

# Notes on the Category of “Gay Film” [1995]\*

Stefan Hayn

My short films are concerned to a varying degree with the meaning of sexual identity. This evening they will be confronted by a textual critique. Occasion for this critique as well as context within which the films were made is a no longer entirely new but nonetheless booming “genre.” Hundreds of so-called gay and lesbian films screening at festivals all over the world promote a model of sexual identity that, no matter how questionable, continues to attest an emancipatory character. Recent film theory extrapolated from a feminist critique of patriarchal structures has also focused on this category previously classified as “underground,” in order to emphasize media’s capacity to provide minorities with a sense of identity as a political alternative to what mainstream entertainment offers. At the same time, the entertainment value of drag queens has made them regular guests on contemporary television shows and TV series.

As I have restricted my discussion to male homosexuality, my line of questioning will proceed as follows: How did this category come to be? What does it imply in terms of content and aesthetics? And what about the subversive character repeatedly attributed to “gay film,” its potentially critical take on a society within which it continues to stand for otherness?

My lecture is divided into three sections, between which films will be screened. It will conclude with *Flaming Creatures* (1962) by Jack Smith, a film that explored the question of sexual identity over thirty years ago, and from today’s point of view answered it far more radically than most anything seen since.

1.

As a fundamental hypothesis I would like to assume a definition of sexuality that does not correspond to the ahistorical notion of a natural constant opposite to the capitalist sociality. How we define sexuality and sexual identity is instead the result of an ongoing historical process. This applies equally to “normal” sexuality beneficial to reproduction, as well as to its differentiated “perversions:” Hetero- just as homosexuality and all other variations are socially generated categories that confront the individual with their regionally differentiated and fully realized lifestyle norms.

This argumentation that sexual identity models are fabricated does not contradict the fact that today’s lifestyles based on different sexual preferences still meet with varying degrees of social acceptance. “Coming out”—or “professing” a homosexual desire at home, at school, in a workplace, etc.—may still be

\* The lecture has been published in German in *Rundbrief Film: Filme in lesbisch-schwulem Kontext* (August 1995), ed. Thomas Behm and Jens Schneiderheinze, 65–75.

a difficult and painful process for the individual. Not only do legal code and judicial practice pass down the exploitation of women. Moral double standards regarding incest taboos and the fact that every aspect of life is turned into pornography perpetuate a watered-down heterosexually conditioned compulsion.

However, the taboo-breaking wave of the so-called sexual revolution felt to this day has made it clear that the simple reversal strategy—revealing and labeling previously hidden sexual preferences in order to free a personal desire—only succeeds in displacing traditional power relations. In explicit criticism of Wilhelm Reich's hypothesis of repression, Michel Foucault pointed out that the public exposure of—or scientific discourse—in regard to previously hidden and sanctioned forms of sexual desire does not abolish social repression, but rather produces more complex power relations on a new level.<sup>1</sup> This means that Western society can be characterized as having undergone waves of liberalization and repression only in an external sense over the past thirty years. The "real" process aims for a modern form of social access to the individual via sexuality—paradoxically introduced by the "activists" of various "sexual revolutions."

This transmutation of emancipation efforts into their opposite is particularly visible in the gay liberation movement, or within the so-called gay subculture. While "professional" gays at the end of the 1960s launched emancipatory slogans, which in turn were profitably used by a branch of the leisure and entertainment industry that is booming to this day, thereby contributing to a framework within which sex became anonymous and detached from any (relationship) obligations in regard to the partner—a mere matter of bodily exchange between "free" agents. As discussed by contemporary sexologists, the product yielded by this rationalization of intimate desire is "gay identity"—what was foreign and entirely other has finally advanced to a modern, socially integrated norm of subjectivity constructed around sexual desire. "Free your ass and your mind will follow!" is not an activist's slogan championing anal sex as a subversive act in the AIDS era. Coupled with the additional phrase "Everyone is an original," it is the advertising slogan for Chesterfield cigarettes anno 1994.

This development rendered the call to emancipate the individual via sexuality more and more obsolete. There is no escape, no "coming out" anymore; on the contrary, there is a pressure of "coming in," an endlessly refined coercion to belong to the community of sexual beings. To the extent that everybody is "allowed" to participate, or must "be an original"; differences are increasingly flattened out. An external uniformity becomes increasingly perfected. And what remains can be called "the mannequin," as Wolfgang Hegener puts it: "It is genderless, and at the same time, a 'little man,' a 'little penis' and

perhaps also a 'little phallus'; it is sexually encoded, no part of it escapes being sexualized; furthermore this (fashion) body—entirely engaged in producing and consuming—becomes a venue for multifaceted narcissistic enactments. Ultimately it is a body full of sexual signs and demands that remains un-touchable, self-referential, nothing other than a blank form for miscellaneous wrappings."<sup>2</sup>

2.

Ever since there have been films, they have been classified for a wide variety of reasons according to special criteria. Classical film theory categorizes films primarily according to formal/aesthetic characteristics for purposes of analysis and critique, while the film industry is known to use genre classifications more often than not to elicit potential audiences. At the same time it is often the films themselves that establish and modify classification models, especially the stylistically pioneering films. In the case of "gay film," it is the interweaving of diverse political ambitions, artistic inventions, and economic interests that give rise to its differentiated contemporary form. When, in the following argumentation, I chose certain films as examples, it is due to their function as historical focal points in terms of representing a "productive collaboration" between public, film criticism, film industry, and filmmakers.

