Voyeuristic Pleasure in Cinema:

A study of voyeurism in *Peeping Tom, Rear Window* and *Psycho*

Written by: Delil Hasan Sütcü

Table of Contents

Abstract

Popular culture is brimming with examples of voyeurism and has been ever since the beginning of cinema. We, the audience, take part in this voyeurism as we with our own free choose to watch these films. This paper will analyse the three films *Peeping Tom* (1960), *Rear Window* (1954) and *Psycho* (1960) to determine the root of the voyeurism, both in film and in us.

Keywords: Voyeurism, Cinema, Rear Window, Peeping Tom, Psycho, Scopophilia

Introduction

It is wrong, yet we still do it. When we look outside the window or sit in a cinema auditorium our eyes do not shy away from whatever we may see. What is the obsession of watching that draws our attention to such a degree that we can sit in a dark place, filled with people and look into the lives of others and their trials and tribulations? Or even at home we see this obsession. As Alfred Hitchcock once said, "*I'll bet you that nine out of ten people, if they see a woman across the courtyard undressing for bed, or even a man puttering around in his room, will stay and look; no one turns away and says, 'It's none of my business.' They could pull down the blinds, but they never do; they stand there and look.*" It is wrong, yet we still do it. We do not have a problem with watching the lives of others yet we would feel violated if it were to happen to us. We are up in arms if the government suggests surveillance on its citizens and still we want to watch others. This morbid curiosity tends to be a vital element in cinema. Norman K. Denzin states that between the years 1900 and 1995 Hollywood made at least 1,200 films, "*in which the warranted and unwarranted voyeuristic activities of one or more of the main characters has been presented as a problem which the character, the film, and by implication the other members of society self-consciously struggle to resolve.* (Denzin, 1995, p. 1) It seems as if there have always been voyeuristic tendencies in Hollywood cinema. David Greven compares Hitchcock films with Freud and they share "*a resistance to the view of heterosexuality as 'natural,' as the self-evident basis of normal human life.*" (Greven, 2013, p. 3) Yet according to Constantine Sandis, "*Hitchcock's grasp of human psychology was chiefly - if not entirely - intuitive. He did not embrace any specific psychological theory and his knowledge of both the academic discipline and the medical practice it eventually gave rise to (a practice which he often expressed a strong distaste for) was fairly limited.*" (Sandis, 2009, p.57)

If we go back to the beginning of cinema with the invention of the camera by the Lumière brothers we notice the heavy use of "indirect voyeurism". The 1900 film *As Seen through a Telescope* by George Albert Smith features a man on the street with his telescope watching other people. The interesting aspect of it is the man is looking at the ankle of a woman. Clearly this film is presenting one of the first examples of voyeurism in cinema.

The voyeur is typically presented as a "*'diseased', often paranoid, violent individual who violates the norms of everyday life. Films validate these depictions of the voyeur by having persons in power (family members, editors, supervisors, the police) articulate how and why the voyeur is a*

sick or deviant person and why his or her gaze is inappropriate." (ibid, p. 3) Hollywood presents the voyeur as someone with a mental illness yet are we all mentally ill? We all enjoy a night at the cinema but does that mean we as a society are mentally ill?

This paper will examine three films that all are said to contain voyeuristic tendencies. The three films are: *Peeping Tom* (1960) by Michael Powell and *Psycho* (1960) and *Rear Window* (1954) both by Alfred Hitchcock. Furthermore, the paper will determine the moral viewpoint of the films and the two directors. Why are they attempting to create films based on taboo subjects and do the films have a deeper meaning than just entertainment? In order to accomplish this I will join forces with different forerunners on the field of voyeurism in general and in cinema, such as Sigmund Freud, Norman K. Denzin and Laura Mulvey. The first chapter will present and discuss scopophilia and exhibitionism as well as voyeurism/scopophilia in cinema. The second chapter will focus on analysing the three films *Peeping Tom*, *Psycho* and *Rear Window* in an attempt to establish their voyeuristic tendencies as well as to discover the reasoning of the directors as to why they have chosen to create these films. The third and last chapter will summarise the previous statements and piece them together.

Theory

There are always two people in every picture: the photographer and the viewer.

- Ansel Adams

A window, curtain or a bush do not gaze at me, eyes behind them see me.

- Norman K. Denzin

Voyeur: One who derives gratification from surreptitiously watching sex acts or objects; a Pepping Tom; one who takes a morbid interest in sordid sights; one who sees; may also be called a spy reporter, peeper, detective, psychoanalyst, sociologist, or anthropologist.

The Voyeur's Gaze: 'Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorizing to the point that he [she] is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against him[her]serf. A superb formula: power exercised continuously and for what turns out to be a minimal cost.'

- Michel Foucault

I'll bet you that nine out of ten people, if they see a woman across the courtyard undressing for bed, or even a man puttering around in his room, will stay and look; no one turns away and says, 'It's none of my business.' They could pull down the blinds, but they never do; they stand there and look.

- Alfred Hitchcock

Fetishism

According to Magnus Hirschfeld, scopophilia and exhibitionism, both stems from the so-called fetishism which he in turn describes as sexual anomalies in *Other Partial Impulses*. The word fetish itself represents a sort of idolisation of an object of worship. This in turn can be described as sexual

objectification of a person's body or other items. Every pervasion has its roots in everyday life. Hirschfeld mentions that:

> In a purely quantitative sense, a perversion is only an exaggeration or an intensification of tendencies inherent in the normal person. Every normal person is "a little" scopophile; but in pathological scopophilia the desire of seeing certain things becomes an obsession. Similarly, every normal person in erotic intercourse derives a certain amount of pleasure from the act of uncovering the body, but to the exhibitionist, uncovering is the end itself. Fetishism also has its roots in normal sexual life, and only becomes a perversion when exaggerated to an independent practice. (Hirschfeld, p. 535)

From this we can deduce that fetishism is seen in everyday life and every "normal" person is a little scophophile. This does not mean that we all run around and spy on each other in the hopes of sneaking a peek of a certain body part from the neighbour. On the contrary, it is simple human instinct to get the urge to look, or as Hirschberg calls it: "normal fetishism". Hirschfeld further mentions Richard von Krafft-Ebing's definition of this partial attraction as "individual fetish attraction" and regards it as "the germ of all physiological love". On the other hand we have the pathological fetishism which, as described earlier is the most extreme form of the individual fetish. A person that derives a high degree a sexual stimulus from an object that is entirely separate from the loved person itself, such as the hair or the foot. (ibid. p. 536) Sigmund Freud further explains the theory, as well as Hirschfeld, with the addition of sexual attraction of inanimate objects, such as shoes and/or clothing. This will be discussed further later on.

The term fetishism was initially coined by the French psychologist Alfred Binet but it was not before Richard von Krafft-Ebing adopted the term that it became more known. Krafft-Ebing described it as the abnormal, or as Freud would say, perversely fascination of an object, animate or inanimate, had to an individual, exactly because of their association to something else. According to Vern Bullough "(…) *such association came through masturbatory fantasies, a causal factor in which* [Krafft-Ebing] *originally strongly believed, but he later proved willing to modify this belief somewhat.*" (Bullough, 1994, n.p.)

The Austrian psychologist Wilhelm Stekel's contribution to the theory of fetishism is in many ways the same as Hirschberg by acknowledging the fact that everyone possesses their own form of sexual attraction that varies with different peoples. This is what Stekel and the abovementioned psychologists call normal fetishes. It is first when the subject does not accept their sexual partner but instead they themselves appropriate the function of a love object, e.g. when the subject please themselves with the possession of, let's say, a women's shoe and considers the sexual partner as unimportant or even unsettling. But where Stekel's definition differs is how the subject perceives the opposite sex. Stekel defines this as a homosexual fetishism in which the subject in a way becomes afraid of the opposite sex. Stekel explains:

> I said the possession of the woman and thereby almost allied myself with many authors who forget the fact that there is also a homosexual fetishism. Such is, in my experience, the end of every case of fetishism. Succinctly, the essence of such a condition can be totally explained as a retreat from the female, flight from woman. Fetishism always develops into a depreciation of the female, regardless of the causes, and the same is true of the few cases of female fetishism which I have been able to observe. In the latter type of case, there occurs a deflation of the value of the male and simultaneously the person strives to find a form of sexual gratification which will make the sexual partner superfluous. (Stekel, p. 3-4)

Stekel believes there to be a sense of terror with the subjects opposite sex. When the subject has fulfilled his sexual need s/he will immediately abandon the idea of returning "the favour", if I may be so bold. Stekel mentions a quote by Binet "*accident agissant sur un sujet predispose*" or "an accident affecting a predisposed subject." This refers to a subject's first sexual contact that will eventually become imprinted on the subject's sexual feelings; "*so that only the memory of this impression can provoke passion. A boy sees the naked bust of his governess and thereby experiences his first sexual excitement.*" (ibid. p. 4) We must examine the childhood and which "sexual elements" they were exposed to before we can identify the fetish.

Going back to Hirschfeld's theory of inanimate objects as fetishes we notice fashion and sexual life has come to an almost interchangeable state. In our society fashion has reach unimaginable heights in regards to women who willingly follow:

> "(…) the vogue for no breasts, hips, or waists, or their accentuation (…) Since in the social life of the present age nudity plays an insignificant role and man is used from early childhood to regard the body and its coverings as a single unit, it is only natural that clothes should be a factor of the first importance in sexual life. Particularly in the case of men, the idea of sexual attraction is associated with feminine clothes. For instance, a young man seeing a nude woman for the first time may find the sight not only strange but even somewhat terrifying. The association between feminine sexual attraction and feminine clothes may then become indissoluble, the fully dressed women being permanently preferred to the nude woman, if the young man concerned happens to be afflicted with a sexual abnormality which hinders in the natural satisfaction of his sexual impulses. (Hirschfeld, p. 480-481)

We notice an unusual regard to women and the, perhaps most important inanimate object that can satisfy a man's sexual pleasure. Hirschfeld furthermore wrote to 1000 men asking whether they preferred a woman's body to be nude, partially nude or fully clothed. Out of the 1000 men in the case 350 answered that they were most attracted by the nude body whereas 400 voted for partially nude. However a whopping 250 men wrote back with a preference for the fully clothed body. The alarming fact of this case is that 65% of the men preferred either a fully clothed or partially clothed body as against to completely naked "[which] *shows what devastation a hypocritical civilization has wrought in the man's sexual life tor*(sic) *there is but one step from this to the pathogenic clothes fetishism.*" (ibid, p. 481)

Let us expand Richard von Krafft-Ebing's previous definition of the partial attraction as "individual fetish attraction" and as "the germ of all physiological love" and the pathological attraction in regards to inanimate objects. If we look between the normal partial attraction, in which the law of sexual selection is based, and the pathological partial attraction, which is limited to only an isolated peculiarity, we notice the:

> (…)wide realm of these passionate loves which connect the fascinating detail with the person to whom it belongs or of whom it is part, but

> overestimate this detail to such an extent that it is not so much the person possessing the quality concerned who is desired as the quality with the person who happens to be attached to it. (…) This applies to normal fetishism, the opposite of which is pathological fetishism, which manifests itself in its most extreme form in the fact that the patient derives a high degree of sexual excitement from an object that is entirely separate from the loved person, such as a hank of hair or a shoe. (ibid, p. 445)

A particularly important aspect of the difference between the normal partial attraction versus the pathological attraction can be seen in the individual's only desire for an object that has some connection to the loved person. The individual manages to completely disregard the loved one in order to have a sexual relationship with the inanimate object.

Exhibitionism

According to Magnus Hirschfeld, exhibitionism is the pathological urge to expose one's sexual organs or other intimate parts of the body in order to derive sexual stimulation. Exhibitionists are usually shy by nature except, of course, for when they are in the process of exposing. Clearly a strong contrast is seen here. An indispensable feature in an exhibitionists act is the reaction of the victim which in turn finds this sexually stimulating. We can go even further in saying that the individual receives more stimuli the stronger the reaction of the victim is. A victim that chooses to escape, show fear or blushing will more likely induce sexual pleasure in the individual in contrast to the victim that simply ignores the "display". The exhibitionist's main priority is to evoke an emotion so powerful from the victim that all other acts accompanying the exposure are only of a secondary character. In order to generate these excessive emotions from the victim, the exhibitionist will use obscene language, or even invite the victim to "take hold," and so on; in other words the exhibitionist will attempt to bring attention to the exposed part. Other methods of achieving this is by coughing or whistling during the act of exposure, or even throwing sweets to children and thus manipulating them to see or touch. But whereas obscene language used by the exhibitionist during

the act of exposure is only of a secondary character, such talk can even constitute the sole act of exhibitionism. As mentioned earlier, the exhibitionist's gratification is reached with the reaction he evokes. That is why it is also possible for an exhibitionist to derive sexual pleasure by spoken words alone. This is called a verbal exhibitionist, and is, of course, far rarer than the "ordinary" type. The verbal exhibitionist's most powerful weapon is the telephone. With this he derives sexual pleasure from the victim's outraged tone.

Let us move on to a more contemporary notion of exhibitionism. A survey of 2,450 Swedes age 18 to 60 was conducted by Niklas Långström and Michael C. Seto in 2006 and showed surprising fact of exhibitionism in a contemporary society. Seventy-six, or 3.1 pct. of the surveyed testified to at least once having felt sexually stimulated by exposing their genitals to a stranger; in other words they show signs of exhibitionism. Furthermore, men were more likely to expose their genitals than women (4.1 pct. versus 2.1 pct. respectively). Compared with the general population as a whole, we notice that exhibitionists, as well as voyeurs, are more sexually active. The study tells us, they are easily aroused, masturbate more often and have sex with partners more frequently than someone who does not suffer from exhibitionism. (Långström & Seto, 2006, p. 430-3)

What does this information tell us? For starters, exhibitionism still exists in contemporary society and it not just spread amongst a handful of people. We can further speculate that exhibitionists will not be eagerly keen to tell everyone that they are exhibitionists. It must be risky to be one as it is usually illegal to "flash" genitals in public. Furthermore, it also invites ridicule and contempt, for example, the monikers "dirty old dog" or "pervert".

Scopophilia

Scopophilia can be roughly translated into the act of deriving pleasure from looking on a pathological level. According to Freud, sexual pleasure can be derived by either touching or looking. Humans have at least a minimal urge of touching to obtain normal sexual aim. Just a simple touch of the skin of the sexual object creates pleasure and produces a supply of new excitement. That is why the urge to touch cannot be considered a perversion if the sexual act is proceeded with. This is also true with looking which is just an extension to touching. Freud argues

that "[t]*he manner in which the libidinous excitement is frequently awakened is by the optical impression, and selection takes account of this circumstance* (…) *by making the sexual object a thing of beauty.*" The concealment of the body, which goes along with society, keeps sexual curiosity abreast. Man will always try to find a way to uncover the hidden parts.

