

**"Every time we fuck, we win": The Public Sphere  
of Queer, Feminist, and Lesbian Porn  
as a (Safe) Space for Sexual Empowerment**

INGRID RYBERG

**Ingrid Ryberg** is the director of the drag king documentary *Drag-kingdom of Sweden* (2002), the lesbian short *Phone Fuck* (2009), one of the shorts in the Swedish feminist porn film collection *Dirty Diaries*, with Mia Engberg (2009). She has published articles in academic journals, such as *Film International*, *Montage AV*, and *Frauen und Film*, and regularly writes for the Swedish movie magazine *FLM*. In 2012 she defended her doctoral thesis, "Imagining Safe Space: The Politics and Ethics of Queer, Feminist, and Lesbian Pornography," in the Department of Media Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Launched in 2006, the Pornfilmfestival Berlin has become a central arena for the current queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture. Though the festival has hosted guests such as Candida Royalle and Shine Louise Houston and workshops on feminist porn and safer sex since its inception, the audience for the festival is quite mixed. When I attended the festival in October 2010, I had a deeply ambivalent experience. I went to see the film *Much More Pussy* by the French director Emilie Jovet, one of the prominent figures in the current wave of queer, feminist, and lesbian porn in Europe and North America. *Much More Pussy* is the second film Jovet made that documents the burlesque performance "The Queer X Show," where a group of seven sex-radical women toured Europe in a minibus during the summer of 2009. While the first film *Too Much Pussy: Feminist Sluts in The Queer X Show* focuses on the performances and discussions among the seven women, the second film, *Much More Pussy*, focuses more on the sexual encounters that occurred during their tour. I had attended "The Queer X Show" when they performed in Stockholm in August 2009 and was excited to see what Jovet had made of the footage documenting the tour.

During the screening something occurred that forced me to grapple with the simultaneous experience of pleasure and danger involved in

porn spectatorship for women. As I will discuss later, this incident made me powerfully aware of how there can be no simple equation between queer, feminist, and lesbian pornography and empowerment. In this article, I intend to unravel some of the issues at stake in queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture and struggles for sexual empowerment. I draw on ethnographic fieldwork in European porn production and exhibition contexts, specifically the Pornfilmfestival Berlin screening of *Much More Pussy*. I argue that this film culture may act as both a *counter public* and an *intimate public* space for queer, feminist, and lesbian subjects, and that it is in the tensions and dynamic transactions between these notions of publicness that the potential for a safe space can be both located and undermined. Importantly, empowerment is not an issue of individual agency. Rather, it is an ongoing and collective process of negotiating the norms that both surround and incorporate us. I claim that this continuous, collective negotiation can potentially make queer, feminist, and lesbian pornography a safe space for sexual empowerment for women and queer people.

#### Claiming Public Space for Queer, Feminist, and Lesbian Sexual Discourse

"The Queer X Show" and the Pornfilmfestival Berlin are two examples of the contemporary queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture as it has emerged in Europe over the last decade. Other examples are the Post Porn Politics Symposium held in Berlin in October 2006 (hosting guests such as Annie Sprinkle), Paris Porn Film Fest launched in 2009, the performance collective Girls Who Like Porno in Barcelona (2003–2007), and the Swedish feminist porn collection *Dirty Diaries: Twelve Shorts of Feminist Porn* (Engberg, 2009), for which I directed the lesbian short *Phone Fuck* (Ryberg, 2009). The emergence of this film culture in Europe is closely related to and overlapping with North American examples such as the Feminist Porn Awards in Toronto (2006–) and the Good Vibrations Independent Erotic Film Festival in San Francisco (2005–). San Francisco-based filmmakers such as Shine Louise Houston, Courtney Trouble, and Madison Young are frequent guests at the Pornfilmfestival Berlin and "The Queer X Show," which gathers sex-radical women from France, Germany, and from the United States.