It could be said that initially the discussion regarding the category of "gay film" was concerned with the search for screen figures to identify with. Cinema served as a projection space for daily questions and desires. Ten years ago, when I started going to the cinema more regularly, I often chose films related to the topic of homosexuality. Later on, I encountered gay film as a "class in its own" when attending topical festivals and thematically focused series, where the most various narrative, documentary, and experimental films from the entire spectrum of film history were introduced as a "genre." Artistically advanced cinema, like *Michael* (1924) by Carl Theodor Dreyer, was supposed to constitute a standard of gay cinematic socialization as well as, for example, the pornographic film *Nights in Black Leather* (1973) by Peter Berlin.

With this type of film selection and the assumption of "gay film" as a festival motto, the function of identity construction became effective not only for the individual but also for a "minority audience" thereby generated. As a result, gay film festivals have become one of today's most important occasions for "community building." People look for a representation of themselves in the cinema—consequently cinema is supposed to mirror the sociopolitical situation of homosexuals.

1 Michel Foucault, *Der Wille zum Wissen – Sexualität und Wahrheit 1* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983).

2 Wolfgang Hegener, *Das Mannequin – Vom sexuellen Subjekt zum geschlechtslosen Selbst* (Tübingen: konkursbuch, 1992), 10.

The question of representation also became the starting point of a certain branch of cultural studies. Gay film becoming a "scientific category" meant that certain films were extracted from the historical context of their production and reception, and integrated into comparative systems in regard to gender and sexuality. "Queer studies," as this new branch of film, or rather cultural studies from the United States was called, mainly projected a special societal and historical model of identity—the Western "gay identity" of the 1960s—retrospectively onto cultural history, mostly in order to prove the repressive character of existing aesthetical and historical approaches. Derived from feminist theory, queer studies, in large part, use ahistorical categories, like "the male gaze," "female aesthetics," etc., to stress a positively pitched history of an "oppressed minority" as foundation for further social emancipation.

In short, by the time I started making films, a "gay film history" had been written, "gay aesthetics" had been established, and the category of gay film had already been formed with all its questionable theoretical implications. Under these premises, homosexuality as assertion of one's subjectivity on the screen seemed highly problematic to me. By using the title *Gay film = This Film Is by a Gay Man* (1989), I tried to provide a polemical quintessence of the combination derived from this kind of identity politics that compulsively linked the artist, his work, and the representation of a minority to the "outside" world. My impression was based on cinematic experiences at the time, as well as on Vito Russo's book *The Celluloid Closet* (1981),<sup>3</sup> a starting point of queer film studies. What Russo tried to praise as emancipation from Hollywood's "closetedness" riddled by intrigue is a direct transfer of the "coming out" slogan to the film world. The filmmaker openly acknowledging his homosexuality functions as a medial mouthpiece—he is obliged to publicly represent the current minority interest.

Incidentally, the archetype of this kind of coming out on a movie screen was introduced by Kenneth Anger in his film *Fireworks* (1947), long before gay liberation was proclaimed. What back then appeared as a strange, subjective alternative world captured on film, developed over the course of time into the perfect identity prison for the "gay filmmaker," as it was represented by Rosa von Praunheim.

In 1971 Praunheim used the politicization of cinema happening at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s in Germany to initiate a German gay rights movement modeled on the United States, with his film *It's Not the Homosexual Who Is Perverse, but the Situation in Which He Lives*. Praunheim developed a routine out of the provocative impact the film had on the "minority" it caricatured, as well as on the broad, heterosexual audience—using the self-ironic motto "Sex and career."<sup>4</sup> While Frieda Grafe describes "the entire,

aggressive, vulgar directness of content" in 1977 as "indigestible leftovers" of his films,<sup>5</sup> what was once indigestible and subversive takes on a compulsively maintained air of provocation. Praunheim performed his specially developed model of the gay filmmaker ad absurdum, condemned to break taboos acknowledged as no longer taboo and to defend his monopoly in the crossfire of a gay public that felt falsely represented.

While for Praunheim, gay characters were supposed to come down off the screen and heighten the awareness of homosexuality to bring social change, this educational impetus based on identity politics in cinema was superseded in the mid-1980s by an opposite model. More or less harmless narratives about relationships, like *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1986) by Stephen Frears, aimed for integration into the existing social order, saying: "Homosexuals are basically as normal as you and me."

But lifestyle politics in the 1980s had different faces. The British filmmaker Derek Jarman became the new "king" of a reanimated "gay underground," both for the "minority community" newly regrouping in response to AIDS, as well as for a majority of film critics. Certainly a reason for this was that Jarman initially left questionable aspects of identity politics behind in order to foreground questions of aesthetics. Gay film was declared to be innovative art house cinema, especially referencing certain American experimental filmmakers of the 1960s whose formal approach grew important for Jarman in two respects.

Reference number one is the problematization of the film material to be found in experimental cinema: people like Ken Jacobs conveyed a sense of the materiality of the medium, the grain of the film stock, using the newly available and relatively inexpensive 16 mm material either out of analytical interest or economic need. Jarman registered the aesthetic surface as an empty poetic form from these, in part extremely consequential experiments, starting with his early Super 8 films and proceeding all the way to the video and computer processed imagery of his 35 mm movies.

Reference number two is the aforementioned Anger. In 1963, with *Scorpio Rising*, Anger used ironic quotations from everyday life and youth culture as well as standard Hollywood fare to develop a visual vocabulary and create a "camp" aesthetic that influences prevalent, ironic aesthetic advertising styles to this day. Anger's trendsetting motorcycle cult mix finds an analog in

3 Vito Russo, *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981). Published in German as *Die Schwule Traumfabrik: Homosexualität im Film* (Berlin: Bruno Gmünder Verlag, 1990).

