

# INTRODUCTION

## Pornography, Technology, Archive

Tim Dean

The volume's title, *Porn Archives*, conjoins terms with opposing connotations: pornography evokes an ostensibly private experience, while the archive conjures publicly accessible records; porn tends to be semisecret, unofficial, and stigmatized, while archives signify officialdom and state approbation; porn's appeal lies partly in its lack of respectability, whereas archives are nothing if not respectable—so much so, in fact, that putting pornography into the archive is widely regarded as a good way of killing its appeal. If porn is juicy, then the archive is dry as dust. Archives offer sites of preservation and permanence, whereas porn is commonly considered to be ephemeral and amenable to destruction, no less so by its fans than by the police. Given these opposing meanings, in what sense can we speak of “porn archives”?

This volume is built on the premise that pornography as a category emerges in tandem with the archive, through historically specific procedures of sequestration. Rather than being opposed, pornography and the archive come into being together as functions of modernity. Although historians and critics (such as Lynn Hunt, Walter Kendrick, and Frances Ferguson) have recognized pornography as a central feature of modernity, insufficient attention has been paid to the role of archiving practices in pornography's historical development. We suggest that it is impossible to understand the contemporary proliferation of porn without appreciating the history of its archivization. The chapters assembled here respond to that gap in historical understanding by thinking through the complex interrelationship between various pornographies and the archives that condition them.

This project has become both possible and necessary as a result of rapid advances in digital technology that, over the past decade or so, have dramatically increased not only access to porn but also awareness of the significance of archival techniques. Whether or not we consult porn online, we're all constantly accessing archives electronically in ways that prompt reflection on the status of the archive. In this context, it has become evident that critical dis-

cussion of digital porn would benefit from a much broader historical consideration of predigital archiving practices, all of which depend on different media technologies. Hunt, for example, argues that “it was only when print culture opened the possibility of the masses gaining access to writing and pictures that pornography began to emerge as a separate genre of representation.”<sup>1</sup> It is the conjoining of a new technology with widespread access to it that makes pornography possible. Focusing on the technologies of print culture, Hunt pushes the date for “the invention of pornography” as far back as the sixteenth century, toward the dawn of modernity.

However, others locate that date later, not least because the word *pornography* was coined in English only in the mid-nineteenth century (its French cognates appeared slightly earlier). Sexually explicit images seem always to have existed, but pornography as a category of aesthetic, moral, and juridical classification is a modern invention. The story of the discovery of Pompeii, rehearsed by Walter Kendrick in *The Secret Museum*, helps to account for this invention by showing how the category of pornography was created at the same time as an archive to house the erotic objects being unearthed.<sup>2</sup> Although it took most of the eighteenth century and much of the nineteenth to dig out those Roman cities that had been buried by the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD, very early in the process sexually explicit frescoes and artifacts came to light. Many of these discoveries featured the god Priapus, who, as Kendrick observes, “can be identified by his gigantic erect phallus, often out of all human scale.”<sup>3</sup> Priapus is the original avatar of the well hung. One might say that the story of the discovery of Pompeii is a tale of archaeologists encountering way more dick than they could possibly handle.

Yet the archaeological process in southern Italy represents something more, since it set in motion a shift in the archaeology of knowledge. Too valuable to be destroyed, the Pompeian artifacts were considered too provocative to be displayed alongside other ancient discoveries; hence, they prompted a new classification, that of pornography, which enabled their preservation via sequestration. In other words, what the sexually explicit images and objects provoked was not simply outrage or lust but a special kind of archive. Here the term *archive* refers to both a physical space for holding the sexually explicit and a conceptual system for grasping it (an archive in the Foucauldian sense). The physical space was a locked chamber at the Museo Borbonico, an institution that—significantly for the link between archives and nationhood—became the National Archaeological Museum of Naples. The conceptual system likewise entailed an apparatus for segregating sexually potent material and strictly regulating access to it. By 1866 the locked room at Museo Borbonico, stuffed with erotic artifacts from Pompeii, was known as the Pornographic Collection (*Raccolta Pornografica*).<sup>4</sup>

Modern information science distinguishes between a collection and an archive; technically they are not the same thing. And Kendrick, in his account of the discovery of Pompeii, does not describe the sequestration of explicit material as archiving. But using the term *archive* more capaciously—as researchers increasingly have been doing across a range of disciplines—enables us to appreciate how the gesture of separation that creates “pornography” in the mid-nineteenth century creates along with it an archive, a new system of classification and preservation. The crucial difference between ancient and modern approaches to explicit material is that at Pompeii it was not hidden but integrated with other aspects of civic and domestic life. In contrast, the nineteenth century invented pornography by insisting on its segregation from public view. As Michel Foucault argues with respect to madness and confinement, it is the fundamental gesture of segregating certain kinds of people from the rest of society that brings the new category—in this case, madness as a specifically clinical diagnosis—into existence.<sup>5</sup> Just as the seventeenth century’s locking up of heterogeneous social elements in former leprosariums enabled the creation of a new kind of illness, so the nineteenth century’s locking up of sexually explicit artifacts enabled the creation of a new genre. And just as there can be no mental illness without the institution of the hospital, so there is no pornography without the institution of the archive.

### The Archival Turn

This volume draws on, and contributes to, the “archival turn” that has magnetized attention across a range of disciplines over the past few decades, from history, philosophy, and anthropology to cultural studies, information science, and law. Interest in the archive responds to a widespread concern with questions of cultural memory and the ways in which societies choose to preserve the past or permit its disappearance. Broadly speaking, the significance of archives lies in their role as institutions, furnished with an array of technologies, for preserving or erasing the past. The artifacts discovered at Pompeii could have been destroyed, as most erotically explicit material has been destroyed throughout the centuries; but instead they were preserved, via the paradoxical method of concealment, because they offered a particular kind of historical evidence. Even as they preserve traces of the past, however, archives are distinguished by differing degrees of publicness: the more sensitive their holdings, the harder they are to access. As Jennifer Burns Bright and Ronan Crowley explain in their contribution to the volume, modern libraries that hold material regarded as obscene frequently leave those holdings uncataloged or archive them via a separate, less transparent cataloging system. Archives preserve, but, in so doing, they always regulate access to what they pre-

serve, thus helping to shape what is remembered and what forgotten. Much of the recent interest in archives stems from this basic recognition that archival practices, far from innocent, are politically loaded.<sup>6</sup>

“Secret files were and are perceived to be the opposite of democracy,” observes the legal theorist Cornelia Vismann in her fascinating study of archival technologies.<sup>7</sup> Just as archives include certain things by excluding others, so they also routinely exclude particular classes of witness to what they include. This is no less the case for the often unofficial porn archives that interest us than for the official state archives discussed by Vismann. In both cases, relations of power mediate the criteria of inclusion and exclusion in ways that merit investigation. Archival research entails not just grubbing around to see what the archive contains but also analysis at the metalevel, in an effort to make visible the constraints determining otherwise imperceptible principles of inclusion, classification, and access. It is this metalevel of analysis that Foucault is referring to when, in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, he differentiates archives from statements, discourses, and institutions.<sup>8</sup> The significance of these distinctions for our purposes lies in their implication that researching porn archives involves focus less on the sexually explicit image or text per se than on the archival systems that condition their intelligibility as pornographic to begin with. The chapters collected here demonstrate how archival work is thus highly theoretical and abstract at the same time as it is ineluctably empirical, particular, and rather dirty.