In the *Too Much Pussy* press release on Facebook, explicit reference was made to American "pro-sex" feminists such as Annie Sprinkle, Candida Royale, and Carol Queen; it positioned the performers in "The

Queer X Show” as new actors in the same revolution to playfully affirm sexuality and reinvent new representations of desire and pleasure.<sup>1</sup> In the early 1980s, Sprinkle made *Deep Inside Annie Sprinkle*, and Royale formed the production company Femme Productions, ushering in a new era of porn from the point of view of women. Lesbian sex videos also started to be produced by companies such as Fatale Media. Both Femme Productions and Fatale Media were examples of sex-radical activism in the then-ongoing, heated feminist debates known as the sex wars. In these debates, issues such as pornography, sadomasochism, and lesbian butch/femme roles became a dividing line between sex radicals and cultural feminists.<sup>2</sup> In cultural feminism, women’s sexuality was seen as radically different from male models of genital and penetrative sex.<sup>3</sup> Lesbian porn challenged this framing of female sexuality as intimate, nurturing, and reciprocal, and celebrated sex roles and acts considered antifeminist and patriarchal (in the antiporn discourse) such as butch/femme, rough sex, and penetration with dildos.<sup>4</sup> Lesbian porn also appropriated mainstream hardcore conventions like the money shot, the meat shot, and the principle of maximum visibility.<sup>5</sup>

The sex wars changed the feminist landscape for good, and it is a crucial context for understanding the contemporary feminist, queer, and lesbian porn film culture. But the story of the sex wars is also a story often told and, as argued by Clare Hemmings, forms part of a developmental narrative structuring the feminist past as decade specific, as a progression from the essentialist 1970s to a more refined understanding of differences in the 1990s and 2000s.<sup>6</sup> In accordance with Hemmings’s call for a conceptualization of the feminist past “as a series of ongoing contests and relationships rather than a process of imagined linear displacement,” I propose a more nuanced understanding of queer, feminist, and lesbian porn.<sup>7</sup> Focusing too much on the dividing line between cultural feminism and sex radicalism, one misses important overlaps, intertexts, notions, and features within this film culture. As Chris Straayer argues in her chronicling of lesbian sexual representations in film and video, the ideologies of both cultural feminism and “pro-sex” lesbians “frequently intersect in independent video,” where women’s struggle for sexual agency, self-definition, and empowerment prevails as a central concern.<sup>8</sup>

This film culture also builds on the second-wave feminist tradition of consciousness-raising groups as safe spaces for empowerment. These spaces were shaped by the idea that, through sharing and learning from one another’s experiences of oppression and explorations of one’s body

and sexuality, women become more self-confident and autonomous. Jane Gerhard contends that before second-wave radical feminism had fractured into different interests, groups, and sexual agendas during the 1970s, sexual pleasure was framed as the key to liberation and became synonymous with empowerment and self-determination.<sup>9</sup> The impulses of both antiporn critique and sex radicalism coexisted in radical feminism in the late 1960s and early 1970s and "resulted in a productive moment of activism" where sexual pleasure was claimed as every woman's right.<sup>10</sup> One example of this activism is the Boston Women's Health Collective classic *Our Bodies, Ourselves*. Describing their experiences of empowerment in coming together and sharing and learning about their bodies, they write:

For us, body education is core education. Our bodies are the physical bases from which we move out into the world; ignorance, uncertainty—even, at worst, shame—about our physical selves create in us an alienation from ourselves that keeps us from being the whole people that we could be.

As we managed to be more trusting with each other we found that talking about ourselves and our sexuality can be very liberating. . . . [W]ith each other's support, we have become more accepting of our sexuality, and we have begun to explore aspects of ourselves that we hadn't thought much about before. . . . We are learning to define our sexuality in our own terms. . . . Our sexuality is complex because it involves physical, psychological, emotional, and political factors.<sup>11</sup>

Looking again at "The Queer X Show," it is possible to see how it inscribes itself into this second-wave feminist tradition of women's groups, consciousness-raising, and the politics of sexual pleasure. Moreover, in the two films about "The Queer X Show," the intimate dialogue and knowledge production within this group of women is central, evident also in their blog, where the performer Mad Kate wrote:

What I appreciate most about this tour so far is the privilege and comfort of being surrounded by incredibly wonderful queer women; our ability to have these amazing conversations and not to feel like any of my opinions or feelings are wrong or illegitimate.

