

# The Troubled Legitimation of Beauty YouTube

An analysis of discourses within Facebook comments concerning beauty

Youtuber James Charles

Sanne Tukker

6255426

Advisor: dr. Hanna Surma

Media en Cultuur, 2019-2020, block 4

Bachelor Thesis

11-06-2020

Word count: 7388

## **Content**

<b>Verklaring Intellectueel Eigendom .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Gendered Culture .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>New Technologies and Genre .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Unintelligent Content and Delegitimizing Audiences .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Method .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Analysis .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>YouTube Influencers and their Content .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>YouTube Influencers and their Audience .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>25</b>

## Verklaring Intellectueel Eigendom

De Universiteit Utrecht definieert plagiaat als volgt:

Plagiaat is het overnemen van stukken, gedachten, redeneringen van anderen en deze laten doorgaan voor eigen werk.

De volgende zaken worden in elk geval als plagiaat aangemerkt:

- het knippen en plakken van tekst van digitale bronnen zoals encyclopedieën of digitale tijdschriften zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het knippen en plakken van teksten van het internet zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het overnemen van gedrukt materiaal zoals boeken, tijdschriften of encyclopedieën zonder aanhalingstekens of verwijzing;
- het opnemen van een vertaling van teksten van anderen zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing (zogenaamd “vertaalplagiaat”);
- het parafraseren van teksten van anderen zonder verwijzing. Een parafraze mag nooit bestaan uit louter vervangen van enkele woorden door synoniemen;
- het overnemen van beeld-, geluids- of testmateriaal van anderen zonder verwijzing en zodoende laten doorgaan voor eigen werk;
- het overnemen van werk van andere studenten en dit laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Indien dit gebeurt met toestemming van de andere student is de laatste medeplichtig aan plagiaat;
- het indienen van werkstukken die verworven zijn van een commerciële instelling (zoals een internetsite met uittreksels of papers) of die al dan niet tegen betaling door iemand anders zijn geschreven.

Ik heb bovenstaande definitie van plagiaat zorgvuldig gelezen en verklaar hierbij dat ik mij in het aangehechte BA-eindwerkstuk niet schuldig gemaakt heb aan plagiaat.

Tevens verklaar ik dat dit werkstuk niet ingeleverd is/zal worden voor een andere cursus, in de huidige of in aangepaste vorm.

Naam: Sanne Tukker

Studentnummer: 6255426

Plaats: Utrecht

Datum: 08-06-2020

Handtekening:



## **Abstract**

In this thesis I present an analysis of Facebook comments discussing the feud between beauty YouTubers James Charles and Tati Westbrook. These Facebook comments allowed me to conduct an analysis of the discourses which focus specifically on beauty YouTuber James Charles. Within this thesis YouTube is considered a new and more technologically advanced form of television. This technologically advanced aspect of YouTube makes YouTube as a new form of television more eligible for easier legitimization of the medium. However, through the analysis of the Facebook comments I find that denigrating discourses that have surrounded television for decades, also appear to be persistent in this new form of television as well. After in-depth analysis I find that this is mainly due to Charles' assumed audience of teenage girls, as well as Charles' content being compared to genres of television that are considered to belong to low culture, such as reality television. I argue that the delegitimation of Charles and his content is strongly intertwined with ideas surrounding gendered culture and what kind of culture is considered to be 'good' or 'bad.' Charles' content is considered 'bad', and to commenters this also means that the young audience that Charles is assumed to attract needs to be protected from the negative influence that the commentators Charles consider to be. I argue that although Charles' content is viewed by millions of people, the discourses around his channel and his audience delegitimize it for reasons similar to the reasons people have delegitimized broadcast television for decades.

## **Keywords**

YouTube, legitimization, feminised culture, genre, audiences

## Introduction

In May of 2019, beauty YouTuber Tati Westbrook uploaded a video to YouTube titled “bye sister,” in which she accused fellow beauty YouTuber James Charles of multiple inappropriate behaviours.<sup>1</sup> Charles lost millions of subscribers, and in response he uploaded an apology video explaining his behaviour and accused Westbrook of making false accusations. This in turn led to a subscriber battle between Westbrook and Charles.<sup>2</sup> The YouTube feud was internationally covered by big news companies such as BBC News and many people commented on the coverage on Facebook. These comments served as the basis for my research where I explore denigrating discourses defined by Newman and Levine. I combined my findings with recent analytical research on the discourse around YouTube, especially the 2020 article by media scholars Ruth A Deller and Kathryn Murphy who discussed attitudes towards YouTube celebrities.<sup>3</sup> The research by Deller and Murphy focuses on denigrating attitudes coming from established media outlets, such as broadcast television. My research, however, finds that these sentiments also exist within the audience that I am researching, rather than within the reporting of the BBC itself.

In 2012, television scholars Michael Z. Newman and Elana Levine wrote that in the first decade of the new millennium, “television has achieved the status of great art, or at least of respectable culture [...] At the same time, the very discourses that have denigrated and delegitimated the medium for many decades persist.”<sup>4</sup> Hence, Newman and Levine argue that they see a two-sided development. On the one hand, the existing hierarchies between television and other media forms are challenged, but on the other hand, longstanding ideas about television prevail.<sup>5</sup> Newman and Levine discuss television fleeing the domestic, and thus traditionally feminised, space, as one essential factor on the path to television’s legitimation.<sup>6</sup> The authors argue that, “outside of the home, the television shifts from one set of values

---

<sup>1</sup> “YouTube-Ruzie Kost Beauty-Goeroe James Charles Miljoenen Volgers,” NOS, accessed March 3, 2020, <https://nos.nl/artikel/2284656-youtube-ruzie-kost-beauty-goeroe-james-charles-miljoenen-volgers.html?fbclid=IwAR0YXoWCbu-p9eQOQOHMK4isMF1kL9Bqw0Lzx88MTV4ci59nCjbStZXtNQZg>. It should be noted that James Charles was also accused of sexual misconduct. Although the accusations have not been proven to be true, this kind of behaviour is of course inexcusable. This thesis in no way tries to ignore these accusations or pass them off as unimportant by never mentioning them. The reason the accusations are not highlighted in my thesis, is because I feel like this discussion is highly complicated and goes beyond whether he actually did it or not. The focus within my thesis lies on Charles as a YouTuber, and on his content, not on the possibility of wrongdoings in his personal life. Keeping that in mind, and acknowledging that his wrongdoings have not been proven to be true, I have chosen not to include them as a factor in my thesis. Again, stressing that this does not mean I condone such behaviour.

<sup>2</sup> “YouTube-Ruzie Kost Beauty-Goeroe James Charles Miljoenen Volgers,” NOS, accessed March 3, 2020, <https://nos.nl/artikel/2284656-youtube-ruzie-kost-beauty-goeroe-james-charles-miljoenen-volgers.html?fbclid=IwAR0YXoWCbu-p9eQOQOHMK4isMF1kL9Bqw0Lzx88MTV4ci59nCjbStZXtNQZg>.

<sup>3</sup> Ruth A. Deller and Kathryn Murphy, “‘Zoella Hasn’t Really Written a Book, She’s Written a Cheque’: Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 23, no. 1 (2020): 118.

<sup>4</sup> Michael Z. Newman and Elana Levine, *Legitimizing Television: Media Convergence and Cultural Status* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 2.

<sup>5</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 146.

to another, now it may be public rather than private, active rather than passive, productive rather than just passing time, and masculine rather than feminine.”<sup>7</sup> Considering that internet content can be viewed anywhere by anyone with an internet connection nowadays, the internet lends itself to more easily taking television outside of the home.<sup>8</sup> It is therefore interesting to research which discourses continue into the digital realm of television, and in the case of my research, on YouTube. My research aims to supplement Newman and Levine’s argument that, although emerging discourses around television suggest television has been legitimated, the older narratives surrounding the medium, which construct television as inferior and thus not worthy of legitimation, are still very much around.<sup>9</sup> By analysing the discourse around a moment of crisis in the YouTube world, namely the feud between beauty YouTubers James Charles and Tati Westbrook, I aim to show that the discourses that Newman and Levine identified around television are continued in discourses surrounding YouTube.

In my research, I look at YouTube from a television studies perspective. This is useful not only because it allows me to understand and explain phenomena that can be found on YouTube through the extensive field of television studies, but also because YouTube is often described as a new form of television by a variety of scholars.<sup>10</sup> For my research, I accept that YouTube is a new form of television, rather than argue for it. This allows me to truly focus on the discourse around YouTube. By using this television studies perspective, my research will also contribute to the field of television studies. My research is based on work by scholars, such as Lynn Spigel, Andreas Huyssen and Michael Z. Newman and Elana Levine, among others. I take their theories and findings to interpret the results of my research. The discursive construction of YouTube and the specific role that the gendering of content and audiences plays within the process of making meaning of the phenomenon of James Charles is the focus of my research. To narrow my focus, I answer the following research question: in what way do Facebook users respond to the reporting by BBC News of the YouTube feud between James Charles and Tati Westbrook? In answering this question, I first sketch the theoretical framework my research is based on,

---

<sup>7</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 146.

<sup>8</sup> Watching television through the internet means television can be watched anywhere. People are not confined to the television sets inside their homes anymore and this allows television to be freed from its domestic connotations.

<sup>9</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 2.

<sup>10</sup> William Uricchio, “The Future of a Medium Once Known as Television,” in *The YouTube Reader*, ed. Pelle Snickars and Patrick Vonderau (Stockholm: National Library of Sweden, 2009), 28-35.

José van Dijck, “YouTube Beyond Technology and Cultural Form,” in *After the Break: Television Theory Today*, ed. Marijke de Valck and Jan Teurlings (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013), 156-157. In 2009, the argument for YouTube as television was made by William Uricchio in *The YouTube Reader* when he draws parallels between broadcast television and YouTube with regards to what exactly each medium entails. He draws similarities in streaming, liveness, flow and dispersed publics. Although Uricchio finds that in 2009 he cannot even begin to predict where YouTube will go in the future, he does locate potential for YouTube as next-generation television. In 2013, José van Dijck described YouTube in terms of a technology, cultural form and social practice and found YouTube to be intrinsically linked to mainstream television productions and that it must be studied in a way that combines multiple layers of the platform, just like television is often studied. Both thus argue for a study of YouTube through the lens of television studies in order to make sense of the medium. Of course these are only two authors of a large group of authors arguing for YouTube as television, but I would argue that both Uricchio and Van Dijck are really influential in the field of television.

in which ideas about gendered culture, television audiences and the idea of micro-celebrities will be discussed. Next, I explain my methodological choice of a discourse analysis in detail and introduce my sub-questions. Following this, I explain the findings of my analysis which will be divided into two main parts. The first part focuses on YouTube influencers and their content, and the second part focuses on YouTube influencers and their audience. Afterwards, my research will be summarised with a conclusion.

## **Gendered Culture**

Newman and Levine argue that television can only be legitimated if the discourse around television allows for legitimation.<sup>11</sup> Newman and Levine refer to the theoretical concepts French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu developed in his 1984 study about class differences. By using Bourdieu's ideas they argue that through taste, or the appearance of certain tastes, people differentiate themselves from others.<sup>12</sup> This means that certain tastes are perceived as worthy of discussion and importance, whereas other tastes are seen as insignificant.<sup>13</sup> Newman and Levine note that "the deepest function of taste distinction is to reproduce the dominant social structure, to perpetuate unequal divisions by class and other social groupings."<sup>14</sup> Thus, taste helps people understand and organize their social space. Taste is related to the legitimation of any medium in the sense that discourse around a medium shows whether that medium is considered in good or bad taste, which also contributes to whether the medium is even considered to be worthy of discussion at all.<sup>15</sup> Newman and Levine argue that ideas surrounding taste are also often gendered. They found that within historical television discourse, television has been closely related to femininity and lower classes, which will be explained in more detail below.<sup>16</sup> Newman and Levine refer to research that has exemplified television's close relation to femininity and its corresponding problems. I will discuss a few of these issues further after a discussion of arguments made by comparative literature scholar Andreas Huyssen regarding gendered culture.

Mass culture has been gendered feminine since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century states Huyssen, whereas high culture, or artistic culture has historically been gendered as masculine.<sup>17</sup> According to Huyssen, this is largely the result of men historically having been in positions of power to control notions about good and bad culture.<sup>18</sup> This gendering of high and low cultures has implications for the perception of those cultures. Mass culture and its strong historical connotations to femininity are deemed frivolous and unimportant by those in positions of power.<sup>19</sup> This in contrast to artistic high culture, which has

---

<sup>11</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 2.

<sup>12</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 6.

<sup>13</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 6.

<sup>14</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 6.

<sup>15</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 7.

<sup>16</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 7.

<sup>17</sup> Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 62.

