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Introduction

When analyzing any artistic medium, one is essentially acknowledging that a constructed artifice can be used as a tool for investigating the society from which the work was produced. Canonically the field of Art History has interpreted the world according to theories and conclusion derived principally from paintings, sculptures, and architecture, the categories of visual culture traditionally regarded as “fine arts.” Human identities and social roles however, are also highly constructed, multifaceted artifices and when analyzed in the same way that the fine arts are, can yield just as compelling results. The mass reproducibility of photography and film makes these mediums instrumental tools in the construction of identities. Thus, movie stars and Hollywood archetypes are the quintessential examples of constructed, seemingly mechanically produced identities. Marshall McLuhan’s The Mechanical Bride refers to the American filmmaker Cecil B. DeMille’s assessment of early Hollywood starlets:

Trouble is, remarked C.B., they all look alike, “just as though they were stamped out of a mint like silver dollars ... The eyes, the lips, the hair, all are done in a certain type of way. Their faces are a certain typed way.¹

The inquiries and observations presented within McLuhan’s text signify the immense cultural shift caused by post-War technological innovations regarding the mass production of objects, information, and archetypal identities. The section of the McLuhan’s text that this quote comes from is titled “Love Goddess Assembly

“Line”, a phrase that perfectly articulates how human identities are mass produced to a point at which they become recognizable as iconic “types.” Widespread proliferation of these characters’ images throughout visual culture fuels this method of identity production and mass produced icons become models used to demonstrate the ideals and standards of mainstream society. Using Marilyn Monroe as an example, John McHale states:

The details of her iconography are too self-evident to require attention-drawing – the parted lips, the ambivalently naïve speech and the ‘indescribable’ walk – all had universal imitation. The emphasis on the ‘vital statistic’ as numerical sex index rating coincided with her rise and figured largely in her iconography. She fulfills another important quality of her type ikon by the way she swamped the media. Books published, biographies, feature articles, associated products, contests, etc., apart from actual box office returns, make an astonishing total.²

The character types represented in Hollywood films are the idealizations of various social roles found in mainstream Western culture. For the majority of individuals in society, these archetypal roles provide an ideal figure to identify with and aspire to become. For those that do not fit into conventional societal norms however, the perpetuation of Hollywood icons can encourage their marginalization. As a result, however, alternative icons, structured according to the desires of the oppressed, have the potential to emerge. The development of underground cinema, served as one way for filmmakers to explore aspects of society avoided by mainstream media and in turn, produce subversive archetypes. As queer identities

grew more widespread over the course of the 20th century, gay culture became a source of inspiration for underground cinema and it was not long until queer archetypal roles took shape. The two central figures to gay media throughout most of the 20th century, are known as the hustler and the queen.

The relationship between the queen and hustler was originally constructed by film historian and queer theorist, Richard Dyer, to explain how these two character types became the principal icons of 1960s pre-Stonewall gay culture in Europe and America. The archetypes that make up this paradigm are opposites and exist as manifestations of the “subject object split” that had dominated the structures of gay cinema since the early 20th century. Within this dualistic dynamic exists the role of the passive, hyper-masculine “hustler” and his counterpart, the active, flamboyantly feminine “queen”. Compared to queens, hustlers are typically depicted as being quiet, aloof, and ideally “straight”, even when acting within a same-sex context. While the queen’s role is fully devoted to signifiers of femininity, the hustler’s is almost exclusively absorbed with adhering to a masculine performance. The hustler, also referred to as “trade”, exists to be looked at, talked about, and pursued by queens.  

Beginning in the 1960s, Andy Warhol and his Factory served as a smaller scale and lower profile Hollywood production studio dedicated to capturing and sharing the rough glamour of Manhattan’s underground subcultures through the collection and production of an ever-changing entourage of personalities known as

---

the Warhol superstars. Art historian, Simon Watney, compares Warhol’s factory to Disney Studios in the way that each produced larger than life characters who represented “iconic types” of 20th century American culture.⁴

The hustler and queen’s explicit demonstrations of artifice, often contradicted by their determination for authenticity profoundly resonates with Susan Sontag’s ideas concerning camp sensibility making these roles exemplary Factory produced archetypes.⁵ Although these character types developed decades before the label “Warhol superstar” existed and manifested in numerous film and literary depictions prior to Warhol’s Pop art career, the Factory stands out as a significant point of interest in the dialogue of the hustler and queen archetypes simply due to high degree of images produced by Warhol’s proverbial assembly line clearly modeled after these queer archetypal blueprints.

While the hustler and queen strongly rely upon their diametric relationship with one another for identification, it is also important to look at how each of these types is constructed individually. Each analysis will aim to establish a clearer sense of the traits that fundamentally define these archetypes by looking at a series of Factory models paying specific attention to physical appearances, photographs, and film roles. However, as previously suggested by McHale, aesthetics are not quite enough to construct a truly iconic identity. Thus, in addition to visual media, this analysis also aims to demonstrate how biographical narratives and public reception

can serve as key elements to a total image. Going further than simply disassembling these icons, these archetypal investigations are also oriented to both expose the truly performative nature of gender roles and to look more in depth at how these iconic archetypes operate as simultaneously empowering and oppressive forces to queer culture.

Moving chronologically, this analysis will first look at the role of the hustler, paying close attention to how images of the hustler coming out of the Factory changed from the early to late 1960s and how this trajectory parallels both the evolution of the film industry as well as the rise of a widespread gay identity. This approach to deconstructing the hustler image explores potential origins of the hustler’s iconic aesthetic and behavioral qualities principally centered around Western, or more specifically American, idealized masculinity. Throughout this analysis it is also important to keep in mind Warhol’s own iconic personality as well as queer identity and how his role in the production of hustler characters differed from his more recognized and socially accepted career as a pop artist.

Perhaps a direct response to the emergence of the most developed and arguably most iconic Factory hustler, Joe Dallesandro status in the late 1960s, the strongest images of Factory queens assembled and obtained superstar status within the Factory by early 1970s. Unlike the hustler, whose role requires a sense of solidarity and distance, especially from other hustlers, the queen’s image and iconic status can usually be recognized within the context of other queens. In fact, arguably the most famous of Warhol’s queens, Candy Darling, Holly Woodlawn, and
Jackie Curtis performed their roles alongside one another, each imparting attributes of their individual personalities upon the archetype. While still very much part of “Warhol Studios”, these roles were largely produced by filmmaker and close Warhol associate, Paul Morrissey. Compared to hustler, analyzing the construction of a queen poses a slightly more complex endeavor due to the slightly more abstract or fluid nature of the queen’s role. Like the hustler, the queen is subversive to the gender binary and traditional gender roles and unlike the hustler, demonstrates the existence of difference and disconnect between sex and gender in that neither biological sex nor gender identity can prevent someone from embodying the queen archetype. As a result, Factory queens demonstrated gender performativity to a far greater degree than Warhol’s hustlers with an unapologetic embrace of explicit artifice; an almost paradoxical method required to become their authentic selves. This overtly camp aspect of the queen is crucial as it exhibits the immense efforts queer identities must take in order to navigate throughout mainstream culture and speaks to how contemporary queer identities responded, and still do respond, to societal oppression.
Chapter 1

On Hustlers:

Despite being arguably the most famous openly gay artist of the 20th Century, Andy Warhol’s most iconic pop works lack clear visual signifiers that might suggest the influence of his sexuality. These works are often perceived as mechanical, repetitive, and cold; more sexually ambiguous than explicitly gay. The detached nature of works like *Campbell’s Soup Cans* makes discussing the role of gender and sexuality in Warhol’s work challenging. His role as a queer artist becomes far more relevant however when looking at Warhol in the context of his expansive entourage. Warhol’s Factory attracted a vast and ever changing collection of characters from diverse backgrounds. Some of these individuals shined brighter than others in Warhol’s eyes and would be chosen as the stars of his films. Warhol’s films were motivated by a desire to create an underground Hollywood constructed by blending underground film tropes with mainstream cinematic archetypes. A key queer element to Warhol’s films was his use of “the hustler”, a role that embodied a complex ideal of masculinity that was highly desirable in contemporary gay culture throughout the 20th century. Although the hustler is not a role that is unique to Warhol’s films, looking at Warhol’s reoccurring production of hustler figures allows one to gain a sense of how this character type reflected the values of gay culture during the mid-20th century.

The evolution in Warhol’s production of underground stars mirrors the ways in which Hollywood’s use of film stars evolved over the early decades of the 20th
century. The rise of movie star personalities, according to William E. Jones, was a seemingly spontaneous phenomenon that occurred approximately between 1910 and 1920.\textsuperscript{6} Prior to the apotheosis of these early “movie gods,” the commercial profitability of utilizing actors as personalities remained unknown to Hollywood producers. Instead these producers used uncredited performers due to a fear that the potential fame the performers might obtain would result in them demanding more money for their work.\textsuperscript{7} In 1965, Kenneth Anger summarized the shift in audiences’ perceptions of Hollywood performers in \textit{Hollywood Babylon},

...when crowds all over the country seemed be flocking to see favorite performers known only as “Little Mary,” “The Biograph Boy,” or “The Vitagraph Girl,” the disdained actors, until then thought of as little more than hired help, suddenly acquired ticket-selling importance. The already-famous faces took on names and rapidly-rising salaries: the Star System – a decidedly mixed blessing – was born.\textsuperscript{8}

Richard Dyer’s \textit{Stars} elaborates further on the evolution of stardom stating that the early “gods or goddesses” of film modeled ideal behavior while later on, stars took on personas that extended beyond their time on-screen. They had names, backstories, and personal lives that contributed to their image of stardom. Although these images were still very much idealized they were far more humanized than the idols that came before them. As Dyer puts it, these stars, such as Marilyn Monroe and Robert Redford for example, were “embodiments of typical acting”. The construction of type based stars made Hollywood celebrities more relatable and

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.
easier for audiences to consume. Dyer states that these stars were understood as “people like you and me” rather than the abstract idealism represented in earlier cinema and were therefore better suited to be aspiration models for fans. ⁹

**Blow Job:**

When Warhol began his career as a film-maker, like Hollywood, his earliest cinema was silent and featured actors whose identities and levels of fame were not intended to directly affect the work's reception. Stephen Koch describes the Warhol's early filming process in one of the earliest texts dedicated to Warhol's films, Stargazer:

> A motorized Bolex would be set up, loaded with approximately three-minute, one-hundred-foot magazines. Shooting consisted simply in turning on a key lamp, starting the camera, and letting the magazine run out. There was never a camera movement and only a very occasional zoom ... Editing consisted of gluing together each 100-foot take on leader, invariably leaving in the weakening and whitening emulsion and the perforated tags at the end of the roll. ¹⁰

Out of the estimated 100 or more films produced by Warhol during the 1960s, *Blow Job* has developed a comparatively well-developed reputation since its 1964 release and is an exemplary product of Warhol's initial signature shooting style.¹¹ The film presents a stationary, black-white, shot of the uncredited actor DeVeren Bookwalter's head and neck as he presumably receives and reacts to fellatio being performed outside the scope of the frame. Just like in early 20th century Hollywood

---


¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.
films, the identity of Blow Job's star was chosen to dramatically influence the film's plot; he was simply cast to fill the role of “man getting a blow job.”

Warhol underscores the lack of importance placed on the actor’s identity when he describes how he casted the film in his memoir, POPism. According to Warhol, he had originally asked an actor named Charles Rydell to perform in Blow Job by pitching the idea of having five young men perform fellatio on him while the camera filmed his face. Although, Rydell agreed to Warhol’s pitch, on filming day, Warhol discovered that Rydell had only done so under the assumption that Warhol’s seemingly ridiculous plan was a joke. Fortunately, Rydell’s absence was not a challenging obstacle for Warhol to overcome. Even though Warhol describes his initial choice as an “actor”, Rydell was far from being a Hollywood icon whose identity would have had significance in the film. In reality, it appears that the film’s star never mattered much to Warhol as he states: “We wound up using a good-looking kid who happened to be hanging around the factory.”

Ultimately, this casting narrative suggests that capitalizing on stardom was not at all an intention for making Blow Job. The film’s subject, in this case, is really more of an object for the camera, the audience, and most importantly, Warhol to look upon.

Despite Warhol’s intentions, Blow Job’s anonymous, slow moving subject, framed as an object of desire, did become a meaningful identity element on film. The fellated man’s silence, anonymity, and small range of movement forces his

---

physical appearance to take on a leading role in an audience’s interpretation of his character and the film. At times however, this can be particularly challenging due to the overhead lighting that over exposes and obscures a clear image of the man’s features. As Warhol teases viewers with lighting and restricted gaze, the audience is left with just clear enough of an image to make them want more.

