

SEBASTIAN JAGIELSKI
Jagiellonian University

‘I Like Taboo’¹: Queering the cinema of Krzysztof Zanussi

ABSTRACT

*The specific Polish discourse on homosexuality was devoid of queers (especially in the era of communism) and their representations. This invisibility – paradoxically – has contributed to the fact that queers easily penetrated into the core of the national culture. In Polish movies one can easily trace numerous characters, elements and themes permeated with queer desire. The codes of queer desire are also present in the films of Krzysztof Zanussi, one of the most important Polish directors of the communist era, who is seen as a moral authority in Polish public space. The ‘language of disguise’ used in his films (especially in *Camouflage*) not only hides political secrets, but also sexual ones; they both operate on a similar premise.*

KEYWORDS

Polish cinema
Krzysztof Zanussi
queer theory
queer representations
homosexuality
homosociality
socialism

The lack of interest shown by critics in exploring LGBTQ themes in Polish cinema was influenced primarily by the strong aversion of critics, academics and film-makers towards the first articles which analysed Polish films from the perspective of Lesbian and Gay Studies. A significant example can be found in the reception of Małgorzata Sadowska and Bartosz Żurawiecki’s critical text on gay and homophobic themes in the cinema of Krzysztof Zanussi (2006). The majority of readers interpreted the text as an attempt to discredit the prominent director, perceived as a moral authority in the film community. Tadeusz Bradecki, an actor who once worked with Zanussi, wrote:

The tactic of the authors was simple: with carefully considered words they conveyed that the director had homosexual leanings in his work.

1. These words come from the film *Kontrakt/Contract* (Zanussi, 1980). They are spoken by Dorothy (Maja Komorowska) when Penelope (Leslie Caron), Adam’s sister in law (Tadeusz Łomnicki), is trying to let him know that his brother Staszek is gay.

2. 'The phenomenons such as Iwaszkiewicz, Andrzejewski or Mach would have been unthinkable in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev and Brezhnev', wrote German Ritz, noting also that 'the traditional Russian culture shows (...) less repressive [than that of the Soviet Union] attitude towards homosexuality, which can be observed when it comes to Nikolai Klyuev and Sergei Yesenin' (Ritz 2002b: 235).

3. In 1985, by the order of the Minister of Internal Affairs Czesław Kiszczak, the law enforcement agencies launched a nationwide homophobic campaign code-named 'Hyacinth', which sought to register the personal data of homosexual men. On the one hand, the 'Hyacinth' action contributed to an even tighter closing of the 'homosexual closet', and on the other, it increased gay activism (e.g. the niche quasi-underground magazine *Filo-Express* was born as a response to the persecution, see Tomasiak (2012: 39–46)).

They by no means implied that was the case in his private life. If he found the article offensive and sued, it would confirm that he himself was homophobic. And that was the case.

(2004: 137)

Academic critics, on the other hand, completely ignored the article. Mariola Marczak in her article 'Zanussi namiętny', writes in a footnote:

I consider Małgorzata Sadowska and Bartosz Żurawiecki's remarks on the presence of homoerotic themes in the works of Krzysztof Zanussi as an over-interpretation. They tend to read the signals connected with the carnality by using only one point of view. Nevertheless, the thesis they formulate is often based on false assumptions, which stem from personal preferences.

(2008: 384, n. 9)

Rather than arguing with the text, Marczak states that the arguments of the critics 'stem from [their] personal preferences', which ridicules the article as an example of subjective and non academic work. In addition, she discredits them by suggesting that they are gay. If the ideological status quo is to be maintained, it is crucial to invalidate all subversive views. Only with this strategy can the suppression continue and areas of Polish cinema inviting queer analysis remain excluded from critical reflection.

It is true that there has never been a Polish gay cinema or New Queer Cinema. However, there are many non-heterosexual characters and themes, symbols of queer desire, and examples of a queer aesthetics and a queer gaze. The obscure presence of queers in Polish cinema results mainly from a specific Polish discourse on homosexuality. In the public sphere, especially in the era of communism, homosexuality was devoid of any depiction, and without representation it did not actually exist in the collective consciousness. This invisibility, paradoxically, has contributed to the fact that queers easily penetrated into the core of Polish national culture (cf. Ritz 2002a). Obscured and neutralized otherness has been incorporated into the realm of what is commonly acceptable as familiar, normative and tolerable. All that which was excluded from the official discourse was hidden behind the facade, leaving traces of (non)presence in the texts themselves.

The reasons for tabooing homosexuality in Poland are to be found in the negative view purported by the Catholic Church and in Polish moral conservatism. Under communism the Polish discourse about homosexuality was also influenced to some extent by political factors. The tsarist codex was abolished in 1917 in the Russian Empire, which also resulted in the depenalization of sodomy. However, in 1934 severe penalties for homosexuals were introduced in the Soviet Union: up to five years of hard labour (Healey 2002).² The example of the USSR was followed by some European countries but not postwar Poland, where the codex from 1932 was in use. It did not criminalize homosexual practices, but the attitude of the authorities remained largely unchanged (see the repressive action 'Hyacinth'³). It is also worth noting that homosexuals did not show, or so it seems, an especially rebellious attitude towards the system. Michał Witkowski, a Polish gay novelist, in his *Lubiewo/Lovetown*, mocked this indifference:

I didn't know any Rebellious Queer. Against the system. Not a single Fighting Queer. [...] They wanted to be fucked by the system, wanted

to be inactive, passive, obedient ... Or just, as usual, they lived in their own imaginary world so they didn't care about reality at all.