Archival dirt may take the form of dust from disintegrating documents and artifacts; it may take the form of smut associated with illicit sexual representations; or it may take the form of political dirt generated by the friction of ceaseless microstruggles for power.<sup>9</sup> The claim that archives, far from serving as neutral repositories, are closely tied to political power has been developed by Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and many others. Derrida, for example, traces the etymological links between archive and authority in order to suggest that “there is no political power without control of the archive”; indeed, he contends that “effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and the access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation.”<sup>10</sup> What is particularly relevant to the study of pornography in Derrida’s critique is his insistence that archives confer authority, including disciplinary authority. Every academic discipline has its archives, broadly understood, and without archival authorization any discipline founders. As Linda Williams argues, the scholarly study of pornography requires archives for its disciplinary legitimacy.<sup>11</sup> Yet, since obscenity always threatens to undermine authority (whether of an individual or an institution), pornography’s presence in the archive represents a double-edged sword. Pornography in the archive is at once legitimated and potentially corrosive: what

kind of a library (or museum) are you running if it's chock full of porn? Porn archives, ostensibly authorizing the legitimacy of the study of pornography, may simultaneously undermine the authority of the archive. The contributors to this volume negotiate that tension in differing ways, as have many archivists and pornographers before them.

In *Archive Fever*, Derrida pursues a related tension that seems to inhere in the archive. By describing archivization in terms of Freud's concept of the death drive, Derrida shows how archival power consists in the capacity to destroy as well as to preserve. It is not merely that institutions such as libraries are often compelled to deaccess or destroy some of their holdings in order to make room for new ones but, more fundamentally, that the urge to archive necessitates destruction. This argument is especially pertinent to the place of pornography in the archive because porn is routinely deemed more worthy of destruction than of preservation. Only rarely is porn valued as a form of knowledge in its own right or as making a contribution to understanding the history of sexuality. What kind of archaeology of human sexuality would be possible without porn archives? Another way of framing this question would be to ask why we need the distance of centuries to grasp that sexually explicit representations (such as those unearthed at Pompeii) are historically valuable and merit preservation. As the outlandish dimensions of Priapus suggest, pornography does not need to adhere to the criteria of documentary realism in order to furnish vital evidence about human sexuality.

The evidence furnished by pornography may be historical, sexological, erotic, or forensic. Everyone instinctively knows that pornographic evidence displays distinct values in different contexts. And it is precisely because archives, insofar as they record the past, offer potentially forensic evidence that porn archives are so frequently destroyed rather than preserved. In recent years, we have become increasingly aware of how pornography—which now is more readily produced and disseminated than ever before—can be incriminating. Your porn archives may be used not only by you but against you. The capacity of archivization to destroy as well as to preserve is nowhere more apparent than in the juridical realm (not to mention the court of public opinion). Just ask Anthony Weiner, the New York congressman whose inadvertent circulation, via Twitter, of a picture of his penis shattered his hitherto successful political career.

Although by priapic standards Weiner appeared quite impressive, the photographic evidence of his hungness could not have been more damaging. When, early in the summer of 2011, his secret archive of risqué self-portraits emerged into the glare of mainstream media attention, the destructive power of archivization became fully evident. To observe that Weiner was sufficiently well hung to fuck himself is to say that his porn archive caught up with him

once its forensic potential was unleashed. Of the many lessons to be drawn from this morality tale, not the least significant involves the capacity of new technologies to exceed—and thus, in a sense, to outsmart—even their most experienced users.<sup>12</sup> Weiner was done in as much by the archival properties of digital technology as by sexual explicitness. In this respect his case, far from exceptional, is exemplary. Key features of digital technology exceed the intentions of any user, with far-reaching implications for porn and its archivization.

### *Pornography in the Age of Its Digital Reproducibility*

Weinergate, as the affair became known, was mediated as a scandal not of pornography per se but, more specifically, of sexting. As new technologies give rise to new possibilities for pornographic representation, we require new terminology, new legislation, and new social norms to accommodate it. The neologism *sexting*—derived from the relatively recent use of *text* as a verb to describe using a mobile-phone keypad to create and send typed messages—primarily refers to the use of a smart phone, with its built-in camera, to make and transmit sexually explicit messages and images. While we were not really paying attention, our phones morphed into porn-production devices. And not just our phones. Originating with mobile-phone practices, the term *sexting* has been extended to cover the production of explicit images through personal computers, web cameras (camming), and video-game systems as well. Hunt's observation—that pornography emerges with the conjunction of a new technology and widespread access to it—has never been more relevant. Yet what distinguishes the new image technologies from their predecessors is the ease of reproducibility, which lends every mobile-phone photo unprecedented potential for viral circulation. Now anyone with a phone and Internet access may become a pornographer.

This circumstance has elicited widespread concern, in part because teenagers, legally defined as children, are among the most active practitioners of sexting. When, as happens with increasing frequency, a teenage girl uses her cell phone to send her boyfriend a nude photograph of herself, she unwittingly renders them both vulnerable to indictment under child-pornography statutes. Paradoxically, she is both the producer of the pornographic image and, if she is under eighteen, its legally defined victim.<sup>13</sup> Since, in the United States, it is illegal even to possess material defined as child pornography, her boyfriend likewise becomes vulnerable to felony charges. In 2009, for example, a fourteen-year-old girl from New Jersey faced child-pornography charges and sex-offender registration requirements after she posted on her MySpace page nearly thirty photographs of herself naked.<sup>14</sup> As a Harvard Law

School report on this new phenomenon makes clear, the problem lies in how “once it is out of the hands of the minors involved, a sexted image is indistinguishable from any other sexually explicit image of a minor.”<sup>15</sup> Needless to say, a sexted image is distinguished precisely by the alacrity with which it escapes the intention and control of its author.

Social hysteria around kiddie porn, discussed by Steven Ruszczycky in his contribution to the volume, distracts our attention from the broader issues entailed by digital technology’s transformation of pornography. Weinergate made spectacularly evident that it is not just teenagers who barely know what they’re doing when they use their phones to take naked pictures of themselves. To focus on youngsters sexting or to engage in hand-wringing over Weiner’s antics is to treat as exceptional and, hence, as avoidable something that actually now implicates everyone. Much of the furor around Weinergate involved scapegoating a prominent figure for our own libidinal investment in, and promiscuous use of, the technologies that tripped up his career. Statistics suggest that sexting has become a routine part of young people’s erotic lives and, indeed, that digital technology has made potential pornographers of us all.<sup>16</sup> The archival properties of this ubiquitous technology escape any individual’s control, not merely that of an impulsive teenager or a reckless congressman. Far from merely contingent or anecdotal, the ungovernability of the digital image represents an essential part of its structure.