> (…) [I]f the interest is turned from the genitals to the form of the body (…) the tendency to linger at this intermediary sexual aim of the sexually accentuated looking is found to a certain degree in most normals(*sic*). (…)On the other hand, the fondness for looking becomes a perversion (a) when it limits itself entirely to the genitals; (b) when it becomes connected with the overcoming of loathing (voyeurs and onlookers at the functions of excretion); and (c) when instead of preparing for the normal sexual aim it suppresses it. The latter, if I may draw conclusions from a single analysis, is in a most pronounced way true of exhibitionists, who expose their genitals so as in turn to bring to view the genitals of others. (Freud, p. 18)

The pervasion consists in striving, to ones upmost ability, to look. This of course forces the voyeur to have an audience, i.e. unwilling participants. The act of voyeurism is an invasion of the privacy of others. Bullough believes that Western society and American society in particular, are allowing voyeurs to fulfil their needs through the use of peep shows and striptease. "(…) *perhaps we can now charge exhibitionists to put on a show. In a sense, we pay exhibitionists when we pay to see strip tease artists or nude models. The concept just needs to be extended. Such decisions again, however, are political decisions, since conflicting rights are involved and the ultimate decision is not one that sex researchers can make.*" (Bullough, 1994)

It sounds like Bullough believes that we should just gather all the voyeurs and make them watch the exhibitionists. However, if we look back at Niklas Långström and Michael C. Seto's survey the trend continues. The survey reveals that one hundred and ninety-one, or 7.7 pct., of the respondents have at least once been sexually aroused by spying on others having sex. Furthermore, men were more voyeuristic than their female counterpart (11.5 pct. versus 3.9 pct.). It is no surprise that men are more voyeuristic than women. As stated before, voyeurs are called peeping Toms and not peeping Tina. We can perhaps relate this to the current pornography industry that is clearly directed

towards a male audience. This is also true in the survey as the frequent use of porn was the best indicator for voyeurism. Långström and Seto argues that if one were to engage in voyeuristic, or for that matter exhibitionistic, behaviour s/he would naturally go against social norms and might even violate criminal laws (e.g. if the person exposed themselves or spied upon non-consenting persons). This leads to the subject having to potentially breaking the law in order to fulfil his sexual needs (Långström & Seto, 2006, p. 433).

Let us move on to the use of scopophilia in cinema, more specifically the theory of Laura Mulvey and her *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*. Mulvey believes classic Hollywood cinema to be a male dominated industry. The spectator is being put in a heterosexual and masculine position while the woman is the object of sexual desire and the 'male gaze'. Mulvey postulates that this gender power is asymmetric and is a controlling force of Hollywood cinema. Hollywood is a man dominated place where phallus is god and women represent the castration anxiety. Mulvey suggests that:

> [t]he paradox of phallocentrism in all its manifestations is that it depends on the image of the castrated woman to give order and meaning to the world. An idea of woman stands as lynch pin to the system: it is her lack that produces the phallus as a symbolic presence, it is her desire to make good the lack that the phallus signifies. Recent writing (…) has not sufficiently brought out the importance of the representation of the female form in a symbolic order in which, in the last resort, it speaks castration and nothing else. (…) [T]he function of woman in forming the patriarchal unconscious is two-fold, she symbolises the castration threat by her real absence of a penis and second thereby raises her child into the symbolic. Once this has been achieved, her meaning in the process is at an end, it does not last into the world of law and language except as a memory which oscillates between memory of maternal plenitude and memory of lack. (Mulvey, 1999, p.833-4)

It is the throw-away society that rules in Hollywood when it comes to women. Women are the root of the castration anxiety in cinema. Mulvey compares women to the bleeding wound of the

castration and thus "[w]*omen then stands in patriarchal culture as signifier for the male other, bound by a symbolic order in which man can live out his phantasies and obsessions through linguistic commands by imposing them to the silent image of women still tied to her place as bearer of meaning, not maker of meaning.*"(ibid, p. 834) Women suffer in the male hierarchy of Hollywood and are only useful when the man can command her to fulfil his wishes. She is only to be used as an object of sex.

Cinema evolved from focusing only on the capitalistic gain from film to be both financial beneficial and artisanal. Through this change cinema came the avant-garde cinema that changed Hollywood. However, the change would not only affect the financial aspect of cinema but also the view of women. Mainstream cinema "*coded the erotic into the language of the dominant patriarchal order. In the highly developed Hollywood cinema it was only these codes that the alienated subject, torn in his imaginary memory by a sense of loss, by the terror of potential lack in phantasy, came near to finding a glimpse of satisfaction: through its formal beauty and its play on his own formative obsession.*" (ibid. p. 835)

As mentioned earlier, scopophilia is the urge to look to obtain sexual satisfaction. Freud declared that the urge to look stems from childhood, when we are curious to see the "forbidden parts" of the body, exactly because they are forbidden. This curiosity will be present in ourselves throughout our lives and exist as an erotic basis for pleasure in looking at another person as an object. This curiosity can in rare cases turn into an obsession, or a pervasion as Freud calls it. Mulvey compares cinema to scopophilia. Cinema creates films where there is a sexual imbalance and is split up into two groups: the active/male and the passive/female. The so-called male gaze is, through his curiosity, spewing his phantasy onto the female form which is created after his own image. "*In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote* to-be-looked-at-ness. *Women displayed as sexual object is a leit-motiff or erotic spectacle: from pin-ups to strip-tease, from Ziegfeld to Busby Berkeley, she holds the look, plays to and signifies male desire.*" There cannot be a film without the presence of a female, yet her only role in the film solely lies upon the man's visual pleasure of her. The female is a driving force for the hero (the man) to obtain his goal. Budd Boetticher mentions that the only thing that counts is "(…) *what the heroine provokes, or rather what she represents. She is the one, or rather the love or fear she inspires in the hero, or else the concern he feels for her, who makes him act the way the does. In herself the woman has not the slightest importance.*" (ibid. p, 837) The female motivates the hero, yet does not

have the ability to think and act on her own. The woman serves two purposes in the film: as the erotic object for the hero of the film or as the erotic object for the audience within the cinema.

There is a strict active/passive heterosexual division of labour in Hollywood. Mulvey argues that "*according to the principles of the ruling ideology and the physical structures that back it up, the male figure cannot bear the burden of sexual objectification.*" (ibid. p. 838) Men are unwilling to gaze at male exhibitionists in films. Therefore there is a split in the narrative and the spectacle as they support the man's role as the active and the burden of furthering the story. The male presence controls the film and its wishes and thus is the representative of power. Consequently, the film is structured in such a way that the audience can relate to one figure who is in control. (ibid.)

Mulvey's *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* was published in 1975 but now, 40 years after, does it still hold up with present purposes? According to Norman K. Denzin, the answer is a definite no. Denzin lists these following grounds as to why that is the case: its unethical use of the psychoanalytic model; its simplistic conception of the female spectatorship position; its failure to adequately deal with masochism and voyeurism; its use of the male sexual pervert as its model of the gaze; its conflation of spectacle and narrative, and its unquestioning acceptance of the "screen" as a fixed ground where narrative and spectacle are played out; its biased reading of the Hitchcock's film as support for the theory; its over-emphasis on binary opposition; its inability to interpret those films where the categories of the gaze collapse and male and female figures interchangeably identify with and gaze upon one another; and its conflation and potential confusion of the textual and empirical spectator. (Denzin, 1999, p. 43)

It is easy to discredit and invalidate work done over 40 years ago but in my personal opinion Denzin has got a valid point. Mulvey continues throughout the paper to be extremely biased and narrow. Denzin continues:

> [Mulvey's *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*] is based on a limited conception of looking and voyeurism. It ignores alternative models of spectatorship and gazing. It fails to articulate the interaction and interplay between desire and identification, which often involves multiple identities for the male and female figure. It does not conceptualize any positive version of the female gaze, or the female character (beyond transvestism and the masquerade). (Nor does it

> present the male gaze in a favourable light.) It represses female desire, while clinging to a single meta-narrative about male and female sexuality. It does not permit, that is, and active, interactional relationship between the spectator, the gaze, narrative, spectacle and the screen. (ibid.)

Denzin mentions the term 'the investigative voyeur'. With the invention of the camera the world became not only interested but also able to see the world differently. Mankind would no longer have a degree of uncertainty and instability in the visual field but instead record events and stabilise the field. The camera being invented created a transformation in "*a previously valued self, called the voyeur, spectator, or the looking self. This self became an extension of the camera's looking eye. It would know itself and others through the investigative, inquisitive, often erotic gaze, the gaze which would render the other interactionally naked.*"(ibid. p. 50) The use of camera would in a way invalidate the use of the naked eye. The camera would be used, as mentioned before, to record events; events that before the camera would be in a sense meaningless, as it could be witnessed once. The camera is usually used in films as an apparatus that connects the audience to the film. The (male) protagonist takes a picture of the female and thus the viewer assumes the voyeuristic gaze of the voyeur in the film. As a consequence of this action the figure of the female form transforms into a gratifying sexual object for the male viewer.

Now we have a voyeur in the film whose job is indeed to look. Although the 'investigative voyeur' looks for a living, he will nonetheless have a different 'look on things'. He will understand when others could not. "*This person would emerge as a new version of the conscious subject who joined vision with knowing, and truth with seeing.*" (ibid.) We now enjoy the presence of the journalist and detective; who looks for a living. These official, state-sanctioned employees would enter society and return with news about the affairs of said society. The gaze of the journalist and detective was one set up with the interest of the state and its protection.

Opposing the official and state-sanctioned journalist and detective we have the private investigator and the burned-out journalist or journalist who fought with their editor. The private detective, also known as PIs (eyes), shamuses, sleuth or private eyes, will typically be cynical as a result of a career filled with unforeseen turn of events, while the journalist will have had enough of the job as a result of a row with the editor. These two characters' current role in society spoke to "*the general belief that the state and its control agencies were corrupt, inept, brutal and*

ideologically biased in the direction of the ruling class. The private detective and the reporter spoke for the underclass, those persons who were mistreated by the police, and the other official agencies of society." (ibid. p. 51) These two professionals would typically have the camera as their primary weapon. Both will use their knowledge of the streets in their endeavours and will usually have some form of loathing towards 'the man' or other authoritarian entities.

The journalist and the private investigator will typically be the victims of certain abuses such as alcoholism and drug addiction, but also alienation, isolation and fractured personal relationships. As the 'investigator voyeur' is obsessed to looking they quickly become detached from others and thus become outsiders because of their work. Nevertheless they always will try their utmost to crack the case or bring the criminals to justice, despite being reserved and isolated. Because of this mania the 'investigator voyeur' will most likely experience a form of pain or even further isolation. "*Driven by a private morality which often goes against the public conscience and public morality,* (…) *investigative voyeurs set their own standards of right and wrong. These standards, or codes of conduct, lead the voyeur not to report certain crimes, thereby practicing a vigilante version of law and order*." (ibid. p. 56) In order to fight crime the 'investigative voyeur' will use crime to reach the target; fight fire with fire if you will. They will experience difficulties in upholding the social norms and codes that exist in society.

The price for upholding the society to a certain standard is high and must be paid. That price is worth paying though because in the end the benefits for the society outweigh the personal feelings of an individual, even though this individual will most certainly experience various elements of harm to himself. (ibid. p. 57)

Difference between Voyeurism and Scopophilia

When reading about the two terms scopophilia and voyeurism one can easily become confused as both terms are sometimes used interchangeably. If we take a look at Oxford Dictionaries' description of the two terms we can see that this is very much the case. Voyeurism: "*The practice of gaining sexual pleasure from watching others when they are naked or engaged in sexual activity*" and scopophilia: "*Sexual pleasure derived chiefly from watching others when they are naked or engaged in sexual activity; voyeurism.*" We notice that these two descriptions are to some extent exactly the same; the latter even has the word voyeurism in it. On the subject of scopophilia Freud states that "*[scopophilia], at an extreme, can become fixated into perversion, producing obsessive*

voyeurs and peeping toms, whose only sexual satisfaction can come from watching, in an active controlling sense, an objectified other." Much like the description from Oxford Dictionaries, scopophilia is an obsessive urge to look at sexual acts to obtain sexual gratification. But how is this exactly different from voyeurism? According to Otto Fenichel, describing a voyeur in a case study in which a man rented a room in a bordello and instead of engaging in sexual activities chose to look through a peephole into an adjoining room where another man and women had sexual intercourse: "*Voyeurs are fixated on experiences that aroused their castration anxiety, either primal scenes or the sight of adult genitals.*" Having this description of voyeurism in mind, Jonathan M. Metzl believes that:

> 'Primal scenes', for instance, traced back to the age when the voyeur may have witnessed his parents in coital embrace, while 'castration anxiety' represented the voyeur's startled recognition of his own helplessness and exposure. These moments of terror were re-experienced when the man looked through the keyhole: thus he cried and wished the woman would comfort him. Yet according to Fenichel, the ultimate purpose of the exercise was precisely that the voyeur prove to himself that the looked-upon scene was not a repetition of castration, or an apperception of its 'dangerous nature'. Instead, the bordello provided a scene that erroneously appeared to be under the voyeur's mastery and control – hence the masturbation – while allowing him to avert his eyes from the real source of his inquietude. Casting aspersion on this mastery, Fenichel looked beneath the false veneer of the voyeur's content (the couple) to the vulnerability and emptiness acknowledged in his form (the compulsion to displace anxiety). (Metzl, 2004, p 416)

Again we can see that the description of voyeurism and scopophilia are difficult to differentiate between. They both describe an individual deriving pleasure from looking, but where they differ is the voyeur having at least some control of his behaviour whereas the scopophilic seems to be out of control in his behaviour. Although the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th

edition (DSM IV) suggests voyeurism to be a mental illness, defining it as a person who looks at "*individuals, usually strangers, who are naked, in the process of disrobing, or engaging in sexual activity*" (ibid), one could speculate this to apply to every human being. This description could easily be interpreted as someone watching pornography and masturbating.

Surveillance in Cinema

We are living in a society where everything you do and say can be recorded and stored by governments and corporations. These two entities use this data in order to analyse our everyday needs and to anticipate and pre-empt potential crimes and terrorism. As consumers we are constantly being monitored by cameras, by using a credit card or by our phone. A simple journey to the shops can mean we are being recorded an infinite number of times. Cameras in the street, the shopping mall or even at the train station can record us and constantly keep whoever is watching us up-to-date of our whereabouts. The urban landscape provides plenty of opportunities for companies and the government to collect data. One could almost say that we are now less valuable than the data you produce. The idea of a surveillance society is best known from George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) where the government has incorporated the use of omnipresent governmental surveillance in order to subjugate the population. The government in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* would use the fictional character Big Brother as their primary "weapon" against the people. In contemporary society one could say that Big Brother no longer works alone. *He* has got the help of thousands of "little brothers" to help him out, such as cameras and satellites.

Throughout the twentieth century the idea of incorporating popular culture with surveillance has risen steadily, especially after 9/11. This can be seen in films, such as Alfred Hitchcock's *Rear Window* (1954), Michael Powell *Peeping Tom* (1960), Francis Ford Coppola's *The Conversation* (1974) and Tony Scott's *Enemy of the State* (1998). When discussing surveillance in literature one cannot omit George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and *We* (1924). These novels and films are united by the fact that they all touches upon the personal and political impact of surveillance.