<sup>18</sup> Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, 62.

<sup>19</sup> Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, 62.

been related to masculinity, and thus deemed to be prestigious and worthy of discussion by those involved in the making of such culture, usually men.<sup>20</sup> A medium that has, since its inception, been strongly related to femininity is television and because of this television is often ascribed the negative characteristics that have been related to feminised culture as well.

In 1992 Lynn Spigel discussed the implications of the gendering of television, basing her arguments in Huyssen's findings. In her text, Spigel discusses television in the 1950s.<sup>21</sup> She explains that the television set was advertised as belonging to the domestic sphere, and thus it was marketed as belonging to the realm of femininity.<sup>22</sup> The television was sold as a household appliance that only the women in the household needed to concern themselves with.<sup>23</sup> This strong connection between the television set and the woman in the house caused anxiety concerning established order and questioned who held cultural authority, especially as the television started to have a prominent place in the household.<sup>24</sup> Who had authority, the father (and thus men) or the television set (and thus women), was questioned.<sup>25</sup> Not only does this exemplify the strong connection between television and femininity, it also shows the troubled connotations that come with femininity. Where men were thought to have the right to cultural authority, women slowly began claiming some authority through television. This ultimately led to the delegitimation of the medium, instead of the empowerment of women.<sup>26</sup>

Where Spigel analyses the discursive construction of television through magazine articles and ads, and thus focuses on the assumed television audience at the time, Lyanne Joyrich starts her research at the television programmes. She researched what ideas and assumptions about television audiences show up in television programmes themselves throughout the 1980s.<sup>27</sup> She did this by analysing television's reception, as well as television programmes in order to figure out how television depicts itself.<sup>28</sup> Through this research, Joyrich found similar notions as Spigel. Joyrich describes that television is often devalued because its viewers are seen as juvenile or as bored housewives. She describes that television programmes of the 1980s imagined the typical television viewer to be "passive, lazy, vulgar, or stupid – a bored housewife or lethargic child."<sup>29</sup> Although discovered through different objects of analysis, both Spigel and Joyrich find that television has a troubling relationship with its assumed audience. When taking the arguments of Newman and Levine into account, it becomes evident that

---

<sup>20</sup> Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, 62.

<sup>21</sup> Lynn Spigel, *Make Room for TV: Television and the Family Ideal in Postwar America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 87.

<sup>22</sup> Spigel, *Make Room for TV*, 76-77.

<sup>23</sup> Spigel, *Make Room for TV*, 75.

<sup>24</sup> Spigel, *Make Room for TV*, 89.

<sup>25</sup> Spigel, *Make Room for TV*, 89.

<sup>26</sup> Spigel, *Make Room for TV*, 86.

<sup>27</sup> Lynne Joyrich, *Re-viewing Reception: Television, Gender, and Postmodern Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 22.

<sup>28</sup> Joyrich, *Re-viewing Reception*, 23.

<sup>29</sup> Joyrich, *Re-viewing Reception: Television*, 22.

television has a close relationship to low culture and femininity, which has consequences for the assumed quality of television.

## New Technologies and Genre

It should be noted that Spigel and Joyrich wrote their texts during the 1990s, that they took a historical approach and that television as a medium is constantly in flux. Newman and Levine state that the discourse around television and its audience seems to have transformed dramatically in some aspects.<sup>30</sup> They argue that in times of convergence, television has become a more legitimate medium because certain audiences are constructed as having more agency.<sup>31</sup> Newman and Levine discuss this perception (amongst other aspects) in terms of television technologies of agency.<sup>32</sup> They argue that technologies from VCRs to interactive television and on-demand television are perceived as giving their users far more agency than traditional linear television ever did.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, they state that discourses on more advanced television technology, such as HD television, pulled television from the realm of femininity to the realm of masculinity. This transfer, they believe, allows for the legitimation of television more than ever before.<sup>34</sup>

A good example of an advanced technology is the internet. One scholar who contributes to the legitimating discourse around internet-distributed television is Michael Strangelove. He argues that the internet has the potential to significantly change how people watch television because of its different affordances compared to broadcast television.<sup>35</sup> Thus, the internet appears to be a textbook example of a technology of agency which more easily legitimates television because it connects the medium to a discourse of technological advancement. It should be noted that Newman and Levine also argue that, academically, television has gone through a period of legitimation over the last three decades.<sup>36</sup> They

---

<sup>30</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 7.

<sup>31</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 7.

<sup>32</sup> Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006), 3.

According to Henry Jenkins, these times of convergence mean that “consumers are encouraged to seek out new information and make connections among dispersed media content.” By convergence, I mean the flow of content across multiple media platforms, the cooperation between multiple media industries, and the migratory behavior of media audiences who would go almost anywhere in search of the kinds of entertainment experiences they wanted. Convergence is a word that manages to describe technological, industrial, cultural, and social changes, depending on who's speaking and what they think they are talking about.

<sup>33</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 129-130.

<sup>34</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 101.

<sup>35</sup> Michael Strangelove, *Post-TV: Piracy, Cord-Cutting, and the Future of Television* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), 124-125.

Strangelove does this by arguing that the audience of internet-distributed television is constructed as an audience with a lot of agency. Strangelove calls this an audience of ‘cord-cutters’ who decide to no longer pay for traditional television but rather watch television through the internet, either legally or illegally. He argues that this is thus an audience that no longer has to obey by the rules of broadcast television and appears to have a lot of agency. This appearance of agency creates a legitimating discourse around said audience, which in turn helps to legitimate internet-distributed television.

<sup>36</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 154.

found that it has become increasingly accepted to study television at a university level, which legitimates the medium at an academic level as well.<sup>37</sup>

An important aspect of Newman and Levine's discussion of the legitimation of television is their argument on how genre affects legitimation. They state that even though many praise serialised television shows, programs like daytime soap operas are never discussed in a positive way.<sup>38</sup> In fact, the genre of soap opera is even used by makers of so-called "quality television" to describe what a show of high quality should not be.<sup>39</sup> When it is emphasised that a television show is absolutely not a soap opera, it means that the show must be of decent quality.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the genre of soap opera is something to actively distance a show from, in order to achieve a status of quality television.<sup>41</sup> Newman and Levine therefore argue that whenever television shows that are considered quality television disassociate themselves from soap operas, it not only legitimates the television show as being of good quality, but also further delegitimizes soap operas. In this way, one genre gains prestige through the delegitimation of the other. Significantly, soap operas are also heavily gendered as feminine, which brings me back to arguments made by Huyssen as well as Spigel, and it furthermore exemplifies the underappreciation of feminised culture.

Another television genre that Newman and Levine explicitly describe as a site of "disparagement" and continues to be "painted as inferior" is reality television.<sup>42</sup> One programme named by Newman and Levine as an example of reality television that is often immediately dismissed is *Jersey Shore*, and they are not alone in naming this as a prime example of trashy reality television.<sup>43</sup> In research by Charles Allan McCoy and Roscoe C. Scarborough that questions why people watch television that they themselves are dismissive of, *Jersey Shore* was one of the television shows that was regarded "bad" television by all subjects.<sup>44</sup> In a similar way to soap operas, reality television can also be regarded as a form of television that "quality" television tries to distinguish itself from.<sup>45</sup>

### **Unintelligent Content and Delegitimizing Audiences**

As discussed above, television's issues with legitimation stem largely from the medium being gendered as feminine, but most importantly, from its audience being perceived as feminine. In their 2020 text, Ruth A. Deller and Kathryn Murphy have identified problems regarding media representations of

---

<sup>37</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 154.

<sup>38</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 81.

<sup>39</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 83.

<sup>40</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 83.

<sup>41</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 99.

<sup>42</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 13.

<sup>43</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 13.

<sup>44</sup> Charles Allan McCoy and Roscoe C. Scarborough, "Watching "Bad" Television: Ironic Consumption, Camp, and Guilty Pleasures," *Poetics* 47 (2014): 41-42.

<sup>45</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 13.

YouTube celebrities and their audiences.<sup>46</sup> Deller and Murphy describe how the audience of YouTube stars is often considered to be made of teenage girls who lack any kind of intellect and good taste.<sup>47</sup> Another problem that they note is that because internet celebrities often have a young following, or are assumed to have a young following, fears regarding the impact of these internet celebrities on young people persist.<sup>48</sup> These fears are not new, as Spigel described similar fears being present in the 1950s concerning broadcast television. This indicates that certain narratives are so persistent that they transfer from one medium onto another and from one decade into the next.

Another important part of internet culture that is mentioned by Deller and Murphy is the idea of the “microcelebrity”. This term was originally described by Theresa M. Senft in 2009, but Deller and Murphy describe microcelebrity as being a practice in which internet celebrities perform as themselves in such a way in order to corporately brand their persona and make money online.<sup>49</sup> In 2013, Senft herself described that the idea of the microcelebrity was thought of as fraudulent, and that the concept of microcelebrity was in crisis.<sup>50</sup> This notion is also stressed by Deller and Murphy when they describe the fine line that YouTubers constantly walk between authenticity and performativity.<sup>51</sup> This authenticity lies at the core of much of the media criticism towards YouTubers, and the sentiment that YouTubers do not deserve their income or fame is described as popular by Deller and Murphy.<sup>52</sup> This goes hand in hand with the assumption that people do not know who famous YouTubers are, regardless of their millions of subscribers and the millions of the people that have seen their videos.<sup>53</sup> This exemplifies how YouTube fame is not thought of as real fame by legacy media, and that legacy media do not perceive YouTube celebrities as “real” celebrities.<sup>54</sup> By not acknowledging YouTube celebrities as real celebrities, their audiences are also quickly dismissed, which is something I will describe in my analysis as well.<sup>55</sup>

My research is based on all the above described theory, but it will mainly use Newman and Levine’s ideas, who developed their argument by building on Huyssen’s, Spigel’s and Joyrich’s research. I will also use the ideas described by Deller and Murphy in order to interpret my findings.

---

<sup>46</sup> It should be noted that methodologically and in terms of the research question, the research by Deller and Murphy is very similar to research mentioned above such as research by Spigel and Joyrich. The only difference is the medium that they are researching. Where Spigel and Joyrich are researching broadcast television, Deller and Murphy focus on YouTube. They all write about the discursive construction of a specific medium’s audience and, in turn, the medium itself. This is important to keep in mind because it shows that similar research, although done on different forms of media shows similar results, meaning that the described ideas are not strongly related to one medium but are rather a common sentiment in discussions regardless of medium.

<sup>47</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 125.

<sup>48</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 122.

<sup>49</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 114.

<sup>50</sup> Theresa M. Senft, “Microcelebrity and the Branded Self,” in *A Companion to New Media Dynamics*, ed. John Hartley, Jean Burgess and Axel Bruns (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2013), 347.

<sup>51</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 115.

<sup>52</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 115.

<sup>53</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 118.

<sup>54</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 118.

<sup>55</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 125.

## Method

As mentioned before, Newman and Levine argue that the legitimation of television is a two-sided discussion. On one side, discourses on technological advancements and increased agency for users legitimate the medium. On the other side, persisting discourses surrounding television audiences and genre delegitimize the medium. My research focused on the comments of BBC News' Facebook post discussing the feud between beauty YouTubers James Charles and Tati Westbrook. Thus, my research focuses on a very specific part of YouTube, namely the beauty community, and specifically on James Charles. Having said that, whenever I refer to 'YouTube' within this thesis, I only refer to the specific part of YouTube that I am researching. I am aware that the claims I will make in my analysis and conclusion are not applicable to YouTube as a whole. However, my research will contribute to research on the discursive construction of YouTube in legacy media and its audience because it is embedded within research in that field.

Spigel argues for an analysis of discourses instead of doing a discourse analysis.<sup>56</sup> Based on this argument, I have decided to conduct an analysis of discourses. Spigel argues that within one discourse analytical research one can find multiple and often contradictory discourses.<sup>57</sup> An analysis of discourses, Spigel argues, allows a researcher to specifically describe different discourses without needing to delve deeper into the backgrounds of each discourse. This creates more freedom within the analysis to let the research material speak for itself.<sup>58</sup> To properly allow the research material to speak for itself, I have decided to formulate a very open research question, namely: In what way do Facebook users respond to the reporting by BBC News of the YouTube feud between James Charles and Tati Westbrook? After initial analysis of my research material two main themes stood out and formed the sub-questions that gave my research focus. The sub-questions are: 1) What kind of ideas about YouTube influencers and their content are expressed in the collected Facebook comments? And 2) What kind of ideas about the audience of YouTube influencers are expressed in the collected Facebook comments?