I am familiar with a school of thought that believes sexual desire is superfluous, that these are the things that can and should be repressed and reconsidered, or that sexual freedom is luxury or even childish. But I can't agree; freedom to express one's self sexually

is tied into every freedom of expression of the body, from speech to basic needs like eating and sleeping. When we don't have the rope around us we suddenly realize just how much easier we can breathe.<sup>12</sup>

Like second-wave feminist activism around issues of sexual pleasure, the contemporary queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture constructs public arenas for feminist discourses on sexuality. Lynn Comella highlights how the NOW Conference on Female Sexuality in New York in 1973 anticipated the Barnard Conference in 1982 in "[creating] a public space for women to come together and talk openly about their sexuality at a time when women had few opportunities to do so."<sup>13</sup> As Jane Juffer points out, women's access to public discourses on sexuality, such as the masturbation discourse in feminist literature of the 1970s, altered the conditions for, not just material, but also mental access to their own bodies and sexual pleasure.<sup>14</sup> Women's sexual organs, including the clitoris and cervix, menstruation, and masturbation, were celebrated in consciousness-raising groups and literature, as well as in the artwork of Judy Chicago and Carolee Schneemann and in the films by Barbara Hammer and Anne Sevrerson.<sup>15</sup> In her blog entry Mad Kate describes how the participants in the show, at an early stage of the tour, examine their cervixes together. In "The Queer X Show" the practice of cervix examination was also performed on stage by the sex educator and performer Sadie Lune, echoing both Annie Sprinkle's public cervix announcements in the 1990s, and the opening up of public discourse and space for feminist consciousness-raising around sexuality in the 1970s.

Such reclaiming of public space is also invoked in a number of the shorts in the Swedish feminist porn collection *Dirty Diaries*. For instance, in her short *Flasher Girl on Tour*, conceptual artist Joanna Rytel plays the role of a female exhibitionist who exposes herself in various public places in Paris, such as in the Metro. Wearing a strap-on vibrator that she controls with a remote, she also visits the red-light district Pigalle where she stalks and objectifies various men. In its attack on and appropriation of male dominated public sexualized spaces, Rytel's film ties in with a long-running tradition of feminist performance art and intervention in public spaces. *Flasher Girl on Tour* echoes, for instance, Valie Export's performance *Genital Panik* (1968), where Export exposed her genitals in a movie theater as a comment on women's role in cinema. In Åsa Sandzén's film *Dildoman*, an animation set in a stripclub, the female strippers subvert the action by using one of the male visitors—a

figure based on the former leader of the Swedish Christian Democratic Party, Alf Svensson—as a dildo. Similarly, Pella Kågerman's film *Body Contact*, a mockumentary about an amateur porn film shoot staged by two women and a man that they find on an Internet dating site, reclaims the sexualized public domain of the Internet. The man they pick up and invite is at first reluctant but eventually allows them to film the sex, performing what he believes are good porn positions (like "doggy style"). In all three films, male-dominated, sexualized public space is appropriated for women's sexual pleasure and gendered power relations are put into question.

#### Conditions of Access and Agency in the Sexualized Public Sphere

At the Pornfilmfestival Berlin 2010, I attended the screening of *Much More Pussy* with a female friend. Together, we settled down toward the front of the theater at the cinema Movimiento in the Kreuzberg district, the main location of the festival. The theater soon became crowded. Jouvét, as well as some of the women from the show, were also present. This was the first public screening of the film. A man sat down next to my friend and from the very start I noticed that the way he looked and smiled at her was too pushy and far from invited. My friend started to fidget, holding her arms tight around herself. I asked her if she wanted me to tell him to back off. She said, "No, it's okay."

Then the film started and I was absorbed by the force of the intimate interactions among the women in the film; by the affective intensity of their different experiences and thoughts on gender and sexuality that they share with each other and bring into sexual role-play and fantasy; and by the careful responsiveness and participative presence of Jouvét's camera. After the screening, as I left the theater, I realized that I had not noticed any more fidgeting by my friend. I did not get the chance to ask her about it then, but I hoped that it was not just that I had been completely overwhelmed by the film and unaware of what happened next to me. Perhaps the man stopped once the film started. Perhaps he lost his rude courage once confronted with the fierce women in the film, with the control they possessed over their own sexualities and bodies. This was the fantasy I wanted to believe and chose to take with me when I returned to Sweden. Because if, as the film's punk soundtrack repeatedly declares, quoting the queer activist group Queer Nations' 1990 manifesto: "every time we fuck, we win"—this man should not. Or, was

this man in fact the symbolic “winner” of the sexualized public sphere enabling this film culture?

