

***Mad Men's* Deceptive (Critique Of) Creativity**

JULIE ROBERT

UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SYDNEY

The nature of creativity in AMC's *Mad Men* had been a background issue up until its fourth season. It then began to offer subtle but provocative interventions in debates about the mythology of alcohol and inspiration, industry-specific definitions of creativity and, through them, the paradoxical relation of creative expression to silence. Taking up this last point at the narratological level via a reading of silences and analepses in the fourth season, this study illuminates *Mad Men's* more recent engagements with creativity.

Within the context of the Sterling Cooper Draper Pryce agency, creativity is first and foremost a commodity for sale. Creative thinking *and* the ability to translate these brilliant ideas into viable marketing strategies are paramount. One without the other is of limited value. This industry-specific notion of creativity is explained in a 1960 article in the *Journal of Marketing* by Albert Politz, a New York-based market researcher working in the advertising industry. He defines 'creativity' as 'the *advanced* form of imagination where it is *purposively* used by abiding to rigid rules and by meeting practical conditions'.¹ Similar studies of perceptions of

creativity in advertising work from a notion that it 'differs from artistic expression and other forms of creativity-for-the-sake-of-creativity'.² Although this view is not endorsed to the same extent among those within the industry, even those working on the creative rather than the accounts side of the industry agree that creativity is 'more than originality'.³

Also implied in these definitions culled from industry insiders is the notion that creativity is not a solo endeavour. It is the product and multistep process of transforming ideas into campaigns that combine words, images and sounds, and the deliberate delivery of these compositions to target audiences. In the show, this division of creativity into its constituent parts is made plain when we look at the roles each character plays within what is a very typical agency. Copywriters like Peggy Olson and Freddy Rumson produce taglines and slogans, Salvatore Romano heads the art department to generate images for print campaigns, Harry Crane pilots the television department and is responsible for selecting the right faces and voices to animate commercials. Even accounts people like Roger Stirling and Pete Campbell play a role in helping clients reach their target audience or opening up new markets to maximise sales. The whole process is ostensibly managed by a senior staff member, creative director Don Draper, whose very title suggests a coordination and perhaps an assemblage of creativity generated by others.

As in most group efforts, not everyone's participation is perceived as carrying the same weight. Factors such as race, class, gender and age affect whose creativity is valued and to what degree. In early episodes, for instance, there is a sense of disbelief that Don could draw inspiration for a campaign from a black waiter's opinions about his preferred brand of cigarettes.⁴ The ideas from women, be they copywriters, secretaries or market researchers—even when drawn from direct experience afforded them by their gender—are routinely questioned and are frequently abandoned in favour of what the men around the table think. Youth is similarly seen as a liability, in part because younger contributors are assumed to lack knowledge, as is the case when Pete's insights into Japanese culture are taken up and given credence only when endorsed by Don and Bert Cooper.⁵ Such 'limits' on creativity point to the fact that irrespective of results, or even outside evaluation, not all creativity is equal. A good idea is more likely to be recognised as such if it comes from one of the established, white men in the room.

The elision of what or whose input goes into making a good creative idea contributes to a feeling—one often cultivated by those in creative fields—that creativity is the result of a somewhat mysterious process. In the show, Pete Campbell, exemplifies this idea as he tours prospective clients around the offices. He ushers his guests into the room now dubbed the creative lounge and explains the process of generating ads by stating: ‘We can’t tell you how it happens, but it does happen here.’⁶ Campbell’s cryptic statement posits creativity as a trade secret, a sort of secret ingredient or classified way of doing things that ensures consistently profitable results for clients. This romanticised and mystique-building sales pitch trades on a general lack of understanding about how creativity comes into being.

