Media and Peeping Tom Culture: Violating Familial Privacy and Communal Responsibility in the Evolution of Voyeurism

Golam Rabbani

Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

In the name of visual pleasure, there are different entertainments in today's media that instigate voyeurism among common viewers. In this study, the author intends to focus on two phases where the spectators are turning voyeurs without their consent. In the first phase, the study reveals the process where film influences voyeuristic behavior. The urge to explore others' private matters starts through the way film reflects, reveals, and even plays on the straight, socially established interpretation of sexual difference which controls images, erotic ways of looking, and spectacle. Several voyeuristic means in films pursue set formation, and they all persuade the viewer to identify with the male character by allowing the viewer to see what he sees through different voyeuristic means. The use of devices as a telescope, magnifying glass, and keyholes is the motivation for the close-up shots. They turn the viewer into a participant and spectator and allow the viewer to look at previously unseen and hidden details, but they do not let the viewer become totally a part of the action. In this study, films like *Peeping Tom* and *Sliver* are analyzed to understand big screen voyeurism. In the second phase, this study presents the voyeurism initiated by television programs such as reality shows, "soap operas", daytime television, talk shows, real life documentaries, and "docudramas". At the pinnacle, there are the government, police, and the employers who are assisting to produce a new "watched" culture with the use of closed circuit TV devices. Some camera operators are known to have made "greatest hits" tapes and other material captured on CCTV has become the footage used to create television programs for entertainment purposes. Thus, they are influencing public voyeurism. Programs like "Big Daddy", "Big Brother", and "Big Boss" are disclosing personal activities of the characters through hidden cameras. They are considered as soft-core pornography on mainstream television and satellite channels.

Keywords: voyeurism, Peeping Tom, reality shows, films and voyeurs, regular voyeur

Introduction

Entertainment, the most diversified and effective sector of human creation, is changing with the evolution of technology. And with this evolution of entertainment, there are certain films and programs in world media that instigate voyeurism among common viewers. In this study, the author intends to focus on two phases where the spectators are turning voyeurs without their consent. In the first phase, this study reveals the film influences voyeuristic behavior. The intention to explore others' private matters initiates through the way film replicates, reveals, and even plays on the straight, socially established interpretation of sexual difference which manipulates images, erotic ways of looking and spectacle. Several categories of voyeur film, for example, *Peeping Tom* and *Sliver*, pursue set formation, and they all persuade the viewer to identify with character by

Golam Rabbani, assistant professor, Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Jahangirnagar University.

allowing the viewer to see what he/she sees through different voyeuristic means. The use of such devices as a telescope, magnifying glass, and keyholes are the motivations for the close-up shots. These optical devices initiate the first ever truly narrative use of close-up in cinema. They turn the viewer into a participant and spectator. Also, they allow the viewer to look at previously unseen and hidden details, but they do not let the viewer become totally a part of the action. In an extreme case, this gaze can become fixated into a perversion, producing "voyeurs who can only gain sexual satisfaction from watching an objectified other" (Mulvey, 1998, p. 587). While Calvert (2000), in his book *Voyeur Nation*, illustrated the extent of nonsexual voyeurism, he did not reject the increasing amount of voyeuristic media or the deviant connotation that persists to follow the term. So, if we are becoming more voyeuristic, then it is uncertain whether we can keep our moral degeneration in limits. In the second phase, this study presents the voyeurism initiated by television programs such as reality shows, "soap operas", daytime television, talk shows, real life documentaries, and "docudramas". They are spreading voyeurism on a world-wide scale. At the pinnacle, there are the government, police, and the employers who are supporting to produce a new "watched" culture with the use of closed circuit TV devices. Therefore, programs like *Big Daddy*, *Big Brother*, and *Big Boss* are disclosing personal activities of the characters through hidden cameras. They are considered as soft-core pornography on mainstream television and satellite channels.

