

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Frey, Mattias and Janssen, Sara (2018) Researching Sex and the Cinema in the #MeToo Age. *Film Studies*, 18 (1). pp. 1-13. ISSN 1469-0314. (In press)

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/68969/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Researching Sex and the Cinema in the #MeToo Age

Mattias Frey and Sara Janssen University of Kent

Abstract

This introduction to the *Film Studies* special issue on Sex and the Cinema considers the special place of sex as an object of inquiry in film studies. Providing an overview of three major topic approaches and methodologies – (1) representation, spectatorship and identity politics; (2) the increasing scrutiny of pornography; and (3) new cinema history/media industries studies – this piece argues that the parameters of and changes to the research of sex, broadly defined, in film studies reflect the development of the field and discipline since the 1970s, including the increased focus on putatively ‘low’ cultural forms, on areas of film culture beyond representation and on methods beyond textual/formal analysis.

Keywords: film studies; representation; pornography; media industries; research methods

From the extremes of Disney canoodling at one end of the spectrum to pornography at the other, sex has always had a central role in moving images. The Edison Studios production *The Kiss* (1896), an 18-second short depicting a peck on the lips, is often cited as evidence of the early and intense interest in expressions of sexuality in moving images. This role has never been confined to representations in individual scenes, but has taken shape in every industrial and cultural aspect of their production, dissemination and consumption, from the Hollywood casting couch and red-light-district alleyways, to parked cars at drive-ins and the YouPorn user’s bedroom.

Most recently, sex and cinema have been linked in the public imagination and prominent discussions, set off by allegations of sexual harassment and assault against Harvey Weinstein, Kevin Spacey and other leading figures in the film world. The #MeToo movement has lifted the veil on the persistent, gendered imbalance of power structures in the media industries and other professions, and demonstrated how sex has been instrumentalised to express and cement these hierarchies. Indeed, the renewed attention reveals how politics and power are intimately related to any discussion of sex and cinema and how this topic commands broader implications and deep social impact. (As we write this introduction, news headlines are screaming about the President of the United States launching legal proceedings against porn star Stormy Daniels.)

In turn, sex has held a key position in film scholarship, aesthetics and the cognate disciplines that appraise moving images and their function in society. Stanley Cavell is hardly the only critic, scholar, philosopher or media observer to suggest that marriage and sexual reproduction have formed the dominant narrative telos for Hollywood since the beginnings of the studio system.¹ In recent years, this academic presence has only grown, in the form of key individual publications as well as burgeoning subfields (e.g., porn studies) and objects of inquiry (e.g., grindhouse programming). Although the idea for this volume, and the essays that comprise it, preceded the #MeToo movement by years, the fortuitous coincidence in timing perhaps indicates how the themes and emphases of sex and moving-image media have been percolating under the surface of academic inquiry and the social imaginary for some time.

As a substantial intervention into this ongoing research, the Centre for Film and Media Research, the Aesthetics Research Centre and the journal *Film Studies* staged a major

international conference on the topic of ‘Sex and the Cinema’ at the University of Kent in December 2016. Organisers Mattias Frey, Sara Janssen, Hans Maes and Peter Stanfield welcomed nearly 100 participants, including keynote speakers Jennifer Lyon Bell, Daniel Biltreyst, A. W. Eaton and Jon Lewis. We thank all presenters and delegates for their intellectual input and exchange; the following pages represent only a small fraction of the scholarly output from the event.

The interdisciplinary conference, and this volume, have aimed to investigate the role of sex on screen, in cinematic spaces and among the film world’s various domains. We had the ambition to bring together the most exciting and cutting-edge research engaging with the myriad connections between sex and the moving image. Contributors were encouraged to interpret both ‘sex’ and ‘cinema’ broadly and creatively and they responded in kind with historical or contemporary examinations of programming practices, festivals, specialty distributors and exhibitors; genres, cycles and production trends that pertain to or make strategic use of sex or sexuality; the use of sex in marketing and promotional materials; and the aesthetics and ethics of sex films, from smut to erotica. We were interested in production conditions and labour issues, regulation and censorship, zoning and the policing of public spaces, cultural activism and community building, not to mention gender, sexuality, race, class intersectionality. Our call received a significant response, well beyond our expectations. Together, the present collection of articles illustrates the diverse ways in which representations of sex have historically been brought to the screen and provides insight into the specific issues that shape the production, dissemination and reception of these images. It also serves as a microcosm of the wide range of approaches and methodologies adopted by film scholars today, across formats, genres, historical moments and geographical locations.