To ascribe creativity to something largely unknowable yet still beyond the individual helps to explain why it has been figured as both a collective endeavour and a solitary attribute, the province of a genius-type figure. The fusion of the ill-understood notion of genius and the degree of sociability involved in many drinking situations moreover fosters a link between creativity and alcohol (as well as drugs).⁷ When the deistic qualities of creativity are added to the mix, alcohol becomes a transformative substance, a sort of potion or elixir, which can alter those who consume it. The consciousness altering effects of absinthe, the drink of choice in nineteenth-century French cafes, were celebrated by poets and artists like Nerval, Baudelaire and Lautrec, who used their works to laud the effects of the green fairy—a sort of supernatural figure who brought both inspiration and intoxication. Arnold Ludwig’s study of the biographies of thirty-four celebrated individuals—visual artists, writers, composers and/or performers—with documented tendencies to drink heavily reveals that the artists acknowledge the role that alcohol plays in their creative processes. They cite it as that which accelerates the flow of ideas and removes the strictures of self-censorship, which are needed to initiate the creative process.⁸

Scientists who sought to determine the veracity of not only the artists’ claims about the effect of alcohol on their creative process but also the general mythology of drunken creativity have taken up these subjective assessments about the muse-like qualities of spirits and other libations, as if to bring logical explanation to the otherwise mysterious process. Experimental psychologists Lapp, Collins and Izzo concluded that the creative advantage attributed to alcohol is indeed real, although

it has more to do with the drinker's expectation of greater creative ability than it does with the pharmacological properties of the drink.⁹ Alcohol, like many drugs, they argue, produces a substantial placebo effect, in this case fuelled by the positive associations of alcohol and creativity.

Alcohol and creativity, for all the emphasis on their causal relationship, are also correlated in several other ways. Beaveridge and Yorston note the ideas of social transgression that inhere to both genius and drunkenness to suggest that our recognition of creativity may come from our inability or unwillingness to separate out the 'creative' and therefore normatively transgressive product from the process of its creation.¹⁰ Ludwig's research into creative alcoholics' self-perceptions of their creativity while intoxicated supports these findings. Many artists felt that alcohol was a useful creative catalyst, although a significant number also recognised that it impeded the work of sustained creativity because it often had negative effects on the quality of what they produced.¹¹

Ludwig's observations bring us to another significant element in the mythology of alcohol and creativity: that the association will outlive its utility and what was once a productive association will become an impediment to the creative process. Writers and artists, according to the mythology, have to either give up the drink or be consumed by a pattern of consumption that becomes detrimental to their creative process. The idea is that the frenetic pace of drinking and creation cannot be sustained and the artist will burn out or become a victim of what has come to be regarded as a pathological relationship to alcohol. Cases like that of Malcolm Lowry and Jack Kerouac, both of whom died from complications directly related to their drinking, lend credence not only to the cautionary side of the association, but also to the notion that alcohol does not constitute a dependency so long as the drinker/creator is producing good work. When the work is judged to suffer the genius becomes a drunk.

In many ways, the convivial influence of alcohol and the social or collective nature of some types of creativity helps guard against such pronouncements. For those in creative professions, the sociability produced by drink could be seen to bolster the synergy needed to work collaboratively, something Hunt, MacKenzie and Joe-Laidler note of other occupations where 'group solidarity at work is further established by drinking together on and off the job'.¹² Indeed, many anthropological

studies of drinking focus on its role in group settings as tracing the contours of belonging and acceptance.¹³ When 'drinking acts to mark the boundaries of personal and group identities, making it a practice of inclusion and exclusion' it becomes a powerful force in either constructing or tearing down social barriers such as those of a so-called 'creative community,' be it of a Greek symposium, a nineteenth-century Left Bank cafe or a 1960s advertising agency where whisky counts as an office supply.¹⁴