This sense of teasing dominates the film in its entirety as Warhol controls the audience’s view with a fixed frame filled with semi-obscured, subtly varying action. The scene lasts approximately 36 minutes and is composed of ten 16 mm film reels meant to be projected at 18 frames per second, the speed used for silent films. Over the course of these 36 minutes, we see only see the movements of the actor’s head, face, and sometimes hands all of which are assumed to be responding to the blow job being performed by a figure whose leather covered shoulder appears in the frame just quickly enough to support the title’s implications by suggesting the existence of another human just below our range of visibility.

The most captivating quality of Blow Job is its ability to have held the intrigue of audiences when so many of Warhol’s films did not. One would expect that releasing a film in which the only subject matter consists of the slow paced head and facial movement of a man’s partially obscured face would pose an immense challenge to attracting audiences let alone generating critical thought. Surely the blunt, risqué title may have been initially helpful for peeking public interest, however due to the fact that there are no explicit displays of sexuality in

---

the film, the truly most compelling aspect of the film is how it forces viewers to imagine the plot they truly desire to see in a realm completely separated from the onscreen images.

Koch’s interpretation of *Blow Job* is linked closely with themes of male homosexual desire and the construction of gay identities often used as recognizable tropes in not only Warhol and Morrissey’s work, but in media appealing to gay audiences as a whole. Discussing the physical appearance of the film’s actor, Koch writes:

The recipient looks like a once fresh-faced, foursquare Eagle Scout, a veteran of countless archery contests and cookouts, who discovers in the process of becoming the all-American boy some weak psychic nerves that send him helplessly gliding in activities for which no merit badges are awarded, in which he discovers the body he acquired on those jamborees and tramps in the woods becoming a bit hollow-eyed, just a touch faisandé. Whereupon he takes that body to the Big Apple, where he finds it to be a very sellable commodity. Large numbers of Warhol leads began their careers as homosexual hustlers. It seems a pretty safe bet that the star of *Blow Job* belongs in their company.¹⁴

As indicated by Koch, this highly romanticised description is influenced by later films such as Warhol’s *My Hustler* and Morrissey’s *Flesh* in which the characters portrayed by the male leads fully resonate with the hustler archetype. Koch’s mention of hustlers and commodification of the male body links back to Dyer’s proposed hustler-queen paradigm which genders both the hustler and his consumer according to a traditional gender binary even if the relationship occurs

---

between members of the same sex. If in this case, the star of *Blow Job* is recognized as a hustler, Warhol and the audience become his queen.

Koch's allusion to consumerism is also noteworthy when considering the film's reception in a post-war context in which socially, consumerism was viewed as far more gendered system than it is today. Warhol articulates in *POPism* that when seeking an explanation from Emile De Antonio for why Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg looked down on him, “De” answered with several reasons that related to Warhol's feminine or “swish” attributes. According to De Antonio, one specific reason that Johns and Rauschenberg looked down on Warhol was that he proudly played the role of consumer.\(^\text{15}\) Kenneth E. Silver's “Modes of Disclosure: The Construction of Gay Identity and the Rise of Pop Art” elaborates upon De Antonio's reasoning. Regarding consumers and their feminine connotation, Silver explains that in post-war America, consumerism, especially supermarket consumerism, was largely associated with women. To reiterate this concept, Silver clarifies, “Only an unmanly man ventured forth to the market, according to the stereotype.”\(^\text{16}\)

Although the hustler-queen paradigm is largely based on the recognition of gender stereotypes, in some cases like *Blow Job*, the roles can be viewed as somewhat subversive to a patriarchal society due to the fact that the inherently feminine queens are in control over the hustler. Alternatively, the true power holder

---


in this paradigm is always debatable because if all of a queen’s attention is focused on the hustler, even if focused on control, then perhaps the hustler is truly the dominant figure.

Warhol’s role in this paradigm is expressed through the attention he gives to the objects in front of his camera and the control he communicates through the voyeuristic gaze clearly evident in Warhol’s early cinematic works. Douglas Crimp, author of “Our Kind of Movie”: The Films of Andy Warhol, offers two conflicting opinions concerning voyeurism in Warhol’s films. Crimp acknowledges Koch’s opinion that voyeurism is the theme that “dominates all Warhol’s early films and defines their aesthetic” but complicates this claim by countering with the opinions of David James, author of Allegories of Cinema. James states that Warhol’s films do not depict true voyeurism in that voyeurism is defined by “repetitive looking at unsuspecting people.” James points out the falsity of Warhol’s film subjects by claiming that they “narcissistically exhibit” their bodies as they perform for “a camera whose power lies in its threat to look away.” Crimp’s own argument is also concerned with falsity but is based the opinion that Warhol did not actually film actors against their will. Alternatively, Warhol’s films may also be looked as extremely honest. The stationary camera work and purposeful lack of editing constantly remind the viewer of the medium. It is obvious to any viewer that they are not truly spying on a real human’s private moments and yet, one cannot help

but feeling at least slightly voyeuristic. Even if the voyeurism is feigned, it is clear how these films’ slowed paces, focused gazes, and drawn out durations would easily appeal to voyeuristic desires.

Each of these arguments are important to keep in mind when analyzing how themes of sexuality and gender are communicated through media. Arguments similar to James’ regarding the falsity of material could be made with respect to the ways gender is interpreted through constructed images. Proposing an argument along this train of thought reminds us that ultimately, these archetypal roles and the gender stereotypes that inspire them are all essentially based on fiction. At the same time however, even if subject matter expressed through media is manufactured, the content remains a reflection of the culture that produced it.

Koch views voyeurism in Warhol’s film as being closely related to sexuality and thus, exploring this theme can be useful for interpreting how gay identities were communicated through images. According to Koch:

> Sex is always just on the verge of any Warhol film, one can feel it; but his early silent films are not really sexual in the way his later films became, all shimmering with crevices and organs and groins …But the early works are erotic in a less obvious sense. They are the creations of a profoundly voyeuristic mind.  

A slightly earlier Warhol film, *Sleep*, released in 1963 closely relates to *Blow Job* through themes of voyeurism and sexuality. *Sleep* is composed of shots focused on a nearly nude sleeping man repeated over the span of approximately six hours.

---

Through the series of black-and-white shots fixed on the man’s still body parts, the sleeper is visually dissected and abstracted. Koch compares the act of sleeping to an orgasm in that both experiences are shared universally thus making the subject impersonal. Like *Blow Job*, there exists a tension in *Sleep* between eroticism and boredom. It is logical to assume that the fragmented imagery, fixed gazes, and exaggerated length of *Sleep* can be quite boring or frustrating for audiences to sit through and yet, for some viewers, the film caters to specific sexual and voyeuristic desires. Warhol achieves this sense of eroticism by teasing viewers and luring them in with suggestive imagery while withholding more explicit sexuality from their gaze. The use of voyeurism as a theme to enhance eroticism, and in some cases homoeroticism, was not a new convention in underground cinema when Warhol began filmmaking and therefore, even though the gender of the fellatio performer is left to the viewer's imagination, one might also be lead to think of homosexuality due to imagery in *Blow Job* that closely resembles Jean Genet’s *Un Chant D’Amour*.

As Dyer explains, “[Genet’s] name evokes a flavor, a set of images, a world – you don’t have to have read his works to know what sort of thing you’re going to get when someone says such-and-such is Genet-esque, nor to be able to catch allusions to him in so many novels, films and theatre pieces or to grasp the significance of the frequent references to him in the major intellectual trends of the post-war years.”

In other words, Genet is an icon capable of contributed a sense of homoeroticism to

---

19 Ibid, 40.
anything associated with his identity. With that said, it would be naïve to suggest that Warhol’s work was uninformed by such a central figure to queer visual culture. *Blow Job* and *Un Chant D’Amour* each feature voyeurism as well as fellatio and communicate these themes through strikingly similar imagery. One scene of Genet’s film, presents a guard as he watches prisoners masturbate. Without the guard’s gaze, a masturbating prisoners cannot be clearly defined as homosexual and therefore the scene relies on the act of voyeurism to set a homoerotic tone. In *Blow Job*, the guard has been removed, and the camera’s fixed gaze forces the viewer to take his place. The relationship between the voyeur and the watched subject is not always homosexual but, like the hustler, is open to the possibility.

Like *Blow Job*, the fellatio in *Un Chant D’Amour* is takes place outside of the viewer’s gaze. Instead, the oral sex act is signified by a man blowing smoke through a straw into another man’s mouth (figs 2 and 3). Although the scene takes place in a prison in which the two men are held in separate cells, the phallic straw and seminal smoke are clear euphuisms for the sexual connection between them. With this image in mind, one cannot ignore how the resemblance between this smoking straw and Bookwalter’s smoking cigarette visually and thematically links Genet’s work with Warhol’s.

Both Genet and Warhol cast their film actors in chiaroscuro lighting, use black-and-white film that romanticize their actor’s physical features in similarly

---

21 Ibid, 26.
close-up camera angles. In Genet’s film, the actors are not classically beautiful men; they are rugged, dangerous criminals. The use of chiaroscuro lighting however, recalling the beauty of Italian Renaissance paintings, softens each man’s appearance, sweetens the interaction between them, and likely encourages viewers to be more sympathetic toward their criminality. Although Blow Job’s star is slightly more fresh-faced and wholesome than Genet’s prisoners, when watched receiving fellatio in a similar in similar lighting on black-and-white film, one can understand how Koch, who was most likely familiar with Genet’s work, might identity an air of delinquency around the actor.

Genet’s sexualized prisoners may be interpreted as one link in the development of the hustler archetype in that both of these identities are products of gay culture that possess highly masculine and criminal traits. These character types also were likely to have been partly influenced by the queer idealization of military men that followed World War II. Queer theorist, John D’Emilio elaborates further on the Second World War’s influence in the formation of widespread, recognizable gay identities:

The war severely disrupted traditional patterns of gender relations and sexuality and temporarily created a new erotic situation conducive to homosexual expression. It plucked millions of young men and women, whose sexual identities were just forming out of their homes, out of towns and small cities, out of the heterosexual sexual environment of the family and dropped them into sex-segregated situations ... For men and women already gay, it provided an opportunity to meet people like themselves.

---

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid, 117.
Unsurprisingly, following the war, gay eroticism quickly became linked with the military and all-American, masculine aesthetics. Unlike the hustler, the idealized G.I. represents a slightly purer and more conventional form of eroticized masculinity. He is an archetype that holds the possibility to serve as both a model for gay men to desire and for straight men to aspire to become without compromising their heterosexuality because the truly ideal all-American man does not have sex with other men. While, the restrictions of upholding masculinity and good social standing make the erotic G.I. image out of reach for gay men, the hustler makes up for this flaw in that he is able to maintain his masculinity by only having sex with men who will pay for it. The quick but drastic shift from American hero to prostitute that occurs from adding homosexuality, ultimately communicates that even though the hustler archetype is a product of gay culture, the character is quite evidently shaped by homophobia and misogyny.

Paul America, *My Hustler*

Released in 1965, *My Hustler* was Warhol’s first collaborative work with Paul Morrissey and marks a transitional point in Warhol’s film career as it broke away from more experimental films like *Sleep* and *Blow Job*. Although the film is narrative, the plot and camera work remain fairly simple. The film is split into two shots, an interior and exterior, each lasting approximately thirty-three minutes. 26 The opening shot quickly introduces a john at his Fire Island home before panning

---

over to his hired hustler, played by an actor known as Paul America, reclining on a beach (fig 4). The simplicity of subject matter in the shot echoes Warhol’s earlier films like *Sleep* and *Blow Job* in which a stationary camera transforms the film’s subject into an object. The camera focuses our gaze on the hustler as his body is objectified by voices heard arguing over him from off screen. The voices come from a deck overlooking the beach on which the john, an aging queen played by Ed Hood, drinks and converses with Joe Campbell (also known as the Sugar Plum Fairy), an older hustler, and Genevieve Charbin, a stereotypical “fag hag.” Through this use of archetypes immediately recognizable to queer culture, the film speaks most directly to gay audiences.

The second shot takes place in a tightly spaced bathroom interior in which we see America carefully tending to his appearance alongside the Sugar Plum Fairy. Crimp’s description of the scene accurately describes the hustlers’ exaggerated performance of masculinity.