Here I’m referring to the manner in which digital images automatically encode metadata that serve an archival function. Sexting furnishes a basis for legal intervention because the technology it employs generates pornography and its archive simultaneously. The fact that every digital image, no matter how amateur, is accompanied by a comparatively sophisticated archive of information bears more than forensic significance. It means, too, that every digital image has virtually unlimited audience potential built into its structure, and consequently any digital image can be displaced from its original context with startling ease. In a marvelous discussion of the Abu Ghraib archive, W. J. T. Mitchell explains this transformation in the conditions of photography:

The digital camera is a radically different technical apparatus from the analog camera: it is not just lightweight and easily concealed, but linked in unprecedented ways to a vast infrastructure of reproduction and circulation. . . . We have to think of the digital camera, not only as an extension of the eyes and memory of an individual, but as linked very intimately to a global network of collective perception, memory, and imagining via e-mail and postings on the Internet. . . . It is as if digital images are directly connected to the filing cabinets where they are stored and the retrieval system that

makes their circulation possible, carrying their own archiving system with them as part of their automatism.<sup>17</sup>

As a result of this transformation in the production and circulation of images, we start to see how the ease with which digital porn is created is matched only by the difficulty of fathoming its implications. It is not just particular images that have gone viral but imagery itself—with the metaphor of viral replication becoming a recurrent trope for attempting to grasp these changes.<sup>18</sup> The study of pornography, far from suffering a dearth of archives (as Williams laments), thus confronts a surfeit of them. We have more porn archives than we know what to do with. Now the problem lies in how the proliferation of image data outpaces any capacity to measure, analyze, or comprehend it. If, as suggested apropos Pompeii, pornography comes into existence with the archive, then that claim is more than substantiated in our current digital era—although what is meant by the term *archive* has shifted. And while the nineteenth-century archives that preserved sexually explicit material did so by rigorously restricting access, one of the distinguishing features of contemporary digital archives is their extraordinary accessibility. What once was preserved only by virtue of secrecy now manifests, thanks to the properties of digital technology, secrecy as its least likely characteristic. Today anyone with access to Wikipedia can view an image of *Pan and the Goat*, probably the most provocative statue found at Pompeii.

Further, everyone can just as easily upload to the Internet pictures and videos of themselves naked or having sex. Despite the exponential growth of the porn industry in recent years, most explicit digital imagery falls under the rubric of amateur productions. Ordinary people use their phones and personal computers to produce porn for the purpose of seduction, rather than for commercial purposes (though who or what is being seduced may not be readily discernible). The young man who masturbates upon waking is unremarkable, even archetypal; but the legion of young—and not-so-young—men who use their laptops' built-in cameras to record this morning ritual, in order to post it online, are engaged in a form of sexual activity that has yet to be accurately named or understood. Likewise, using a phone to take a picture of one's genitals and then posting it online needs to be recognized as a new sexual act, perhaps a novel kind of foreplay. To characterize such behavior as simple exhibitionism or to invoke it as evidence of a "culture of voyeurism" is to diagnose without understanding it.

Whether or not we categorize such practices as sexting, it would be easy to describe them, following Foucault, as so many confessions of the flesh, wherein the deployment of sexuality takes advantage of new technological opportunities for inciting sex to speak.<sup>19</sup> From this perspective, what's in-



volved in the amateur production of explicit digital imagery is less any individual agency or desire than the agency of a transindividual force that acts through us in order to regulate our sexuality. We may think we've mastered the technology, but we do not control its broader implications, any more than we control the fate of images posted online. Indeed, from a certain perspective, the new digital technologies master us.

### *Archives of Affect, Counterarchives*

If there is no pornography without an accompanying archive, then we need to consider more specifically what porn captures and preserves. The discussion of digital imagery makes clear that pornography archives information of at least two kinds. First, each image encodes precise metadata that enables both unlimited reproduction of the image and forensic tracking of its provenance. However, the production of such images serves a broader tracking function by intensifying surveillance of our bodies and sexualities. To participate in sexting or online porn, in any shape or form, is to be constantly disclosing information about one's desire and thus to be working within the regulatory deployment of sexuality. This point—which may come as unwelcome news to those who imagine their online activities as politically resistant or necessarily transgressive—emphasizes the degree to which digital technologies capture and preserve information without their users' consent. When I see a sign at the entrance to the gym's locker room stating that the use of cellular phones is forbidden, I'm being alerted to a similar point. Almost everyone now has the technology to capture surreptitiously images of others and information about them—a fact that exponentially multiplies potential sites of porn production. Our bodies are subject to surveillance more than ever before.

This Foucauldian take on digital sex, while far from unwarranted, might be understood as one of many manifestations of a paranoid approach to pornography. It's another way of expressing the widespread fear that pornography is intrinsically harmful. A less paranoid approach would acknowledge that, in addition to archiving information, *pornography archives pleasure*. The elementary recognition at the heart of this volume is that porn is itself an archive—of sex, of fantasy, of desire, of bodies and their actions, and of pleasure. Pornography, at least in its photographic forms, preserves evidence of something that is otherwise transient and ephemeral. It enables intimacy to enter the archive, and it is valuable for that reason alone. Indeed, pornography offers evidence about a whole gamut of social issues and desires by showing us things that otherwise tend to remain imperceptible. Much of the confusion about pornography's value stems from the objection that its representations are not realistic (“my body doesn't look like that”). But as the case of Priapus sug-

gests, pornography need not be realistic to furnish valuable evidence; realism is just one of several valid criteria in archival research.

The nineteenth-century archaeologists and curators tasked with handling priapic artifacts intuited something that contemporary scholars have begun to emphasize—namely, that archives contain not just information but also affect. What stirred the Victorians' apprehension was their sense of the artifacts' capacity to arouse uncontrollable feelings of lust in the viewer. Recent scholarship on archives, especially that inspired by feminist, queer, and post-colonialist methodologies, has stressed the affective dimension of the archive—though without considering feelings specifically of pleasure or lust.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps because this scholarship has tended to focus primarily on so-called negative affects, it has been reluctant to acknowledge that pornography constitutes a massive archive of heterogeneous feelings and affects. In order to grasp how sexuality works in modern culture, we need to appreciate that porn, too, is an archive of feeling. Certainly this is a major source of pornography's significance for those whose desires depart from social norms—as many of the chapters collected here attest. By preserving traces of nonnormative pleasures, porn facilitates not only the tracking but also the reactivation of these pleasures; and it may do so without requiring imaginary identification to experience them. Porn archives are important not least because sexual minorities use them as a form of cultural memory.<sup>21</sup>

This understanding of pornography's archival capacity stems partly from a queer perspective on porn and partly from scholarship that has enlarged our sense of what constitutes an archive. Taking stock of how pornography archives affect in addition to information entails recognizing that the notion of the archive bears more than one meaning. "The term 'archive' has become a kind of loose signifier for a disparate set of concepts," observes one surveyor of the field.<sup>22</sup> It is not simply a question of how the archives of virtual data held in digital images complicate traditional conceptions of the archive as a repository of documents. More fundamentally, the issue of the archive concerns the dramatic expansion of the term to cover unofficial, idiosyncratic, and personal collections of material, in addition to those that historically have served the nation-state. According to this perspective, an individual scholar's assemblage of various sources, just as much as an amateur's stash of comics or porn, may be regarded as an archive. The term now encompasses private as well as public collections and, indeed, spans cultural dimensions, ranging from the most modest, disordered groupings of material to the macro level of discursive systems (à la Foucault).

Work on the archive has been motivated as much by the desire to legitimate new fields of inquiry (no discipline without its archive) as by the conviction that unofficial archives may be turned against their official counterparts.