(2006: 30)

It is true that the lack of criminalization of homosexuality in the PRL did not encourage gay people to act, but another reason for their inaction was that they were prone to political blackmail. In Poland there was a proletarian homosexuality but also a 'high' homosexuality of the elites, represented by such esteemed writers as Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, Jerzy Andrzejewski, Jerzy Zawieyski and Wilhelm Mach. Tolerated by party luminaries, not only did they enjoy multiple privileges, received awards and easily crossed borders, but also almost freely realized their 'apostate' desire and what is more, the state authorities were willing to help them in the fight against blackmailers. Interestingly, the government helped Iwaszkiewicz fight them during the Stalinist period, a time of the greatest terror, while in the 1960s the writer apparently could not expect this kind of assistance. However, when these luminaries shifted sides and joined the ranks of the opposition, they did not hesitate to use this knowledge for their own purposes, as demonstrated by the case of Andrzejewski.⁴

The word homosexual itself was banned during the communist period: a queer with fluttering artificial eyelashes might still slip into the background of a comedy but under no circumstances could he be named. The specific place of the queer in Polish consciousness is different than in modern European countries, but essentially comparable to the situation in other People's Republics (see Jovanović 2012). It can be assumed that the blurring of the border between heterosexuality and homosexuality does not arouse any anxiety because what is homosexual does not appear as such. The sexualization of the relationships between men does not cause panic since these bonds have not been marked as non-normative. Nonetheless, what is repressed and forbidden remains hidden under the skin, but becomes apparent in the fractures on the surface of official discourse. Homoeroticism was therefore not excluded from the culture of the Polish People's Republic, but it had become invisible. Moreover, in the Polish context until the end of the 1970s, the sexual outsider was not a regular scapegoat, as due to the country's subjection to external control (by the USSR), differences within the national community faded into the background. In other words, internal repressions appeared frivolous in comparison to the external threats of state oppression.

In Polish cinema of the communist period, queer issues are particularly present in the films of Zanussi, one of the leading directors of that time. Male Eros saturates the image with erotic energy, which adds a pinch of ambiguity to his works, contributing to the success of these films among audiences. This desire is volatile, ephemeral, hidden and blurred, as if located within the borders of what is legitimized by official culture, giving the impression of being safe.

THE LANGUAGE OF DISGUISE

Barwy ochronne/Camouflage (1976) is considered the most important film in Zanussi's career. The action takes place at a camp for academics where political opposition is intertwined with sexual otherness. The movie was regarded as subversive even during its production, but no one noticed that the 'language of disguise' conceals not only political but also sexual mystery. This brings to mind the reflections of Kevin Moss, who in 'The underground closet: Political and sexual dissidence in East European culture' (1995) shows that similar

4. The author of *Ashes and Diamonds* (1948) edited Letter to the Persecuted Participants of the Labor Protest in 1976, after the events in Radom, Ursus and Płock, to support the families of the repressed and was involved in the creation of KOR. The authorities responded with a forged document where Andrzejewski supposedly called for equality for sexual minorities.

5. Prohibited in the United States as a result of the introduction of the Hays Code (see, e.g. Russo (1995); Benshoff and Griffin (2006)).
6. At Polish universities in the communist period, the title of docent was mandatory in order to become a professor. Zanussi's early films were called 'docent' movies.

mechanisms were used in the West to hide sexual otherness and to construct the 'homosexual closet'. In Central and Eastern Europe they served as the tools to disguise political opposition. Moss notes that, sexual and political otherness are dissimilar to other differences; they are not immediately recognizable in official discourse. These differences, contrary to race, ethnicity or gender, are neither public nor stable. The narratives of political and sexual otherness are influenced by the control of information: exposing and concealing. The secret cannot be revealed because it violates valid political/sexual standards. Moss derives his argument from Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, who writes in the *Epistemology of the Closet* that the secret in western culture always points to sexual, especially homosexual concealment (1990: 73). At the end of the nineteenth century, homosexuality was established as a mystery. Its exposure brought equally destructive consequences as the discovery of a political secret during the communist period, such as violence, imprisonment and death.

As Moss argues, the mechanisms for encoding prohibited content in relation to political opposition and sexual otherness are similar. Over the years, a sophisticated 'language of disguise' was developed to encrypt forbidden content. The text that hides political and/or sexual mystery is filled with metaphors, metonymies, ambiguous words, allusions and poses. Moss's reflections can undoubtedly be implemented in the area of cinema. The 'language of disguise' was used to conceal (homo)sexual content in Western Europe and in the United States until the end of the 1960s, while in Central and Eastern Europe the reference was to serve in the political struggle (opposition vs government) during the communist period. The canon of Euro-American classical cinema is composed of films that disguise homoerotic desire.⁵ Similarly, the canon of Polish cinema is founded on movies that encourage similar readings, based on Aesopian language. However, the main difference is that they usually did not hide a sexual secret, but rather political content that destabilized the system. In the Polish cinema, political mystery did not cross paths with the sexual, unlike in Károly Makk's *Egymásra Nézők/Another Way* (1982), as analysed by Moss. *Camouflage* is more of a challenge for the critic than Makk's film, because while *Another Way* precisely illustrates the interface between sexual and political otherness, the relation between the political and the sexual is blurred in Zanussi's film.

Camouflage is widely considered as the flagship of the Cinema of Moral Anxiety, alongside *Człowiek z marmuru/Man of Marble* (Wajda, 1976). The trend consisted of films made in 1977–1981 that refer, as a substitute for political issues, to contemporary social problems and ethical norms. Thus, *Camouflage* was recognized as the description of 'a badly organized society in which the laws of nature suppress human values' (Bobowski 1996: 26). It was interpreted on the one hand as a socio-political satire and on the other as a modern morality tale. The first perspective, dominant upon the film's release, sees *Camouflage* as a satire of academic circles. The reason for the horrifying erosion of the academic ethos was the massacre of the intelligentsia in March 1968 (Hendrykowski 2007: 183). Szelestowski (Zbigniew Zapasiewicz), the associate professor (Polish docent⁶), a 'cowardly vulgarian', as he was called by B. Michalek (1977: 12–17), personifies a degraded, dishonest and petrified system of real socialism, while the assistant, Kruszewski's (Piotr Garlicki) rebellion symbolizes the situation of a society corrupted by the state at the time (Dabert 2000: 153). However, even the obvious division between the 'bad' Szelestowski and the 'good' Kruszewski proved to be highly problematic with the passing of time. Modern scholars have questioned the dominant

interpretation of Szelestowski as a Mephisto who craves the soul of the young man. In more recent criticism, the psychodrama created by the docent is perceived as a kind of vaccine that should protect Kruszewski from moral decay (Dabert 2000) and simultaneously introduce him to the world of men and masculinity (Radkiewicz 2005). I believe that Szelestowski draws out the truth about Kruszewski's hypocritical sexuality. Thus, the opening of the door of the socialist 'closet' is here as subversive, oppositional and revolutionary as discovering the truth about social and political life in Poland in the 1970s.