Since Spigel does not lay out a clear path of how to actually do an analysis of discourses, I will be following Rosalind Gill's steps of discourse analysis while keeping Spigel's ideas in mind.<sup>59</sup> According to Gill, a discourse analysis starts at collecting the research material.<sup>60</sup> I collected the first twelve comments and their corresponding responses beneath the Facebook post of BBC News reporting

---

<sup>56</sup> Lynn Spigel, "The Rise of Television and its Audience: Reception History as Cultural History," Angelo Sate University Symposium, 1998.

<sup>57</sup> Spigel, "The Rise of Television and its Audience."

<sup>58</sup> Spigel, "The Rise of Television and its Audience."

<sup>59</sup> It is reasonable to follow Gill's steps while still conducting an analysis of discourse as described by Spigel because both are talking about bottom-up approach to doing research. This means that both start their research at the research material. However, only Gill describes a very structured manner of doing a discourse analysis, where Spigel keeps how to actually do an analysis of discourses somewhat vague.

<sup>60</sup> Rosalind Gill, "Discourse Analysis," in *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, ed. Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2011), 180.

on the feud between James Charles and Tati Westbrook. These comments were collected between April 6 and April 8 of 2020 and were collected by copying and pasting them. I made sure that the comments were sorted according to Facebook's "most relevant" option.<sup>61</sup> The reason I decided to collect the first twelve comments and their corresponding reactions was because, after these comments, I found no new patterns within the data. Furthermore, collecting and analysing more comments would be unreasonable within the span of this thesis. The result was that I ended up with a total of 154 individual comments.

The second step, according to Gill, is to learn to read the material, including all its nuances.<sup>62</sup> By reading the material over and over again, I became familiar with the research material, which helped me with the third step, coding the material.<sup>63</sup> By coding the material, I found the two main themes described above, 1) YouTubers and their content and 2) YouTubers and their audience. After following the fourth step of closely analysing the discourse, I found a total of five sub-themes.<sup>64</sup> Within the first theme I found three subthemes, which were, a) Charles' internet feud is not newsworthy, b) legacy media such as the BBC are inherently different from YouTube content and c) Charles' feud can be compared to reality tv. These sub-themes will also be discussed in my analysis. For the second main theme, I found two sub-themes, a) Charles' audience is stupid and the opposite of "us" (the commenters) and b) Charles has a young and impressionable audience that should be protected against negative influences. After reviewing people's opinions and statements I could start making the connection between my collected comments and the theories described above.

It is important to reflect on the fact that none of the people that I have collected comments from have ever consented to being part of the research. However, I think that people not knowing that they are being studied can benefit a research project because people are more likely to voice their true opinions. Nonetheless, I am aware that I never asked anyone's permission and I have chosen not to anonymise the comments. I have done this because of a couple of reasons that are supported by arguments made by Katrin Tiidenberg. Firstly, I have collected comments from a public space on Facebook. It is true that a Facebook account is necessary to view the comments beneath the BBC News' post, but there are no other restrictions to viewing these comments.<sup>65</sup> In addition, removing people's names strips the commenters identities from their opinions, which they never asked for either. Lastly, my research does not discuss any controversial material.<sup>66</sup> People are not voicing radical ideas or controversial political views but are commenting on a YouTube feud. This is not to say that this feud is insignificant, but it seems unlikely that people will be harmed if anyone finds out what they commented

---

<sup>61</sup> From what I can tell about Facebook's 'most relevant' sorting, Facebook considers 'most relevant' to be the comments with the most likes or on which most people commented. This is only assumed because I cannot know how exactly this Facebook algorithm works.

<sup>62</sup> Gill, "Discourse Analysis," 181.

<sup>63</sup> Gill, "Discourse Analysis," 181.

<sup>64</sup> Gill, "Discourse Analysis," 182.

<sup>65</sup> Katrin Tiidenberg, "Ethics in Digital Research," in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection*, ed. Uwe Flick (London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publications, 2018): 471.

<sup>66</sup> Tiidenberg, "Ethics in Digital Research," 472-473.

on this particular BBC News post. With these reasons in mind, I have decided to not anonymise my research material.

## **Analysis**

After analysing 154 Facebook comments debating the BBC post concerning the feud between Charles and Westbrook, I found that most comments could be divided into the following two groups: comments expressing ideas and opinions about 1) YouTubers and their content and 2) YouTubers and their assumed audience. These two themes will be discussed separately, and within these themes sub-themes can be found as described in my method's section. These sub-themes will be discussed with their according main theme below. In this way I will describe my findings in a very structured manner, step by step.

### **YouTube Influencers and their Content**

In this part of my analysis I will be answering the question: What kind of ideas about YouTube influencers and their content are expressed in the collected Facebook comments? The first and the most outstanding group of responses to the BBC News post appears to be that people do not care. This corresponds with my first sub-theme: Charles is not newsworthy. This sentiment becomes abundantly clear through comments such as: "words cannot express how much I don't care", "I'm sure there are more important issues going on around the world than this!", "loss of internet views is not news though" and "even your comment was more important than this whole issue."<sup>67</sup> These commenters agree that Charles' internet feud is not important enough to be covered by a news outlet such as the BBC. One reason for their outspoken disagreement with a source like the BBC covering something related to internet culture can be linked to the ideas that surround internet culture and its celebrities. As Deller and Murphy describe in their 2020 article, YouTube celebrities are continually scrutinised and made fun of by established media outlets (legacy media).<sup>68</sup> Even YouTube celebrities with millions of fans are assumed to not be known by an audience who watch traditional media, such as broadcast television.<sup>69</sup> This assumption that people do not know YouTube celebrities is considered a direct result of the idea that "online fame is, somehow, not 'real' fame."<sup>70</sup> Deller and Murphy have found these ideas among large media outlets such as the BBC. However, in my research these ideas are also present in the

---

<sup>67</sup> See comments 1, 3, 3k and 3x.

<sup>68</sup> Deller and Murphy, "Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities," 118.

<sup>69</sup> Deller and Murphy, "Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities," 118.

<sup>70</sup> Deller and Murphy, "Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities," 118.

comment sections of such media outlets, and thus commenters feel like the BBC is wasting their time by covering the YouTube feud.<sup>71</sup>

The scrutinization of YouTubers, according to Deller and Murphy, is also a result of the assumption that content on YouTube is easy to make and has no added value.<sup>72</sup> This is clearly visible in my research material as well. Comments such as: “its time to realize that these worthless self proclaimed ‘influencers’ are as useless as cow dung. they do nothing but demean, and dumb down our societies. Stop making stupid people famous. Ignore them and they will dry up and go away.”; “judge me if you want, sometimes mindless makeup tutorials are nice” and “I lost a million brain cells by reading this”, exemplify people’s feelings about the content that YouTubers put out.<sup>73</sup> Putting the word influencer between quotation marks shows how the commenter cannot take that title seriously, and relating the influencers and their content to “cow dung” while saying it “dumbs down societies” clearly shows that the commenter feels like the content put out by Charles is absolutely worthless. Even the commenter admitting to watching makeup tutorials makes sure to label these makeup tutorials as mindless. The comments mentioned above all describe Charles, or the content he produces as dumb, worthless and clearly not worthy of discussion by any established media outlet, even if they admit to being familiar with the content themselves. These comments explain why these individuals feel like the BBC should not be covering his feud.

This brings me to my second sub-theme, that Charles’ content is considered different from legacy media, and thus the BBC. In abovementioned comments, commenters appear to see a clash between the BBC, which is a legacy media outlet, and internet culture. This is a clash that is also described by Deller and Murphy.<sup>74</sup> The strong contrast that is revealed by commenters between the BBC and Charles shows an implied hierarchy between the two. The comments already show that there is an overwhelming sentiment that the BBC should not be discussing something so frivolous and stupid as a YouTube feud. Furthermore, comments like “the BBC just made you care” in response to “words cannot express how much I don’t care” exemplify how BBC News is considered a trustworthy news outlet which has the power to decide what is news and what is not. This authority is in stark contrast to the feelings of commenters towards the content produced and put on YouTube by Charles, which is seen as frivolous and stupid.<sup>75</sup> One commenter responds to the comment “loss of internet views is not news though” by saying, “evidently it is.”<sup>76</sup> Their response, reaffirms that when the BBC marks something as

---

<sup>71</sup> It could also be interesting to look into the BBC News article itself in order to analyse if and how the content about the YouTubers in the article and their content is constructed within the article. Also, this would allow for an analysis of whether the ideas expressed in the comments reflect sentiments described within the article. This is however not part of this research because there is no space for such a discussion within the space of this paper. However, it could be interesting for future research.

<sup>72</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 119-120.

<sup>73</sup> See comments 4e, 6f, 7.

<sup>74</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 119.

<sup>75</sup> See comments 2q and 2.

<sup>76</sup> See comments 3k and 3l.

newsworthy, it must be. In this way commenters reinforce the BBC as a medium that is in power of making such decisions.

Looking through the lens of Bourdieu's ideas about taste as discussed by Newman and Levine allows me to interpret the selected comments in such a way that they can tell me something about the appreciation of Charles' content. Charles' content is considered worthless by commenters, it does not add anything of value to society, but rather it dumbs it down. Taste, according to Bourdieu, comes from opposition. When one defines something as of poor quality, it makes that which has opposing characteristics something of good quality.<sup>77</sup> In the abovementioned comments, the distinction between the BBC and Charles is clearly made, since commenters do not understand why such a trustworthy source like the BBC would cover something so frivolous like a YouTube feud. This translates to the BBC being seen as that which is of good quality, thus making Charles and his content that of disreputable quality. The opposition legitimates one source while delegitimizing the other.

In my third sub-theme I will discuss one of the reasons why Charles' content falls into the realm of femininity according to commenters. This occurs because commenters compare his content to reality television. Makeup tutorials and lifestyle focused videos are assumed to be aimed at women and, in the case of Charles, teenage girls.<sup>78</sup> One commenter wrote a comment that received 462 likes which described how although he read the article, he still could not find any interesting part of the story. Intriguingly, he linked the feud to the reality programme *Jersey Shore* and the makeup brand Sephora:

“I opened and read the entire article despite having no idea who they were, no idea of what they're talking about. I was open minded that maybe there was something relevant in it. After reading it, I still have no interest in whatever drama they're talking about. This was just Jersey Shore meets Sephora.”<sup>79</sup>

A lot of people seemed to think this was a rather accurate description and comment that as well. Comments such as “brilliant”, “this is gold” and cry laughing emojis confirmed people's agreement.<sup>80</sup>

The comparison of the feud between Charles and Westbrook to Jersey Shore meets Sephora is interesting because it pulls the internet drama out of the internet sphere and compares it to cultural objects of low value such as reality television. The commenter tries to make sense of a new phenomenon by comparing it to something people are already familiar with, broadcast television. *Jersey Shore* is a

---

<sup>77</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Oxon: Routledge, 1984), 470.

<sup>78</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 125.

<sup>79</sup> See comment 10.

<sup>80</sup> The comment described above is the most important example of people comparing the feud to reality television and television celebrities, and was also liked by 462 people, making it significant. However, there are other examples within my research material that also exemplify this connection commenters draw between James Charles and reality television celebrities.

reality television show which is considered “trashy” and Sephora is a well-known makeup brand.<sup>81</sup> According to the commenter, combining these two form the basis of Charles vs. Westbrook. Both *Jersey Shore* and Sephora already have meaning in people’s everyday lives, so these references come with certain connotations. I argue that both come with connotations of femininity. Newman and Levine directly link *Jersey Shore* to a discourse of inferior genres on television, and reality television is often placed in the category of so-called “trashy” television.<sup>82</sup> This brings me back to genres, and how genres that are perceived as feminine are considered frivolous and of lesser value.<sup>83</sup> So by putting Charles’ content in the same realm as reality television, commenters are essentially saying that his content is frivolous, worthless and not worthy of attention, since this is the way in which reality television is usually described.<sup>84</sup>

Everything described above seems to boil down to the BBC being considered a reputable news outlet throughout history whereas the beauty community on YouTube is made out to be everything that the BBC is not. This gives beauty YouTube a reputation of being trashy, frivolous and worthless. Within the comments of the BBC News post, it seems like YouTube is discussed in similar terms that television used to be discussed, and in specific aspects still is. This discourse aligns with the notion of Newman and Levine, that “the very discourses that have denigrated and delegitimated the medium [television] for many decades persist.”<sup>85</sup> Now, these discourses can not only be found in discussions regarding television, but also in the newer medium of YouTube. The discourses that Newman and Levine analyse are strongly intertwined with ideas about gender and genre, which were a result of the assumed television audience.<sup>86</sup> Similar problems persist within the realms of the internet, and especially within the realms of beauty content on YouTube.