In this introduction, we contextualise the essays that follow by previewing their larger themes and methodological emphases and by simultaneously indicating how they fit into the grand visions and research protocols of the discipline. How have film and media scholars come to approach and understand sex and the cinema? Identifying three major trends, we argue that each directly reflects the development of the discipline, including film studies' roots in literature and feminist discussions, as well as the expansion of the field's acceptable boundaries of inquiry to take account of putatively 'low' forms (pornography), not to mention the margins and larger epiphenomena of cultural studies. This intimate, shadow-like relationship gestures above all to the fundamental importance of sex and the cinema to film studies and its evolving self-understandings.

I. Representation, Spectatorship and Identity Politics

It would only be a slight simplification to claim that film studies began with the issue of sex. Although a number of scholars have traced the subject back to multifarious origins in business and communications departments, the modern discipline has a deep-rooted Anglo-American founding myth in the articulations of critics working for the British Film Institute, founding the journal *Screen* and writing seminal tracts on the intertwined nature of gender, sexual desire and film form.² Issues of sex and sexuality as well as, by extension, sexual difference, have played a pivotal role in establishing a major tradition of film theory, with sexuality conceptualised as the driving force shaping spectators' engagement with the filmic image. In the prototype and most prominent example of this approach, 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', Laura Mulvey polemically asserts the concept of a male gaze as the structuring logic of Hollywood cinema, positing the female character as the sexual spectacle that freezes the flow of action in favour of 'moments of erotic contemplation'.³ The male protagonist, in contrast, pushes the narrative forward and functions as the bearer of the look. Mulvey's psychoanalytic framework functions to describe the workings of the cinematic apparatus,

which invites an identification with a masculine heterosexual desire and delimits the position of women to that of sexual spectacle for the male characters, the camera and the audience alike. In effect, sex serves as a means to broach normative representations of gender and imbalanced economies of desire. Mulvey's essay served to prod the discipline away from the humanistic currents of the time (promoting film as an art and its makers as artists), towards a political, epistemological and moral critique of cinema.

Groundbreaking at the time and hugely influential as one of the most read and cited essays in the humanities even today, Mulvey's article should be seen as emblematic of a larger current of thinking about sex and the cinema performed by Barbara Clover, Pam Cook, Elizabeth Cowie, Mary Ann Doane, Jane Gaines, Molly Haskell, Julia Lesage and many others. This research gained traction across a wide range of upstart journals including *Camera Obscura*, *Women and Film*, *Frauen und Film*, *Jump Cut* and, much later, *Feminist Media Histories*.

Mulvey's provocation also spurred a range of critiques and efforts at elaboration and extension, often opening up different ways of considering representations of sexuality in audiences' engagement with the moving image. For instance, both Richard Dyer and Steve Neale foreground the notion of masculinity as sexual spectacle;⁴ in 'Desperately Seeking Difference,' Jackie Stacey raises the question of the female spectator's pleasure, arguing for a 'more flexible and mobile model of spectatorship and cinematic pleasure'.⁵ Stacey's focus on 'the relations between women on the screen and between these representations and the women in the audience'⁶ also marks a shift in focus from a heterosexual model of sexual difference – like the one adopted by Mulvey – to an interest in exploring spectatorship and representation in relation to same-sex desire. Indeed, perhaps one of the most dramatic trajectories in this mode of inquiry is the broader inclusion and increasingly intense focus on gay, lesbian and queer scholarship on film. Whereas seminal histories like *The Celluloid*

Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies and anthologies such as *How Do I Look: Queer Film and Video* and *Queer Looks: Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Film and Video* focus primarily on representations of gay characters or the exemplary achievements of LGBT filmmakers,⁷ other scholars have taken up the notion of ‘queering’ to describe a particular mode of reception.⁸