A few months later I emailed my friend in Berlin asking her what had really happened during the screening. She answered that the man had put his arm on the armrest, then slowly moved it closer to her body and touched her. She writes:

The hand was there throughout the film, on the armrest. At some point I put his hand back at the armrest since it had landed on my side of it. The person did not seem to realize that he did something that made me feel unease. When I looked at him, he seemed to have the coziest time ever, seemed mostly happy that I looked at him.<sup>16</sup>

As this example demonstrates, any understanding of queer, feminist, and lesbian porn as potentially sexually empowering needs to take into account where, when, and how the experience of it takes place. As Jane Juffer argues, the meanings of pornography need to be located in relation to specific contexts of production, distribution, and consumption. In her work on the home as a site for women’s porn consumption, Juffer problematizes ideas about the transformative power of interpretation as an isolated practice, as placeless individual reader agency, and subversion in an undifferentiated public sphere.<sup>17</sup> The conditions of access and agency, the relation between the individual subject, and the forces that enable and constrict her movement between sites where porn is available, need to be analyzed.<sup>18</sup>

As my example from the Pornfilmfestival Berlin demonstrates, these enabling and constricting forces are not just economic or material but also cultural and lived as embodied experience. Differently gendered, classed, and raced bodies are differently conditioned and located. In Sara Ahmed’s phenomenological terms they extend differently in space—precisely as in this situation where the man next to my friend reached past his side of the armrest to touch her while she squeezed her arms around herself. In Ahmed’s argument, bodies take the shape of norms that are repeated over time and with force, and “gender becomes naturalized as a property of bodies [. . .] partly through the loop of this repetition.”<sup>19</sup> In her email my friend writes:

Despite my thirty years I still have not learned to say no, that I’m in charge of my body and very easily could tell a man to stop if he crosses a boundary. Words to mark boundaries are something I’ve often needed but not had access to. I have to struggle to dare saying no; it does not come naturally.

My fi  
ing t  
have  
of dis  
becom  
insigh  
uneve  
ment  
tion c  
shaped  
ater in  
Ahmed  
action

The tra  
seen as  
tions, a  
may co  
this film  
Just as e  
discour  
conduct  
as an are  
and exp  
ater and  
dynamic  
of *Much*  
on the s  
interacti  
my friend  
redefined  
culture an  
I suggest  
and the c  
the wider  
dynamic t  
*intimate p*

My friend describes how she had arrived at this screening with the feeling that here she could feel bodily loose and free, that she would not have to be self-conscious about her body in this context. Her experience of discomfort in the theater is akin to the feeling of disorientation, of becoming an object, of "losing one's place."<sup>20</sup> Referencing Frantz Fanon's insights about racial abjection, Ahmed contends that "disorientation is unevenly distributed: some bodies more than others have their involvement in the world called into crisis."<sup>21</sup> The bodily feeling of disorientation can be "a violent feeling, and a feeling that is affected by violence, or shaped by violence directed toward the body."<sup>22</sup> This situation in the theater in Berlin involved white bodies, but can still be understood through Ahmed's discussion about how violation and disorientation may block action and accumulate stress.<sup>23</sup>

#### Queer, Feminist, and Lesbian Porn as an Alternative Public Sphere

The transnational queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture can be seen as an alternative public sphere where such forces, naturalized directions, and stress are negotiated and reformulated, and where new worlds may come into reach. Borrowing from film historian Miriam Hansen, this film culture potentially enables an alternative experiential horizon.<sup>24</sup> Just as early cinema in Hansen's argument opened up an arena for a new discourse on femininity and a redefinition of norms and codes of sexual conduct, so too can this contemporary film culture be said to function as an arena where new sexual discourses and conduct can be articulated and expressed.<sup>25</sup> This arena involves both the physical space of the theater and "the phantasmagoric space on the screen, and the multiple and dynamic transactions between these spaces."<sup>26</sup> At play in my experience of *Much More Pussy* were such dynamic transactions: between the space on the screen and the space of the theater; between the empowering interactions among the women in the film; between this man harassing my friend and my own expectations that here gendered norms would be redefined, not reinforced; between the queer, feminist, and lesbian film culture and the wider sexualized public sphere.

I suggest one way of understanding the ambivalence of this experience and the complexity of this alternative public sphere's overlapping with the wider sexualized public is to conceptualize it also as a multiple and dynamic transaction between the spaces of *counter public* activism and *intimate public* affirmation. As theorized by Nancy Fraser, Iris Marion

Young, and Michael Warner, the notion of counter public describes an alternative space where marginalized groups formulate and circulate counter discourses, where new understandings and ideas of their experiences, identities, and interests are encouraged and mobilized to challenge the wider public.<sup>27</sup> I contend that queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture can be understood as a counter public sphere where dominant notions of sexuality and gender are challenged.