Voyeurism

In psycho-biological words, voyeurism (from French, *voir*, to look at) is a paraphilia of "the solicitational/allurative type in which erotic arousal and facilitation or attainment of orgasm are responsive to (and dependent upon) the risk of being discovered while covertly or illicitly watching a stranger disrobing or engaging in sexual activity" (Pranzarone, 2008). It is the reciprocal paraphilic condition of exhibitionism. A voyeur is also known as a Peeping Tom. The risk of exposure while illicitly watching or overhearing nudity or sexual activity particularly contributes to the stimulation of the paraphilic voyeur (Pranzarone, 2008). If we cross out the word "sexual", then it reads: one who seeks stimulation by visual means. This latest depiction seems proper for the current world. Some psychiatrists apply another word to tag our appeal to visual media which is scopophilia. Scopophilia essentially means to derive pleasure from looking. Freud associated scopophilia with objectifying others with a controlling and curious gaze.

Voyeurism on Big Screen

The discussion on the big screen voyeurism leads to the first film—Uri Zohar's *Peeping Tom* (1973)[1]. The film unveils the voyeurism of an Israeli male through his tragic pessimistic existence. The act of peeping begins as a private action performed by Gutte, who looks through peepholes. He keeps Avi and Duvidke away and enters a space that includes the room in which Eli and Dina are having sex. He gets a pillow, and while continuing to peep through another hole, he is involved in auto-eroticism. Meanwhile, Avi and Duvidke return, and Gutte shows the gesture that they can stay. Like the viewer of the film, Gutte's satisfaction relies on a demonstration with a restricted time edge, so he cannot let himself be troubled by his mates' company. Each manages a peeping point (collectively as the film characters and alone as the observer of the film in the cinema hall), and in the dark, their eyes are fixated on the "screen".

Zohar (1973) manifested an exciting dialectic that instigates from two different viewing points: the

---

[1] Directed by Uri Zohar, the film is the first one of a trilogy. The other two films are *Big Eyes* and *Save the Lifeguard*. Both deal with a hero who resembles Gutte in *Peeping Tom*, as well as with similar themes that use voyeurism as a focal point. The film *Peeping Tom* or *Metzitzim* is a comic-satire. Uri Zohar is the writer and Arik Einstein made the screenplay.

diegetic[2] point (that of the voyeurs in the film) versus that of the audience. On the diegetic level,

> Both Gutte and Eli—who are absent from our sight but present in Gutte's and his friends' field of vision—are engaged in two performing activities designated for the look of the Other. These actions of bad faith[3] (for-the-Other) define both of them as objects. Ironically, the objectification of the female characters in the film, their debasement (the fact that woman is cast aside in this reciprocity of Eli and Gutte and treated as merely a sex object), reinforces Eli and Gutte's mutual reification. (Meiri, 2005, p. 113)

Eli's major enthusiasm as a philanderer is that of acting for Gutte, whose awareness of Eli's enthusiasm is, in fact, part of his own motivation for peeping.

The act of voyeurism in the scene is highlighted not only by never presenting the object of the gaze, but also by the light beams originating from the room in which Eli and Dina are involved in sexual activity. The radiance shapes circles of light around the eyes of the voyeurs. The primary shot is a side-angle of the three Peeping Tom together, then particular shots of each of them, continued by one more shot of the three as one. Therefore, it could be assumed that the reciprocated reification[4] of Gutte and Eli is not exacting impediment to the satisfaction of the spectator, even though the point of voyeurism is not present. As our personal stare is required to center (because of the illumination) on the act of peeping itself, the spectator can still recognize with the voyeuristic position. *Peeping Tom* desists from shot/reverse shots (particularly in this scene). Here, the editing mechanism that usually exemplifies diegetic voyeurism and evidently strengthens our detection with the voyeuristic central character, his contentment and sagacity of control. The technique of shot/reverse shot is described in film theory as a moment of suture and richness.

> The function of the diegetic look (the point-of-view shots) is to conceal the fact that the enunciator of a shot is also an outside authority (the director of the film, for example), in order to maintain the coherence of the fiction, with which we are supposed to identify. In the scene being discussed, the absence of shot/reverse shots is an impediment to making the distinction between subject/object. (Meiri, 2005, p. 115)

The "possessor" of the gaze in cinema is generally the "subject". In Zohar's (1973) view, he is an object. Zohar, however, lets his spectator get pleasure from a voyeuristic point through recognition with the work of peeping itself, as clarified by Christian Metz. Metz (1982) asserted that the three essential features of the cinematic signifier (distance, the absence of the actors from the screen, and the segregation of spaces) turn it into a "psychoanalytic" signifier in common and an "Oedipal" one in particular. He chiefly mentioned the practices of disavowal[5] and fetishism that signal the Oedipal predicament, re-endorsed in movies within an economy of absence-presence[6].