More recently, scholars have addressed queer cinema in a way that transcends the focus on Anglo-American film practices.⁹ In their book *Queer Cinema in the World*, Karl Schoonover and Rosalind Galt argue that queer cinema ‘elaborates new accounts of the world, offering alternatives to the embedded capitalist, national, hetero- and homonormative maps’.¹⁰ Discussing the different ways in which queer has found a place in the discipline of film studies, they offer a similar overview to the one described above, pointing out that ‘queer film studies has included those seemingly straight films that LGBT audiences have made indelibly queer’ as well as referring to a queer film methodology that consists of ‘a textual focus that defines queer films as those that depict queer people diegetically’.¹¹ However, they also refer to another aspect of queer cinema that is highly relevant to this special issue, stating that ‘the representation of same-sex or other dissident sex acts is for many spectators a defining pleasure of queer cinema’, concluding that ‘sex sells is not exactly news, but the organization of cinema’s sexual pleasures can help us to understand the affective force of queer film cultures’.¹² This observation highlights not only the extent to which a broader conceptualisation of sexuality has been central to film scholarship on representation and spectatorship, but also points to the representation of sex in film more narrowly. Expanding beyond the parameters of queer cinema, then, the depiction of sex acts in Hollywood and art cinema has been the focus of much scholarly interest, with Linda Williams proposing the double meaning of the verb *to screen* (as both revelation and concealment) as a way of understanding the cinematic treatment of sex.¹³ Indeed, there is no way of addressing the topic

of sex in the cinema without engaging with that elusive category of film dedicated to the explicit representation of sex: pornography.

II. Pornography

Although there has been evidence of filmic pornography since shortly after the invention of the medium, the topic was long considered unworthy of serious study. This finally began to change after the publication of Linda Williams' 1989 study, *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the "Frenzy of the Visible"*. With this book, Williams lays the groundwork for a whole generation of scholarship to follow, by adopting a Foucauldian framework and arguing that pornography partakes in a 'modern compulsion to speak incessantly about sex'.¹⁴ Distancing herself from the polemic tone and the anti/pro dichotomy that dominated the discussion of pornography during the feminist sex wars of the 1980s, Williams proposes that scholars approach the study of pornography as they would any other film genre. In her book, Williams presents the reader with an overview of the historical development of heterosexual hard-core moving-image pornography, ranging from the stag films that dominated the first half of the twentieth century to the rise of the narrative feature during the Golden Age of Porn in the 1970s and ending with the 'couples porn' produced by filmmakers like Candida Royalle in the 1980s. Deploying textual analysis, Williams focuses on the style, narrative and iconography of pornography, as well as anatomising its norms and conventions with comparisons to other genres, such as the musical. She concludes that pornography is guided by the principle of 'maximum visibility'; the convention of the 'money shot' constitutes an involuntary bodily confessional moment, making visible the 'truth' of sexual pleasure.¹⁵

Just like the larger topic of sex and the cinema, the study of pornography has gradually broadened to encompass more diverse identity groups. If Williams' book is limited to the

study of heterosexual pornography, for instance, other scholars have engaged with the particular functions, meanings and modes of address shaping gay and lesbian pornography.¹⁶ Moreover, following the important work performed by scholars such as Kobena Mercer and Richard Fung, recent monographs including *A Taste for Brown Sugar: Black Women in Pornography* and *The Black Body in Ecstasy: Reading Race, Reading Pornography* draw attention to questions of gender and race in relation to pornography. Both Laura Kipnis and Constance Penley address issues of class, a topic deserving of much more attention than it is currently receiving.¹⁷