We see them from the side, while seeing their faces in a medicine-cabinet mirror. They jockey for position in front of it, changing places again and again throughout the reel. They see each other in the mirror too. They check each other out surreptitiously while paying closest attention to themselves. Their narcissism is stunning, even for a Warhol film: to say that they primp is an understatement, if only because they do so for thirty-three minutes straight. They shower, dry off, shave, brush their teeth, comb their hair, clean their ears with Q-tips, clean their nails, apply talcum powder, dry themselves again, comb their hair again, and again, and again. Paul takes a piss, Joe watches out of the corner of his eye. Joe sprays deodorant on his underarms and mists cologne on his shoulders and hair. He dries Paul’s back.

---

rubs it, moves his hands around to Paul’s chest and massages it. He does this all while pretending disinterest in Paul’s body ...28

Narcissism developed as a trope used to signify homosexuality in films as a result of Freud’s popular theories regarding male homosexuality.29 The exhibition of narcissism works well when constructing a hustler in that it communicates homosexuality while still allowing the hustler to “act straight” as he pays more attention to himself than he does to other men. As they focus on only themselves in the small bathroom, the men avoid making a direct connection that would inevitably alter their archetypal identities. This characteristic of the hustler is one that ties closely to reality in that connection, particularly for gay people at the time of the film’s release, was dangerous.30

For closeted gays, passing in a straight world, meant disconnecting from oneself and from others. Hustlers are an exaggerated embodiment of this reality, a representation of a gay man’s daily anxieties repackaged as an object of desire. Due to the threat of connection, the hustler’s recognizability predominately thrives at a distance.31 Reclining on the beach, Paul America is seen as a prized object, a male odalisque as the queens reinforce his value and objectivity as they argue from afar.

---

30 Ibid, 145.
31 Ibid.
As this distance lessens, so does the hustler’s objectivity and the more he acts, the more contrived his image appears.

Koch refers to the bathroom scene as a “theatricalization of masculinity.”

The narcissism and forceful disconnection in this scene is almost too exaggerated for the hustlers to maintain their masculine images. A tension runs throughout the entire charade as the fantasy verges on collapse as small bathroom exposes what happens during the absence of a clear queen. The hustler is an icon who is defined through opposition to femininity and when only comparable to his likeness, the archetype loses meaning as the hustler’s display of masculinity becomes increasingly transparent the longer he is alone with another hustler.

Another way the the hustler communicates his disconnect is through professionalism. As a strict professional, the hustler affirms his role as an object with the implication that he could be possessed by anyone for the right price. The hustler’s sex partners become emotionally divorced through his professionalism and thus a truly professional hustler has the potential to have sex with men because it is his job, not because he is gay. These examples of disconnect show that a hustler’s image requires a constant performance of detachment and passivity that mentally and emotionally separates himself from the femininity and homosexuality. Even the

---

star of *Blow Job* makes an effort to look vaguely into the distance as if distracted while its assumed he is receiving fellatio. Compared to *Blow Job* however, *My Hustler* produces images that much more effectively communicate gender roles by using a juxtaposition of both masculine and feminine performances. For example, the construction of Paul America and Campbell’s masculine archetype is far stronger when their feigned detachment is seen in opposition to Hood and Chabon’s stereotypical “bitchiness.”

When comparing Paul America’s hustler image to Bookwalter’s, it is helpful to once again look to Koch’s interpretation of the subject matter: “Paul America, the pop name that stinks of locker rooms, a name that flies in the wind from a from a late-1950’s convertible sailing down the pike, making a laughable narcissistic fist.”

It is clear that Koch sees an evident aesthetic similarity between Paul America and Bookwalter, the star of *Blow Job*, when he describe the *My Hustler* star as “another raunchy Eagle Scout in Warhol’s long line of male sex objects.”

Koch’s somewhat bitter and moralizing descriptions and the “line” that he establishes appears to be linked mostly by the men’s deviant sexuality, however these descriptions also suggest that each of these men possess traits that visually evoke a sense of innocence and all-American idealism. The actors are aesthetically similar in that they are blonde, white, conventionally attractive young men, which perhaps for Koch was enough to communicate this sense of all-Americanism.

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid, 80.
Dyer’s outlines several social types originally developed by the sociologist Orrin E. Klapp and explains how this system of typology is used as the basis for Hollywood cinematic archetypes. Of these types, the category that most accurately fits Koch’s “Eagle Scout” image is known as the “good Joe”; an archetype Dyer explains as “the central theme of the American ethos.” Dyer does not give specific instructions on how one constructs the good Joe with physical appearance, but perhaps a commercially handsome face and complimented by Paul America’s patriotic pseudonym were enough to remind Koch of the good Joe type. Dyer goes on to explain that the good Joe is known for being a fair “he-man” who despite possessing a “rough and ready air” is a non-dominant character whose archetypal identity is communicated on film by “differentiating him from other characters (including women, villains and other men who don’t fit”).

While being a hustler most likely excludes a character from the good Joe type, if Paul America’s sexuality had been left unknown, his “Eagle Scout” attributes would certainly fit the good Joe criteria. In other words, Paul America’s physical appearance is not enough to define his role as a hustler. In Koch’s opinion, the role of the hustler is purely sexual: “The hustler, identifying himself as the sexuality of his flesh and nothing more, proposes himself as a wholly passive and will-less being, subject exclusively to the will of others.” While Koch’s imagined “all-American boy-gone-bad” characterization of Paul America is clearly influenced
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by sexual nature of the hustler role, and not solely his physical appearance, Koch’s elaborate background stories invented for Paul America and Bookwalter likely not strikingly similar by coincidence. Despite expressing this opinion regarding hustlers that in no way resembles the good Joe, based on his descriptions of Bookwalter and Paul America, Koch clearly sees a connection between hustlers and this all-American character.

Parker Tyler, author of *Screening the Sexes: Homosexuality in Movies*, describes Paul America as a “pure male-physique type, tall, platinum blond” with a “sweet, languid, and easygoing” personality. Besides the “pure male-physique”, none of Tyler’s descriptors are specific trademarks of a hustler and these traits could easily be molded into a number of character types. When combined with the “Paul America” moniker however, a more recognizable icon begins to take shape. The combination of Paul America’s name and appearance recalls the all-American image erotized by gay culture after World War II. The choice to attribute the name “Paul America” to a hustler points to a clear connection between fetishized military men and the construction of hustlers. With this connection in mind, the good-Joe-gone-bad origin story of hustler types suggested by Koch’s characterizations appear more logical.

Joe Dallesandro:

Ironically, the hustler, who more closely resembled the sex objects described by Koch but in no way exhibits traces of a good Joe past, turned out to be arguably the most iconic Factory hustler, Joe Dallesandro. When looking at mass media
portrayals of male sexuality, both homosexual and heterosexual, Joe Dallesandro is a particularly key figure. In fact, according to John Water’s, Dallesandro, “forever changed male sexuality in cinema.” Dallesandro’s influence, unlike previously mentioned stars, has extended far beyond the Factory and as a result, a far greater amount of biographical information regarding Dallesandro can be accessed and should be taken advantage of when analyzing his specific hustler image. Although biographical information can be sometimes unreliable, especially when it concerns details of star’s life prior to appearing in the public eye, the plasticity of a star’s early life story can be extremely influential when constructing how a star is perceived by audiences. It can be assumed that a wide enough interest in Dallesandro’s origin story did not exist until after the actor had a well established film career and so, any early biographical information released to the media and archived by writers were only additional facets of the bad boy persona and sex symbol status that Dallesandro had already successfully obtained through the mass proliferation of iconic image. The fact that Dallesandro’s image remains an influence to Western culture nearly half a century after the actor’s first film debut is a true testament to the successful collaborative work between Dallesandro, Warhol, and Morrissey in constructing such an appealing and well-developed star persona. Unlike the earlier manifestations of Factory hustlers whose whose troubled back stories had to be imagined by viewers. Dallesandro’s hustler image,

while certainly constructed to elicit similar feelings and associations to the roles portrayed Paul America and Bookwalter, possessed a deeper level of authenticity in that his hustler persona is traceable back to his real-life birth.

In 1948, Joseph Angelo D'Alessandro was born in Pensacola, Florida. At the time, Dallesandro’s father was an eighteen-year-old, Italian American sailor stationed at a nearby naval base with his wife, sixteen-year-old Thelma Testman. Prior to Dallesandro’s birth, the couple already had an infant son named Robert who would later also become involved with the Factory as Warhol’s chauffeur and as the star of a small role in Morrisey’s *Trash*. Not long after his birth, Dallesandro’s mother was arrested in Florida for interstate auto theft and as result, was sentenced to five years in a state penitentiary. The couple’s young children were relocated to separate branches of the Angel Guardian Home in Harlem and Brooklyn, New York. Eventually the sibling’s were united and were fostered together by a Brooklyn couple and when Dallesandro turned fourteen he moved into his grandparent’s home in Queens where he was fully reunited with his father.40

Like any celebrity biography, the details of Dallesandro’s early life should be read with some skepticism, especially considering that many of these details were recounted by Dallesandro at an age much older than when he experienced them. With this said, pure validity is not truly relevant when looking at Dallesandro in
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this context. Ultimately, the construction of his biography, true or not, can be looked at as another facet of his star persona.

The story of Dallesandro’s childhood hardship functions extremely well as a complementary anchor to the career the actor would later establish. Essentially, the time spent at the Angel Guardian Home can be read as a foundational period of his life that would later significantly influence the cinematic roles Dallesandro would play and the hustler image he would represent to both underground and popular media. The story, like Dallesandro’s handsome face, naturally evokes a sympathetic response from viewers and instantly makes his criminal persona more forgivable while simultaneously increasing his desirability. According to Dallesandro, he was trained by his caregivers on how to appeal to potential foster parents despite being, apparently, more favorable as a white child among his mostly black peers. “It was just a matter of deciding which one I was going to say ‘Will you be my mommy?’ to, and it was hard. I didn’t want to say it. So you see, events in my life prepared me to be the kind of actor who could just come off the street and do it. I was taught to deliver lines when I was very young.”

While Dallesandro personally credits the Angel Guardian Home for developing his young acting talent, this story contains even more ties to the actor’s later life. Just like Dallesandro’s on-screen character, the actor’s biography, tells the story of young male navigating through adversity with the help of his desirable physical appearance and sexual ambiguity. Stephen Watson, author of Factory
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Made: The Warhol Sixties, tells the story of Dallesandro getting expelled from school at the age of fifteen after being sent to the principal for “playing” with a female hall monitor by wrapping his kerchief around her neck. It was not the hall monitor interaction that resulted in the expulsion however; he was expelled for punching his principal in the nose. After being expelled, Dallesandro, who Watson points out “always hung out with slightly older guys”, became involved in gang activity. After the failed execution his forty-seventh car heist Dallesandro was ultimately, shot and arrested by police. Following the arrest, Dallesandro was sent to Camp Cass Rehabilitation Center for Boys in New York’s Catskill Mountains. The camp taught Dallesandro how to do strenuous farm work and from his fellow “bad boy” campers, Joe learned how to make homemade tattoos using needles and India Ink. A fellow camper, drew a “Little Joe” design for Dallesandro, who, as the story goes, poked into his arm by himself.42

Whether or not the exact details of the actor’s biography are true, Dallesandro’s life story, especially his rebellious teen years, perfectly compliments his tough guy image and his homoerotic sex appeal. Beginning with the interaction between Dallesandro and the female hall monitor, the actor takes part in a heterosexual role that one might view as a precursor to his later tumultuous cinematic relationships with women on film. The interaction and its heterosexual implications reinforce Dallesandro’s masculinity without signifying explicit straightness, thus the story plays into the well-established homoerotic trope of
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constructing a straight exterior for a character that does not negate the potential for homosexual relations. Watson makes a point to suggest that the interaction that led to Dallesandro’s expulsion was just “rough play”. This implication proposes that Dallesandro’s intentions were not inherently violent and adds a not-so-subtle sense of sadomasochism to the story as Watson describes Dallesandro’s “long black kerchief” around the hall monitor’s neck.\footnote{Ibid.} Anyone with a general understanding of the hustler archetype can recognize how the details of Dallesandro’s early life read as events that clearly foreshadow the cinematic roles he would become famous for. These biographical details however were publicized after Dallesandro had become a cinematic icon and while they may be factual, their close resemblance to the tropes associated with the hustler archetype makes it probable that Dallesandro’s biographical narrative was strategically retold to compliment and further develop his hustler image.