The political allusions were supported by the hearsay surrounding the film, already known to viewers at premiere screenings, while the deep layer of hidden sexuality has been noticed by only a few researchers so far. Sadowska and Żurawiecki tried to examine hidden homosexual desires in the films of Zanussi by following the homophobic stereotypes that are generously used by the director, especially in his later works. They also reconstructed the space of the closet in which the characters were kept in his early films. The main topic of Zanussi's movies is the conflict between the male world of the intellect and the disturbing world of hysterical women. It is, according to the critics, the male hero's confrontation with his own repressed sexuality (Sadowska and Żurawiecki 2006). Moreover, Ewa Mazierska, in her article about gay themes in Polish cinema, notes that many scenes in *Camouflage* are evocative of 'homosexual activity' (like the camera snooping up on the campers) and the main characters are trying to adjust to the heterosexual norm (they force themselves to lust after women) in order not to fall to the bottom of the social ladder on top of which stands Oedipus, Vice-Rector of the University (Mazierska 2008).

THE DESIRE TO BE PROHIBITED

Zanussi often said in his interviews that *Camouflage* was not supposed to be a (masked) political film but one in which nature clashes with culture:

This film became a part of the then current discussion on the relation between culture and nature. Characterized by the birth of anti-culture theory, which emphasized the leading role of nature: nature had to be good, and culture evil from the beginning. I, of course, wanted to poke my tongue out at those people, I wanted to show how it's all tangled. [...] In general, there is a reference to the issues of human nature and the nature of the world. But it went unnoticed by the viewers in Poland at that time.

(Zanussi 2008: 178)

It is useful to follow the path indicated by the director himself because it will shed some light on the ambivalent relationship between Szelestowski and Kruszewski. Already in the opening scenes, the docent states that a person can learn a lot, especially about himself, by observing nature. Through his eyes, the viewer also sees the birds in the sky, then, a moment later, an anthill. *Camouflage* has its own leitmotif; scenes depicting nature are intercut with the protagonists' disputes. This is accentuated through the plot: Szelestowski takes his camera everywhere, directing his lens at flying birds, nests in the trees and ducks in the pond. He is even identified with nature. Images of nature are usually shown when Szlestowski is accompanied by the assistant whom he wants to seduce. It is as if the very presence of the young interlocutor stimulates his primal feeling. He does not, of course,

7. The prototype of the female figure in Zanussi's *oeuvre* is Bella in *Family Life*. She is introduced to the viewers as Tarzan in a skirt: she slides off a rope in a tree dressed only in underwear and a carelessly placed red robe. She symbolizes not only nature, but also liberated eroticism, therefore everything the Zanussi men retreat from. In this cinema we are confronted with two types of female characters, the anti-intellectual and the neurotic (Morstin-Popławska 2010). The first is represented by intellectually challenged wives like those in *The Structure of Crystals, Mountains at Dusk* (1970), and *Iluminacja/Illumination* (1972), while the second is embodied by unmarried women, mentally unstable, crazy, unpredictable, lonely and rejected as well as self-conscious (Bella, Anna in *Behind the Wall*, Julia in *Stan posiadania/Inventory* (1989), or Nina in *Wherever You Are*). Thus Zanussi's women are doomed to be either stupid or crazy and all women are 'isolated from the healthy male circle' (Morstin-Popławska 2010: 41).

communicate his desire but plays a sophisticated game which leads to the fact that Kruszewski, who does not allow himself to accept his true desires, will at last discover those suppressed impulses. The older colleague will enable the younger to realize them.

The scene in which the protagonists meet each other is already significant: Szelestowski is walking in the woods, photographing birds when he hears the distant voices of Nelly (Christine Paul) being seduced ostentatiously, by Kruszewski. The docent peeps on the young couple until Kruszewski concludes his advances. The scene of the first meeting clearly illustrates what attracts Szelestowski to the assistant and then compels him not to leave the young colleague's side even for a second. Kruszewski's attractive body is the ultimate bait. This relationship is similar to ancient *erastes* (an older man who courted or was in a paederastic relationship with a young man) and *eromenos* (a young man that was pursued sexually by an adult man): the former became a mentor and guide to the latter, only when the younger man seduced him with his body. Zanussi himself insisted in many interviews that *Camouflage* is about 'temptation: about the tempter and the tempted' (Zanussi 2008: 175). Szelestowski is the tempter and Kruszewski the tempted. If the docent is a voyeur and a skilful seducer, his adversary is someone who wants to be seduced, who, in other words, can be seduced. Seduction is always a self-seduction (Baudrillard 1990: 173): Szelestowski seduces Kruszewski with his intellect because he was seduced by him, by his youth and male sexiness. On the other hand, being the subject of a conquest by an experienced tempter is seductive because Kruszewski is a narcissist in love with himself, who wants to be seduced. That is why the interaction with Nelly, who expects him to take the initiative, ends in failure. All of the protagonists play a game based on attraction and repulsion. For example, Szelestowski negotiates a price for sex with a waitress and asks Kruszewski for the right money, thus checking if the young man is jealous. And when the docent is heading towards the woman, Kruszewski tries to stop him. Both men discourage each other from the women who perform the function of obstacle: the young scientist tries to dissuade Szelestowski from sex with a waitress and the docent interferes with Kruszewski's advances towards Nelly.

Unlike in previous films,⁷ in *Camouflage* it is a woman who symbolizes civilization: Nelly puts a collar on a cat's neck, which is later taken off by the docent. The Englishwoman represents the repressive society and leads Kruszewski to the recognition of the reality principle while Szelestowski leads him to the opposing pleasure principle. The release of male-male desire on the heath is anticipated during a talk following the assistant's defeat at a conference. The docent accuses him of inconsistency: he says that Kruszewski wanted to be both, brave and cautious, honest and diplomatic. He adds: 'You do not have this bit of madness in you and I'm afraid that you never will' and unscrews a faucet. Kruszewski's suppressed tensions, desires and impulses are released during a scene that takes place at dawn on the heath, when Szelestowski unleashes him from the shackles of culture. The docent leads his adversary to a pier, where Nelly is making love to a lifeguard. What is more, he provokes the betrayed Kruszewski by mocking him that such a 'sophisticated' woman gives herself to such a 'loser' (probably 'due to his size', he adds). Kruszewski finally explodes. He attacks Szelestowski who falls down pretending that he is dead. The would-be murderer weeps in despair with his head in his hands, as if he has just lost a loved one. After a while, the docent tickles his younger colleague with branch. The assistant has been fooled yet



Figure 1: Zbigniew Zapasiewicz as Szelestowski and Piotr Garlicki as Kruszewski in *Camouflage*.

