European Journal of Social Sciences Studies
ISSN: 2501-8590
ISSN-L: 2501-8590
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/soc

DOI: 10.46827/ejsss.v11i1.1940 Volume 11 | Issue 1 | 2025

THE MYTH OF AMERICAN CHILL: FROM COOL-HEADED FREEDOM TO AUTHORITARIAN ICE—AND BACK

Brant von Goble[i]
Széchenyi István University,
Hungary

Abstract:
The American ideal of "chill," once a myth of resilience, tolerance, and laid-back freedom, has been hollowed out by the combined forces of hyper-agency, punitive chivalry, and rising authoritarianism. Through cultural myths, legal frameworks, and media narratives, agency has been distorted into isolation, chill into coldness, and strength into domination. Drawing on examples from pop culture, legal policy, and tragic real-world failures—from family courts to drill rap to school shootings—this paper traces how the American dream of effortless cool was weaponized against the citizenry, men in particular. Yet even amid decay, hope remains. By recovering the relational roots of chill, tempering agency with compassion, and restoring principled skepticism toward power, a quieter, freer path can still be reclaimed. The foundational myth that once sustained America has led her astray, but it can be remade, and with it, a better destiny reclaimed.

Keywords: American myth, authoritarianism, chivalric masculinity, isolation and community, pop culture narratives

1. Introduction

In January 2025, Jessica Brösche, a 26-year-old German tattoo artist, attempted to enter the United States from Tijuana, Mexico, accompanied by her American best friend, Amelia Lofving. The two were traveling with tattoo equipment, anticipating a carefree visit to Los Angeles, a city globally mythologized for its creativity, freedom, and laid-back culture. Instead, Brösche was detained by U.S. Customs and Border Protection despite holding valid travel documents, including a return ticket to Berlin. Authorities accused her of planning unauthorized work solely due to the tools she carried. She was held for days in a border cell, then transferred to the Otay Mesa detention center, where she spent over a month, including eight days in solitary confinement, a period she later described as "like a horror movie" (Dunbar, 2025).

[i] Correspondence: email brant.von.goble@sze.hu

What likely shocked Brösche was not the questioning (after all, there may be nothing more instinctively natural to a German than presenting papers upon request), but its severity and how quickly the "chill" she expected—an ethos of relaxed freedom, emotional steadiness, and principled tolerance so central to the tattoo scene and self-expressive counterlife—collided with the cold, hard walls of authoritarian, Kantian rigidity.

That even such a compliant traveler could be stripped, confined, and isolated speaks to a deeper contradiction, one central to this paper: that the American ideal of *chill* and the reality of authoritarianism are not opposites, but twin expressions of a deeper cultural logic. This logic is rooted in *hyper-agency*—the belief that individuals must be solely responsible for their fate, regardless of structural conditions. Reinforced and driven by a chivalric code demanding both provision and restraint—dignity and debasement—this mindset has reshaped the U.S. legal system, fueling punitive family courts, tough-on-crime legislation, the post-9/11 security fixation, and a widespread tolerance for extreme inequality. Media narratives, such as the television series *24* and the film *Falling Down* (1993), reflect and at times subtly affirm a society that punishes vulnerability as moral failure and cloaks coercion in the language of freedom.

At its core, hyper-agency is a cultural expectation of radical self-accountability—the idea that every individual must master their circumstances alone, and that misfortune signals personal inadequacy (Ehrenreich, 2009; Faludi, 2000; Kimmel, 2015). The *chill myth*, meanwhile, projects an image of rebellious ease and emotional independence but often masks cold detachment, isolation, and a merciless intolerance for weakness (Hooks, 2004; Kimmel, 2008; Sennett, 1977). Chivalry, in this context, merges a warrior's protective code with the self-abasing ideal of courtly love, creating what we shall term the *honor-debasement tension*: the paradoxical exaltation and humiliation of men (but rarely, if ever, women), whose value hinges on stoic provision and the silent endurance of indignities, both expected and absurd (Duby, 1980; Kimmel, 2015). These forces—chill, hyper-agency, and chivalry—form a cultural triad of dualities: each ideal offers liberation but conceals its own inversion.

The argument herein unfolds across culture, law, and story: beginning with the origins and embedded tensions of chivalry and hyper-agency, moving through the rise of America's punitive and militarized state, and finally examining how both courts and characters reflect the collapse of *chill into control*. The conclusion asks not only how we arrived at this point but whether a freer path remains, one in which chill might be reimagined through compassion rather than coercion.

2. Captain Cold: Chivalry, Hyper-Agency, and the Origins of the American Impossible

2.1 Defining Chivalry

Chivalry is not unique to American culture; most societies ask men to protect, provide, and endure to varying degrees (van Creveld, 2013). However, American chivalry is distinguished by its fusion with hyper-agency's demand to protect entirely unaided, under the presumption that any failure is not circumstantial but personal, avoidable, and

ultimately moral. This version of chivalry offers no cavalry, no brotherhood, no village—just a lone figure standing between his loved ones and the world (Gilmore, 1990).

This particular American affliction dignifies violence when wielded in defense, especially of women or children, and from the courtly tradition, it inherits a form of masochistic servitude—a man's value proven by his sacrifice, his dignity purchased through self-erasure. Most curiously, American chivalry cannot even assert its own necessity. The protected, especially if female, could have acted for themselves, the culture insists, yet expecting them to do so is offensive (Kimmel, 2017). This is the fate of Captain Cold: to give all, be told it was not needed, and still be punished if he does anything less.

2.2 The Honor-Debasement Tension

American chivalry and American chill share a peculiar trait: both must appear effortless. The ideal man does not struggle; he endures. He must never seem to want praise, nor appear wounded by sacrifice. The performance must be seamless—calm under pressure, attractive without vanity, powerful without pride, and always ready to relinquish that power at his lady's command (Faludi, 2000; Kimmel, 2015).

By contrast, Latin machismo is allowed to announce itself. A man may take offense, show pride, and defend his honor with heat and flourish. The Mediterranean man may do much the same. The Gaul is permitted dramatic flair (Gilmore, 1990). Passion is expected; performance is part of the point. However, for the Middle American man, especially the suburban professional, there are no Tony Lamas, no embroidered jackets, no theatrical gestures. There is only the suit, and even that must never fit too well—just well enough. Flyover Country Man must not *spend* on presentation, yet he must always look presentable (Kimmel, 2015; Rotundo, 1993).

In this aesthetic and emotional regime, even righteous anger is suspect. A man may sacrifice everything, but the moment he voices frustration, he risks becoming ridiculous. He must accept the divorce, lose the children, pay the price, and somehow carry on, but not *too well*, lest he exude the wrong sort of cold.

2.3 Hyper-agency's Rise and Cultural Roots

If American chivalry offers the external script of masculine virtue, then hyper-agency supplies its emotional engine, demanding that men endure without help, internalize all failure, and mistake suffering for strength. This ideal of radical self-responsibility is often assumed to be a timeless American trait. In actuality, it is the product of cultural, political, and emotional transformations throughout the 19th and 20th centuries (DiLorenzo, 2010; Putnam, 2000). Hyper-agency is not natural, nor was it inevitable; it is a myth born of rupture.

In the early 19th century, Alexis de Tocqueville (2000) praised the United States as a land of intense civic engagement. Men found dignity not through isolation, but through participation in associations, mutual aid societies, churches, town halls, and fraternal orders. These networks formed a thick web of social and emotional support, buffering individuals from collapse. Manhood was collective. Dignity was mutual.

This began to fracture during and after the Civil War. That conflict dislocated millions and shattered the homes, traditions, and kin networks of North and South alike. Former soldiers returned to burned towns and broken communities. Emancipated Black men were freed into legal ambiguity and social hostility. Many wandered westward, not in search of freedom, but in flight from loss. These men became the prototypes of a new archetype: the solitary male, wounded, dispossessed, and expected to rebuild without complaint. While the psychological toll of war went unacknowledged, its emotional suppression was celebrated (Faust, 2008; Foner, 1988; Richardson, 2007).