Moreover, if much of this scholarship primarily uses textual analysis in order to dissect issues of representation, some scholars have posed broader questions relating to film culture and argued that other methods might be more appropriate to understand the roles pornography plays in social life. For instance, John Champagne polemically asserts that the common practice of textual analysis in film studies ‘particularly obscures both the social and historical conditions in which certain kind of texts circulate and the everyday uses to which subjects put such texts’.¹⁸ Engaging with the specific ways in which gay pornography is circulated in arcades and porn theatres, Champagne proposes an alternative approach to studying gay pornography, advocating reception studies as a tool to better ‘understand the porno viewing experience as part of a set of cultural and social rituals and practices’.¹⁹ Investigating a much different phenomenon, Jane Juffer advances a similar argument in her focus on the emergence of sexually explicit materials targeted towards women, which she calls ‘domesticated porn’.²⁰ Taking issue with the emphasis on transgression in considerations of pornography, and engaging with the regulatory conditions that inform processes of categorisation, Juffer asks her reader to consider ‘what are the material and discursive conditions in which *different kinds* of pornography are produced, distributed, obtained, and consumed?’²¹

Since the initial publication of *Hard Core* in 1989, a more or less codified and coherent subfield of pornography studies has emerged, resulting in the publication of topic-specific readers²² as well as the 2014 establishment of the journal *Porn Studies* under the editorship of Feona Attwood and Clarissa Smith. Unlike the moralistic tone of earlier writing, this recent scholarship aspires to take pornography seriously, eschewing reductive understandings for nuanced investigations of the various subgenres and niches that have come to proliferate in the pornographic landscape since the advent of the Web 2.0.²³ In recent years, scholarly work has ranged from a careful consideration of the ‘gendered choreographies’ of mainstream heterosexual pornography, to discussions of realism in amateur and gonzo porn, to an engagement with imagery that has been labelled alternative, indie, ethical, feminist and queer pornography.²⁴ Of particular interest is the publication of *The Feminist Porn Book*, which includes work by both academics and practitioners. The editors state that ‘like feminist porn itself, the diverse voices in this collection challenge entrenched, divisive dichotomies of academic and popular, scholar and sex worker, pornographer and feminist’.²⁵ In doing so, the collection raises important questions about who has the right to speak with authority about the contentious issue of pornography, embodying the slogan ‘nothing about us without us’.

Research in the field of porn studies has not been reserved to considerations of contemporary pornography but also expands on seminal works on the history of pornography by Walter Kendrick and Lynne Hunt.²⁶ Media historian Amy Herzog investigates the history of peep arcades, while the anthology *Porn Archives* explores the problematic status of the archive in relation to pornography, engaging with the question of pornography *as* archive as well as the issue of archiving pornography.²⁷ Beyond matters of temporality, porn studies has also explored the spaces in which pornography is consumed, ranging from public screenings of pornography in past and present, to the individualised and embodied practices of consumption invited by online pornography.²⁸ All of these perspectives, then, illustrate the importance of

developing a diverse set of approaches towards researching pornography, including not only traditional film methodologies like close analysis and reception studies, but also applying less familiar lenses, including (auto-)ethnography, affective methodologies and critical frameworks that address labour issues and worker's rights. These emphases anticipate a third and final key frame: approaches commonly characterised as the New Film History, New Cinema History and (Critical) Media Industries Studies.

III. New Cinema History and Media Industries Studies

Already in the 1970s and especially in the 1980s, scholars working in the humanistic departments where film was most commonly researched and taught (film studies, communications, English, other languages) began agitating for more attention to concerns beyond the text itself, and considerations of the audience more rigorous than the then prevalent 'subject theories' and their applications in textual-analysis interpretations. Steve Neale suggested how institutional practices have demonstrable effects on representational forms, ideological attitudes and genre cycles – including the role of sex in art cinema.²⁹ Thomas Elsaesser, Andrew Higson and others called for more attention to distribution, exhibition and consumption practices, as a way to complement the hitherto dominant focus on filmmakers, modes of production and textual analysis.³⁰ Elsaesser's formulation of a New Film History would find more extensive usage in the 1990s and 2000s with a new generation of scholars who refined and actualised these research protocols, supplementing what was then still a largely aesthetically orientated field.