Other details of the biography work more subtly at supporting Dallesandro’s hustler image. Watson’s choice to include Dallesandro’s preference for friendships with older boys may have been intended as a brief explanation as to how teenage Dallesandro was introduced to criminal activity, however given Dallesandro’s famed status as a gay pin-up, this small detail cannot be read without the hustler’s queer desirability in mind. Allusion to Dallesandro’s close ties to gay culture quietly resound throughout the description of his gang involvement in that gangs are typically homosocial structures and that it has been well established that a
significant portion of Dallesandro’s hustler appeal is a result of his close relationship with danger and crime. The homoerotic themes of Dallesandro’s biography take a clearer shape when it is revealed that his life of gang directly led him to a camp whose attendees are purely made up of other criminal boys. Though not explicitly romantic, is not a far stretch to see the exchange of a hand-drawn nickname between Dallesandro and a fellow camper as an affectionate gesture. The story also has echoes of narcissism, a trait previously described as being commonly associated with male homosexuality, when one thinks of Dallesandro performing his masculinity and proving his strength by repeatedly stabbing himself with a needle to spell out his own name.

Dallesandro managed to escaped the camp before his four-month sentence had ended and decided to leave New York. To fund his departure, Dallesandro robbed a theatre, that had been managed by a gay friend and traveled to Mexico along with another male friend before moving to Los Angeles. Dallesandro only spent three months in Los Angeles before a judge sent him back to his father’s home after he was arrested for assault.44 The short period of time between his escape from Camp Cass and his cross-country road trip concludes this summary of Dallesandro’s early biography because during the actor’s brief time spent in Los Angeles, came the first images of Dallesandro that truly sparked his career and rise to sex symbol status. In keeping with the Dallesandro’s biography leading up to this point, the

The aforementioned section contains details so extraneous that it seems odd anyone would bother to include them. The fact that these details are included probably means they were intentionally incorporated to underscore Dallesandro’s evolution into a hustler icon. For example, knowing that Dallesandro had a gay friend and that he traveled alongside another male friend does nothing for Dallesandro’s image but reiterate that, as is expected of hustlers, he had familiarity with homosexuality and crime. Overall, Dallesandro stands out from other Factory hustlers because his image has been reproduced at greater volumes and has received by greater audiences. No matter the medium, an image of Dallesandro is immediately recognized as the hustler he was constructed to be. Dallesandro’s biography is important because, even though it is not visual, it exists as another key element of his artifice that helps to preserve the recognition of Dallesandro as an icon and model hustler.

The first visual images of Dallesandro to resonate with his hustler stardom are modelling photographs taken in 1965 while the actor was in Los Angeles. In the 1940s, the circulation of erotic gay imagery in the United States was started by two photography studios known as Bruce of Los Angeles and the Athletic Model Guild, or AMG. Boyd McDonald, author of Cruising the Movies: A Sexual Guide to Oldies on TV, explains the foundational role that these studios played in establishing a gay visual culture.
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...decades before photographs of bareassed men became a staple product on newsstands, Bob Mizer, founder of AMG, has been supplying movies and still photographs of the finest male flesh obtainable. He has had trouble with cops and other sexually deranged people and has survived as a hero of modern homosexuality. By now, he has accumulated what is doubtless the world’s greatest treasure of photographs of naked men and of men in posing straps and jock straps, including some of the finest pieces of ass in the military (or AWOL from the military) ... The AMG collection is overwhelming; there is nothing I can say about it. But nothing has to be said; the AMG photographs speak the international language of lust.46

In the studio’s early years, AMG helped perpetuate the eroticization and desirability of sculpted male physiques and erotic, all-American sailor and soldier archetypes by circulating homoerotic imagery intended specifically for gay men (figs 5 and 6). Although gay pornography was illegal in the United States at this time, Mizer was able to disguise his business by claiming that his photos of sexualized nude men were taken for artistic purposes.47 Starting AMG in Los Angeles, the home of Hollywood, meant that Mizer had no shortage of body conscious men to model for him. Mizer recruited from gyms and muscle beaches and primarily targeted body builders, aspiring actors, men who appeared to be “muscled by hard labor”, as well as a variety of “boy-next-door-types.”48

In these early photographs, Dallesandro appears with a clean cut hairstyle and holds his body in poses that accentuate his muscular physique. Based purely on these photographs’ formal characteristics, Dallesandro does not yet fit the hustler aesthetic (fig 7). Dallesandro’s nudity in the photos makes him a blank slate and defining him as any specific character type from these early images is difficult. Out of context, they lack a clear reference to homosexuality, however when framed as act of sexualizing his body for financial gain, these photos do, in fact, resonate with Dallesandro’s hustler role.

In 1967, Dallesandro became involved with the Factory when Morrissey took an interest in casting him in films. Warhol’s description of his initial impression of Dallesandro reads as follows:

We’d met Joe Dallesandro when he wandered by mistake into the apartment in the Village where we were shooting a reel for Loves of Ondine – he was on his way to visit somebody in another apartment in the building. But when we saw the reel with him in it developed, he turned out to have a screen look and a hot-cold personality that Paul got very excited about.

... Paul seemed to see Joe as another Brando or James Dean – a person with a kind the kind of screen magic that’d appeal to both men and women. When saw Paul one day looking Joe’s face over critically, holding his hair back so he could pick out his “bad side,” I could tell that Paul was really interested in making movies with him.49

Framing Dallesandro as an underground alternative to Brando and Dean marks a crucial turning point in the construction of Dallesandro’s archetypal image. By the 1960s the personal lives of these actors had long been the topics of gay gossip

and despite, playing heterosexual characters in films, their images had become well established gay pin-ups.\textsuperscript{50} Brando and Dean’s stardom serves as a blueprint model perfect for articulating the combination of heterosexual performativity and homosexual desirability needed to construct the hustler image and channeling these Hollywood stars into his underground work, Dallesandro began to truly embody the traits that define the hustler type. Looking to Brando and Dean for inspiration also creates a distinction between the style of hustler portrayed by Dallesandro and the hustlers portrayed by Bookwalter and Paul America. While Koch may have seen traces of Hollywood’s good Joe type in the Factory hustlers that came before him, Dallesandro’s public image more closely emulated the subversive Hollywood role known as “the rebel.”\textsuperscript{51}

Dyer explains that while most roles in Hollywood films reflect Western society’s dominate social values, some Hollywood film archetypes are constructed based on a rejection of these dominate values. Characters performing the latter, more subversive roles often come from marginalized social groups, thus it is no surprise that this type of role would more clearly resonate with hustler characters than dominate types like the good Joe. The rebel (also known as “the rebel hero”) and the “independent woman” are two examples of character types seen in Hollywood cinema that represent the manifestations of alternative or marginalized social values. Dyer includes Brando and Dean in the rebel category and while it is

true that not all rebels can be labeled hustlers, based on Dyer’s description of type, it seems that all hustlers exhibit characteristics of a rebel.  

The traces of the good Joe type perceived by Koch when analyzing images of Paul America in *My Hustler* and Bookwalter in *Blow Job* were predominately influenced by each actors’ physical appearances however, no matter how white and clean cut a hustler’s appearance is, the archetype’s role still goes against the morals of dominate society. Under Morrissey’s direction. Dallesandro became the Factory’s most sexualized hustler incarnation. Dallesandro’s long, dark hair and stern expressions signified an image of the hustler that had significantly changed from the bleach blond, easy-going Paul America and depictions of Dallesandro produced by the Factory shed any potential for recognition as anything but a rebel and a hustler (fig 8).

Still closely associated with Warhol, Morrissey began directing his own films beginning in 1967. Although the films were and often still are considered Warhol productions, Morrissey took a noticeably more “commercial” approach to filmmaking in the sense that they followed narrative storylines and were approximately the same length as mainstream commercial films. When it came to content however, the films maintained an underground sensibility by presenting content typically avoided by Hollywood. Drug-use, violence, and gore were common threads throughout Morrissey’s films that helped added a higher level of authenticity and
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realism to Dallesandro’s hustler image. Additionally, the narrative structure of these films allowed Morrissey to exhibit a more in depth look at the numerous ways in which the image of a hustler can be presented. Reaffirming once again, how the role of a hustler is defined according to its binary opposite, Waugh explains:

> If the queen is effeminate, intense, decked out, oral, desirous, and to use Tyler’s 1960s word, “offbeat,” the hustler – or “trade” – is butch, laid-back, stripped bare, taciturn, ambivalent, and “straight.” The queen looks, the trade is looked at: she verbalized and he is spoken to or about. The trade’s iconographical manifestations include a few subtypes, from the biker, the muscleboy, the gigolo, and the cowboy to the surfer, but the variations are in getup, not in substance or style.⁵⁴

“Trade”, a word often associated with hustlers, is an identity whose roots can be traced back to the early 20th century. The label’s origins come from a time prior to the existence of a commonly recognized gay identity. This was a time when men were allowed to engage in sexual acts with one another without having to label their sexuality because there was no need to differentiate heterosexuality from homosexuality. Heterosexuality was simply the assumed nature of all sexual relations and gendered roles were structured according to this assumption. An early 20th century example of this is the relationship between “men” and “fairies”. These relationships existed between two biological males but were not viewed as gay in the way they would be today because these roles mimicked the sexual relationships between males and females. As the label’s connotation implies, fairies were identifiable by their feminine demeanors, and by definition, performance of strictly
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passive sexual roles. As long as a fairy’s sexual partner played an insertive role, he would be viewed as a man.  

The relationships between men and fairies closely resembles the hustler-queen paradigm in that, each mirrors traditional gender roles rather than biological sex. A relationship that more closely resembles the hustler-queen paradigm however, exists specifically between trade and fairies. Trade, according to a definition provided a self-identified fairy in 1919, was a label given to men who “would stand to have queer persons fool around [with] him in any way, shape, or manner.” Unlike the hustler, the original definition of trade could be applied to straight-identified men who had sex with fairies or gay men for pleasure but according to Chauncey: “Trade was also increasingly used in the middle-third of the century to refer to straight-identified men who worked as prostitutes serving gay identified men, reversing the dynamic of economic exchange and desire implied by the original meaning.”

Exploring the theme of social deviance, specifically prostitution, as a foundational element in the construction of the hustler, once again recalls World War II in that during the war, men were exposed to sexual relations in Europe that were not as common in the United States. Explaining the conclusions of a 1955 study conducted by Alfred Kinsey, in order to illustrate the ways in which European travel influenced gay culture in the United States, Chauncey writes:
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Many Italian youths adopted an instrumental attitude toward their bodies before marriage and did not consider it shameful to use them to secure cash or advancement, observers reported, and even many married men were willing to engage in homosexual relations so long as they took the “manly part.” Only the adult male who took the “woman’s part” was stigmatized.\(^{57}\)

In addition to World War II, the formation of the gay identity, and consequently, the hustler, was also strongly influenced by capitalism and the rise of the working class. During the latter half of the 19\(^{th}\) century, the free labor system took off in the United States and individuals began leaving their interdependent family units to become wage laborers. By the beginning of 20\(^{th}\) century there existed a growing class of men and women wage laborers that, because of their separation from the familial sphere, were allowed more freedom to pursue their erotic same-sex desires.\(^{58}\) The hustler, a figure who sells his body for economic gain, can be viewed as an exaggerated manifestation of this phenomenon.

The hustler archetype draws heavily upon the working class for inspiration and while this may not be so apparent when looking at the hustler’s portrayed by Bookwalter and Paul America, Dallesandro’s roles make this connection very clear. In fact, Jennifer Doyle, author of Tricks of the Trade: Pop Art/Pop Sex, refers to Dallesandro as a “working-class hero” when describing his role in Flesh, a film in
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which he plays a hustler who has sex with men in order to support his wife who needs the money to afford an illegal abortion for her extramarital female lover.\textsuperscript{59} Dallesandro performs as several of the hustler manifestations throughout several of Morrissey’s films and each of these various identities come out of the “working-class bachelor subculture”. This subculture was predominately composed of three occupations: seamen, such as marine merchants and sailors; transient workers, who worked outside of the city as agricultural laborers, and construction workers; and common laborers, who worked within city performing rough manual labor jobs. Chauncey notes that this bachelor subculture was also the “primary locus” of fairy and trade parings and specifically looks to the subculture’s dynamics to explain the sexual cultures of immigrant Italian, Irish, African-American, and Anglo-American working-class men.\textsuperscript{60} With this in mind, Dallesandro’s Italian name adds another layer of authenticity to his hustler image.

Visually, Dallesandro’s hustler role is reaffirmed through the circulation of sexualized, pin-up style photographs and several nude film appearances. Dallesandro’s nudity helps to define his hustler image by literally exposing the way that his appearance differs from a queen’s physical appearance. A hustler’s bareness emphasizes his body’s masculine features and implies a sense of naturalism that demonstrates the opposite of a queen’s usually elaborate and

visibly artificial feminine exteriors. Nude or otherwise sexualized images of Dallesandro also underscore his role as an object of erotic desire.