Earlier frontier myths, figures like Natty Bumppo, portrayed rugged men, but men who moved within relational frameworks: navigating between Native and settler cultures, forming alliances, and belonging, however precariously, to a world of human ties. Postbellum myth rejected this model. The lone cowboy, the gunslinger, the stoic sheriff—these were men without homes, without tribes. Their virtue lay not in cooperation, but in endurance. They stood apart, not among (Cooper, 1986; Etulain, 1996; Slotkin, 1973)

What began as trauma was transformed into strength, first by the literature of the time, then by the emerging language of cinema, which was aesthetically and morally drawn to the image of a solitary figure silhouetted against the vast, untamed horizon. The cowboy became more than a man; he became a symbol—a deeply American moral and spiritual ideal who conquered space by denying dependence, who survived not through relationship, but through refusal (Slotkin, 1998; Tompkins, 1992; Wright, 1975).

This transformation coincided with the rise of the centralized American nation-state. As the Civil War weakened the autonomy of individual states and strengthened federal authority, a more abstract, more nationalized identity began to take hold. This process was not uniquely American. As Benedict Anderson (2006) has argued, the late 19th century witnessed nations worldwide inventing themselves through shared language, print culture, and heroic archetypes, constructing "imagined communities" to replace fractured regional ties.

In this context, what might have remained one of many transitional eras instead crystallized into a permanent sense of national character—a narrative exported and echoed across other emerging nations as the boundaries between nobleman and commoner, citizen and subject, narrowed, and print capitalism extended its reach. What had been a rupture became a foundation. What had been coping became myth (Anderson, 2006; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983).

A man was no longer first a Virginian, or a son of a local lineage, but *an American*—a designation less relational than conceptual, anchored not in family or community, but in ideals, flags, and symbolic figures. And among those figures, none loomed larger than the solitary man who stood apart, quiet, honorable, and alone.

In this new framework, emotional independence became patriotic. The man who needed no one symbolized the nation that had transcended division and personal weakness. Stoicism was no longer just masculine; it was the mark of the true American.

By the late 20th century, the social supports that once balanced these ideals had largely disappeared. America's civic infrastructure, once a buffer against personal

collapse, had eroded. Men no longer belonged to masonic lodges, church groups, or civic leagues. They no longer bowled in teams. Even emotional life had been privatized: romantic partnership replaced communal belonging, and the nuclear family became the lone site of meaning and support (Coontz, 1992; Giddens, 1992; Illouz, 1997; Putnam, 2000).

This shift created extraordinary emotional pressure. Men were expected to find not only companionship but identity in romantic love. The partner, once one thread in a communal web, was now cast as best friend, emotional anchor, and sole confidante. When that bond failed, through divorce, estrangement, or emotional disillusionment, there was no village to fall back on. There was only failure.

Over the past seventy years, every major cultural and economic transition has only deepened this isolation. Boomer romanticism and divorce culture, serial monogamy and blended families; the rise of hustle culture, the valorization of the entrepreneur, the death of unions, and the precarity of the gig economy; even the expansion of corporate HR micromanagement into emotional life—all have chipped away at what little remained of the collective (Hochschild, 1983; Graeber, 2018; Standing, 2011).

Even critical reappraisals of the hyper-agentic myth through acid Westerns, sociological critiques, or psychological realism have done little to dislodge it. The myth absorbs its own subversions. It is anti-fragile.

Hyper-agency, once a makeshift response to cultural trauma, has become the gold standard of masculine virtue, leaving no space for need, grief, or shared struggle.

3. The Historical Rise of Authoritarian Culture

3.1 Pre-1970s Context: The Last Peak of Chill

Echoes of the communal ideal praised by de Tocqueville survived into the 1960s counterculture, when the chill myth briefly flourished in earnest. Woodstock and *Easy Rider* (1969) captured the era's dream of freedom, emotional authenticity, and rebellion. This was not just aesthetic: thousands of communes and intentional communities sprang up across the country—some spiritual, like *The Farm* in Tennessee; others rationalist and egalitarian, like *Twin Oaks* in Virginia; and others, like *Drop City*, completely anarchic. Groups like the Diggers in San Francisco set up free stores and public kitchens, rejecting capitalism not through protest but through immediate alternatives (Fairfield, 1972; Miller, 1999). The Black Panther Party, in parallel, ran community clinics and breakfast programs—asserting a different kind of chill: one rooted in mutual aid and resistance, echoing the ethnic support networks and mutual benefit societies that had defined American civic life in the 19th century (Beito, 2000; Nelson, 2011).

This vision of relational freedom found a philosophical home in the pages of the *Whole Earth Catalog*, whose mantra, "Access to Tools," promised that autonomy could be compassionate and shared (Turner, 2006). Nevertheless, even in these utopias, the rugged individual never fully disappeared. He remained, simply draped in tie-dye instead of camouflage, praised not just for connection but for surviving on the edge. *Easy Rider* ends not with transcendence but with a shotgun blast. *Zabriskie Point* (1970) ends with silence.

In each of these movements—communal, religious, technological, or radical—the seeds of hyper-agency persisted. They did not always bloom immediately (Barbrook & Cameron, 1996; Turner, 2006). However, where relational resilience faltered, hyper-agency reasserted itself—often in its darkest forms: surveillance, authoritarian leadership, or performative strength masquerading as justice (Wolin, 2008; Zuboff, 2019).

3.2 1970s–1990s: Seeds of Authoritarianism

By the 1970s, the American myth of chill—freedom, emotional independence, self-made identity—was under severe strain. Hyper-agency, once tied to liberation, increasingly became a mechanism of control.

The War on Drugs, launched under Nixon and intensified through Rockefeller's harsh mandatory sentencing laws, reimagined personal failure as criminality. Men who stumbled through addiction, poverty, or youthful recklessness were not seen as victims of social decay, but as enemies of public order (Alexander, 2010; Hinton, 2016). The 1990s Crime Bill only deepened this logic, contributing to the explosive rise of incarceration rates: from about 150 per 100,000 Americans in 1972 to 680 per 100,000 by 2021, and climbing to 700 per 100,000 in 2022 (Buehler & Kluckow, 2024).

Chivalry, too, was repurposed toward punitive ends. The "super-predator" panic of the 1990s, popularized by figures like John DiIulio and adopted politically by President Clinton, cast young men, especially young Black men, as moral monsters beyond redemption. Protecting society no longer meant reinforcing community ties; it meant eliminating threats through incarceration (DiIulio, 1995; Hinton, 2016).

Meanwhile, profound economic shifts were quietly eroding the collective foundation. Globalization and outsourcing gutted the American manufacturing base—an estimated 30% decline between 1980 and 2000 (Scott, 2015). Union power collapsed. Wages stagnated. Elites promoted hyper-agency myths not only culturally but economically, valorizing the entrepreneur and the hustler as models of virtue, while ignoring the systemic forces destabilizing ordinary life (Freeman, 2007; Harris, 2017; Tokumitsu, 2015).

However, even before this structural authoritarianism took firm hold, the cultural soil had already begun to sour. The 1970s witnessed not only the rise of punitive policies but also the eclipse of countercultural collectivism by charismatic authoritarianism. Two of the era's darkest figures, Charles Manson and Jim Jones, emerged not as rebels against the chill ethos, but as its grotesque inheritors.

Manson, steeped in the language of peace and music, co-opted the aesthetic of the hippie movement while twisting its underlying message. The folk guitar and flowered shirts remained, but beneath them simmered a doctrine of paranoia, possession, and control, *possibly* engineered by the CIA. His cult turned communal vulnerability into an instrument of murder, offering a vision of freedom that demanded submission, a community bound not by love but by fear (Melnick, 2018; O'Neill & Piepenbring, 2019).

Jones, for his part, began with the trappings of a progressive, interracial, utopian community. The People's Temple preached economic justice, racial harmony, and shared purpose. But over time, Jones transformed from charismatic leader to paranoiac despot,

gradually demanding ever greater displays of loyalty. In 1978, over 900 followers died in what Jones framed as a revolutionary suicide, but which, for many, was simply murder by manipulation. The line between communion and coercion had been obliterated (Chidester, 2003; Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d.; Guinn, 2017).