The official story—of a nation, a people, an ethnicity, or a sexuality—can be contested by the hitherto unsanctioned stories contained within marginal archives. Here what the archive holds is political resistance. This insight, developed from Walter Benjamin’s rethinking of historiography via Foucault’s account of subjugated knowledges, has led to research on what are variously known as counterarchives, migrant archives, and queer archives: a multi-pronged, cross-disciplinary project of identifying, collecting, and preserving the traces of that which otherwise remains obscure, ephemeral, itinerant, and precarious.<sup>23</sup> *Porn Archives* contributes to this cross-disciplinary project in manifold ways, even as the counterarchival status of pornography remains equivocal. On the one hand, what Rodrigo Lazo says of migrant archives—that they “reside in obscurity and are always at the edge of annihilation”—applies equally to porn archives.<sup>24</sup> This becomes evident when one considers, for example, the archive of early twentieth-century stag films preserved by the Kinsey Institute archive in Bloomington, Indiana. As Williams explains: “An archive of stag films is not like any film archive. It was not acquired to preserve film history but as a record of sexual practices; all of its films were illicitly made and distributed and no one properly ‘owns’ their copyright. It is something of a miracle—and a tribute to Alfred Kinsey’s voracious, nonjudgmental interest in everything having to do with sex—that this archive exists at all.”<sup>25</sup> Since porn is regarded as ephemera, the conditions that facilitate its archivization remain so contingent, often depending on the zeal of a particular individual, as to make its preservation seem miraculous. On the other hand, however, porn is routinely archived for mundane commercial reasons. The recent digitization of *Playboy*’s entire fifty-seven-year magazine run, featuring “every pictorial, interview, centerfold, investigative reporting piece, story, cartoon, advertisement and image that ever appeared in the magazine,” represents a valuable resource for scholars of pornography and postwar U.S. culture.<sup>26</sup> As a record of mainstream erotic tastes made available for profit, *iPlayboy.com* hardly constitutes a counterarchive. Yet to the extent that non-target audiences, such as queer and feminist scholars, may use it against the grain, this new online resource nevertheless harbors significant counterarchival potential.

The *Playboy* example helps clarify how the term *counterarchive* refers less to a determinate place or archival content than to a strategic practice or a particular style of constituting the archive’s legibility. Less an entity than a relation, the counterarchive works to unsettle those orders of knowledge established in and through official archives.<sup>27</sup> By exposing the libidinal investments that a given regime prefers to keep out of sight, porn archives may disrupt the dominant narrative, even as they also may consolidate the deployment of sexuality by tracking and molding their subjects’ desires. In the end, pornog-

raphy remains too heterogeneous to consistently qualify as counterarchival. Its heterogeneity as a category also explains why it makes little sense to take a position either “for” or “against” it. The antiporn-anticensorship battles of previous generations relied on essentialized notions of what pornography is and does. However, when one considers the full range of existing porn archives, as well as the role of archivization in shaping porn’s meanings, then both pro and anti positions ultimately become untenable.

### *Passions of the Collector*

Antiporn critiques, whether feminist or otherwise, tend to take representations in which men dominate women as defining pornography. By thus assuming a heterosexual paradigm, criticism on pornography, both popular and academic, has a harder time grasping either porn’s heterogeneity or the variety of functions it may fulfill. *Porn Archives* attempts to redress that imbalance by queering the critical perspective on pornography in various ways. More than considering simply nonheterosexual content, the contributors investigate the counterheteronormative uses to which porn—whether mainstream or marginal—may be put. Examining porn in terms of its archivization involves analyzing explicitness as something whose meaning and effects, far from self-evident, are context dependent. Such a perspective entails taking some distance from the feminist debates that brought the study of pornography into academia in the first place.<sup>28</sup> Or, rather, the perspective entails reframing those debates in queer terms by acknowledging that gender is only one factor, not necessarily the most important one, when considering sexuality and its manifestations. As the chapters collected here demonstrate, categories of racial difference, ethnic difference, national difference, able-bodiedness, and generational difference need to supplement—indeed, to displace—sexual difference as the principal axis structuring erotic intelligibility. Otherwise, lacking a broadly conceived queer perspective, critics of porn unwittingly reinscribe the heteronormative framework that organizes so much of social and cultural life, including mainstream pornography.

A queer perspective on pornography makes visible the artificiality of the normative division of desire into straight and gay. This is another way of saying that the notion of sexual identity is itself an artifact of heteronormativity. The closer one looks at various pornographies, the more clearly one sees how little porn respects sexual-identity categories. This point became evident in what is now regarded as a classic work of porn archiving, Samuel Delany’s *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*, a book that collated the author’s reminiscences of life in the porn theaters of New York’s Times Square over several decades, until the theaters’ destruction under the Rudy Giuliani administration

during the late 1990s.<sup>29</sup> Working as an informal, idiosyncratic, yet nonetheless passionate archivist, Delany undertook a labor of preservation through storytelling, in the face of a concerted, long-term program of annihilation. His book documents how the Times Square porn theaters fostered beneficent relationships, often interracial and cross class, among their legion of patrons; in turn, those relationships, social as well as sexual, conditioned the meaning of the images screened. Dramatizing how the films' heterosexual content did nothing to deter erotic activity among the almost exclusively male audience, Delany underscores the irrelevance of sexual-identity categories to the experience of pleasure in these institutions. Porn enables ostensibly straight men to come together in ways that don't always reinforce heteronormativity.

As with many of the chapters collected here, Delany's work makes plain that researching and archiving pornography is rarely characterized by scholarly objectivity. Instead, it partakes of what one of the editors of Benjamin's archive calls "the passions of the collector."<sup>30</sup> Benjamin, himself a major archivist, took the figure of the collector (as well as that of the ragpicker) to embody his ethics of historical salvage, where value is found in what has been discarded as outmoded or worthless. Any archive constituted in this manner, but especially a porn archive saved from obliteration thanks to "the passions of the collector," is likely to be incomplete, disordered, and irreducibly subjective. What such an archive lacks in order or completeness, however, it will make up for in traces of subjectivity and desire that otherwise would have been lost to the historical record. This is especially important in the case of minority sexualities, because conventional historical traces—marriage and birth records, all the signs that confer recognition on normative relationships—tend to be absent. The passions of the collector often incline toward the queer end of the spectrum for just this reason.<sup>31</sup>

However, as in Benjamin's comparison of the collector with the ragpicker, substantial class differences divide those whose passions encourage the collecting of rare erotica and those who, with lesser means, collect erotic experience, all the better to archive it. It is not coincidental, in Delany's account of pornography, that class—rather than gender, race, or sexuality—remains the most significant category of analysis. When, to take another example, one considers Henry Spencer Ashbee, the Victorian gentleman whose extraordinary collection of pornography became the basis of the Private Case at the British Museum, one sees how he enjoyed, along with economic privilege, a kind of access to pornography that routinely was denied women and the lower classes.<sup>32</sup> Yet while socially privileged in terms of his gender, race, class, and nation, Ashbee, albeit married with children, was not sexually normative in his erotic tastes and practices. His interest in what now would be categorized as BDSM (specifically, flagellation), together with his exceptional commit-

ment to archiving pornography, marks this Victorian gentleman as distinctly queer. Indeed, the practice of collecting pornography, as a kind of sublimated promiscuity that seeks out more and more mediated sexual experience, is always potentially queer, insofar as it resists the monogamous ideal governing heteronormativity.