Under the banner of a New Cinema History, Daniel Biltereyst, Richard Maltby, Phillippe Meers, Peter Stanfield and others dove into archives and sought out new ways to understand individual films as existing within systems of finance, technology, distribution, exhibition, censorship and cultural history. Working at an intersection with sociology, Annette Kuhn and

Jackie Stacey were key proponents of social histories featuring qualitative audience research of cinemagoing memories, highlighting among other things the libidinal economies at issue in female spectators' engagement with film stars. This work is being picked up and pushed forward by Daniela Treveri Gennari, Lies Van de Vijver and others.³¹

To be sure, research on sex and cinema in this vein is varied in emphasis and method. It includes, for example, Jon Lewis' *Hollywood v. Hardcore*, which examines legal judgments, movie ratings and the institutional history of cinema lobby groups and business associations. Lewis convincingly argues that the brief flowering of pornography as mainstream in the 1970s United States, and its quick relegation to the cultural fringes, had as much to do with commercial facts of distribution and exhibition and the lobbying power of the MPAA as with filmmakers' ideas and representations, cultural mores or government censorship, strictly defined.³² Following in this vein, Peter Alilunas has recently extended the line of such research to examine the transition of pornography from film to video, expounding on the 'cultural and legal efforts to regulate, contain, limit, or eradicate pornography'.³³ Sexually explicit work has often been distributed and consumed in distinctive spaces, public and private. Books such as Austin Fisher and Johnny Walker's volume, *Grindhouse*, and David Church's *Grindhouse Nostalgia* pursue these cinemas and their unique milieux.³⁴

Most recently, the Media Industries movement has subsumed many of these approaches, proposing mid-level research solutions informed by both political economy and cultural studies. Exemplary studies overlay top-down examinations of high-powered business and creative decision-makers with bottom-up investigations of hitherto voiceless but vital workers within the system, juxtaposing soft-core videographers with reality-show casting directors and television factory manufacturers.³⁵ The main principle that undergirds Media Industry Studies – the belief that media industries emerge from (1) underlying social conditions and

contradictions; (2) working practices, hierarchies and ownership patterns; (3) and the discourses communicated by practitioners – necessitates diverse and interlocking objects and methods of inquiry, from trade publications and practitioner interviews, to legal documents and ethnographic observation.³⁶ Examining the institutional incentives – in festival and cinema programming, funding decisions, critics’ reviews, DVD distribution lists, arts educational institutions, structures of small national cinemas and other realms – that motivate the production and reception of provocative, sexually explicit and graphically violent art films, Mattias Frey’s *Extreme Cinema* delivers one example about how a media industries framework can be brought to bear on sex and the cinema.³⁷

A final case in point of the media industries approach returns us to the issues that framed Laura Mulvey’s seminal essay, even while marking the long trajectory of the discipline. Erin Hill’s *Never Done: A History of Women’s Work in Media Production* examines the gendered labour practices, institutional structures and hierarchies at work in Hollywood studios in the early twentieth century.³⁸ Challenging the industry myth that women ‘did not participate in much of film history except as actors or, more rarely, as screenwriters’, Hill convincingly details how women were integral to the work of many Hollywood production departments. *Never Done* shows how professional status, privilege and remuneration intertwined inversely with gender; the industrial system spawned a way of speaking bound up with essentialist notions of feminine traits and norms: e.g., women were sought in some outward-facing roles to ‘give good phone’. Employing both top-down and bottom-up approaches to researching the tasks, structures and hierarchies of film studios, when traditional sources, such as the studios’ own archival documents, proved unforthcoming, Hill seeks out unconventional means to buttress her analysis: e.g., using studio-produced industrials to assess the intentionally forgotten histories of African American female workers. As we continue our conversations about how to expand women’s roles in all aspects of media culture under the rubric of

#MeToo, *Never Done* represents exemplary scholarship. Furthermore, it suggests how larger investigations of sex and the cinema must also include the longer history of gender, power dynamics and media work – and the sexuality but also sexual violence that often grease that system.

Special Issue Articles

The next two articles firmly partake of this third line of inquiry. Indeed, Daniel Biltereyst, the author of the following contribution, ‘Sex Cinemas, Limit Transgression and the Aura of “Forbiddenness”: The Emergence of *risqués* cinemas and *Cinema Leopold* in Ghent, Belgium, 1945-54’, is a pioneering doyen in the New Cinema History movement. Here he continues that important work in a postwar history of the Cinema Leopold, a Ghent movie house known for its risqué programming. Biltereyst examines programming strategies, interviews former patrons, uncovers the biography of its owner, investigates the spatial politics of the cinema in relation to the city of Ghent and provides insight into the larger social protocols and institutional discourses of the theatre, its competitors, the press and censors. The result is a masterclass in constructing a rigorous approach to the subject’s titillating ballyhoo.