8. We know, at least from the scene in *Women in Love* (Russell, 1969), in which Alan Bates and Oliver Reed are fighting completely naked, that struggle is sometimes a mask of sexual activity.
9. It is significant that in *Behind the Wall* Zapasiewicz plays a hero who can be read as the earlier incarnation of Szelestowski. He does everything to avoid infatuated Anna, while in *Camouflage* he does his best to fall into the arms of another man.

again. The men are now fighting, locked in embrace. The struggle, so intimate, ecstatic and saturated with erotic tension, is the only way in which the macho men can express their repressed desire.⁸ Desire stimulated first by their joint snooping on the couple engaged in sexual intercourse and then freely manifested in the male–male embrace. ‘Finally, you show the animal inside you’, says the triumphant docent and a sense of fulfilment can be heard in his voice. The scene, which can be seen as a metaphor for sexual intercourse, depicts the alternate conditions of slow build up and sudden explosion, the ebb and flow, until, as in Eisenstein’s films (Fernandez 1991: 73–77), there is finally calm. The goal has been achieved, the lust has found a release in a mixture of aggression and sex drive, an eruption of physical excitement culminating in the orgasm that the male characters of Zanussi’s films never allow themselves.⁹

As my analysis demonstrates, the male protagonists struggling with their desires in Zanussi’s movies are not tempted by women but by men. Masculinity is ‘consumed’ by the male gaze, while women almost never appear as sexual objects. In other words, the male body is eroticized, while the female is desexualized. In *Życie rodzinne/Family Life* (Zanussi, 1970), for example, after having sex with Marek (Jan Nowicki), Bella (Maja Komorowska) runs out of the bushes with no clothes on. Her physicality is portrayed as primitive, animalistic and what is more, when she trips up on the steps on her way into the house she is degraded even further. The images of the naked male body that so often feature in the early films of Zanussi have subversive potential, not only because they destabilize patriarchal norms but mainly because they break the law. Naked male genitals were censored in Polish art after 1945, just like the most subversive political statements. The



Figure 2: Zbigniew Zapasiewicz and Piotr Garlicki in *Camouflage*.

nude was regarded as pornography, which was prohibited in the socialist state (Leszkowicz 2012: 128). Full male nudity is therefore symptomatic of *Camouflage*'s rejection of both Polish prudery and socialist norms. To students bathing naked in a lake, Szelestowski hypocritically points out that they are at a student camp, not a nudist beach and threatens to inform the disciplinary committee. Soon after, he zones in on an attractive naked Italian who makes a provocative gesture at him. Male genitals are not the sign of impurity, sin and depravity here, as in the Christian tradition and in Zanussi's later films, but a sign of freedom, desire and beauty. They point to the affirmation of male flesh as derived directly from the ancient tradition, a theme not repeated by the director since the 'pope-and-church' movies, where nudity and sex are invariably associated with humiliation and shame, as in *Paradigm* (Zanussi, 1985), *Urok wszechczyny/Deceptive Charm* (Zanussi, 1996), *Serce na dłoni/And a Warm Heart* (Zanussi, 2008) or the forces of evil as in *Wherever You Are* (Zanussi, 1988) where Nina rapes her husband in a hysterical frenzy.

If the American hidden history of gay erotica was born in classic musicals (Doty 1997), then in Polish cinema it was to some extent built by Zanussi's films. Whenever he wanted to show the carefree, forever attractive male body, the director always resorted to the same tricks. The image of the naked Italian in *Camouflage*, based on Mediterranean homosexual topos, is not rooted in the plot, but is rather an example of visual excess. That sexually desirable body, which is soon forgotten by the viewer, reminds us that homoeroticism in Zanussi's movies usually manifests itself in the form of voyeurism: these images are ephemeral, fractional and epiphanic. It is as if male voyeurs were afraid of being caught right in the act of filling their eyes with allegedly indecent images. Therefore, eroticism is quickly restrained. Moreover, in contrast to the common trend in Polish cinema of casting unattractive actors in major roles

(especially in the Cinema of Moral Anxiety), Zanussi, like Andrzej Wajda, almost always makes handsome men the subject of the (male) gaze: Marek Perepeczko in *Góry o zmierzchu/Mountains at Dusk* (Zanussi, 1970), Jan Nowicki and Daniel Olbrychski in *Family Life*, Marek Piwowski in *Bilans kwartałny/A Woman's Decision* (Zanussi, 1974), Piotr Garlicki in *Camouflage*, or Julian Sands in *Wherever You Are*. To avoid exceeding the limits of decency, the director educts and justifies male eroticism with male activities in public spaces: sports (rowers and men who exercise at a gym in *A Woman's Decision*), or activities related to cleansing oneself: close friends bathe together in *Struktura kryształu/The Structure of Crystals* (Zanussi, 1969), and in *Wege in der Nacht/Ways in the Night* (Zanussi, 1979).

Gagged desire is the hidden core of the early films of Zanussi. It is a hushed but, nevertheless, existing foundation. It is something that fascinates and disturbs the male characters at the same time. The forbidden desire in the cinema of Zanussi takes the form of male friendship and brotherhood and/or is looking for scientific zeal (never artistic passion as in the modernist variant). Exemplifying the first type is the director's debut, *The Structure of Crystals*, which was just the first episode in a series of tender films about male friendship. The second trend was first explored in *Za ścianą/Behind the Wall* (Zanussi, 1971), which tells the story of trapped masculinity with the distinctive character of an alienated scientist. The first film is about two friends, physicists, who are meeting after many years. Marek (Andrzej Źarnecki) is pursuing a brilliant scientific career and has just returned from a scholarship in the United States. Jan (Jan Mysłowicz), is quite the opposite, leading a silent, contemplative life in the countryside with his wife, Anna. The men indulge in philosophical disputes, go for walks, play sports together: run, arm wrestle and bathe together. A similar tenderness is also present in later films about close male friendship (especially in *Family Life*, *Camouflage* and *Ways in the Night*). However, these male narratives are almost never concluded with a happy ending. The men always split up, as if they have to be punished for the fact that their relationship took on a too intimate a character.