If access to porn and its archives has been historically an issue of social class, then technological developments during the mid- to late twentieth century have transformed the landscape by democratizing access to the means of representation. Here the relevant case would be Sam Steward, the English-professor-turned-tattoo-artist, whose impressive porn archiving, detailed by historian Justin Spring, exemplifies the passions of the collector.<sup>33</sup> By comparison with Ashbee, Steward appears as more of a collector of erotic experience—even as what distinguishes him in turn from other twentieth-century gay adventurers was the meticulous recording of his thousands of sexual encounters. Like a good librarian, Steward archived those encounters in an index card-based “Stud File” and, when Polaroid technology came along to facilitate amateur pornography, he took snapshots of his men too.<sup>34</sup> Although Steward became one of Alfred Kinsey’s most valuable informants, his collecting and archiving were motivated primarily by the search for pleasure. Or perhaps we should say that, in Steward’s case, the practice of archiving to preserve and enhance erotic pleasure did not require any pretension to scientific knowledge as its alibi. His porn archive constituted more of an *ars erotica* than a *scientia sexualis*.<sup>35</sup> Ashbee and Steward—both world-class porn archivists, both passionate about BDSM, both queer in their own ways—were divided by differences the most salient of which was *not* sexual identity.

As these examples indicate, the question of class in porn involves at least three dimensions. First, in terms of content, pornography since the Marquis de Sade has repeatedly, almost obsessively, taken differences of social class as its subject.<sup>36</sup> Second, until recently social class was a primary factor in determining access to the archives of pornography. Third, beyond questions of content and access, class has been central to porn’s capacity for diagramming otherwise imperceptible forms of social mobility. That, at least, is the claim of Frances Ferguson’s *Pornography, the Theory*, a book whose distinctive thesis has not yet been assimilated by the field of porn studies.<sup>37</sup> This failure is attributable in part to how the field tends to be divided between scholars working in film studies and those who approach pornography from other disciplinary perspectives. *Porn Archives* attempts to bridge that divide by including a broader range of disciplinary approaches and by offering a sustained engagement with Ferguson’s account of pornography. This volume stages a cross-disciplinary conversation about pornography, with contributions from

scholars working in art history, information science, and ethnic studies, as well as in literary, film, and media studies.

The challenge of assimilating competing accounts of pornography is partly a question of disciplinarity. But it is also, as I've been suggesting, a question of technology. Thinking about porn in terms of different media—whether painting, sculpture, print, photography, film, video, or digital—alters the account of porn that is likely to be generated, just as any experience of porn depends on the technology through which it is mediated. Regardless of content, a pornographic image on film cannot be the same as a digital pornographic image, for example. Not only that: critics of pornography face the additional challenge of negotiating an intractable tension between porn as a technology of knowledge (part of the will to know) and porn as a technology of pleasure. Whatever form it takes, pornography is never just one thing. The term *pornography* designates not a single, homogeneous entity about which judgments may be made but a plurality of genres, media, technologies, and conditioning archives. Rather than awkwardly referring to *pornographies*, we have chosen to speak instead of *porn archives*, wishing to acknowledge both the heterogeneity of the category and the conviction that sexual explicitness, in spite of appearances, bears no essential meaning.

### *Pedagogical Archives*

*Porn Archives* begins with Linda Williams surveying the field of pornography studies that she widely is regarded as having founded. Her assessment, useful as a supplementary introduction to this volume, is critical of the state of the field, which she finds to be lacking much of the scholarly infrastructure that typically supports academic disciplines and subfields. At the heart of the problem is what she calls “the missing archive.” From the perspective of film studies, the “lack of preservation of the pornographic heritage is appalling”; it hobbles the field’s development. This is a very real problem, although it changes complexion when one considers porn archives from a vantage other than that of film history. In addition to the archive, Williams engages tough questions of pedagogy and critical terminology—questions that remain central to the study of pornography from any disciplinary perspective.

The question of pedagogy is central to the next chapter, which archives a classroom conversation with Frances Ferguson about her book *Pornography, the Theory*. Ferguson situates the issue of institutions in a broader historical perspective by comparing pornography to the eighteenth-century utilitarian classroom theorized by Jeremy Bentham. In so doing, she clarifies the distinctiveness of her own account of pornography while also anticipating the dis-

cussion of pedagogy found in several of the volume's chapters. Because Ferguson's account has not been engaged by scholars in porn studies, we wanted to include this interview with her as a way of connecting the implications of *Pornography, the Theory* to wider debates. Pornography for Ferguson, like the Benthamite classroom, constitutes a "utilitarian social structure," characterized by the extreme perceptibility of shifting value assignments as bodies become mobile in a circumscribed space. Elaborating her account in relation to Catharine MacKinnon's critique of pornography as sexual harassment, Ferguson explains how "something can be pornographic without being sexually explicit": what makes it pornographic is not its content but its use in a social situation of inequality. The original way in which Ferguson connects pornography to the nonsexual dynamics of social systems is particularly illuminating for subsequent *Porn Archives* chapters that take up and engage her thinking in different contexts (such as that of disability porn).

In chapter 3, the experimental videographer Nguyen Tan Hoang addresses pornography in the classroom from a specifically queer perspective. By drawing on his own experience as a student making sexually explicit videos, Nguyen concretizes the discussion of pedagogy. His archive of instructional scenes exemplifies how teaching may involve less imitation than initiation—and hence his title's allusion to *The Opening of Misty Beethoven* (directed by Henry Paris, 1976), a hard-core classic of eroto-pedagogic initiation based on *Pygmalion*. Nguyen describes how the roster of teachers named in his title helped him to develop his aesthetic practice of creating "counterpornographies," and how he learned not simply to critique the sexually explicit but also queerly to produce it. Aspiring through his work to "expand the official gay-porn archive," Nguyen crosses sexuality with axes of racial, ethnic, and intergenerational difference in a contestatory fashion that aims to interrogate porn without draining it of heat. By revealing the classroom as a site of something more than institutional discipline, his chapter resonates with Ferguson's account of Benthamite education.

In chapter 4, David Squires extends the focus on education by considering how the presence of pornography in the library "raises an entire set of questions about intellectual freedom, community service, media access, heterogeneous social values, and more-practical concerns about how to manage potentially sensitive collections." This chapter develops the discussion of porn's institutional status by, on the one hand, bringing to bear debates in postwar information science about the preservation of sexually explicit material, and, on the other, considering libraries as imaginary spaces. Building on an analysis of the library scene in Pauline Réage's *Story of O* (where the heroine submits to sexual instruction at the hands of sadistic gentlemen patrons), Squires examines the library as an institution charged with the pedagogical



mission to educate its users. This mission expanded to the possibility of sexual education after obscenity law shifted its focus from books to films during the 1960s, thereby presenting libraries with a new set of questions and opportunities. The shift in censorship policy positioned libraries to become privileged institutional sites for negotiating so-called community standards. Drawing on Ferguson's account of pornography as defined not by content but by social use, Squires shows how libraries—like classrooms—actively participate in the social production of knowledge about sex.

### *Historical Archives*

The degree to which part I considers historical issues suggests just how artificial the separation is between it and part II. Nevertheless, the chapters in “Historical Archives” focus especially closely on particular moments in the history of pornography, beginning with Jennifer Burns Bright and Ronan Crowley's account of the evolution of library policies governing access to sexually explicit material. This coauthored chapter considers the situation of the sexuality researcher who, in today's library context, is constrained to peruse pornography in public. Here the archive is not missing, just peculiarly troublesome to consult, since “the contemporary scholar of pornography is an unwitting heir of old battles for and against sequestration.” Tracing the history of these battles at the British Museum Library and the Kinsey Institute, Bright and Crowley demonstrate how conventions of disciplinary space continue to determine the circulation of material among shifting publics and counterpublics. This history is not simply one of expanding access following sexual liberation but instead tells the story of mutating protocols and intensifying regulation—a story, that is, of discipline in the Foucauldian sense. Print pornography, mediated by libraries and hybrid institutions such as the Kinsey Institute, is archived according to disciplinary systems that continue to evolve.