In an article published on the Swedish political debate website *News-mill* the week of the premiere of *Dirty Diaries* in August 2009, the director Marit Östberg argues in favor of taking control of sexual objectification and “screaming out our horniness”:

Feminist porn wants people to be horny, wants to encourage people to feel sexy and to be sexual objects, but decide for themselves how, why and for whom. Once you have that power it is much easier to decide when you DO NOT want to be sexual. [—] *Dirty Diaries* is an important project because we need to create more images of desire, ways of having sex and different ways of screaming out our horniness. We need more portraits of sexy fantasies. With the film *Authority* in *Dirty Diaries* I want to celebrate all the proud, shameless, horny and queer bodies that paint their dreams over the public sphere.<sup>28</sup>

Through Marit Östberg's and other *Dirty Diaries* filmmakers' participation in media, as well as through the film's wide circulation in Sweden and abroad, *Dirty Diaries* gained far more publicity than the male-dominated space of Swedish filmmaking normally allows.<sup>29</sup> By using mobile phone cameras, these queer feminist porn filmmakers entered into the means of production by sharing and circulating their self-represented sexuality in public.

However, according to Lauren Berlant, the concept of counter public overemphasizes a political register.<sup>30</sup> In her work on intimate publics, Berlant focuses more on how publics are affectively structured as scenes for identification, reflection, and recognition and less by political aspirations. What is highlighted in Berlant's work is less a trajectory from the margins to mobilized resistance in the wider public, but a trajectory at the level of subjectivity, where the members of an intimate public, sharing a sense of social belonging, are empowered and acknowledged affectively.

Queer, feminist, and lesbian pornography also functions as such an affirming intimate public. Across this film culture, notions of identification, reflection, and recognition are central. They reoccur in my fieldwork interviews, in productions, and in research, for instance in Cherry

Smyth's discussion about the newly emerged category of lesbian porn in 1990:

Lesbian sexuality has been repressed, rendered invisible and impotent by society. By watching porn, we can on some level recognize ourselves, defend our right to express our sexuality and assert our desire. It includes us in a subcultural system of coded sexual styles, gestures and icons which affirms our sense of belonging.<sup>31</sup>

Hence, I claim that the two trajectories of counter and intimate publics run parallel and intertwine in this film culture where participation is as much a matter of personal development and sexual self-exploration as of activism, of making a new discourse on sexuality and gender visible and accessible in the wider public. In my experience in Berlin, these two trajectories clashed. The public sharing of an intimate project of sexual recognition, self-discovery, and affective identification seemed to only play into the hands of dominant gender and sexual structures. It seemed to result more in exposure than in safety, affirmation, or conquering.

A number of theorists also problematize the politics of public visibility for marginalized groups.<sup>32</sup> Phil Hubbard, for instance, rejects the "conceptualization of public space as representing a democratic space where marginalized groups can seek to oppose oppressive aspects of heteronormality," and the idea that "having free access to public space represents the achievement of full citizenship."<sup>33</sup> Importantly, while queer, feminist, and lesbian porn films, as pointed out before, often thematize a reclaiming of public space, this does not happen without negotiation. In her reading of the films of Candida Royalle, Linda Williams demonstrates how they create public settings for women's sexual explorations that are both safe and exciting.<sup>34</sup> In Joanna Rytel's *Dirty Diaries* contribution *Flasher Girl on Tour*, risks involved in reclaiming the sexualized public are also explicitly addressed. As she describes it, Rytel strategically only exposes herself in safe places:

What if somebody gets a hard-on and wants to rape you while you're sitting there on a park bench jacking off! . . . I've decided to simply expose myself where it's safe and where nobody can interrupt me. Obviously I wouldn't just jack off in the park like some male moron. Nope, I choose smart places. I have two favourite spots: balconies facing courtyards with hundreds of windows and on shore in front of passing ferries and boats. I mean, who's gonna jump in and stop me?!<sup>35</sup>