4 Rosa von Praunheim, *Sex und Karriere* (Hamburg: Rohwolt, 1978).

5 Frieda Grafe, "Beschriebener Film – Rosa von Praunheim Bruder! Sex und Karriere," *Die Republik*, nos. 72–75 (1985): 222.

Jarman's reflection on lifestyle politics of punk and pop culture, further enhanced and modernized by Jarman's own contemporary artistic efforts. Here please recall the symbiosis of Jarman/Pet Shop Boys.

Jarman attempted to reinforce the politicization of his cinematic aestheticism—to sum up his artistic process—which he later introduced under the motto "Queer instead of gay," in the spirit of the newer "queer" movement. Jarman's HIV infection and illness became a central theme within this context. In the end, his film *Blue* was celebrated as having attained the height of an artistically cinematic radicalism.<sup>6</sup> Jarman was said to have found the most appropriate artistic expression for his HIV-related blindness in the film's use of a monochromatically blue screen.

And so we arrive at contemporary premises of (film) production and reception. The shiny blank surface of digital images is no longer capable of revealing the difference between itself and a phenomenal experience of the world. In other words, film or media artists behind the work are doomed to disappear in competition with the development of technology, and so there is an increasing need to enable the human being = the artist to be perceptible in ever-cruder forms. An answer to this situation is a drive for authenticity that ignores all taboos, as in the above quoted reception of Jarman's film—a reception which by now can only be characterized as cynical.

The loss of every distinction between the artistic intention and the compulsion to sell is affirmed in ever-new forms and constitutes the supposedly subversive accomplishment of the gay film genre today. Accordingly, to be "critical" in New Queer Cinema at the beginning of the 1990s implied the transmission of the latest aesthetic accomplishments along lines of Calvin Klein underwear ads, in combination with the currently most politically correct, prescribed quotas in regard to the number of women, black people, and people with AIDS. The complementary strategy—presenting mass murderers, Nazis, and other monsters in ironic opposition to the "correctness"—consisted in conceptually as well as the missionizing of the rest of the world with this model of emancipation, realized by queer film festivals from Wuppertal, to St. Petersburg, all the way to Tokyo.

To summarize, gay film as a genre mirrors different variations of gay identity, but more importantly, this genre in its function as a mass medium initially established and modernized the identity model. Alongside the question as to what degree this "branch of film" participates in an ultimately repressive discourse in regard to sexuality, the genre simultaneously takes on a pioneering role within a commodified aestheticization of life. Both fields—sexuality and aestheticization—are together transmitted by the gay filmmaker as a model of contemporary (artist-) subjectivity.

3.  
"The first article I ever published in the *Voice* was on *Flaming Creatures*, and I can truly say that no art has moved me more deeply than the midnight slide shows and glacially paced performances Jack used to stage at the Plaster Foundation of Atlantis on pre-Soho Green Street."<sup>7</sup> So wrote Jim Hoberman, chief film critic of New York's *Village Voice*, in the obituary honoring Jack Smith who died as a welfare case from an AIDS-related illness in 1989. Even if considered only as a marginal character in the official annals of art and film history, Smith is esteemed in certain circles as a legendary performance artist and filmmaker of the first generation in the American underground and independent film movement—registered by many as providing the initial artistic impetus for their own creative work. Secondhand anecdotes about his boundless creativity, on the one hand, and his eccentric if not paranoid, habitual contentiousness, on the other hand, proliferate the little that remains of almost thirty years of his artistic productivity: short prose and theater texts; some interviews and essays (i.e., about Maria Montez and Josef von Sternberg); Smith as an actor in films by Ken Jacobs, Bill Rice, and Andy Warhol; and as the single complete and preserved work, the forty-minute film *Flaming Creatures*, which he directed, shot, and edited in 1962.

"I started making a comedy about everything that I thought was funny. [...] The first audiences were laughing from the beginning all the way through. But then that writing started—and it became a sex thing. [...] When they got through licking their chops over the movie there was no more laughter. There was dead silence in the auditorium."<sup>8</sup> If one takes at face value what Smith told Sylvère Lotringer during an interview in 1978, it was the scandals staged by others that associated *Flaming Creatures* with a supposed provocative attitude. The transgression of sexual taboos—as in times of censorship of pornography the film was perceived—provided publicity for a new form of film production. The New American Cinema—this cinematically innovative movement centered in New York at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s—was mainly initiated by the filmmaker Jonas Mekas. Mekas had brought *Flaming Creatures* to the experimental film festival of Knokke in 1963—and due to the festival management's prohibition of the film, he projected it in his hotel room, instantly turning the film into a sensation and insider tip on the international film scene. According to Smith, given Mekas's newspaper article emphasizing the allegedly

6 Wolfram Schütte, "Nachruf zu Lebzeiten – Derek Jarman's neuer Film *Blue*," *Magnus*, no. 3/94 (March 1994)

7 Jim Hoberman, "Jack Smith, 1932–89," *Historical Treasures*, ed. Ira Cohen (New York: Hanuman, 1990), 10–11.

8 Sylvère Lotringer, "Jack Smith – Uncle Fishhook und die heilige Babykack – Kunst," in *New Yorker Gespräche* (Berlin: Merve-Verlag, 1983): 83. Jack Smith, interview by Sylvère Lotringer, "Uncle Fishhook and the Holy Baby Poo-Poo of Art," *Semiotext(e)* 3, no. 2 (1978).

pornographic nature of the film, the police confiscated a print of the film and further screenings in New York were forbidden. Smith consequently referred to Mekas as "Uncle Fishhook," personification of the culture industry in a new and alternative way, and as such, as a lifelong object of hatred.