> In Zohar's film, the way the peeping scene is designed connotes the primal scene in all its specificity, creating even the ambivalence of what the little child saw/imagined (because we never get to see what goes on behind the "closed door"). On the other hand, the act of peeping (as well as eavesdropping) is emphasized. In reference to Metz, we may say that even

---

[2] Related with "Digesis" means a narration or recitation. Diegetic is related with film music that occurs as part of the action (rather than as background), and can be heard by the film's characters.

[3] "Bad faith" is a term coined by Sartre to denote a defense mechanism invented by man's consciousness in order to help him contend with alienation. Bad faith is a state in which the individual flees the anxiety of freedom, of being doomed to make choices, by lying to himself, while being aware of it.

[4] Reification in thought occurs when an abstract concept describing a relationship or context is treated as a concrete "thing", or if something is treated as if it were a separate object when this is inappropriate because it is not an object or because it does not truly exist in separation.

[5] Denying the act of having sexual pleasure while watching others private activities.

[6] The film leads us to believe that Gutte is impotent. Although his peeping rites may be read as compensatory, the impotence itself may be read symbolically as an acknowledgment of the phallus as masquerade, as representing lack.

prior to Dina and Eli's arrival at the cabin, Gutte is having a hard time in choosing the most suitable hole, reminding us of the importance of occupying "good seats" in the movie theater. The light beams in this context connote the projector—the machine responsible for creating those absent present images on the screen. (Meiri, 2005, p. 116)

At the last part of the scene, the three voyeurs turn their heads away, as if demanding to pass on the prominence from visual to auditory pleasure. The off-screen voices of Eli and Dina are additional implications of both the primordial scene and the absence-presence economy of the movie.

The viewer pointed by Metz concurrently trusts in the subsistence/presence of what he observes on the screen and understands that what he observes is not actually there. It is the not-being-there that improves the understanding of voyeurism. The awareness of the fact that film indicates absence (lack), the observer is also aware of the verity that recognition with the image is a delusion that attempts to pay off for the lack. Gutte's voyeurism as well as Eli's fetishism is intensely ingrained in their consciousness that the concrete act of intercourse, or love making—as well as observing it—cannot recompense for the lack. In further words, "in *Peeping Tom*, love-making and the love of cinema are tantamount to bad faith and masquerade" (Meiri, 2005, p. 116). This dispute is made solid at the last part of the scene, which demonstrates a drastic change in the spectator's position/experience.

The last part of the scene presents a deconstruction of the voyeuristic-fetishistic scenario apparently occupied by the viewer. In the final shot, the arrangement of the camera changes. As a consequence, we are now required to watch the voyeurs' behinds. We are forced to alter our place from one of satisfaction to a point of uneasiness, as if we had been caught in the act of peeping. Any delusion of having power over the image or being a subject is now crushed by the change of mise-en-scène[7], which causes a crack between the peeping eyes of Gutte and his friends and those of the spectator. This is more highlighted by the buzzing of Gutte's telephone, finishing the ceremonial peeping as well as demonstrating the conclusion of every movie, which is always shocking to some degree (the disturbing instant itself is already experienced after the alteration of camera position). It is at this instant that we become conscious that voyeurism/fetishism is equivalent to bad faith by effectively experiencing the suspension of our own illusion of being "subjects". The alteration of the camera position changes the mise-en-scène radically. Therefore, our spectator location discloses our helplessness, much as in Sartre's explanation of the look of others. The finest illustration in this milieu is the keyhole metaphor, which, too, connotes "the primal scene". It portrays a man who (determined by envy or inquisitiveness) puts his ear to the door and stares through a keyhole. Suddenly, he hears footsteps in the hall, footsteps that remind him that someone is staring at him. This is the moment when the self appears to haunt the unreflective awareness. The individual is presented to consciousness (for which the self subsists on the level of objects in the world) as the person is an entity for the other.