Both figures illuminate a central tension: when collectivism lacks grounding in accountability, structure, and genuine mutuality, it becomes fertile ground for hyper-agency to reassert itself, not democratically, but dictatorially. These cults were not antithetical to American myths—they were mutated expressions of them. Individual salvation, charismatic force, and self-reliance twisted into their most predatory forms.

This punitive transformation was not limited to rhetoric or incarceration policy. It also reshaped the physical instruments of domestic governance. In 1997, the United States formalized the 1033 Program, allowing surplus military equipment to be transferred to local police departments. Armored vehicles, assault rifles, and battlefield gear—tools designed for foreign wars—began appearing in American neighborhoods. This development, framed as necessary to fight crime, further blurred the line between policing and soldiering, between citizenship and insurgency. The citizen was no longer protected by the state, but surveilled and subdued by it (Balko, 2013).

During the same period, another development reinforced the punitive logic of hyper-agency: the rise of carceral feminism. Early feminist figures such as Erin Pizzey, working in Britain, emphasized that family violence was often relational and structural, not solely the product of male domination (Pizzey, 2011). Yet by the 1980s, a more punitive framework gained dominance, recasting men as inherent threats and the state as the necessary protector. This perspective found institutional expression in the United States through models like the Duluth framework and legislation such as the Violence Against Women Act (1994). Under this logic, chivalry's ancient demand—that men protect at all costs—was re-inscribed into law, but stripped of relational nuance. Male failure, whether emotional or behavioral, became grounds for immediate state intervention. Hyper-agency was no longer just a social expectation; it was a legal mandate (Gruber, 2020; Schneider, 2000).

3.3 Post-9/11 Climax: The Fusion of Hyper-agency and Authoritarianism

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, catalyzed the final fusion of hyper-agency and authoritarian culture. In the immediate aftermath, the American ethos shifted almost overnight. Once central to the national self-image, personal freedom was swiftly subordinated to the demands of security, surveillance, and unquestioned obedience.

The Patriot Act—enacted just six weeks after the attacks—expanded government authority to surveil, detain, and monitor citizens with minimal oversight. Militarized policing intensified nationwide, as did the blending of military and domestic security roles (American Library Association, n.d.; Katzenstein, 2020; U.S. Department of Justice, 2001). Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, costing over $2 trillion *each* (Crawford, 2020; Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, 2021), were justified through appeals to national strength, moral clarity, and self-sacrificial duty. Hyper-agency became not just a masculine ideal, but a patriotic requirement.

Chivalry's old warrior code found new, resplendent life. Firefighters and first responders were lauded as "heroes," symbols of stoic sacrifice and duty without complaint, their masculinity suddenly useful again (Faludi, 2007). Television shows like *24* depicted protagonists such as Jack Bauer as embodiments of the new American ideal: solitary, ruthless, willing to break rules and endure (and administer) torture for the greater good. Bauer did not rebel against the system; he became its sanctioned extension—the hyper-agent weaponized by the state (Kearns & Young, 2017; Mayer, 2008).

Meanwhile, the chill myth—the idea of effortless freedom, of laid-back self-expression—collapsed entirely. In airports, citizens removed their shoes, submitted to searches, and answered to armed agents with meek compliance. Surveillance expanded into public and private life alike. A nation once self-mythologized as defiant and rebellious now internalized control as safety, obedience as honor (Faludi, 2007; Lyon, 2003; Wolf, 2007).

Outsiders, particularly European visitors, were often startled by how quickly Americans adapted to the new regime. What they perceived as excessive security theater, humiliating searches, and draconian punishment seemed at odds with the country's advertised love of freedom (Ash, 2004; Judt, 2005; Todorov, 2010). However, to many Americans, this was not a contradiction. It was the natural fulfillment of hyper-agency's logic: if the individual is wholly responsible for his fate, then any failure, whether personal, economic, or national, is a form of moral collapse requiring correction, punishment, or purgation.

By the mid-2000s, hyper-agency, authoritarian governance, and chivalric self-erasure had fused into a single cultural ideal. The man who suffers in silence, the citizen who trades liberty for security, the soldier who fights endless wars without resolution—all were cast not as victims of a failing system, but as exemplars of virtue (Bacevich, 2013; Faludi, 2007; Lakoff, 2016; Lyon, 2003).

The chill myth was not abandoned. It was reabsorbed into the machinery of control—another mask, another sacrifice. And in that transformation, the deep neuroticism of the solitary man is revealed. To survive in isolation, without allies or affirmation, is no mean feat of nature. It is a condition of existential dread to the uncultivated mind.

Buddhadasa Bhikkhu, the Thai reformist monk who spent years in forest solitude, once noted that the great struggle of the solitary man was not hunger, but the sound of wild animals in the night—proof that one was truly alone. Endurance, he taught, required cultivated mental stillness, a discipline of years (Buddhadasa, 2014).

The American chill man receives no such training. He is expected to stay upright and true, with no compass, no map, and no sight of the horizon. To suffer without comprehension. To fail without forgiveness. For the unprepared, this is not merely difficult; it is often *impossible* (Gurian, 1996; Lakoff, 2016; Lasch, 1991).

4. Family Courts: Chivalric Hyper-Agency in Action

4.1 Chivalric Expectations

The American family court system embodies institutionalized chivalric hyper-agency—a fusion of romantic idealism and legal coercion that turns provision into obligation and loyalty into liability. What was once a courtly virtue is now a legal mandate, stripped of dignity and enforced by law.

Men may be ordered to support children they cannot see—or did not father—due to presumptions, errors, or default judgments. Punitive enforcement and bureaucratic indifference can reduce a man to lifelong penury and repeated imprisonment, forcing him to enrich the very system that impoverishes him (Baskerville, 2007; Soss et al., 2011). He becomes a provider not by choice, but by paperwork or proximity, and once cast, the role is nearly inescapable.

No-fault divorce further removes moral context from legal outcomes. Betrayal or abandonment often holds no weight, especially if the man is wronged (Parkman, 2000). He may be evicted, lose custody of his children, and be ordered to fund the household that replaced him. Grief or protest is pathologized; protective orders may be issued reflexively, barring him from home and children without due process (Mills, 2003). Stoic silence becomes less a virtue than a means of survival.

This is chivalry without nobility—romantic duty turned into bureaucratic punishment. Unlike Latin machismo, which allows some expression of pride or pain, the American chivalric model demands silent submission. A man must fund the family that expelled him and feign gratitude for the right to do so. The toll extracted in the name of such duty is not only financial, but spiritual: a slow, bureaucratic erasure of the self.

4.2 Hyper-agency's Punitiveness and the Willful Destruction of Men

This system does more than reflect and amplify distorted chivalry—it enforces hyper-agency as policy. Men are expected to meet obligations regardless of circumstance. Job loss, illness, or regional collapse aren't mitigating factors; they are treated as excuses. Misfortune becomes a mark of moral failure.

This mindset is distinctly American. In more collectivist cultures, conflict is often addressed through mediation and shared responsibility. *Shower* (1999), a Chinese film centered on a traditional Beijing bathhouse, offers a subtle contrast. A couple with visible domestic tensions is counseled by the elder men of the community, not isolated, but encouraged toward reconciliation. The bathhouse becomes a space for healing, where broken ties invite continuity, not exile.

By contrast, American courts impose judgment rather than dialogue, reinforced by a popular discourse steeped in deep vindictiveness toward fathers. Men who fall behind on child support—due to job loss, custody changes, or bureaucratic error—face license suspensions, wage garnishments, and incarceration (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2020; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, n.d.; *Turner v. Rogers*, 2011). These measures disproportionately harm low-income men. Enforcement routinely targets the poor, and incarceration for nonpayment remains legal in many states

(Turetsky, 2007). Over 70% of outstanding child support debt is owed by men earning under $10,000 annually (Harris et al., 2010; Sorensen et al., 2007; Waller & Plotnick, 2001). Although *Turner* acknowledged due process concerns, it did not require legal counsel for indigent defendants, leaving many to navigate hearings alone, further compounding their disadvantage.