For its first three seasons, *Mad Men* largely adhered to such assumptions about creativity. The creative team of copywriters and artists at the advertising agency worked collectively (albeit not with everyone's input credited equally) to come up with ideas, but the agency's notoriously private creative director, Don Draper, called the shots as a sort of genius-like figure whose processes were more carefully concealed from viewers. With regard to alcohol's role in the process, the show also upholds much of the mythology. Time after time, viewers tune in to a familiar scene; from the ever-present bottles of whisky, liberal doses are poured as the members of the nearly exclusively male creative team gather to pitch ideas to one another and to develop ad campaigns for iconic products. In the opening episode of the fourth season, for instance, two junior copywriters are seen bouncing ideas off each other in the creative lounge, half full glasses of whisky in hand, as though to remind viewers not used to the milieu that alcohol and sociability go hand in hand in the creative process.¹⁵ Imbibing also helps consolidate membership in the creative team. Peggy's first success with the Belle Jolie lipstick pitch is rewarded with a drink among the men of the office who normally only indulge with female staff during explicitly social times, not as part of the normal boozy office interactions among themselves.¹⁶ Even the downside of alcohol and creativity, the 'inevitable' burnout and professional undoing, is chronicled in the case of Freddy Rumson, an alcoholic copywriter who is temporarily sidelined when he can no longer function in the profession.

Whether or not the association of alcohol and creativity or alcohol and the creative industries is well founded, viewers of the profoundly realistic show are enticed into believing the mythology as presented, even when it is contradictory. The show's official website plays on the connection with a guide for recreating the show's many classic cocktails and a feature about the drama in the *New York Times*

Magazine is titled 'Smoking, Drinking, Writing, Womanizing, Smoking, Drinking...', which clearly lays out the series' vice-driven orientation.¹⁷ In the article, author Alex Winchell solicits the reminiscences of advertising creative directors who worked in the 1960s to either endorse or dispute the depiction of the industry at the time. While some, like George Lois, argue that the show give the false impression 'it was all three martini lunches', others like Jerry Della Femina find the portrayals to be closer to the truth than many sceptics, particularly in the current corporate climate, would suspect.¹⁸ Almost as if to respond to the early commentary on the subject, the show's fourth season began to explore more deeply the generally positive but superficial relationship between alcohol and creativity and to question the associations it had previously upheld. It now problematised the role of alcohol as muse and thus undermined the productive side of an association that was already marred by the gendered nature of the office drinking practices and the undervaluing of creative inputs from those considered outsiders or neophytes.

In 'Waldorf Stories', the agency's creative director both simultaneously reinforces and destroys the mystique of the drunken artist that surrounds him.¹⁹ As the agency executives celebrate before the Clio Awards, for which Don's 'Billy the Kid' Glo-Coat floor wax commercial has been nominated, they find themselves having to handle an unexpectedly rescheduled pitch for a breakfast cereal campaign. Quite obviously impaired, Don tries his original marketing strategy only to have it fall flat. In desperation, he tosses out good, bad, repeated and stolen taglines, one after another, hoping one will appeal to the prospective clients. They finally seize upon a line that Don had heard earlier that morning from an unsuccessful job applicant and that he had then, unconsciously and drunkenly, passed off as his own.

This episode of what masquerades as creativity elicits a variety of reactions. For the executives from Quaker Oats, who witness Don bounce ideas around while obviously intoxicated, they believe they are witness to that process normally hidden from view: drunken but genius-like creativity. Don's reputation for brilliance precedes him and it stokes the belief that he is advertising's equivalent of the true creative type evoked in the cultural commonplaces and placebo-effect producing lore. The clients, because they have no knowledge of the job interview from earlier in the day, and Don, because he seems to have forgotten it and the line he just sold in a cocktail-induced fog, are ignorant of the chosen slogan's source and therefore find

it creative. Don's reputation for creativity and brilliant on-the-spot performance not only excuse what would otherwise have been perceived as unprofessional conduct (showing up to a meeting while sloppily drunk), but also allows the clients and everybody else in the room except for Peggy, a junior copywriter and Don's protégée, to attribute his ad-libbed performance to a centuries-old pattern of finding the muse, to paraphrase Yves Herseant, in the bottle.²⁰ Through (assumed) creativity, alcohol is rescued from social and professional *faux pas* to a key prop in not only maintaining, but also building Don's reputation as a genius.