Therefore, voyeuristic means in films follow set arrangement, and they all convince the spectator to identify particularly with the male character by allowing the spectator to see what he sees. Here, the application of such devices as a telescope, magnifying glass, and keyholes are the stimuli for the close-up shots. These visual devices generate the first ever truly elaborate use of close-up in cinema. Such devices are used in the film *Sliver*[8] by Noyce (1993) where he explored Voyeurism in a vaguely different light in recent years. With the

---

[7] Stemming from the theater, the French term mise-en-scène literally means "putting on stage". When applied to the cinema, mise-en-scène refers to everything that appears before the camera and its arrangement—sets, props, actors, costumes, and lighting. Mise-en-scène also includes the positioning and movement of actors on the set, which is called blocking.

[8] Based on Ira Levin's novel *Sliver*, this movie was released in 1993 and the screenplay was made by Joe Eszterhas.

celebrities Sharon Stone and William Baldwin as victim and voyeur, this film was distinguished as an erotic suspenseful story approximately playing off the accomplishment of *Basic Instinct*. It was located in a hi-tech apartment house owned by Baldwin who had cameras set up in every room. He takes pleasure in watching other peoples' activities, and he takes a sexual curiosity in Stone during watching her. He tries to commence her into his voyeuristic world, which is a diverse approach from natural. Therefore, by introducing a female personality to the position of voyeur, we question the concept of voyeurism and its ethical propositions. There is an exciting scene in which Baldwin sends Stone a telescope as a present, and she employs it to look into the residence across from her and attains pleasure from observing a couple make love. Eventually, she moves away to think whether what she is doing is right or not. While she looks once more, she sees the couple inspecting her through their own telescope.

In case of watching a film such as *Peeping Tom* or *Sliver*, critics have distinguished that the conditions of screening and narrative conventions give the spectator an illusion of looking in/on a private world. So, while spectators are participating in imaginary voyeurism, they are made to sense as if the experience is real. In order to remark further on the urge and psychosomatic effects of watching television and film, feminist researcher Laura Mulvey mentions Lacan's mirror stage theory in her article, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema". "When a child recognizes its own image in a mirror is crucial for the construction of the ego" (Mulvey, 1998, p. 588). This mirror instant predates verbal communication for a child and supports its identification with other people. As we become older we carry on categorizing the people we see on TV and film screens just as we did with our own mirror images as a child. This is ill-fated in Mulvey's judgment, because these idealized figures are constructed with a politics at the rear, such as the objectification of women. Nonetheless, despite of visual media, Lacan informs us that we will never locate the principle ego that we first observed in our mirrors as infants.

Regular Voyeurs

Now let us put our eyes away from big screen and concentrate on the current world. In the current 9/11 scenario, once again we live in an impression of terror, as we are instructed to complain any and all actions that may be supposed dissident or probably threatening. As panic alerts persist to rise and fall in an apparently random manner, we cannot help but speculate just how safe we really are. Public belief is divided as to whether such measures as the Patriot Act are helping to keep any country secure. U. S. Attorney General, John Ashcroft, says "the Patriot Act has equipped law enforcement with critical investigative tools that are helping us win the war on terror" (Ashcroft, 2004). In an article written for *New York Times Upfront,* Ashcroft draws the act's three chief actions: to seal "gaping holes in our ability to investigate terrorists" (2004), to modernize "our antiterrorism laws to meet the challenges of new technology, and new threats" (2004), and to let "different agencies—at the federal, state, and local level—to share information and work together to fight terrorism as a team" (2004). Though, Democratic Senator of Wisconsin, Russell Feingold, argues "The Patriot Act gives the government too much power to get information on law-abiding Americans" (Feingold, 2004). In his argument, also presented in *New York Times Upfront*, Feingold notifies us that "as long as the government says that the information is sought for an international terrorism or counterintelligence investigation" (2004), the government is able to get entrance into our "highly personal information" such as: medical and economic records, publication subscriptions, library accounts, and internet-based works. The Patriot Act, with its outcome, permits American government to investigate whomever they think appropriate. In any specified social order, there will always be stability between security and freedom. When we sense insecure, we are more likely to

abandon certain freedom. However, if people authorize the government to maintain such a pervasive eye, then they are also encouraging a certain stage of voyeurism.