The world as it is after the departure of the faithful companion is shown in *Behind the Wall* where we follow the alienated scientist. The woman who lures him into her apartment on the pretext of showing him her publication is a dangerous, fearsome stranger. What is more, Anna (Maja Komorowska), unaware of Jan's forced masquerade, is trying to get close to him, and so grows his fear of the feminine, culminating in a scene where he runs away from a mere kiss. In his world there is no place either for Anna or for any other woman. He is completely devoted to his scientific work. Science is a non-sexual way to invest sexual energy, to satisfy desire through its displacement. The character's resolve to channel his erotic desire into science makes him an acceptable member of society. But in the company of a woman who may make a sexual advance on him, he seems irritated and restless as he knows his cover may be exposed. Is this not the reason for his frantic assurance that he does not like Tchaikovsky? In short, in *Behind the Wall* there is a narrative of a perfectly closed closet under attack from the outside (Anna), where science is a form of sublimation.¹⁰ Zanussi's men are in hiding, separated from anything that might affect their stable world based on self-control, coolness, distance and indifference. They struggle with what is Other within themselves. The intellect becomes a form of defense against the male Eros, suffocated in the bud but yet still to be reborn. It is not an irrelevant fact that Zanussi chose academics to be the protagonists of his works: but only those

10. Homosexuality (active) was recognized in psychoanalytic discourse as an example of anti-culture. It is an example of non-procreative sexuality which is not looking for any reason or alibi. Sexuality that does not serve procreation is prohibited, condemned and excluded as a perversion. For that reason it must be as sexuality that is a goal in itself, subordinated to the mechanisms of control and repression. According to Freud, repression of homosexual desire leads to the emergence of socialization.

It is known that a large number of homosexual people are distinguished by highly developed social stimuli and dedication to public affairs. (...) From the point of view of psychoanalysis, we are accustomed to regard the social attitudes as a sublimation of feelings towards a same-sex object.
(Freud 1996: 186)

According to this approach same-sex desire changes into the feelings of friendship, brotherhood and universal love for humanity. Gays sublimate their sexuality in social relations in order to not be rejected by society.

who are engaged in physics, biology and mathematics, who promote the progress of civilization (it is not without reason that the scientists ridiculed in *Camouflage* are humanists). In this world, based on what is verifiable, logical and pragmatic, the desires of the body must be tamed.

Thus, the leading (albeit hidden) theme of the early films of Zanussi is not male–male desire, as it seems at first glance, but the prohibition of that desire. As Judith Butler wrote, inspired by S. Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930):

within renunciation, the desire is kept intact, and there is a strange and important way in which prohibition might be said to *preserve* desire. [...] moral interdictions, especially those that are turned against the body, are themselves sustained by the very bodily activity that they seek to curb. [...] prohibition becomes the displaced site of satisfaction for the 'instinct' or desire that is prohibited, an occasion for the reliving of the instinct under the rubric of the condemning law. This is of course the source of that form of comedy in which the bearer of the moral law turns out to be the most serious transgressor of its precepts. [...] The prohibition does not seek the obliteration of prohibited desire; on the contrary, prohibition pursues the reproduction of prohibited desire and becomes itself intensified through the renunciations it effects. The afterlife of prohibited desire takes place through the prohibition itself, where the prohibition not only sustains, but is *sustained by*, the desire that it forces into renunciation. In this sense, then, renunciation takes place *through* the very desire that is renounced, which is to say that the desire is *never* renounced, but becomes preserved and reasserted in the very structure of renunciation.

(1997: 116–17, original emphasis).

Camouflage is the only one of Zanussi's film in which the body and its desires triumphs, rather than spirit, culture, and moral order. The movie concludes with a scene that shows the world after the 'prohibition' is violated. 'There is an animal' in Kruszewski, and the male–male embrace has unlocked the body, ripped open the cloak of distance and control. Significantly, the explosion of suppressed emotion happens in a public space, a site where gays usually sought the satisfaction of their carnal desires at that time. An open space in Zanussi's films always connotes instincts, biology, nature, while the closed space smothers what is spontaneous and authentic, in short, it is merged with culture. The alienated scientists are desperately escaping from the open because those places threaten the stability of their mimicry. *Camouflage* is different: internal transgression takes place away from the usual classrooms, design offices and laboratories.

The motif of the open space as a place of transgression has already appeared in *Family Life* in which the release of hidden desire was a result of the journey from the city to the family home. A young engineer who works at an architectural office, Wit (Daniel Olbrychski), returns to his bourgeois home with a colleague, Marek, after six years of absence. The dilapidated villa is inhabited by his alcoholic father, tired aunt and a sister with a tarnished reputation (Bella was sentenced to jail for prostitution). Bella becomes a kind of a master of ceremonies, a catalyst for the sudden burst of suppressed emotion. The director himself admitted that *Family Life* was inspired by the dramas of Tennessee Williams (D'Agostini 1980: 9). There are many similarities:

the beginning (where the son returns home lured by the alleged illness of his father); the dramatic tricks that gradually build up the tension, which is followed by a sudden eruption of emotion; the main protagonists (a sexually frustrated 'cat on a hot tin roof' and a man who seduces her with his masculine sex appeal (Nowicki as a Polish Marlon Brando and Paul Newman)); and finally, the sultry, vibrant atmosphere saturated with intense hidden passions. There is only one person who comes from another world, the world of Zanussi, Wit who, as suggested by the director, is withdrawn, smothered and closed. Why can he not be himself? It is necessary to take a closer look at the movie's final sequence because it sheds some light on the character's masquerade and to some extent refers to the *Camouflage* final scene. In the morning Wit catches Marek and Bella in the bushes and the men fall out. But before that they conduct a decisive conversation:

Wit: Drive safely, you're drunk.

Marek: Don't worry. [...] And why do you talk to me like that: drive carefully, you're drunk, put some clothes on, you'll catch a cold, huh? And what if instead you came up and punched me in the face? You can't do that, can you? [...] Brother, I won't tell you why it happened, what happened between us [Marek and Bella]. You will never understand it.

Wit: Maybe.

Marek: What maybe?