The use of surveillance has been present ever since the birth of cinema. According to Thomas Levin:

> The relationship between cinema and surveillance is both long and complicated. Indeed one could argue that employee surveillance plays a key role in the very birth of the medium since, no matter what else it is, Louis Lumiere's 1895 *La Sortie des usines Lumire* is also the gaze of the boss/owner observing his workers as they leave the factory. Early cinema is replete with micro-dramas of surveillance in which people are followed and recorded using both visual (photographic/cinematic) and acoustic (gramophonic) means. (Levin, 2002, p. 581)

This might be an exaggeration of the simple and harmless act of recording people while they were leaving their workplace. However, seeing as the invention of this new contraption (the camera) were exciting and innovative at the time it is no surprise that people would "take up arms" in contemporary society. The simple recordings conducted by the Lumière brothers at a train station have even led to certain urban legends that many people still believe to this day. In *L'arrivée d'un train en gare de La Ciotat*, translated to *The Arrival of a Train at La Ciotat Station*, the brothers placed the camera close to the train tracks and recorded a train arriving at the station. This, allegedly, resulted in panic during the showing of the "film" and caused the audience to flee. Not surprising, seeing as the audience would naturally be overwhelmed by the moving image of a life-sized train coming straight towards them. The Lumière brothers were of course not the only ones to let the people enjoy the moving images. According to Catherine Zimmer the company American Mutoscope and Biograph Company produced a series of films show-casing the procedures and workers in the Westinghouse Works in 1904. Zimmer further states:

> While the early Lumière productions were exemplary of the documentary functions of the new cinematic technology, other early explorations were more spectacular and performance driven, particularly in the United States. And as these performances assumed a narrative form, themes of surveillance soon followed. Early shorts such as *Grandma's Reading Glass* (1900), *As Seen through a Telescope* (1900), and *Photographing a Female Crook* (1904) incorporate visual technologies onscreen and reflexively thematize the act of watching (in the case of *Photographing a Female Crook*, explicitly for the purpose of

> identification). Beyond these reflexive examples of voyeurism narratives and/or those focusing on visual apparatus as narrative devices (which remain a staple of surveillance cinema), the first ten years of cinema saw the Edison Company regularly churning out "caught in the act" stories, implicitly casting the construction of cinematic narrative and cinematic technology as a revelatory device around crime and sexuality in particular. (Zimmer, 2015, p. 6)

Surveillance cinema has indeed has its birth along with the birth of cinema itself. The first film recordings apparently all had elements of the "caught in the act" phenomenon. Of course the term "caught in the act" would suggest an act of indecency or crime instead of simply an everyday act. Comparing the two recordings *As Seen through a Telescope* and *Grandma's Reading Glass* we notice a change in the "caught in the act" phenomenon. The former features a man standing in the street with a telescope or spyglass and "spies" on a woman's ankle being caressed by her lover. It is not until the end we notice that it is not only us, the audience that watches the ankle but also the man with the telescope. The man is literally caught in the act by the woman's lover, as he slaps the man with the telescope. The latter features an elderly woman and her, presumably, grandchild. The grandchild examines different objects with a huge magnifying glass: the newspaper, the inside of a pocket watch, a canary in its cage, his grandmother's eye and a cat. We notice the "caught in the act" as actual being caught in the act of doing everyday things, such as sitting with family and examine different objects. One could be as bold as suggesting that it is in fact us, as the audience that can be said to be "caught in the act". We blatantly watch these two people in their private homes without any regards to their privacy.

Zimmer mentions the work of Tom Gunning in which he states "*[t]he camera recording the very act of malefaction appears in drama, literature, and early film before it was really an important process of criminal detection*. (…) *While the perfection of video has now made the recording of a crime a pervasive and effective form of surveillance (as well as a form of media entertainment), a fascination with photographic evidence of misdeeds seems to predate considerably its widespread application in reality.*" (ibid. p. 7) We notice how the invention of the camera had a profound impact on the perception of the phenomenon of being "caught in the act". Crimes would now have a perverted, albeit effective, aspect when being recorded because of the human fascination of the act itself.

The Motion Picture Production Code

From the very beginnings of American cinema, the agents of moral uplift have regarded the medium with watchful wariness, alert to any indication that movies are, as they suspect, a pathway to cultural decay.

- Mike Mashon

The Motion Picture Production Code (MPPC) was a set of guidelines that were put in place to govern the content of Hollywood productions. Following the shift from silent films to sound films and certain scandals in Hollywood cinema audience demanded a change in the production of Hollywood films. During the early 1900s the cost for producing a film in Hollywood plummeted making way for practically anyone to call themselves producers, even if it were for only one film. These producers would usually create films in which the plot was "daring" as these films were in high demand. This in turn led to many of the films to be morally flawed. Furthermore, the death of the actress Virginia Rappe, in which fellow actor Roscoe "Fatty" Arbuckle was charged for manslaughter, were a contributing factor Hollywood's already crumbling reputation. Moviegoers saw Hollywood as a place of decadence and sins and this, in turn, "*led to legal censorship. Chicago was first with censorship in 1909. From 1909 to 1922 eight states passed similar laws, as did a number of cities.*" (Shurlock, 1947, p. 140) A few producers attempted to circumvent the laws by creating films in which scenes that were deemed illegal were cut from the end product. This endeavour relieved some of the tension but the laws were simply not enough. Thus the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America Inc. (MPPDA) were introduced in 1922 by producers and distributors who had already invested heavily in Hollywood. The role of the MPPDA was to counter the decadence of Hollywood and in "*1924 the directors of the association passed a resolution to discourage purchase of questionable books and plays as source material for motion pictures. (…) In 1927 the directors adopted a series of general cautions to serve as a guide in the production of talking pictures.*" (ibid) Though the new guidelines made a dent in Hollywood's problems it was nowhere nearly enough. The reason for this was that the review board of the MPPDA consisted of producers which meant that producers of Hollywood films would submit their screenplay to other producers who were usually friends or acquaintances and thus there would be a conflict of interest. With the newly created National Legion of Decency, also known as the Catholic

Legion of Decency, an organisation which tried to combat immoral and impure content in Hollywood, and the threat of total censorship by the US government of Hollywood, a new friendship was created. According to Gregory D. Black:

> (…) each film was submitted to the Catholic Legion of Decency for a final review. The PCA and the Legion worked closely together and often combined forces to prevent studios from offending Catholic sensibilities, but the Legion always stood ready to condemn any film it believed immoral. A Legion condemnation shook Hollywood to its core because Catholics, some twenty million strong, were theoretically forbidden, under the penalty of mortal sin, to attend the condemned film. Any theatre that exhibited a condemned film was targeted for boycott by Catholic organizations such as the Knight of Columbus. The industry believed that the combination of negative publicity and Catholic boycott would make it impossible for any Legion-condemned film to make a profit. Rather than risk a loss of income or challenge the Legion's authority to censor their product, producers bowed to the pressure and cut the offending material from all prints exhibited worldwide. (Black, 1997, p. 5)

The director of the PCA, Will H. Hays, officially hired the fierce Catholic Joseph I. Breen as his assistance in 1934, yet Breen's role were larger than a simple assistance. The PCA, now colloquially called the Breen office, collaborated with the Legion and had all Hollywood scripts submitted for approval. Before a film was deemed worthy for production or distribution it would now require a seal of approval from the PCA.

Breen was known to be fiercely anti-Semitic. In 1932 Breen wrote a letter to a Catholic priest stating that Hollywood was "*a rotten bunch of vile people with no respect for anything beyond the making of money. Here we have Paganism rampant and in its most virulent form. Drunkenness and debauchery are commonplace. Sexual pervasion is rampant* (…) *any number of our directors and stars are perverts. Ninety-five percent of these folks are Jews of an Eastern European lineage. They are, probably, the scum of the earth*." (Eyman, 2005, pp. 342-3) Having opinions similar to this was commonplace amongst the population during the times of the PCA as was shown in a poll conducted at that time which revealed that "*45 percent of Americans believed Jews were less honest*

than Gentiles in business; 35 percent believed that European Jews were largely responsible for their oppression. Likewise, public opinion polls from 1938 to 1941 said that a third to a half of the public believed that Jews had "too much power in the United States"; after Pearl Harbor, agreement with that proposition rose to 50 percent." (ibid, p. 343)

The years between 1930 and 1934 are often referred to as the "pre-code" era because the code was not upheld to standard. The United States was in the worst financial period of its history even to this day. The Great Depression swept over the country bringing only misery and despair leaving the people with nothing. This paved way for film producers to create plenty of films for a low price as there was no one standing in their way. One could be tempted to say that these films were created to provide an escape from the Great Depression, yet many of the films during the pre-code era touched upon subjects which "(…) *portrayed America with a realism previously unseen in its history. Warner Bros, with its stories 'torn from today's headlines', was the most prominent practitioner, but even the more patrician MGM – with 'more stars than there are in heaven' – was not averse to allowing the grim reality of daily life from seeping into the dream factory*." (Mashon, 2014, p. 20) However, the correct answer to this is, according to Mike Mashon, a "(…) *combination of bureaucratic sclerosis and the economic, political and cultural crisis brought by the Great Depression* [which] *ushered in a vibrant era of filmmaking and the introduction of many stars whose personas would forever be rooted in their pre-code films.*" (ibid, p. 22)

Peeping Tom

We've become a race of peeping Toms

- Stella to Jeff, *Rear Window*

[Peeping Tom is] not a horror film. It's a film of compassion, of observation and memory, yes! It's a film about the cinema from 1900 to 1960. A film to be tasted with delight in the centuries to come. It's the opposite of a realistic film. It's a reverie.

- Michael Powell

Other movies let us enjoy voyeurism; this one extracts a price.

- Roger Ebert's review on *Peeping Tom*

On the surface there is not much that can be said about *Peeping Tom*. It is simply a film about looking. The protagonist Mark Lewis, played by the Austrian actor Karlheinz Böhm, is working as a focus puller at a British film studio. In his spare time he provides a local porn shop with pictures of pin-up girls and he is an avid film enthusiast as well as being an amateur filmmaker, although his preferred genre of film involves creeping up on women with a knife concealed in the tripod of his camera. As soon as the women realises their fates Mark brings up a mirror to allow the women to witness their own faces being filled with terror as he stabs them in the throat. Mark records the event and watches it over and over at home but never seems to achieve the correct camera angle or the perfect background music. It is only when his neighbour Helen, played by Anna Massey, asks about his habits he reveals his hobby to be filmmaking and is currently working on a "documentary". Mark shows her films taken by his father A. N. Lewis, curiously played by the director of the film itself Michael Powell. As a psychologist specialising in the subject of fear, Mark's father uses his own child for experiments. These experiments include waking Mark up in the middle of the night with a flashlight and dropping living lizards on top of his bed to record the subsequent fear. To make matters worse we are shown a recording of Mark's mother lying lifeless in bed with Mark next to her crying. Only six weeks later we are witnessing Mark's father already being remarried as if his previous wife has just ceased to exist. Mark receives his first camera as a present from his father during the wedding.

The relations between filmmaking, fear and sex are represented throughout the film. Mark feels both a sexual connection and actual fear with his camera and with the concept of fear. There are many instances of Mark having a sexual connection with his camera and with the element of fear. When the discovery of Vivian's body is on the doorsteps, Mark quickly grabs his camera and shoots the expression of fear from the two actors. He slyly carries this out in connection to his job as the focus puller. After being on a date with Helen Mark receives a kiss from her and he responds by kissing the camera, or rather the lens. When a policeman handles Mark's camera, Mark cannot stop fiddling with his hands and keep reaching out for it. Mark furthermore mirrors the officer's moves as if his heart would stop if he could not have it back. One can almost say that instead of Mark

instructing the camera to do what he wishes the roles are now reversed, i.e. the camera is now the director of "the film of Mark". Another example is shortly after Mark has presented the gift, a piece of jewellery, for Helen and she try to decide whether she should wear the jewellery on the shoulder or the neckline. Mark's response to this is to copy her moves as if he is the camera and is recording her.

Before we delve any deeper into the film let us take a quick look at the legend of Lady Godiva and peeping Tom. The title of the film refers to the well-known peeping Tom but before we can understand Tom we must look at the legend of Lady Godiva. According to the *Oxford Dictionary of English Folklore* Lady Godiva was:

> [t]he wife of Earl Leofric of Mercia, and a devout and generous patron of churches and abbeys, she was Lady of Coventry in her own right. (…) [She was] inspired by the Trinity and the Blessed Virgin, [and] begged her husband to free Coventry from tax, until, angry at her persistence, he told her that if she rode naked across the crowded market-place, he would grant her request. She agreed, but let her hair hang loose, so that 'her whole body was veiled except her fair white legs'. Her husband 'counted this a miracle', and lifted the tax.

We see an intelligent woman pleading her husband, the Earl, to rid the citizens of their heavy taxes. The Earl agrees but only if she will ride through the town's marketplace *au naturel*. She did so with only her hair covering her, except her legs. On another account of the event, the Lady's deed was no longer done with a religious aspect but with sheer cleverness. The Lady would order all the citizens to stay inside their houses during her ride. The citizens would honour her wish, but, alas, for every action there must an equal reaction, or in this case, a "double" reaction. The town's tailor Tom would peep through the shutters of his window to glimpse at the Lady and according to legend would be struck blind or even dead. Thus the term peeping Tom became one that derives sexual pleasure from watching from hiding places as others disrobe or engage in sexual activities. The legend of peeping Tom would first come into account over six centuries after the legend of Lady Godiva.

It is easy to simply brand Tom as a voyeur although what he did is something very common to mankind. One could even say that the blame lies entirely on Lady Godiva as it was her choice to undress and ride through town. Nobody forced her as it was her husband that in anger, or maybe even in a sporting mood, challenged her to this daring event. She could simply turn the challenge down. According to John Draeger, Lady Godiva could be classified as an exhibitionist in a sense. She knew that someone might be able to look out of their window even though she bid them to not. In order words, Tom simply did not need to use any form of deception to reach his goal. The choice of riding naked was entirely her own and he merely looked out the window. Draeger argues that:

> If exhibitionism requires the intent to shock or arouse, then it seems Godiva was not an exhibitionist in the usual sense. But even if she was motivated by concern for the public good, it seems that she was expressing a free choice with full knowledge that being naked on horseback could result in being seen naked on horseback. It may have been unwise and she may have been ambivalent about the choice, but she consented to being seen and thus could not have reasonably complained about being exposed. (Draeger, 2011, pp. 43-4)

Obviously Tom could honour the Lady's request but chose not to as is his right. We expect each other to respect our wishes when it comes to privacy and not doing so becomes an event worth mentioning. However, there is also the issue of turning a blind eye to these wishes in order to satisfy one's sexual satisfaction. Yet this means that Tom must heed the requests of the Lady, or other people for that matter, without any exception (no matter how unreasonable they may be). We can compare this to present day with a woman that has recently received a new haircut that she did not like or has gained a few extra pounds. This person could then ask other people to not look at her as she was walking down the street. People could then of course choose not to look at her, in order to respect her wish. It would be quite rude to make tactless comments of her, but surely, no one can claim a general right of not being seen. She could have meant this wish wholeheartedly but nonetheless it would be impossible to force people to not look at her and thus make her wish unreasonable. Equally, we can say that Lady Godiva's was making a political statement and not attempting to parade her body. She may have asked her subjects to not look and they could have respected her wish. This of course does not mean that they must at all cost honour her request.