For Peggy, who was both present for the job interview and is sober enough to remember the provenance of the misappropriated line, this on-the-spot creativity is little more than a sham. While others among Draper's colleagues appear uncomfortable as the public face of the agency behaves in a manner that risks both embarrassment and loss of business, Peggy's privileged perspective, one that gives her access to what might be too much information, justifies her alarm when Don finally delivers the account-clinching slogan and the others breathe a sigh of relief. It is that she knows more than the others, knows that the line is not original and that she can expose her boss' creativity not as the product of the drunken genius, but rather of a dysfunctional and deceitful 'collaboration', that turns the popular notion of creativity on its head.

The different reactions to Don's ad-libbing and the vastly different conclusions those who witness the performance reach about his creative abilities speak to the importance of the unlikely factors of silence and invisible processes, or ignorance, in determinations about what is and is not creative. Given that popular views of creativity emphasise originality and novelty, it is logical to expect that ignorance of precedence can establish, at the very least, a subjective view of creativity. Theorists like David Bohm, however, see creativity as a process that inherently depends on silence for the generation of ideas, not just to establish judgements of creativity after the fact. He argues that silence is necessary to perceiving and seizing upon stimuli or thoughts that others may ignore or grasping patterns that may otherwise go unnoticed amid confusion. In *On Creativity* he defines his title subject as the act of perceiving that which may be uncomfortable or challenging to our views of order. 'Real perception ... is capable of seeing something new and unfamiliar' and 'requires that one be attentive, alert, aware and sensitive'.²¹ If creativity for Bohm is defined

by productive internal silence, Don's drunkenness all but precludes attentiveness or alertness. (After all, he cannot even remember having heard the line elsewhere.) His lack of perspicacity and thus of what Bohm would call genuine creativity therefore leaves creativity to the judgment of others. For Bohm, this situation means the only creativity to be found in the conference room is purely relative, which is to say predicated on the secondary silence that is the ignorance of others.

When Peggy's privileged position allows her to react with obvious concern at the end of the pitch meeting, she signals what viewers may have already begun to suspect—that Don's drunken creativity is in fact thievery made possible and even justified by intoxication. Confirmation of this suspicion comes when she criticises Don's 'creative' strategy by confronting him about why she has to work late on another campaign that was stalled: 'I do have to be here because of some stupid idea from Danny who you had to hire because you stole his other stupid idea because you were drunk.'²² Put so succinctly, Don can do little to dodge the accusation and although he fails to become the woebegone figure of the cautionary tale about alcohol, creativity and burnout, his reputation in this regard is (perhaps for the first time) put into question.

As Peggy lashes out at her boss, she signals two key elements in *Mad Men's* treatment of creativity. First, while alcohol plays a role in the creative process of advertising it is not the one the first three seasons and popular mythology have led us to expect. The inhibitions that are lowered by the tittle are not those of self-censorship that bind the would-be artist to convention, but those that impose a sense of professional ethics on an industry leader and senior partner in the agency. When Don defends himself against Peggy's charge, his intoxication is not even a factor in his defence, let alone in any acceptance of responsibility on his part. It is a non-entity in the discussion, save for the bottle of whisky on the table in front of him. The refusal to address Peggy's claims about alcohol playing a role in the deception during the pitch suggests that Don sees alcohol as irrelevant to creativity although he trades in that myth for professional success and it is a practice that he engages in, consciously or otherwise. He sees his job as selling ads, not as being creative. If alcohol allows him to make the sale, it is justified, as are its consequences. The drink is thus recast as the spur to getting the job of advertising done, not as a creative engine, but of pleasing clients, entertaining and loosening

them up, and selling them what they want, which is confidence in the talent they hire. Alcohol accordingly cements its role as the facilitator of business dealings and the hallmark of the male-dominated, good-living culture the show as whole puts centre stage.

