yet accurate representation of Elisabeth's life. The scene uses the shrimp as a metaphor for what is happening to Elisabeth: the process of being "chewed up and spit out." Harvey goes on to say, "At 50, well, it stops" (*The Substance* 00:08:28-00:08:33), referring to Elisabeth's age, to which

she replies, “What stops?” (*The Substance* 00:08:33-00:08:34). This question leaves Harvey unable to answer. After some stammering and avoiding the question, he sees his friend and leaves the table, leaving Elisabeth alone and left with no closure. Harvey’s inability to answer Elisabeth’s question of “what stops” exemplifies Harvey’s view of Elisabeth as a commodifiable object. While it can’t be confirmed or known what Harvey was thinking, one can speculate what his response would have been based on his previous statements about Elisabeth, and although there is not a direct mention of money, it is not an aspect that we can just ignore. Capital is at the forefront of the Hollywood industry; therefore, we can’t look at this situation without considering Harvey’s underlying motive other than Elisabeth being “old.” We can correlate Elisabeth and her firing to commercial gain, or a lack thereof. In Harvey’s eyes, Elisabeth is an object that makes him money, and now that this object is old and used up, he has to move on to a new one. Harvey does not view Elisabeth, or even Sue for that matter, as people with agency; they are both seen only for their bodies. Harvey diminishes Elisabeth down to an object to be disposed of; one that no longer has any value or merit to him. Elisabeth’s and Sue’s bodies are seen through Harvey’s eyes and, more broadly, the patriarch’s eyes as “The ultimate commercial tool…reducing [them] to mere commodities rather than individuals with autonomy” (Oki 173).

Towards the end of the film, we also see the continuation of the pattern of Harvey as a patriarchal symbol. In the same manner that Harvey was able to determine that Elisabeth was done, he is also able to “create” a star as well. Leading up to the New Year's show, Harvey tells the other white male executives, braggingly, that Sue is his “most beautiful creation” and that he has “shaped her for success” (*The Substance* 02:04:23-02:04:27), implying that Sue is his to take credit for. This interaction reveals that Harvey feels as if he has ownership over Sue, the same

way he felt he had ownership over Elisabeth. In calling her his creation and saying he has shaped her implies she is an object to be created, shaped, and molded, not an autonomous human being.

Men Assigning Worth

Throughout the entirety of the film, we see the continuing theme of men being the ones who determine women's worth. We see two men hosting auditions to replace Elisabeth. It is important to add here that neither of these men are objectively good looking people, and yet, they are responsible for finding someone who is. They even make an off-handed comment about a woman auditioning saying "too bad her boobs aren't in the middle of her face instead of that nose" (*The Substance* 00:37:12-00:37:17). After these two men deemed this woman to be unworthy of the part, Sue comes in, in which the men react by saying "looks like everything sure is in the right place this time" (*The Substance* 00:37:33–00:37:37) implying that her body is the deciding factor of this role, and again, reducing her worth down to being an object. The pattern we are seeing here is that men have the authority to say what they want about women's bodies, and have the power and control over them. They have the capability of both hiring and firing, directly tying their worth to the say of the man. In this world, women are not respected or regarded as valuable beyond their looks. This idea is reinforced when Harvey can't even remember his assistant's (female) name. As the assistant reminds him that her name is Isabella, he mocks her and tells her that he is calling her Cindy now because "who has time to say [Isabella]" (*The Substance* 00:39:12-00:39:15). This scene is important as it establishes that Harvey not only has no respect for Elisabeth because she is no longer making him money, but for all women in general, even his young assistant. We can see this through the way he says he allegedly has "no time" to say her real name; he does not denote women as being worthy of his time unless they truly have something to offer him, as Sue does. As we can see through Harvey's

actions, it is clear why Elisabeth would be willing to take something like the Substance, because she has been taught that her worth only correlates to her body and her looks. Without them, she is useless and finds no value in herself because she has not been told otherwise. The men in this film represent a larger issue we have in our society where the patriarchy has become the deciding factor of women's value and worth.