Considering the reasonableness of Lady Godiva's request and the reasonableness of Tom's peeping we can boil it down to the social norms of society. (ibid, p. 44)

Let us move on from the definition of what a peeping Tom is and on to the film *Peeping Tom* (1960). The history of the film is almost as extraordinary as the film itself. In 1960 British filmmaker Michael Powell made the film that would destroy his career, despite it being seen as a masterpiece today. A well-known director with dozens of films regarded as works of art, such as 'The Red Shoes', 'The Life and Death of Colonel Blimp' and 'A Canterbury Tale', Powell's choice of making the film *Peeping Tom* would destroy his career. Critics scorned the film for pretty much everything. Derek Hill from the Tribune said: "*The only satisfactory way to dispose of Peeping Tom would be to shovel it up and flush it swiftly down the nearest sewer. Even then the stench would remain.*" Nina Hibbin from the Daily Worker said: "*From its slumbering, mildly salacious beginning, to its appallingly sadomasochistic and depraved climax, it is wholly evil.*" Another example was Vincent Canby from the New York Times: "*I find it difficult to become morally outraged by "Peeping Tom" and even more difficult to see this movie as anything more than an excruciatingly schematic, very solemn melodrama, quite badly acted by everyone.*" Finally, and perhaps the most pictorial critic, Leonard Moseley from the Daily Express reviewed it as such: "*- neither the hopeless leper colonies of East Pakistan* (…) *nor the gutters of Calcutta – has left me with such a feeling of nausea and depression as I got this week while sitting through a new British film called* Peeping Tom." The vicious critical reception of the film forced Powell's to the wilderness and he effectively became the number one persona non grata of the film industry, despite his earlier work being praised to the skies.

As with so many other films, *Peeping Tom* and Michael Powell regained their rightful popularity later on as a result of growing quite a cult reputation, although copies of the film were hard to come by. As a result of this Martin Scorsese who loved Powell's film, paid the New York Film Festival to host a screening of *Peeping Tom*. Scorsese was a catalyst in getting Powell's career back on track. Later on the Edinburgh Film Festival named their award for Best British Feature Film after Michael Powell. These examples are just proof that Powell and *Peeping Tom* were simply ahead of their time. The self-same critics that assaulted and belittled Powell and *Peeping Tom* would later admit to their failure and express praise for them. Dilys Powell from the Sunday Times commented on the film in 1994 by saying: "*In 1960, I hated the piece, and, together with a great many other British critics, said so. Today, I am convinced it is a masterpiece. If, in some afterlife, conversation is*

permitted, I shall think it my duty to seek out Michael Powell and apologise." Another critic had a change of opinion with *Peeping Tom*. Michael Robinson from the Financial Times wrote in 1994: "*I was one of the antis at the time, then I warmed to it, and now I've gone a bit cold on it again. Thirty-five years ago ... it was quite an extraordinarily explicit piece of sadism. I think [it] would still make me uneasy, as it did then - because it was so personal, and one felt like one was prying.*" Let us ask the question that is on our mind. Why did the film cause so much outrage when Alfred Hitchcock's Psycho was released only months after with stunning reviews and Oscar nominations? Was it because that is what to be expected from Hitchcock and not Powell? Let us first concentrate on the protagonist or anti-hero if you will. Karlheinz Böhm gives us a stunning portrayal of the shy and wounded Mark Lewis, who works as a focus puller in a British film studio. Mark is a baby-faced and blue-eyed handsome man who spends his time taking girlie pictures and dabbles in filmmaking. Later on it is revealed that he as a child was the victim of great pain and suffering because of his scientist father and his experiments on the nervous system's reaction to fear. This has caused a great deal of mental damage to Mark as he now has become a mass murderer with voyeuristic tendencies. Let us take a look at the very beginning of the film as it gives us an indication into which way this film will take us. We are presented by a black screen which eventually zooms out to reveal an archery target with multiple arrows around it. The archery target is in some way the reverse RAF roundel; blue on the outside, followed by red, white and black. Afterwards an arrow is quickly shot in dead centre and the text "*A Michael Powell Production*" appears. Powell had in collaboration with Emeric Pressburger created a production company and made a series of film together in the 1940s and 1950s. Together they were called The Archers. After a fade we suddenly cut to the image of a closed eye. The eye opens as quickly as the arrow was shot into the centre, filling the screen as did the archery target. The eye is blue, like the centre of the archery target. We see many similarities with the eye and the target. The bull's-eye appropriately introduces the film's first character and the first image: an eye. The swift opening of the eye suggests surprise or even fear. The audience quickly realises that it is more likely fear as the film's soundtrack helps them. Two chords are played during this sequence: the first one, being a steady tone, as the eye is closed, while the other chord being a deeper tone as the eye opens. Who is the possessor of the eye? Is it the victim or is the assailant? We are led to believe that the eye reacts to fear which means that eye belong to the observant rather than the observer. The possessor of the eye has clearly been shocked by something. We can see this by the widen pupil of the eye: the possessor is clearly in danger.

This scene, briefly as it may be, serves as some form of an establishing shot. An establishing shot is commonly a shot to (as the term would suggest) establish the geographical of physical location of the film. Here however it serves as the ideological positioning of the film. We see that someone is seeing someone who obviously will do them harm. We are with a blink of the eye (both metaphorically and literally) cast into the black abyss in with Mark Lewis mind resides. Although we cannot specifically determine if the eye is looking directly in the camera or the assailant we could say that it is doing both. There are small flickering movements in the eye that would suggest it not looking only at Lewis but also at us: the audience. We are allowed to observe the horror that is presented to the woman while we sit in comfort. We are thus in a position of power over the film in which we can observe while no immediate threat is on us.

The eye opens on to a street where we see a prostitute, Dora, and (still anonymous) Mark approaching her, whistling faintly. There is a cut to the Mark's midriff where we see a 16mm camera hidden under his duffle coat. The film's camera is slowly going out of focus as Mark is moving towards it and leaves us with the voyeuristic camera's eye. Jeremy Hawthorne tells us of the ambiguity of the 'subjective' camera of Mark:

> [W]e switch to something akin to subjective camera as we follow what we assume is being filmed by this intradiegetic camera. I say 'something akin to', because we see the cross of the viewfinder imposed on what is in front of us, so that although Dora in one sense appears to look at, and talk to, 'us', 'we' are looking through the viewfinder of a camera she cannot as yet see, and through which no-one is actually looking. The effect is thus like subjective camera but with a weird distancing effect. The viewer cannot sink into the fantasy that he or she is in the world of the film, being addressed by Dora, because we are presumably seeing something that the still anonymous Mark is not seeing in quite the same form, as we know that he cannot be looking through the camera's viewfinder. This particular ciné camera has to be held at eye-level for the viewfinder to be used; moreover, Mark cannot be looking through the viewfinder at the start of the encounter, otherwise Dora would notice this and not be shocked later on when she becomes aware of the camera. (Hawthorne, 2009, pp. 306-7)

Michael Powell's attempt to include us, the audience, into the film fails. We see something which would be humanly impossible for Mark to see. Mark's camera works as some form of connecting link between the audience and the film itself but exactly because of the placement of the camera in this first scene the illusion is broken. Dora looks and speaks to both us and Mark even though she looks at a point that she should not be aware of. Subsequently this becomes apparent as she looks directly into Mark's camera before she is murdered thus breaking the illusion.

Mark makes his way over to Dora who is standing in front of a store filled with mangled mannequins. Maybe a hint to what is going to happen to Dora and a hint to the audience to tell them what they should expect from the film. Mark films the legs of Dora and slowly tilts the camera up in a sort of elevator shot. Dora becomes the passive object as Mulvey would express it, while at first Mark and then later the audience is the active. While walking towards Dora's flat Mark films her in an aggressive manner, as a predator locked on to its prey. Dora has ceased to be the glamorous female in the scene and is slowly becoming the victim. In Dora's room as she is getting undressed, Dora's perception of Mark's camera becomes confusing. Mark removes the outer chamber of one of the legs of the tripod and reveals the knife on the edge of it. The music begins to play and the light from the mirror shines on Dora as she responds with a look of disbelieve which follows with fear while the camera moves closer. Laura Mulvey explains the concept of the following scene where Mark reviews the murder:

> A camera records a scene, one specific moment in time, which is the fossilised in time. Once projected that moment can be replayed and repeated. The camera's look at the scene becomes the spectators look at the screen. Here, the different times in spectatorship had doubled up again. The screen changes size. It shifts between the time of the story, when Mark is watching his film, and the time when any audience watches Peeping Tom in the cinema. While the credits roll, these layers of time that are usually invisible become uneasily visible for the audience of Peeping Tom. The story is showing us an extreme; a perversion, but it also reflects outwards onto the cinema's intrinsic fascination with looking and the ease in which it can make peeping Toms of us all. The credits, superimposed on the 16mm projection, is a

> reminder that the makers of Peeping Tom are also, on their side, complicit. The name of the Director of Photography is superimposed on the climax of the sequence and the name of the director is superimposed on the projector. (AcademicChannel1)

Mulvey states that the film is trying to get the audience involved in the film as much as possible. Much like the first scene there is a confusion regarding who is looking at whom. We watch Mark watch his film while the credits roll. If it were not for the credits reminding us of the fictional aspect of film one would believe their point of view to be that of Mark's point of view.

The trope of having a film within a film is commonplace for most horror films. We see what the murderer sees but almost never what the victim sees. In *Peeping Tom* we are witness to Mark's father's recording of his studies, which in itself consists of different layers of who is watching who. Michael Powell plays the role of Mark Lewis' father while the young Lewis is played by Powell's actual son. There is a layer of father watching son both in the film and in the real world. These double layers of film within film are showed in many instances throughout the film. Mark explains to Helen that he wants to film her watching a film of him ('*wanted to photograph you watching*'); Mark tells Vivian that he is '*photographing you photographing me*'; and as he arranges his own death he turns to the Helen and says '*watch them Helen, watch them say goodbye!*'. This recurring pattern reminds us that we are watching someone being watched by someone else. (Hawthorne, pp. 313-4) Kaja Silverman suggests that:

> Peeping Tom gives new emphasis to the concept of reflexivity. Not only does it foreground the workings of the apparatus, and the place given there to voyeurism and sadism, but its remarkable structure suggests that dominant cinema is indeed a mirror with a delayed reflection. It deploys the film-within-a-film trope with a new and radical effect, making it into a device for dramatizing the displacement of lack from the male to the female subject. (Silverman, 1988, p. 32)

Silverman gives us two examples of the film-within-the-film. Mark as an adult tries to come to terms with his father's abuse by creating a film. The second one being Mark's father's recordings of his "scientific" experiments. Both films try to reason with themselves by having the label

"documentary" but both are elaborately staged. Dr Lewis forces Mark to cry which he then films; films that are later used to tell both the audience and Helen of Mark's difficulties. Dr Lewis had a purpose with the films, at least that is what he believed, yet Mark was scarred for life which can be seen in his actions later. These actions contain the same level of staginess as Dr Lewis' actions. Mark would film his victims while attacking them while they could see their own fear. If we look closer to the recordings of Dr Lewis we can see that Mark were a victim of this as well. D. Lewis would burst into the room of Mark while recording it. There seems to be some kind of glare, most likely from a mirror. Mark is simply following in his father's footsteps as he also presents his victims with a mirror.

Let us take a look at the murder of Vivian. The film's voyeuristic tendencies are overly represented in this scene. There are three sets of camera, all of which serve to determine the viewer's perspective of the film. Hawthorne describes the three cameras as such:

> First there is (a) the extradiegetic camera (actually cameras, as we cut between different angles), filming first Vivian and then Mark and Vivian, ostensibly invisible to them and representing no intradiegetic presence. Next there is (b) the studio camera through which Vivian looks, and through which on occasions the viewer may imagine that he or she is looking. And then there is (c) Mark's own ciné-camera, the one with which he actually films Vivian's death. In the closing seconds of this scene it is not always clear whether we are being given (a) or (c). (Hawthorne, p. 318)

Again we are left with the confusion of which camera we should have our focus on. The voyeurism is heavy. We watch Mark as he is watching Vivian. She is then watching him through the cameras present on stage.

Vivian is presented as the passive object as she is dancing and generally being the object of desire; she "possesses" the looked-at-ness which Mulvey presented. The knife-edged leg of the tripod symbolises the phallus and Mark insert the phallus into Vivian as he kills her. We as the audience are left behind helpless to witness this. Yet, if we had the chance to step in and do something we would not. According to Brenda S. Gardenour Walter we simply enjoy it too much:

> The consumption of horror films is a multivalent act of voyeurism in which the screen serves as a peephole through which the viewer observes vulnerable bodies imperilled, stripped, parted and penetrated, tortured into revealing their hidden compartments and their foul glistening viscera. In the darkened safety of the theatre (…) the voyeur experiences the archetypically male killer's powerful thrill over the objectified and submissive archetypical female body. (Padva, 2014, p. 231)

We have become accustomed to the constant violence we experience every day. Furthermore, the darkness of the cinema tricks us into having, for a lack of a better word, sympathy with the killer, who, as Walter mentions, archetypically is male. We can identify ourselves with the killer. As Laura Mulvey mentioned earlier the role of the female is solely included in the film to give the man sexual pleasure. Vivian is only important in the aspect of being killed so the film can progress. We can furthermore include Budd Boetticher's quote into this: "(…) *what the heroine provokes, or rather what she represents. She is the one, or rather the love or fear she inspires in the hero, or else the concern he feels for her, who makes him act the way the does. In herself the woman has not the slightest importance.*" Vivian is only here to be feared by Mark and to fear the actions of Mark.

The music in this scene furthermore plays an important part. The jazzy music from the tape recorder is played throughout the scene, except in the last few seconds. The music stops as Mark creeps slowly towards Vivian with the knife-edged leg of the tripod and suddenly utters the words: "There's something else". As soon as these words are said the music begins again, though this time it is the familiar "dramatic" piano music, which in some way has become the leitmotif or "soundtrack" for the murderer. The music warns us of the impending climax, both film wise and for Mark's *jouissance*.

In the beginning of the chapter I discussed the connection between fear and sexual gratification. As we have seen throughout the film, the use of cameras is heavily present. Of course the primary example of this is Mark's use of the camera he received as a present form his father. Mark manages to negotiate a world he would be lost in if it were not for the camera. The constant presence of camera in the film creates some sort of barrier between Mark and his potential personal relationships. An example of this is when he and Helen are on a date. As suspected, Mark has

difficulties expressing his feelings and emotions towards Helen and instead tells her, "I feel… I can't describe it… I could only photograph it." Yet we, the audience, know that whenever Mark plans on attacking his next victim he records them with the camera. However, Mark's feelings for Helen are extraordinary because at another moment in the film, he chooses not to film her and contemplatively comments, "Whatever I photograph I always lose." Mark is battling for Helen's life, yet he still, subconsciously, wishes to kill her.

Let us take a look at the scene where Mark, as the gentleman he is, gifts Helen a brooch. One could say this is a metaphor to Mark's earlier experience with his father during the experiments. Silverman argues that this is solely Mark's attempt to reverse his standing with Helen. Mark is simply trying to associate himself with his father. "[H]*e gives Helen a lizard brooch, thereby attempting to locate her in the position he occupied as a child when his father dropped a live lizard into his bed. As Helen tries to decide where to pin the brooch, moving it around on her dress, voyeurism gives way to identification.*" (Silverman, p. 35) Mark mimics the movements of Helen, thus putting himself in the place of the camera. As he later explains to Helen "I feel… I can't describe it… I could only photograph it", we notice that he is and wants to be the camera. As Helen is trying on the brooch we notice Mark is copying her. Mark is responding to her as a camera would and perhaps tries to record this moment as his father did.