The widespread recognition of Dallesandro’s hustler image comes from the fact that it has been reproduced in so many films. Therefore, it can be challenging to choose one film in which Dallesandro best exemplifies the ideal qualities of a hustler. There are cases such as Flesh for Frankenstein and Blood for Dracula, respectively released in 1973 and 1974, in which Dallesandro plays characters who do not engage at all with homosexuality and only stay true to the actor’s overarching hustler image through these characters’ class, occupation, and sexualization. These explicitly straight roles may add to Dallesandro’s hustler appeal, but these roles would not have been beneficial in the same regard had it not been for previous roles in which the potential for Dallesandro’s sexual relations were more open ended. *Lonesome Cowboys*, released in 1968, is a film that utilizes themes found in previous depictions of Factory hustlers while also incorporating the more rebellious character traits that Dallesandro became known for.

*Lonesome Cowboys* features a scene in which Dallesandro, a member of a small close-knit group of cowboys, is complimented by his cowboy compatriate on his “sexy jacket” that makes him look “butch.” The fellow cowboy then advises Dallesandro on how he should style his hair and also suggests that the two of them do ballet-style exercises designed to “[put] meat on the buns.” The dedication to the maintenance of physical appearance and exaggerated performances of masculinity in this scene is reminiscent of *My Hustler*’s bathroom scene. Unlike the men in *My
*Hustler* however, Dallesandro and his fellow cowboy are not hired hustlers and because of this, the men in Lonesome Cowboys have no need to detach themselves from each other. The occupations of the men in the bathroom are enough to suggest the possibility of homosexual relations to occur and therefore a sense of detachment is required to uphold the straight fantasy but in Lonesome Cowboys, the suggestive homoerotic dialogue between the men is needed to appeal to the erotic desires of a gay male audience because otherwise, it would just be another film about straight cowboys. In Dyer’s opinion:

> The conversation is camp, cowboys talking about their hair and doing pliés, but it also acknowledges that strain in US gay culture that came into its own in the Nautilized seventies, the conscious creation of a hunky lok – so the jacket is good because it ‘looks butch’ and the exercise is good because it tones and builds up the arse. ‘Male’ qualities are being stressed, but there is no intention of passing for straight.61

Perhaps the success of Dallesandro as a hustler comes down to his roles strong camp sensibility. The construction of a hustler is based solely on the idealization of an artifice. Great lengths are taken to construct these characters to appear as genuinely masculine and straight as possible but as objects of gay desire, this process is destined for failure from the start. The idealization of hustlers and the sources from which this character type originates speaks to the nature of how gay culture, and society in general, has evolved over time. In many ways the hustler reflects the conditions of gay men living in a misogynistic and homophobic society.
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Most closeted, and many openly gay men feel the need to reject signs of femininity and are compelled to idealize masculine traits in themselves as a result of a society that, still to this day, devalues femininity. The hustler-queen paradigm represents more than just the lives of gay men however. Ultimately this pairing articulates the highly constructed and performative natures of Western society’s accepted gender roles.
Figure 1 Andy Warhol, Blow Job, 1964, 16mm film, black and white. Available from Magenta Magazine, mag.magentafoundation.org, (accessed April 25, 2016).
Figure 4 Andy Warhol, My Hustler, 1965, Film, Black and white. Available from Advocate, advocate.com (Accessed April 20, 2016).
Figure 5 Bob Mizer, “Physique Pictorial May 1953”, 1953, magazine cover. Available from The Bob Mizer Foundation, bobmizerfoundation.org. (Accessed April 30, 2016).
Figure 7 Bob Mizer, Joe Dallesandro in Physique Pictorial, 1975, Photograph. Available from Lansure’s Music Paraphernalia, lansuresmusicparaphernalia.blogspot.com, (accessed April 30, 2016).
Figure 8 Village Voice advertisement for the opening of Trash, 1970. Advertisement. Available from Warholstars.org, warholstars.org, (accessed May 1, 2016).
Chapter 2
On Queens:

Paralleling the way in which Hollywood both mirrors and constitutes mainstream American culture, Andy Warhol’s underground films served as a medium through which he could both recreate iconic character types commonly found within pop culture while constructing his own personal, idealized version of America. The preexisting archetypal roles that Warhol drew upon to assemble the characters of his films are often defined by a set of traits centered around the gendered roles within American culture. Although the 1960s were a time in America when gendered behavior and aesthetics for both women and men were being revolutionized, Warhol’s use of drag queens and transgender women made it possible for him to reappropriate the icons of past decades and decontextualize these identities within his underground films.

Judith Butler’s 1990 essay, “Imitation and Gender Insubordination”, provides a lens particularly useful for delving further into Warhol’s interest in drag queens and transgender women. From a Butlerian perspective, the art of drag, sometimes referred to as “female impersonation” is not actually the imitation of an original or natural identity. Because there are no universal genders with physical and behavioral traits that remain globally and historically constant, drag cannot truly be considered an appropriation of a natural or rightful gender but rather, the approximation of an idealized image of gender recognizable within its cultural context. Drag is, in itself, an act that exhibits the ways in
which gender must be constantly performed in order to be understood by an audience. The film industry, both mainstream and underground, is similar to drag in that it points out the theatricality that goes into communicating gender through the usage of cinematic tropes that develop from gender stereotypes.

Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman reference a 1967 case study performed by Harold Finkle, in their essay “Doing Gender”, which describes how a transgender woman known as Agnes goes about navigating her daily social interactions while constantly working to pass as a woman. Although she identified as a woman, Agnes had never experienced growing up as girl and therefore lacked a complete understanding of the nuanced ways in which female children learn to express femininity in order to be eventually recognized as women. Women who have been designated female at birth, often can deviate their behavior and appearances from society’s constantly changing ideal of femininity and still be seen as women; Agnes however, had to perform as “120 percent female” in order to pass as the gender she identified as. While this overcompensation of femininity may have been necessary for Agnes to pass as a woman, an overdone feminine performance also risks assumptions of falsity.

Like the work of West, Zimmerman, and Finkle, Warhol’s Philosophy possesses an understanding of the immense amount work required of an individual to pass as a gender not assigned to them at birth. In the chapter titled Love (Senility), Warhol states that he
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is “fascinated by boys who spend their lives trying to be complete girls, because they have to work so hard – double-time – getting rid of all the tell-tale male signs and drawing in all the female signs”. Drag queens play a different social role than transgender women in that they exaggerate femininity to a degree that surpasses simply trying to pass as biologically female and the inherent falsity of this feminine parody is precisely what makes a drag queen camp. No matter if a queen identifies as a man or transgender woman out-of-drag, when in drag, a queen’s image typically goes far beyond the appearance of a “natural female” and instead emulates the images of society’s most celebrated divas and starlets. In The Philosophy of Andy Warhol (From A to B and Back Again), Warhol offers his thoughts on role of the drag in the media:

...Drag queens are living testimony to the way women used to want to be, the way some people still want them to be, and the way some women still actually want to be. Drags are ambulatory archives of ideal moviestar womanhood.

Drag and drag balls were quintessential components of queer culture, mostly for urban gay men, since the turn of the 20th century. Prior to the widespread unification of gay identities that followed WWII, gay men in urban areas, such as New York City, attempted to establish a sense of collective identity through drag balls. From the drag ball emerged the queen archetype; a figure who Chauncey regards as the “symbolic embodiment of gay culture.”
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gay culture, but rather were inspired by gay observations of dominant cultural patterns. Essentially, drag balls were queer interpretations of masquerade balls, a centuries-old tradition that had been popular within vice districts of American cities during the 1880s and 1890s. Masquerades fostered an environment where participants could transgress the social boundaries of class, race, and gender. These events were especially appealing to gay men and women because their identities could not be differentiated from other guests and in some cases the presence of gay men was even openly welcomed as homosexuality was seen as an element that amplified the sense of inversion that was fundamental to these events. In some instances, however, gay men in drag were not tolerated at masquerades because their feminine impersonations were perceived as true expressions of their perversion and not subversive to their everyday societal roles.69

Gay men began coordinating their own masquerade balls in the form of drag balls as early as the 1890s and by the 1920s, venues such as Webster Hall became the site of annual drag balls organized for mainly homosexual audiences and smaller venues, such as Frank’s Place in Brooklyn, allowed gay men in drag to dance with sailors at events held every two weeks.70 Unsurprisingly, many gay men looked down on the ostentatious displays of femininity constructed by queens, however ultimately, these balls were integral to shaping the way homosexuality would be portrayed in the media by shining a spotlight on the dramatic appearances and behavior characteristic of the queen archetype.71
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A queen, as stated in the previous chapter, is an icon recognized for her exaggerated femininity and demonstrates a complete reversal of the hustler’s role. Despite their oppositional traits however, the queen and hustler share a common origin in that each were inspired by the United States’ most idealized images of gender in 20th century. Drawing a comparison between the queen and the hustler, Dyer further elaborates:

The queen too could be taken as a symptomatic figure of the USA: ‘her’ hysterical affectation could be seen as another product of the obsession with effeminacy, with the exaggeration of sex difference in US life, and ‘her’ very being as a ‘fake’ woman, ‘her’ excitement when a man thinks she is ‘real’ (i.e. a woman), ‘her’ modelling of herself on movie stars, all suggest a life lived on the basis of illusion. But the queens also have tremendous energy, courage, and conviction.

A juxtaposition between Blow Job and Warhol’s Mario Banana series, released as two parts in 1964, presents a clear depiction of how the queen and the hustler construct their respective images with opposing characteristics. Like Blow Job, Mario Banana exhibits the theme of fellatio with a fixed, close-up shot of a single performer’s head and upper body. Despite these films’ similar formal and thematic qualities, the solo star of Mario Banana, a queen known as Mario Montez, differentiates her image from Blow Job’s detached Bookwalter by making direct eye contact with her viewers as she mocks performing fellatio while decorated in jewelry, make up, and a fluffy white wig (fig 9). The Mario Banana films are devoid of the same sense of eroticism Warhol communicates in Blow Job through partially obscured or hidden content and a voyeuristic gaze. Instead of acting as a purely passive, unsuspecting subject to Warhol’s camera, the queen activates
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the fixed frame as she brings the blow job into view. Contrary to Blow Job's poor visible clarity, Warhol's use of bright lighting and colored film clearly depicts Montez' face and expressions. Crimp reiterates the differences between archetypes communicates by shifts in clarity by stating: “The queen is fully visible; the hustler is harder to make out.”74 As her role sacrifices eroticism for blunt clarity, the queen also forgoes passivity by exhibiting her own agency. Montez demonstrates her archetypes active role, as she both comically and seductively peels, licks, sucks, and bites a banana she holds delicately with white evening gloves.75 When compared to the erotically charged Blow Job, Mario Banana, despite Montez' alluring outward gaze, is more explicitly camp due to film’s embrace of elaborate artifice and jocular, satirical tone that once again reaffirms the hustler’s role as object of the desire and the queen’s role of eccentric entertainer.

Out of all the characters produced by the Factory, the underground film stars Candy Darling, Holly Woodlawn, and Jackie Curtis stand out as particularly fascinating identities and truly iconic queens. When it comes to discussing these figures today, language choice, particularly pronouns, can pose a challenge due to the ways that mainstream concepts of gender have changed since the initial receptions of these queens. During the 1960s and 1970s, “transgender” was not a term regularly used to refer to individuals who did not identify as the gender they were assigned at birth, especially if these individuals had not undergone gender-reassignment surgery and thus many sources vary between the use of masculine and feminine pronouns in reference to these queens.
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While it can prove problematic to assign anachronistic labels, for this analysis, each of these figures will be predominately refereed to in the context of their queen roles defined purely by exterior gender presentation, not biological sex or interior gender identity.

Although Warhol had explored many variations of the queen archetype throughout the 1960s, it was not until the arrivals of Darling, Woodlawn, and Curtis at the end of the decade that the Factory’s most iconic queen performances began to emerge. By the mid-sixties Warhol and his devoted Factory regulars were deeply fascinated with reconstructing the camp, glamour and decay of Hollywood through their own underground film productions. Morrissey’s narrative and slightly commercial approach to film making played a fundamental role in helping the Factory achieve any resemblance to Hollywood. Morrissey’s film’s also served as the basis for the majority of the Factory’s iconic queer archetypes. Darling, Woodlawn, and Curtis served as the perfect cast of characters for Morrissey to cast in these films because like Dallesandro, they could communicate the characteristics of preexisting Hollywood icons while maintaining an underground sensibility. Already believing they had the charisma and talent to achieve fame, each of these performers stepped into the Factory embodying star qualities drawn the pantheon of Hollywood goddesses that came before them.