Watching *Flaming Creatures* today, it becomes clear that its radical statement in regard to the question of the meaning of sexual identity lies beyond intentional identification and beyond affirmative provocation; in fact, Smith's film shows in an almost analytical presentation the problematic results of a "sexual revolution" that had just started at the time. The "mannequins" prowl around in diverse costumes, eventually to theatrically fall into one another's arms—they are not innocent as claimed by Susan Sontag in her essay on *Flaming Creatures*,<sup>9</sup> anything but. They realize they are being used to pull off a scam by the time the off-screen advertising dude praises the latest, heart-shaped lipstick that supposedly bestows everyone with a heart-shaped mouth that remains perfectly shaped even while giving a blow job. The product palette of sexual emancipation is already far too familiar to them to still allow the pursuit of target-oriented sexual acts motivated by a serious sexual attraction. Boredom and interchangeability becomes widespread with the endless wagging of breasts and penises. Nonetheless, people keep applying the lipstick, so that the age-old game and only pastime can keep starting up again.

In *Flaming Creatures* I made use of the mass dreams I find I have inherited. The deep soulfulness and beauty I feel from the popular culture of my formative years moved me and I sifted through the mould passed down by my parents' generation in order to discover for myself a cinematic form. Believing that style, the way in which an artist handles a theme, rises above all subject matter, I chose the most artificial and decadent scene structure—an earthquake, an orgy, a dance routine—as the outline for my own film. I filmed and edited these scenes in a more or less abstract manner so that a high pitch of delirium (again) would be felt and the poetic ambiguities inherent in the "pop culture" scenes would become manifest.<sup>10</sup>

In this fellowship application from 1964, adhering to the tradition of Sternberg, Smith pronounces the central significance of the visual in cinema against the story-oriented routine Hollywood had fallen into at the time. Unlike Sternberg's lavish studio settings, Smith's scenes are supplied by the giant and perpetually growing garbage dumps of industrial mass production. By recycling pieces from mass culture, Smith stresses his own bias as a starting point for his critique of the excessiveness of capitalist production. This form of critique distinguishes Smith's burlesque method from the "camp" lifestyle, described by Sontag in the mid-1960s, as a pioneering aesthetic worldview that "is neutral with respect to content [...] disengaged, depoliticized."<sup>11</sup> Taking her essay

"Notes on 'Camp'" (1964) as a mirror of the contemporary zeitgeist, it becomes understandable that Smith considered the scandalous success of his film's reception to be based on a misunderstanding. He grew increasingly skeptical of any interpretations of art as well as the strategies of the art market.

In 1963 he filmed *Normal Love*, a supposedly comprehensive, feature film-like project, but he never assembled a definitive version. He subsequently no longer produced films, instead staging performances—in part incorporating slides and film fragments creating Happenings, or unique events directly linked to his own person as opposed to tradable products.

In conclusion, it can be maintained that from the point of *Flaming Creatures* all the way through the time of his fragmentary late work, Smith attempted to "rescue" the autonomy of the artwork in the age of the culture industry from meeting the empty fate of "art for art's sake," on the one hand, and "Tendenzkunst," ideologically tendentious art, on the other.

To guarantee a subjectivity that defies alienation, Smith used his own person ever more recklessly in his work—and in this he might be counted as one of the "unsophisticated" people who took the call a little too seriously to "extend the concept of art," as the new demarcation between art and life was programmatically called in the 1960s. That he has not yet gone down in the annals of art or film history as an icon of exemplary suffering, is in large part due to his megalomania. "I mean I didn't want this, to create a race of prostitute drag queens. I'm ashamed of it," he stated from his sickbed in 1988.<sup>12</sup>

If praises are to be sung to the radicalism of a path such as that pursued by Smith to the bitter end, a dated form of art that perpetually exacts the sacrifice of the artist is promoted—even if only in the form of his or her "madness." Nowadays the universally offered escape from this bourgeois notion of art is to affirm art as design in the world of commodities, as was illustrated in the critique of the category of gay film. But as long as a critical relationship to society is maintained, this cannot be an option. In his investigation of European aestheticism, Ralph-Rainer Wuthenow describes this historical situation that

9 Susan Sontag, "Jack Smith's *Flaming Creatures*," in *Against Interpretation, and Other Essays* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1966), 229.

10 Jack Smith, "Notes for the Ford Foundation Application – Program in Humanities and the Arts," in *Film Culture*, no. 76 (1992): 25.

11 Susan Sontag, "Anmerkungen zu 'Camp,'" in *Kunst und Anti-Kunst: 24 literarische Analysen* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag, 1982), 324.

12 Jack Smith, "Remarks on Art and the Theater," in *Historical Treasures*, 126.

remains unresolved to this day in the following manner: "The artists have become suspicious of themselves. There are only two possible answers to this dilemma: A farewell to art, or, a new foundation that will also be of a social nature, in order to achieve some kind of liability."<sup>13</sup>

English translation of a lecture presented by Stefan Hayn on April 24, 1995, at Kino Arsenal, Berlin, under the title "What to Put on Top of Jack Smith's Memorial Christmas Tree?" Screening of films by Hayn *Schwulenfilm* (Gay film, 1989), *Tuntenfilm* (Queeny film, 1990), *Pissen* (Piss, 1989/90), *Fontvella's Box* (1991/92), *What to Put on Top of Jack Smith's Memorial Christmas Tree?* (1994), and Smith's *Flaming Creatures* (1962).