In chapter 6, Loren Glass examines another historically crucial institution that mediated print pornography: Grove Press. Anticensorship victories in the trials of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, *Tropic of Cancer*, and *Naked Lunch* allowed Grove Press to publish a host of “underground” Victorian titles, including *My Secret Life*, the pornographic autobiography of an anonymous Victorian gentleman. As with the writing of Sade, such works had been previously unavailable to all but a handful of readers. A significant chapter in the history of democratizing access to sexually explicit works, the story of Grove Press involves what Glass calls the “desacralization” of obscenity. By domesticating the Sadean aura, Grove made Sade available to not only a mainstream audience but also the possibility of feminist critique. Glass's history shows how “the dissolution of

the sacred category of evil as a descriptor of pornographic texts enabled the secular category of politics to emerge as the central battleground.” This process also laid the groundwork for the U.S. reception of Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*, whose critique of a censorship model of sex (that is, the repressive hypothesis) invokes *My Secret Life* and *Sade* as exemplars.

The influence of Foucault’s *History of Sexuality* is central also to Joseph Bristow’s analysis, in chapter 7, of *Teleny*, an anonymous work from 1893 that Neil Bartlett called “London’s first gay porn novel.” Showing how *Teleny*’s erudition supports its “concerted defense of homoerotic pleasure,” Bristow reshapes our understanding of pornography as a technology of knowledge. Rather than serving the normalizing deployment of sexuality that Foucault saw emerging in the Victorian period, *Teleny* draws on an astonishing range of discourses—scholarly, aesthetic, musical, scientific—in order to articulate a counterdiscursive challenge to the medicolegal pathologization of homosexuality. Bristow’s meticulous locating of the novel in its historical and bibliographic contexts enables us to appreciate how powerfully original *Teleny* is. At the same time, he emphasizes that it is not simply cosmopolitan erudition that distinguishes this novel but also its passionate celebration of the “gay phallus,” its unabashed pleasure in “the physiological splendor of the ejaculating male organ.” In this way, the chapter contributes a historical argument on behalf of the importance of pornographic representation for minority sexualities.

### Image Archives

The chapters in part III, by focusing on primarily still images in a range of visual media, draw our attention to the heterogeneity of visual archives in which sexually explicit images occur. In chapter 8, Robert L. Caserio contrasts explicit homoerotic art with contemporary digital porn to interrogate the dichotomy between activity and passivity that structures so much of erotic life. Examining the work of Lucian Freud, Francis Bacon, and John O’Reilly, Caserio finds a profound meditation on erotic passivity that challenges the wider culture’s commitment to agency and mastery. That commitment was central to the popular rationale for video technology, which emphasized the viewer’s privacy and enhanced agency in the viewing experience, thanks to the possibilities of remote-control manipulation of the image. The privileging of agency was also central to feminist critiques of pornography, which argued on behalf of women’s agency and control over their sexuality. Given this context, the erotic allure of masculine passivity and, indeed, the queer agency in passivity that Caserio discloses are all the more striking.

By contrast, the next chapter focuses on masculine activity in one of its

most hyperbolic guises—namely, gay black porn superhero comics. Darieck Scott shows how the comic form exaggerates particular attributes (whether superhero powers or sexual prowess) far beyond any human proportion, and how exaggeration may perform critical work, especially in a racial context where black men already are caricatured as oversexed and hyperphallicized. Although the hyperbolic muscularity of mainstream comic superheroes makes them ripe for gay appropriation, the gay black porn comics drawn by Belasco, David Barnes, and Patrick Fillion render the protagonists heroic by exaggerating their sexual beauty and allure. The emphasis on black beauty gives these porn comics a utopian dimension, argues Scott, even as they position the ideal reader as nonblack in order to maximize the desirability of blackness. As with other porn archives, these gay black porn comics are not simply showing us sexually explicit content but also teaching us how to look at it.

Another archive that experimented with representations of gay sex—this time through collage—is the subject of chapter 10. Robert Dewhurst unearths the history of *Gay Sunshine*, a San Francisco–based news monthly that ran throughout the 1970s and that, by means of a collagist aesthetic, “sought to assemble a lost archive of queer subcultural and literary history.” From its inaugural issue, *Gay Sunshine* subjected the pornographic centerfold to what Dewhurst calls “pornopoetic” collage treatment by mingling and overlaying poems with nude male figures. Dewhurst connects this collage technique, which combines disparate and fragmentary materials, with the practice of queer-archive assembly, which entails pluralistic inventiveness and a “radical global politics of solidarity.” *Gay Sunshine*, located in the crucial decade between Stonewall and AIDS, prefigures through its aesthetics the emergence of coalitional queer politics in the 1990s. Together with the other chapters in “Image Archives,” Dewhurst’s contribution suggests how historical constraints on erotic expression—particularly for gay men—promoted forms of experiment in which representational realism seemed the least important criterion.

Chapter 11, “This Is What Porn Can Be Like!,” pursues the question of queer pornographic expression from a female perspective by archiving a conversation between the feminist porn scholar Mireille Miller-Young and the producer-director Shine Louise Houston, whose film *Champion* recently won the Movie of the Year award at the Feminist Porn Awards in Toronto. The conversation affords multiple insights into not only the role of female producers and consumers of pornography but also the impact of new media technologies from a filmmaker’s perspective. Houston describes the economic constraints of running a business in the age of Internet porn, which sometimes generate tension between capturing women’s sexual pleasure on screen and producing films that work as aesthetic or commercial artifacts. Despite the

enumeration of manifold constraints, however, what comes through most strongly in the conversation is that this queer, feminist filmmaker bears a utopian vision of pornography's possibilities for minorities—"This is *what porn can be like!*" Houston and Miller-Young share with the volume's other contributors a determination to take the best examples as representative of the genre, rather than the worst—in other words, to treat pornography on a par with other expressive genres, such as the novel.

### Rough Archives

If the chapters in "Image Archives" focus on queer representations, those in "Rough Archives" focus on primarily heterosexual moving-image porn that falls outside the mainstream. Since these chapters examine pornographic scenarios involving women—scenarios that also typically involve domination or violence—they engage feminist debates about disequilibriums of power in porn more directly than do other contributions to *Porn Archives*. In chapter 12, Lisa Downing intervenes in these debates by considering the snuff film, a genre that epitomizes the radical feminist critique of pornography. Distinct from the missing archive or fugitive archive, snuff constitutes a *fantasmatic archive*—one containing no verifiable instances—that nonetheless performs significant cultural work. Tracking the itinerary of this fantasmatic archive, Downing offers a critique of recent obscenity legislation in the United Kingdom that criminalizes the possession of images simulating erotic death. She shows how Britain's "extreme images" laws entail policing fantasy rather than sexual consent, all in the service of enforcing the majority's erotic norms. If the problem is less censorship than intensifying normalization, then we start to see how categories of sexual identity take a backseat to broader questions of power and coercion.