More than thirty years prior to Warhol’s first film, actresses such as Greta Garbo began setting the standards of beauty for female actresses and as a result, established an ideal image of femininity in United States.⁷⁶ Stars like Garbo were also significant to the
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foundation of queer archetypes like the queen due to their strong appeal to gay men who experienced isolation and exclusion in their dominate, heterosexual, patriarchal culture.\textsuperscript{77} According to Dyer, the four ways in which audiences consume stardom are emotional affinity, self-identification, imitation and projection.\textsuperscript{78} Having an emotional affinity for a star establishes a baseline from which the consumption of stars can escalate. Being susceptible to this emotional affinity because of their marginalization, gay men as well as other queer individuals are able obtain a level emotional fulfillment they might be unable to receive through their everyday interactions as they witness and self-identify with their idols being desired and celebrated on screen. The consumption of stardom can go further as self-identification turns to imitation and stars like Marilyn Monroe, Kim Novak, Hedy Lamar, and Joan Crawford each become models for their viewers’ existence. In Morrissey’s cinema imitation turns into projection as the film’s queens emulate specific visual and behavioral traits of cinematic icons.

In the summer of 1967, Warhol met Jackie Curtis and Candy Darling, known as Hope Slattery at the time, in the West Village. Describing his first impression of the queens, Warhol writes:

Walking just ahead of us was a boy about nineteen or twenty with wispy Beatle bangs, and next to him was a tall, sensational blonde drag queen in very high heels and a sundress that she made sure had one strap falling onto her upper arm.\textsuperscript{79}

In Warhol’s eyes, Darling was the “most striking queen around.” Compared to
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Curtis, who Warhol referred to as a man, and Woodlawn, who projected a more parodied image of womanhood, Darling was meticulously dedicated to living as both a glamorous and “real” woman who dealt with real women’s issues. According to Warhol, Darling fantasized about being a woman one might find waitressing in a diner, a lesbian, and even a “whore that slapped around men and treated them like dirt.”

If she could not live the life of a glamorous actress, she at least wanted to live the life of a strong, independent, yet still vulnerable woman:

Candy didn’t want to be a perfect woman – that would be too simple, and besides it would give her away. What she wanted was to be a woman with all the little problems that a woman has to deal with – runs in her stocking, runny mascara, men that left her ... the more real she could make the little problems, the less real the big one –her cock– would be.

Darling’s efforts to show the world that she dealt with the same problems faced by all women are all examples of “doing gender” and suggest that all details of her life revolved around being an authentic woman and not just a performer. The biographical details of Darling’s early life present another facet of the actress that contributes an additional layer of femininity to the image of womanhood Darling presented to the world. Whether or not these details are completely true, they represent a perception of Darling that works to counteract the the discrepancy between her gender assigned at birth and the gender she would embody as an underground film star. Darling was born James Lawrence Slattery in 1944 in Massapequa, New York and according Watson, possessed feminine beauty traits even in early childhood which allegedly earned her the title of Most
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Beautiful Baby Girl from Gertz Department Store in Jamaica, Queens. As a baby, Slattery later was given the nicknames “Greta” and “Marilyn” by neighborhood children whose parents prohibited them from playing with him. A series of headshots taken of a ten-year-old Slattery shows alterations drawn in pencil by the young Slattery (fig 10). On the first of the portraits, young Slattery hides a boyish crew cut underneath a lightly shaded bobbed hairstyle that curls upward at the ends. These alterations in appearance suggest that even during childhood, Slattery felt more natural presenting a feminine appearance.  

Much like Warhol, Slattery turned to television for comfort, but not to Western or crime series that portrayed depictions of masculinity idealized by Americans in the 1950s. Instead, Slattery enjoyed reruns of Million Dollar Movie and Gone with the Wind. As a teenager, Slattery began attending a local gay bar known the Hay Loft dressed in semidrag. She soon became known as “the Actress” and was considered a “repository of late-1940s feminine glamour”. The details of Darling’s origin story reach a finale when the Slattery’s mother was presented with the glamourous young woman that her teenage son aspired to be. The conclusion of this story, also an affirmation of Darling’s beauty, is summed up with Slattery’s mother understanding that there was no way she could tell her son to live life as man: the image presented to her was just too beautiful and too talented.  

In 1968, Warhol and Morrissey decided to cast Darling alongside Woodlawn and Curtis, in a satirical film about the women’s liberation movement called Women in Revolt
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after Warhol was shot by Valerie Solanas, an over zealous women's rights activist. The film, released in 1971, offered Darling the opportunity to channel the cinematic women that inspired her since childhood. By far the most glamorous character in the film, Darling plays a wealthy society woman from Long Island and delivers several Marilyn--esque monologues as her character donates her name and money to the feminist movement, in hopes of becoming a film star.85

A portrait of Darling taken by Peter Beard around 1970, perfectly communicates how Darling's image visually connected to blonde Hollywood starlets from the past (fig 11). Her thin, arched eyebrows are evocative of Lana Turner's image while her beauty mark recalls portraits of Marilyn Monroe (figs 12 and 13). Darling’s blonde curls are the ultimate signifier of her connection to Old Hollywood glamour as they create a visual connection between all three iconic identities. Looking at a photograph of Darling next to portraits of Monroe and Novak creates a series of images hauntingly similar to Warhol’s prints of repeated Marilyns. One can see the subtle variations in each face and yet it appears that each of these actresses was cast from the same blonde mold. Darling’s fame never reached the heights of her Hollywood role models, but her passion for achieving stardom combined with her intensely dedicated performance of womanhood made her the perfect candidate for Warhol’s reincarnation of Old Hollywood. Women in Revolt gave Darling the opportunity to be a star in her own right as she recreated the performances of her favorite actresses on-screen, such as the scene where Darling’s character tries to impress an agent with monologues such as Kim Novak’s “I don’t need you” speech from the
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1957 film, *Jeanne Eagles*. A marked difference between the glamour portraits of Darling, Monroe, and Novak is Darling’s lack of cleavage. While Monroe and Novak emphasize the sexuality associated with their stardom with low necklines, Darling masks her chest with clothing that, although feminine, hides her upper body. Instead, she emulates the feminine allure of her film idols with her classic blonde hair, elegant make up, and oversized jewelry.

At the time of the film’s release, Woodlawn had been arguably the cast’s most famous star. Prior to *Women in Revolt*, Woodlawn had acted in Morrissey’s *Trash*. A film in which she performed her queen role alongside the hustler, Joe Dallesandro. Morrissey’s film earned Woodlawn major recognition as an actress and prompted Darling to write a letter to Warhol describing her jealousy toward Woodlawn’s fame:

> Everyone is sick to hear about Holly being nominated for an Academy Award. The idea! The she should be given an award just for being the slob that she really is. Can you believe that? They’re sending Holly to all the photographers. She’s in the Times, and I’m the forgotten woman.

While Darling’s letter obviously exaggerates Woodlawn’s fame, her melodramatic tone exemplifies her commitment to living a cinematic reality. For a brief period after *Trash*’s release, Woodlawn received significant praise for the conviction with which she played Dallesandro’s wife. The newly famous Woodlawn attended as many as six *Trash* screenings, gave newspaper interviews, and was even recognized by her fans in public. Although she believed herself to look like Sharon Tate, as Darling points out in her letter, many people perceived Woodlawn’s image as an example of “drag-done-wrong.”
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the only real physical similarities between Woodlawn and Tate being large eyes, long hair, and thin physiques, Woodlawn’s self-identification with Tate around the time of her controversial murder speaks to the Factory’s obsession with both Hollywood glamour and Hollywood decay (figs 14 and 15).

Comparing both Woodlawn and Curtis to Darling, Warhol biographer Wayne Koestenbaum writes that “Jackie and Holly epitomized deliberately failed drag: maleness, alarming as a pimple, pops through their feminine screens. Candy was more demure.” Despite her passible feminine beauty and her closeness to Warhol, Darling’s career lacked the same trajectory as Woodlawn’s. Before Woodlawn’s debut in Trash, Darling starred in Morrissey’s 1968 film, Flesh, with Curtis and Dallesandro. In an interview with Patrick Smith, author of Warhol’s Art and Films, Woodlawn explains that Darling had been closer Warhol than her other friends and that it was Darling who had inspired her to be in films after she told her Warhol could turn anyone into a star. Woodlawn also tells Smith that although she considered Flesh to be a “real movie” and she enjoyed seeing her friends star in it, she would have rather seen a Lana Turner film. Although, Woodlawn is making a negative comparison between Darling and her idol, Lana Turner, her statement makes it clear that Darling’s image was connected to Turner in Woodlawn’s mind.

Paralleling Woodlawn’s post-Trash ascension to stardom, Darling obtained a greater degree of notoriety in the wake of Women in Revolt. In the few years following the film’s release, Darling was written about in society columns alongside celebrities like Jane
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Fonda and Truman Capote, and even discussed cinematic beauty with former editor of Vogue and Harper’s Bazar, Diana Vreeland via letter correspondence.\(^\text{90}\) Unfortunately, Darling had already experienced a devastating blow to her career in 1970, when she was denied being cast as the transgender protagonist of the cinematic version of Gore Vidal’s *Myra Breckinridge*.\(^\text{91}\) Rather than Darling, the film’s leading role was played Raquel Welch, a cisgender actress whose feminine, curvaceous body communicated a more conventional appeal to the male gaze and therefore allowed Welch to be more easily sexualized than Darling. While Welch’s acting presented gender transition as an erotic fantasy, Darling’s experienced the less idealized reality. Warhol and Darling both believed that if she was going star in a true Hollywood film, it would have been *Myra Breckinridge*. This harsh blow to Darling’s ego permanently changed her attitude toward stardom as it signified to Darling that she would never make it in Hollywood.\(^\text{92}\) Darling died of terminal cancer just three years after the release of *Women in Revolt* and out of all photographs taken of Darling, the images of her on her deathbed has become one of the most well known.

The photographs, taken by Peter Hujar (fig 16), show Darling in her hospital bed, in full makeup, with voluminous blonde hair falling over her pillows, surrounded by flowers from her adoring friends and fans. Darling softly gazes into the camera’s lens with a peaceful expression as her arms stretch backward into an elegant pose. In closer shot,
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Darling shows a slight smile on her face (fig 17). Her final farewells to her friends reads like an Oscar acceptance speech:

To whom it may concern
By the time you read this I will be gone. Unfortunately before my death I had no desire left for life. Even with all my friends and my career on the upswing I felt too empty to go on in this unreal existence. I am just so bored by everything. You might say bored to death. It may sound ridiculous but is true. I have arranged my own funeral arrangements with a guest list and it is paid for. I would like to say goodbye to Jackie Curtis, I think you're fabulous. Holly, Sam Green a true friend and noble person, Ron Link I'll never forget you, Andy Warhol what can I say, Paul Morrissey, Lennie you know I loved you, Andy you too, Jeremiah don't take it too badly just remember what a bitch I was, Geraldine I guess you saw it coming. Richard Turley & Richard Golub I know I could've been a star but I decided I didn't want it. Manuel, I'm better off now. Terry I love you. Susan I am sorry, did you know I couldn't last, I always knew it. I wish I could meet you all again.

Goodbye for Now
Love Always,
Candy Darling

Darling’s calm facial expressions resonate with the acceptance of defeat resounding within this goodbye letter, however her modelesque poses, hair, make, and confident gaze suggest that her spirit not totally defeated by cancer or Hollywood rejection. Even on her deathbed, Darling was a superstar.