The second facet of creativity explored in this fourth season is that gaps in understanding about Don's creative process (like so many other facets of the character's life) must be filled in after the fact. When this factor combines with the new role attributed to alcohol—in the Quaker Oats pitch most directly, but also most strikingly in the discussions of the forementioned Glo-Coat commercial—*Mad Men* offers its most pointed critiques of the nature of creativity.

When the fourth season begins, viewers are vaulted into the daily routine of the fully functioning and successful new agency. A year has passed between the founding of this new partnership at the close of the third season and the series begins with news of Don's success with the Glo-Coat advertisement. This interval conceals from the viewer the creative process behind the most celebrated creative output in the show, if such things can be measured via the conferral of the industry Clio award and acclaim. Also unseen is the increase in Don's already staggering alcohol intake. The fact that the parallel phenomena of increased creativity and augmented consumption occur during a year-long gap in the narrative suggests there is something about this latest and ostensibly most successful meshing of alcohol and creativity that calls not for expression, but for silence.

To be sure, narratives of all sorts make use of elisions. *Mad Men* in particular tends to let a considerable amount of time pass between seasons. All in all, this constitutes an obvious and acceptable narrative break for audiences. Weiner's use of narrative gaps would be relatively unremarkable, merely another technique common to scriptwriters of serials, were it not for the combination of factors—increased alcohol consumption and superior creativity—that are normally central to the narrative, but which are elided between the third and fourth seasons. It is this feeling of being shut out and also, to reference Millicent Bell, of being entitled to know what has been omitted that pushes viewers to question the elision and to see it as 'a provocation a challenge to our working hypothesis of the plot's meaning'.²³

In her discussion of ellipses, Mieke Bal explains that breaks in the story often occur because what happened is painful, difficult or shameful, and as a result cannot

be related to the reader or the audience.²⁴ Although I would argue that the reasons for ellipses are far more numerous than Bal suggests—for instance that the events are simply too mundane to merit mention, that they have been forgotten, that their accuracy is uncertain, or that an author deliberately seeks to add intrigue—her point still seems to ring true in relation to Draper, his drinking and his creativity.²⁵

Like any addiction, excessive drinking can cause feelings of shame and may result in closeted behaviour. Concealing Don's crossing of the fine line (one always better observed in hindsight) between being a hard drinker whose consumption is inconspicuous within the club-like milieu of Sterling Cooper Draper Pryce, to being a habitual drunk thus fits with the larger social pattern of trying to hide or disguise repeated overindulgence. Early in the fourth season, however, viewers learn that Don's consumption has become problematic when many of the series' secondary female characters, including Don's secretary Alison and his neighbour Phoebe imply that this new conduct—forgetting his keys, staggering home at all hours, sleeping off the hangover in his office—has become something of a routine.²⁶ These analepses, brought to our attention by the women who are normally excluded from the circle of boozy professional male camaraderie, fill in the blank of the season break and help to establish the basis for Don's downward spiral and subsequent attempts to limit his consumption.

Analepses, such as Peggy's flippant reminder to Don about how the Quaker Oats advertisement came into existence, also establish that alcohol has potentially impaired Don's recollection of events related to his work. This episode is mirrored in her claiming the bulk of the work on the Glo-Coat commercial in her discussion with another colleague. When Peggy offers her version of the events that took place during the narrative gap she valorises her own, ostensibly forgotten, contribution at the same time as she informs viewers of what happened during the months not shown on camera: 'Let me tell you, I had a lot to do with Glo-Coat ... a lot. The idea especially. Yep. Don put the whole cowboy thing on it. I don't know if it was that revolutionary.'²⁷ Taken together, these analepses sow doubt as to whether or not Don has developed a habit of taking credit for others' ideas and forgetting about it.

Don's subsequent and equally indignant recounting of the advertisement's origins, however, yields a narrative that is almost completely antithetical to Peggy's and supplies viewers with an alternative version of events:

Don: Are you out of your mind? You gave me twenty ideas and I picked out one of them that was a kernel that became that commercial.