Sweden offers a meaningful contrast: child support is based on actual income, and when parents cannot pay, the state covers the shortfall and seeks modest repayment (Försäkringskassan, n.d.). The goal is to support the family, not to subordinate the father. In this model, family cohesion and child welfare take precedence over punishment (OECD, 2011).

In the U.S., punitive logic is reinforced by romantic ideals from the Boomer era. Courts still expect the emotionally available "wife guy"—a husband and father whose identity is bound to family. But this is historically anomalous. For most of history, marriage was a practical alliance, not an emotional crucible (Cherlin, 2009; Coontz, 2005). The Boomer generation recast marriage as identity-defining, layering impossible emotional demands atop economic ones. As Whitehead (1998) observes, the normalization of divorce reframed personal loss not as tragedy, but as individual failing—a view that persists today, as public grief is interpreted as bitterness, protest as threat, and love itself becomes a liability.

Unlike the communal wisdom of *Shower*, where flaws are met with patience, American courts isolate and penalize. Vulnerability becomes a crisis. Hyper-agency becomes law: a man must meet every burden without hope of compassion. For some, this leads to despair. Family court involvement is linked to heightened suicide risk—particularly among men facing custody loss or prolonged litigation (Barry & Liddon, 2020; Jamison et al., 2019).

4.3 Impact and Importance: In Furtherance of Isolation

The consequences of this legal-cultural framework extend far beyond individual men. International observers, often steeped in the myth of American egalitarianism, are stunned to find that a nation celebrated for personal freedom enforces some of the harshest family court penalties in the developed world (Baskerville, 2007; Skinner & Davidson, 2009). Expatriates, particularly from Europe, may expect informality and flexibility, only to be met with economic control, moral absolutism, and unilateral enforcement.

This retributive impulse reflects a broader American tendency: the U.S. imprisons a larger share of its population and imposes longer sentences than any other developed nation (Sawyer & Wagner, 2020; Walmsley, 2018). The same harshness that governs criminal law permeates family courts, transforming vulnerability into justification for surveillance and control.

The result is a nation where myths no longer fortify, but fragilize. Freedom becomes a slogan; justice, a transaction. Alienated from their communities and hemmed in by bureaucracy, Americans—especially fathers—are both needed and discarded, bound and exiled in the same breath.

Civic trust withers into reluctant compliance. Faith in institutions deteriorates not only among the judged, but also among those who witness the judgment (Braver & O'Connell, 1998). What remains is not only despair, but a hollowing of the relational fabric itself, a retreat from belonging (Putnam, 2000).

Beneath the collapse lies a deeper tragedy: the destruction of those who remained faithful. These men are not undone by vice, but by loyalty outliving its usefulness. They work, provide, and obey—only to find no sanctioned path back when stripped of their role. If they fail economically, they are debased; if they resist, they are cast as villains. Grief becomes guilt. Duty becomes disgrace.

Other cultures frame such loss differently. In *The Piano in a Factory* (2010), a Chinese father's custody fight amid industrial collapse is met with solidarity and humor, echoing the themes of *Shower* (1999), previously discussed, where human flaws invite restoration rather than exile. Failure is acknowledged without criminalization; dignity is preserved through communal bonds.

In America's hyper-agentic model, economic failure is personal humiliation. There is no village to witness, no collective memory to soften the fall. The man who sacrifices everything is left with no banner to carry, no kingdom to serve, and no god who will answer when he finally cries out.

This fallen archetype reverberates across American music and film, leaving a trail of broken songs and shattered heroes. In Bruce Springsteen's "Born in the U.S.A.," bitter disillusionment festers beneath the anthemic surface. In *First Blood* (1982), a retired special forces soldier learns that service has rendered him not honored, but hunted. In *Falling Down* (1993), William Foster's slow unraveling captures the unbearable tension between loyalty and dispossession. Each narrative does not merely dramatize loss; it mourns the betrayal of an old ideal and warns of a culture that demands stoic devotion only to abandon its most faithful sons.

5. Martyrs, Monsters, and Instruments of the Machine: Pop Culture's Betrayal of Chill

5.1 Jack Bauer's Chivalric Hyper-Agency

If the family courts represent the practical machinery of hyper-agency, then popular culture is its cathedral. In the world of media, the same forces that punish men in court are elevated into grand narratives of heroism, sacrifice, and, paradoxically, demonization. Film and television do not merely reflect cultural expectations; they valorize, normalize, and give them narrative force. Private pain becomes public myth. And no figure is more valorized than Jack Bauer. Across eight seasons of *24*, Bauer is not merely a protector, but a martyr: a man who saves his country not through principle, but through pain. He tortures, deceives, and destroys, not out of ambition, but because no one else will act. Through Bauer and Hollywood's broader pantheon of solo heroes, the impossible demands of hyper-agency are not questioned—they are glorified.

Bauer does not serve a lady, but a nation. His love is not romantic but civic, and yet, his arc mirrors the emotional mechanics of courtly love: restraint, sacrifice, abasement, and unacknowledged suffering. He is a knight without a court, a man whose

dignity lies in silent endurance and whose virtue is measured by how much damage he absorbs to preserve others. He embodies the ultimate fusion of chivalric hyper-agency and authoritarian necessity—an ideological contradiction resolved only by fantasy, where unchecked authority and reckless self-sacrifice are natural extensions of moral duty.

This fantasy is perhaps most potent in Season 2, when Bauer's moral descent hardens into ritual. In one scene, he tortures a suspect by electrocuting him with a defibrillator, eliciting not just information but admiration. The act is not considered desperation, but competence: cool, controlled, and necessary. By Season 6, the collapse of ethical boundaries is complete: Bauer suffocates his own brother with a plastic bag before drugging him into confession—a moment of familial betrayal reframed as patriotic resolve.

These scenes, while shocking, were not fringe entertainment. *24* aired during prime time and reached as many as 12 million viewers. Its influence was so great that in 2007, Brigadier General Patrick Finnegan visited the set to plead with producers, warning that soldiers were emulating Bauer's techniques. "The kids see it and say, 'If torture is wrong, what about *24*?'" he explained. Meanwhile, interrogators at Abu Ghraib admitted to modeling mock executions after the show (Hron, 2008).

Here, Foucault's (1995) prediction—that disciplinary spectacle would be replaced by hidden surveillance—reverses itself. The spectacle returns, not as horror, but as heroism. Torture becomes not merely permissible, but aspirational. A darker alchemy unfolds: the transformation of moral decay into emotional clarity. Bauer is damned by his actions, but damned nobly. His cool detachment becomes a virtue, not a vice. He hurts others not because he enjoys it, but because the world demands it—and that, the narrative insists, is what makes him a man.

While *24* presents torture as the dark sacrament of the hyper-agentic man—atonement through violence, clarity through pain, *Unthinkable* (2010) serves as its uneasy reflection. Where Jack Bauer suffers for the nation and emerges ennobled by necessity, the protagonist of *Unthinkable*, known only as "H" (played by Samuel L. Jackson), descends into moral opacity. Tasked with extracting the location of hidden nuclear bombs, he tortures a suspected terrorist and former special forces operator with escalating brutality, yet each act, rather than reinforcing his heroism, corrodes it. There is no mythic backdrop, no framing of martyrdom. His choices leave him isolated, repellent, and perhaps irredeemable.

What makes *Unthinkable* especially chilling is that H's adversary does not merely survive torture; he embraces it. He is prepared for it, shaped by it, perhaps even sanctified by it in his own mind. To extract the truth, H must not only abandon his principles, but also adopt the worldview of the man he seeks to break. The result is not just moral erosion, but existential collapse. The film refuses resolution, lingering in the bleak space where coercion taints all outcomes. It is a rare meditation within American cinema: a reckoning with the cost of hyper-agency when stripped of glory, and a challenge to the fantasy that violence and moral corruption, once justified, can remain containable.