#### Literature

Foucault, Michel. *Der Wille zum Wissen – Sexualität und Wahrheit 1*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983.

Grafe, Frieda. "Beschriebener Film – Rosa von Praunheim Bruder! Sex und Karriere." *Die Republik*, nos.72–75 (1985).

Hegener, Wolfgang. *Das Mannequin: Vom sexuellen Subjekt zum geschlechtslosen Selbst*. Tübingen: Konkursbuch, 1992.

Hoberman, Jim. "Jack Smith, 1932–89." In *Historical Treasures*, edited by Ira Cohen. New York: Hanuman, 1990.

Lotringer, Sylvère. "Uncle Fishhook and the Holy Baby Poo-Poo of Art." *Semiotext(e)* 3, no. 2 (1978).

Praunheim, Rosa von. *Sex und Karriere*. Hamburg: Rohwolt, 1978.

Russo, Vito. *Die Schwule Traumfabrik*. Berlin: Bruno Gmünder Verlag, 1990.

—. *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1981.

Schütte, Wolfram. "Nachruf zu Lebzeiten – Derek Jarman's neuer Film 'Blue.'" *Magnus*, no. 3/94 (March 1994).

Smith, Jack. "Notes for the Ford Foundation Application – Program in Humanities and the Arts." *Film Culture*, no. 76 (1992).

—. "Remarks on Art and the Theater." In *Historical Treasures*, edited by Ira Cohen. New York: Hanuman Books, 1990.

Sontag, Susan. "Jack Smith's Flaming Creatures." In *Against Interpretation, and Other Essays*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1966.

—. "Anmerkungen zu 'Camp.'" In *Kunst und Antikunst: 24 literarische Analysen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag, 1982.

Wuthenow, Ralph-Rainer. *Muse, Maske, Meduse: Europäischer Ästhetizismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1978.

13 Ralph-Rainer Wuthenow, *Muse, Maske, Meduse: Europäischer Ästhetizismus*, Edition Suhrkamp (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1978), 31.

**QQ:****Queer and Questioning  
Dietmar Schwärzler**

Fig. 1  
Johannes Schweiger, *Offijism Chair – Missoni*, 2015. Terry cloth, 100 percent cotton, metal, plastic. Design: Flammati Painterly Stripe / Cento Settanta. *Offijism Chair – Pitpull Polished Leather*, 2015. Terry cloth, 100 percent cotton, blackened goat skin, metal, plastic. *Partitions / Cabin Walls / Glory Slits*, 2015. Porcelain, aged pin wood panels, Swiss navy silicone lubricant. Installation view, weloveschool.org © Johannes Schweiger. Courtesy of the artist.

**Queer in Trans-Formation****A Conversation between Jakob Lena Knebl,  
Hans Scheirl, and Ruby Sircar**

Fig. 2  
Roberta Lima, *Setting Foot: deconstructing the sapatão (Self-portrait 01)*, 2013. Black-and-white silver gelatin (on Baryt paper), 125 × 165 cm. Courtesy of the artist.

**Appearing Differently:****Abstraction's Transgender and  
Queer Capacities****David J. Getsy in Conversation with  
William J. Simmons**

Fig. 3  
Gordon Hall, *SET (V)*, 2014. Acrylic and pigmented joint compound on wood, 47.6 × 50.8 × 3.2 cm. © Gordon Hall. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 4  
Jonah Groeneboer, *bent hip*, 2014. Thread and brass bars, 213.4 × 53.3 × 76.2 cm. © Jonah Groeneboer. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 5  
Prem Sahib, *You & Me Both II*, 2013. Steel and paint, 10 × 30 × 10 cm. Edition of 3. © Prem Sahib. Courtesy of the artist and Galleria Lorcan O'Neill, Rome.

Fig. 6  
Heather Cassils, *The Resilience of the 20%*, 2013. Poured black concrete cast of clay bash. 122 × 91.5 × 61 cm. © Heather Cassils. Courtesy of the artist and Ronald Feldman Fine Arts, New York.

Fig. 7  
Jimmy DeSana, *Instant Camera*, 1980. Vintage C-print, 56.8 × 76.5 cm. Courtesy of the Estate of Jimmy DeSana and Salon 94, New York.

**Eyelips:****On Tejal Shah's *Between the Waves*  
Nanna Heidenreich**

Figs. 8–13  
Tejal Shah, *Between the Waves*, 2012. Main film, channel I, color, b/w, surround sound 5.1, 26:20 min, film still. © Tejal Shah. Courtesy of the artist.

**To Think with the Whole Body****Katia Sepúlveda in Conversation with Nina  
Hoechtl**

Figs. 14–19  
Katia Sepúlveda, *Untitled*, 2005. Drawing on paper, 20 × 25 cm. Courtesy of the artist.

Figs. 20–22  
Katia Sepúlveda, *Lx jotx nostrx*, 2014. Street art in Tijuana México. Courtesy of the artist. Photo: Melina Mao.

Figs. 23–26  
Katia Sepúlveda, *Pascha Revolution!*, 2012. Performances in Cologne, Germany. Documentation by Auriel. Courtesy of the artist.

Figs. 27–29  
Katia Sepúlveda, *Postsexual*, 2007. Video still. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 30  
Katia Sepúlveda, *Wish*, 2010/11. Video still. Courtesy of the artist.

**Notes on the Category of "Gay Film" [1995]****Stefan Hayn**

Figs. 31–139  
Stefan Hayn, *Pissen/Piss*, 1989/90. Filmstills, Super 8 blown up to 16 mm, optical sound, 12 min. Courtesy of Stefan Hayn.