Wit is secretly in love with his peasant friend, who fascinates him with his strength, masculinity and vitality. The romantic tension complicates their relationship but this relation escapes the stereotypical scenario: Wit, instead



Figure 3: Daniel Olbrychski as Wit and Maja Komorowska as Bella in *Family Life*.

of punching his friend like 'a man', shows him tender and excessive affection, which eventually destroys this fraternal relationship. When Marek is already gone, Bella sits next to her brother in an empty fountain and he puts his tired head on her lap. He starts to cry. As Roland Barthes wrote:

Is it perhaps a disposition proper to the amorous type, this propensity to dissolve in tears? Subjected to the Image-repertoire, he flouts the censure which today forbids the adult tears and by which a man means to protest his virility (Piaf's satisfaction and maternal tenderness: *Mais vous pleurez, Milord!*) – By releasing his tears without constraint, he follows the orders of the amorous body....

(1990: 180, original emphasis)

Wit's tears are, as Barthes wrote, the tears of a man in love. However, he cannot reveal his love and this powerlessness is the reason for his suffering. Bella, of course, knows that her brother has played the role of unhappy lover in this triangle. And her soothing gestures have a hint of motherly understanding. In *Family Life*, but also in *Ways in the Night* and, most of all, in *Camouflage* the stories of desire are marked with male tears. And those tears are the sign of love.

POLITICAL AND SEXUAL OPPOSITION

In *Camouflage* the political codes adjoin the sexual: both mysteries operate on a similar basis. The Aesopian language is used in equal measure to express both the camouflaged political message and the sexual. The title of the film itself is not neutral, of course. The animated opening credits show animals, but very specific animals: amphibians and reptiles, which, in contrast to predators, are not able to fight in an open struggle. To survive they resort to camouflage and mimicry, which protects them against threat. If camouflage is the biological mechanism of adjustment then who is using camouflage in Zanussi's film? According to the critics, it is Szelestowski who is camouflaged, ensuring his own comfort and safety: the mimicry enables him to climb up the career ladder without any remorse, especially when the whole system is based on connections, conformism and the corruption of reality. Others argue that the title illustrates the attitude of the docent as much as Kruszewski: the assistant wears protective colours to survive and Szelestowski uses camouflage to alert his interlocutor about certain threats (Dabert 2000: 163). However, the title of the film can also be interpreted according to Queer Theory (Mazierska 2008): queers resort to camouflage to avoid condemnation, abuse and exclusion. The usage of mimicry characterizes those who are in the closet, hiding their non-normative sexuality. These men are no different to 'ordinary' men: they blend into the background, a prerequisite for functioning in the public space. Thus the title of the film may also mean homosexual disguise. The men wear the protective colours (the mask of the heterosexual male) to hide their shameful secret. It must remain unspoken of, even if it is no longer so well kept. Zanussi's protagonists, through silent signs and gestures, are well aware of each other's secret, though they do not reveal themselves to each other as this would mean full exposure. And yet, they are fully conscious of the mysterious tension which connotes their secret desire, a desire between men who know.

The Aesopian language that codes banned political and sexual content is based on ambiguity and allusions. Not only are words ambiguous in

Camouflage but also barely suggested gestures, as well as numerous allusions and motifs both political and sexual. Starting from the mentor–student relationship that is based on seduction and therefore associated with the ancient Greeks, the images of the eroticized male body which bring to mind the Mediterranean homosexual topos, signs of sexual repression and sublimation or sadomasochism – all these codes, motifs and secret signs create a ‘language of disguise’ which calls for a perceptive viewer to decipher them. The director desired to have enlightened viewers when it came to political allusions, which were meant to create an aura of opposition to the dominant ideology, a movie whose true (read: political) meaning was camouflaged. There were at least two scenes that fulfilled this function: the recital of Krzysztof Kamil Baczyński and Wisława Szymborska’s poems by Halina Mikołajska¹¹ and the presence of the sculpture of Mateusz Birkut, Wajda’s hero from *Man of Marble*, which was placed on the steps of the hotel.¹² The presence of Mikołajska and Birkut’s sculpture was not relevant to the non-enlightened viewer, while he/she who was sensitive to any political signals was able to see that they were signs of opposition. It is useful to bear in mind that the film’s release came at a time when there were still fresh memories of the suppression of the political protests in Radom. The interpretations of the problem of hidden political allusions in *Camouflage* paradoxically correspond to those which are looking for disguised (homo)sexual references, because both political and sexual dissidents had to adapt to a world in which the laws of the chameleon rule. Mimicry appears to be the only way to survive in a reality in which gameplay is the only norm. An Aesopian language therefore allowed the expression of an unadulterated message. What is most real in films that use the ‘language of disguise’ is never expressed directly.

CONCLUSION

Male homosexual desire was never named in the early cinema of Zanussi. It is perhaps the reason why these films are placed at the heart of the canon of Polish cinema and still shape the collective identity and its narratives. The advantage of this strategy is that the subversive male–male desire was deposited on the margins of official discourse and freely penetrated the centre of Polish cinema. The disadvantage is that its latent and ephemeral life is not what it truly is. The Queer language of disguise is, according to A. Doty, a ‘shadowy realm’: it allows the traditional heteronormative culture to use queer to its own normative goals and enjoy the profits, while not admitting what it really means (1997: xi–xii). In other words, despite the fact that queer desire is at the centre of Polish cinema’s canon, one can still argue that it is foreign not only to Polish cinema, but to Polish national identity in general. When homosexuality became more open and easy to read in Poland, the male Eros disappeared from the films of Zanussi. In *Camouflage* we saw a romance between two strong men who were playing a secret game of seduction. Those men were masculine and did not resemble stereotypical gays. They were attracted to those like them. However, since the 1980s Zanussi’s films are populated by ‘fags’, absent from this previous universe, and with them his cinema became stained with homophobia (*Contract* (1980), *And a Warm Heart*). The emergence of the ‘fagot’ is an important turning point because from then on homosocial male desire disappears from the films of Zanussi as well as the male–male romances and the tension between lust and suppression. At the same time the movies lose impetus and emotional

11. In the scene of the recital the stage performance is less important than the actress who recites the poems: Mikołajska was an active member of the KOR opposition and there was a censorship on her persona which in practice meant that she could not participate in official artistic life. Despite the ban, Zanussi hired her and did not change his mind even when he was ordered to remove her from the cast.
12. The production of *Camouflage* began in Łódź only weeks after Wajda completed the filming of his own dissident movie. ‘It was like a wink to the audience, a sign that we have something in common, Birkut stayed with us’ said the director. He also mentioned that one of the censors asked him if the sculpture was taken from Wajda’s film, ‘Oh no!, I said, it’s Rodin’. ‘Oh, if it’s Rodin, let it be’ (Zanussi 2008: 179).