### **YouTube Influencers and their Audience**

In this second part of my analysis, I will be answering the question: What kind of ideas about the audience of YouTube influencers are expressed in the collected Facebook comments? Within the comments discussing Charles’ audience, two larger themes can be identified, a) Charles’ audience is stupid and the opposite of ‘us’ (the commenters), and b) Charles has a young and impressionable audience that should be protected against negative influences.

In their comments, people actively distanced themselves from Charles’ audience and the internet feud. This was shown in comments such as, “I’m almost 40 and I’ve never heard of this guy either”, “im 25 and I have no idea who these people are XD”, “I know about this because of my 18year old daughter,

---

<sup>81</sup> McCoy and Scarborough, “Watching “Bad” Television,” 41-42.

<sup>82</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 13.

<sup>83</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 81.

<sup>84</sup> McCoy and Scarborough, “Watching “Bad” Television,” 41-42.

<sup>85</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 2.

<sup>86</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 86-91.

it is indeed newsworthy to her”, “Right, I have no idea who this person is, but from what I’ve heard their career needed a killing” and “I’m not old and idgaf.”<sup>87</sup> These people actively distance themselves from Charles by saying they are either older than Charles’ assumed audience and thus do not belong to it, or they make it very clear that they do not know who Charles is, regardless of their age. Being unfamiliar with Charles’ channel and persona is something to show off, as it makes clear that you are not part of his audience. This differentiation that commenters make between themselves and Charles’ assumed audience delegitimizes Charles’ YouTube channel because, apparently, his channel is not worthy of their time or knowledge. This also implies that people who spend their time watching Charles’ videos must be either stupid, or young and impressionable. These statements align with Bourdieu’s ideas about taste. Bourdieu has argued that when people have knowledge about certain subjects, it allows for a recognition of said subjects.<sup>88</sup> In the case of Charles, people are actively showing off their lack of knowledge, which in turn means that Charles and his audience are not recognised, and thus they remain unacknowledged. Commenters flaunting they are not familiar with Charles’ content also coincides with arguments made by Deller and Murphy, who argue that YouTube celebrities are not seen as actual celebrities and that their fame is thought of as fake by legacy media.<sup>89</sup> The comments I studied show that delegitimation is not only present within coverage of YouTube celebrities by legacy media, but also happens within the discourse within the audiences of legacy media. This also ties in with Huysen’s argument about how mass culture is often undervalued. According to Huysen, feminine mass culture, which Charles is constructed to be part of by commenters, is traditionally seen as inferior to more artistic high culture, that is often classified as masculine.<sup>90</sup> By actively distancing themselves from Charles and his channel, people are not only saying that his content is not important enough and that not knowing Charles is something to be proud of, but they are also saying that Charles’ audience is something one should not want to be part of. Not knowing Charles legitimates their own taste, and it pulls them away from the feminised mass culture. In turn, these statements delegitimize the taste of the people who do watch Charles’ videos. As a result, not only Charles is perceived as not worthy of attention, but his audience is as well.

The question that remains is on what grounds people are distancing themselves from understanding Charles and understanding his content or fame. From the comments above, it shows that some people distance themselves from Charles because of their age. “I’m almost 40 and have never heard of this guy either” is one example of such a comment. By mentioning his age, the commenter implicitly says that Charles has an opposing target demographic, namely younger people. Other commenters share the opinion that Charles’ content is meant for a young and predominantly female audience. People assuming that Charles’ audience consists of teenage girls can be found within people

---

<sup>87</sup> See comment 4, 4c, 4t, 4cc.

<sup>88</sup> Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 468.

<sup>89</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 118.

<sup>90</sup> Huysen, *After the Great Divide*, 62.

explaining that the feud between Charles and Westbrook had been explained to them by their teenage daughter. This assumption can also be found in comments like: “the vast, vast, VAST, majority of those 16.9 million viewers were under 15 years old and female”, “he’s a major influencer for teens primarily” and “are you in his 12-14 year old demographic?”<sup>91</sup> When it comes to my research, it does not matter whether the claims made by these commenters are factually correct. What matters, is that the commenters assume that that is Charles’ audience. Charles is perceived as someone with a young fan base and because of that, his content is delegitimated.

According to the analysed comments, Charles’ assumed young and female fanbase is precisely what makes him unimportant. Within the comments I have gathered, these teenage girls that are assumed to make up Charles’ audience are not always simply referred to as teenagers or young girls. One commenter calls them “mindless zombies” while another refers to them as “twits flocking to see him [Charles].”<sup>92</sup> Someone else notes that they “need someone to translate anything said by anyone under 25!” These commenters clearly feel like Charles’ young and female fanbase consists of unintelligent people who the commenters feel out of touch with. Charles’ assumed audience of teenage girls and the way people talk about his audience delegitimizes his channel instantly, because his audience is not seen as a legitimating audience. Deller and Murphy found that teen girl culture is often regarded as the lowest possible culture one could be part of, and that it is considered to lack “artistic and technical merit, intellectual depth or ‘good taste.’”<sup>93</sup> Teen girl culture is seen as hysterical and excessive, which is the opposite of what “good culture” is supposed to be.<sup>94</sup> From this follows the idea that whenever anything is associated with teen girl culture, it is automatically deemed trashy, unimportant and stupid. So when commenters feel like Charles’ demographic consists of teenage girls, it instantly delegitimizes him.

The second sub-theme found throughout the comments is that commenters feel like people should keep an eye on Charles because they think he could have a negative influence on young people. Ideas regarding parental control show up throughout the comment section through comments like: “to people who say they don’t care, one of the biggest influencers inappropriately influencing your kids is pretty important as most kids watch more YouTube than you’d think”, “that’s the problem though isn’t it, that he’s an influencer to begin with. That this is what the kids are consuming, living through others some are a terrible influence. Parents need to start taking control of this” and “good example for children would be not letting them watch this kind of stupid videos.”<sup>95</sup> That these commenters chose to use words such as “terrible influence” and “inappropriately influencing” show that they are linked to ideas of parental control. This puts these comments in the same discursive realm as the discussion of early television by Spigel. During the 1950s, television was thought to “disrupt good habits of nutrition,

---

<sup>91</sup> See comments 4l, 4t, 2cc, 2ff and 6p.

<sup>92</sup> See comments 3ee and 7h.

<sup>93</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 125.

<sup>94</sup> Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, 62.

<sup>95</sup> See comments 6, 6d and 6s.

hygiene, social behavior, and education.”<sup>96</sup> In short, television was thought to morally corrupt people and especially children.<sup>97</sup> In the case of Charles, it appears that plenty of people are worried about the influence of his content on young people and on their morals. Charles appears to be the cause of a moral panic.<sup>98</sup> This is something described by Deller and Murphy as well. They argue that moral panic often happens with the rise of any new medium and that “in such moral panics, children and youth are characterised, often simultaneously, as delinquents whose behaviour is unacceptable and as vulnerable victims needing protection.”<sup>99</sup> The fact that commenters argue that parents need to start taking control of the kind of videos their children consume reflects the sentiments described by Deller and Murphy.

Within the comments of people arguing that Charles’ content is meant for a young and predominantly female audience clashing opinions exist. On the one hand, people think that Charles and everything he stands for should not be taken seriously because his content is meant for a young audience and is thus not worthy or to be understood by people outside his demographic. On the other hand, people think that Charles and his content should be taken seriously and discussed precisely because of his young following. These people do not wish to discuss Charles’ content because they appreciate it, but rather because they feel like people should be warned against it. These people are afraid that Charles will have a negative influence on the younger generation, and in order to prevent that, they feel like Charles’ content and persona should be put in a negative spotlight in order to make sure people refrain from letting their children watch his content. In either case, people who assume Charles’ content is for a young and female audience contribute to the delegitimizing discourse around his content one way or another.

## **Conclusion**

I will first give a brief summary of the answers to my sub-questions to discuss the conclusions that can be drawn from my analysis in regards to my research question: in what way do Facebook users respond to the reporting by BBC News of the YouTube feud between James Charles and Tati Westbrook?

Firstly, what kind of ideas about YouTube influencers and their content are expressed in the collected Facebook comments? After analysing the collected comments, three main findings came to light. Commenters discuss Charles’ content as 1) not newsworthy, 2) different from legacy media and 3) similar to reality television. Charles’ YouTube content is perceived as frivolous and worthless. It has become clear that ways in which broadcast television content was discussed in the past, and at times is still discussed today, can also be found within discourses around YouTube. The discourses around

---

<sup>96</sup> Spiegel, *Make Room for TV*, 83.

<sup>97</sup> Spiegel, *Make Room for TV*, 83.

<sup>98</sup> It is likely that part of this moral panic is also intertwined with the way Charles breaks through gender stereotypes by being a man that wears makeup as well as being an openly gay man. He is in this way actively challenging the status quo, which is likely where some of people’s discomfort comes from. However, this is something that deserves more in-depth analysis and discussion than is possible within the span of my thesis.

<sup>99</sup> Deller and Murphy, “Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities,” 121-122.

YouTube show that Newman and Levine's argument that denigrating discourses around television persist to this day, can be extended to a new form of television, YouTube.<sup>100</sup> The discourses are not only present in discussion of broadcast television today, but have continued onto YouTube, a new form of television.

Secondly, what kind of ideas about the audience of YouTube influencers are expressed in the collected Facebook comments? Two main themes have been identified: 1) Charles' audience is stupid and the opposite of "us" (the commenters) and 2) Charles has a young and impressionable audience that should be protected against negative influences. The commenters overall believe that Charles' audience consists of young people, specifically teenage girls. One group of commenters feels like Charles' audience further proves the point that Charles and his content are frivolous and worthless precisely because of his assumed teen girl audience. On the other hand, people argue that Charles' audience is young and impressionable and should be protected from the negative influences Charles' content might have on young people. These are sentiments that can be found within the history of television as well, as for example described by Spigel when she discusses the moral panic that existed during the 1950s.<sup>101</sup> Such sentiments have thus proven to withstand the test of time.

This brings me to my research question: in what way do Facebook users respond to the reporting by BBC News of the YouTube feud between James Charles and Tati Westbrook? After my analysis it is clear that commenters do not focus much attention on the feud between Charles and Westbrook, but rather focus on Charles, his content and his audience, which are not viewed in a positive light by most commenters. Commenters feel like something as frivolous and unimportant as a YouTuber should not be covered by an established media outlet like BBC News. As the summaries described above make clear, Charles, his content and his audience are delegitimated by commenters for similar reasons that have delegitimated television throughout the years. Thus, it can be concluded that Newman and Levine's statement that "the very discourses that have denigrated and delegitimated the medium for many decades persist" holds true within my research as well.<sup>102</sup> My research has shown that these discourses do not simply continue within the realm of broadcast television, but can also be found within new media forms, such as YouTube.

Of course, it should be noted that my research has focused on one very specific aspect of YouTube and I can therefore not make any sweeping statement regarding YouTube as a whole. However, it seems unlikely that sentiments similar to the ones I have found within the limits of my research can only be found within this very specific part of YouTube. The research by Deller and Murphy, for example, showed similar sentiments concerning YouTubers, although these came from legacy media and not from audiences.<sup>103</sup> Additional research will have to look into this further in order

---

<sup>100</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 2.

<sup>101</sup> Spigel, *Make Room for TV*, 81.

<sup>102</sup> Newman and Levine, *Legitimizing Television*, 2.

<sup>103</sup> Deller and Murphy, "Mainstream Media Representations of YouTube Celebrities," 125.

to draw more generalising conclusions regarding this topic. Regardless of whether similar sentiments can be found within other parts of YouTube, it is clear that the reasons people have for disliking Charles and his content are problematic. It highlights the undervaluation of teen girl culture and of feminised mass culture. This is a conclusion that Deller and Murphy arrived at as well, and this by itself is something that I, being a feminist, consider to be very alarming.

Lastly, it is important to note that my research only focused on a very particular audience, namely the audience of BBC News on Facebook. It is likely that I would get a very different answer to my research question had I focused on the discourse within Charles' actual audience, or even the audience from a different media outlet. This is something that further research would have to analyse. For now, it seems as though YouTube has legitimising affordances, but that persistent denigrating discourses continue to delegitimize the medium. The legitimization of beauty YouTube still has a long way to go as does the acceptance of an unapologetically female culture. I think an acknowledgement of the existence of quality within this culture would be a first small step towards the legitimization of both beauty YouTube and female culture.

## Bibliography

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Oxon: Routledge, 1984.

Deller, Ruth A. and Kathryn Murphy. “Zoella Hasn’t Really Written a Book, She’s Written a Cheque’: Mainstream Media Representation of YouTube Celebrities.” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 23, no. 1 (2020): 112-132.

Dijck, José van. “YouTube Beyond Technology and Cultural Form.” In *After the Break: Television Theory Today*, edited by Marijke de Valck and Jan Teurlings, 147-159. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013.