That *Unthinkable* was largely forgotten, while *24* was mythologized, is itself a telling cultural parable. The American hyper-agentic man cannot survive ambiguity. He must act—decisively, unilaterally, and above all, righteously. Bauer is tortured by the world and so tortures it back. He is wounded by moral complexity and therefore silences it. He becomes the man the system demands: one who absorbs violence, channels it, and emerges not as a casualty, but as a code. He is not permitted grief, reflection, or regret, only action. In that, he mirrors the very citizens who worship him: a society that turns stoic suffering into masculine ritual, and moral exhaustion into televised resolve.

5.2 *Falling Down*'s Tragic Rebellion

Where Bauer embodies hyper-agency mythologized—violence sanctified, sacrifice glorified—*Falling Down* (1993) presents a more tragic, more human unraveling. In William "D-FENS" Foster (Michael Douglas), we see not the knight triumphant, but the knight broken.

A recently laid-off defense engineer, Foster drifts through a society that no longer needs the skills, loyalties, or protections he once offered. In his white shirt and tie—faded banners of a forgotten middle-class honor, their very *Dilbertesque* absurdity rendered almost tragic—he staggers across a sweltering Los Angeles, demanding civility from a world that either never shared his values or has long since abandoned them. His rebellion does not begin with grandstanding, but with small, desperate refusals: a protest against the price of a meal, against meaningless bureaucratic decrees, against the casual humiliations of daily life. Yet as the day unfolds, these refusals escalate into violence. Foster becomes less a man than a monument to misplaced faith: a figure broken not by vice, but by the slow, invisible disintegration of the promises that once gave his life meaning. He is a tragic emblem of the man who, finding no sanctioned path for grief, anger, or redemption, is left to destroy himself in search of what no longer exists.

Foster's foil, Sergeant Prendergast (Robert Duvall), mirrors a different path through the same landscape. On his final day before retirement, Prendergast is mocked by his colleagues, controlled by his wife's relentless anxieties, and quietly stripped of public dignity. Yet he submits without protest. He bears indignities as part of his duty, fulfilling the chivalric expectation that the *good man* absorbs humiliation with grace. Where Foster breaks under the strain of lost status, Prendergast bends, surviving, but at the cost of near-total erasure.

Their final confrontation crystallizes the paradox. Cornered, Foster asks, almost bewildered, "I'm the bad guy?" In that moment, he confronts the terrible inversion at the heart of the American honor-debasement tension: that even noble suffering, if voiced or made visible, becomes criminal. Foster's death by police gunfire is not simply a narrative end. It is a cultural verdict: the hyper-agentic man, once failed, must vanish, either into silent compliance or public annihilation. In both men, the myth of American chill—stoic resilience without cost—collapses into either self-destruction or total submission.

In a culture where agency is demanded but forgiveness is denied, there is no true survival—only different forms of disappearance.

The rebel breaks. The servant bends. Both are punished.

6. Chill, Not Ice: Giving Authoritarianism the Cold Shoulder

6.1 Concrete Proposals: Tempering Chill, Resisting Authoritarianism

To preserve chill, we must reconnect composure, independence, and courage to community, patience, and trust—before these virtues are co-opted by authoritarianism. Chill should not signify domination or withdrawal, but the quiet determination to remain fully human, even under strain.

A. Rebuild Trust Horizontally, Not Vertically

Authoritarianism thrives when men distrust their neighbors but worship distant power. As Putnam (2000) shows, the collapse of local trust leaves individuals exposed to centralized control. Arendt (1958) deepens this warning, arguing that loneliness is not just a symptom of decline, but a precondition for totalitarianism. To resist this slide, we must rebuild relational trust through neighborhood mediation, civic gatherings, and mutual aid, not sprawling bureaucracies. Hyper-agency must be dispersed, not concentrated.

The goal is not blind compliance, but shared stewardship: the collective maintenance of a shared life.

B. Reframe Strength as Endurance with Compassion

Authoritarian myths teach that strength lies in cruelty, the subjugation of others, and the will to harden the heart against all suffering. As Koestler (1952) revealed in *Darkness at Noon*, when men are severed from tradition and trust, they drift into systems that worship betrayal as duty and brutality as virtue. Fromm (1941) deepens this warning, showing that in times of fear, people do not merely tolerate cruelty; they mistake it for necessity, even for love. Against this bleak alchemy, we must reclaim an older truth: that real strength lies not in the conquest of others, but in the refusal to let hardship erode humanity.

Our stories must change. Films, songs, and cultural myths must lift up those who withstand hardship without losing their laughter, who offer protection neither as martyrdom nor as control, but as a shared act—where strength never eclipses respect—and who suffer without becoming cruel. Coolness must be reimagined, not as numbness, but as the quiet courage to feel without breaking.

We must call back a cinema of fellowship and chosen loyalty: tales like *The Magnificent Seven* (1960), where flawed men, aware of the costs, nonetheless band together in mutual respect, not for mindless sacrifice, but for the shared defense of a fragile good. Their losses are real, and the world's gratitude fleeting, but the brotherhood they forge stands as its own reward. In a culture that honors voluntary solidarity over coerced endurance, men might find again that mercy is not weakness, but the final proof of strength.

C. Restore Local Pride without Falling into Tribalism

Communities must be allowed—indeed encouraged—to take pride in themselves, not in opposition to others, but in the quiet dignity of self-maintenance. Pride is not the enemy of freedom; as de Tocqueville (2000) observed, it can anchor liberty by strengthening bonds of trust and mutual responsibility. But it must be pride rooted in care, not conquest. Public commemorations, localized craftsmanship, and spaces for civic gathering offer pathways to renew this spirit without tipping into aggression. To resist cultural atomization, communities must relearn to commemorate, to cultivate, and to convene, thereby reviving the ordinary rituals that once bound free people together.
A man who feels rooted will not need a tyrant to tell him who he is.

D. Decouple Agency from Isolation

The hyper-agentic myth taught men that needing others was weakness—a lesson that, as Fromm (1941) warned, leads not to freedom, but to deeper loneliness.

A better myth must teach that true agency lies in seeking and offering strength wisely. Chill must become a shared virtue: the ability to remain steady together, not merely alone.

Educational systems should nurture relational resilience, not just individual rights, but the arts of conflict resolution, emotional regulation, and collective dignity. This is not a surrender of reason or autonomy, but a recognition that no one should bear existence in perfect isolation.

To survive hardship with grace requires more than inner strength; it calls for a quiet web of mutual support, something chill culture once knew and must now remember.

E. Legal Reform to Rebuild Dignity

The law must no longer assume that failure is deviance. Family courts, criminal justice systems, and civil penalties must be reoriented toward preserving dignity while encouraging responsibility. This demands rejecting tribalistic fear-mongering, whether in the form of carceral feminism, punitive child support enforcement, or moral panics, and embracing mediation, proportional remedies, and restorative frameworks.

Research on restorative justice demonstrates that mediation and proportionality better serve both victims and communities (Umbreit et al., 2005), while punitive enforcement and fear-driven policies often entrench injustice and worsen social fragmentation (Gruber, 2020; Sorensen et al., 2007). Everyone, even the chillest citizen, has a breaking point. Law must become the steward of relational restoration, not merely the punisher of human frailty. A man who falters economically, emotionally, or socially must be offered pathways to rebuild, not condemned to permanent alienation. Responsibility must be demanded—but forgiveness must be permitted. Without such reform, the cycle of fear, isolation, and authoritarian grasping will only continue, feeding the very monsters we claim to abhor.

F. Rekindle Principled Skepticism, Not Reflexive Defiance

A free society demands not mindless obedience nor mindless rebellion, but principled skepticism: the courage to question authority without abandoning the value of order itself. As both Mill (2002) and Arendt (1958) warned, a free society depends not on blind obedience or reckless rebellion, but on the principled exercise of independent judgment—the only true safeguard against both authoritarian control and chaotic collapse.

Chill, at its best, teaches confidence in one's own judgment: the ability to weigh claims, to doubt both tyrants and populists, and to uphold truth over mere title. Respect must be earned by character and evidence—not conferred automatically by uniforms, degrees, or power. This ethos—self-assured but responsible—is the antidote to both authoritarian rule and nihilistic chaos.