Peggy: So you remember?

Don: I do. It was something about a cowboy. Congratulations.

Peggy: No. It was something about a kid locked in a closet because his mother was making him wait for the floor to dry, which is basically the whole commercial.

Don: It's a kernel.

Peggy: Which you changed just enough so that it was yours.

Don: I changed it into a commercial. What? Are we going to shoot him in the dark in the closet? That's the way it works. There are no credits on commercials.

Peggy: But you got the Clio.²⁸

Peggy and Don each present their account of who did what in respect to producing the final product; Peggy claims the concept, minus the cowboy angle, as her own while Don attributes nothing except the idea of the cowboy to his protégée. For Peggy, creativity is the idea, her initial flash of imagination that was shared with her boss and that was then tweaked by him into a viable marketing strategy. In this, she subscribes to modern popular notions of creativity, which are predicated on originality, and the expression of these novel ideas. Her opinions also mirror those of critics like Pope who are uneasy with advertising's way of being creative and who privilege the creative process over its commodity aspects.²⁹ For the much more experienced creative director, with his sarcastic quip about shooting the kid in the closet in the dark, the initial idea—that novel kernel—is significantly less important than the ability to manipulate it into an innovative but commercially pragmatic version of itself. Don's defence of his meriting the professional recognition and by implication the Clio award speaks to an understanding of creativity firmly rooted in the conventions of advertising as a business. This view closely aligns with conceptions such as those advanced by Carter, who maintains 'in many way [*sic*], creation also involves co-creation'.³⁰

As the short but heated exchange continues, Peggy's points about the specifics of who did what, in what state and which parts ought to count for more in the total value of the ad are countered by Don's arguments that her ideas are company property by virtue of the fact she is an employee. The creative director moves the debate into the less volatile territory of the nature of wage work and corporate creativity and in doing so he also succeeds in shifting the conversation away from his drunkenness or sobriety. His manner of sidestepping the particularities of events that occurred or were likely to have occurred while drunk raises suspicions that the avoidance may stem from a deliberate evasion. The motivation could be a literal inability to comment on the events due to not remembering—or a desire to not have to discuss actions that provoke shame. Greta Olson notes in her studies of prose writing (novels and short stories in particular) that discrepancies, memory gaps and omissions like the ones depicted here are signals of unreliable narration.³¹ Don's drinking therefore impugns his credibility as a reliable narrator of the more recent events, casts doubt on his ability to fill in the gaps created by the season break and thus privileges Peggy's recounting of events.

The silence of the season break can accordingly be filled in by the viewer who can draw upon the hints left by the writers—Peggy's anger about unacknowledged input, Don's heavy drinking, his inability to remember which ideas are his, and a corroborating incident that would form a pattern—to hypothesise that Don usurped Peggy's idea in the same manner that he stole Danny's. Such a theory would also help to explain what could be seen as Peggy's disproportionate ire over Don's passing off Danny's idea as his own and her linking of the two incidents in one reproach. This is not to say that there may not be several other factors at play, including the idea that Peggy can empathise with the inexperienced job applicant with the desire to be made a full and recognised part of the creative team. Other factors notwithstanding, the silences that shroud the creative processes behind the ads point to something that ought to be concealed and which can only be spoken of behind closed doors because it threatens the myths of creativity that help the firm market itself.

The silences and narrative gaps in the show might therefore be construed as concealing a manner of open secret about creativity, which is that the drunken form practiced by Don is little more than a kind of ethically suspect corporate creativity.

What might otherwise be understood as a legitimate disagreement over intellectual property between employer and employee or a tough lesson being taught to a novice by a more senior colleague becomes a question tainted by the negative associations of alcohol, its links to illness, criminality and the inability to carry out one's work, social and family responsibilities. Given these connotations, which have defined many of the popular conceptions and scholarly studies of alcohol, are all seen in Don's behaviour in the fourth season it is fair to say that he trades the creative or romantic myths about alcohol for the negative ones. Viewers are thus left to ponder what has become of his fabled creativity. With the form of creativity once legitimised by the show no longer fully operational and the role of alcohol coming into question, it is the practices behind the mythology that are exposed: harvesting the creativity of those working under you, recognising the creative type more than the creative idea and using alcohol to sell the idea as much as to generate it.