intensity. The 'fag' is used by the director to make a distinction between male-male desire and negatively evaluated homosexual desire. In other words, if the effeminate 'fagot' from *Contract* is a loathsome homosexual, an anomaly and aberration, the masculine Szelestowski cannot be homosexual as well. Not without reason Zanussi castrated his films from male-male desire, a foundation of his early movies. After all, the beginning of the 1980s marked the end of the poetics of sublimation. It was the time, in Poland as elsewhere, of a change in discourse. The body marked with desire was no longer innocent. It became non-normative. Zanussi's films were now flooded with effeminate 'fagots from the ballet' (*Contract*), and escort agencies (*And a Warm Heart*), with the director concluding that homosexuality threatens the development of civilization (Zanussi 1998). This resulted in him being labelled a homophobe. 'So I defend myself against that idiotic homophobia as much as I can', complained Zanussi, 'it is so trendy now in Poland because you have to have an enemy, so I became the homophobe on call' (2008: 245). Zanussi earned his 'homophobe' label by creating *Deceptive Charm*, a film based on the theme of heterosexual virtue put at risk. The director, however, persistently rebutted the allegations:

This film [...] was idiotically accused of homophobia, but this is the last thing it is all about. The homosexual is doing bad things for completely other reasons than those that we all expect. So the film is rather about the fact that people who have a critical attitude towards homosexuals do not realize at all that these people will have completely different defects than those that we all are expecting.

(Zanussi 2008: 244–45)

Zanussi therefore suggests that gays are not bad because they are gay, but because they have, like heterosexuals, other defects that are only obscured by



Figure 4: Zbigniew Zapasiewicz in *Deceptive Charm*.

their homosexuality. In that case, we must be even more vigilant, the director seems to caution. It is impossible to agree with Zanussi that the allegation of homophobia in *Deceptive Charm* is 'idiotic'. It is hard to find in Polish cinema a queer character who combines as many negative gay stereotypes as the hero of this film: a blase, creepy and effeminate old aristocrat who wants to dominate and corrupt a youngster who is passive, pure and full of ideals.

However, before Zanussi became a 'homophobe on call' for whom homosexuality is associated with demoralization and sadomasochism (*Paradigm, Deceptive Charm*), blackmail (*Wherever You Are*) or effeminate 'fagots' (*Contract, And a Warm Heart*), he created a highly evocative representation of male homosocial desire in his early films. A representation that saturates the images with subcutaneous tension, ambiguity and suppressed emotions. Unfortunately there is no trace of that desire in the conservative films made after *From a Far Country* (Zanussi, 1981), a movie about John Paul II.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Paulina Gorlewska for help in translating a Polish original of this text into English.

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (1990), *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (trans. R. Howard), London and New York: Penguin Books.
- Baudrillard, J. (1990), *Seduction* (trans. Brian Singer), London: Macmillan.
- Benshoff, H. M. and Griffin, S. (2006), *Queer Images. A History of Gay and Lesbian Film in America*, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bobowski, S. (1996), *Dyskurs filmowy Zanussiego/Zanussi's Film Discourse*, Wrocław: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Polonistyki Wrocławskiej.
- Bradecki, T. (2004), 'Skrzynka na emalie'/'An email box', *Dialog*, Vol. 8, pp. 136–37.
- Butler, J. (1997), *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*, New York: Routledge.
- D'Agostini, P. (1980), *Krzysztof Zanussi*, Firenze: La nuova Italia.
- Dabert, D. (2000), 'Konstrukcja aluzyjna "Barw ochronnych" Krzysztofa Zanussiego'/'The allusive construction of "Camouflage" by Krzysztof Zanussi', in M. Hendrykowska (ed.), *Widziane po latach. Analizy i interpretacje filmu polskiego/Watched Years Later. Analyses and Interpretations of Polish Cinema*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, pp. 148–66.
- Doty, A. (1997), *Making Things Perfectly Queer. Interpreting Mass Culture*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fernandez, D. (1991), 'Eisenstein: drzewo i korzenie'/'Eisenstein: The tree and the roots', *Film na Świecie*, Vol. 1, pp. 73–77.
- Freud, S. (1996), 'O niektórych mechanizmach nerwicowych w wypadku zazdrości, paranoi i homoseksualizmu'/'Some neurotic mechanisms in jealousy, paranoia and homosexuality', in R. Reszke (eds), *Charakter a erotyka/Character and Erotica* (trans. D. Rogalski), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo KR, pp. 178–86.
- Healey, D. (2002), 'The disappearance of the Russian Queen, or how the Soviet Closet was born', in B. Evans Clemens, R. Friedman and D. Healey (eds), *Russian Masculinities in History and Culture*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 152–71.