Rytel exposes the stakes involved in reclaiming public space for queer

and feminist sexual culture. In her work on lesbian cinema, Lee Wallace demonstrates how the apartment acts as both a public and private space in lesbian feature films; the apartment “[refits] the contradictions between [lesbian cultural] aspiration and [sexual] dissidence and thus can provide the fictional setting for lesbian narratives that are simultaneously socially smooth and sexually rough.”<sup>36</sup> In Shine Louise Houston’s film *The Crash Pad* (2005) and *The Crash Pad Series* (2008–), the apartment is staged as precisely such a flexible space of publicity and privacy. The “crash pad” is an apartment for casual sex where those who have the key can go for play dates or chance encounters. The early Fatale Media production *Suburban Dykes* (1990) also reclaims domestic space as a sexually empowering space when the film’s bored lesbian couple calls an escort service and gets a visit from a leather dyke to spice up their sex life. My own *Dirty Diaries* film *Phone Fuck* is about two women’s sexual encounter over the phone while both are masturbating in their separate apartments. The private space of the two women’s apartments and their respective autoeroticism is shared between them in a mutual fantasy—but also publicly—through mobile phone technology.

#### Every Time We Fuck, We Win: Recognition, Resistance, and Repetition

What the image of the two intertwining—but also conflicting—trajectories of intimate and counter public spheres allows is an understanding of this film culture as a site for the continuous process of negotiation. This negotiation involves working through intersecting power structures, at the level of individual subjectivity as well as on the social level. Rather than isolated acts of subversion and reader agency in an undifferentiated public sphere, experiences in this film culture, just as mine and my friend’s, remain multiple, complex, and even contradictory. **Empowerment** is never guaranteed, but contingent. It is continuously fought for. In her email, my friend underscored the importance of reflecting on and talking about her experience in the theater. She found that it could potentially provide her with new tools for handling similar situations of violence, disorientation, and objectification in the future. The complex film experiences taking place in these spaces can be understood as queer moments of disorder, where, in Ahmed’s terms, the world becomes slantwise. Ahmed contends that “such moments may be the source of vitality as well as giddiness” and that “[w]e might even find joy and excitement in the horror.”<sup>37</sup>

As such this film culture can also be understood with Ann Cvetkov-

ich's consideration of the healing potential of alternative sexual publics, where negative affect and trauma is embraced rather than refused.<sup>38</sup> She argues that "[a]llowing a place for trauma within sexuality is consistent with efforts to keep sexuality queer, to maintain a place for shame and perversion within public discourses of sexuality rather than purging them of their messiness in order to make them acceptable."<sup>39</sup> She finds that lesbian subcultures and writing on sexuality forge emotional knowledge as well as sexual pleasure out of its very roots in pain and difficulty. In these celebrations of "the hard-won experiences of sexual pleasure," intimate lives are situated in relation to different forms of oppression, to experiences of homophobia and shame in the public.<sup>40</sup>

Such a negotiation of social relations is also central in the queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture and this is also what the women in "The Queer X Show" do. In the performance, as well as in the two films *Too Much Pussy* and *Much More Pussy*, the performers share their hard-won experiences of sexual pleasure as well as the pain and difficulties in living in a sexist, homophobic, and racist world. Their conversations and their sexual performances work through the norms, conventions, and taboos shaping and pressing on their lives, bodies, and desires. During their tour, they literally face the violence of these norms. In Paris, one of their friends was subject to a hate crime after returning home from their show and, in Malmö, they participated in a ceremony for the murdered victims of a shooting attack against a gay youth center in Tel Aviv.

The force that blew me away when I saw *Much More Pussy* was not the force of an ultimate transformation of gender and sexual hierarchies, or a construction of an alternative world beyond these hierarchies, but the force of a continuous resistance in the face of these hierarchies. This is the agency and empowerment for which this film culture may provide new conditions. In this public sphere, we might, as Ahmed puts it, "come into contact with other bodies to support the action of following paths that have not been cleared."<sup>42</sup> Here, safety is not a safe world or a clear path, but the public sphere where the un-safety of being queer, female, or lesbian is forcefully acknowledged, worked through, and challenged. Queer Nation's lyrics in the soundtracks for *Too Much Pussy* and *Much More Pussy*, "Every time we fuck, we win," can only be understood in relation to its constant repetition, the claim made again and again. As the manifesto says: "Being queer . . . means everyday fighting oppression; homophobia, racism, misogyny, the bigotry of religious hypocrites, and our own self-hatred." Through the collective and repeated resistance to oppression, the queer, feminist, and lesbian porn film culture adds courage, agency, and, importantly, pleasure to this everyday fight.