**The Politics of Queer Archives****Karol Radziszewski**

Fig. 140  
Ryszard Kisiel, *Filo*, 1989. Magazine mock-up. Courtesy of Karol Radziszewski.

Fig. 141  
Karol Radziszewski, vitrine (*Filo*, 1986–90, and *DIK Fagazine*, 2005–14, magazines). Photo: Wojciech Olech. Courtesy of the artist and CoCA in Torun.

Fig. 142  
Karol Radziszewski, *Kisieland*, 2012. Film still. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 143  
Karol Radziszewski, *Kisieland*, 2014. Installation view (from left to right): *AIDS Wallpaper*, digital print, 2012, dimensions variable; *AIDS (Cadmium red)*, 2013, acrylic

on canvas, 100 × 100 cm; *AIDS (Cobalt Blue)*, 2014, acrylic on canvas, 200 × 200 cm; vitrine (*DIK Fagazine*, 2005–14, and *Filo*, 1986–90, magazines); Ryszard Kisiel, photographs, digital print, 1985–86, each 100 × 66 cm; *Kisieland*, film, 2012, 30 min. Centre of Contemporary Art “Znaki Czasu” in Torun. Photo: Wojciech Olech. Courtesy of the artist and CoCA.

#### A Chart of Universal History

##### Kaucyila Brooke and Vaginal Davis in Conversation with Daniel Hendrickson

Fig. 144  
Kaucyila Brooke with Gala Porras-Kim, graphic rendering of *Unofficial Seal*, 2012. Dimensions variable. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 145  
Vaginal Davis, *Denham Fouts – The Best Kept Boy in the World*, 2015. Clay, Wet & Wild solid gold nail polish, hydrogen peroxide, glycerine, AquaNet hair spray, and witch hazel, 17 × 10.5 × 3 cm. Courtesy of the Rod Bianco Gallery, Oslo.

#### Disfiguration:

##### On Violence and Negativity in Queer Art

##### Eliza Steinbock

Figs. 146–147  
eddie gesso, detail from “Attempt to Complicate” series, 2007. Paint on canvas and wood panels, 33 × 33 cm. © eddie gesso. Courtesy of the artist.

Figs. 148–149  
Heather Cassils, *Becoming an Image*, 2012. C-print, 55.8 × 76.2 cm. © Heather Cassils. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 150  
Heather Cassils, *Advertisement: Homage to Benglis*, from the series “Cuts: A Traditional Sculpture,” 2011. C-print, 76.2 × 101.6 cm. © Heather Cassils. Photograph by the artist and Robin Black. Courtesy of the artist.

Figs. 151–153  
Josephine Krieg, *Gender Violence*, Stockholm Pride, 2004. Digital photograph. © Del LaGrace Volcano. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 154  
Del LaGrace Volcano, *Herm Back*, 2011. Digital C-print, 40.6 × 50.8 cm. © Del LaGrace Volcano. Courtesy of the artist.

#### Editors and Fugitives

##### Ulrike Müller in Conversation with Harmony Hammond

Fig. 155  
Harmony Hammond, *Rib*, 2013. Oil and mixed-media on canvas, 268.61 × 178.44 cm. © HarmonyHammond/Licensed by VAGA, New York. Courtesy of Alexander Gray Associates, New York. Photo: John Vokoun.

Fig. 156  
Harmony Hammond, *Rib* (detail), 2013. Oil and mixed-media on canvas, 268.61 × 178.44 cm. © HarmonyHammond/Licensed by VAGA, New York. Courtesy of Alexander Gray Associates, New York. Photo: John Vokoun.

Fig. 157  
Harmony Hammond, *Red Bed*, 2011. Oil and mixed-media on canvas, 204.47 × 138.43 cm. © HarmonyHammond/Licensed by VAGA, New York. Courtesy of Alexander Gray Associates, New York. Photo: John Vokoun.

Fig. 158  
Ulrike Müller, *Mirrors*, 2013. Vitreous enamel on steel, 39.5 × 30.5 cm. Courtesy of the artist and Callicoon Fine Arts. Photo: Chris Austin.

Fig. 159  
Ulrike Müller, *Weather*, 2013. Vitreous enamel on steel, 39.5 × 30.5 cm. Courtesy of the artist and Callicoon Fine Arts. Photo: Chris Austin.

Fig. 160  
Ulrike Müller, *Weather*, installation view at Callicoon Fine Arts, New York, 2014. Courtesy of the artist and Callicoon Fine Arts. Photo: Chris Austin.

#### Becoming Plural:

##### An Interview Collage of Roe Rosen’s Conversations with Hila Peleg, Erika Balsom, Dietmar Schwärzler, and the Audience Dietmar Schwärzler

Fig. 161  
Justine Frank, *The Sisters Frankomas*, 1931. Oil on canvas. 90 × 120 cm. Courtesy of Roe Rosen and Rosenfeld Gallery, Tel Aviv.

Fig. 162  
Justine Frank, *Frank’s Guild*, 1936. Oil on canvas, 100 × 100 cm. Courtesy of Roe Rosen and Rosenfeld Gallery, Tel Aviv.

Fig. 163  
Roe Rosen and Erika Balsom, “Dead and Alive, A Conversation,” in *Berlin Documentary Forum 3* (Berlin: Haus der

Kulturen der Welt, 2014), 178–81, 179–80. Collage by Dietmar Schwärzler. Courtesy of Erika Balsom and Hila Peleg (Eds.).