In turn, Adrian Smith continues the emphasis on forbidden films and censors’ discourse in his investigation of Swedish sex education films in 1970s Britain. At that time, canny distributors and exhibitors capitalised on viewers’ association of certain foreign cultures (especially French and Scandinavian) with liberal sexuality. Smith scrutinises the case of *More About the Language of Love* (*Mera ur Kärlekens språk*, 1970), a Swedish sex education film distributed in Britain as exotic pornography. The release precipitated moralist campaigns, which were brought to bear on the country’s convoluted system of classification and censorship and led to

a court case against the cinema manager and owner. Detailing the contemporary press notice and uncovering meeting minutes and examiners' reports from the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC), the Greater London Council (GLC) and other governmental and quasi-governmental organisations, Smith paints a historically and culturally specific portrait of sex, film and censorship.

Laura Treglia, for her part, combines a study of the industrial transformation of the Japanese film industry with a consideration of representation and genre aligned with our first rubric, above. In the 1960s and 1970s, Japanese studios released a variety of *sukeban* films, exploitation pictures that featured recalcitrant young women as sassy gang leaders who openly mocked male sexual desires. Treglia deftly shows how the production cycle derived from, and addressed, several needs: it protected the flailing Tōei and Nikkatsu studios against financial collapse at the same time that it tapped into social desires for transgressive representations of youth culture, and especially women's sexuality, in a politically ambivalent way. Treglia's contribution demonstrates how the major approaches to studying sex and the cinema outlined above are hardly mutually exclusive. Indeed, they can productively inform each other.

From a very different perspective, Catalin Brylla also engages with some of the formative questions raised in first section of this introduction above, by addressing issues of representation and spectatorship in relation to the musical documentary *Pornography: The Musical* (2003). However, Brylla also introduces another issue highly relevant in thinking through the relation between sex and the moving image, namely storytelling. By comparing the film in question to other documentaries about the porn industry, and combining cognitive theories with Judith Butler's notion of 'performativity,' Brylla argues that the film bypasses any stereotypical portrayals of sex workers through its particular authorial reflexivity and

spectatorial address. One of the few articles in this special issue that uses the traditional film methodology of textual analysis—as part of a wider interdisciplinary framework—Brylla’s discussion of the documentary treatment of the porn industry also draws attention to some of the issues raised above with regards to researching media industries, exploring the discourses communicated by porn performers within this hybrid example of musical documentary.

Before a series of book reviews that pertain to the special issue theme, Jennifer Lyon Bell’s contribution presents a fascinating source of insight into the practical, theoretical and ethical considerations that shape her artistic practice as a porn director. Speaking to the second line of inquiry mentioned in this introduction, Bell’s blend of artist manifesto and academic essay contributes to the burgeoning field of porn studies, by emphasising the intersection of pornography and empathy. Building on cognitive film theorist Murray Smith’s work on character engagement and spectatorship, Bell turns to a discussion of her short *Headshot* (2006) in order to demonstrate how she purposefully creates character empathy using film form. In doing so, Bell makes an original intervention into wider debates around spectatorship and pornography, transcending a reductive and simplistic understanding of porn spectatorship in terms of voyeurism and objectification. Moreover, in highlighting some of the ways in which the concept of empathy informs the production process, Bell’s article also demonstrates the importance on moving beyond questions of representation when engaging with the ethical implications of pornography, by shifting focus to media production and offering insights from the perspective of an independent porn producer.

¹ See, for example, Stanley Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

² For recent reckonings with the prehistory of film studies as a discipline, see, for example, Dana Polan, *Scenes of Instruction: The Beginnings of the U.S. Study of Film*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007; Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson (eds), *Inventing Film Studies*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.

³ Laura Mulvey, 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', in Patricia Erens (ed.), *Issues in Feminist Film Criticism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990 [1975], p. 33.