- Hendrykowski, M. (2007), 'Krzysztof Zanussi testuje środowisko naukowe'/'Krzysztof Zanussi is Testing the Scientific Community', in T. Lubelski and K. J. Zarębski (eds), *Historia kina polskiego/History of Polish Cinema*, Warszawa: Fundacja Kino, pp. 181–3.
- Jovanović, N. (2012), 'My own private Yugoslavia: František Čap and the socialist celluloid closet', *Studies in Eastern European Cinema*, 3: 2, pp. 211–29.
- Kosofsky Sedgwick, E. (1990), *Epistemology of the Closet*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Leszkowicz, P. (2012), *Nagi mężczyzna. Akt męski w sztuce polskiej po 1945 roku/Naked Man. The Male Nude in post-1945 Polish Art*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Makk, Károly (1982), *Egymásra Nézel/Another Way*, Budapest: Mafilm Dialog Filmstudio and Meridian Films.
- Marczak, M. (2008), 'Zanussi namiętny'/'Passionate Zanussi', in K. Klejsa and E. Nurczyńska-Fidelska (eds), *Kino polskie: reinterpretacje. Historia – ideologia – polityka/Polish Cinema: Reinterpretations. History – Ideology – Politics*, Kraków: Rabid, pp. 377–412.
- Mazierska, E. (2008), *Masculinities in Polish, Czech and Slovak Cinema. Black Peters and Man of Marble*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Michalek, B. (1997), 'Nowy ton'/'A new tone', *Kino*, Vol. 4, pp. 12–7.
- Morstin-Popławska, A. (2010), 'Neurotyczne i antyintelektualne kobiety zanussoidalne'/'Zanussi's neurotic and anti-intellectual women', *Lamus*, Vol. 1, pp. 36–41.
- Moss, K. (1995), 'The underground closet: Political and sexual dissidence in East European culture', in E. E. Berry (ed.), *Postcommunism and the Body Politic*, New York: New York University Press, pp. 229–51.
- Radkiewicz, M. (2005), 'XY – Tożsamość mężczyzny w polskich filmach fabularnych'/'XY: The identity of a man in Polish feature films', in E. Durys and E. Ostrowska (eds), *Gender: Wizerunki kobiet i mężczyzn w kulturze/Gender: The Images of Women and Men in Culture*, Kraków: Rabid, pp. 259–68.
- Ritz, G. (2002a), 'Dyskurs płci w ujęciu porównawczym'/'Gender: A comparative Approach', in G. Ritz (ed.), *Nić w labiryncie pożądania. Gender i płć w literaturze polskiej od romantyzmu do postmodernizmu/The Thread in the Labyrinth of Desire. Gender and Sex in Polish Literature from Romanticism to Postmodernism* (trans. M. Łukasiewicz), Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, pp. 42–51.
- (2002b), 'Solidarność a seksualny outsider'/'Solidarity and the sexual outsider', in G. Ritz (ed.), *Nić w labiryncie pożądania. Gender i płć w literaturze polskiej od romantyzmu do postmodernizmu/The Thread in the Labyrinth of Desire. Gender and Sex in Polish Literature from Romanticism to Postmodernism* (trans. M. Łukasiewicz), Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, pp. 232–45.
- Russell, Ken (1969), *Women in Love*, London: Brandywine Productions.
- Russo, V. (1995), *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Sadowska, M. and Żurawiecki, B. (2006), 'Barwy ochronne, czyli kino seksualnego niepokoju'/'Camouflage or the cinema of sexual anxiety', in T. Basiuk, D. Ferens and T. Sikora (eds), *Parametry pożądania. Kultura odmienców wobec homofobii/The Parameters of Desire. Queer Culture towards Homophobia*, Kraków: Universitas, pp. 153–60.
- Tomasik, K. (2012), *Gejeler. Mniejszości seksualne w PRL-ul'Gejeler'. Sexual Minorities in People's Republic of Poland*, Warszawa: Wyd. Krytyki Politycznej.
- Wajda, Andrzej (1976), *Człowiek z marmuru/Man of Marble*, Warszawa: Zespół Filmowy X.

- Witkowski, M. (2006), *Lubiewo/Lovetown*, Kraków: Korporacja Ha!art.
- Zanussi, Krzysztof (1969), *Struktura kryształu/The Structure of Crystals*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1970), *Góry o zmierzchu/Mountains at Dusk*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1970), *Życie rodzinne/Family Life*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1971), *Za ścianą/Behind the Wall*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1972), *Iluminacja/Illumination*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1974), *Bilans kwartalny/A Woman's Decision*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1976), *Barwy ochronne/Camouflage*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1979), *Wege in der Nacht/Ways in the Night*, Cologne: Westdeutscher Rundfunk.
- (1980), *Kontrakt/Contract*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1981), *Da un paese lontano. Giovanni Paolo II/From a Far Country*, Roma: Trans World Film.
- (1985), *Paradigm*, Paris: TF1 Films Production, Pierson Productions and Maki Films.
- (1988), *Wherever You Are*, Cologne and Warszawa: Gerhard Schmidt Production and Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1989), *Stan posiadania/Inventory*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (1996), *Urok wszechczyny/Deceptive Charm*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor/Telewizja Polska.
- (1997), *Pora umierać. Wspomnienia, refleksje, anegdoty/It's Time to Die. Memories, Thoughts, Anecdotes*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Tenten.
- (1998), 'Siedem czyli "Opowieści weekendowe" Krzysztofa Zanussiego'/'Seven Or 'Weekend Stories' by Krzysztof Zanussi, interview with Bożena Janicka', *Kino*, Vol. 3, pp. 29–30.
- (2008), *Serce na dłoni/And a Warm Heart*, Warszawa: Studio Filmowe Tor.
- (2008), 'Sylwetka artysty'/'An arist's figure', interview with Iga Czarawska, Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawniczo-Poligraficzna.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Jagielski, S. (2013), "I Like Taboo": Queering the cinema of Krzysztof Zanussi', *Studies in Eastern European Cinema* 4: 2, pp. 143–159, doi: 10.1386/seec.4.2.143_1

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Sebastian Jagielski is an assistant professor of Film Studies in the Institute of Audiovisual Arts at the Jagiellonian University. He is a co-editor of the volume *Ciało i seksualność w kinie polskim/ Body and Sexuality in Polish Cinema* (Kraków, 2009). He is currently completing a book on male homosocial desire in Polish cinema. His research focuses on Polish cinema, queer cinema and queer theory.

Contact: Instytut Sztuk Audiowizualnych, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, ul. Łojasiewicza 4, 30-348 Kraków, Poland.
E-mail: sebastian.jagielski@uj.edu.pl

Sebastian Jagielski has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.



intellect

www.intellectbooks.com

publishers
of original
thinking

Journal of European Popular Culture

ISSN 204061348 | Online ISSN 20406142
2 issues per volume | Volume 4, 2013

Aims and Scope

The *Journal of European Popular Culture* investigates the creative cultures of Europe, present and past. Exploring European popular imagery, media, new media, film, music, art and design, architecture, drama and dance, fine art, literature and the writing arts, and more, the journal is also of interest to those considering the influence of European creativity and European creative artefacts worldwide.

Call for Papers

This peer-reviewed journal seeks lively submissions on all aspects of European cultural and creative activity. The journal is interested in contemporary practices, but also in historical, contextual, biographical or theoretical analyses relating to past cultural activities in Europe. Papers or exploratory critical or creative pieces relating to European popular culture are all very welcome.



Editors

Graeme Harper
Oakland University
chair@creativeuniversities.com

Owen Evans
Edge Hill University
owen.evans@edgehill.ac.uk

Cristina Johnston
University of Stirling
cristina.johnston@stir.ac.uk