Fig. 164  
Hila Peleg, “Hila Peleg in Conversation with Roe Rosen,” January 2011, in *Constelaciones de Lenguaje/Language Constellations*, ed. Eduardo Thomas (Mexico City: Injerto, 2011), 134–47, 137. Collage by Dietmar Schwärzler. Courtesy of Hila Peleg and Eduardo Thomas.

Fig. 165  
Hila Peleg, “Hila Peleg in Conversation with Roe Rosen,” January 2011, in *Constelaciones de Lenguaje/Language Constellations*, ed. Eduardo Thomas (Mexico City: Injerto, 2011), 134–47, 139. Collage by Dietmar Schwärzler. Courtesy of Hila Peleg and Eduardo Thomas.

Fig. 166  
Roe Rosen and Erika Balsom, “Dead and Alive, A Conversation,” in *Berlin Documentary Forum 3* (Berlin: Haus der Kulturen der Welt, 2014), 178–81, 178–79. Collage by Dietmar Schwärzler. Courtesy of Erika Balsom and Hila Peleg (Eds.).

Fig. 167  
Roe Rosen, *Vladimir’s Night: Maxim Komar-Myshkin* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014), 139. Courtesy of Roe Rosen.

Fig. 168  
Roe Rosen, *Vladimir’s Night: Maxim Komar-Myshkin* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014), 51. Courtesy of Roe Rosen.

Fig. 169  
Roe Rosen and Erika Balsom, “Dead and Alive, A Conversation,” in *Berlin Documentary Forum 3* (Berlin: Haus der Kulturen der Welt, 2014), 178–81, 180–81. Collage by Dietmar Schwärzler. Courtesy of Erika Balsom and Hila Peleg (Eds.).

Fig. 170  
Justine Frank, *The Stained Portfolio No. 56 (The Hebrew Alphabet)*, 1927. Gouache on paper, 33 × 38 cm. Courtesy of Roe Rosen and Rosenfeld Gallery, Tel Aviv.

#### Search in Clouded Terrain

##### Anna Daučíková in Conversation with Christiane Erharter

Fig. 171  
Anča Daučíková, 33 *Scenes*, installation view, The Function Room, London, 2014. Photo: The Function Room, London.

Figs. 172–174  
Anča Daučíková, *Scene Book*, 2014. Thirty-six sheets, 29.7 × 21 cm, coil bound.

Published by Vargas Organisation, London, on the occasion of Daučíková’s exhibition “33 Scenes,” The Function Room, London, October 2014. Photo: Vargas Organisation, London.

#### Music, Zines, Films, Drawings, Clothes, & Girls

##### G. B. Jones in Conversation with Dietmar Schwärzler

Fig. 175  
Cover of *Hide*, issue 5, 1985. Courtesy of G. B. Jones.

Fig. 176  
Cover of *Double Bill*, issue 2, 1992. Courtesy of G. B. Jones.

Fig. 177  
Cover of *J.D.s*, issue 1, 1985. Courtesy of G. B. Jones.

Fig. 178  
Cover of *J.D.s*, issue 5, 1988. Courtesy of G. B. Jones.

Figs. 179–180  
G. B. Jones, *Tribute to Félicien Rops*, 2005. Pencil on paper, 22.86 × 30.48 cm. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 181  
G. B. Jones, *Bar Room Brawl*, 1999. Pencil on paper, 22.86 × 30.48 cm. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 182  
G. B. Jones, *Subversive Literature #2*, 1995. Pencil on paper, 22.86 × 30.48 cm. Courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 183  
G. B. Jones, *Motorcycle Girls*, 1987. Pencil on paper, 21.59 × 35.56 cm. Courtesy of the artist.

#### Between “Bodies without Bodies” and Body Landscapes:

##### Queer Artistic Negotiations

##### Barbara Paul

Fig. 184  
Felix Gonzalez-Torres, “Untitled” (*Portrait of Ross in L.A.*), 1991. Endless supply of candies individually wrapped in multi-colored cellophane. Overall dimensions vary with installation, ideal weight: 175 lbs. © The Felix Gonzalez-Torres Foundation. Courtesy of Andrea Rosen Gallery, New York.

Fig. 185  
Julian Göthe, *The Impossible Net*, 2012. Wall installation, ropes, variable, 655 × 452 cm. © Julian Göthe and Galerie Daniel Buchholz, Berlin/Cologne. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 186

Toni Schmale, *bend over your boyfriend*, 2010. Object made of concrete, extent 117 cm, height 63 cm.

© Toni Schmale. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 187

Viktoria Tremmel, *Sewing Your Own Balls*, 2011. Object made of wood and metal, 50 × 50 cm and drawing, pencil, crayon on paper, 30 × 30 cm, framed; *Breast Supporter with Hollow Penis Attachment*, 2011. Objects, four part, mixed-media and drawing, pencil, crayon, and marker on paper, 20 × 42 cm, framed; *Do Not Look in the Hole*, object *The Hole*, two part, wood, metal, table, and drawing, pencil on paper, 21 × 30 cm, framed, 2011.

© Viktoria Tremmel and Hamish Morrison Galerie, Berlin. Photo: Viktoria Tremmel.

Fig. 188

Viktoria Tremmel, *Breast Supporter with Hollow Penis Attachment*, 2011. Drawing, pencil, crayon, and marker on paper, 20 × 42 cm, framed. © Viktoria Tremmel and Hamish Morrison Galerie, Berlin. Photo: Viktoria Tremmel.

Fig. 189

Viktoria Tremmel, *Do Not Look in the Hole*, 2011. Pencil on paper, 21 × 30 cm, framed. © Viktoria Tremmel and Hamish Morrison Galerie, Berlin. Photo: Viktoria Tremmel.