A culture of principled skepticism would not merely oppose injustice; it would prevent its slow normalization, preserving both agency and community from those who would corrode either in the name of "safety" or "progress." To revive this ethos, education must prioritize the development of rational thought, critical inquiry, and civil debate, not merely rote compliance or reflexive outrage. Public culture must celebrate those who question wisely, who resist both herd mentality and authoritarian commands without lapsing into cynicism. Chill, properly understood, is not detachment from truth, but steadfastness in the pursuit of it: a calm, confident refusal to yield one's conscience to either fear or fashion.

America's founding generation understood this ideal. In the spirited debates surrounding the *Federalist Papers*, complex arguments were published in newspapers for ordinary citizens to read, debate, and judge on their merits. Public life demanded not blind loyalty to party or person, but an active engagement with ideas—a standard of civic literacy that honored the intelligence of the common man. Rebuilding this tradition of serious, participatory discourse is not merely desirable; it is essential to restoring both freedom and community.

7. From Hyper-Agency to Hollow Spectacle and From Spectacle to Strength

7.1 Hyper-Agency's Final Mutation: From Virtue to Violence

We must consider these reforms not as luxuries, but as necessities. Without them, the path ahead leads not to stagnation but putrefaction: a slow transmutation of hyper-agency from stoic endurance into hollow spectacle, from dignity into domination. The forces already at work will not dissipate on their own. They will curdle, as they have already begun to—turning myths of resilience into rituals of destruction.

Hyper-agency, in its earliest form, still carried a tragic nobility. The man who stood alone—silent, enduring, stoic—was honored not for triumph over others, but for shouldering unbearable weight without surrender. Even in isolation, there was dignity. Even in collapse, there was honor.

This early form of hyper-agency is embodied powerfully in *There Will Be Blood* (2007), where Daniel Plainview begins as a driven, self-reliant prospector but gradually

spirals into a violent, isolated despot. His independence, once a source of rugged pride, corrodes into paranoia and resentment. Plainview's descent mirrors the American mythos of the self-made man pushed to its breaking point, until success itself becomes a kind of madness, and isolation the only remaining proof of strength.

But as the communal frameworks that once gave shape to these ideals disintegrated, so too did their meaning. Endurance hardened into numbness. Rebellion soured into spectacle. Without relationships to restore the fallen to fellowship, or shared myths to sanctify suffering, agency lost its compass, reduced to a profane ritual, a desperate pounding against the walls of an indifferent world.

In this vacuum, two distorted paths emerged: both born of grief, both desperate to reclaim agency after its betrayal.

7.2 Collapse of Collectivity: Two Paths into the Void

The first path clings, however brokenly, to the remnants of brotherhood. In drill rap culture—epitomized by figures like King Von, a Chicago rapper who, as some have argued, may stand as hip-hop's first true serial killer (Trap Lore Ross, 2023)—violence becomes a distorted form of loyalty: a way to manufacture belonging from the ruins of abandoned communities.

Crew replaces kin. Territory replaces shared purpose. Vengeance replaces solidarity. What once might have been righteous anger against injustice collapses into endless retaliation: a performance of strength severed from any larger hope of restoration.

Emerging from drill rap (a subculture distinct from broader hip-hop in its brutal embrace of violence and its portrayal of community as a hollowed battlefield), King Von did not merely participate in this collapse; he embodied it. His world was not one of solidarity or shared struggle, but of perpetual betrayal and blood debt.

Yet his conduct was not without its own grim logic.

Drill culture, in its way, extends and parodies chivalry in its most martial sense; it demands respect, it takes offense, it defends honor through extraordinary force, but it does so without the tempering forces of compassion, duty, or proportionality. Chivalric forms remain; chivalric virtues evaporate.

The second path embraces isolation fully, shedding even the thinnest pretense of collectivity.

Nowhere is this more chillingly illustrated than in the 1999 Columbine High School massacre, when two teenage boys, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, murdered 13 people before killing themselves. Dressed in black dusters, steeped in violent video games, and quoting Nietzsche without understanding, they cast themselves as misunderstood rebels in a hostile world (Cullen, 2009). Yet they sought no brotherhood. They wanted no followers. Their rebellion was not a call to change, but a demand for attention through destruction.

As Gladwell (2015) observed, Columbine's aftermath marked a grim cultural turning point: Harris and Klebold unintentionally created a "cultural script," a dark mythology in which acts of spectacular violence became, for the alienated, a perverse

form of significance. What had once been the adolescent yearning for independence, the chill ideal of cool self-possession, was hollowed out, severed from any higher meaning, and weaponized into spectacle.

This was hijacked cool: a grotesque mimicry of independence, stripped of compassion, stripped of purpose, performed solely for the bitter affirmation of existence. The adolescent longing for recognition, once a catalyst for self-discovery, was corrupted into nihilistic theater: *I act, therefore I am, even if that act is annihilation.*

Deceived by false myths—stories that promised power but delivered only isolation—and seduced by the confusion of infamy with glory, they mistook destruction for freedom and directionless rage for purpose. What began as a revolt against conformity and mindlessness fell into depravity, binding those who followed not in triumph, but in chains of darkness.

These two forms of collapse, violent collectivism without solidarity and violent individualism without purpose, reveal the terminal stage of hyper-agency when untethered from community, compassion, and any greater cause.

What remains is force.

What remains is spectacle.

What remains is loneliness, sharpened into a weapon.

7.3 From Spectacle to Stillness: The Refuge and Return of Chill

When the bonds of solidarity fray, when hyper-agency decays into nihilism, and when rebellion itself is emptied into spectacle—what remains to hold a man upright? The answer is not found in louder violence, nor in deeper isolation, nor even in the endless churn of new myths. It is found, quietly, in the oldest of lessons: that agency without compassion, and chill without connection, rot from within.

This is where Buddhadasa Bhikkhu, the Thai monk and philosopher, offers a final, humbling contrast. Buddhadasa Bhikkhu offers a humbling contrast to modern hyper-agency.

He lived alone in the Thai forests, not to escape the world, but to master presence—resilience rooted not in stoicism or spectacle, but in mindful awareness. He learned to suffer without performance, to act without applause, to feel without being ruled by feeling.

In a world that demands rebellion without hope and endurance without aid, his solitude is not defeat but a final, authentic chill—anchored not in apathy or control, but in the calm recognition of grief without submission to it.

He tempered agency, rather than rejected it. He refined rebellion, rather than renounced it.

His path offers a quiet alternative to both drill's hollow fraternity and Columbine's performative alienation: not collapse, not conquest, but preservation—the slow, stubborn staying of the course when everything invites collapse.

8. Conclusion: The Quiet Reclamation of the American Heart

Across the landscapes we have explored—family courts and city streets, screen dramas and violent songs—one truth repeats itself: hyper-agency, stripped of compassion, leaves only a husk—a reminder of a strength that once lived, but no longer breathes.

It promises dignity, but yields despair.

It demands endurance, but mocks the fallen.

It offers rebellion, but only rebellion as performance: the spectacle of King Von's martyrdom, the nihilism of Columbine's ruin, the grim loyalty of drill crews to invisible empires of turf.

Chivalry, once a code of honor, became an instrument of humiliation.

Chill, once a posture of resilience and freedom, became a mask for surveillance, isolation, and state control.

Even our heroes, from Jack Bauer to William Foster, are trapped by these contradictions: damned if they endure, damned if they rebel.

Yet this is not the end of the story.

The myths we inherit are not destiny. They are maps, and we may choose whatever roads on them we please.

Chill, if it is to survive, must be reclaimed not as detachment or domination, but as *shared resilience.*

Agency must be rooted not in endless self-assertion, but in conscious, rational strength—the ability to act not from fear, rage, or nihilism, but from presence.

The world does not need more spectacles of collapse. Not more men punished for being human, or heroes glorified for becoming monsters.

It needs something quieter, older, and infinitely harder to forge: not slogans or postures, but living forces of weight and consequence:

- Skepticism that questions authority without descending into paranoia.
- Endurance that accepts help without shame.
- Rebellion that preserves dignity—not spectacle.

Each man faces this choice. Each culture does, too.