Elisabeth's Piety

Now I would like to circle back to my earlier notion of Elisabeth aligning herself with the patriarchy. Now that we have an understanding of the culture and setting in which Elisabeth exists in, it can be seen more clearly as to why she adheres to the unrealistic expectation of staying young instead of choosing to resist. Elisabeth, as we can see throughout different spots in the film, is deeply insecure, but rightfully so, as her job, success, and liking depends on the state of her body and overall physical looks. Elisabeth conforms to patriarchal ideals because she assumes that she will be liked again and find worth in herself finally. In falling in line with her own piety, we see a sense of what Burke described as "Gregarious obedience" (Permanence and Change 76). She follows her own knowing and "orientation"; even if it may take her down a bad path, it is still *her* orientation, so she chooses to accept it. We see that throughout the movie, she is chasing this feeling of wanting to be liked and accepted, hence why she chose to take The Substance. One example that shows us Elisabeth's longing for validation (again, directly from Harvey) is that even after she is fired from the company that she had been working at for years, and then becoming Sue, she goes right back to the same production company to audition for the role that Elisabeth was just fired from. This is a direct "loyalty to the system of [her] being" (Burke, "Permanence and Change" 71). In Elisabeth's mind, it is essentially her only choice; she

does it to appease what she knows: that being young and hot again will make her feel good about herself.

Calling our attention to a feminist theory concept to help explain this, I want to bring to light Audre Lorde's notion of "The Master's Tools," an idea that tells us that choosing to fall in line with the dominant will not reward you because, at the end of the day, "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (Lorde). This framework can help to describe what Elisabeth was trying to accomplish initially; if she does what Harvey (the patriarchy) wants, she can then be rewarded with all the validation, right? But what is slowly shown to us throughout the movie is that even when she tries to work within the system, it still fails her. We can foreshadow, even from the beginning, that this will not work out for Elisabeth, no matter how hard she tries, because the system is not set up for her to succeed. In this case, the "master's tools" metaphorically represent The Substance procedure and the "master's house" is Harvey, or more broadly speaking, the patriarchy. Elisabeth presumes that taking the substance will result in some sort of liberation for herself. If she can just be young again, she can get her job back, she can be liked again, she can like herself again. However, the ending of the film reveals to both the audience and to Elisabeth that working within the system will never dismantle the system, and while there may be temporary rewards (such as Sue's success at first), there is no long-term payout.

Juxtaposition in Elisabeth

The juxtaposition we bear witness to throughout the film with Elisabeth's actions is one between love and hate. Elisabeth takes The Substance to gain back confidence, to relive her stardom, and feel loved again. However, once Sue is born, we actually see a significant increase in Elisabeth's insecurity and self-hatred. This is the beginning of the "atom cracking" (Burke,

"Attitudes Towards History" 308), whereas viewers, we're observing these opposing ideas that reposition our perspective. The juxtaposing ideas here are that Elisabeth decides to take The Substance to regain validation, self-security, and confidence. This is then contrasted with the progression of self-hate after taking The Substance. One instance where we see this juxtaposition of Elisabeth's decision is in the scene where she is getting ready for a date.

A little over the halfway mark of the movie, Elisabeth, feeling extra down, has a recollection of Fred, an old classmate (that, respectively speaking, is just an average guy) she had run into earlier in the movie, telling her that she is "still the most beautiful girl in the whole wide world" (*The Substance* 01:10:30-01:10:35). Elisabeth decides to call him, and they set up a date. At this point, it appears as if things are looking up for Elisabeth. She even smiles, which is one of the first times we have seen her smile throughout the whole movie, even further highlighting Elisabeth's need for male validation specifically. As she is in the midst of her getting-ready process, we see her revisit the mirror several times, as if contemplating whether or not her body is worthy of even going on a date after looking at Sue and making adjustments to her makeup and wardrobe each time. The scene progressively gets more intense and aggressive. Elisabeth is visibly growing frustrated, as she forcefully reapplies more makeup. Finally, we think she is going to leave. She makes it all the way to the door this time, before seeing a reflection of Sue's billboard in the doorknob. It is almost as if Sue is taunting her, reminding Elisabeth that no matter the fact that they are "the same person" at the end of the day, Elisabeth still has to live inside this "old" body. Coming to the pinnacle of the scene, Elisabeth returns to her mirror for a third time, angrily ripping off the scarf she had used to conceal the wrinkles on her chest. She then begins to aggressively wipe off her bright red lipstick in a messy, enraged way. The lipstick residue is now spread across her face, and she begins, in a fit of rage, rubbing both of her hands