The film *Peeping Tom* tries to find a path between the voyeuristic tendencies of Mark Lewis and the audience. Yet the extravaganza of scopophilia does not simply put the process of looking on the spotlight. It, as Peter Wollen suggests, "*aestheticises the look.*" (Wollen, 1994, p. 21) The audience own voyeurism is made astonishingly obvious and even more astonishingly, the audience can identify themselves with the protagonist. As Roger Ebert mentioned in an epigraph of this chapter, "*other movies let us enjoy voyeurism; this one extracts a price*" we can nod in agreement. *Peeping Tom* is an excruciating film that forces the audience to look at the horror, even though we have paid to see

it. The voyeuristic tendency of the film comes alive because of us, as we make our way to the cinema to look at other people's lives.

Rear Window

If thou gaze long into an abyss, the abyss will also gaze into thee.

- Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*

It is well-known that Alfred Hitchcock's films are filled to the brim with suspense, voyeurism and the gaze. Norma Denzin argues that Hitchcock's films usually followed the same predictable format, "*typically combining the elements of a thriller, including chase scenes, with a male-female romance, where the male may have to prove his worthiness (and love) to the female.*" (Denzin, p. 116) Yet *Rear Window* does not; in fact it is for the most part the complete opposite. This 1954 film looks into the world of renowned photographer L. B. Jeffries, or Jeff, played by James Stewart, who in an accident has broken his leg which is now in cast. As a result of this he is confined to his "(…) *two-room apartment with nothing to do but look out the window at the neighbours.*" Like the audience who watch the film, Jeff is just another viewer. He sees as much as we do. As the summer goes on and the heat becomes unbearable the other tenants of Jeff's complex begins to open their windows and thus reveal their life story to both Jeff and to us. Each window that opens creates a new and unique tale for Jeff. He even gives the tenants, or characters as they have become, names; Miss Torso, a beautiful dancer, Miss Lonely Hears, a loveless bachelorette, a young newlywed couple, a songwriter and of course the salesman, Thorwald, living with his wife who is confined to the bed most likely because of illness. One day Jeff notices the absence of Thorwald's wife and through Sherlock Holmes-esque deduction, albeit only with his camera with a telephoto lens, he convinces himself that she has been murdered by her husband. Jeff shares his news with his girlfriend Lisa, played by Grace Kelly, and his house nurse Stella. Psychically unable to solve the murder himself he enlists the help of Lisa and Thelma.

The relationship between Jeff and Lisa is one without emotion, at least for Jeff. This changes according to Jon Gartenberg as he is "[u]*nable to confront the personal dimensions of his own love story, he instead gazes at the romantic liaisons of others. Physically immobilized at home, he turns from inward reflection to the world out- side his window, substituting a feeling of visual omnipotence for his physical and emotional deficiencies.*" (Gartenberg, 1990, p. 5) As Jeff enlists the help of Lisa and Thelma his relationship with Lisa becomes one of caring and love, especially when she is in danger. Laura Mulvey argues that Lisa in danger forces Jeff to change his emotional status with her.

> As he watches, an erotic dimension is added to his look, a central image to the drama. His girlfriend Lisa had been of little sexual interest to him, more of less a drag, so long as she remained on the spectator side. When she crosses the barrier between his room and the block opposite, their relationship is re-born erotically. He does not merely watch her through his lens, as a distant meaningful image, he also sees her as a guilty intruder exposed by a dangerous man threatening her with punishment, and thus finally saves her. Lisa's exhibitionism has already been established by her obsessive interest in dress and style, in being a passive image of visual perfection: Jeffries' voyeurism and activity have also been established through his work as a photo-journalist, a maker of stories and captor images. However, his enforced inactivity, binding him to his seas as a spectator, puts him squarely in the phantasy position of the cinema audience. (Mulvey, p. 842)

It is as if Jeff changes personality because of the potential harm done to Lisa. Only when his girlfriend becomes an extension of himself, instead of being a person with her own will, he can begin to accept her into his life. She becomes subjugated to his and vice versa.

The film incorporates voyeurism in many ways as *Peeping Tom* did. We have a person suffering from scopophilia who turns the watched into an object and thus gives the watcher a sense of power. The question that looms is whether Jeff actually is turned on by his voyeuristic tendencies. We already know that he missed the thrill of being a photographer but does this mean that there actually is a murder happening or is he imagining it. Initially both Lisa and Stella are rejecting the idea of a

murderer. Lisa even tries to prophesise Jeff's future by saying, "If you could only see yourself (…) sitting around looking out the window to kill time is one thing, but doing it the way you are with binoculars and wild opinions about every little thing you see is diseased." Even Jeff's friend the detective, Tom Doyle, condemns his actions and claims them to be an invasion of privacy. As we, the audience, are forced to only see what Jeff sees we quickly also becomes voyeurs. The thought process of Jeff alludes to the question of whether Jeff's actions are justified. He breaks the law in order to bring someone to justice, yet in doing so he drags the audience into it. Although breaking the law is obviously illegal and wrong, Anders Albrechtslund argues that Jeff's action is, in his own thoughts, acceptable because of his job.

> Interestingly, Jeffries first picks up his binoculars, but hesitates when he contemplates the obvious voyeuristic intent, and *then* finds his camera lens, as if the professional tool can serve as an alibi for the watching, replacing the private (and inappropriate) curiosity with the cool distance of work interest. In a way, his immobility is an alibi for watching, since his physical disability deprives him the ability to act. (Albrechtslund, 2008, p. 134)

As discussed earlier the gaze involves both the act of voyeurism and the relationship between male and female. Jeff being the active independent object has the passive dependent object, Lisa, in his grasp, or at least that is how it should be. Hitchcock deters from this by making Jeff nearly helpless and dependent, at least in his wheelchair. We see the active male vs. passive female stereotype turned upside down. Lisa, as well as Stella, joins Jeff in his voyeurism later in the film as they find more and more clues of a potential murder. By actively searching for clues in Thorwald's apartment Lisa gets caught by Thorwald and he furthermore discovers Jeff's "hiding place". In this final scene as Thorwald is approaching Jeff's apartment and upon reaching we still do not know for certain that Thorwald is a murderer. Yet as the "fight" between Jeff and Thorwald ensues we are left without a doubt that he is. As Jeff has had his doubts of his actions as a voyeur they are now both justified but also disapproved. Ruth Perlmutter argues that, "*The murderer, in a reversal, seeks out and attacks Jeff who defends himself with flashbulbs, but is defenestrated from his own rear window (the frame of guilt).*" (Perlmutter, 1985, p. 54)

The relationship between Jeff and Lisa deserves a more in-depth discussion. Lisa is constantly competing with rest of the world to be loved by Jeff. Laura Christiansen argues that Jeff enjoys looking at women instead of actually being with them. "[Lisa] (…) *at one point pulling the blinds closed and announcing, "The show is over for tonight." As such, it seems that Jeff "enjoys gazing at women more than being with them." This is further emphasized by his renewed interest in Lisa as she becomes involved in helping him solve the murder.*" (Padva & Buchweitz, 2014, p.161-2) As Lisa takes part in solving the case Jeff status rises from being a simple sexual voyeur to an active male. Furthermore, "*it is more than just Lisa's occupying the male gaze that changes Jeff's view of her – she helps him become 'active' by helping him to assert his masculinity though solving of the crime, allowing him to act vicariously.*" (ibid.) At the end of the film we are witnessing Lisa final transition from just being a female in Jeff's life to becoming more than that. After Jeff has been defenestrated and Thorwald caught:

> [Jeff] is not where he was at the beginning, bored, unsettled, and anxious about making any commitment to Lisa. He has experienced danger. He has seen Lisa go into a life-threatening situation and come out alive 'I'm so proud of you, if anything had happened to you…". He also proved that a murder happened. Granted, both legs in a cast, back turned to the courtyard, smile on his face, he appears to have given up his voyeurism for marriage to Lisa. In actuality he has kept his voyeurism and got a wife in the bargain. (…) His smile is at least two-faced. Like the cat that caught the canary, he trapped Thorvald (sic): no loss of face here. His smile also reflects Lisa's capitulation to his position. She is willing to become a woman of danger, even a woman who will read *Beyond the High Himalayas!* He has the best of both possible worlds. (Denzin, p. 119-120)

One could say the film ends with a happy ending, yet the aforementioned quote tells us that Jeff has in some way simply convinced Lisa to change her position as a woman. It was him that persuaded her to break into Thorwald's home; it was him that, from practically nothing, came up with a serious crime as murder.

If we take a look at the title of the film *Rear Window* we can interpret it as the protagonist becomes the link between audience and film. What Jeff sees is what we see; he is in his own way creating the film for us. As the film uses many point of view shots from Jeff's aspect we can deduce that he is who we should be identifying ourselves with. Denzin argues,

> It is apparent that Hitchcock titled his film *Rear Window* for at least two reasons. Peering through a rear window immediately implies voyeurism and Peeping Tomism, Jeff is given a visual standpoint which is absolute: he cannot see himself seeing himself, only we as viewers occupy this position. Jeff can only be a voyeur. The eye that looks cannot see itself looking. 'The eye can only see itself in the third eye's pupil.' Heeding Stella's advice, 'people ought to get outside their own house and look in for a change', Jeff seeks out a third eye that would return his gaze. And he is terrified when this happens. (ibid, p. 121)

In a sense we as viewers are in a higher position of power than Jeff. As we see what he sees we can still see everything he cannot once the camera is facing him. This means we are even more voyeuristic than he is. If we look at the very first scene we notice it beginning with the raising of three bamboo blinds. This movement suggests the raising and lowering of a theatre curtain; we are now allowed into the film. This opening scene, which runs for about 3 ½ minutes, introduces us to Jeff solely through visual means. We discover he is male, his background as a photographer, his broken leg meaning he is confined to the wheelchair, dramatic photos of cars and fire indicating he is not a simple photographer but instead an adventurous and daring one, and fashion magazines hinting to a relationship with a female. We even get a shot of the thermometer indicating a very hot day and why all the windows are open and why Jeff has difficulties sleeping and stays up and sit in front of his window through the night. We are bombarded with information of Jeff yet he does not know anything about us. In a mere matter of minutes we are witnessing Jeff's entire life. This unjust division of knowledge is the entire premise of the film, although this division ceases to exist after this point. Subsequently, both Jeff and we are fed the same information throughout the film making the division of knowledge equal.

If we look back at the term 'investigative voyeur' and try to apply it here we can see some similarities. As mentioned, the investigative voyeur would no longer be dependent on his eyes after the invention of the camera. With the camera he could now freeze a moment in time thus immortalise that moment. If we relate this to *Rear Window* we see the connection between the two. As we discover later, Jeff is an accomplished photographer known for his audacious work and has now become an extension of his camera. Yet, interestingly Jeff never actually takes a picture of his suspect or any evidence he might have found. This could mean that Jeff seeks the adventure so much that he subconsciously has seen what might have not been there to begin with. Jeff is unable to do his job as a result of a physical injury yet he is still using the object that is most associated with his job: the camera. Another trait of the investigative voyeur is their unique will and force they apply to their job. Jeff is, despite his injury, maintaining his belief in the murder and will not shy away from bringing the criminal to justice, even though it means that he will have to put people he loves in danger. Furthermore, Jeff knows of the unlawfulness and wrongfulness of spying on other people but chooses to ignore it because of the greater good, thus becoming a vigilante.

Psycho

What can be said about Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho* which has not already been said? From the infamous shower scene to the constant suspense by the Master of Suspense has kept us on the edge of our seats throughout the years. A film that rocked Hollywood and the film industry to the core as it went right to the limit, broke it and went further than that. The plot of the film is fairly simple; Marion, played by Janet Leigh, steals $40,000 from her boss to pay for her wedding with her lover Sam who have inherited a debt from his father and thus cannot pay for it. Marion drives through two nights and finally decides to stop at the Bates Motel where she rents a room for the night. The Bates Motel is run by Norman Bates, a goofy and timid man that tells Marion that he lives in the large house behind the motel with his mother. Marion returns to her room where she begins counting the money she stole. In the adjoining room Norman takes down a painting revealing a peephole into Marion's room. He watches her with great intensity and then dashes off home. Marion steps into the shower and the (in)famous shower scene takes place. So far the film has concentrated the plot around Marion but now shifts its attention to Norman. Now we are introduced to the private detective Arbogast, who has been hired by Marion's boss to track her down and the

money she stole. Arbogast arrives at the Bates Motel and interrogates Norman who informs the detective that Marion has in fact been at the motel but has left. Not convinced by his answer Arbogast demands to speak to Norman's mother but is refused. Determined to speak with the mother, Arbogast calls Sam and Marion's sister, Lila, and tells them that he intends to sneak back to the motel and speak to the mother. Upon arriving to the house he starts up the stairs and before reaching the top he is stabbed by Mother Bates. Meanwhile, Sam and Lila have been waiting for a call from Arbogast so Sam sets out to the motel to figure out the cause of the missing call. At the motel Sam finds no clue of the whereabouts of both Marion and Arbogast or even Norman, who is in the process of disposing of the body of the detective. Sam returns to Lila and they both venture out to inform the Sheriff of the disappearance of Arbogast. Sheriff Chambers tells them that Norman's mother has been dead and buried for the past ten years after she and her lover was poisoned. This causes Sam and Lila to investigate the Bates Motel further and they check in to the motel as husband and wife. At the motel the pair discovers clues that point to Marion and the $40,000. Sam speaks to Norman to stall him while Lila sneaks up to the house to speak with the mother. Norman begins growing agitated by the questions and when Sam asks about the mother Norman realises what is going on. Sam tries to keep Norman from leaving and a fight ensues. Sam is knocked out and Norman runs towards the house. Meanwhile Lila sees Norman running towards the house and quickly runs down the stairs to the basement. Here she sees a shape of a woman sitting in a chair in the middle of a room. She taps the woman on the shoulder and the chair swivels around revealing the desiccated remains of an old woman and eyeless sockets. Lila scream and turns away only to see the mother yet again wielding a large knife blocking the only escape. Just before stabbing Lila Sam arrives and pacifies the mother. The wig of the mother falls off revealing Norman to be dressed as his mother. In the next shot, Sam, Lila and the sheriff are listening to a psychiatrist who tells them that he has gotten a confession, but not from Norman himself. Instead he got it from the mother. The personality of 'Norman' has ceased to exist and has been taken over completely by 'Mother'. After the death of Norman's father, Norman received the undivided attention of his mother and when she became attached to a lover some of that attention ceased. Norman's jealousy made him poison both his mother and her lover, but consumed with guilt he stole the corpse of his mother and preserved it at home. Norman began to divide his mind with his mother to further the illusion of her still being alive. Norman would often be both himself and his mother and have conversations with his mother while dressed as her, but sometimes the mother's personality would completely take over and as the psychiatrist says: "*He was never all 'Norman',*

but he was often only 'Mother'." As the jealousy of 'Mother' grew stronger of Norman and his attraction to girls she would 'take over' Norman and kill the girls. We see Norman sitting alone in a room in the end while we hear the 'Mother' side of him speaking of her not being able to kill anyone and she "(…) *wouldn't even harm a fly.*" Norman looks up to the camera while the desiccated head of his mother is superimposed as the camera fades to a car being towed out of a swamp and the film ends.