We can be Foster, broken under impossible expectations.

We can be Bauer, sacrificing humanity for hollow triumphs.

We can be the drill soldier, dying for illusions.

Or we can strive for something better: strong without cruelty, chill without coldness, free without abandonment, loyal without servitude.

Only then can citizens and visitors alike—from dyed-in-the-wool American boys to tatted-up German tourists—once again enjoy the chill that gave America her peculiar charm, her bold, reckless appeal, and that incandescent greatness once worn with effortless ease.

We made the myths that destroy us.

We can remake them.

And in that work, even now, agency endures.

Agency is not preserved in isolation, nor is chill born of apathy.
They endure only in those who shoulder their burdens as adamantine armor,
who do not flee the darkness,
who do not betray themselves to despair,
and who, even when all songs fail, still walk the hard road unbroken.

Acknowledgements
Research for this paper was conducted using AI tools. The author assumes full responsibility for the contents herein and has independently verified all sources and reference material.

About the Author(s)
Brant von Goble, Ed.D., is a full-time researcher at Széchenyi István University in Hungary. He holds a doctorate in education from Western Kentucky University, where his research focused on motivation and social-emotional development. His academic interests include cross-cultural education, second-language acquisition, and the cognitive dimensions of learning. A former university lecturer, he has presented at the annual conferences of the American Educational Research Association and the Association for Psychological Science.

References

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness.* The New Press. Retrieved from https://newjimcrow.com/

American Library Association. (n.d.). *Chronology of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001.* https://tinyurl.com/krsmjwez

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). Verso. (Original work published 1983). Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yc4wpxpa

Arendt, H. (1958). *The origins of totalitarianism* (2nd ed.). Meridian Books. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yc6p23ct

Ash, T. (2004). *Free world: America, Europe, and the surprising future of the West.* Random House. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/56y5em6t

Bacevich, A. (2013). *The new American militarism: How Americans are seduced by war.* Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-new-american-militarism-9780199931767?cc=ro&lang=en&

Balko, R. (2013). *Rise of the warrior cop: The militarization of America's police forces.* PublicAffairs. Retrieved from https://www.hachettebookgroup.com/titles/radley-balko/rise-of-the-warrior-cop/9781610392129/?lens=publicaffairs

Barbrook, R., & Cameron, A. (1996). The Californian ideology. *Science as Culture, 6*(1), 44–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/09505439609526455

Barry, J., & Liddon, L. (2020). Child contact problems and family court issues are related to chronic mental health problems for men following family breakdown. *Psychreg Journal of Psychology, 4*(3), 57–66. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/5bxbb5th

Baskerville, S. (2007). *Taken into custody: The war against fathers, marriage, and the family*. Cumberland House. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2007-19664-000

Beito, D. (2000). *From mutual aid to the welfare state: Fraternal societies and social services, 1890–1967*. University of North Carolina Press. Retrieved from https://uncpress.org/book/9780807848418/from-mutual-aid-to-the-welfare-state/

Braver, S., & O'Connell, D. (1998). *Divorced dads: Shattering the myths.* Tarcher. https://tinyurl.com/psrzceku

Buddhadasa Bhikkhu. (2014). *Heartwood of the Bodhi tree: The Buddha's teachings on voidness* (S. Santikaro, Ed. & Trans.). Wisdom Publications. (Original work published 1994). Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/zm8r35cz

Buehler, E., & Kluckow, R. (2024). *Correctional populations in the United States, 2022 – Statistical tables* (NCJ 308699). U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/m3z725js

Cherlin, A. (2009). *The marriage-go-round: The state of marriage and the family in America today*. Alfred A. Knopf. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/5eknaxt3

Chidester, D. (2003). *Salvation and suicide: An interpretation of Jim Jones, the Peoples Temple, and Jonestown* (Rev. ed.). Indiana University Press. (Original work published 1988). Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt16gzbxp

Coontz, S. (1992). *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap.* Basic Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/2152408

Coontz, S. (2005). *Marriage, a history: How love conquered marriage*. Viking. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2005-06504-000

Cooper, J. (1986). *The last of the Mohicans* (R. Slotkin, Intro.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1826). Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4yc9mdrk

Crawford, N. (2020, February 6). *The Iraq War has cost the US nearly $2 trillion.* Military Times. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/nafcbxrc

Cullen, D. (2009). *Columbine*. Twelve. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/5cedhsue

DiIulio, J. (1995). *The coming of the super-predators.* The Weekly Standard. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4bujzrm7

DiLorenzo, T. (2010). The culture of violence in the American West: Myth versus reality. *The Independent Review, 15*(2), 227–239. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/24562364

Duby, G. (1980). *The chivalrous society* (C. Postan, Trans.). University of California Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/bddctkew

Dunbar, M. (2025, March 3). 'Like a horror movie': Ice detaining German tourist in California indefinitely. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/322kr4tx

Ehrenreich, B. (2009). *Bright-sided: How positive thinking is undermining America.* Metropolitan Books. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2s3mz8rx

Etulain, R. (1996). *Re-imagining the modern American West: A century of fiction, history, and art.* University of Arizona Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1qwwjgx

Fairfield, R. (1972). *Communes USA: A personal tour.* Penguin Books. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/332wxp7r

Faludi, S. (2000). *Stiffed: The betrayal of the American man.* HarperCollins. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/ycyez2w2

Faludi, S. (2007). *The terror dream: Fear and fantasy in post-9/11 America.* Metropolitan Books. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/caecze42

Faust, D. (2008). *This republic of suffering: Death and the American Civil War.* Alfred A. Knopf. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4ry9wsn4

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (n.d.). *Jonestown: California Congressman Leo Ryan was concerned.* FBI. https://www.fbi.gov/history/famous-cases/jonestown

Foner, E. (1988). *Reconstruction: America's unfinished revolution, 1863–1877.* Harper & Row. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/3u3bubx9

Försäkringskassan. (n.d.). *Maintenance support when the child lives with you*. Swedish Social Insurance Agency. https://tinyurl.com/4vv6uw2m

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975). Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/3f33ef6n

Freeman, R. (2007). *America works: Thoughts on the exceptional U.S. labor market.* Russell Sage Foundation. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yek4vv8j

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. Farrar & Rinehart. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1942-01072-000

Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love, and eroticism in modern societies.* Stanford University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2s3u4u7m

Gilmore, D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity.* Yale University Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vm2vj

Gladwell, M. (2015, October 19). Thresholds of Violence: How school shootings catch on. *The New Yorker*. https://archive.ph/j4RpQ

Graeber, D. (2018). *Bullshit jobs: A theory.* Allen Lane. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/37zd9tyj

Gruber, A. (2020). *The feminist war on crime: The unexpected role of women's liberation in mass incarceration.* University of California Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvxhrhq6

Guinn, J. (2017). *The road to Jonestown: Jim Jones and Peoples Temple.* Simon & Schuster. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/r4d5wjhk

Gurian, M. (1996). *The wonder of boys: What parents, mentors, and educators can do to shape boys into exceptional men.* Tarcher. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/3va4yux2

Harris, A., Evans, H., & Beckett, K. (2010). Drawing blood from stones: Legal debt and social inequality in the contemporary United States. *American Journal of Sociology, 115*(6), 1753–1799. https://doi.org/10.1086/651940

Harris, M. (2017). *Kids these days: Human capital and the making of Millennials.* Little, Brown and Company. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/39ab9j4p

Hinton, E. (2016). *From the war on poverty to the war on crime: The making of mass incarceration in America.* Harvard University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/5n98ux5k

Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (1983). *The invention of tradition.* Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/cc3zknb9

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* University of California Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/mskaz6jj

Hooks, B. (2004). *The will to change: Men, masculinity, and love.* Washington Square Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yc753f83

Hron, M. (2008). Torture goes pop! *Peace Review*, 20(1), 22–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650701873684

Illouz, E. (1997). *Consuming the romantic utopia: Love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism.* University of California Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/jj.2711559

Jamison, E., Bol, K., & Mintz, S. (2019). Analysis of the effects on time between divorce decree and suicide. *Crisis, 40*(5), 325–331. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000563