Fig. 190

Stefanie Seibold, *Untitled (Corner Piece)*, 2012. Cardboard polystyrene mirror, 125 × 47 × 37 cm. Courtesy of Artothek des Bundes, Vienna. Photo: Pascal Petignat.

Fig. 191

Hans Scheirl, *Dandy's Gut—Bowels of a Film*, 2012. Mixed-media installation: sculpture, sound, papier mâché, diverse objects, wood, installation with props, storyboards, etc., from the film *Dandy Dust*, 1998. Sound: answering-machine messages from the production time of *Dandy Dust*, dimensions variable. © Hans Scheirl. Background (left to right): Anna Daučíková, *Search in Clouded Terrain: 3 Situations*, 2012. Video, 9 min. © Anna Daučíková; Justine Frank, *The Sisters Frankomas*, 1931. Oil on canvas, 90 × 120 cm; *Frank's Guild*, 1936. Oil on canvas, 100 × 100 cm, framed; *From the Stained Portfolio*, 1927. Gouache on paper, 33 × 38 cm, framed. © Roee Rosen and Rosenfeld Gallery, Tel Aviv; Damiana Garcia and Vaginal Davis, *Vaginal Davis In Bed With Damiana Garcia*, 2010.

Video, 4 min. © Michael Lucid.

Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 192

Hans Scheirl, *Dandy's Gut—Bowels of a Film*, 2012. Mixed-media installation: sculpture, sound, papier mâché, diverse objects, wood, installation with props, storyboards, etc., from the film *Dandy Dust*, 1998. Sound: answering-machine messages from the production time of *Dandy Dust*, dimensions variable.

© Hans Scheirl. Background (left to right): Kaucyila Brooke, *The Last Time I Saw You (Wakeenah Falls Upper, Horsetail Fall, Wakeenah Falls Lower)*, 2012. C-prints, 102.7 × 79.8 cm, framed. © Kaucyila Brooke and Galerie Andreas Huber, Vienna. Ulrike Müller, *Blue* (with a photograph by Sherif Sonbol), 2011. Inkjet and paper collé on paper, 36 × 28 cm, framed.

© Ulrike Müller. Anna Daučíková, *Search in Clouded Terrain: 3 Situations*, 2012.

Video, 9 min. © Anna Daučíková.

Photo: Lisa Rastl.

#### Display, Performance

##### Johannes Porsch

Fig. 193

Robert Vörös, blueprint of the exhibition's interior design for "Pink Labor on Golden Streets," Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, 2012. Courtesy of Robert Vörös.

Fig. 194

Robert Vörös, reference photograph of the exhibition's interior design, 2012.

Photograph courtesy of Robert Vörös.

#### Appendix

Fig. 195

Foyer with installation by Julian Göthe, *The Impossible Net*, 2012. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 196

Left to right: Ulrike Müller, 4 vitreous enamels on steel from the series *Fever 103*, 2010; sculptures and drawings by Viktoria Tremmel, *Sewing Your Own Balls*, *The Hole*, *Do Not Look in the Hole*, *Breast Supporter with Hollow Penis Attachment*, 2011; on the easel a draft by David Zeller, *Studie zu Tropen*, 2011. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 197

Left to right: Sculptures by Viktoria Tremmel; David Zeller; Katrina Daschner, *Bertha*, *Lichtstrahl*, *Silber Glitter*, *Projektion*, *Las Vegas*, *Position Drehbühne*, 2012. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 198

Left to right: Katrina Daschner; Viktoria Tremmel; film by Rosa von Praunheim, *Rosa Arbeiter auf goldener Straße, Teil II*, 1968. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 199

Foreground: wallpaper by Karol Radziszewski, *Kisieland*, 2009–2012. Background: two paintings by Justine Frank, *The Sisters Frankomas*, 1931; *Frank's Guild*, 1936.

Fig. 200

From left to right: Justine Frank; sculpture by Hans Scheirl, *Dandy's Gut—Bowels of a Film*, 2012. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 201

Left: video installation by Anna Daučíková, *Search in Clouded Terrain: 3 Situations*, 2012. Right: Justine Frank, *The Sisters Frankomas*, 1931, *Frank's Guild*, 1936, *From the Stained Portfolio*, 1927.

Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 202

Mateusz Lesman, *Skizzenbuch III*, 2009–11, *Skizzenbuch IV*, 2011–12. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 203

Tejal Shah, *I AM*, 2010. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 204

Foreground: Hans Scheirl. Background (left to right) Stefanie Seibold, *Untitled (Corner Piece)*, 2012; Nilbar Güreş, *Llorando*, 2012; Kaucyila Brooke. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 205

Left to right: Kaucyila Brooke; Ulrike Müller; Hans Scheirl; Anna Daučíková; Justine Frank; film by Vaginal Davis/Damiana Garcia, *In Bed With Damiana Garcia*, 2010. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 206

Left to right: Stefan Hayn, *Queeny film*, 1988–89; David Zeller, *Tropen #1*, 2012. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 207

In the front sculpture by Toni Schmale, *bend over your boyfriend*, 2010. Left: Pauline Boudry/Renate Lorenz. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 208

Pauline Boudry/Renate Lorenz, *Toxic*, 2012. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 209

Vitrine: Pauline Boudry/Renate Lorenz, *Toxic*, 2012. Photo: Lisa Rastl.

Fig. 210

Katarzyna Kozyra, *Il Castrato*, 2006. Photo: Lisa Rastl.