In order to deconstruct Darling’s image and the public perception of her character even further, it is important to consider how the reception of Hujar’s photographs have changed over time. During the 1970s and 1980s, Hujar depicted sexuality in ways that were rejected by the majority of his contemporary audiences. Hujar mainly photographed images revolving around his life and the sexual subcultures found in New York City’s
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marginalized social spheres. 94 Today, Hujar’s work has shed its formerly seedy reputation and is recognized as fine art. Bill Arnig’s essay “No One Sucks There Toes Like That Anymore” relates the erotic nature of Hujar’s work to the images produced by Bruce of Los Angeles and Bob Mizer’s Athletic Model Guild. However, while Bruce of Los Angeles and AMG remained fixed within the world of pornography, Hujar’s camp approach to photography allowed his work to transcend into the world of art.95 Hujar’s photographs of Darling exhibit the campy beauty of his images and illustrates how, according to Arnig, Hujar “got his models to be themselves in their most theatricalized versions.”96 Hujar’s photographs of Darling exhibit the actress’s beauty and star quality even to viewers who are unaware of her identity. As Arnig explains:

If we only knew that the pretty blond woman surrounded by flowers was in a hospital dying, it would be a memorable image. If you know she is a transsexual in a period when gender reassignment was rare, we have another layer. When you know that she was one of the lucky ones in many ways (as she got to perform in “real” movies as a glamorous woman due to the intervention of Andy Warhol) the image becomes one that artists today need to make their own …We see the glamour Darling who will not let something like leukemia stop her from rivaling an 30s actress in terms of transcendent beauty.97

In 2005, the Hujar’s Candy Darling on Her Deathbed was chosen by the transgender singer and songwriter Antony Hegarty, of Antony and the Johnsons, to be used as the cover of the band’s album titled I Am A Bird Now. Hegarty’s use of the portrait
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suggests that she trusted that Hujar’s photograph could accurately convey qualities of Darling’s identity that would ultimately lend themselves to the message of the album. This was not the first time that Darling’s image was perpetuated through music however. In fact, Lou Reed’s Walk on the Wild Side, released in 1972, referenced all three of Women in Revolt’s queens.\textsuperscript{98} The lines dedicated to Darling read as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
Candy came from out on the island,  
In the backroom she was everybody’s darling  
But she never lost her head  
Even when she was giving head  
She says, “Hey babe, take a walk on the wild side”\textsuperscript{99}
\end{verbatim}

Reed’s lyrics present an image of Darling that somewhat contradicts the grace and glamour depicted in Hujar’s photographs or Darling’s comparisons to Old Hollywood starlets, however the lyrical illusion adds another level of glamour to Darling’s image in that it contributes a muse-like quality to Darling’s overall iconic identity. A significant difference between the portrayals of Darling, Curtis, and Woodlawn in Reed’s lyrics is that Walk on the Wild Side suggests that Curtis and Woodlawn were biologically male and makes no such implication about Darling. Comparatively, Reed’s allusions to Woodlawn and Curtis imparts a theme of artifice, that cannot be interpreted through his reference to Darling and combined with the muse-like that suggests an element of objectification, the image of Darling portrayed by the song does not closely resemble the queen archetype.

Unlike Curtis and Woodlawn, Darling’s resemblance to the role of the queen is predominately hinged on technicality. By most contemporary audiences, Darling was
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perceived as a man in permanent drag and thus, always a queen. While Curtis and Woodlawn were perceived similarly, their brazen, exaggerated feminine performances evoked a sense of inevitable failure that perpetuated the characteristics of camp and the role of a queen. Curtis and Woodlawn’s chaotic embodiments of womanhood often revealed an underlying suggestion of masculinity that could only be compensated for with more over-the-top femininity in an endless cycle of failure that demonstrated the fragility of gender. Darling however performed a version of femininity that was more constant, committed, and generally reserved. In *Women in Revolt*, her character is a lesbian implying that her image does not need to be reaffirmed with masculine objects of desire and despite her efforts to present herself as an active woman with agency, she exhibits an image of passivity when her character is manipulated into having sex with a man who promises her fame and success.

If Darling had been the Factory’s route to accessing the beauty of former Hollywood idols, Curtis represented simultaneous desire to subvert Hollywood glamour. Aesthetically, Curtis exhibited the most masculinity of *Women in Revolt*’s three leading queens and, as previously mentioned, was the only one of these underground superstars that Warhol referred to as a man because unlike Darling and Woodlawn, Curtis presented as a man when Warhol first met her in 1967. Warhol states in *POPism*, that playing the role of a woman, Curtis was believable because of the exaggerated comedy she put into her performances. When Curtis was in an “in-between stage”, however, Warhol became
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uncomfortable with her appearance.\textsuperscript{101}

Curtis began taking female hormones around the same time that she began filming \textit{Flesh} with Darling. Curtis assumed an androgynous rather than feminine image at this time by completely removing her eyebrows and wearing very heavy makeup.\textsuperscript{102} A still from \textit{Flesh} presents an image of Curtis far less decadent than her look would eventually become (fig. 9). Her façade remains fairly subdued despite her thick make-up, not quite heavy enough to conceal hints of a beard, and her reddish-brown hair is styled in short but feminine cut. A photograph of Curtis from 1969 however shows a much less muted presentation. This photo, taken by Billy Sullivan, depicts an eyebrow-less Curtis with teased, curly red hair and a face completely masked by dense foundation and glittery eye make-up (fig 16).

Perhaps an attempt to increase the irony of \textit{Women in Revolt}, Curtis, the most masculine of three superstars, plays the film’s most devoted feminist and is referred to as “the Queen of the P.I.G.s (Politically Involved Girls)”. Acting as her group’s outspoken organizer and the harshest critic of men, Curtis’ image and character traits recall cinematic roles made famous by Joan Crawford.\textsuperscript{103} Her character is aesthetically rougher around the edges than Woodlawn and Darling and a fiercely strong, independent woman.

Like the “rebel” discussed in the previous chapter, the role of the “independent woman” is an example of a subversive Hollywood archetype due to the role’s opposition to
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dominant social values.\textsuperscript{104} Paralleling the similarities between the hustler and the rebel, the role of the queen closely resembles the independent woman. Ultimately these ties between mainstream and underground film archetypes reiterate that hustler and queen type characters were not always exclusive to queer or underground culture and instead, were inspired by subversive gender relations observable within mainstream culture. Dyer explains that the strong woman can divided into two subcategories known as the “superfemale” or a “superwoman”.\textsuperscript{105} To further elaborate on this categorization, Dyer quotes Molly Haskell, author of \textit{From Reverence to Rape}. According to Haskell:

\begin{quote}
[The superfemale is] a woman who, while exceedingly ‘feminine’ and flirtatious, is too ambitious and intelligent for the docile role society has decreed she play...She remains within traditional society, but having no worthwhile project for her creative energies, turns them onto the only available material – the people around her – with demonic results...[The superwoman is] a woman who, like the superfemale, has a high degree of intelligence or imagination but instead of exploiting her femininity, adopts male characteristics in order to enjoy male prerogative, or merely to survive.\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}

All three leads of \textit{Women in Revolt} demonstrates characteristics of both the superfemale and the superwoman over the course of the film. The queens embody the traits of the superfemale through their exaggerated feminine appearances and through their characters’ rebellious views regarding patriarchy while the defining traits of the superwoman can be observed as the queens’ campy performances reveal their masculine characteristics. In addition to Darling, Woodlawn, and Curtis, other fundamental woman of Warhol’s entourage, such as Edie Sedgwick and Brigid Berlin, resonate well with
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Haskell’s description. Attributing the qualities of the strong woman to women like Sedgwick and Berlin, who cannot be so clearly defined as queens, suggests that while it may be true that all queens embody the role of the strong woman, not all strong women are queens.

Although *Women in Revolt* was essentially a mockery of feminism and the women’s liberation movement, the group of women involved in Warhol’s Factory and the portrayals of women seen in Warhol’s films imply that he truly admired powerful, independent women. Due to the significance psychoanalytic theory had in shaping the perception of homosexuality during the 20th century, uses of the hustler and queen roles sometimes traced back to the theory that gay men grew up with an over dependency on maternal care. In childhood and adulthood, Warhol had a close and complex relationship with his mother. Warhol’s father, Andrej Warhola, was absent for most of Warhol’s childhood because he often had to travel as part of his career as coal miner. When Warhol was just thirteen years old his father died, leaving his mother, Julia Warhola, to raise Warhol and his two brothers alone. During his childhood, Warhol’s mother was his most prominent source of love and attention. She was a safe haven from bullies at school who harassed him for his effeminate nature while also serving as a nurse and entertainer during Warhol’s childhood bouts of St. Vitus’ Dance. Julia also helped foster Warhol’s love of art and pop culture as she rewarded her son with candy for his drawings and read Dick Tracy

comics to him while sickness made him bedridden. Not long after Warhol moved to Manhattan after graduating college, his mother moved in with him and continued to support and care for him.

Simon Watney’s essay, “Queer Andy”, takes a look into Warhol’s childhood from a psychoanalytical perspective particularly paying interest to the relationship between Warhol and his mother. The analysis ultimately suggests that Warhol’s artistic career was shaped by a combination of the adversity that Warhol faced growing up as a queer child and the ways in which he found comfort in both his mother and mass media. The sickly and anxious young Warhol found solace from the bullying in his exterior world and the sickness within his interior world by spending his time dressing up in his mother’s clothing, watching popular 1930s films, listening to the radio, and cutting out pictures from advertisements and magazines. Later on, Warhol would appropriate these elements of mass media to construct his own idealized version of America. According to Watney, “Warhol was endlessly sensitive to the maternal pull of American culture, with its countless cultural images of strong, confident, and articulate women.”

With these theories in mind, one scene of Women in Revolt in which Curtis is shown with her infant child takes on a whole new significance. Although Curtis was the most masculine of the film’s three leading actresses, Warhol chose to show her as the only one to have a child. Becoming a mother, alters Curtis’ image in a complex manner. Because
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masculinity and strength are connotatively linked in America’s cultural ideology, on one hand, Curtis is the obvious choice to take on the role of the strong mother. In this case, it is possible that Curtis’ character serves not only for the purpose of recreating strong female archetypes, but also as a way for Warhol to pay homage to his own mother. On the other hand, the theories regarding gender performativity expressed by Butler, West, and Zimmerman, suggest that perhaps the reason Curtis’ character became a mother was an effort to counteract her more masculine traits. Playing the role of a mother signifies an intrinsic femininity in Curtis and this scene is arguably Curtis’ most feminine appearance in the film, even without a heavily made-up feminine exterior.

Visually, figures playing the queen role in Factory films usually dress and behave in eccentric or outlandish manners and Women in Revolt’s queen perfectly exemplify the loud and over-the-top personalities associated with archetype. As Parker Tyler explains, drag and female impersonation on film was often associated with chaotic and even violent behavior due to drag’s association with marginalized society. Tyler elaborates on this perception by looking back to the origins of drag and explains how these dated views of queer culture influences film by referencing Myra Breckinridge:

[Drag balls] tended – if only because of their link with the gangster world – to get a bit rowdy; inevitably, their tone was a cutely disrespectful parody of high social style … The female impersonator as a rowdy is an enigmatic image with many tentacles of interest. Myra herself seems to illustrate the transsexual operation as an act of female-impersonator violence. After all, she becomes a con woman with pretty rough methods.
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The association between female impersonation and danger or chaos clearly has both homophobic and misogynistic roots. Paralleling the ways in which the hustler reshapes negative perceptions of gay men into hyper-masculine objects of desire, the role of the queen transforms mainstream society’s fear of gender transitioning into strong, assertive, and highly feminine women performing active rather than passive social roles.

Although neither Darling, Woodlawn, nor Curtis were designated women at birth, by constructing images of femininity that emulate idealized feminine icons celebrated and firmly implanted within the memories of their contemporary popular culture, these stars were able to successfully signify their iconic queen roles. Ultimately, the representations of women and femininity produced by Warhol’s Factory demonstrate the instability of socially constructed gender binaries and the necessity to constantly reinforce gender identities through performativity.
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Figure 11 Peter Beard, Photograph of Candy Darling, circa 1970, Photograph.
Figure 12 Everett, Photograph of Kim Novak, 1956, Photograph.
Figure 13 Frank Powolny, Marilyn Monroe, 1953, Gelatin silver print.
Figure 14 Peter Hujar, Candy Darling on Her Deathbed III, 1973, Black and white photograph.
Figure 15 Peter Hujar, Candy Darling on Her Deathbed III, 1973, Black and white photograph.
Figure 16 Jack Mitchell, Photograph of Holly Woodlawn, 1970, Photograph.
Figure 17 Twentieth Century Fox, Photograph of Sharon Tate, 1967, Photograph.
Figure 18 Jackie Curtis and Candy Darling in Paul Morrissey’s Flesh, 1968, Film still.
Figure 19 Billy Sullivan, Jackie Curtis 2, 1969, Photograph.
Figure 20 Jackie Curtis in Andy Warhol’s Women in Revolt, 1971, Film still.
Conclusion

The use of the hustler and queen image in underground media both reflected and helped shape Western culture’s perception of queer identities throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century however, as demonstrated by \textit{Women in Revolt}, these archetypes could also be utilized to portray heterosexual relationships. Based on the evidence observed thus far, it appears that only the queen’s role is flexible enough to be performed by either men or women, while the stricter criteria for the hustler’s role suggests that only men can perform the level of masculinity necessary to construct a hustler’s image. The very nature of the hustler-queen paradigm however is defined by an opposition created by the reversal of traditional active and passive roles resulting in character types defined by either “masculine” femininity or “feminine” masculinity. Logically, this blending of traditional gender traits implies that women must, in fact, be able to identify with the traits of the hyper-masculine hustler. There are examples of feminine Warhol superstars, such as Edie Sedgwick and Brigid Berlin, whose images do not so clearly resonate with the characteristics of the queen archetype, even though, like queens, they were perceived as strong, subversive women. With the “men’s only” restrictions temporarily removed from the hustler type, it may prove useful to look at these women’s roles within the Factory and see how they relate to not only the image of the queen but also the hustler.