Psycho is probably the film most associated with Alfred Hitchcock. It is certainly the most successful and he made it relatively late in his career; 1960. At that time the film was shocking as it portrayed sex and violence and completely changed the horror genre. As David Greven points out:

> (…) Alfred Hitchcock's 1960 film *Psycho* gives us an illicit view of post-coital lunchtime lovers in a hotel room, he shirtless, she in her bra and half-slip. "The sex angle was raised," François Truffaut remarks in one of his famous interviews with the director, "so later on the audience would think that Anthony Perkins is merely a voyeur. If I'm not mistaken," Truffaut continues, "out of your fifty works, this is the only film showing a woman in a brassiere." Hitchcock confirms that his choices reflect his awareness that the "audiences are changing." Through such innovations as the bared brassiere, the film announces itself as daring and modern, "a new – altogether different – entertainment," as the poster for the film, which shows Janet Leigh in her white bra and half-slip only, proclaimed. Determinedly breaking taboos in terms of what can be shown and inferred in a movie, *Psycho* shows us more than movies had before: more flesh, more violence, and for the first time in American film, according to its makers, a flushing toilet. (Greven, 2013, p. 89)

To think that Norman Bates is simply a harmless voyeur, as we saw earlier with L.B. Jeffries in *Rear Window*, is a ruse played by Hitchcock as he loves to do. As mentioned earlier, there is not a real protagonist in the film as we first follow Marion and after her death, Bates. But who is the

actual "psycho" in the film? One could argue that both of the protagonists are indeed psychos. At first one imagines Marion to be the psycho as she steals the money and flees with increasing paranoia of the possible repercussions of her crime. But as she is suddenly killed off the film changes its focus around her theft to her murder. One could argue that the whole beginning of the film involving Marion is simply a ruse by Hitchcock to make her sudden murder appear even more shocking and disturbing. Yet why would Hitchcock make a film where the first 45 minutes are, to some extent, indifferent to the rest of the film. If we take a look at Freud's term 'the uncanny' or *unheimlich* in the original German, literally meaning the 'un-homely', is the feeling you get when experiencing something familiar that is strangely unfamiliar, like seeing a perfect recreated robot of oneself or looking in a mirror and seeing ones backside. Freud was interested in the recurring motif of the so-called 'uncanny double' or doppelgänger, which is someone or something that is disturbingly like the self yet completely separated of it. As Freud puts it, "*Thus we have characters who are to be considered identical because they look alike. This relation is accentuated by mental processes leaping from one of these characters to another – by what we should call -, so that the one possesses knowledge, feelings and experience in common with the other. Or it is marked by the fact that the subject identifies himself with someone else, so that he is in doubt as to which his self is, or substitutes the extraneous self for his own.*" Freud argues that the doppelgänger is disturbing exactly because they are like the self and yet threateningly other. He further argues that "*the feeling of something uncanny is directly attached to* (…) *the idea of being robbed of one's eyes.* (…) *Uncertainty whether an object is living or inanimate* (…) *is quite irrelevant in connection with this other, more striking instance of uncanniness.*" Keeping Freud's theory in mind let us take a look the film. In *Psycho* we see the uncanny double being Norman's mother; his alter ego. But one could also argue that Marion and Norman are uncanny doubles of each other. In most of their interactions we see a perfectly placed mirror in the background suggesting they are in fact mirroring, or doubling if you will, each other. Marion and Norman share similarities that suggests their stories to not be different at all but instead they accompany each other. If we take a look at the scene where Marion drives away with the money feeling more and more paranoid of her crime we notice a change in both her and the films behaviour. After being followed by the police officer and subsequently changing her car we notice the editing of the film to be more abrupt if you will. Before the car scene the changes from scene to scene would be marked by a simple fade, which we know is a classic film trick for 'time has passed between these two shots'. But now, even though the sky outside becomes darker and darker we are shown this in cuts and not fades as previously. The

shots get tighter and tighter on Marion's face, the depth of field decreases and the lighting shifts from light/day to dark/night. Hitchcock achieves to move the time of the film from day to night but stylistically speaking the film moves from an apparent objective reality to a subjective noir-ish internal reality. He is taking us from Marion's 'light/day' to Norman's 'dark/night' and at the climax Marion smiles and looks directly into the camera which bears a strong resemblance to Norman's smile in the very last scene of the film. (Is This Just Reality?, 2016)

There are many instances of the gaze in *Psycho*, the obvious ones being Norman looking through the peephole and the empty eye sockets of Mother. Keeping Freud's argument of "*the feeling of something uncanny is directly attached to* (…) *the idea of being robbed of one's eyes*" in mind, we can see the 'uncanny-ness' of Norman's mother. According to George Toles:

> Perhaps because the eye seems to represent identity simultaneously at its point of fullest concentration and maximum vulnerability, it naturally functions, in works so deeply concerned with aggression, as the principal locus of metaphoric transformation and exchange. The eye, after all, is the ultimate goal for any act of violation; it is the luminous outward sign of the private soul one wishes to smudge with depravity. But the eye is also profoundly linked with repression, and here it becomes threatening to the violator as well. Everything from the realm of experience that has proven damaging to the self, that has inflicted psychic wounds, has been channelled through the eye. (Toles, 1984, pp.631-2)

The eye acts as a metaphor for the reasons behind violence. Whenever someone commits an act of violence there is always an eye watching and judging. Yet when we look at Norman's mother we notice the lack of eyes which has been replaced with deep sockets of nothingness. Exactly because of the lack of eyes the crimes committed by Norman becomes more acceptable, as it is the mother that commits the murders and not Norman, as we are told in the ending. Toles continue by mentioning that "*punishment inflicted on the eye is* (…) *a means of severing someone's ties with the world (as is the case of Oedipus).*" (ibid, p. 633) As the mother is without eyes her ability to exist in our society has ceased to exist and thus she can be able to do whatever she pleases, including murder. It is worth remarking that:

> It is only with Norman's final speech that the director's mode of joking seems to merge with the awareness of a figure within the film's world. When the mysteriously mocking voice of "Mrs. Bates" at last reaches us, we cannot avoid the feeling that in its paradoxically "vacant" depravity it is the one voice we have heard that genuinely expresses the film's tone: "It is sad when a mother has to speak the words that condemn her own son." (…) Mrs. Bates, whose sockets are both full and hollow, directly scrutinizes us (the viewers) with the gelded eyes of decency. She speaks quietly to us of a mother's duty to put an end to a bad son while we are confounded by the sight of her effortlessly inhabiting the lost son's body. (Yet another case of a character's gaze turning into the image it is forbidden to see.) (ibid. pp. 634-5)

Let us take a closer look at the peephole and shower scene. Obviously the scene is heavily voyeuristic but if we look deeper we see a number of interesting things. The use of the eye, first Norman peeping through the peephole to watch Marion and secondly after the murder of Marion the extreme close-up of her eye tells us a couple of things. First of all when Norman watches Marion she is dressed in "*a black bra and black half-slip, in contrast to the white undergarments of the first scene. She wears the color of her sin – the infamous stolen $40,000. If we stick with this moral framework, as Hitchcock himself did, one might ask about Norman's sinful spying.*" (Greven, 2013, p. 90) If we were to look at the conversations Marion has with Sam and Norman we see they are contrastive of each other. When speaking to Sam as she is getting dressed she says "*We can see each other. We can even have dinner, but respectively. In my house with my mother's picture on the mantle and my sister broil a big steak for three.*" If we compare this conversation with the one she has with Norman we notice that her wish has in some way become true. She wants to have dinner respectively with her mother's picture on the mantle; that is, under the symbolic gaze of authority. Later on when she shares dinner with Norman they move away from the motel room to his parlour. Not only are they being watched by the unseen eyes of the stuffed birds and painting but the parlour is only a stone throw away from the Bates house where Mother is watching over them. This means that Marion had her dream of having a respectable relationship with Sam fulfilled, yet in a more

bizarre way. Marion, who in search of a 'normal' life, is murdered and ceases to exist and becomes 'Norman' instead.

The Motion Picture Production Code in *Peeping Tom*, *Rear Window* and *Psycho*

While Hitchcock was directing films in Hollywood the head of the MPPC was Joseph Breen and the Geoffrey Shurlock. According to Joseph Stefano, the screenwriter of *Psycho*, Hitchcock would be in a constant tussle with the heads of the Production Code as was evident by the fact that the director would film extra scenes or dialogue in his films which he knew the PCA would not accept, in order to keep their minds of the scenes he would want to keep in the final edition of the film. Especially in *Psycho* the head of the Production Code was up in arms because of the risqué dialogue, the amount of sex or allusions toward it and the obvious incestuous relationship between Norman and his mother. The rough cut sent to the PCA would after their objections, such as: "*the word "transvestite." They said, "You cannot use that word." And I said, "Why? It's a scientific word." And they, apparently, had some preconceived notion that this was very dirty, and that I was trying to put one over on them. So we got a dictionary, and it's a man who likes to wear women's clothes*" be edited again and then sent to the cinemas. This was also the case in *Rear Window*. In the first cut of this Jeffries neighbour would appear topless yet this was again just done to divert the PCA's attention to the rest of the film. Hereafter the scene was replaced with an alternative non-topless take. Returning to *Psycho*, once the final edit of the film was ready to be sent to the PCA, it was first screened for Paramount Pictures PCA liaison. According to Peggy Robertson, Hitchcock's assistant, who was present during the screening which unfolded as follows:

> So we start running it and Luigi laughs at Hitch's appearance in the film, which took place in the beginning of the film [...] Then comes the shower sequence. We're all sort of looking on placidly. Luigi: "Stop! Stop! My God!" So Hitch said, "Yes, Luigi, what is it?" Luigi: "I saw her breast." "No, you didn't, Luigi. It's just in your dirty mind. You didn't see a breast at all. Yes, we'll run it again." So we ran it again. "Well,

> Luigi, did you see a breast?" "No, but we're going to be in a lot of trouble with it." [...] We made him realize that he was wrong, that he hadn't seen a breast, that it was a perfectly charming little Sunday afternoon shower sequence, and we sent it off with Luigi to the censor. (The Making of *Psycho*, transcript)

As expected the film received critic by the PCA about the shower scene. Curiously, three of the censors stating they saw nudity while two stated they did not. Hitchcock was returned the film with instruction to remove any sign of nudity from the film. Hitchcock did what you would expect him to do: nothing at all. He sent the same edit of the film to the PCA but this time their roles were reversed – the 3 censors that saw nudity during the first screening now saw no nudity and vice versa with the last 2.

The Production Code were replaced with the MPAA film rating system as the new head of the MPPC Jack Valenti saw the social and civic changes happening in the US. The film industry sought artistic freedoms and thus removed the Hays Code's censorship. According to David Greven:

> While contemporary film studies has more than rightly challenged the Mulvey-model of the heterosexual male gaze in the classical Hollywood cinema, it is undeniably true that, given the strictures of the Production Code, the films of classical Hollywood revolve around – at least, this is their manifest sexual content – the heterosexual desire that ostensibly motivates all film narratives of the period. A number of insurgent factors began to topple this heterosexual reign. The collapse of the studio system in the 1960s, a shift heralded by Hitchcock in his independent, TV-crew-helmed *Psycho*; the increasingly public Cold War threat of homosexuality; the increasing visibility of pornography; and the incipient stirrings of what would become a full-blown, if short-lived, Sexual Revolution all helped to create a postmodern Hollywood as well as viewing subject. Synthesizing or anticipating these shifts and

> tensions, *Psycho* is central to the development of a postmodern masculinity. (Greven, 2013, p. 91)

The changes happening in the US and the continual disregard of directors such as Hitchcock and Powell to the Hays Code helped create more artistic liberty free of censorship.

Conclusion

This paper has analysed and discussed the voyeuristic tendencies in cinema and in ourselves. The first chapter covered the historical and the definitional aspect of fetishism, exhibitionism and scopophilia. These terms were later used in the second chapter that consisted of three films: *Peeping Tom* by Michael Powell, *Rear Window* and *Psycho* by Alfred Hitchcock. These three films were analysed to determine their voyeuristic tendencies as well as the audience's. Some interesting discoveries were made. We noticed that Mark, the protagonist in *Peeping Tom* were a by-product of his childhood which were filled with abuse. This forced him to identify with his father to a point where he would use fear on his victims, as his father did to him. The first scene paints the picture of what we should expect from the film. We are presented with Mark's point of view as he is making his way towards his next victim, the prostitute Dora. We see him exposing himself through the camera as it has a firm grip on him. Mark has gradually ceased to exist spiritually and instead transferred into the camera. The camera tells him what to do and how to do it. The dichotomy between male and female appears as well in this first scene. Mark being the male and thus in power while Dora as the female becomes subjugated to him. Mark's camera, or the audience's connection between them and the film, is presented as the most important aspect in the film. In the scene where Mark kills Vivian we are presented with three different cameras, all of which presents their own point of view. Despite the three cameras we are exposed to Mark's point of view when he finally kills Vivian, making us a part of the brutality.

The second film *Rear Window* follows in many ways the same path of *Peeping Tom*. Obviously there is still a murderer in the film, although he has switched side. Now the protagonist is the prey. L.B. Jeffries, or simply Jeff, is a photographer confined to a wheelchair due to an injury he picked up while photographing. Jeff bored out of his mind begins to spy on his neighbours. During this he discovers one of his neighbours missing and presumes her husband has killed her. Obviously this film is teeming with voyeurism as the former film did. Jeff makes a living by looking at people. Now because of his disability he still looks at people, even though he must break the law in order to do so. The audience is in the same way Jeff is, confined to his apartment. We never move outside the apartment and only see what Jeff sees. The relationship between male and female is a fickle one in *Rear Window*. Jeff is engaged to Lisa yet he does not want to marry because of his audacious lifestyle compared to hers. Yet when Lisa joins forces with Jeff and "become his legs" his perception of her changes. We can compare Jeff to that of the investigative voyeur. His primary weapon in combating the enemy is the camera and his will power goes as far as to breaking the law.

The third and final film *Psycho* sees the almost incestuous relationship between Norman and his mother evolve from a two-sided relationship into a completely one-sided relationship. The use of the eye is constant in the film as it symbolises the gaze, of course, but also the transition of both Marion and Norman; Marion's transition to 'Nor(mal)man' and Norman's transition from being himself half of the times to completely losing himself. The presence, and equally absence, of eyes is present which gives the mother 'the right' to kill as she is not human as the eyes, as Freud mentions, "*the feeling of something uncanny is directly attached to* (…) *the idea of being robbed of one's eyes*." The relationship between Norman and his mother is as if taken directly from the tale of *Oedipus*; Norman being Oedipus who kills his father (or lover in this case) and marries his mother (or developing an extremely close relationship with his mother that bereft Norman of his own personality).

As a final remark I would like to discuss the intrinsic details of our interest in voyeurism. It is simply because it is inherent in us. We enjoy it too much and would not change it. We simply seek entertainment and are willing to spy on others to achieve this. As Brenda S. Gardenour Walter mentioned earlier, "*The consumption of horror films is a multivalent act of voyeurism in which the screen serves as a peephole through which the viewer observes vulnerable bodies imperilled, stripped, parted and penetrated, tortured (...). In the darkened safety of the theatre (...) the voyeur experiences the archetypically male killer's powerful thrill over the objectified and submissive*

archetypical female body." Although this does not represent all film it does however represent the two films being analysed in this paper. We can sit in total silence and darkness and watch other people go on with their lives or lives being mangled and mutilated. It does not make a difference. It is wrong, yet we still do it and as Magnus Hirschfeld so eloquently puts it, "*Every normal person is "a little" scopophile.*"

Bibliography

Journals and Books

Albrechtslund, Anders. "Surveillance and Ethics in Film: Rear Window and The Conversation." *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture* 15.2 (2008): 129-44. Web.