Gill, Rosalind. “Discourse Analysis.” In *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, edited by Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell, 173-190. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2011.

Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.

Joyrich, Lynne. *Re-viewing Reception: Television, Gender, and Postmodern Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

McCoy, Charles Allan and Roscoe C. Scarborough. “Watching “Bad” Television: Ironic Consumption, Camp and Guilty Pleasure.” *Poetics* 47 (2018): 41-59.

Newman, Michael Z. and Elana Levine. *Legitimizing Television: Media Convergence and Cultural Status*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

NOS. “YouTube-Ruzie Kost Beauty-Goeroe James Charles Miljoenen Volgers.” Accessed March 3, 2020. <https://nos.nl/artikel/2284656-youtube-ruzie-kost-beauty-goeroe-james-charles-miljoenen-volgers.html?fbclid=IwAR0YXoWCbu-p9eQQOHMK4isMF1kL9Bqw0Lzx88MTV4ci59nCjbStZXtNQZg>.

Senft, Theresa M.. “Microcelebrity and the Branded Self.” In *A Companion to New Media Dynamics*,

edited by John Hartley, Jean Burgess and Axel Bruns, 346-354. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2013.

Spigel, Lynn. *Make Room for TV: Television and the Family Ideal in Postwar America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Spigel, Lynn. "The Rise of Television and its Audience: Reception History as Cultural History." Angelo State University Symposium, 1998.

Strangelove, Michael. *Post-TV: Piracy, Cord Cutting, and the Future of Television*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Tiidenberg, Katrin. "Ethics in Digital Research." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection*, edited by Uwe Flick, 466-481. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publications, 2018.

Uricchio, William. "The Future of a Medium Once Known as Television." In *The YouTube Reader*, edited by Pelle Snickars and Patrick Vonderau, 24-39. Stockholm: National Library of Sweden, 2009.

## Appendix

BBC News – Sorted by most relevant, and collected between April 6 and 8, 2020

<https://www.facebook.com/bbcnews/posts/10156689028367217>

Not newsworthy

Different from the BBC

Comparison to reality tv/aspects of reality tv

The audience is young and impressionable and should be protected

Charles' audience is different from 'us'

1. Scarlett Gustavo – Some of these Youtubers need to be humble from time to time.. God giveth and he taketh. – 6
2. Wendy Power – Words cannot express how much I don't care... 😞 – 5 d.
  - a. Natali Zapata – But here you are... 🙄 - 89
  - b. Kim Parker Adcock – Wendy took the words right off my finger tips! Natali good point, had to click to make the same comment. Moving on... - 12
  - c. Wendy Power - Natali Zapata it could have been something interesting but thank you for taking the time to comment. Nothing to see here.... – 13
  - d. Katie Evans - You just expressed it in words, Wendy – 21
  - e. Craig Dis - Natali Zapata actually saying nothing doesn't mean you don't care it just means you haven't commented, and saying you don't care is a valid form of an expression of an opinion. – 27
  - f. Lenviève Vu Ng - Actually you do care. You care about how the hell this is even important 🙄 or newsworthy. – 10
  - g. Joanna Elwell - Why do people call it EPL?. And, not, just, the premiership or league? – 1
  - h. Elisa Debayle - #Metoo 😏 😏 – 5
  - i. Alidia Joseph - Me too 😊
  - j. Brian Fox – That was such a great story, Wendy. Tell it again. – 11
  - k. Melissa Victoria – Natali Zapata yes here she is commenting that she DOESN'T care.....LMAO... your comment didn't make a point 😂 😂
  - l. Karen K Cawker-Davison – Wendy Power I thought it was hilarious, especially with that smiley face... Everyone is entitled to their opinions and you expressed yours 🙄 – 3

m. Maria González – I had no idea who he was until I saw him on the MET Gala's Instagram.

n. Shereen Samy Hanna – Wendy Power I will use it – 1

o. Gustavo Luis – Enough to comment 🙄 – 2

p. Emma Anne – Wendy Power best comment on the internet today 🙄🙄🙄🙄🙄 – 2

q. Jonathan Birch – The BBC just made your care. – 1



r. Katerina Vrinioti -

s. Leann Stacks – Wendy Power so take time out of your day to comment how much you don't care. That will show us you don't care. – 6

t. Gaz Rowley-Jones – Wendy Power what a beautiful sentence – 3

u. Imran Khan - 🙄 and here u r... - 2

v. Sabir Khan – Wendy Power hmmm – 1

w. Kaury Édith – **Oh Lhi Cheet** me – 1

x. Pata Craipe – **Kaury Édtih** cest pour ca que je tai pas tagué – 1

y. Marueen Mo Schudardt – Natali Zapata yes, here is Wendy Power, entertaining us unlike your snotty a\*\*.. – 2

z. Mishou Ngansi - Hahahaha. You crazy sis 🙄🙄🙄 – 1

aa. John Paget – Leann Stacks Try again in English next time love. – 1

bb. Francesca Cook – I had no idea who any of these people were until yesterday. But the tea is SCALDING and I'm here for all of it. Watching him bleed hundreds of subscribers in seconds on youtube is invigorating – 1

cc. Sarah Kimmel - Honestly? You should care. The vast, vast, VAST majority of those 16.9 million viewers were under 15 years old and female. This guy, who has previously been labeled as a racist, entitled and clueless, is now being outed for being a sexual predator who does not accept the word "no," has been viewed as a role model by an enormous, enthralled and passionate audience. It's a cult of personality that needs to be broken. – 14

dd. Fanny Uppenberg – But you should. – 2

ee. Chelsy Nicholson – Wendy Power no one cares that you don't care – 2

ff. Jess Strunk – Wendy Power : He's a major influencer for teens primarily. You should care. – 3

- gg. Leann Stacks – John Paget I wrote my sentences in plain English. Maybe you should learn to read.
- hh. Leann Stacks – John Paget, PS, try punctuation in your statements next time.
- ii. Keyondra Grimes-Lester – Wendy Power the genius irony in this comment is why I love this comment! – 1
- jj. Kucing Parsi – but numbers can: 0/10
- kk. Rishi Tutu - [Akshat Mathur](#) 😂😂😂😂😂😂 – 1
- ll. Anwen Kya Hayward – And yet you commented
- mm. Phil Wheatley – Wendy Power you could of expressed it by not commenting an just scrolling past no words needed
- nn. Sabir Khan – thanx
- oo. Sabir Khan – heee



pp. Sabir Khan -

3. David Gould – I’m sure there are more important issues going on around the world than this!

– 3,9 d.

- a. Mark Coleman – but no one cares – 2
- b. Melissa Victoria – Literally – 1
- c. Georg Grossmaier – Yeah, the whole ProJared thing for example... - 2
- d. Leya Ann Marshall – Then go read those 🧐 - 71
- e. Keith Peters – David Gould This is Facebook. – 6
- f. David Noise – As Mexican.. i just love bbc news.. it reminds me of those “first world countries” also had massive stupidity. – 2
- g. Alix Holslin – News is news – 13
- h. Len Griffin – David Gould ..exactly... but it’s BBC ‘news’ – 1
- i. Daria Meisterhans – David Gould people like him create many of the other important issues tho since he is influencing young teenagers 😊 – 24
- j. William Churchston – David Gould not 4 James who has worked so hard 2 build up a following. It is not happy 4 him and it IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.
- k. Chermaïne Vicx – Loss of Internet views is not news though. – 3
- l. Alex Holslin – Evidently it is – 1
- m. Katie Kitchell-Carlson - That’s why they post a variety of stories of assorted importance, much like how traditional newspapers have different sections of varying

seriousness - world news, business, a couple of advice columns, entertainment, comics, etc....

See, this is just one story of many that they have posted today, so there are plenty more for you to go peruse according to your current reading mood. The thing you are looking at right now is not the only thing there is :) – 36

- n. Eric Kawczynski – Charmaine Vicx why isn't it,
- o. Stefano Birion – David Gould in Italy you would have been defined as a something-else-ist! Positively somethingelseist!
- p. William Weis – David Gould at least it's not a but the Kardashians
- q. Jackson Chan – Len Art Leon every publication has entertainment news. – 5
- r. Abdalla Jawdat – Like There are demonstrations in in sudan against military leading the country
- s. J Patrick O'Quinnaghan – Yet, you chose to comment on this. – 4
- t. Abo Zobayer – Absolutely
- u. Katie Woodgate – David Gould this is the future generation. Instead of declaring war countries and thus allies will just unfollow each other on social media 🚫🚫🚫 – 10
- v. James Michuki – David Gould why not comment on those important issues – 2
- w. Caitlyn Kropp – David, of course there are. But his is a very interesting time. The internet is obviously prominent and this is the first time a person has lost over a million followers in two days. Its shows that people pay attention to more than content and look at the person in front of the camera as a person – 2
- x. Paul AF – David Gould even your comment was more important than this whole issue 😊 – 2
- y. Malizza Miller – David Gould we agree – 1
- z. Alex McCance – William Weis There's a photo of him with a Kardashian in the article.
- aa. Jess Strunk – David Gould : BBC has written other articles today. Also, given his personal behavior of being predatory, it is important as that he is an influencer with a base that are mostly teenagers. – 8
- bb. Nabajit Ray – He has lot 2 M subscribers
- cc. Ben Coley – That is a matter of opinion.. And 14 million people think this is important....
- dd. Shreya Singh – **Agrimaa Singh**
- ee. David Tran – Mindless zombies

ff. David Tran – Evil has its cuteness. Coldness has its sweetness. Life is vice versa. Nothing is certain except death. Do not let your darkness controls your happiness. Do not make happiness commands your fear. We are born to live not born to die. Fate and destiny go hand in hand. What you wish might come true. What you want might not eventuate. Expect less but give nothing more than your kindness. Evilness will not prevail as long as you believe in righteous. – 1

gg. David Wilson – I agree! yesterday and today on BREAKFAST news there was NOTHING (under 2 minutes) about increase in Organised Crime in the UK...BUT: Premier League Football got 20 minutes (out of 30) yesterday and today 18 minutes (out of 30)...BBC priority appears to be “good news”. This story as with “crime” clearly not that important! – 1

hh. Alex Davies – This isn’t even the biggest thing on YouTube. Like how many people on there have been found soliciting nudes from children? – 1

4. Steve Ste McCormack – Dear everyone in the comments giving out about the BBC reporting this. I’m almost 40 and I’ve never heard of this guy either, but YouTube celebrity is the next generation’s TV celebrity so while it may not make sense to us older folks, this is noteworthy as any lightweight celebrity gossip pieces... if you don’t get it do as I do, ignore and more on, let those who do care read and comment – 1,5 d.

a. Ed Parry – Steve Ste McCormack You Didn’t even move on though. You wrote an essay about this non story. – 31

b. Ralph Anderson – You’re a champ 😊 – 10

c. Danielle Gleadhill – Old folk .. im 25 and I have no ides who these people are XD – 31

d. Steve Ste McCormack – Ed Parry hardly, 30 seconds typing and not about the story about people being needlessly cross about the story.

e. Mark Lauria – Its time to realize that these worthless self proclaimed ‘influencers’ are as useless as cow dung. they do nothing but demean, and dumb down our societies. Stop making stupid people famous. Ignore them and they will dry up and go away.

f. Ross Harper – I agree youtube is the younger generations TV but this isn’t really newsworthy, maybe if s/he had died then I’d understand – 4

g. Ed Parry – Steve Ste McCormack You still haven’t moved on... - 2

h. Nathan Smith Jr. – Steve Ste McCormack Steve, is a smart man. Be like Steve. – 9

i. Latoya Archer – Hey almost 40 is old speak for yourself dude you 😏 – 4

j. Andy Mckay – Steve Ste McCormack haha, spot on that. I don’t understand it all but what you’re saying is bob on, it’s the equivalent of a TV star to young folk. – 3