⁴ Richard Dyer, 'Don't Look Now – The Male Pin-Up', *Screen* 23: 3-4 (1982), 61-73; Steve Neale, 'Masculinity as Spectacle', *Screen* 24: 6 (1983), 2-17.

⁵ Jackie Stacey, 'Desperately Seeking Difference', *Screen* 28: 1 (1987), 49.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁷ Vito Russell, *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies*, New York: Harper and Row, 1981; Bad Object-Choices (eds), *How Do I Look? Queer Film and Video*, Seattle: Bay Press, 1991; Martha Gever, John Greyson and Pratibha Parmar (eds), *Queer Looks: Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Film and Video*, New York/London: Routledge, 1993.

⁸ Alexander Doty, *Flaming Classics: Queering the Film Canon*, New York/London: Routledge, 2000, p. 2.

⁹ Nick Rees-Roberts, *French Queer Cinema*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008; Chris Perriam, *Spanish Queer Cinema*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013; Robin Griffiths (ed.), *Queer Cinema in Europe*, Bristol/Chicago: Intellect.

¹⁰ Karl Schoonover, Rosalind Galt, *Queer Cinema in the World*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016, p. 5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹³ Linda Williams, *Screening Sex*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008, p. 2. See also: Darren Kerr and Donna Peberdy (eds), *Tainted Love: Screening Sexual Perversion*, London/New York: I.B. Tauris, 2017.

¹⁴ Linda Williams, *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the "Frenzy of the Visible"*,

Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999 [1989], p. 2.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 48-9.

¹⁶ Richard Dyer, 'Male Gay Porn: Coming to Terms', *Jump Cut* 30 (1985)

www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC30folder/GayPornDyer; Richard Dyer, 'Idol

Thoughts: Orgasm and Self-Reflexivity in Gay Pornography', *Critical Quarterly* 36: 1

(1994), 49-62; Thomas Waugh, *Hard to Imagine: Gay Male Eroticism in Photography and*

Film from Their Beginnings to Stonewall, New York: Columbia University Press; John

Mercer, *Gay Pornography: Representations of Masculinity and Sexuality*, London/New York:

I.B Tauris; Kobena Mercer, 'Skin Head Sex Thing: Racial Difference and the Homoerotic

Imagination', in Bad Object-Choices (eds), *How Do I Look: Queer Film and Video*, Seattle:

Bay Press, pp. 169-210; Richard Fung, 'Looking for My Penis: The Eroticized Asian in Gay

Video Porn', in Bad Object-Choices (eds.), *How Do I Look: Queer Film and Video*, Seattle:

Bay Press, pp. 145-161; Heather Butler, 'What Do You Call a Lesbian with Long Fingers?

The Development of Lesbian and Dyke Pornography', in Linda Williams (ed.) *Porn Studies*,

Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004, 167-97; Mary T. Conway, 'Spectatorship in

Lesbian Porn: The Woman's Woman's Film', *Wide Angle* 19: 3 (1997), 91-113; Lisa

Henderson, 'Lesbian Pornography: Cultural Transgression and Sexual Demystification',

Women and Language 14: 1 (1991), 3-12; Cherry Smyth, 'The Pleasure Threshold: Looking

at Lesbian Pornography on Film', *Feminist Review* 34 (1990), 152-9.

¹⁷ Mireille Miller-Young, *A Taste for Brown Sugar: Black Women in Pornography*, Durham,

NC: Duke University Press, 2014; Jennifer C. Nash, *The Black Body in Ecstasy: Reading*

Race, Reading Pornography, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014; Laura Kipnis,

Bound and Gagged: Pornography and the Politics of Fantasy in America, New York: Grove

Press, 1996; Constance Penley, Crackers and Whackers: The White Thrashing of Porn', in

Matt Wrey and Annalee Newitz (eds), *White Thrash: Race and Class in America*, New York: Routledge, 1997, 89-112.

¹⁸ John Champagne, ““Stop Reading Films!” Film Studies, Close Analysis, and Gay Pornography’, *Cinema Journal* 36: 4 (1997), 76.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

²⁰ Jane Juffer, *At Home with Pornography: Women, Sex, and Everyday Life*, New York: New York University Press, 1998.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²² Linda Williams (ed.), *Porn Studies*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

²³ Feona Attwood (ed.), *Porn.com: Making Sense of Online Pornography*, New York: Peter Lang, 2010; Susanna Paasonen, *Carnal Resonance: Affect and Online Pornography*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011.