Black, Gregory D. *The Catholic Crusade against the Movies: 1940-1975*. Cambridge U Press, 1998. Print.

Brown, Adam and Chalkley, Tony, "Beautiful, Unethical, Dangerous: Screening Surveillance and Maintaining Insecurities." *Reconstruction: studies in contemporary culture,* 12.3 (2012): 1-12. Web

Denzin, Norman K. *The cinematic society: the voyeur's gaze*. London: Sage Publications, 1995. Print.

Doherty, Thomas. Hollywood's Censor, edited by Thomas Doherty, Columbia University Press, 2007. ProQuest Ebook Central

Doherty, Thomas. "Video, Science Fiction, and the Cinema of Surveillance." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 2.2 (6) (1989): 69-79. Web.

Freud, Sigmund. *Freud - Complete Work*. 2010. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*. Web. <https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=http://www.sigmundfreud.net/three-essays-on-the-theory-of-sexuality.pdf>.

Gartenberg, Jon. "An Eye on Film: The Photographer as Voyeur." *MoMA* 2.4 (1990): 5+22 . Web.

Greven, David. *Psycho-Sexual*: University of Texas Press, 2013. Web.

Hawthorn, Jeremy, 'Morality, voyeurism, and 'point of view': Michael Powell's Peeping Tom (1960), Nordic Journal of English Studies, Vol. 2 No. 2., 2009

Herzog, Todd. "The Banality of Surveillance: Michael Haneke's "Caché" and Life after the End of Privacy." *Modern Austrian Literature* 43.2 (2010): 25-40 *JSTOR*. Association of Austrian Studies. Web.

Hirschfeld, Magnus. *Other Partial Impulses*. *Curtin University*. Web. 1 Dec. 2016.

Hultkrans, A. (2006). Surveillance in the cinema: here's looking at you, kid. Retrieved September 26, 2016, from http://www.stim.com/Stim-x/7.1/SurvFilms/SurvFilms.html

Kammerer, Dietmar. "Video Surveillance in Hollywood Movies." *Surveillance and Society* 2.2 (2004): 464-473. Web.

Levin, C. T. Y. (2002). Rhetoric of the Temporal Index: Surveillant Narration and the Cinema of "Real Time". In T. Y. Levin, U. Frohne & P. Weibel (Eds.), *CTRL [Space]*. *Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother* (pp. 578-593). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Liu, Catherine. "The Wall, the Window and the Alcove: Visualizing Privacy." *Surveillance and Society* 9.1 (2011): 203-214. Web.

Lyon, David, Kevin D. Haggerty, and Kirstie Ball. *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Långström, Niklas, and Michael C. Seto. "Exhibitionistic and Voyeuristic Behavior in a Swedish National Population Survey." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 35.4 (2006): 427-35. Web.

Mashon, Mike, and Bell, James. "Pre-code Hollywood." *Sight and Sound* 24.5 (2014): 20-26 *ProQuest*

Metzl, Jonathan M. "From scopophilia to Survivor: A brief history of voyeurism." *Textual Practice* 18.3 (2004): 415-34. *Taylor Francis Online*. Web.

Mulvey, Laura. (1999) "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings.* Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP: 833-44.

Norris, Clive, and Gary Armstrong. *The maximum surveillance society: the rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg, 1999. Print.

Padva, Gilad, and Nurit Buchweitz, eds. *Sensational pleasures in cinema, literature and visual culture: the phallic eye*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. Print.

Perlmutter, Ruth. "Rear Window: A "Construction-Story"" *Journal of Film and Video* 37.2 (1985): 53-65. Web.

Rule, J. B. (1973). *Private lives and public surveillance*. London: Allen Lane.

Sandis, Constantine. "Hitchcock's Conscious Use of Freud's Unconscious ." *Europe's Journal of Psychology* (2009): 56-81. Web.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice In Psychoanalysis and Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana U Press, 1988. Print.

Smithsimon, Molly. "Private Lives, Public Spaces." *Dissent* 50.1 (2003) 43-49. *Academic Search Premier*. Web.

Stekel, Wilhelm. *SEXUAL ABERRATIONS: The Phenomena of Fetishism in Relation to Sex*. London: Vision Limited, Web. 2 Dec. 2016.

Stewart, Garrett. "Surveillance Cinema." *Film Quarterly* 66.2 (2012): 5-15. *JSTOR*. University of California Press. Web.

Wollen, Peter. *DYING FOR ART* Sight and Sound; Vol. 4 No. 12 Screen Studies Collection, 1994

Zimmer, Catherine. "Surveillance and Social Memory: "Strange Days" Indeed." *Discourse* 32.3 (2010): 302-20. *JSTOR*. Wayne State University Press. Web.

Zimmer, Catherine. *Surveillance cinema*. New York: New York U Press, 2015. Print.

Zimmer, Catherine. "Surveillance Cinema: Narrative between Technology and Politics." *Surveillance & Society* 8.4 (2011): 427-40. Web.

Films and videos

AcademicChannel1, 'PeepingTom-Mulvey.mov'. Online video clip. YouTube. YouTube, 22. Nov. 2009. Web. 31 Dec 2016

Is This Just Fantasy?, 'Understanding Psycho: The Uncanny'. Online video clip. YouTube. YouTube, 1. Aug. 2016. Web. 6. June 2017

Peeping Tom. Dir. Michael Powell. Perf. Karlheinz Böhm, Anna Massey, Moira Shearer. Anglo-Amalgamated Film Distributors , 1960. DVD.

Psycho. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock. Perf. Anthony Perkins and Janet Leigh. Paramount Pictures, 1960. DVD.

Rear window. Dir. Alfred Hitchcock. Perf. James Stewart and Grace Kelly. Paramount, 1954. DVD.

The Making of Psycho. *Psycho*. 1997. Web. 06 June 2017. Transcript.

Websites

Brooks, Xan. "The Peeping Tom timebomb." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media, 18 Nov. 2010. Web. 02 Jan. 2017.

Canby, Vincent. "Film: Michael Powell's 'Peeping Tom':The Cast." *The New York Times*. 14 Oct. 1979. Web. 02 Jan. 2017.

Gritten, David. "Michael Powell's 'Peeping Tom': the film that killed a career." *The Telegraph*. Telegraph Media Group, 27 Aug. 2010. Web. 02 Jan. 2017.

Mulvey, Laura. "Peeping Tom." *The Criterion Collection*. N.p., 15 Nov. 1999. Web. 02 Jan. 2017.

The Independent. Independent Digital News and Media, n.d. Web. 02 Jan. 2017. <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/film-its-the-critics-prerogative-to-change-their-minds-1295870.html>.

"Watch out! Peeping Tom's about." *Evening Standard*. N.p., 12 Nov. 2012. Web. 02 Jan. 2017.

Appendix:

THE PRODUCTION CODE

Motion picture producers recognize the high trust and confidence which have been placed in them by the people of the world and which have made motion pictures a universal form of entertainment. They recognize their responsibility to the public because of this trust and because entertainment and art are important influences in the life of a nation. Hence, though regarding motion pictures primarily as entertainment without any explicit purpose of teaching or propaganda, they know that the motion picture within its own field of entertainment may be directly responsible for spiritual or moral progress, for higher types of social life, and for much correct thinking. During the rapid transition from silent to talking pictures they realized the necessity and the opportunity of subscribing to a Code to govern the production of talking pictures and of re-acknowledging this responsibility. On their part, they ask from the public and from the public leaders a sympathetic understanding of their purposes and problems and a spirit of cooperation that will allow them the freedom and opportunity necessary to bring the motion picture to a still higher level of wholesome entertainment for all the people.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1. No picture shall be produced which will lower the moral standards of those who see it. Hence the sympathy of the audience shall never be thrown to the side of crime, wrongdoing, evil or sin.

2. Correct standards of life, subject only to the requirements of drama and entertainment, shall be presented.

3. Law, natural or human, shall not be ridiculed, nor shall sympathy be created for its violation. PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS I. CRIMES AGAINST THE LAW These shall never again be presented in such a way as to throw sympathy with the crime as against law and justice or to inspire others with a desire for imitation. 1. Murder 2. a. The technique of murder must be presented in a way that will not inspire imitation. b. Brutal killings are not to be presented in detail. c. Revenge in modern times shall not be justified. Methods of Crime should not be explicitly presented. a. Theft, robbery, safe-cracking, and dynamiting of trains, mines, buildings, etc., should not be detailed in method. b. Arson must be subject to the same safeguards. c. The use of firearms should be restricted to essentials. The illegal drug traffic, and drug addiction, must never be presented.

II. SEX The sanctity of the institution of marriage and the home shall be upheld. Pictures shall not infer that low forms of sex relationship are the accepted or common thing. 1. Adultery and Illicit Sex , sometimes necessary plot material, must not be explicitly treated, or justified, or presented attractively. 2. Scenes of Passion a. These should not be introduced except when they are definitely essential to the plot. b. Excessive and lustful kissing, lustful embraces, suggestive postures and gestures are not to be shown. c. In general, passion should be treated in such manner as not to stimulate the lower and baser emotions. 3. Seduction or Rape a. These should never be more than suggested, and then only when essential for the plot. They must never be shown by explicit method. b. They are never the proper subject for comedy. Sex perversion or any inference of it is forbidden. White slavery shall not be treated. Abortion, sex hygiene and venereal diseases are not proper subjects for theatrical motion pictures. 2 Scenes of actual child birth , in fact or in silhouette, are never to be presented. Children's sex organs are never to be exposed.

III. VULGARITY The treatment of low, disgusting, unpleasant, though not necessarily evil, subjects, should be guided always by the dictates of good taste and a proper regard for the sensibilities of the audience.

IV. OBSCENITY Obscenity in word, gesture, reference, song, joke, or by suggestion (even when likely to be understood only by part of the audience) is forbidden. V. PROFANITY Pointed profanity and every other profane or vulgar expression, however used, are forbidden. No approval by the Production Code Administration shall be given to the use of words and phrases in motion pictures including, but not limited to, the following: " Bronx Cheer " (the sound) Chippie, God, Lord, Jesus, Christ (unless used reverently) Nuts (except when meaning crazy) Cripes, Madam (relating to prostitution) Nance, Fairy (in a vulgar sense) Finger (the) Fire —cries of Gawd Goose (in a vulgar sense) Hot (as applied to a woman) Toilet Gags "In your hat" Pansy Razzberry (the sound) S.O.B . Son-of-a, Tart, Whore.

In the administration of Section V of the Production Code, the Production Code Administration may take cognizance of the fact that the following words and phrases are obviously offensive to the patrons of motion pictures in the United States and more particularly to the patrons of motion pictures in foreign countries: Chink, Dago, Frog, Greaser, Hunkie, Kike, Nigger, Spic, Wop, Yid. It should also be noted that the words "hell" and "damn," if used without moderation, will be considered offensive by many members of the audience. Their use, therefore, should be governed by the discretion and the prudent advice of the Code Administration.

VI. COSTUMES 1. Complete nudity is never permitted. This includes nudity in fact or in silhouette, or any licentious notice thereof by other characters in the picture. Undressing scenes should be avoided, and never used save where essential to the plot. Indecent or undue exposure is forbidden. Dancing costumes intended to permit undue exposure or indecent movements in the dance are forbidden.

VII. DANCES 1. Dances suggesting or representing sexual actions or indecent passion are forbidden. 2. Dances which emphasize indecent movements are to be regarded as obscene.

VIII. RELIGION 1. No film or episode may throw ridicule on any religious faith. 2. Ministers of religion in their character as ministers of religion should not be used as comic characters or as villains. 3. Ceremonies of any definite religion should be carefully and respectfully handled.

IX. LOCATIONS The treatment of bedrooms must be governed by good taste and delicacy.

X. NATIONAL FEELINGS 1. The use of the Flag shall be consistently respectful. 2. The history, institutions, prominent people and citizenry of all nations shall be represented fairly.

XI. TITLES The following titles shall not be used: 3 1. Titles which are salacious, indecent, obscene, profane, or vulgar. 2. Titles which suggest or are currently associated in the public mind with material, characters or occupations unsuitable for the screen. 3. Titles which are otherwise objectionable.

XII. SPECIAL SUBJECTS The following subjects must be treated within the careful limits of good taste. Actual hangings or electrocutions as legal punishments for crime. Third degree methods. Brutality and possible gruesomeness. The sale of women, or a woman selling her virtue. Surgical operations. Miscegenation. Liquor and drinking.

SPECIAL REGULATIONS ON CRIME IN MOTION PICTURES RESOLVED (December 20, 1938), that the Board of Directors of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., hereby ratifies, approves and confirms the interpretations of The Production Code, the practices thereunder, and the resolutions indicating and confirming such interpretations heretofore adopted by the Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., all effectuating regulations relative to the treatment of crime in motion pictures, as follows: 1. Details of crime must never be shown and care should be exercised at all times in discussing such details. 2. Action suggestive of wholesale slaughter of human beings, either by criminals in conflict with police, or as between warring factions of criminals, or in public disorder of any kind, will not be allowed. 3. There must be no suggestion, at any time, of excessive brutality. 4. Because of the increase in the number of films in which murder is frequently committed, action showing the taking of human life, even in the mystery stories, is to be cut to the minimum. These frequent presentations of murder tend to lessen regard for the sacredness for life. 5. Suicide, as a solution of problems occurring in the development of screen drama, is to be discouraged as morally questionable and as bad theatre— unless absolutely necessary for the development of the plot. It should never be justified or glorified, or used to defeat the due process of law. 6. There must be no display, at any time, of machine guns, sub-machine guns or other weapons generally classified as illegal weapons in the hands of gangsters, or other criminals, and there are to be no off-stage sounds of the repercussions of these guns. There must be no new, unique or trick methods shown for concealing guns. The flaunting of weapons by

gangsters, or other criminals, will not be allowed. All discussions and dialogue on the part of gangsters regarding guns should be cut to the minimum. There must be no scenes, at any time, showing law-enforcing officers dying at the hands of criminals unless such scenes are absolutely necessary to the development of the plot. This includes private detectives and guards for banks, motor trucks, etc. 5 11. With special reference to the crime of kidnapping— or illegal abduction— such stories are acceptable under the Code only when: (a) the kidnapping or abduction is not the main theme of the story; (b) the person kidnapped is not a child; (c) there are no details of the crime of kidnapping; (d) no profit accrues to the abductors or kidnappers; and (e) where the kidnappers are punished. It is understood and agreed that the word kidnapping as used in paragraph (11) of these Regulations, is intended to mean abduction, or illegal detention, in modern times, by criminals for ransom. 12. Pictures dealing with criminal activism in which minors participate, or to which minors are related, shall not be approved if they incite demoralizing imitation on the part of youth. 13. No picture shall be approved dealing with the life of a notorious criminal of current or recent times which uses the name, nickname, or alias of such notorious criminal in the film, nor shall a picture be approved if based upon the life of such a notorious criminal unless the character shown in the film be punished for crimes shown in the film as committed by him.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION ON COSTUMES On October 25, 1939, the Board of Directors of the Motion Picture Association of America Inc., adopted the following resolution: RESOLVED that the provisions of Paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of Sub-Division VI of the Production Code, in their application to costumes, nudity, indecent or undue exposure, and dancing costumes, shall not be interpreted to exclude authentically photographed scenes photographed in a foreign land, of natives of such foreign land, showingnative life, if such scenes are a necessary and integral part of a motion picture depicting exclusively such land and native life, provided that no such scenes shall be intrinsically objectionable nor made a part of any motion picture produced in any studio, and provided further that no emphasis shall be made in any scenes of the customs or garb of such natives or in the exploitation thereof.