- k. Alkamal Rahman – Steve Ste McCormack their About page reads “Welcome to BBC News on Facebook, for the stories that matter to you.”  
Can you show me one person in the comments, for whom this story matters? If not, people are allowed to call them out on it, and making them report on stories that matter, not about some ridiculous online spat where some guy on YouTube lost a million out of 15 million followers – 4
- l. Maria Obaid – Rightly said! My teenage daughter tried to sum up the events leading up to this, to me today and I couldn’t fathom what the fuss is about. Nevertheless it was interesting enough for her to follow – 5
- m. Simon Lee – Old folk 🙄🙄 14m subscriber on a planet of 7bn. Most don’t know who this fool is – 4
- n. Shauna Yates – Steve Ste McCormack omg sensible people do exist 🙄 – 4
- o. Steve Ste McCormack – Alkamal Rahman like I said, I don’t get it, but a million people doing something has to count as a noteworthy event to those million people right? – 5
- p. Kerry McDougal – I’m older than you and I know who he is and what he does, he is by far a fool. He is a talented young Make Up artist who likes to spill the tea and have a little of his tea spilled too. He will survive this 🙄 – 2
- q. Steve Ste McCormack – Ed Parry and you still insist on missing my point, but thanks for your contribution all the same. – 3
- r. Steve Ste McCormack – Simon Lee true, but a million people doing something for the same reason is a significant event, if TV ratings of Game of Thrones, or Netflix subscribers dropped by a million overnight that’d be a significant story so while I don’t really understand this, and on a global level it’s only an insignificant blip so are a lot of things... - 7
- s. Ed Parry – Steve Ste McCormack Still going...
- t. Katrine McDermott – Steve Ste McCormack I know about this because of my 18year old daughter, it is indeed newsworthy to her – 2
- u. Steve Ste McCormack – Ed Parry and you continue to miss my point which was a note to everyone else getting worked up about the story, it was meant to be a short thought, and I think my point stands for itself, feel free to reply again if you insist on having the last word, I don’t expect I’ll bother responding though. – 8
- v. Sarah Hawthorn – Almost 40 isn’t old.
- w. Jennifer Custer – Don’t go usin logic on em now Steve lol Their heads’ll implode 🙄 – 3

x. Steve Ste McCormack – Sarah Hawthorne older than the demographic that cares about this story I suspect though, or maybe not, to be honest I don't know, just seems to me that the next generation is more focused on YouTube celebrity than say the TV/Pop/Movie stars that my generation followed. – 2

y. Isabelle Sadler – Maria Obdaid it's because he's supposedly been a sexual predator, and has marketed 'anxiety pills' to his young fan base. – 1

z. Bill Christenson – Steve Ste McCormack celebrities are just modern day jesters.

aa. Taylor Rae – Steve Ste McCormack honestly, this was one of the only sensible comments I've seen. – 2

bb. La Luna – Steve Steve McCormack



cc. Chaz Amber – I'm not old and idgaf – 1

dd. Daniel Philips – Steve Ste McCormack but his is the BBC, they don't do lightweight celebrity gossip.

ee. Steve Ste McCormack – Daniel Phillips they kind of do though in today's social media heavy world everyone needs to generate tons of content to stay relevant, the BBC is no different. – 2

ff. Omar Malik – Alkamal Rahman BBC Wouldn't post it if they weren't getting views. Its news to 10 of millions of people so...

gg. Matin Drienka – If it was good quality journalism it would be presented the way which would capture attention of people who have no idea who the heck James Charles is. – 1

hh. Ayub Souza-Ali Jaff – Steve Ste McCormack this has nothing to do with age, young people with more than one brain cell don't want to read this garbage either – 1

ii. Valkyrie Kay – Right, I have no idea who this person is, but from what I've heard their career needed a killing. And over 10 million people subscribing to your stuff makes you a celebrity, TV or online. My 10 year old step daughter likes watching YouTube, not TV. Now I do that and use the Pluto TV app for TV shows. Cable and dish will die soon and be replaced by streaming services entirely, fighting it by saying bloggers, vloggers, influencers aren't celebrities/jobs/human will only be in vain. – 3

jj. Danielle Rotella – They are fighting over vitamins. Its stupid to any generation with a brain. – 1

kk. David Doolan – Steve Ste McCormack A man talking sense? What is this, an alternate dimension??

ll. Reyna Ramli Herinaldi – Steve Ste McCormack Agree... 👍 – 1

mm. Chris D. Hernandez Ruano – No trash is trash no matter the generation.

nn. Paul Mihell – Steve Ste McCormack only, you're not 'ignoring it and moving on' are you? You're having a little patronising, self-righteous rant aren't you?

oo. Jamine Nguyet Tran – Steve Ste McCormack There are pages for celebrity gossip, I hope BBC won't turn into one

pp. Anubhav Chauhan – Paul Mihell How is that a self-righteous rant? Enlighten me please. – 1

qq. Steve Ste McCormack – Paul Mihell not my intention to be patronising or self-righteous, just to point out that the world is changing and like it or not YouTubers and online celebrities are becoming increasingly culturally relevant and newsworthy... - 1

rr. Claire Worthington – Steve Ste McCormack You're absolutely right. I don't know who this person is myself but I'm sure if it was a person a lot of older people knew, they'd be castigating younger generations for not knowing who it was. But since they don't and it's on YouTube, anyone who does know him is just a silly, young person. 😞

5. Mohamed Lofti – Until now almost 4 million lost; but the fact is that even 10 subscribers for him is more than enough, while famous singers blindly supported him because of his photoshopped makeup now they must be responsible as well for this mess that a teenager doesn't know how to behave in society, how to be a positive person for his world or at least being productive. It's people's mistake as well for giving so much credit to him, paying 500\$ to meeting with him? For real? – 1

6. Valerie Lopez – Tati was concerned that James is a role model to primarily 12-14 year olds and is exhibiting inappropriate behavior. To people who say they don't care, one of the biggest influencers inappropriately influencing your kids is pretty important as most kids watch more YouTube than you'd think. His face is everywhere. (I love Tati and watched her video about this and agreed with what she said involving his scandals recently. I'm all about setting a good example for kids.) – 1,2 d.

a. Zulfiqar R. Baloch – Valerie Lopez 👉 this one actually knows and follows this crap – 15

b. Mandy Kirleis – Valerie Lopez so true. – 3

c. Kim Mount – Valerie Lopez yes! ❤️

- d. Shin Akira – Valerie Lopez that’s the problem though isn’t it, that he’s an influencer to begin with. That this is what kids are consuming, living through others some who are a terrible influence. Parents need to start taking control of this – 40
- e. Parker Coughlan – Valerie Lopez absolutely! – 1
- f. Valerie Lopez – Zulfiqar R. Baloch I do. Been watching Tati for yeeeeeeaaaarrrrrs!! Judge me if you want, sometimes mindless makeup tutorials are nice. But I agree that if kids are watching stuff it shouldn’t be about how to gain fame, power and money and then how to use it to your own advantage at the cost of the other’s self worth. Human beings aren’t trophies to be conquered. – 30
- g. Zulfiqar R. Baloch – Valerie Lopez with this i agree. – 2
- h. Joanna Winters – This Tati (what kind of name is that for adult?) would be happy and fine if he was pushing her vitamins on kids. All this supplement culture is stupid and even dangerous. – 19
- i. Sofiia R Iurchenko – Valerie Lopez 🤝 agree
- j. Ashley Theresa – Shin Akira this is just the new kind of celebrity, kids have been looking up to celebrities for generations whose parents thought they were inappropriate, Elvis Presley is a prime example.. it’s gonna continue to happen into further generations, celebrity status has just changed over the years. It is a shame this kid turned out the way he did. He seemed so kid friendly in the beginning 😊 – 7
- k. Valerie Lopez – Tati openly says to talk to a physician before taking her supplements. Aside from that, I just think people not knowing the full story and not caring is dangerous because she brings up a valid point. Watch who your kids watch and take into account their values and actions. If that’s not important to you, that’s fine. But I care what the future adults of our society are watching and learning from. – 15
- l. Jonathan Harris – eh... don’t care – 1
- m. Valerie Lopez – Jonathan Harris and that’s your prerogative 😊 isn’t it fabulous? – 2
- n. Ron Nelson – Valerie Lopez

See my reply for more info and details regarding the real situation here.

- o. Sonila Kar – Valerie Lopez his face is everywhere? 😊 i did not know of his existence till now 😊 – 3
- p. Valerie Lopez – Sonila Kar are you in his 12-14 year old demographic? I watch makeup tutorials and have an 18 year old niece that’s how I know him. Bought his palette for her a while ago. And just because you don’t know what a problem is doesn’t mean it doesn’t exist. – 15

- q. Jess Marie – Joanna Winters her name is Tatiana, why insult her name? My name is Jessica but everyone calls me Jess. Same Thing. Her supplements are not geared towards children, SugerBearHair is, they are literally in the shape of gummy bears... leave it out if you have no idea what you're talking about and are just trying to be mean! – 16
- r. Nate Searson – Joanna Winters there is a lot more to this situation than just the vitamins. The vitamins issue is less that James didn't promote Tati's product (he's said since the beginning his audience is kids and he didn't want to promote vitamins to then and she's never fought it). The issue is he chose not to and then went back on his morals as well as betraying the women who built his career, just to get into a festival, before lying about a product he'd only been using a week. – 4
- s. Ana Maria De Sena Barcellares – Good example for children should be not letting them watch this kind of stupid videos... - 2
- t. Adam Guy – If I had a kid who was dumb enough to be influenced by a YouTube "celebrity", I'd abort them. – 1
- u. Letty Sanches – Valerie Lopez still don't care. Don't know this dude or whoever Tati is. So yeah don't care.
- v. Christina Pandora Hantzinikolas – Joanna Winters 1st she doesn't push her vitamins onto kids, her viewing demographic is older. Second she agreed when he told her he shouldn't show vitamins because the majority of his audience is much younger than hers. That was until he could make money
- w. Shannon Caroline – Joanna Winters it's short for Tatiana and I think demeaning someone's name is slightly childish and irrelevant. And she was ok with him not promoting her product because of his rational was the age of his viewers. However once a lot of money was tossed his way he changed his tune and promoted author bear hair. So it's not that he wouldn't support her but rather being hypocritical and a sell out. – 1
- x. Ron Nelson – Sean Esskeetit  
 Many missed a few biology lessons (a 'he' can never be a real 'she!'). Real reality regarding males and females, regardless of religion:  
 \*\* You cannot change a male into a female or vice versa without changing everything including DNA, bone/muscle structure, all glands, organs and brains etc. to the opposite sex which is impossible to do.  
 No matter what clothes you wear to hide your true sex identity, how many drugs you pump into your veins nor how many body parts you change, etc. you are still the sex you were born as. No matter what you try to do you are still the sex you were born as (no man can become a real 'she').

You can only try to mask what is real = altered reality that has no foundation in actual reality. I can mimic Elvis Presley in every way possible but I am still not him no matter what I do. Likewise, a physical male can try his best to mimic a female but he can never be a female (in reality he cannot know what a real female is because he was never one - for over 35 years I witnessed many trying to be the opposite sex - they can only exaggerate opposite sex characteristics because they can never be the opposite sex). Our kids are being lied to big time.

'Attached' to the physical sex they were born as, these people will never be right nor truly happy (they will always be in conflict internally as they know they are not acting in accordance with the sex they were born as). Claiming skewed gender is separate from the physical sex you were born as is somehow another version of normal is complete nonsense, a crock of the worst kind = it is a defect.

\* People are 'not' born as nor are they predisposed to be anything other than the sex they were born as (except 'possibly' a very tiny percentage, about .001% of those making the claim 'might' have a case - again, a defect). The rest are the result of our human 'pressures' environment stupidities (which now includes telling kids lgbtq is normal behavior making it easier to con them).

Much of this stupidity might be able to be corrected or rightly dealt with if caught early enough (not by being an enabler, placating their fantasy land altered reality desires which also harms the person into them) which more and more is about trying to fuse altered reality to actual reality, like mixing oil with water - it only appears to blend to the untrained eye.

Altered reality has no foundation in actual reality which is governed by and obeys laws of Physics (permanent 'fixed' points of actual reality with respect to other permanent 'fixed' points actual reality is permanently anchored to = you cannot defeat laws of Physics. You cannot alter, rearrange, set aside, replace, erase or destroy laws of Physics.

\* Sadly, many liberals think you can paint a brick wall as a rainbow and the wall turns into a rainbow. However, it is sure to cause serious damage if you try to drive through that permanent wall (of actual reality) at 200 mph (now imagine the 'mass' of 10 billion people doing the same thing, the more you allow yourself to get sucked in the harder it will be to escape = Again, you can never defeat laws of Physics). – 4

- y. Aj Alvarez X – Valerie Lopez She didn't care about any of that UNTIL #vitaminpillgate.. this is a 37 year old woman acting like vindictive teenager. Now all of the sudden she wants to get you on her soapbox and preach...#Byegirl
- z. Jacey Allyn Kihm – Ron Nelson, you like to hear yourself talk don't you? Lort. That's a whole bag of 'no thank you' from me sir. 🙄

7. George Leon – I lost a million brain cells by reading this – 1,2 d.

a. Lin Wingrove - #MeToo 🤔 – 8

b. Vinod Badhan – George Leon save some for later. There’s more idiots to come.