## Notes

1. Emilie Jouvét, "Too Much Pussy! Feminist Sluts in The Queer X Show: un road-movie documentaire entre filles," trans. Ingrid Ryberg, March 2, 2010, [http://www.facebook.com/?ref=logo#!/note.php?note\\_id=334096238387&id=119867167658&ref=mf](http://www.facebook.com/?ref=logo#!/note.php?note_id=334096238387&id=119867167658&ref=mf).
2. Carol S. Vance, "More Danger, More Pleasure: A Decade After the Barnard Sexuality Conference," in *Pleasure and Danger, Exploring Female Sexuality*, ed. Carol S. Vance (London: Pandora Press: 1992 [1984]), xxi.
3. Jane Gerhard, *Desiring Revolution: Second-wave Feminism and the Rewriting of American Sexual Thought, 1920 to 1982* (New York: Columbia University Press 2001), 158. Hanna Hallgren, *When Lesbians Became Women—When Women Became Lesbian. Lesbian Feminist's Production of Discourses Regarding Sex, Sexuality, Body and Identity During the 1970s and the 1980s in Sweden* (Göteborg: Kabusa Böcker, 2008).
4. Gerhard, *Desiring Revolution*, 149–82; Richard Dyer, "Lesbian/Woman: Lesbian Cultural Feminist Film," *Now You See It: Studies on Lesbian and Gay Film* (London: Routledge, 1990), 169–200; Heather Butler, "What Do You Call A Lesbian with Long Fingers? The Development of Lesbian and Dyke Pornography," in *Porn Studies*, ed. Linda Williams (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 178; Nan D. Hunter, "Contextualizing the Sexuality Debates: A Chronology 1966–2005," *Sex Wars, Sexual Dissent and Political Culture*, eds. Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter (New York: Routledge, 2006), 15–28; Mary T. Conway, "Spectatorship in Lesbian Porn: The Woman's Woman's Film," *Wide Angel* 19, no. 3 (July 1997): 94; Chris Straayer, "Discourse Intercourse," in *Deviant Eyes, Deviant Bodies: Sexual Re-orientation in Film and Video* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 184–232; Terralee Bensinger, "Lesbian Pornography: The Re/Making of (a) Community," *Discourse* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1992): 69–93.
5. Ragan Rhyne, "Hard-core Shopping: Educating Consumption in SIR Video Production's Lesbian Porn," *The Velvet Light Trap* 59 (Spring 2007): 45; Butler, "What Do You Call," 167–97; Eithne Johnson, "Excess and Ecstasy: Constructing Female Pleasure in Porn Movies," *The Velvet Light Trap* 32 (Fall 1993): 30–49.
6. Clare Hemmings, "Telling Feminist Stories," *Feminist Theory* 6, no. 2 (2005): 115–39.
7. Hemmings, "Telling Feminist Stories," 131.
8. Straayer, "Discourse Intercourse," 204.
9. Gerhard, *Desiring Revolution*, 2, 4, 6.
10. *Ibid.*, 153.
11. The Boston Women's Health Book Collective, *Our Bodies, Ourselves: A Book By and For Women* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973[71]), 3, 23.
12. Mad Kate, "27 July 2009," *The Queer X Show* (blog), August 3, 2009, <http://queerxshow.wordpress.com/2009/08/03/27-july-2009/>.
13. Lynn Comella, "Looking Backward: Barnard and Its Legacies," *The Communication Review* 11 (2008): 207.
14. Jane Juffer, *At Home with Pornography: Women, Sex, and Everyday Life* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).
15. "Dyketactics" and "Women I Love," *The Films of Barbara Hammer* directed by Barbara Hammer (1974, 1976; New York: Women Make Movies, 1981), VHS; Barbara Hammer, *Menses* (1974), 16 mm and Barbara Hammer, *Multiple Orgasm*

(1976  
Cany  
(1973  
Raine  
Big C  
18–32  
Femin  
(Lond  
16. I  
17. J  
18. I  
19. S  
and Lo  
20. A  
21. I  
22. I  
23. I  
24. M  
(Camb  
25. H  
26. I  
27. Na  
of Actua  
"Unruly  
Review 2  
lics," Pub  
28. Ma  
August 2  
kvinno  
print/103  
29. An  
was their  
about Mic  
2009, htt  
2011, http  
Ringborg,  
17, 2010, h  
Diaries was  
tember 10,  
twelve cour  
30. Laure  
ity in Ameri  
31. Cherr  
Film," *Femin  
32. Peggy  
Routledge, I  
Leisure Spac  
macy, CitiZen  
33. Hubba*