on her face out of frustration, almost looking as if she is ripping out her eyelashes and hair because she is so mad (*The Substance* 01:10:42-01:16:10). The anger and frustration that build here in the back-and-forth of returning to the mirror show the audience how Elisabeth's relationship with herself is only worsening. The repetition of revisiting the mirror every time she questions her beauty is significant here, as she has an unhealthy obsession with viewing herself. The mirror serves as a site of both reflection and self-discipline. She doesn't actually decide to make changes to her appearance until she is looking at herself in the mirror. This image she is seeing of herself is contrasted with the one of Sue, the hotter younger version of herself. She intentionally returns to the mirror as a way to punish herself, as a reminder that she is not good enough and she has to live with it. When she sees herself in the mirror for the final time in this scene, her facial expression is one that is furious, not sad or dissatisfied. In this anger, she copes by taking it out on herself. Elisabeth essentially begins to self-discipline because she no longer deems this version of herself lovable or worthy; not even worthy enough of going out with an awkward, dorky guy from high school, for that matter.

This scene reveals a juxtaposition in that Sue was created for Elisabeth to gain back some form of self-love and agency, and yet it is resulting in the exact opposite directly because of Sue. This juxtaposition continues when Sue's misuse of The Substance results in Elisabeth's body decaying and turning into a hairless, hunched-over, immobilized, terrifying version of herself. Elisabeth tried so desperately to get a younger version of herself that it backfired and resulted in the oldest, most horrifying version of herself. Over the course of the film, we begin to see a resentment building for Sue that was not initially there. At the beginning of The Substance's cycle, we see Elisabeth longing for her 7 days to be up to switch over to Sue, as she does not value her time as Elisabeth. However, we begin to see a shift in Elisabeth's attitude after Sue

begins “stealing” from her by going over her 7 days. Elisabeth’s anger, of course, made sense, as Sue was misusing the Substance, which drained Elisabeth, resulting in her turning into the monster-esque version of herself.

The last time we saw Elisabeth’s point of view before she transitioned to this version, she was furious at Sue and had left the apartment disgusting, covering it with food and plastering newspapers over the windows to avoid seeing the billboard of Sue. Then, the next time she wakes up is when she has turned into her current version, so as viewers, our assumption is that Elisabeth hates Sue now and is done with her. This assumption is further confirmed by her decision to order the injection to end The Substance. After Sue has betrayed Elisabeth so badly, leaving her to rot and turn into a decrepit human, Elisabeth goes to inject Sue with the shot, deciding to be done with The Substance, but stops halfway through and says, “I can’t do this. I need you cause I hate myself… You’re the only lovable part of me” (*The Substance* 01:44:06-01:44:36). This scene is extremely vulnerable for Elisabeth. She is quite literally at her lowest point, and admits out loud that she hates herself as she is crying. The vulnerability and raw emotion in this part of the film reveal another caustic stretch. The juxtaposition that we are seeing here is Elisabeth’s vulnerability contrasted with her abject nature. Rarely throughout the film have we actually heard Elisabeth blatantly express how she is feeling, other than when she was complaining about Sue’s behavior. We have only been able to assume Elisabeth’s feelings for the most part through her body language, facial expressions, and actions, but in this scene she is explicit with what she is feeling and states it out loud, despite the fact that no one can actually hear her. We could only infer that she was insecure and hated herself, but here, there is a shift where perhaps she didn’t know it before, but now she has stated out loud that she hates herself

and that Sue is the only part that is lovable. The emotional rawness of this scene, with Elisabeth being soft and crying contrasted with her monstrous appearance, reveals a new perspective.

The more Elisabeth has aged, the more she has been cast aside, not just by Harvey, but Sue as well. Throughout the movie, as she becomes a bitter old hag, who is arguably (but understandably) losing her mind, there is a natural feeling of uncomfortableness that is produced by Elisabeth. When she wakes up and turns into this version, she is genuinely scary to look at now. Her bones are protruding, she is bald, her breasts are hanging off her body, her skin is discolored; she is completely unrecognizable now in a way that feels uneasy to digest. You don't want to. In fact, the film editing even directly implies an intentional dislike of Elisabeth's character. When showing the back and forth between Elisabeth's point of view and Sue's, Elisabeth's is always edited with a gloomy, depressing, or discomforting tone and is often shorter in time. Her scenes tend to be "boring," showing her just sitting on the couch watching TV. On the other hand, Sue's point of view is much brighter, literally and metaphorically. The music is fun, the lighting changes, and Sue's life appears through the edit to be fun and entertaining. As viewers, it is like we are being told that Elisabeth isn't even worth looking at or having a good storyline. The atom cracking here is in her vulnerability contrasted with the abject. Elisabeth at this point has been written off, as both unworthy in the film, but also outside of the film. In this moment, though, when she is vulnerable, the atom cracks and there is a gain of empathy which can enable a new perspective.