²⁴ Susanna Paasonen, ‘Repetition and Hyperbole: The Gendered Choreographies of Heteroporn’, in Karen Boyle (ed.), *Everyday Pornography*, London/New York: Routledge, 2010, pp. 63-76; Niels Van Doorn, ‘Keeping It Real: User-generated Pornography, Gender Reification, and Visual Pleasure’, *Convergence* 16: 4 (2010), 411-30; Tristan Taormino, Celine Parreñas Shimizu, Constance Penley and Mireille Miller-Young (eds), *The Feminist Porn Book: The Politics of Producing Pleasure*, New York: The Feminist Press, 2013.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁶ Walter Kendrick, *The Secret Museum: Pornography in Modern Culture*, Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987; Lynn Hunt, *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity 1500-1800*, New York: Zone Books, 1993.

²⁷ Amy Herzog, ‘In the Flesh: Space and Embodiment in the Pornographic Peep Arcade’, *The Velvet Light Trap* 62 (2008), 29-43; Tim Dean, Steven Ruszczycky and David Squires (eds), *Porn Archives*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.

-
- ²⁸ Elena Gorfinkel, 'Wet Dreams: Erotic Film Festivals of the Early 1970s and the Utopian Public Sphere', in Eric Schaefer (ed.), *Sex Scene: Media and the Sexual Revolution*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014, pp. 126-50; Ingrid Ryberg, "'Every time we fuck we win": The Public Sphere of Queer, Feminist, and Lesbian Porn as a (Safe) Space for Sexual Empowerment', in Tristan Taormino, Celine Parreñas Shimizu, Constance Penley and Mireille Miller-Young (eds), *The Feminist Porn Book: The Politics of Producing Pleasure*, New York: The Feminist Press, 2013, pp. 140-55; Paasonen, *Carnal Resonance*.
- ²⁹ Steve Neale, 'Art Cinema as Institution', *Screen* 22: 1 (1981), 11-40.
- ³⁰ See Thomas Elsaesser, 'The New Film History', *Sight and Sound* 55: 4 (1986), 246-51; Andrew Higson, 'The Concept of National Cinema', *Screen* 30: 4 (1989), 36-47; James Chapman, Mark Glancy and Sue Harper (eds), *The New Film History: Sources, Methods, Approaches*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007.
- ³¹ Richard Maltby, Daniel Biltereyst and Philippe Meers (eds), *Explorations in New Cinema History: Approaches and Case Studies*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011; Annette Kuhn, *An Everyday Magic: Cinema and Cultural Memory*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2002; Jackie Stacey, *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship*, London: Routledge, 1994.
- ³² Jon Lewis, *Hollywood v. Hardcore: How the Struggle over Censorship Created the Modern Film Industry*, New York: New York University Press, 2000.
- ³³ Peter Alilunas, *Smutty Little Movies: The Creation and Regulation of Adult Video*, Oakland: University of California Press, 2016.
- ³⁴ Austin Fisher and Johnny Walker (eds), *Grindhouse: Cultural Exchange on 42nd Street*, New York: Bloomsbury, 2016; David Church, *Grindhouse Nostalgia: Memory, Home Video and Exploitation Film Fandom*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.
- ³⁵ Vicki Mayer, *Below the Line: Producers and Production Studies in the New Television Economy*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

³⁶ Matthew Freeman, *Industrial Approaches to Media: A Methodological Gateway to Industry Studies*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, esp. p. 13; see also Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren (eds), *Media Industries: History, Theory, and Method*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009; Timothy Havens, Amanda Lotz and Serra Tinic, 'Critical Media Industry Studies: A Research Approach', *Communication, Culture and Critique* 2 (2009), 234-53.

³⁷ Mattias Frey, *Extreme Cinema: The Transgressive Rhetoric of Today's Art Film Culture*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016.

³⁸ Erin Hill, *Never Done: A History of Women's Work in Media Production*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016.