😂😂😂😂 – 6

c. Lê Vi – I mean, you chose to read it. – 1

d. Lin Wingrove – Vindo Badhan Yes, no doubt 😏 – 1

e. George Leon – Lê Vi I surely did. 😏 – 1

f. Bryan Escalera López – George Leon you got billions you wont miss them – 1

g. George Leon – Bryan Escalera López why do you have to bring up facts? 😏

h. Christine Slade – Isn’t he the one who caused the big traffic jam in Birmingham, because of all the twits flocking to see him? 😏😏

i. Christine Slade – Lê Vi If it comes up on our page, it’s difficult to avoid! 😏😏

j. Matthew Quirk – The headline alone cost me 10k. I’ll sop there.

k. Kim Kirtley Dolan – George Leon your post made me laugh out loud. 🤔 – 1

l. Marko Whitmore – You’re now on par with your average remain voter, how do you feel?

m. Paul Taylor – Thanks for the warning. I’ll try and save mine 😏 – 1

n. Chinenye Ezeliora – What!! 😂😂😂

o. Delilah Morgan – George Leon so basically you have 1 left? Thoughts and prayers for you. – 1

p. Victoria Palu – **Rachel Helu** this 😏 – 1

q. Lee Zhi Eng – This is how you start the zombie apocalypse – 1

r. Gaurav Négi – George Leon nailed it ❤️👍

s. Cayetano Harvey – Kim Kirtley Dolan I swear to God, he got me right there.

8. Savannah Hayler – the ‘article’ fails to mention that he has been outed by several trustworthy sources to be sexual predator, attempting to coerce straight men into ‘turning’ gay for him, not taking no for an answer, seeing turning straight men gay as a challenge and for the famous ones, threatening to ruin their careers over it. this article is very misformed and poorly writes as its missing pretty much all of the important information – 2,5 d.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> As mentioned before I have chosen not to focus on the accusations towards Charles because within the span of this thesis, or likely within any bachelor thesis, this is too complicated an issue to comment on. The accusations have not been proven true, however, that does not take away that Charles has done things that suggest such predatory behaviour and that his by itself is also inexcusable. Reading through the comments discussing the accusation however, leads me to believe that this discussion goes further than whether he is actually guilty or not. Commenters highlighting ‘gay predator’ rather than simply ‘predator’ also lead me to believe that this discussion is strongly intertwined with a rejection of queerness in general and a rejection of

- a. Niki Scott – Savannah Hayler he tried turning grayson dolan and when he was having none of it james got nasty and tried to threaten to destroy his life! hes only known thanks to tati and the twins anyway – 45
- b. Savannah Hayler – i know, i never liked him i watched a few of his videos a few years ago and i always though he was really fake and not even good at makeup lol. hopefully everyone will forget about him after this. cant beliee he tried to sell his tour tickets at \$500 each as well! im sure all those people want a refund now lol – 39
- c. Linda Stubbs – He’s admitted a liking for straight men, and of course there’s the allegation that he groped somebody at school. That it’s been downplayed by the media is very worrying. – 44
- d. Savannah Hayler – theres also proof that he has his tinder set that he is a woman so that straight men have him come up as a possible match, and allegations that he tricked a sports team at his highschool into thinking he was a girl and getting nudes out of them which is absolutely awful – 57
- e. Nazatul Syu’aida – Savannah Hayler shouldn’t he be investigated? I mean idk if there’s actual proof but if those accusations are true shouldn’t they reported?
- f. Warren J. Swage Jr. – I don’t know this guy, what he’s accused of and really don’t care but  
I have news for you ladies. Gay guys always go after straight guys and a good percentage of the time we turn them even if it’s just for an hour. 😊 – 75
- g. Savannah Hayler – joe if you look it up on youtube theres a video he made with a straight man where he spent the whole time asking him questions like ‘have you ever been with a man?’ and things of that nature when its very clear the guy was really uncomfortable with it. you can see that james is getting a kick out of it too its disgusting – 43
- h. Joe Latiolait – Savannah Hayler I’m sure he would do great in prison...ouch! – 12
- i. Zia Kulcsár – Savannah Hayler they also forgot to mentioned what Tati said about him saying it’s okay to harass a straight waiter sexually just because he’s “famous” **BBC News** seems a little biased towards the sexual predators side. Especially saying the whole issue was because he supported her rivals vitamins, which they’d known is not the truth if they watched the video. she specifically says that she’s cutting ties with him because of his general behaviour. – 45
- j. Bianca R Vieira – Tati’s video was eye-opening. This man is a sexual predator and a user. Very worrying to hear some of the stories. – 48

---

Charles as a gay man. Sexual predatory behaviour is always inexcusable but this discussion is far more complicated than simply that, and I cannot even begin to cover such issues within the span of my bachelor thesis.

- k. Laura McConnell Nguyen – Savannah Taylor you seem to possess better journalistic skills than this BBC writer. – 35
- l. Allison Young – Warren J. Swage JR. So what, are you saying that you are better than women? Why don't you go after each other? Have a problem with fellow gays or what? This only proves that men, gay and straight, are shallow. Sure, gay boys are pretty and probably let themselves be used in humiliating or downright criminals ways that many women wouldn't but what else? Life is not all about sex however shocking is that. – 8
- m. Matt John Thomas – Warren, if a man had sex with you, he's gay or bisexual, whether he's comfortable admitting it or not. You can't "turn" a heterosexual any more than some douchy bro claiming he "turns" lesbians. But its still pretty creepy to brag about whether true or not. – 198
- n. Anna Gillespie – **Johnny Davies**
- o. Kerry McDougal – Matt John Thomas YES! THAT exactly that. He flirted with straight men as much as Tati would have is she wasn't tied down with a husband, she helped him grow from nothing and just so happened he became more successful than her, her pot of tea overflowed and she just spilled all this out and the army of Anti James came running to back her up, anything to sabotage a successful young man. If he's guilty of any unwanted sexual contact then that should be a Police matter....INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY. – 26
- p. Kerry Young Cook – Warren J. Swage Jr. Going by your logic being gay must be a choice? I mean it must be if your are "turning straight men gay". You cannot make a heterosexual person gay, fact, if they are getting freaky between the sheets with you then they are closeted gay/bisexual and that's the extent of it, it has nothing to do with you being that good that you can turn them 🤔🤔🤔🤔, unlucky. What a plum!
- q. Donna Chapman – Kerry McDougall Tati is straight. She has every right to go after single straight men if she was single. James knew these men were straight and used his status to try and pressure them gay for his own sexual pleasure and gratification. Even threatening some. Nothing to do with jealousy. – 50
- r. Susana De Castro – Savannah Hayler bbc should hire you! 🌸 – 4
- s. Carmen Rivera – Who? – 1
- t. Pete Duffield – Warren J. Swage Jr. your comment is every bit as dodgy as 'Pray away the Gay' conversion therapy.... – 2
- u. J Maat Ch – Savannah Hayler yup. He's a sexual predator. The article was poorly written. – 7
- v. Áine Foley – How do you turn someone straight gay exactly? 🤔 – 20

- w. Desiree Baker – Kerry McDougall seriously? It’s not just Tati saying all of this a few people have now come forward and said exactly what James is like, he’s big headed and thinks just because he’s “famous” he can do what he like but when it doesn’t go his way he tries making out he’s the victim. I used to like James but after all this coming out about him.... – 8
- x. Jan Ferlin – **Maya Deneut** – 1
- y. Travis Combs - Savannah Hayler Meh, I got gay friends, been to gay bars. Tbh, that’s something almost all gay men do at some point and something I’ve seen lots of Lesbians do with other women as well. I can’t tell you how many times I’ve gotten the old “how do you know if you’ve never tried”. Was I uncomfortable? Yes. Was it predatory? No. They were taking their shots hoping for a dude that was actually on the DL. As much as he may have made other people uncomfortable and likely been overly forward with his advances in a way I wouldn’t appreciate, we’re really getting too lax with the term “predator” these days. Unless he coerced them in some way or made certain threats which I didn’t see he isn’t what I would classify as a predator.
- z. Kerry McDougall – Desiree Baker have you heard his side? I haven’t, I’ve heard every accusation and his ‘apology’ but I haven’t heard him say I’m guilty of it all, despite his fame there’s two sides to every story. – 4
- aa. Natalie Louise Felton - Savannah Hayler well 🍷 said 🍷 – 1
- bb. Thomas Muldoon – Warren J. Swage Jr. u might unintentionally be giving some people justification for gay bashing. Just a thought 😞 – 1 (angry)
- cc. Joyce P Brown – Matt John Thomas

You got that right!

I am a Alpha Lesbian

- dd. Martin Drienka – That’s how BBC lowered their standard! – 1
- ee. Irving Cornejo Calderon – Warren J. Swage Jr. Just shut up – 2
- ff. Sebah Mariam Jalal – Savannah Hayler if those ‘outings’ are speculation then it can not be reported as news therefore cannot be mentioned in the article. – 5
- gg. Chesney Hawkes Dawson – You can’t ‘turn someone gay’ however you can pressurize someone into doing something they don’t want to. It’s sexual assault. – 4
- hh. Caleb Gosse – Savannah Hayler they literally discussed this exact issue – 1
- ii. Sarah Beth Gable – Savannah Hayler thanks for that. I have no idea who either of these people are, but even still it seemed that there was more than a little context missing from the article – 2

- jj. Nikki Ericksen – If you “turn” a straight man... he’s not straight – 20
- kk. Abu Zobayer – Agree 100% - 1
- ll. Hannah Louise – and he’s racist and transphobic
- mm. Khrystina Bailey – Thank you. Nothing in the article really ranked apologies and ending friendships over. I’ve heard the “turn them gay” said as a fairly standard joke, so the article left me rather confused. – 2
- nn. Sarah Kimmel – Sabah Mariam Jalal Its getting to be a lot more than speculation as the receipts pile up. Too bad BBC journalists aren’t as quick on the draw as YouTube drama channels... - 2
- oo. Stephen Macken – Oh look, a libelous comment on the BBC News Facebook post...
- pp. Desiree Baker – Kerry McDougall have you even seen everything that’s coming out about him? Yeah there’s two sides to every story but is he even attempting to get his side of the story out there? No. Is he even saying anything about the people that are “outing” him? No. He is staying quiet about everything. If someone was saying something about me that wasn’t true I would be out there trying to set everything straight and fighting against it but more & more people are showing what he is like. Like it or not there is proof out there about what he’s like and what he’s been saying but he’s not saying a single word about it. – 7
- qq. Cheryl Sorba Lagoria – **Nikki Ericksen** Thank You👍
- rr. Louis Chen Kian Seng – Savannah Hayler you meant girls don't try to seduce men? On the other hand, in an adults world, seduction is something so outdated, if a man not interested in him, nothing will happen. It takes 2 to tango. I'm actually more worried about you, from what you have said, you apparently don't know what is happening in this world and nothing about men. – 2
- ss. Paolo Ariedo – They are ALLEGATIONS, though. None have been tried in court.

The BBC will be dragged through hell if they ran an allegation without a tonne of evidence recognized by the court – 5