When some people blame the government for the spread of voyeuristic tendencies, others stay constant that technology is a blunder. "Give a man a video camera and see his voyeuristic instincts bloom" (Sardar, 2000). Almost everyone is entangled with the information super highway where voyeuristic websites are increasing rapidly. In the book, *Invasion of Privacy*, ex-intelligence officer Louis Mizell Jr. says "More than 20,000 women, men, and children are unknowingly taped every day in situations where the expectation and the right to privacy should be guaranteed" (Calvert, 2000, p. 201). Most of these footages have their way in the World Wide Web. However, this cybernetic and voyeuristic eye leads both ways. "Every website we visit, every store we browse in, every magazine we skim (on the internet) creates electronic footprints that increasingly can be traced back to us" (Rosen, 2000, p. 7). In additional words, even voyeuristic web surfers are being observed in a not so "un-voyeuristic" style. The most recent subject regarding voyeuristic technology is the vastly desired camera phone, which can promptly and simply download to the web. This astounding equipment is contributing to both virtue and vice. Unfortunately, only the virtue is the focus here; the vice is promoting voyeurism and turning it into a regular action.

Voyeurism and "Reality" Shows

In the present Television Media, "reality" programs has been steadily rising since the 1980s until practically exploding in the year 2000. These days, it seems that "reality" shows far outnumber any other brand of entertainment. Programs, such as "soap operas", daytime television, talk shows, real life documentaries and "docudramas", are spreading voyeurism on a world-wide scale. At the pinnacle, there are the government, police, and the employers who are assisting to produce a new "watched" culture with the use of closed circuit TV devices. Whilst such supervision is usually devoted to crime fighting, it is unregulated and open to abuse by camera operators. It is estimated that up to 10% of the time spent filming women on CCTV cameras by shops, businesses, and organizations is motivated by voyeurism (Gabler, 2000, p. 4). Some camera operators are known to have made "greatest hits" tapes, and other material captured on CCTV has become the footage used to create television programs for entertainment purposes. Thus, they are influencing public voyeurism. In his book, Clay Calvert deals with these and many more issues regarding the rising reputation of "reality" TV and the propagation of voyeurism itself. Calvert begins his book by expanding upon the meaning of voyeurism and its connection with television programming by originating the term "mediated voyeurism". This term explains the consumption of programming and images utilizing scenarios that expose "apparently real and unguarded lives" for the function of amusement or information that come with the cost of another's privacy. We should remember that this privacy can be taken unknowingly or, as in most cases, be given up freely. In Calvert's view, conventional definitions of voyeurism do not apply to the replicated voyeurism offered by "reality" TV (Calvert, 2000, p. 22). While he acknowledges that some of our mediated voyeurisms have sexual overtones, he declares that the major part of what should be defined as mediated voyeurism is nonsexual. In an attempt to improve the clarification of both the aspects of mediated voyeurism and the variety of "reality-based" programming, as well as other media sources, Calvert subsequently continues to allocate four groups of mediated voyeurism: video voyeurism, which expresses supposedly un-manipulated practicality; reconstructed voyeurism, which consists of reenactments and adaptations of actual events; tell-all/show-all voyeurism, which comprises both television newsmagazines and talk shows; and sexual voyeurism, which includes pornographic voyeuristic substance. These four categories supply us a better perceptive of how the meaning and use of the

term "voyeurism" has changed since its creation.

Furthermore, our compulsion to watch others, either in reality or on the silver screen, stems from our own internal needs to better understand ourselves. And the same compulsion is responsible for seemingly bottomless worldwide appetite for "reality" TV. After all, "real" TV stars "allow us to connect directly with them because they are us—people who are separated from us by nothing more than the break of getting on the air" (Gabler, 2000, p. 4). Here, actors only present us fabricated and idealized personas, which Lacan has previously perceived we will never become. In the quest of self-identity and public consciousness all through a time of insecurity, many people are asking the media for answers. While world-wide news channels keep us updated on probable fanatic threats, "reality" TV provides us with an apparently real gauge for suitable public and private manners. "Much of our social reality today… is generated through mass-mediated content, such as television shows and motion pictures, rather than direct, firsthand experience with people, places, and practices" (Calvert, 2000, p. 22).