Camp's contribution

In my final section, I would like to discuss the uses of satire and camp in the film and how they contribute to Perspective by Incongruity. Specifically examining the end of the film, I argue that the last 10 minutes of the film are camp and used as a sort of textual wink. Having a

greater understanding of the *campiness* and satirical nature of this part of the film can help us to actually understand its meaning, as opposed to regarding it as just a "bad ending."

At this point in the film, Sue has now injected herself with The Substance, resulting in the creation of Monstro-Elisasue, a deformed, mutilated version of both Elisabeth and Sue. Elisasue shows up at the New Year's show. The audience is filled with people waiting to watch. The bright stage lights come on to reveal Elisasue. The audience is, of course, shocked and confused. After a brief moment of silence, Elisasue comes on the mic and expresses in her distorted voice that she is so excited to be there. After another beat, Elisasue begins to cough, regurgitating a detached breast onto the floor. The audience looks in disgust. Before Elisasue can do anything, the crowd erupts in screams. A man shouts "shoot the monster" (*The Substance* 02:07:46) and another "it's a freak" (*The Substance* 02:07:48). In the midst of the chaos, she says "no, don't be scared, it's still me" (*The Substance* 02:07:50-02:07:57). As she is crying and trying to explain to everyone that it's still her, they don't care and attempt to kill her. After this moment, there is a huge shift in tone. There is now heavy metal rock music playing as blood from Elisasue's body sprays everywhere and on everyone, almost as if it is raining blood. We then see Elisasue continue on her blood-spraying journey through the hallways of the building, not leaving one wall untouched by her blood. Even the camera has blood dripping down the lens. She leaves the building, collapsing on the sidewalk. Her body falls to pieces, but we can still see Elisabeth's original face. We see her detach from the dismembered organs lying on the ground and painfully drag herself over to her Hollywood star. In this last moment of the film, Elisabeth lies on top of her star, staring up at the sky as it begins to sparkle, and we hear cheers and applause from her imagination. It seems almost as if she is finally happy in this instant, before melting away into a puddle of blood. (*The Substance* 02:05:11-02:02:13:41).

At first glance, the last 10 minutes of this film feel almost out of place. What was such a serious, richly packed movie that seems to hold an important message ends with an unrealistic, cheesy, bloody ending. However, if we look at these 10 minutes through a lens of camp, it is clear that this was intentional. The end of the film feels unserious and comical. It is almost laughable to see such an unrealistic scene of blood spewing everywhere with heavy metal music in the background. These are actually important elements of camp, though, and help us to understand better the incongruity happening here. This moment can be described as a "Means of self-projection" (Babuscio 23). The spraying of blood from Elisabeth's body is her self-projection, as she is free of the scrutiny of subjection and patriarchy. Babuscio explains that camp in horror can include a "personal rebellion against enforced restrictions" (23). Finally erupting for the first time in the film, she is not conforming to what others want or to her own insecurity. Her blood is literally on their hands. Throughout the entirety of the movie, Elisabeth has been giving her body away. First, to her production company for years, then to Sue, and once she is Sue, it's the same cycle of giving her body to the production company. Harvey even tells Sue once she is hired that "[people] want more and more of [her]" (*The Substance* 01:21:47-01:21:49). Extending on this metaphor, their bodies are seen as a site of production, a body that has to give and give at the expense of itself. The notion of giving with no return is proven to us as Elisabeth creates a new body when she's told hers isn't good enough, and yet, even when she gives them what they want with Sue, it still isn't enough.

At the end of the movie, Elisasue is literally giving the audience her body. Her regurgitating her breast is a direct representation of this. This moment is indeed a "violation" of its original "properties" (Burke, "Permanence and Change" 90). This is an example of casuistic stretching, as the breast is removed from the body–its original "linkage" (Burke, "Permanence

and Change" 90), as Burke defines it– and laid on the floor to give to the people. In this way, we see an arguably disgusting moment that feels somewhat meaningless, carrying intense significance, as Elisasue is metaphorically saying, "you wanted my body, well here it is." There is a constant greed that manifests in the whole film, represented as a singular entity through Harvey, but ultimately Harvey is just the metaphor for our society, so while the greed may seem to be singular here, we know it is not. There is a greed for more; a greed for a body that is unattainable, a body that has been abstracted of any soul or human quality and, in turn, is just a commodifiable object, only worthy if capable of giving something. The end of the film is Elisasue giving every last ounce of herself until she can't anymore. We see a major shift in the overall tone of the movie that "Converts the serious into the frivolous" (Sontag 1). In doing so, it allows for a breakdown of our perspectives. The ending is so bad that it becomes good. You're left thinking, "What did I just watch?"