Judt, T. (2005). *Postwar: A history of Europe since 1945.* Penguin Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4esjkth2

Katzenstein, J. (2020, September 16). *The wars are here: How the United States' post-9/11 wars helped militarize U.S. police.* Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Brown University. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/548e543x

Kearns, E., & Young, J. (2017). "If torture is wrong, what about 24?" Torture and the Hollywood effect. *Crime & Delinquency, 64*(12), 1568–1589. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128717738230

Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men.* Harper. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/5cw4pr83

Kimmel, M. (2015). *Angry white men: American masculinity at the end of an era.* Nation Books. https://tinyurl.com/ycyz55na

Kimmel, M. (2017). *Manhood in America: A cultural history* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4swwxzjr

Koestler, A. (1952). *Darkness at noon* (D. Hardy, Trans.). New American Library. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2rw66hhd

Lakoff, G. (2016). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/54pyrzzj

Lasch, C. (1991). *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations.* W. W. Norton & Company. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yrtckuf5

Lyon, D. (2003). *Surveillance after September 11.* Polity Press. Retrieved from https://www.econbiz.de/Record/surveillance-after-september-11-lyon-david/10004721357

Mayer, J. (2008). *The dark side: The inside story of how the war on terror turned into a war on American ideals.* Doubleday. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/53zkvxum

Melnick, J. (2018). *Creepy crawling: Charles Manson and the many lives of America's most infamous family.* Arcade Publishing. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2war9rjm

Mill, J. (2002). *On liberty*. Dover Publications. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/5fzaeaer

Miller, T. (1999). *The 60s communes: Hippies and beyond.* Syracuse University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2udyu4ez

Mills, L. (2003). *Insult to injury: Rethinking our responses to intimate abuse.* Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/3jupxy32

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2020, October 14). *License restrictions for failure to pay child support*. NCSL. https://tinyurl.com/4h9z9frk

Nelson, A. (2011). *Body and soul: The Black Panther Party and the fight against medical discrimination.* University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttt9qf

O'Neill, T., & Piepenbring, D. (2019). *Chaos: Charles Manson, the CIA, and the secret history of the sixties.* Little, Brown and Company. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/35nfbvu2

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2011). *Doing better for families.* OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264098732-en

Parkman, A. (2000). *Good intentions gone awry: No-fault divorce and the American family.* Rowman & Littlefield. Retrieved from https://rowman.com/ISBN/9780847698684

Pizzey, E. (2011). *This way to the revolution: A memoir.* Peter Owen Publishers. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/bdhueeht

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* Simon & Schuster. https://tinyurl.com/43wjmv66

Richardson, H. (2007). *West from Appomattox: The reconstruction of America after the Civil War.* Yale University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/59rhrtxs

Rotundo, E. (1993). *American manhood: Transformations in masculinity from the Revolution to the modern era.* Basic Books.

Sawyer, W., & Wagner, P. (2020). *Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2020*. Prison Policy Initiative. https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2020.html

Schneider, E. (2000). *Battered women and feminist lawmaking.* Yale University Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1npsn7

Scott, R. (2015). *The manufacturing footprint and the importance of U.S. manufacturing jobs.* Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yp7fvfwd

Sennett, R. (1977). *The fall of public man.* Alfred A. Knopf. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1977-23178-000

Skinner, C., & Davidson, J. (2009). Recent trends in child maintenance schemes in 14 countries. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family, 23*(1), 25–52. https://doi.org/10.1093/lawfam/ebn017

Slotkin, R. (1973). *Regeneration through violence: The mythology of the American frontier, 1600–1860.* Wesleyan University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/56th3u9m

Slotkin, R. (1998). *Gunfighter nation: The myth of the frontier in twentieth-century America.* University of Oklahoma Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/mvsmvj3f

Sorensen, E., Sousa, L., & Schaner, S. (2007). *Assessing child support arrears in nine large states and the nation.* Urban Institute. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4atbsxk2

Soss, J., Fording, R., & Schram, S. (2011). *Disciplining the poor: Neoliberal paternalism and the persistent power of race.* University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/me88euff

Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class.* Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved from https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/58691

Tocqueville, A. de. (2000). *Democracy in America* (H. C. Mansfield & D. Winthrop, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1835/1840.) Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/4p8c2ykh

Todorov, T. (2010). *The fear of barbarians: Beyond the clash of civilizations.* University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/mv82fh7p

Tokumitsu, M. (2015). *Do what you love and other lies about success and happiness.* Regan Arts. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/emdp8y3d

Tompkins, J. (1992). *West of everything: The inner life of Westerns.* Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/mr3zyxra

Trap Lore Ross. (2023, April 7). *King Von: Rap's first serial killer* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mAfwToVGh1s

Turetsky, V. (2007). *Staying in jobs and out of the underground: Child support policies that encourage legitimate work.* Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP). https://policyarchive.org/handle/10207/13797

Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011). https://tinyurl.com/3jjs7xaa

Turner, F. (2006). *From counterculture to cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the rise of digital utopianism.* University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/F/bo3773600.html

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement. (n.d.). *Child support services*. Administration for Children & Families. https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css

U.S. Department of Justice. (2001). *The USA PATRIOT Act: Preserving life and liberty.* https://www.justice.gov/archive/ll/highlights.htm

Umbreit, M., Vos, B., Coates, R., & Lightfoot, E. (2005). Restorative justice in the twenty-first century: A social movement full of opportunities and pitfalls. *Marquette Law Review, 89*, 251–304. https://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr/vol89/iss2/3

Van Creveld, M. (2013). *The privileged sex*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2jvkwh39

Waller, M., & Plotnick, R. (2001). Effective child support policy for low-income families: Evidence from street level research. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 20*(1), 89–110. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3325595

Walmsley, R. (2018). *World prison population list* (12th ed.). Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research. https://tinyurl.com/3w3k2jpx

Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs. (2021). *Human and budgetary costs to date of the U.S. war in Afghanistan, 2001–2022.* Brown University, Costs of War Project. https://tinyurl.com/m93nj2b7

Whitehead, B. (1998). *The divorce culture: Rethinking our commitments to marriage and family*. Vintage Books. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/mt6xv4x6

Wolf, N. (2007). *The end of America: Letter of warning to a young patriot.* Chelsea Green Publishing. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/yutujx9v

Wolin, S. (2008). *Democracy incorporated: Managed democracy and the specter of inverted totalitarianism.* Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/2nvajwx9

Wright, W. (1975). *Sixguns and society: A structural study of the Western.* University of California Press. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/mkr7a4we

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power.* PublicAffairs. Retrieved from https://tinyurl.com/59572x5u

Films, Music, and Television Referenced

Anderson, P. (Director). (2007). *There will be blood* [Film]. Ghoulardi Film Company; Scott Rudin Productions. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0469494/

Antonioni, M. (Director). (1970). *Zabriskie point* [Film]. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0066601/

Hopper, D. (Director). (1969). *Easy rider* [Film]. Pando Company; Raybert Productions. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0064276/

Jordan, G. (Director). (2010). *Unthinkable* [Film]. Lleju Productions; Sidney Kimmel Entertainment; Kimmel International. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0914863/

Kotcheff, T. (Director). (1982). *First blood* [Film]. Anabasis Investments; Carolco Pictures. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0083944/

Schumacher, J. (Director). (1993). *Falling down* [Film]. Warner Bros. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0106856/

Springsteen, B. (1984). *Born in the U.S.A.* [Song]. *On Born in the U.S.A.* Columbia Records. https://brucespringsteen.net/albums/born-in-the-u-s-a/

Sturges, J. (Director). (1960). *The magnificent seven* [Film]. The Mirisch Company; Alpha Productions. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0054047/

Surnow, J., & Cochran, R. (Executive Producers). (2001–2010). *24* [TV series]. Imagine Television; 20th Century Fox Television. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0285331/

Zhang, M. (Director). (2010). *The piano in a factory* [Film; Chinese with English subtitles]. Perfect World Pictures. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt1723118/

Zhang, Y. (Director). (1999). *Shower* [Film; Chinese with English subtitles]. Imar Film; Sony Pictures Classics. https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0215369/