Now if we explore the term "reality" TV, we will notice that it is a contradiction in terms. Ziauddin Sardar, in his article "The Rise of the Voyeur", gives his opinion that we are guided to trust that in manufacturing of "reality" TV "the entire panoply for making programs was supposedly swept away. Banality was born with a great deal of high purpose and portentous self-congratulation from the broadcasters" (Sardar, 2000). Producers of some "reality" programs, such as *Survivor* or *The Real World*, would have their viewers believe that their programs plainly witness the lives of real people. Clay Calvert would tag such a plan as video voyeurism. While it is accurate that most "real" TV partakers are not trained actors, they are proficiently chosen by a number of makers who know precisely about what type of individual they are searching for. Then parts of their lives are efficiently edited, like any other illusory series, in order to generate a consistent narrative that can better continue an audience's attentions. It is my faith that the majority of people do not see these resemblances between what is branded "real" and what is coined fiction. The chief difference between "reality" TV and its imaginary foil is a lack of professional writers and actors.

Moreover, while nearly all media companies struggle to formulate internet effective for themselves, Endemol, a Dutch production company, declares to have achieved it (Lehrer, 2000). *Big Brother*, a show that spies on a group of people imprisoned in a house for two to three months, has established the most successful way to employ the internet to increase television viewing. The concept is voyeurism, which is what the show is about, and what the web is perfect for. *Big Brother*, a set-up that generated in the Netherlands, has been publicized across Europe, and has now moved to America and India where 10 people struggle to be the final one present in the house, who obtains a huge cash prize. Spectators watch the dwellers plot against each other. Afterwards, there is a voting method with two phases which decides who is going to be excluded from the show.

The program has been strikingly victorious. In the Netherlands, for example, 27% of the public audience watched it on a regular basis (Lehrer, 2000). Similar to "reality" programming that has swept Europe, the charm of *Big Brother* lies in peeping into other people's lives when they cannot observe yours. The website, with live video cameras, presents improved voyeurism. In Britain, where the show is now continuing for years, the figure of website hits has increased from 350,000 a day in the first week to three million a day now, with each visit lasting an average of 16 minutes (Lehrer, 2000). That places it at the pinnacle of the British Internet league. *Survivor*, the American counterpart, which is located on an island, does not have the additional pleasure of the webcam, and yet the show was just as successful as *Big Brother* has been in Europe.

Sardar believes that while TV executives may state that programs like *Big Brother* could bring us simultaneously in a discussion around the water-cooler, these shows in fact alienate us more from each other by the insinuation that behind closed doors we all have dubious and interesting dealings. He understands that "reality-based" television originates a dehumanizing effect, which diminishes its subjects to commodities. Therefore, it is not likely that we could learn precious and optimistic information about ourselves from a "reality-based" show. What Sardar may coin as narcissism, others may judge it as self-actualization by exploiting others for the study of the self, and how we accommodate into a community.

Neal Gabler, in his article, "Behind the Curtain of TV Voyeurism", wrote that it is the dissident characteristics of voyeurism that lend to its appeal, and that "reality" television permits us to be "moral outlaws". He also refers Freud with the declaration, "to watch unobserved is to appropriate lives and assert oneself over them" (Gabler, 2000). Robert Thompson, head of the Center for the Study of Popular Television at Syracuse University opposes Gabler's proposition. He states "that a voyeuristic tendency is deep in the human heart, and that there were cavemen peeking into the caves of others thousands of years ago" (Lehrer, 2000). While the author can have the same opinion that some stage of our interests in television, and film has a bit voyeuristic roots in our psyches. The author thinks that classification of us as "moral outlaws" is a bit heavy handed. The author would be more suitable to concur with Thompson's caveman theory. Our eyes are usually drawn to living things. We cannot help but be paying attention in the lives around us, whether those lives are imaginary, actual, or somewhere in between as in the case of "reality" TV. Movies and other media have, certainly, utilized this draw to life.