The other incongruity that we are seeing here through the camp lens is the idea of the feminine contrasted with blood and horror. Throughout the film, there is an emphasis on feminine beauty, and the need to have it. It's not just about being young; there is also the aspect of being "hot." We never see Sue look bad; she only appears in tight-fitting clothing that accentuates the perfect curvature of her body, with full, long, bouncy hair that has the perfect curl to it and always appears to be "naturally beautiful." We see this reinforced in many ways through Sue's character. Multiple times throughout the film, other men comment on her beauty or ask what her beauty secrets are. Sue is this angelic, dazzling presence that you can't look away from because she is so alluring. This idea of captivating beauty that we have seen from Sue is then in stark opposition to the idea of repulsion when seeing Elisasue. In the final scene when it breaks out into full-on gore, there is a crack in perspective. We are not used to seeing women

as gross, in the abject. When we are faced with the idea of both femininity and the grotesque simultaneously, they do not fit together. We see it even in the audience's reaction at the New Year's show. Despite the fact that Elisasue is wearing Sue's dress and telling them who she is, they cannot conceptualize that Elisabeth or Sue is now this monster. They cannot face the idea that a beautiful woman had been transformed into a scary, hideous monster. There is no logical thinking in the moment; they only act out of their pieties and decide they know best to kill her. This removal of femininity from its original context makes for an extreme discomfort, one that the audience cannot bear.

So what does this mean?

Now that we have established the incongruities in the film, we can move to what these mean. When faced with these incongruities and issues, Burke states that "the ultimate result is the need of a reorientation, a direct attempt to force the critical structure by shifts of perspective" (Permanence and Change 169). Here is where we need to adopt the "comic corrective." Essentially, we need to reorient or resituate our way of thinking. The film shows a reflection of society's piety, our inability to break the loop. As presented to us in the film and established through analyzing Elisabeth's actions, we act based on our pieties, even if they are ultimately harmful to us. When pointing out or realizing these moments of incongruity, it allows us to transcend our past orientation, becoming a more critical consumer. The film reveals a version of society that feels and looks very reminiscent of ours, and yet, the concept of cellular division to create a new you feels foreign. Conversely, if we take a step back out of our own perceived understanding, we can see that our world is not far off from something like *The Substance*. Having to acknowledge the obvious here, our world has many procedures and drugs to modify the body, ones that include age "reversal." This film invites the audience to consider their current

orientation, not to say whether it is right or wrong, but to instead present a scenario for the viewer to interpret. The incongruities we see throughout the content of the film help to reveal a pattern of issues that can open up the possibility for adopting the comic frame. In doing so, “The comic frame should enable people to be observers of themselves, while acting,” and its goal “would not be passiveness but maximum consciousness” (Burke, “Attitudes Towards History” 171).

Works Cited

Babuscio, Jack. “7 ‘The Cinema of Camp (Aka Camp and the Gay Sensibility).’” *Edinburgh University Press eBooks*, 2019, pp. 117–35. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474465809-012.

Burke, Kenneth. *Attitudes Toward History, Third Edition*. Univ of California Press, 1984.

Burke, Kenneth. *Permanence and Change an Anatomy of Purpose, Third Edition*. University of California Press, 1984.

Lorde, Audre. “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House.” *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, by Audre Lorde, Crossing Press, 1984.

Oki, Olumide Joshua. “Commodification of the Female Body: A Feminist Reading of Ruth Chukwudebe’s *Heavenly Modella.” African Journal of Humanities and Contemporary Education Research*, vol. 18, no. 1, Mar. 2025, pp. 168–83, https://doi.org/10.62154/ajhcer.2025.018.010622.

Sontag, Susan. *Notes on “Camp.”* Penguin Books, 1964.

The Substance. Directed by Coralie Fargeat, performances by Demi Moore, Margaret Qualley, and Denis Quaid, Working Title Films, 2024.

I have acted with honesty and integrity in producing this work and am unaware of anyone who has not. /S/ Brinn Rhodes