Despite the rather negative and transparently disguised image of Sedgwick presented in Warhol’s \textit{Philosophy}, the model, actress, and Warhol superstar’s high level of lasting fame speaks to her influential role in the Factory. During her brief but close friendship with Warhol throughout the course of 1965 and 1966, Sedgwick constructed an
image of femininity that was celebrated by both high and low culture. In a chapter of
Philosophy, titled “Love (Prime)”, referring to Sedgwick as “Taxi,” Warhol tells the story of
“the Fall and Rise of [his] Favorite Sixties Girl”:

...a confused, beautiful debutant who’d split with her family and come to New York. She had a poignantly vacant, vulnerable quality that made her the reflection if everybody’s private fantasies. Taxi could be anything you wanted her to be – a little girl, a woman, intelligent, dumb, rich, poor – anything. She was a wonderful, beautiful blank. The mystique to end all mystiques.114

Although she is remembered by Vogue Italia as the “undisputed queen” of Warhol’s Factory, Sedgwick’s feminine image was far from the queens recognized by queer culture.115 Unlike Women in Revolt’s leading queens, Sedgwick did not have to present an exaggerated performance of her femininity. In fact, Sedgwick achieved her status as an “It Girl” and fashion icon, by adopting a style that was subversive to traditionally feminine appearances.

Sedgwick moved to New York during the summer of 1964.116 She came from a wealthy California family whose lineage could be traced back to the American Revolution, and according to Warhol, the pilgrims.117 Warhol and Sedgwick were introduced in January of the following year and by March, she was a Factory regular and rapidly rising

---

socialite. After covering a party at Steve Paul’s The Scene on 46th Street in August of 1965, Mel Juffe, a reporter for the Journal American, stated to Warhol that he and Edie, were the “absolute pinnacle” of media couples; “the sensation from about August through December of ‘65.” During the same year, Sedgwick frequently appeared in the society columns of New York newspapers and modeled in *Time, Life*, and *Vogue* magazines while also starring as the leading roles in a number of Warhol’s films. The young socialite embodied, a new wave of style and behavior which Diana Vreeland coined as the “youthquake”. In January of 1965, Vogue published an article titled “Youth Quake” describing the phenomenon:

Gone is the once-upon-a-daydream world. The dreams, still there, break into action: writing, singing, acting, designing. Youth, warm and gay as a kitten yet self-sufficient as James Bond, is surprising countries east and west with a sense of assurance serene beyond all years.

In August, of 1966, Sedgwick was featured in Vogue as a representative “youthquaker” (fig 20). The photo of Sedgwick exhibits her signature black tights, short bleached hair, and heavy eye make up. The caption of her photograph reads as follows: “Edie Sedgwick, twenty-two, white-haired with anthracite-black eyes, and legs to swoon over, who stars in Andy Warhol’s underground movies.”

Excluding her heavy makeup, Sedgwick’s short hair and clothing that accentuated

---

120 Ibid., 164
her thin frame represented a modern image of femininity that did not conform to the idealized characteristics that had long been used to sexualize women. Patti Smith’s recollection of her first impression of Sedgwick accurately sums up her iconic style:

The first time I saw Edie was in Vogue magazine in 1965. Vogue magazine was my whole consciousness. I never saw people. I never went to a concert. It was all image. In one issue of Vogue it was Youthquaker people they were talking about. It had a picture of Edie on a bed in a ballet pose. She was like a thin man in black leotards and sort of boat-necked sweater, white hair, and behind her a little white horse drawn on the wall. She was such a strong image that thought, “That’s it.” It represented everything to me … radiating intelligence, speed, being connected with the moment.¹²³

While all prior descriptions of Sedgwick communicate the characteristics of the strong woman archetype and thus, align her with the roles of Darling, Curtis, and Woodlawn, Sedgwick’s childlike or boyish appearance also contributed a level of naivety and innocence to her image. Rather than camp, Sedgwick’s image suggested a hint of tragedy. This theme is echoed by Sedgwick’s appearances in films like Poor Little Rich Girl, Kitchen, and Beauty No. 2 that portrayed Sedgwick as a vacuous object of affection. Due to her heavy drug use, Sedgwick had difficulty memorizing lines and thus her film appearances, just like her features in the press, focused far more on her beauty than acting talent.¹²⁴ Despite her subversive femininity and strong woman persona, in many ways, Warhol’s portrayals of Sedgwick’s sexualized image and minimal acting more closely resembles the role of the hustler than the queen. Perhaps a result of both her economic and cisgender privilege, representations of Sedgwick’s image do not suggest the same level

of effort or active approach to self-presentation that Darling, Curits, and Woodlawn relied on. Like the hustler, Sedgwick’s image, while highly constructed, communicates laziness, stripped-down sex appeal, and the need for maternal guidance, all of which suggest passivity and objectivity. While visiting her parent’s California home in 1966, Sedgwick shocked her family with her appearance. Describing his sister, Johnathan Sedgwick’s states: “[She was] like a stick, no body at all, and wearing the shortest skirts [he had] ever seen, super-fake eyelashes hanging so heavy her eyelids drooped...She was an alien...A painted doll, wobbly, languishing around on chairs, trying to look like a vamp.”125

Sedgwick’s sexualization and drugged passivity is most explicitly notable in her final film Ciao! Manhattan. Factory regulars John Palmer, David Weisman, Robert Margouleff, Genevieve Charbin, and Chuck Wein conceived the idea for Ciao! Manhattan and began filming in 1967 with Sedgwick as their lead and continued until just weeks before Sedgwick’s death in 1971.126 As filming progressed, Sedgwick’s struggle with drug addiction worsened. Consequently, her most hustler-like behavior is observable in the scenes that take place in California after Sedgwick returned home to Santa Barbara in 1968. In these scenes, Sedgwick’s iconic image has changed significantly: her hair is long and brown, her body is notably fuller, and her make-up appears comparatively subdued (fig 21). On film, Sedgwick’s body is sexualized and objectified to a point that many viewers interpret as exploitation in that she is mostly portrayed as nude and either

unconscious or unable to speak coherently.\textsuperscript{127} Sedgwick’s objectivity is emphasized even further by the lustful gaze of the films also hustler-like protagonist, Butch.

\textit{Ciao! Manhattan’s} earliest filmed scenes took place in New York and was originally intended to tell the story of a mission to monitor and control the cities “most beautiful people”; a plot and theme that speaks to a clear Factory influence. Through her performance in these scenes, Sedgwick exhibits her closest resemblance to the role of the queen. Sedgwick’s behavior in these scenes is far more active and energetic while the slight boyishness of her signature image is compensated for by the appearance of her hustler co-star, Paul America.

Sedgwick’s performance in \textit{Ciao! Manhattan} demonstrates that, in certain cases, the superstar could closely resemble both the queen and the hustler, however her image inevitably fails to properly fit into either of these roles because of the realism attached to these depictions. Sedgwick’s image challenged traditional gendered appearances and behavior through innovation while hustlers like Dallesandro and queens like Woodlawn subverted gender by constructing parodies of long-established gender norms. Hustlers and queens, while based on reality, are ultimately campy, exaggerated portrayals of gender and the photographs, film appearances, and biographies that make up their star personae present a fantasy or at the very least, a dramatized version of their realities. While originally, media representations of Sedgwick were certainly intended to communicate a far more idealized view of Sedgwick’s life, this veil of glamour grew more and more

transparent. As her fame increased, Sedgwick’s darkly romantic, underground image could no longer be viewed purely as a construct, but rather a true reflection of her tragic reality.

Berlin is another figure who stands out from other women who frequented the Factory due to her complex relationship with the hustler and queen archetypes. Berlin is remembered as being Warhol’s best friend. As John Waters writes in the “Foreword” of *Brigid Berlin Polaroids*, “When Andy sometimes claimed he was ‘married to his tape recorder’ Brigid must have felt like his mistress.”128 Waters’ statement accurately speaks to Berlin’s disdain for tradition and convention as well as her fearless embrace of sexuality. If one is to consider Warhol a queen, they may also consider Berlin to be his most beloved hustler. This paradigm can be observed in various aspects of Berlin and Warhol’s relationship, such as Berlin’s nonchalant attitude concerning Warhol’s art and fame as well as the opposition between Warhol’s role as voyeur and Berlin’s role as exhibitionist: roles that they each performed through the creation of art.129 Undeniably a rebel, Berlin also used her art to express her resistance to her upper-class, conservative origins as well as the art world’s oppressive attitude towards women.

When attempting to map the roles prescribed by the hustler-queen paradigm onto the relationship between Berlin and Warhol, the instability of fixed gender roles becomes apparent when one takes a more complete look at Berlin in regards to the active role she performed in her relationship to the Factory and how she presented her own image to the

public. It is crucial to note that the public’s perception of Berlin was largely constructed by herself. While sharing a wealthy background and privileged upbringing in common with Sedgwick, a marked difference between the two women is that unlike Sedgwick’s doll-like, passive modelling and acting, Brigid took an active approach to creating images of both herself and the world around her. In Water’s opinion:

    Her self-portraits are splendid; unaffected, unselfconscious and proud. Viva may have been the Garbo of the Warhol stable, but Brigid was the Dina Merrill (albeit larger). Here’s a lady who really lunched but also loved being nude.130

A sizable collection self-portraits taken by Berlin with a Polaroid camera demonstrates her invested interest the art of self-presentation. Through her self-portraits Berlin explores various methods of representing femininity. In some photos she presents herself more passively than others with soft facial expressions and a disconnected gaze which altogether result in a conventionally beautiful image that exhibits characteristics traditionally associated with femininity (fig 22). Photographs such as the aforementioned, lay a neutral groundwork from which Berlin explored self-presentation further by emphasizing or exaggerating femininity through the use of make-up, wigs, costumes, and props. These photos both acknowledge the performativity of gender and evoke the same camp sensibility that queens do through the construction of their over-the-top femininity (fig 23). Berlin’s self-presentation becomes even more subversive to traditional gender roles when she appears nude, sexualizing images of herself that mainstream culture may view as unflattering and unapologetically making strong, active, and direct eye contact with the viewer (figs 24 and 25).

---

The active approach Berlin took to constructing her own image followed through to her method of reacting to the male dominated art world and the Warhol dominated Factory. Perhaps an effort to take control or assert power over her surroundings, Berlin exhibited a nearly obsessive approach to documenting and archiving her world. Berlin reversed the male gaze by turning her camera around to capture some of the most successful men in the art world and then neutralized this gaze by using her camera to indiscriminately reveal the vulnerability in subjects of all genders. Berlin’s camera could even break through the artifice of Warhol’s highly constructed appearance to reveal a vulnerable and human side behind his machine-like exterior persona.131

While the ability to break away from tradition by creating new gender roles and archetypes that structure representation of an entire culture for decades truly exemplifies the artifice and flexibly of gender, looking beyond a queer context and comparing figures such as Sedgwick and Berlin to the hustler and queen archetypes reveals that challenging traditional gender roles through a restructured gender binary is somewhat counterintuitive. Queer culture’s ability to reclaim oppressive stereotypes through the construction of iconic archetypes demonstrates an impressive reversal of power, however attempting to deconstruct the characteristics of these archetypes and analyzing their relation to some of their most notable uses in the media has proven that the ideal qualities of these archetypes are only successfully recognized as ideal when they are clearly fictional. As soon the traits of the queen or hustler lose their sense of campiness, in most cases, they become dark manifestations of the negative stereotypes these characters were
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meant to subvert. Finally, while it may have never been the intention of queer culture to invent these roles as subversive reflections of traditional gender binaries, these archetypes, even when successfully recognized, essentially works to denaturalize queer relationships and non-binary identities and reassert the dominance of heteronormativity by implying that queer identities must conform to structures mirroring heterosexual pairings and binary gender roles.
Figure 21 Enzo Sellario, Edie Sedgwick, Photograph. Available from: The Vogue Archive, (accessed April 13, 2016).
Figure 22 Film still of Edie Sedgwick in John Palmer and David Weisman’s Ciao! Manhattan. Digital image. Available from: academic.blogspot.com, (accessed April 13, 2016).
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