The next chapter pursues these questions by examining the formal principles at work in the archives of "rough sex." Focusing on *Forced Entry* (directed by Lizzy Borden, 2002), an infamous video by Extreme Associates that was subject to federal obscenity indictment, Eugenie Brinkema shows how roughness characterizes not only the sex in the film but also its atypical formal features. Although it is about as hard core as U.S. porn gets, *Forced Entry* exemplifies not the "frenzy of the visible" described by Linda Williams in *Hard Core* but instead what Brinkema calls a *frenzy at the expense of the visible*, thanks to its idiosyncratic roughening of all aspects of the pornographic experience. This roughening also impacts the pornographic archive, which in its normative incarnation would be smooth, complete, and well ordered. Anticipating John Paul Ricco's claims later in the volume, Brinkema argues on behalf of the

ethics of a rough archive, one that does not disavow the roughening effects of time's passage but rather embraces finitude.

In chapter 14, Marcia Klotz investigates BDSM pornography in the context of online interactivity, focusing on the controversial web-based porn studio Insex, founded by the performance artist Brent Scott in 1997 and shut down by Homeland Security in 2005. Probing questions of consent, coercion, and mediated intimacy, Klotz examines the site's experiments with live-feed technology, in which viewers around the world could have a say in what Insex models did. As part of her research, Klotz adopts an interactive methodology and conducts an informal ethnography via online interviews with former site members and models, as well as with the makers of *Graphic Sexual Horror*, a recent documentary about Insex. Like Ferguson, Klotz asks what makes something pornographic when there is no nudity or genital contact involved. Her chapter is also closely in dialogue with Downing's, even as its focus on globalized interactivity anticipates the chapters in the next part.

### Transnational Archives

If Internet technology has contributed to globalization, it likewise has facilitated the transnationalizing of pornography. The chapters in this part examine porn archives beyond the boundaries of the United States, beginning with Ramón E. Soto-Crespo's account of the history of obscenity legislation in Puerto Rico—a history that is closely related, though not identical, to that of the mainland United States. A borderland created through repeated migrations between the island and the mainland, Puerto Rico has a cultural and political specificity that resists the nationalist model on which archival practices conventionally depend. Soto-Crespo argues that migration provides access to pornography at the same time as it problematizes our understanding of the archive. Starting from a description of “el archivo,” the stash of old copies of *Playboy* and *Penthouse* that local island boys hid and treasured, this chapter traces the history of pornography in Puerto Rico and its development in the borderlands. The emergence of Boricua porn during the 1990s offered vibrant images of migrant masculinity that displaced Nuyorican representations of ethnic masculinity as “mongo” or impotent. Analyzing this set of transformations, Soto-Crespo makes the case for a theory and practice of archiving that, decoupled from the nation-state, can accommodate cross-border mobility as well as the ephemera of “trash archives.”

Chapter 16 extends the focus on Latino porn to Latin America, while also developing Soto-Crespo's notion of “trash archives” via the distinctive Brazilian genre of *pornochanchada*. Focusing on *A b . . . profunda* (Deep ass), a Bra-

zilian parody of *Deep Throat*, Melissa Schindler locates the film in its historical context by delineating the neglected genre of pornochanchada, which was trashy without necessarily being sexually explicit. Expanding to Brazil Hunt's thesis that pornography appears when the masses gain access to new technologies, Schindler shows how "what made pornochanchadas distinctive was that they emerged from the historic and artistic redistribution of power that occurred when, all of a sudden, 'everyday' people had access to the film camera—not just to a seat in the theater." Condemned as trashy because they are associated with common people, pornochanchadas are pornographic less because they depict explicit sex than because they reveal how "low-class" tastes and practices consistently traverse class lines. Schindler argues that, through its trashiness, the despised pornochanchada critiques not only U.S. imperialism in Latin America but also Brazil's own complex social hierarchies. A *b . . . profunda* advances this critique by extolling the anus as a site not of waste or trash but of universal pleasure; in so doing, it puts the *ass* back in *aesthetics*.

The next chapter pursues, in specifically philosophical terms, further connections between pornography and social critique. Elaborating Jean-Luc Nancy's work on ethics, John Paul Ricco makes the case for "pornographic faith" as a matter of putting one's trust in the nakedness of being together, where what is entrusted is the shared exposure to vulnerability and the paradoxical singularity of each other's finitude. He contrasts pornographic faith with the global spectacles of disaster and humiliation that Jean Baudrillard christened "war porn," thereby differentiating two opposed senses of pornography, neither of which depends on sexual explicitness. After the explosion of the Abu Ghraib image archive, it has become imperative to distinguish war porn from other superficially similar pornographic imagery. By elaborating pornographic faith as a mode of resistance to the contemporary biopolitics of bodies, Ricco provides the terms for this crucial distinction, even as his globalized framework makes tangible hitherto unremarked biopolitical connections. The chapter's emphasis on finitude links it to Brinkema's, since both argue for the limits of the archive and point, in fascinating ways, to what in pornography remains unarchivable.

Chapter 18 develops the discussion of war porn by examining websites (such as LiveLeak.com) that circulate as pornography digital images of military violence, mutilation, and bombing. This archive of war-related imagery, generated by gun cameras and increasingly sophisticated surveillance technologies, records actual events whose appeal lies partly in the fact that they have not been staged for the camera and, moreover, are too grisly for public viewing. Prabha Manuratne describes how this imagery is reframed in the language of mainstream porn and consumed by "online communities [that] relish combat footage as a sexual object, even as nations wage war in the name

of abstract ideals, such as God, security, or democracy.” Confronting the pleasure of viewing this imagery, she argues that war porn indexes the limits of pornography by abrogating distinctions between fantasy and reality. War porn presents real events through an ethnopolitical fantasy that produces libidinal gratification for those who archive and share it. The chapter’s focus on fantasy, desire, and pleasure as transnationally constituted links Manuratne’s account to not only Ricco’s but also the next chapter’s discussion of pornographic desire across ethnic borders, in the form of foreskin fetishism.

### *Archives of Excess*

It can be hard to countenance the full spectrum of what gives people visual pleasure. Although the archive of war porn—like some of the archives analyzed in this part—exists at the outer reaches of pornography, it manifests certain continuities with mainstream porn in its preoccupation with bodily anomaly and excess. The chapters in this part show how we think about normative bodies and their sexuality by focusing on the pornography of fore-skins, amputees, and underage figures. These chapters get at something central about human desire by looking without blinking at the margins of sexual representation.

Chapter 19 considers the phenomenon of “foreskin fandom,” examining how a small piece of ostensibly excess flesh has become fetishized in gay porn. Harri Kalha, Finland’s leading scholar of pornography, accounts for this phenomenon by locating it in the culture of circumcision that has overdetermined the meaning of the male prepuce. Through the lens of Robert Mapplethorpe’s iconic *Man in a Polyester Suit*, Kalha shows how the foreskin, in addition to being racialized, signifies as natural, untouched, masculine, and desirable, on the one hand while, on the other, it is cast as foreign, dirty, feminine, and disgusting. These meanings make it ripe for fetishization, as does the link between circumcision and castration: “Here is a body part that can easily be lost or has indeed been (partly) lost,” Kalha explains. Appropriating the Freudian model of fetishism, he argues that making a spectacle of the foreskin, as in some gay porn, works to divert attention from its more politically troubling connotations. At the same time, however, the development of communities of foreskin fandom, through pornography and online discussion groups, recasts fetishism as a collective commitment rather than an individual pathology.