- (1976), 16 mm; *Near the Big Chakra* directed by Anne Severson (1972; San Francisco: Canyon Cinema, 2011), DVD; *Mann & Frau & Animal* directed by Valie Export (1973; Virtual-Circuit.org), DVD. See Scott McDonald, Anne Severson, and Yvonne Rainer, "Two Interviews. Demystifying the Female Body: Anne Severson 'Near the Big Chakra,'" Yvonne Rainer: "Privilege," *Film Quarterly*, 45, no. 1 (Autumn 1991): 18–32; Richard Dyer with Julianne Pidduck, "Lesbian/Woman: Lesbian Cultural Feminist Film," in *Now You See It: Studies in Lesbian and Gay Film*, Second Edition (London and New York: Routledge, 2003[90]), 169–200.
16. Email correspondence with author, trans. Ingrid Ryberg, February 17, 2011.
  17. Juffer, *At Home with Pornography*, 15.
  18. *Ibid.*, 8.
  19. Sara Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology, Orientations, Objects, Others* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006), 58.
  20. Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology*, 159–60.
  21. *Ibid.*, 159.
  22. *Ibid.*, 160.
  23. *Ibid.*, 160.
  24. Miriam Hansen, *Babel and Babylon, Spectatorship in American Silent Film* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).
  25. Hansen, *Babel and Babylon*, 118.
  26. *Ibid.*, 118.
  27. Nancy Fraser, "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," *Social Text* 25/26 (1990): 67–68; Iris Marion Young, "Unruly Categories: A Critique of Nancy Fraser's Dual Systems Theory," *New Left Review* 222 (March–April 1997): 8–9; Michael Warner, "Publics and Counterpublics," *Public Culture* 14, no. 1 (Winter 2002): 86.
  28. Marit Östberg, "Vi behöver fler kåta kvinnor i offentligheten," *Newsmill*, August 27, 2009, <http://www.newsmill.se/artikel/2009/08/27/vi-behoever-fler-kata-kvinnor-i-offentligheten?page=1> accessed June 21, 2010, <http://www.newsmill.se/print/10304>.
  29. An article about the project on the daily newspaper *Dagens Nyheter's* website was their second most-read article during 2009 (outnumbered only by an article about Michael Jackson's death) "Mest lästa på DN.se 2009," *DN.se*, December 31, 2009, <http://www.dn.se/nyheter/mest-lasta-pa-dnse-2009>, accessed October 13, 2011, <http://www.dn.se/nyheter/mest-lasta-pa-dnse-2009>. Sofia Curman and Maria Ringborg, "Porr för feminister?" *DN.se Kultur&Nöje*, August 28, 2009, accessed June 17, 2010, <http://www.dn.se/kultur-noje/film-tv/porr-for-feminister-1.940378>. *Dirty Diaries* was also commented on by Conan O'Brien in NBC's *The Tonight Show*, September 10, 2009. By October 2011 the film's distribution rights had been sold to twelve countries.
  30. Lauren Berlant, *The Female Complaint, The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press 2008), 8.
  31. Cherry Smyth, "The Pleasure Threshold: Looking at Lesbian Pornography on Film," *Feminist Review* 34 (1990): 154.
  32. Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993); Beverley Skeggs, "Matter Out of Place: Visibility and Sexualities in Leisure Spaces," *Leisure Studies* 18 (1999): 213–32; Phil Hubbard, "Sex Zones: Intimacy, Citizenship and Public Space," *Sexualities* 4, no. 1 (February 2001): 51–71.
  33. Hubbard, "Sex Zones," 63–64.

34. Linda Williams, *Hard Core, Power, Pleasure and the "Frenzy of The Visible"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 262.
35. Joanna Rytel, Booklet Text, *Dirty Diaries*, directed by Joanna Rytel et. al. (Stockholm, Sweden: Mia Enberg and Story AB Productions and Njuta Films, 2009), DVD.
36. Lee Wallace, *Lesbianism, Cinema, Space, The Sexual Life of Apartments* (New York and London: Routledge, 2009), 133–34.
37. Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology*, 4.
38. Ann Cvetkovich, *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality and Lesbian Public Cultures* (Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2003), 88–89.
39. Cvetkovich, *An Archive of Feelings*, 63.
40. *Ibid.*, 4, 56.
41. Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology*, 170.