- tt. Yudit Carrasco – Savannah Hayler it’s bbc, what’d you expect?
- uu. Ron Nelson – Allison Young The dangers go deeper. Some say homosexuality, transgender, gender brand x, gender bender and related lgbtq stupidity harms no one but this is not true. It harms vulnerable naive kids who are being targeted by lgbtq (in the 1970s I saw a gay sponsored film in which they laid out their agenda, in part to target kids - many lgbtq know that naive kids are easier to con and manipulate just like tobacco and other companies have done to try to boost their sales, number of 'users' etc. for the long-term). If advertizing and promoting products, ideas, ideology, lifestyles, fashion, etc. did not work companies and others would not spend billions on

advertising every year. If you can get a kid to smoke, drink, vape, etc. you can for sure talk a kid into thinking gay is good or they might be trans especially with society reinforcing this stupidity as normal or OK. At this time in lots of places they are pushing to get to the youngest kids as possible (i.e. the gender neutral nonsense = lays the groundwork to slip in shape shifting gender separate from sex stupidity). Sadly, many confuse TRUTH [upsets and offends many] and HATE. Telling someone the truth does not mean you hate them. Pride comes before the fall of a man. Pride parades come before the fall of mankind. Input = output = garbage in = garbage out (kids only know what they are taught and again, are much easier to con). If you disagree with them their stock defense is you are a homophobe, bigot, scared of them or guilty of hate speech. That is nonsense. 'Normalizing' same sex relationships, marriage, transgenders and the like has a major negative impact, harming nuclear families (reality check: there are 2 sexes, male with distinct differences from female not some mishmash garbage - there is no neutral except in foolish fantasy altered reality stupidity that has no foundation in actual reality). You may not understand 'cause & effect' consequences but approving same sex lifestyles lgbtq behavior will have a huge negative effect on the lives of innocent naive impressionable kids = the true power of suggestion and 'media' manipulation especially with respect to naive kids. For over 35 years I lived in an lgbtq saturated area of NYC (I had up close and personal observation every day of their bad behaviors and recruitment technics). Naive kids do not possess right knowledge and more important, they lack real world life experience that is required to rightly understand the real issues and true dangers regarding lgbtq bad behaviors. Kids copy adult behavior (often without even realizing it = '2nd hand smoke effect') = kids must be protected from selfish adults and their poisonous fantasy desires because kids cannot protect themselves (again, kids are much easier to con). I call it the 'undertow effect' as more kids get swept into this behavior or at least support it which will yield more recruits. They start with thinking 2 guys kissing or holding hands, etc. is normal behavior and later that it is not bad and some take it farther (because society is telling them it is OK, as if it always was = the 'big lie'). It makes it easier for lgbtq to recruit more older kids right under your nose while having adverse effect on even younger kids = severe negative consequences 'reaction' cause & effect, domino, ripple and/or 2nd hand smoke effect laws of physics. Many nations and the US made a grave mistake approving gay marriage and other lgbtq bad behavior. Some direct lgbtq influence of kids: Entanglement of Democrats with the fringe special interest lgbtq is a very serious issue (i.e. channel 7, ABC, NYC [owner: Disney 'for families, especially kids'], flaunted lgbtq as absolutely wonderful which it is not - pride parade displayed on TV on a Sunday afternoon [kids

watching] as if it is the 'Macy's Day' parade - coming to kids near you if it has not already = 2nd hand smoke effect). Also, Democrat supporters have had lgbtq proudly displayed in their ads on TV every day (kids watching). They landmarked the Stonewall bar glorifying gay pride in front of kids. They have drag queens holding 'story hour' reading to kids at US libraries and have drag queens at schools to teach kids to accept them as normal = brainwashing. NJ and Cal now force teaching lgbtq history to kids. An ad on TV has 2 gus at urinals, one staring at the other's genitals giving a thumbs up (kids watching). PBS and ABC are running more lgbtq themed programs. \* You cannot turn a male into a female or vice versa without changing everything including DNA, bone/muscle structure, all glands, organs and brains, etc. to the opposite sex (impossible to do). No matter what clothes you wear to hide your real sex, how many drugs you pump into your veins nor how many body parts you change, etc. you are still the sex you were born as. You can never be happy because you know you are not acting in accordance with the sex you were born as. You can only try to mask what is real = altered reality that has no foundation in actual reality. I can mimic Elvis Presley in every way possible but I am still not him no matter what I do. Likewise, a physical male can try his best to mimic a female but he can never be a female (in reality he cannot know what a real female is because he was never one - for over 35 years I watched many try to be the opposite sex - you can only exaggerate the other sex). If gays, transgenders, etc. can claim that they were born as or are predisposed to being their different orientations (fewer than .01% 'possibly' have a legit claim) and should be treated as 'normal' than so should a rapist or thief, etc. be able to make the same claim because they were 'born' that way. The difference is that the latter has immediate effect on our lives (i.e. missing TV, money, jewelry, etc.) which you will not tolerate while actions with respect to the former are not always so obvious until after a few generations (especially if you are not careful to observe their behavior and take action to correct the stupidity). The true ramifications will probably not show up for at least three or more generations when it will probably be too late to fix the problems. Many show that they know the correct gender configuration is really male and female when one of the same gender pair dresses up as and/or acts like they are the opposite sex. Lgbtq perversion dangers: It goes straight to the very core of your brain, spirit and being, making the behaviors hardest to get out of = worse than a heroin addiction. Eventually, like cronic alcoholics many end up with a 'pickled brain' effect (not quite as obvious because of how it effects the brain - unless you carefully learn the effects and know the true differences between males and females, physically and mentally). Sadly, this behavior is a social cancer. Leave it in place and it will spread though out the body (the world - happening now). Men sniffing other men's

butts is nothing to be proud of. Even dogs do it only they have a good excuse, they cannot know any different. Many ways SEEM right but its end = death (Hell = you live alone forever). \* Painting a brick wall as a rainbow does not turn the wall into a rainbow. However, it is sure to cause serious damage if you try to drive through that permanent wall (of actual reality) at 200 mph (imagine the 'mass' of 10 billion people doing the same, the more you allow yourself to get sucked in the harder it is to escape = you cannot defeat laws of Physics). In the end you will either support lgbtq targeting your vulnerable kids to help Dems secure future supporters, potential recruits, votes and funding to be used against the nuclear family, especially their kids (realize it or not, in real reality, they are dynamically opposed to each other) or you will never again vote Democrat to protect your kids and their future (you cannot do both). Word to the wise. – 3

vv. Sabah Marian Jalal – Sarah Kimmel everything must be verified properly if it's to become reported as news. I'm a trained journalist what are you?

ww. Sidonie Rachel Alexis Price – Savannah Hayler **Finlay Duncan** this is what I was saying! X – 1

xx. Chris Birtwhistle – Matt John Thomas the point is these men don't want to sleep with him but he threatens them if they say no – 1

yy. Samuel Anggono – Savannah Hayler because lefties snowflakes media do cheap misleading incorrect articles for money. They have 0 concerns for professional and ethical journalism – 2

zz. Roberta Torterici – **Pinuccia Intermaggio** – 1

aaa. Pinuccia Intermaggio – **Roberta Torterici** sono scioccata – 1

bbb. Heather Martin – Savannah Hayler he sounds as ugly inside as he is on the outside.

ccc. Guillame Drappier – **Marthe Vandeveld** – 1 (angry)

ddd. Sol Ibarra – Savannah Hayler Also, Tatiana didn't have a problem with any of this until James promoted another brand of vitamins who wasn't hers. That's when she decided to "cancel" him. She's no angel either. 🍌🍌

eee. Molly Lunsford – Savannah Hayler exactly.

fff. Sean Andrews – Khrystina Bailey glad I'm not the only one who's confused.

ggg. Misha Garcia – They can be mentioned as speculation, just not as fact.

9. Phil Seaton – I'm pleased to say I've never heard of either of them – 695

a. Dave Smith – Phil Seaton me neither, I have a life in the real world. – 15

b. Migual Martin-Carcia - ቶረከ ሆረከ GET OFF MY LAWN! – 4

c. Marcelo Rocha – Phil Seaton Me neither! 😬 – 1

- d. Dave Smith – Just looked at the photo again, did not realize he's a drag artist – 2
- e. Elaine Dawson – Thank god you weighed in, we were breathlessly waiting to know your fascinating views – 8
- f. Miguel Martin-Garcia - ቶረስ ሆረስ Oh, stuff it. No one is taking away your right to say things. We're just calling out what you say as stupid.

You do NOT have the right to be free of criticism for your public statements. – 4

- g. Elizabeth Pieters – Phil Seaton thank you. Im glad im not the only one.
- h. Lusan Roydj – Phil Seaton #metoo
- i. Chelsy Nicholson – Phil Seaton yeah it looks like it
- j. Hallie Jade – Phil Seaton And you should remain that way
- k. Christopher Chua – Phil Seaton your old. durh – 2
- l. Andrew Noseworthy – Well those days are behind you ‘ol sport.
- m. Emma Clarkson – Oh no, old man isn't one of 16 million plus people who have heard of someone. Can't be important then 😊
- n. Bradley Clarke – Lmao I am both pleased and proud to say I've never heard of either of them.

10. Rick Tafoya – I opened and read the entire article despite having no idea who they were, no idea of what they're talking about. I was open minded that maybe there was something relevant in it. After reading it, i still have no interest in whatever drama they're talking about. This was just Jersey Shore meets Sephora. – 462

- a. Joanne Elwell - @ Rick Tafoya brilliant description. Jersey Shore meets Sephora. 🙄 – 5
- b. Ciara Strain – Rick Tafoya jersey shore mets sephora!!! Brilliant! – 2
- c. Alan Hill – To think there are people who are into this junk who are driving towards me every day... - 6
- d. Elektra Chi Ka YU – Thank God for saying that. I'm not the only clueless one 😊 – 3
- e. Lucy Ochan – I don't even know what I just read – 4
- f. Vakylie Kay – This is gold – 1
- g. Enrique Eliud – He (well I think is a he) is a gay sexual predator.
- h. Fran Platz – Rick Tafoya At least you have an open mind;-) – 1
- i. Joe Sharpe – Amy Holdsworth jersey shore meets Sephora 😊😊😊 – 1
- j. Marie Sosa – He has been accused by numerous celebrities and non celebrities to being a sexual predator posing as women on Tinder to turn some straight men gay and for some who would say no he would threaten them with ending their careers. He also

has mistreated many in the YouTube community and as the days pass more prominent people are speaking out on the allegations – 8

k. Nigesha O'Brien – Anymore, half the time I need someone to translate anything said by anyone under 25! – 1

l. Cindy-Ann Hersom – Rick Tafoya lol me too

m. Cindy Weatherly – Rick Tafoya ahahahahaha!

n. Rida Shah – **Abeera Shah** Jersey Shore meets Sephora 😂😂😂

o. Rinella Levett – Adults may fail to see any relevance in this, but if you have children maybe the fact that his behaviour is abhorrent and your children are being exposed to it might be something to take into consideration – 2



p. Ana Maria De Sena Barcellares -

q. Aeljandro González Gz – Rick Tafoya **Ricardo Contreras** su conclusion final



11. Brian Smith – The very definition of a modern, first world problem – 386

a. Jens Rödiger – This is so embarrassing. I hope no one will discover it in 2,000 years. Whereby: the way it looks at the moment, there won't be anyone in 2,000 years who can discover anything. Fortunately. – 4

b. Megan Elizabeth Drake – Jens Rödiger I hope in 2,000 years people will learn to not be sexual predators.

c. Betty Boosh – The issue isn't the subscribers he has lost, it is the fact that he attempted to force strait men into sexual activity with him by using his status and threatening to ruin them. The BBC as usual just brushed past that part though. – 16

d. Valkyrie Kay – Meh, Greeks and Romans did this type of nonsense and threatened to ruin each other over it too. It was typically politically driven rather than this bull..its a power issue. Still no clue who these people are, just what happened to cause feather to ruffle and mascara to run. – 2

e. Delilah Morgan – Brian Smith sexual predators are a global problem. – 2

f. Atiende Florence – so are they British or Americans? What is the problem here?

12. Lisa Ferguson – I am ashamed that I just read the entire article. 🙄 - 284

a. Tanya Stobbe – Lisa Ferguson Same. Same. 🙄🙄 – 3

b. Lisa Ferguson – Tanya Stobbe – I may need social media rehab. – 8

c. Benton Valentin – Lisa Ferguson what's the important parts? – 2

- d. Lin Wingrove – Yep me too 😊 – 1
- e. Cherika Johnson – Im ashamed. I was trying to find the relevance of the story. Smt. – 4
- f. Jens Rödiger – I accidentally read the article this afternoon when I was sitting in the sun. I must have lost another 5 points from my IQ. Just trying to get them back in. Some red wine will help – hopefully. – 12
- g. Vinod Badhan – Lisa Ferguson I did as well. But I’m glad so I know idiots like this havent influenced my kids. Thank the lord. – 2
- h. Sue Mason – Was it interesting?  
His/her face was hurting my eyes, I couldn’t read it!!
- i. Jens Rödiger – Sue Mason that was my feeling too. It’s like an accident. You do not want to watch, but you need to look at it. I tried to ignore this “Breaking News” but had to read it after it occurred the whole day – and I finally lost at least 5 points of my already severely limited IQ Scale right after reading it. – 2
- j. Gillian McCrindle Laurence – **Tanya Stobbe** – I’ve been getting hourly updates all weekend from Rachael, she used to love him, now she is also thinking of unfollowing him – 1
- k. Tanya Stobbe – **Gillian McCrindle Laurence** – I watched a few of his tutorials on some or other eye make up thingis. He’s good. Seems the celebrity world is a-changing. YouTube is a proper thing. – 1
- l. Stephanie Abdullah - Lisa Ferguson lol lol lol lol
- m. Stephanie Abdullah - Lisa Ferguson lol lol lol lol

Link to article everyone is referring to: [https://www.bbc.com/news/newsbeat-48243905?ns\\_campaign=bbcnews&ocid=socialflow\\_facebook&ns\\_mchannel=social&ns\\_source=facebook&fbclid=IwAR0UY2MNyygtDZeNhH8MKh2iBooy4z9VrWxsqgsz51GvCQdsFXl61PkFCqk](https://www.bbc.com/news/newsbeat-48243905?ns_campaign=bbcnews&ocid=socialflow_facebook&ns_mchannel=social&ns_source=facebook&fbclid=IwAR0UY2MNyygtDZeNhH8MKh2iBooy4z9VrWxsqgsz51GvCQdsFXl61PkFCqk)