In chapter 20, Steven Ruszczycky tackles what currently may be the most controversial archive of fantasy in our culture, that concerning the sexuality of children. Focusing on Matthew Stadler’s novel *Allan Stein* (in which a man seduces—or is seduced by—a teenage boy), Ruszczycky shows how the construction of the pedophile as an identity category works to absolve the rest of

us of any responsibility for these fantasies. Similar to the fictions that child-pornography laws tell about realness and pedophiles, Rusczycky argues, the fantasies of child pornography may offer “new modes of ethical relation between adults and youths that begin with rethinking one’s own relation to what is most troubling about the self.” Outlining a history of these fantasies and the legislation surrounding them, the chapter connects child pornography to broader cultural concerns, thus underscoring porn’s capacity to crystallize the anxieties and desires of the society in which it circulates. The fact that the U.S. Supreme Court defines child pornography as the documentation of a crime links Rusczycky’s study of this marginal subgenre to questions of evidence and forensics that, as we have seen, remain central to any archive.

Examining the archive of same-sex amputee porn, chapter 21 articulates queer theory with disability theory in an effort to develop their shared commitment to treating anomalous bodies and nonnormative practices as not merely defensible but positively desirable. Curious about the processes through which pornography makes disability sexy, I elaborate psychoanalytic categories other than fetishism to describe such processes. The chapter argues that a Freudian theory of sex reveals not that anatomy is destiny but, on the contrary, that fantasy unsettles anatomy. By encouraging psychic mobility, fantasy has the capacity to undermine identity—as does pornography by prioritizing action over identity. The emphasis on action puts my chapter in conversation with Ferguson, as I try to explain how although her and Williams’s accounts of pornography both derive from Foucault, they nevertheless remain sharply distinct in their assessments of the political significance of visibility. Sexual explicitness may be mobilized for widely varying uses, particularly in the realm of disability.

.....

We are happy to include as an appendix to this collection a bibliography of institutional archives of pornography compiled by Caitlin Shanley. Focusing on institutions worldwide, it provides the most comprehensive listing of archives of sexually explicit material yet published. The bibliography will be invaluable for researchers, not least because many of the university collections listed neither publicize their pornographic holdings nor catalog them in ways that make them readily accessible. Sequestered, disguised, and consequently underutilized, these archives suggest just how much sexually explicit material has been preserved—and how much research remains to be done.



## Notes

1. L. Hunt, "Introduction," 13.
2. Kendrick, *The Secret Museum*, 2–17.
3. Kendrick, *The Secret Museum*, 8.
4. See De Simone, "The History of the Museum and the Collection," 169. Subject to multiple closures, reopenings, and reorganizations, the secret museum within a museum finally became fully accessible to the general public only in the twenty-first century.
5. See Foucault, *History of Madness*, chapter 2.
6. Postcolonialist scholarship has been especially committed to developing this insight, at least since Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "The Rani of Sirmur." See also Arondekar, *For the Record*; A. Burton, *Archive Stories*; Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain*.
7. Vismann, *Files*, 12.
8. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 126–31.
9. On the complex materiality of archival dirt, see Steedman, *Dust*.
10. Derrida, *Archive Fever*, 4n1.
11. In addition to her contribution to the present volume, see L. Williams, "'White Slavery' versus the Ethnography of 'Sexworkers.'" Osborne, "The Ordinarity of the Archive," offers a cognate argument that the primary function of archives is to generate epistemological credibility. In "Dirty Little Secrets," Eric Schaefer provides a useful discussion of the issues involved in preserving and accessing moving-image porn.
12. Several newspaper reports noted that Weiner was known as a "technophile," a term that alludes to his early adoption of social-networking technology in political campaigns but that, in this context, also carries overtones of sexual fetishism. See, for example, Michael Barbaro, "Weiner Admits He Sent Lewd Photos; Says He Won't Resign," *New York Times*, June 6, 2011.
13. See Jan Hoffman, "A Girl's Nude Photo, and Altered Lives," *New York Times*, March 26, 2011. In a comprehensive report, Dena Sacco and her collaborators at Harvard Law School survey this issue, with the aim of assessing the constitutionality of recent child-pornography prosecutions, in various states, that involve teenagers sexting. See Sacco et al., *Sexting*.
14. See "Girl Posts Nude Pics, Is Charged with Kid Porn," Associated Press, March 27, 2009. News reports on additional cases are detailed in Sacco et al., *Sexting*, 7–9.
15. Sacco et al., *Sexting*, 22.
16. One survey of sexting behavior, *A Thin Line: Digital Abuse Study* (conducted in September 2009 by MTV in conjunction with the Associated Press), found that 45 percent of sexually active young people had been involved in one or more sexting-related activities (cited in Sacco et al., *Sexting*, 4). As the incidence of sexting increases, the practice is becoming normalized among younger generations, with digital resources becoming as fully integrated into their sex lives as into other aspects of their lives.
17. Mitchell, *Cloning Terror*, 123–24.
18. The circumstance of pornographic imagery's going viral is exacerbated by the sub-genre of bareback porn, which, in some instances, treats one particular virus (HIV) as an object of desire. See Dean, *Unlimited Intimacy*, chapter 2.
19. See Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1.
20. In addition to Arondekar, *For the Record*; and Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain*, see

Cvetkovich, *An Archive of Feelings*; Massumi, "The Archive of Experience"; and D. Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire*.

21. Thomas Waugh, among others, has thoroughly documented this fact vis-à-vis gay men. See, for example, Waugh, *Hard to Imagine*; and Waugh, *Lust Unearthed*.

22. Manoff, "Theories of the Archive from across the Disciplines," 10.

23. On the notion of counterarchives, see Foster, "An Archival Impulse"; Merewether, *The Archive*; and the work of Brent Hayes Edwards. On migrant archives, see Lazo, "Migrant Archives." On queer archives, see Cvetkovich, *Archive of Feelings*; Halberstam, *In a Queer Time and Place*; Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure*; and Herring, *Another Country*.

24. Lazo, "Migrant Archives," 37.

25. L. Williams, "'White Slavery' versus the Ethnography of 'Sexworkers,'" 128.

26. Brandon Griggs, "Playboy Puts 57 Years of Articles, Nudity Online," CNN.com, May 20, 2011, accessed January 2, 2014, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/TECH/web/05/20/playboy.issues.online/>.

27. Thanks to Richard Garner for helpful conversation on this topic.

28. An excellent overview of these debates may be found in Cornell, *Feminism and Pornography*.

29. See Delany, *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*.

30. Wizisla, "Preface," 2.

31. For a discussion of collecting as a specifically queer practice, see Camille and Rifkin, *Other Objects of Desire*; and Herring, "Material Deviance."

32. See Gibson, *The Erotomaniac*.

33. See Spring, *Secret Historian*; and Spring and Steward, *An Obscene Diary*.

34. From an amateur pornographer's perspective, the great boon of Polaroid instant cameras, with their self-developing film, was that this technology, introduced in 1948, enabled the production of sexually explicit photographs without recourse to either a commercial film developer or a home darkroom. Suddenly one could quite easily circumvent both the legal risk of obscenity charges and the practical challenge of developing photographic film independently. I discuss further Steward's archiving practices in "Sam Steward's Pornography."

35. On this distinction, see Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 57–73.

36. For exemplary analyses of class differentials in pornography, see Juffer, *At Home with Pornography*; Kipnis, *Bound and Gagged*, chapter 4; and Penley, "Crackers and Whackers."

37. Ferguson, *Pornography, the Theory*.