

What happened to our original cover, you ask?

Editing a student publication can be an interesting experience for undergraduates, particularly when confronted with corporate and university politics.

Our drama began after Chris Hughes, our multi-media artist, completed our now censored initial cover design. The initial cover featured several original images of unclothed Barbie and Ken dolls. Our intention was to illustrate how women and men are essentially "blank slates"; society's differing expectations for the sexes are, in large part, what determines how we dress, speak, and act.

When first confronted with the possibility of a copyright problem, we found that our greatest difficulty was figuring out where to look for answers. In seeking help, we came across people who informed us that they'd known all along we were headed for trouble, but had failed to share that insight when it could have helped us. At first, we thought it might be a simple matter of giving credit to Mattel, the corporation that produces and owns the rights to Barbie and Ken, and sought the correct format for doing so. But this search led to a labyrinth of other concerns. At every turn, we faced conflicting theories on how we could legally salvage our cover. Should we approach Mattel, should we avoid Mattel, should we represent ourselves to Mattel, should someone else represent us?

Ultimately we were forced to go to Mattel directly even though we'd been advised by many that doing this would mean the end of our cover, whether we were legally in the right or not. When you ask a company permission to use a representation of their product in any form, they are not required to base their decision on what is legally permissible, but instead simply on whether or not they want you to use it. And more often than not, they don't. This was the case for us. According to Mattel, their products are "children's toys...not meant to stimulate discussion." But of course the contrary is true. Barbie and Ken are important cultural icons that cry out for

gender analysis. That they are children's toys is largely why they are often overlooked in discussion. Regardless of their "appreciation for the quality of the journal," the minor legal battle that had involved *New Views on Gender*, the Indiana University Legal Counsel, and the Mattel Corporation resulted in Mattel's denial of permission for the use of our intended cover.

During our tribulations, we did come across people who gave us much-needed support and guidance, who treated the situation as an opportunity for us to learn the importance of independent thinking, questioning motivations, and the 1st amendment. We would like to thank our friends who offered their wise advice and dedicated activism throughout this cover dispute: James Blodgett, Patricia McNeal, Rebecca Torstrick, and Lesley Walker.

This dilemma was certainly not one we would have wished for, but it did give us the benefit of experience rare for undergraduates--insight into the workings of the litigious world in which we live--and we will no doubt take this with us into our careers.

Although it was a definite setback, the loss of an excellent cover did not demoralize us; rather, we were galvanized to create an equally dynamic new design that would draw the eye of the viewer into the images, leading our audience to contemplate their views on gender. We are pleased with the way we navigated a difficult situation and hope that you find this edition of the journal well worth the wait.

The Editors