

‘I LUH YA PAPI’:

J.Lo'S FUTILE ATTEMPT AT MALE ‘OBJECTIFICATION’

MORIBA CUMMINGS | ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR | MORIBACUMMINGS@YAHOO.COM

Jennifer Lopez, “Jenny from the block,” J.Lo – whatever you call her, there is no denying that the latin powerhouse is nothing short of an entertainment phenomenon. With six No. 1 singles under her belt, a respected reputation as a top tier entertainer, and a well endowed stint as a judge on “American Idol,” nothing but the best is expected from the Bronx native. Therefore, when Lopez described the treatment of the newest visual for her latest catchy single, “I Luh Ya Papi” as one of male objectification, many eyebrows were raised in curiosity. Unfortunately, the goal was not met with clarity, as the concept was halfway executed with less focus put on “male objectification” and more on “male fetishization.”

In the opening scene of the music video, Lopez, sitting with a couple of her girlfriends, tosses ideas around of what the video’s concept should be. Random proposals of a zoo theme and a carnival setting are mentioned before one of the ladies says, “Why do men always objectify the women in every single video?” and then continuing, “Why can’t we for once objectify the men?”

Then, J.Lo drifts into “male objectivity/washboard ab wonderland” and things just got weird.

While the deliberately yet cleverly executed remixed looks of J.Los past in the video is a nice touch, the initial message of the video is lost.

The confusion is met when these expectantly visually attrac-

five men are basically and randomly placed in each scene just standing there, in all of their sun-kissed glory, rubbing themselves while the ladies look in pleasure. Successful implementation of eye candy: 1. Objectification of men: 0.

As the video progresses, and amongst the sporadic placements of beauty shots of the video queen herself, it all begins to look like a swimsuit segment from a male pageant; nothing blatantly objectifying in essence, but certainly aesthetically and muscle glorifying. Therefore, when the entire scheme of things is measured, the men ultimately end up being the stars of the video, while Lopez looks on in awe, taking on what seems like the role of an extra in her own video. Misconstrued notion of glorifying the male physique vs. objectification: 1. Actual objectification of men: 0.

While all of the aforementioned points minutely add to the demise of the video’s intended premise, the epic failure is introduced during French Montana’s performance. As the rapper is spitting his 16 bars – or less – fully dressed, Lopez, while undeniably stunning, struts around him in short shorts. Of course, though it defeats the purpose of “male objectification,” it is expected, as she has cultivated a sexy image throughout the years.

The real contradiction arises when two backup dancers appear behind Montana, acting as mere decorations for his rap, thrusting, twerking, and grinding while dressed in skin-tight animal-print bra-top and leggings sets. They do not play any specific role in the video, and do not show off any particular impressive dance skills; actually, you barely even see their faces, confirming that their presence is to fulfill the spacey role of the “video vixen,” ultimately flipping the script on Lopez’s attempt to flip the script herself. Ultimate fail at proposed concept: 1. Objectification of men: 0.

There is no doubt that the video is visually stunning and Lopez looks jarringly younger than half of her less experienced female counterparts in the industry. However, given the direction that was articulated in the video’s commencement, viewers can’t help but be confused by the lack of thoroughness employed in its execution. If thought out carefully, this could have been a clever and potentially game-changing plot. For now, though, all we can do is fantasize of what could’ve been.