Initially characterised as a sort of drunken genius of the creative professions, Don Draper strikes both viewers and characters in the fiction of *Mad Men* as a paragon of his profession. Nevertheless, this reputation for mastery over the bottled muse and indeed the very idea of what constitutes creativity in advertising is challenged by the doubts created by the fourth season's narrative gaps and analepses. As the holes are filled in, the mythology of drunken creativity is partially shattered and replaced by an understanding of alcohol's role as a conduit for the marketing of creativity. In this process, latent tensions over legitimate creativity and its credited version are brought to a head and alcohol's role in marking those inside and outside the creative circles is reinforced. Accordingly, *Mad Men* not only engages with the larger questions raised by scholars like Pope and Bohm, but it also lends a measure of credence to their conclusions that the production of advertising is not synonymous with creativity. This is not to say the show does not add new layers of complexity to what have been off-handed dismissals of advertising's inclusion in the creative professions.

When one looks closely at the tensions and conflicts that surround the creative process in the show—particularly between its two main characters—it becomes clear that Weiner's drama far from subscribes to the kind of 'anything goes' creativity that critics level against advertising. By substituting allegations of plagiarism for the myth of the drunken artist, highlighting how creativity is often

more focused on the 'creative type' than on ideas and showing the consequences of these arrangements through strained relationships, *Mad Men* reveals itself to be a subtle but effective critique of not only the creative industries, but also of several dominant theories about creativity. The show operates on, and indeed develops an understanding of, an idea of creativity that is more contingent than the romantic myths would suggest. It is an idea that also anchors itself in these popular conceptions of creativity because of the very fact that it is these understandings of that speak to the clients and consumers in the commercial environment.

—

Julie Robert is a lecturer in Cultural Studies at the University of Technology, Sydney. She teaches French and Québécois studies within the International Studies program. Her research interests include literature and medicine, political rhetoric of the body, cultural pathography, discourses of alcohol and authority, and participatory public health campaigns.

—NOTES

- ¹ Alfred Politz, 'The Dilemma of Creative Advertising', *The Journal of Marketing*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1960, p. 6.
- ² Leonard N. Reid, Karen Whitehall King and Denise E. DeLorme, 'Top-Level Agency Creative Look at Advertising Creativity Then and Now', *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 27, no. 2, p. 3.
- ³ Scott Koslow, Sheila L. Sasser and Edward A. Riordan, 'What is Creative to Whom and Why? Perceptions in Advertising Agencies', *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 43, March 2003, p. 96.
- ⁴ 'Smoke Gets In Your Eyes', *Mad Men*, season 1, episode 1.
- ⁵ 'The Chrysanthemum and the Sword', *Mad Men*, season 4, episode 5.
- ⁶ 'The Chrysanthemum and the Sword'.
- ⁷ See Sadie Plant, *Writing on Drugs*, Faber and Faber, London, 1999.
- ⁸ Arnold M. Ludwig, 'Alcohol Input and Creative Output', *British Journal of Addiction*, vol. 85, 1990, pp. 953–63.
- ⁹ William M. Lapp, R. Lorraine Collins and Charles V. Izzo, 'On the Enhancement of Creativity by Alcohol: Pharmacology or Expectation?', *American Journal of Psychology*, vol. 107, no. 2, pp. 173–206.
- ¹⁰ Allan Beaveridge and Graeme Yorston, 'I Drink Therefore I Am: Alcohol and Creativity', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, vol. 92, 1999, p. 647.