SPECIAL REGULATIONS ON CRUELTY TO ANIMALS On December 27, 1940, the Board of Directors of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., approved a resolution adopted by the Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., reaffirming previous resolutions of the California Association concerning brutality and possible gruesomeness and apparent cruelty to animals: RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., that

(1) Hereafter, in the production of motion pictures there shall be no use by the members of the Association of the contrivance or apparatus in connection with animals which is known as the "running W",* nor shall any picture submitted to the Production Code Administration be approved if reasonable grounds exist for believing that use of any similar device by the producer of such picture resulted in apparent cruelty to animals; and (2) Hereafter, in the production of motion pictures by the members of the Association, such members shall, as to any picture involving the use of animals, invite on the lot during such shooting and consult with the authorized representative of the American Humane Association; and (3) Steps shall be taken immediately by the members of the Association and by the Production Code Administration to require compliance with these resolutions, which shall bear the same relationship to the sections of the Production Code quoted herein as the Association's special regulations re: Crime in Motion Pictures bear to the sections of the Production Code dealing therewith; and it is FURTHER RESOLVED, that the resolutions of February 19, 1925, and all other resolutions this establishing its policy to prevent all cruelty to animals in the production of motion pictures determination to prevent any such cruelty, be the same and hereby are in all respects reaffirmed. Theatrical motion pictures, that is, pictures intended for the theatre as distinct from pictures intended for churches, schools, lecture halls, educational movements, social reform movements, etc., are primarily to be regarded as ENTERTAINMENT. Mankind has always recognized the importance of entertainment and its value in rebuilding the bodies and souls of human beings. But it has always recognized that entertainment can be a character either HELPFUL or HARMFUL to the human race, and in consequence has clearly distinguished between: a. Entertainment which tends to improve the race, or at least to re-create and rebuild human beings exhausted with the realities of life; and b. Entertainment which tends to degrade human beings, or to lower their standards of life and living. Hence the MORAL IMPORTANCE of entertainment is something which has been universally recognized. It enters intimately into the lives of men and women and affects them closely; it occupies their minds and affections during leisure hours; and ultimately touches the whole of their lives. A man may be judged by his standard of entertainment as easily as by the standard of his work. So correct entertainment raises the whole standard of a nation. Wrong entertainment lowers the whole living conditions and moral ideas of a race. Note, for example, the healthy reactions to healthful sports, like baseball, golf; the unhealthy reactions to sports like cockfighting, bullfighting, bear baiting, etc. Note, too, the effect on ancient nations of gladiatorial combats, the obscene plays of Roman times, etc. 2. Motion pictures are very important as ART. Though a new art, possibly a combination art, it

has the same object as the other arts, the presentation of human thought, emotion, and experience, in terms of an appeal to the soul through the senses. Here, as in entertainment, Art enters intimately into the lives of human beings. Art can be morally good, lifting men to higher levels. This has been done through good music, great painting, authentic fiction, poetry, drama. Art can be morally evil in its effects. This is the case clearly enough with unclean art, indecent books, suggestive drama. The effect on the lives of men and women is obvious. Note: It has often been argued that art in itself is unmoral, neither good nor bad. This is perhaps true of the THING which is music, painting, poetry, etc. But the thing is the PRODUCT of some person's mind and the intention of that mind was either good or bad morally when it produced the thing. Besides the thing it has its EFFECT upon those who come into contact with it. In both these ways, that is, a product of a mind and as the cause of definite effects, it has a deep moral significance and an unmistakable moral quality. Hence: The motion pictures, which are the most popular of modern arts for the masses, have their moral quality from the intention of the minds which produce them and from their effects on the moral lives and reactions of their audiences. This gives them a most important morality. 1. They reproduce the morality of the men who use the pictures as a medium for the expression of their ideas and ideals. 2. They affect the moral standards of those who, through the screen, take in these ideas and ideals. In the case of the motion pictures, this effect may be particularly emphasized because no art has so quick and so widespread an appeal to the masses. It has become in an incredibly short period the art of the multitudes. 3. The motion picture, because of its importance as entertainment and because of the trust placed in it by the peoples of the world, has special MORAL OBLIGATIONS: A. Most arts appeal to the mature. This art appeals at once to every class, mature, immature, developed, undeveloped, law abiding, criminal. Music has its grades for different classes; so have literature and drama. This art of the motion picture, combining as it does the two fundamental appeals of looking at a picture and listening to a story at once reaches every class of society. B. By reason of the mobility of a film and the ease of picture distribution, and because of the possibility of duplicating positives in large quantities, this art reaches places unpenetrated by other forms of art. C. Because of these two facts, it is difficult to produce films intended for only certain classes of people. The exhibitor's theatres are built for the masses, for the cultivated and the rude, the mature and the immature, the self-respecting and the criminal. Films, unlike books and music, can with difficulty be confined to certain selected groups. D. The latitude given to film material cannot, in consequence, be as wide as the latitude given to book material. In addition: a. A book describes; a film vividly presents. One presents on a cold page; the other by apparently living people. b. A book

reaches the mind through words merely; a film reaches the eyes and ears through the reproduction of actual events. c. The reaction of a reader to a book depends largely on the keenness of the reader's imagination; the reaction to a film depends on the vividness of presentation. Hence many things which might be described or suggested in a book could not possibly be presented in a film. E. This is also true when comparing the film with the newspaper. a. Newspapers present by description, films by actual presentation. b. Newspapers are after the fact and present things as having taken place; the film gives the events in the process of enactment and with the apparent reality of life. F. Everything possible in a play is not possible in a film. a. Because of the larger audience of the film , and its consequential mixed character. Psychologically, the larger the audience, the lower the moral mass resistance to suggestion. b. Because through light, enlargement of character, presentation, scenic emphasis, etc., the screen story is brought closer to the audience than the play. c. The enthusiasm for an interest in film actors and actresses, developed beyond anything of the sort in history, makes the audience largely sympathetic toward the characters they portray and the stories in which they figure. Hence the audience is more ready to confuse actor and actress and the characters they portray, and it is most receptive of the emotions and ideals presented by their favorite stars. G. Small communities, remote from sophistication and from the hardening process which often takes place in the ethical and moral standards of groups in larger cities, are easily and readily reached by any sort of film. H. The grandeur of mass settings, large action, spectacular features, etc., affects and arouses more intensely the emotional side of the audience. In general, the mobility, popularity, accessibility, emotional appeal, vividness, straight-forward presentation of fact in the film make for more intimate contact with a larger audience and for greater emotional appeal. Hence the larger moral responsibilities of the motion pictures.

REASONS UNDERLYING THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES1. No picture shall be produced which will lower the moral standards of those who see it. Hence the sympathy of the audience should never be thrown to the side of crime, wrongdoing, evil or sin. This is done: 1. When evil is made to appear attractive or alluring , and good is made to appear unattractive . 2. When the sympathy of the audience is thrown on the side of crime, wrongdoing, evil, sin. The same thing is true of a film that would throw sympathy against goodness, honor, innocence, purity or honesty. NOTE: Sympathy with a person who sins is not the same the same as sympathy with the sin or crime of which he is guilty. We may feel sorry for the plight of the murderer or even understand the circumstances which led him to his crime. We may not feel sympathy with the wrong which he has done. The presentation of evil is often essential for the art or fiction or drama. This in itself is not wrong

provided: a. That evil is not presented alluringly. Even if later in the film the evil is condemned or punished, it must not be allowed to appear so attractive that the audience's emotions are drawn to desire or approve so strongly that later the condemnation is forgotten and only the apparent joy of the sin remembered. b. That throughout, the audience feels sure that evil is wrong and good is right . 2. Correct standards of life shall, as far as possible, be presented. A wide knowledge of life and of living is made possible through the film. When right standards are consistently presented, the motion picture exercises the most powerful influences. It builds character, develops right ideals, inculcates correct principles, and all this in attractive story form. If motion pictures consistently hold up for admiration high types of characters and present stories that will affect lives for the better, they can become the most powerful natural force for the improvement of mankind. 3. Law, natural or human, shall not be ridiculed, nor shall sympathy be created for its violation. By natural law is understood the law which is written in the hearts of all mankind, the great underlying principles of right and justice dictated by conscience. By human law is understood the law written by civilized nations. 1. The presentation of crimes against the law is often necessary for the carrying out of the plot. But the presentation must not throw sympathy with the crime as against the law nor with the criminal as against those who punish him. 2. The courts of the land should not be presented as unjust. This does not mean that a single court may not be represented as unjust, much less that a single court official must not be presented this way. But the court system of the country must not suffer as a result of this presentation.

REASONS UNDERLYING PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS 1. Sin and evil enter into the story of human beings and hence in themselves are valid dramatic material. 2. In the use of this material, it must be distinguished between sins which repel by their very nature, and sins which often attract. a. In the first class come murder, most theft, many legal crimes, lying, hypocrisy, cruelty, etc. b. In the second class come sex sins, sins and crimes of apparent heroism, such as banditry, daring thefts, leadership in evil, organized crime, revenge, etc. The first class needs far less care in treatment, as sins and crimes of this class are naturally unattractive. The audience instinctively condemns all such and is repelled. Hence the important objective must be to avoid the hardening of the audience, especially of those who are young and impressionable, to the thought and fact of crime. People can become accustomed even to murder, cruelty, brutality and repellent crimes, if these are too frequently repeated. The second class needs great care in handling, as the response of human nature to their appeal is obvious. This is treated more fully below. 3. A careful distinction can be made between films intended for general distribution, and films intended for use in theatres restricted to a

limited audience. Themes and plots quite appropriate for the latter would be altogether out of place and dangerous in the former. NOTE: The practice of using a general theatre and limiting its patronage during the showing of a certain film to "Adults Only" is not completely satisfactory and is only partially effective. However, maturer minds may easily understand and accept without harm younger people positive harm. Hence: If there should be created a special type of theatre, catering exclusively to an adult audience, for plays of this character (plays with problem themes, difficult discussions and maturer treatment) it would seem to afford outlet, which does not now exist, for pictures unsuitable for general distribution but permissible for exhibitions to a restricted audience.

CRIMES AGAINST THE LAW The treatment of crimes against the law must not: Teach methods of crime. Inspire potential criminals with a desire for imitation. Make criminals seem heroic and justified. Revenge in modern times shall not be justified. In lands and ages of less developed civilization and moral principles, revenge may sometimes be presented. This would be the case especially in places where no law exists to cover the crime because of which revenge is committed. Because of its evil consequences, the drug traffic should not be presented in any form. The existence of the trade should not be brought to the attention of the audiences.

II. SEX Out of regard for the sanctity of marriage and the home, the triangle , that is, the love of a third party for one already married, needs careful handling. The treatment should not throw sympathy against marriage as an institution. Scenes of passion must be treated with an honest acknowledgement of human nature and its normal reactions. Many scenes cannot be presented without arousing dangerous emotions on the part of the immature, the young or the criminal classes. Even within the limits of pure love, certain facts have been universally regarded by lawmakers as outside the limits of safe presentation. In the case of impure love, the love which society has always regarded as wrong and which has been banned by divine law, the following are important: 1. Impure love must not be presented as attractive and beautiful. 2. It must not be the subject of comedy or farce or treated as material for laughter. 3. It must not be presented in such a way as to arouse passion or morbid curiosity on the part of the audience. 4. It must not be made to seem right and permissible. 5. In general, it must not be detailed in method and manner. III. Vulgarity; IV. Obscenity; V. Profanity Hardly need further explanation than is contained in the Code.

VI. COSTUMES General principles: 1. The effect of nudity or semi-nudity upon the normal man or woman, and much more upon the young and upon immature persons, has been honestly recognized by all lawmakers and moralists. 2. Hence the fact that the nude or semi-nude body may be beautiful

does not make its use in the films moral. For, in addition to its beauty, the effect of the nude or semi-nude body on the normal individual must be taken into consideration. 3. Nudity or semi-nudity used simply to put a "punch" into a picture comes under the head of immoral actions. It is immoral in its effect on the average audience. 4. Nudity can never be permitted as being necessary for the plot. Semi-nudity must not result in undue or indecent exposure. 5. Transparent or translucent materials and silhouette are frequently more suggestive than actual exposure.

VII. DANCES Dancing in general is recognized as an art and as a beautiful form of expressing human emotions. But dances which suggest or represent sexual actions, whether performed solo or with two or more, dances intended to excite the emotional reaction of an audience, dances with movement of the breasts, excessive body movements while the feet are stationary, violate decency and are wrong. VIII. RELIGION The reason why ministers of religion may not be comic characters or villains is simply because the attitude taken toward them may easily become the attitude taken toward religion in general. Religion is lowered in the minds of the audience because of the lowering of the audience's respect for a minister.

IX. LOCATIONS Certain places are so closely and thoroughly associated with sexual life or with sexual sin that their use must be carefully limited.

X. NATIONAL FEELINGS The just rights, history, and feelings of any nation are entitled to most careful consideration and respectful treatment.

XI. TITLES As the title of a picture is the brand on that particular type of goods, it must conform to the ethical practices of all such honest business.

XII. SPECIAL SUBJECTS Such subjects are occasionally necessary for the plot. Their treatment must never offend good taste nor injure the sensibilities of an audience. The use of liquor should never be excessively presented. In scenes from American life, the necessities of the plot and proper characterization alone justify its use. And in this case, it should be shown with moderation.

RESOLUTION FOR UNIFORM INTERPRETATION as amended June 13, 1934. When requested by production managers, the Motion Picture Association of America, Incorporated, shall secure any facts, information or suggestions concerning the probable reception of stories or the manner in which in its opinion they may best be treated. Each production manager shall submit in confidence a copy of each or any script to the Production Code Administration of the Motion Picture

Association of America, Incorporated (and of the Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., California). The Production Code Administration will give the production manager for his guidance such confidential advice and suggestions as experience, research, and information indicate, designating wherein from experience or knowledge it is believed that exception will be taken to the story or treatment. Each production manager of a company belonging to the Motion Picture Association of America, Incorporated, and any producer proposing to distribute and/or distributing his picture through the facilities of any member of the Motion Picture Association of America, Incorporated, shall submit to such Production Code Administration every picture he produces before the negative goes to the laboratory for printing. Said Production Code Administration, having seen the picture, shall inform the production manager in writing whether in its opinion the picture conforms or does not conform to the Code, stating specifically wherein either by theme, treatment or incident, the picture violates the provisions of the Code. In such latter event, the picture shall not be released until the changes indicated by the Production Code Administration have been made; provided, however, that the production manager may appeal from such opinion of said Production Code Administration, so indicated in writing, to the Board of Directors of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., whose finding shall be final, and such production manager and company shall be governed accordingly. 3.