Moreover, before we take our attention away from "real" TV, let us consider another darker aspect of the medium. While talk shows are not usually coined as "reality" television, they do have some similarities. For instance, some of them frequently focus on the lives of ordinary folks. Clay Calvert sets these programs under the group of tell-all/show-all voyeurism. Morning talk shows like *Donahue* and *Oprah* first came on the airwaves in the 1970s. They were anticipated to be educative and beneficial, but as time continues to the 1980s and 1990s a new type of talk show was born. Shows like *Jerry Springer*, *The Jenny Jones Show* have come and gone. Each one with a colorful tale to tell started looking for their 15 minutes of fame, and the show hosts were all too enthusiastic to oblige. In answer, Sardar (2000) remarked, "We have returned with a vengeance to Roman circuses" (2000). In his abovementioned article, Sardar talks about an Episode of *Jerry Springer* entitled, "Secret Mistresses Confronted". The participants were Nancy Campbell-Panitz and her ex-husband, Ralf. While Nancy got the idea that she was requested to reconcile with her ex-husband, Ralf instead informed her in front of millions of spectators that he had remarried. The violent behavior that resulted with Nancy's reaction did not finish in front of the cameras. It was finished with her subsequent bashing and death along with Ralf's surrender to the police. Voyeurism only did not assassinate Nancy Campbell-Panitz. The blame lies not only on the hands of her husband, but also partly on the hand of those authorities who decide to use our ordinary appeal to the lives of others by providing him/her such a horrifying place and approach to converse his/her personal affairs.

Conclusions

As we all possess a right to our own confidentiality, there should be no disgrace in confessing that we watch from time to time. "Voyeurism" is too simple as a term with too hideous connotation to express the full range of our ordinary curiosities. Whether we denounce it or recognize it, there is no doubt that voyeurism is an inevitable component of our society. While we exercise it in the name of national protection with such assesses

as the Patriot Act, we also misuse it for our own deviant subculture. Even though researchers such as Clay Calvert have taken responsibility to expand our perceptive of the media's use of voyeurism, its communal insight remains negative. Films like *Peeping Tom* and "reality-based" television shows have created our own desire for voyeurism. By examining the reputation of this media, we can further recognize our own instinctual desires, both humane and unusual. However, we should keep in mind that whether this media claims to be "real" or fictional, it can perform as both senseless amusement or as parable. As we consume our media, we are required to be strong in our intellectual thinking skills. We must identify when "reality", both on big and small screens, is in actuality plain entertainment. Likewise, we must utilize these same vital intellectual skills to resolve what we observe from our own windows, and think whether it is something worth further surveillance or not. The consciousness should be there with the duty on each of our shoulders.

References

Ashcroft, J. (2004, April 26). Does the Patriot Act go too far? No. *New York Times Upfront.* Retrieved November 4, 2008, from EBSCO online database.

Calvert, C. (2000). *Voyeur nation.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Feingold, R. (2004, April 26). Does the Patriot Act go too far? Yes. *New York Times Upfront.* Retrieved November 4, 2008, from EBSCO online database.

Gabler, N. (2000, July 7). Behind the curtain of TV voyeurism. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved November 4, 2008, from EBSCO online database.

Lehrer, J. (2000, July 5). *Reality TV*. Retrieved November 19, 2008, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/media/july-dec 00/reality_7-5.html

Meiri, S. (2005). Masquerade and bad faith in Peeping Tom. *Shofar, 24*(1), 107-124.

Metz, C. (1982). *The imaginary signifier* (Part I). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mulvey, L. (1998). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. In J. Rivkin, & M. Ryan (Eds.), *Literary theory: An anthology* (pp. 585-595). Maiden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Noyce, P. (Director) (1993). *Sliver*. Los Angeles: Paramount Pictures.

Pranzarone, G. F. (2008, February 20). *Dictionary of sexology.* Retrieved February 21, 2009, from http://www.ffzg.hr/soc io/astulhof/Dictionary%20of%20Sexology.htm

Rosen, J. (2000). *The unwanted gaze.* New York: Random House.

Sardar, Z. (2000, November 6). The rise of the voyeur. *New statesman*. Retrieved November, 4, 2008, from EBSCO online database.

Zohar, U. (Director). (1973). *Peeping Tom*. Israel: Uri Zohar Films.