¹¹ A full 75 per cent of those in Ludwig's study who linked their drinking and their creative output felt alcohol impaired their creative ability, although not all the time nor as the dominant effect (p. 957). They clarified that drinking could stir the creative energies, but that overindulgence had negative effects on the quality of their work, which caused them to have to laboriously edit or rework the previous session's errors and extravagances (p. 961).

¹² Geoffrey P. Hunt, Kathleen MacKenzie and Karen Joe-Laidler, 'Alcohol and Masculinity: The Case of Ethnic Youth Gangs' in *Drinking Cultures: Alcohol and Identity*, ed. Thomas M. Wilson, Berg, Oxford, 2005, p. 228. Attempts to recreate the sociability that often comes with alcohol without its intoxicating effects can be seen in the much talked about offices of companies in the computer industry. In such spaces games (ping pong and billiard tables) were brought in to promote socialising among colleagues while at work.

¹³ See Thomas M. Wilson (ed.), *Drinking Cultures: Alcohol and Identity*, Berg, Oxford, 2005 and Mary Douglas (ed.), *Constructive Drinking: Perspectives on Drink from Anthropology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

¹⁴ Thomas M. Wilson, 'Drinking Cultures: Sites and Practices in the Production and Expression of Identity,' in Wilson (ed.), *Drinking Cultures*, p. 13.

¹⁵ 'Public Relations', *Mad Men*, season 4, episode 1.

¹⁶ 'The Hobo Code', *Mad Men*, season 1, episode 8.

¹⁷ *Mad Men* cocktail guide, <<http://www.amctv.com/shows/cocktail-guide>>.

¹⁸ Alex Winchell, 'Smoking, Drinking, Writing, Womanizing, Smoking, Drinking...', *New York Times Magazine*, 22 June 2008, pp. 34–5.

¹⁹ 'Waldorf Stories', *Mad Men*, season 4, episode 6.

²⁰ Yves Herseant, 'La Muse dans la bouteille: Inspiration et ivresse', *La Tribune de l'art*, 22 October 2006, Paris.

²¹ David Bohm, *On Creativity*, Routledge, London, 1998, p. 5. Here, Bohm echoes many of Eastern philosophies (he cites the influence of Krishnamurti and Buddhism) on creative pursuits, which emphasize the quieting of the mind in order to allow one to be open to new ideas, p. 132.

²² 'The Suitcase', *Mad Men*, season 4, episode 7.

²³ Millicent Bell, 'Narrative Gaps/Narrative Meaning', *Raritan*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1986, p. 87.

²⁴ Mieke Bal, *Narratology*, 2nd edn, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1997, p. 103.

²⁵ Bal's discussion centres on the 'actor', the person who narrates, in a given story. Television, because it depends on the camera to show viewers what is happening, features, in Jakob Lothe's words, 'narration but no narrator'. As a result, the motives for a single character's concealment of some aspects of a story—particularly when the decision to do so is motivated by a sense of culpability—cannot be directly imposed upon film or television. This is not to say, though, that the narrative ellipses in television do not mirror the motives ascribed to more traditional text-based narratives. See Jakob Lothe, *Narrative in Fiction and Film: An Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000, p. 28.

²⁶ 'Christmas Comes But Once A Year', *Mad Men*, season 4, episode 2.

²⁷ 'Waldorf Stories'.

²⁸ 'The Suitcase'.

²⁹ Rob Pope, *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*, Routledge, London, 2005, p. 39.

³⁰ Ronald Carter, *Language and Creativity: The Art of Common Talk*, Routledge, London, 2004, p. 27.

³¹ Television does not limit us to perceiving unreliability solely via these discrepancies that serve as hints to a written text's narrator's unreliability. The multiple points of view afforded by the camera allows the viewer to gain a broader perspective on whether or not Don ought to be viewed as an unreliable narrator of the events that are elided and which must therefore be narrated. See Greta Olson, 'Reconsidering Unreliability: Fallible and Untrustworthy Narrators', *Narrative*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2003, pp. 93-109.